

Parents as Teachers:

Causal Evidence on Home-Based Parental Tutoring

Kristof De Witte and Joana Maldonado

Leuven Economics of Education Research – www.feb.kuleuven.be/LEER

Cherry Blossom Financial Education Institute April 21-22, 2022

Parental Tutoring



Extracurricular private tutoring (e.g. Guill, Lüdtke, & Schwanenberg, 2019; Hof, 2014; Zhang, 2013)

Parental tutoring

Parental involvement in homework (e.g. *Maldonado, De Witte, & Declercq, 2019; Van Voorhis, 2003*)

Home schooling (e.g. *Ray, 2000; Yu, Sackett, & Kuncel, 2016*)

Parental Tutoring



Extracurricular private tutoring (e.g. Guill, Lüdtke, & Schwanenberg, 2019; Hof, 2014; Zhang, 2013)

Parental Tutoring

Parental involvement in homework (e.g. Maldonado, De Witte, & Declercq, 2019; Van Voorhis, 2003)

Home schooling (e.g. *Ray, 2000; Yu, Sackett, & Kuncel, 2016*)

Contribution

Intervention



Intervention	 Home-schooling of financial literacy (e.g. <i>Ray, 2000; Yu, Sackett, & Kuncel, 2016</i>) Extracurricular tutoring by private tutors (e.g. <i>Guill, Lüdtke, & Schwanenberg, 2019; Hof, 2014; Zhang, 2013</i>) Parental involvement in homework (e.g. <i>Maldonado, De Witte, & Declercq, 2019; Van Voorhis, 2003</i>) 	Parents as Teachers Tutoring by Parents	
Outcomes	Student performance (e.g. Mitchell & Begeny, 2014) Parental Self-Efficacy (e.g. Lahart, Kelly, & Tangney, 2009)	Students & Parents Learning Effects	
Methodology & Sample	Early childhood (e.g. Haney & Hill, 2007; Wagner, Spiker, & Linn, 2002) Selection issues & lack of statistical power (e.g. Mitchell & Begeny, 2014; Powell-Smith, Stoner, Shinn, & Good III, 2000)	Causal Effects RCT with 1,434 students in grade 9 & 10	

Intervention



KU LEUVEN

Parental Tutoring

1. Can parental tutoring at home achieve the same learning effects as teacher-led instruction in the class at school?

2. Are there spill-over effects to the parents?



KU LEUVEN

Experimental Design



Classroom Intervention

Standardised computer class

- Interactive & adaptive digital learning path
- Topic: Financial safety nets and insurance
 - E.g.: Social security, income inequality, government support
- · Independent work in groups of two students
- · Detailed instructions for teachers





KU LEUVEN

Relevance to parents

- \rightarrow Personal finance
- → Active citizenship

Leuven Economics of Education Research

Tutoring Intervention



KU LEUVEN

Interactive discussion

• 11 statements: Discussion, decision, explanation



Tutoring Intervention



Interactive discussion

Discussion & Decision



Stelling 1:

De overheid moet er voor zorgen dat er een wettelijk minimumloon

is.

Niet akkoord Geen mening Akkoord



0)

🖹 HUISWERK: STELLINGENSPEL

Stelling 1

Lees de stelling voor. Discussieer dan met je ouder(s) wat elk van jullie erover denkt. Nadat iedereen haar/zijn mening heeft uitgedrukt beslissen jullie of jullie als gezin met de stelling akkoord gaan. Bekijk dan de uitleg op de volgende pagina. Op de laatste pagina kunnen jullie de mening van jullie gezin met de antwoorden van andere gezinnen vergelijken (anoniem).

* Stelling 1:

De overheid moet er voor zorgen dat er een wettelijk minimumloon

is.

Niet akkoord Geen mening Akkoord

Tutoring Intervention



KU LEUVEN

Interactive discussion

Explanation •



Uitleg:

Dat is correct. In 2016 verbleven er 1 812 409 inwoners met een niet-Belgische nationaliteit in België. Meer dan 800 000 van deze immigranten zijn afkomstig uit landen van de EU.

Structuur van de Belgische migratie

	aantal
EU 27	864 756
Europa buiten de EU	128 852
Azië	270 652
Δfrika	467 778



Parents

HUISWERK MET OUDERS

Uitleg stelling 4

Lees de uitleg. Bespreek met uw kind of iedereen de uitleg goed begrijpt

Stelling 4:

De grootste groep immigranten in België komt uit de Europese Unie.

Uitleg:

Dat is correct. In 2016 verbleven er 1 812 409 inwoners met een niet-Belgische nationaliteit in België. Meer dan 800 000 van deze immigranten zijn afkomstig uit landen van de EU.

Structuur van de Belgische migratie

	aantal
EU 27	864 756
Europa buiten de EU	128 852
Azië	270 652
Afrika	467 778

Sample



KU LEUVEN

Student Characteristics at Baseline



	(0) Control	(1) Classroom	(2) Parents	(0)-(1)	(0)-(2)	(1)-(2)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	p-value	p-value	p-value
Female	0.443	0.556	0.529	0.044	0.139	0.694
Age	14.721	14.793	14.769	0.656	0.745	0.887
Grade 9	0.496	0.453	0.415	0.788	0.561	0.825
Private school	0.714	0.863	0.758	0.224	0.776	0.469
Academic track	0.679	0.602	0.790	0.623	0.457	0.293
Language grade 1/5	3.439	3.426	3.462	0.927	0.839	0.817
Mathematics grade 1/5	3.128	3.093	2.935	0.815	0.163	0.310
Socioeconomic status 1/5	3.221	3.188	3.473	0.809	0.019	0.037
ICT at home 0/9	7.181	7.495	7.571	0.053	0.000	0.605
Speaks Dutch at home 0/1	0.788	0.751	0.894	0.702	0.018	0.128
Immigration background 0/1	0.336	0.295	0.246	0.503	0.142	0.365
Parents help with homework 1/5	1.937	1.942	1.938	0.969	0.997	0.976
Family communication frequency 1/5	2.261	2.237	2.246	0.859	0.868	0.948
Number of students	524	430	480			
Number of schools	25	16	21			
Standard deviations in parentheses. The	e value displaye	d for t-tests are p-va	lues. Standard er	rors are cluste	ered at schoo	l level.



Student Test Scores



	(0) Co	ntrol	(1) CI	assroom	(2) Pare	ents	(0)-(1)	(0)-(2)	(1)-(2)
	N	Mean	Ν	Mean	N	Mean	p-value	p-value	p-value
Pretest									
Knowledge Score 0/10	524	4.061	430	4.012	480	4.825	0.898	0.042	0.072
Midline Test									
Targeted knowledge score 0/5	524	2.578	391	3.652	308	3.591	0.000	0.000	0.687
Posttest									
Knowledge score 0/10	524	5.095	430	6.153	480	6.531	0.019	0.000	0.453
Targeted knowledge score 0/5	524	2.578	430	3.533	480	3.398	0.000	0.000	0.577
Second Posttest									
Targeted knowledge score 0/5	524	2.578	92	2.989	176	3.358	0.065	0.006	0.276
Standard deviations in parenthese	es. The v	alue display	ed for t-test	ts are p-valu	les. Standard	errors are	e clustered at sc	hool level	



Parent Test Scores



	(0) Co	ntrol	(1) CI	assroom	(2) Par	ents	(0)-(1)	(0)-(2)	(1)-(2)
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	p-value	p-value	p-value
Parent's education 0/2	233	1.579	184	1.576	366	1.639	0.966	0.354	0.386
Helps with homework 1/5	236	2.127	187	2.332	372	2.094	0.149	0.782	0.109
Values economic education 1/5	214	4.290	175	4.246	246	4.305	0.659	0.789	0.543
Self-assessment 1/5	214	3.701	175	3.749	245	3.792	0.518	0.267	0.440
Pretest									
Knowledge score 0/6	205	3.063	163	3.110	231	3.502	0.799	0.015	0.037
Posttest									
Knowledge score 0/6	103	4.019	85	3.941	304	4.786	0.804	0.001	0.004
Standard deviations in parenthese	es. The v	/alue displaye	ed for t-test	ts are p-value	es. Standard	d errors are c	lustered at sc	hool level	!.



Methodology





Methodology

Intention-to-Treat Regression (ITT)

$$y_{i,j,k}^{1} = \alpha_{0} + \alpha_{1}y_{i,j,k}^{0} + \sum_{1}^{2}\beta_{k}treatment_{k} + \delta \sum X_{i} + \varepsilon_{i,j}$$

- $y_{i,j,k}^1$ standardised posttest score for student *i*, in school *j*
- Reference group: control
- β_k identify the ITT effect for the two treatment groups k=[1,2]
- X_i a vector of covariates of student characteristics measured at baseline
- $\varepsilon_{i,i}$ clustering of standard errors at school level

Results



KU LEUVEN

Students' Knowledge After the Intervention

Posttest	Knowledge		Targeted Knowl	edge		
Classroom	0.523***	0.524***	0.835***	0.834***		
	(0.157)	(0.150)	(0.088)	(0.087)		
Parents	0.531***	0.502***	0.665***	0.635***		
	(0.122)	(0.123)	(0.077)	(0.075)		
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Classroom vs. Parents	0.963	0.891	0.052	0.019		
R-squared	0.226	0.235	0.229	0.240		
N	1434	1434	1223	1223		
OLS regression. Reference category: control group. Standard errors clustered at school level in parentheses. * p <						

0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. Scores are standardised relative to the control group mean at baseline.

Students' Knowledge After the Intervention

Posttest	Knowledge		Targeted Knowl	edge		
Classroom	0.523***	0.524***	0.835***	0.834***		
	(0.157)	(0.150)	(0.088)	(0.087)		
Parents	0.531***	0.502***	0.665***	0.635***		
	(0.122)	(0.123)	(0.077)	(0.075)		
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes		
Classroom vs. Parents	0.963	0.891	0.052	0.019		
R-squared	0.226	0.235	0.229	0.240		
N	1434	1434	1223	1223		
OLS regression. Reference category: control group. Standard errors clustered at school level in parentheses. * p <						

0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. Scores are standardised relative to the control group mean at baseline.

General financial literacy

• No spill-over effect on knowledge about interest, inflation, diversification

Evolution of Students' Knowledge



Instrumental Variables Estimation

Posttest	Knowledge		Targeted Knowledge		
Classroom	0.575***	0.582***	0.823***	0.828***	
	(0.164)	(0.157)	(0.104)	(0.107)	
Parents	0.862***	0.828***	0.813***	0.792***	
	(0.173)	(0.180)	(0.142)	(0.143)	
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Classroom vs. Parents	0.147	0.202	0.944	0.792	
R-squared	0.211	0.221	0.228	0.241	
N	1434	1434	1434	1434	
OLS regression. Reference category: control group. Standard errors clustered at school level in parentheses. * p <					
<u> </u>	ores are standardised	I relative to the contro	ol group mean at bas	eline.	

Instrumental Variables Estimation

Posttest	Knowledge		Targeted Knowledge		
Classroom	0.575***	0.582***	0.823***	0.828***	
	(0.164)	(0.157)	(0.104)	(0.107)	
Parents	0.862***	0.828***	0.813***	0.792***	
	(0.173)	(0.180)	(0.142)	(0.143)	
Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Classroom vs. Parents	0.147	0.202	0.944	0.792	
R-squared	0.211	0.221	0.228	0.241	
N	1434	1434	1434	1434	
OLS regression. Reference category: control group. Standard errors clustered at school level in parentheses. * p <					
0.10, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Scores are standardised relative to the control group mean at baseline.					

Results are robust

- Quantile regression & heterogeneous effects
- Accounting for teacher characteristics
- Lee bounds & matching of student characteristics

Parents: Effects on Knowledge

Parent Posttest	Parental Knowledge			
Classroom	0.093	-0.017		
	(0.162)	(0.139)		
Parents	0.483***	0.351***		
	(0.146)	(0.129)		
Controls	No	Yes		
Classroom vs. Parents	0.026	0.010		
R-squared	0.279	0.368		
N	231	231		
OLS regression. Reference category: control group. Standard errors clustered at school level in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Scores are standardised relative to the control group mean.				

Conclusions



KU LEUVEN

Conclusions

When compliance can be enforced, a complementary parental tutoring session at home can achieve the same knowledge gains as an additional class at school.

- \rightarrow Knowledge about the topics of the tutoring class higher for teacher-led class
- → This advantage of school-based teaching is due to non-compliance with the parental tutoring class at home
- → Replacing a single class at school with home-based teaching by parents does not affect educational equality
- \rightarrow Parental tutoring results in higher persisting learning effects

Parents also experience knowledge gains from tutoring their children

 \rightarrow Parental involvement in education also offers learning benefits for parents



Parents as Teachers:

Causal Evidence on Home-Based Parental Tutoring

Kristof De Witte and Joana Maldonado

Leuven Economics of Education Research – www.feb.kuleuven.be/LEER

Cherry Blossom Financial Education Institute April 21-22, 2022