

Angerer, Silvia; Bolvashenkova, Jana; Glätzle-Rützler, Daniela; Lergetporer, Philipp; Sutter, Matthias

Working Paper

Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data

Working Papers in Economics and Statistics, No. 2021-17

Provided in Cooperation with:

Institute of Public Finance, University of Innsbruck

Suggested Citation: Angerer, Silvia; Bolvashenkova, Jana; Glätzle-Rützler, Daniela; Lergetporer, Philipp; Sutter, Matthias (2021) : Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data, Working Papers in Economics and Statistics, No. 2021-17, University of Innsbruck, Research Platform Empirical and Experimental Economics (eeecon), Innsbruck

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/240445>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data

**Silvia Angerer, Jana Bolvashenkova, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler,
Philipp Lergetporer, Matthias Sutter**

Working Papers in Economics and Statistics

2021-17



University of Innsbruck
Working Papers in Economics and Statistics

The series is jointly edited and published by

- Department of Banking and Finance
- Department of Economics
- Department of Public Finance
- Department of Statistics

Contact address of the editor:
research platform "Empirical and Experimental Economics"
University of Innsbruck
Universitaetsstrasse 15
A-6020 Innsbruck
Austria
Tel: + 43 512 507 71022
Fax: + 43 512 507 2970
E-mail: eeecon@uibk.ac.at

The most recent version of all working papers can be downloaded at
<https://www.uibk.ac.at/eeecon/wopec/>

For a list of recent papers see the backpages of this paper.

Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data*

Silvia Angerer¹, Jana Bolvashenkova², Daniela Glätzle-Rützler³,
Philipp Lergetporer², and Matthias Sutter^{4,3}

¹ UMIT – Private University for Health Sciences, Medical Informatics and Technology

² ifo Institute at the University of Munich

³ University of Innsbruck

⁴ Max Planck Institute for Research into Collective Goods Bonn and University of Cologne and IZA Bonn

Abstract

We present direct evidence on the link between children's patience and educational-track choices years later. Combining an incentivized patience measure of 493 primary-school children with their high-school track choices taken at least three years later at the end of middle school, we find that patience significantly predicts choosing an academic track. This relationship remains robust after controlling for a rich set of covariates, such as family background, school-class fixed effects, risk preferences, and cognitive abilities, and is not driven by sample attrition. Accounting for middle-school GPA as a potential mediating factor suggests a direct link between patience and educational-track choice.

Keywords: patience, education, school track choice, children, lab-in-the-field experiment

JEL classification: C91, D90, I21, J2

21 May 2021

* We thank Marc Piopiunik, Larissa Zierow, and seminar participants at the ifo Center for the Economics of Education for helpful comments. We thank Rudolf Meraner from the South Tyrolean State Board of Education (Deutsches Bildungsressort Bereich Innovation und Beratung), the schools' headmasters (Gabriella Kustatscher, Maria Angela Madera, Eva Dora Oberleiter, Brigitte Öttl, Ursula Pulyer, Vally Valbonesi), and the parents of the involved children for making this study possible, and the children for participation. Financial support from the Government of the autonomous province South Tyrol through grant 315/40.3 is gratefully acknowledged.

1. Introduction

A key feature of many school systems around the world is tracking, which requires children to select one of several school tracks that differ in terms of their academic content, length, and future labor-market opportunities.¹ According to human capital investment theory (e.g., Mincer, 1958; Becker, 1964; Heckman et al., 2006), children’s patience should play a decisive role in their school-track choice, since the additional investments in terms of time, effort, and foregone immediate earnings that are required when choosing an academic school track have to be set against discounted future gains. Yet, direct empirical evidence on the link between children’s patience and their school-track choices is largely lacking. This is the research gap that we address in this paper.

To this end, we link incentivized intertemporal-choice data that we collected in a lab-in-the-field experiment with 493 primary-school children (grades two to five) in Northern Italy with administrative information about their school-track choices taken three to six years later (after middle-school, i.e., after grade eight). The resulting dataset is characterized not only by low attrition, but also by its exceptional richness: It contains detailed individual-level information on children’s family background, an incentivized measure of their risk preferences, cognitive abilities, and middle-school grade point average (GPA).² This combination of experimental, survey-based, and administrative information equips us with the rare opportunity to investigate how patience correlates with educational decisions years later, and how robust the relationship is to controlling for important background characteristics.

We find a strong and positive relationship between patience and school-track choice: Children who are one standard deviation more willing to invest into the future in the intertemporal-choice task conducted in primary school are 4.6 percentage points more likely to choose the highest educational track at the end of middle school. The fact that we measured children’s patience years before they took school-track choices excludes the possibility that our finding suffers from reverse causation problems. We expose our main result to a series of robustness tests. First, to account for sample attrition (which is generally low in our data), we employ inverse-probability weighting and attrition bounding and show that our findings are unaffected by attrition. Second, we control for a host of important background

¹ Throughout the paper, “tracking” refers to between-school tracking where children are sorted into schools with a vocational or an academic focus. This form of tracking is prevalent in many countries: Among the 37 OECD countries that participated in the 2018 PISA test, three track children into different school types at the age of 10 years, four at age 11, three at age 12, three at age 14, and 10 at age 15 (OECD, 2020). See Betts (2011) for a discussion of within-school ability tracking that is present, for instance, in the US.

² In our setting, middle-school GPA refers to the middle-school final grade which is a measure of overall school performance at the end of middle school (see section 3.2 for details).

characteristics, namely children's family background (migration background and proxied parental earnings), school-class fixed effects, an incentivized measure of children's risk-taking, and cognitive ability measured with Raven's test. The association between patience and the educational-track choice remains robust to adding these variables as controls. Third, we investigate the extent to which the relationship between patience and the educational-track choice is mediated by children's middle-school GPA. As expected, GPA is significantly correlated with children's patience, and with the probability to choose the academic track. Importantly, however, controlling for GPA leaves the significant association between patience and academic track choice intact, which suggests a direct link between the two variables.

We contribute to the literature that investigates the relationship between economic preferences and field behavior. Among adults, patience has been shown to predict occupational choices, credit-card borrowing, or unhealthy consumption behavior (e.g., Khwaja et al., 2007; Chabris et al., 2008; Burks et al., 2009; Meier and Sprenger, 2010). Focusing on the field behavior of children and adolescents, previous studies report that more patient children and adolescents are less likely to drink alcohol or smoke, to receive disciplinary referrals, or to drop out from school (e.g., Castillo et al., 2011, 2018, 2020; Sutter et al., 2013; Backes-Gellner et al., 2021). This literature has so far focused on school misconduct, dropout, or achievement test scores (e.g., Bettinger and Slonim, 2007), but school-track choices have not yet been linked to incentivized measures of patience. While we account for the relationships between patience and educational performance (influencing also dropout decisions) in our analysis, we consider our focus on school-track choice an important extension to the existing literature for at least two reasons. First, many education systems entail between-school tracking (OECD, 2020), which implies that a large part of all children around the globe faces the choice between attending a more or less academic school track at some point of their educational career. Second, this choice has important repercussions for their subsequent educational paths, skill development, and labor-market success (e.g., Hanushek et al., 2017). Yet, the extent to which children's economic preferences are a potential driver of these decisions has hardly been studied before.

Our paper also relates to studies showing that hypothetical, non-incentivized measures of patience predict educational outcomes. Closest to our study, Golsteyn et al. (2014) show that more patient individuals are more likely to attend the science track in upper secondary school in Sweden, and have more favorable lifetime outcomes. Interestingly, they show that the relationship between patience and long-run outcomes operates through early human capital investments. Besides relying on an incentivized

patience measure as opposed to a hypothetical one, our study differs from Golsteyn et al. (2014) in terms of the institutional context. The fact that high-school track choice is *not* restricted by past educational performance in the setting that we study (see section 2 for details) makes it likely that children’s patience has a direct effect on school-track choice. In line with human-capital investment theory, we in fact find that patience has explanatory power for academic track choice that is independent from children’s GPA. Relatedly, Cadena and Keys (2015) use data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) and show that respondents aged between 15 and 27 years who are perceived as restless by the interviewer (which is their proxy for impatience) exhibit worse educational and labor-market outcomes as young adults. Furthermore, Figlio et al. (2019) and Hanushek et al. (2020) show that a society’s level of patience measured in international surveys (Hofstede et al., 2010; Falk et al., 2018) is closely linked to student performance in the PISA test. We also relate to the famous psychological studies on the “marshmallow test”, which have shown that the decision of four-year olds not to eat one marshmallow now, but to wait to receive a second one later, predicts educational success and other favorable life outcomes years later (e.g., Mischel et al., 1972, 1989; Shoda et al., 1990). Importantly, Castillo et al. (2020) show that economic time preferences (measured in incentivized decision problems) are a distinct contributing factor to educational outcomes over and above children’s behavior in the marshmallow task, which demonstrates that studying the relationship between experimental measures of time preferences and educational outcomes is an important complement to these psychological studies.

Furthermore, our paper contributes to the education-economics literature on educational tracking. Several studies investigate how (the timing of) between-school tracking affects students’ educational outcomes or labor-market success (e.g., Hanushek and Woessmann, 2006; Pekkarinen et al., 2009; Pekkala Kerr et al., 2013; Piopiunik, 2014; Dustmann et al., 2017). While the results are somewhat mixed, they tend to find that earlier tracking increases inequality in these outcomes. A smaller strand within this literature investigates individual determinants of children’s school-track choices, and finds that relatively older children in a class, those from more advantaged family backgrounds, or those receiving high-intensity mentoring are more likely to choose a more academic school track (e.g., Dustmann, 2004; Mühlenweg and Puhani, 2010; Falk et al., 2020). Yet, school-track choices turn out to be largely unaffected by teachers’ gender, class size, or stated risk preferences of parents (Wölfel and Heineck, 2012; Argaw and Puhani, 2018; Puhani, 2018). To the best of our knowledge, this literature has not yet studied the relationship between incentivized measures of children’s patience and their school-track choices.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the institutional background on the education system in Northern Italy. Section 3 presents our data. Section 4 presents our results, and section 5 concludes.

2. Institutional background

The Italian school system comprises ten years of compulsory school, starting at the age of six years with primary school (see Appendix Figure A1 for a graphical illustration). After five years of primary school, all children attend a comprehensive three-years middle school from which they graduate with an exit exam. Assignment of children to primary- and middle schools is based on the children's place of residence in the schools' catchment areas and thus, unless changing residence, children from one primary school go to the same middle school. Only after graduating from middle school, children can choose between different high-school tracks (of which the first two years are still mandatory, although high schools last for longer).

There are three possible high-school tracks. Children may choose a vocational track or one of two academic tracks: generic high schools with various focus areas (such as sciences, languages, or arts) or technical schools specializing in specific fields of study (e.g., economy, technology). Both types of high schools take five years and lead to the statutory exit exam that is required for university admission. The vocational track is usually organized as a dual apprenticeship that combines formal schooling with in-company training. Its duration is three or four years (depending on the program) and it is oriented towards practical subjects enabling students to enter the labor market upon completion (Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol, 2020a). Children's track choice at the end of middle school has important economic long-term consequences: An academic degree is associated with an average increase in available net income of 18.1% compared with a compulsory school degree (after 10 years of schooling), whereas a professional qualification is associated with an average increase in available net income of 6.6% only (Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol, 2020c). Overall, about 65% of children choose an academic track (35% a generic high school and 30% a technical school) and 35% the vocational track (Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol, 2020b).

Two distinctive features of the Italian school system are particularly noteworthy in the context of our study: First, the school system is comprehensive until the end of middle school, which makes the high-school track choice the first key educational decision that children take. Second, access to different high-school tracks is unrestricted and independent from school grades. This implies that children's educational

careers are not determined by past performance, but largely depend on their high-school track choices that we study as the dependent variable in this paper. The middle-school GPA merely constitutes a guideline for children and their parents as to whether they are suited for the academic track in terms of their educational performance (which is similar to, e.g., non-binding secondary school-track recommendations in several states in Germany; see Bach and Fischer, 2020).³

3. Data

3.1 Experimental data

Patience measure. We elicited children's patience in an incentivized choice experiment using a simple investment task (similar to the convex time budget method of Andreoni and Sprenger, 2012a). Children were endowed with 5 tokens and had to decide how many tokens to consume immediately (by exchanging them into small presents), and how many tokens to invest in the future. Each invested token was doubled and the respective presents were delivered 4 weeks after the experiment. On average, children invested 2.245 (SD: 1.657) tokens into the future (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics). We take the number of invested tokens as our measure of patience. A major advantage of this procedure is that it is very easy to understand, which is crucial to minimize measurement error when eliciting preferences in young children, and at the same time strongly relates to more traditional measures of patience, like choice list tasks.⁴

Experimental procedure and subject pool. Our experiment was part of a larger research project investigating the development of economic decision making in primary-school children. The project was conducted in all fourteen primary schools in Meran (South Tyrol, Italy) with 86% of children participating between 2011 to 2013, and entailed six experimental sessions run during regular school hours (see, e.g., Angerer et al., 2016, for details on the general setting and Sutter et al., 2019, for a review). The time-investment task was part of the fourth experimental session and was conducted in the school year 2012/13, the second year of the research project. Thus, we measured children's patience in grades two to five of primary school. For this paper, only data from children attending German-speaking

³ An interesting question in our context is to what extent parents influence children's school-track choices. While we are not aware of evidence for Italy, Lergetporer et al. (2021) document for Germany that children and parents tend to have equal weight in children's educational decisions, highlighting the relevance of studying the relationship between children's patience and school-track choices. We consider investigating the relative influence of children's and their parents' patience (which tends to be correlated across generations; Kosse and Pfeiffer, 2012) on children's educational choices an interesting avenue for future research.

⁴ In fact, only 4 out of 493 children (0.81%) from our sample had comprehension problems. Excluding these subjects with comprehension problems from the analytical sample does not affect our results qualitatively.

primary schools are analyzed as we did not obtain educational data from Italian-speaking schools as explained below. In total, we obtained time-investment data from 493 second- to fifth-graders (aged 7 to 11 years) in 47 classrooms of seven German-speaking schools. Appendix Table A1 presents the number of subjects broken down by grade and gender.

At the beginning of the experimental session, children were fetched from the classroom and brought to a separate room where the experiment took place. The room contained several individual workplaces for a one-to-one explanation of the task by trained experimenters. All experimenters explained the game orally (see Appendix B for the experimental instructions) to every single child. To check for comprehension, the explanation involved control questions, and children had to repeat the rules of the game in their own words before making their decisions. The decisions were incentivized with experimental tokens that could be exchanged for little presents, like candies, peanuts, stickers, marbles, balloons, wristbands, hair ties, and other non-monetary rewards in an experimental shop.⁵ Each present was worth one token. Children exchanged the tokens chosen for immediate consumption into presents right after the experimental session. Presents selected with the tokens invested into the future were delivered in a sealed envelope with an anonymized child ID exactly 4 weeks after the experiment.

The fact that the time-investment task was embedded in a larger research project allows us to draw on an unusually rich set of control variables. For instance, the dataset contains information on children’s family background (migration background⁶ and proxies for parental earnings), an incentivized risk-investment measure, and children’s cognitive abilities from a modified version of Raven’s test (see Appendix B for details on parental earnings and risk elicitation).⁷

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

⁵ After children selected their presents, we asked them whether or not they liked the presents. Virtually all children stated that they liked the presents.

⁶ In Meran (South Tyrol) about 50% of the population belong to the Italian language group and 50% to the German language group. Migration background is thus a dummy variable indicating whether at least one parent speaks another language than German or Italian as the main language.

⁷ In the risk-investment task, children were endowed with 5 tokens and had to decide how many tokens to invest into a risky lottery (following Gneezy and Potters, 1997, and Charness and Gneezy, 2010). The lottery yielded 2 or 0 tokens with equal probability for each token invested, and non-invested tokens were save earnings for the child. To measure cognitive ability, we used 27 of Raven’s colored progressive matrices (Raven et al., 2004). Each matrix consisted of a geometric figure or pattern with a missing piece. The children had to find the missing piece among 6 possible items. The cognitive ability measure for each subject gives the number of correct answers and ranges from 0 to 27.

3.2 Administrative education data, attrition and sample characteristics

Educational data is provided by all German-speaking schools in Meran after the graduation of children from middle school.⁸ Anonymized administrative data from school records contain the middle-school GPA and the chosen high school (see the bottom part of Table 1 for descriptive statistics on the education data).

Middle-school GPA. The middle-school GPA is a measure of school performance at the end of middle school and is determined as a weighted average of the overall performance during the three middle-school years, and the grades of the final exam and pre-exams. The final exam includes four written exams in the subjects German, Italian, English and Math/Science, and one oral exam. The exams are prepared and evaluated by the teachers of the respective subjects and as such are not standardized, but the contents are based on the overall guidelines provided by the department of education of the government of South Tyrol. Students with a positive admission grade can take the final exam. The admission grade is determined by the class council who evaluates a pre-exam of Math and German together with the performance of the student throughout middle school. The GPA is determined as the weighted average of the admission grade with a weight of 50% together with the four written exams, and the oral exam each with a weight of 10% (Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol, 2017). The lowest passing grade is 6, and the highest possible grade is 10 (average grade in our sample: 8.012).

High-school track choice. The administrative school-record data contain the name of the high school which the child attended in the subsequent year. In our analysis, we distinguish between a child choosing an academic or a vocational high-school track. As explained in section 2, the academic track consists of generic high schools and technical schools (“Fachoberschulen”) whereas the vocational track comprises all vocational schools (“Berufsschule” and “Fachschule”).⁹

Attrition. Experimental and educational data were matched by using a unique and anonymous identification code that was assigned to each child at the beginning of the project. In the administrative data, 449 observations contain information on high-school track choice. Thus, attrition amounts to 44 observations (out of 493) and is exceptionally low at less than 9%.¹⁰ Based on school records, 19 subjects either left or changed school (e.g., due to movings), or had to repeat a grade. From the remaining 25

⁸ Note that the school board for Italian primary schools did not consent to provide equivalent data for the seven Italian schools.

⁹ Throughout the paper, we use the binary measure “academic track” for our analysis, but using a three-point scale for track choices yields qualitatively identical results. Appendix Tables A4 and A5 replicate our main results with three-point measure as dependent variable.

¹⁰ As a comparison, attrition in Castillo et al. (2018) is 32%.

subjects, 4 children graduated from middle school (i.e., obtained a grade 6 or higher), however no high-school track choice data is available. For another 21 children both, GPA and high-school track choice information are missing without further record, which is less than 4% of the whole sample.

Sample characteristics. Table 1 reports descriptive statistics of all variables for our whole sample (columns 1 to 3), as well as broken down for our sample with known/unknown educational-track choice (columns 4 and 5, respectively 6 and 7). The final column 8 reports p-values of two-sided tests between the two samples. The table reveals that for most variables the two samples are not significantly different from each other. Yet, it appears that children with missing high-school choice information are significantly less patient, have a lower score on Raven’s test, and are significantly more likely to have a migration background. These differences across samples are consistent with the interpretation that children with missing high-school information had to repeat a grade or dropped out from school, which would be in line with Castillo et al. (2018) who show more impatient children being less likely to graduate from high school. Importantly, in the next section we employ inverse-probability weighting and attrition bounding to show that selective attrition does not affect our results .

4. Results

4.1 Main Results

Table 2 presents our main result that children’s experimental measure of patience is robustly related to later academic-track choice. Column 1 starts with a bivariate OLS regression of a dummy variable for academic high-school track choice at the end of middle school on the number of tokens invested into the future in the experimental task that children completed in primary school.¹¹ The significant coefficient estimate reveals that increasing the number of tokens saved for the future by one is associated with a 2.7 percentage points increase in the probability to attend an academic track. Controlling for age, gender, and migration background of children in column 2 does not affect this result. One concern with the results so far might be that they simply pick up between-school differences in academic-track choice and the student populations’ patience, but that they might not be robust when only considering within-school variations. In column 3, we therefore include school fixed effects as well as fixed effects for primary-school grade levels and find this does not affect our coefficient estimate of interest. In column 4 we even go a step further and include school-class fixed effects, and find that our results remain robust after

¹¹ Throughout the paper, we employ OLS estimations with robust standard errors, but non-linear Probit models yield qualitatively identical results (see Appendix Tables A2 and A3).

eliminating any (potentially confounding) between-class variation. In what follows, we use this regression model that effectively only compares children *within* the same class as our starting point for further robustness analyses.

Table 2: Relationship between academic track choice and experimental patience measure

The regressions in Table 3 show that our results remain robust after accounting for sample attrition. Given that the probability that we observe a child’s high-school track choice is positively related to a child’s patience (see section 3.2), one obvious concern is that our estimated relationship between patience and school-track choice is biased due to systematic sample attrition. We employ two types of attrition analysis to investigate this issue. First, in column 1, we re-weight the observed data using the inverse probabilities of observing children’s educational-track choice and find that our results do not budge when employing inverse-probability weighting.¹² Second, columns 2 and 3 present bounding analyses where we assign children with missing information on school-track choice different counterfactual values. In column 2 (column 3), we assume that all children with missing information attend (do not attend) an academic track, and find that the estimated relationship of interest remains significant and very similar in magnitude in both scenarios. In sum, our analysis shows that attrition (which is comparably low in our data anyway) does not bias our main results.

Table 3: Accounting for attrition in the dependent variable

4.2 Robustness Analysis

In this section, we draw on the exceptional richness of our data to show that our results are robust to controlling for important background characteristics. Since the purpose of this paper is inherently descriptive, the goal of the subsequent analysis is not to claim that the coefficients reported above reflect the causal effect of patience on school-track choice. Rather, we account for a set of factors that may mediate the relationship between patience and school-track choice, which informs us about the extent to which the association between patience and school-track choice is independent of these other factors.

¹² The predicted probabilities stem from a Probit regression of a dummy variable coded 1 if a child’s school-track choice is known (0 else) on the time-investment decision, age, gender, and migration background.

Table 4: Robustness analysis

The first column of Table 4 depicts our preferred specification (from column 4 of Table 2) as a benchmark, and additional control variables are added in the subsequent columns. In column 2, we add our incentivized measure of children’s risk-taking as an additional control variable. Given the intertemporal nature of educational-investment decisions and the fact that only the present is certain whereas the future always contains an element of uncertainty, one might expect that risk preferences may affect children’s educational choices. Furthermore, previous studies have shown that time and risk preferences are intertwined (e.g., Andreoni and Sprenger, 2012b; Epper and Fehr-Duda, 2019), which highlights the need to control for risk preferences to isolate the independent relationship between patience and educational choices. Adding risk preferences as an additional control variable leaves our coefficient of interest on children’s time-investment decision intact. Furthermore, the coefficient on the risk-investment decision is small and statistically insignificant, reflecting the theoretically ambiguous relationship between risk preferences and human-capital investment.¹³

Next, we add an alternative measure of children’s patience, namely the number of patient choices from a time-preference choice list task, as an additional control variable in column 3,¹⁴ which leaves our coefficient of interest statistically and economically significant. In contrast, the coefficient of the alternative patience measure is small and insignificant, suggesting that the time-investment task is better suited to depict the relationship between patience in children and their school-track choice.

In column 4, we show that our results are also robust to controlling for our measure of parental earnings. Given the previously documented positive relationships between parental socioeconomic status and children’s school-track choice, and between income and patience (e.g., Dohmen et al., 2010), parental earnings may mediate the relationship between children’s patience and school-track choice. While parental earnings are significantly correlated with children’s school-track choice (Spearman’s $\rho = 0.1417$, $p < 0.01$), adding them as an additional control variable to the regression leaves the coefficient on the time-investment decision largely unchanged and significant.

¹³ A priori, the expected relationship between children’s risk preferences and educational choices is undetermined, since an academic track choice entails a range of risky elements that may be negatively correlated (e.g., lower unemployment risk for occupations with higher human-capital requirements, versus higher earnings variance in these jobs). The undetermined direction of the relationship between risk preferences and human-capital investment is highlighted, for instance, in the review by Benzoni and Chyruk (2015).

¹⁴ Children had to take three binary decisions between receiving two experimental tokens today, and receiving 3, 4, respectively 5 experimental tokens in four weeks. We take the number of patient choices in these three tasks as our alternative measure of time preferences.

Turning to cognitive abilities, column 5 reveals that our results are also robust to accounting for children’s performance on Raven’s test. From the outset, one might suspect that the positive correlation between children’s patience and academic school-track choice is due to the fact that both patience and the propensity to choose an academic school track are positively correlated with children’s cognitive abilities. While adding cognitive ability as a control variable yields a highly significant and positive coefficient, the relationship between children’s patience and academic track choice remains positive and significant, suggesting that this relationship is independent of the influence of cognitive abilities on school-track choice.

In sum, this analysis reveals that the relationship between children’s patience and academic-track choice remains robust after controlling for various potential mediating factors. While including all these control variables at the same time in column 6 slightly decreases the statistical significance of the coefficient of interest ($p = 0.09$), it turns significant at the 5-% level again when we impute missing covariates and include imputation-dummies in column 7. Thus, our results suggest an independent and direct relationship between children’s patience and their later school-track choice.

Table 5: Middle-school GPA as mediating factor?

Finally, we scrutinize the role that children’s middle-school GPA plays in mediating the relationship between patience and academic-track choice. As we described in section 2, in the Italian school system, children’s middle-school GPA does *not* determine access to an academic high school, because it is not an admission criterium for these schools. Yet, the GPA may serve as an important signal indicating whether a child is fit for the requirements of an academic high school. As we show in columns 1 and 2 of Table 5, patient children have in fact a higher GPA (probably reflecting more time and effort invested in studying), which may indicate that the relationship between patience and school-track choice operates through children’s GPA. However, adding the GPA as a control variable to our preferred specification in columns 3 and 4 shows that the coefficient on the time-investment decision remains (marginally) significant. The statistical significance of the coefficient of interest turns significant at the 5-% level again when we impute the missing covariate (i.e., middle-school GPA) and include an imputation dummy in column 5. Thus, while the large and highly significant coefficient on the GPA clearly shows its importance for explaining school-track choices, these results again show that patience has independent explanatory power.

5. Conclusion

Experimental measures of patience predict economically important field behavior among adults as well as among children and adolescents (e.g., Khwaja et al., 2007; Chabris et al., 2008; Burks et al., 2009; Meier and Sprenger, 2010; Castillo et al., 2011, 2018, 2020; Sutter et al., 2013). One particularly important economic decision that young children face is the one of choosing an educational track, a key feature of many school systems around the globe (see Betts, 2011, and OECD, 2020). We study the direct link between experimental measures of children’s patience and educational track choices three to six years later. We find a strong and significant positive association between patience and choosing an academic high-school track (instead of a vocational school track), which is robust to accounting for attrition and controlling for a rich set of background characteristics. Controlling for middle-school GPA as a potential mediator, our results suggest a direct link between patience and academic-track choice.

From a policy perspective, our findings suggest that behavioral interventions that increase children’s non-cognitive skills including forward-looking behavior (e.g., Heckman et al., 2010; Alan and Ertac, 2018) may affect children’s school-track choice positively, and may thus have positive long-term consequences (e.g., on labor-market success or skill acquisition). The finding that children’s patience is directly related to children’s academic-track choice – over and above its indirect influence through increased school performance – furthermore suggests that even short-term interventions targeting the specific point in time when school-track decisions are made (e.g., Resnjanskij et al., 2021) can have lasting effects.¹⁵ Such interventions may particularly help children from more disadvantaged backgrounds, who tend to be particularly impatient and tend to engage in more present-oriented behaviors (e.g., Heckman et al., 2011; Andreoni et al., 2019), thereby promoting equality of educational opportunity.

¹⁵ This is particularly true in education systems where children’s previous GPAs are no binding determinant of their educational-choice set as in Italy or several German states.

References

- Alan, S., Ertac, S. (2018). Fostering patience in the classroom: Results from randomized educational intervention. *Journal of Political Economy* 126(5): 1865-1911.
- Andreoni, J., Kuhn, M.A., List, J.A., Samek, A., Sokal, K., Sprenger, C. (2019). Toward an understanding of the development of time preferences: Evidence from field experiments. *Journal of Public Economics* 177: 104039.
- Andreoni, J., Sprenger, C. (2012a). Estimating time preferences from convex budgets. *American Economic Review* 102(7): 3333–56.
- Andreoni, J., Sprenger, C. (2012b). Risk preferences are not time preferences. *American Economic Review* 102(7): 3357-3376.
- Angerer, S., Lergetporer, P., Glätzle-Rützler, D., Sutter, M. (2016). Cooperation and discrimination within and across language borders: Evidence from children in a bilingual city. *European Economic Review* 90: 254-264.
- Argaw, B.A., Puhani, P.A. (2018). Does class size matter for school tracking outcomes after elementary school? Quasi-experimental evidence using administrative panel data from Germany. *Economics of Education Review* 65: 48-57.
- Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol (2017). *Staatliche Abschlussprüfung der Unterstufe – Schuljahr 2017/2018*. Retrieved March 20, 2020, from http://provinz.bz.it/bildung-sprache/deutschsprachige-schule/mitteilungen.asp?publ_page=2
- Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol (2020a). *Oberschule*. Retrieved March 20, 2020, from <http://www.provinz.bz.it/bildung-sprache/deutschsprachige-schule/schueler-eltern/oberschule.asp>.
- Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol (2020b). *Bildung in Zahlen 2018-2019*. Bozen, Landesinstitut für Statistik.
- Autonome Provinz Bozen-Südtirol (2020c). *Nettomonatslöhne der unselbständig Erwerbstätigen 2019*. Bozen, Landesinstitut für Statistik.
- Bach, M., Fischer, M. (2020). Understanding the Response to High-Stakes Incentives in Primary Education. ZEW - Centre for European Economic Research Discussion Paper No. 20-066, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3736769> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3736769>
- Backes-Gellner, U., Herz, H., Kosfeld, M., Oswald, Y. (2021). Do preferences and biases predict life outcomes? Evidence from education and labor market entry decisions. *European Economic Review* 134: 103709.

- Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital, A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Benzoni, L., Chyruk, O. (2015). The value and risk of human capital. *Annual Review of Financial Economics* 7(1): 179-200.
- Bettinger, E., Slonim, R. (2007). Patience among children. *Journal of Public Economics* 91(1-2), 343–63.
- Betts, J.R. (2011). The economics of tracking in education. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Vol. 3, eds. E.A. Hanushek, S. Machin, L. Woessmann: 341-381. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Burks, S.V., Carpenter, J.P., Goette, L., Rustichini, A. (2009). Cognitive skills affect economic preferences, strategic behavior, and job attachment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106(19):7745-7750.
- Cadena, B.C., Keys, B.J. (2015). Human capital and the lifetime costs of impatience. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 7(3): 126-153.
- Castillo, M., Ferraro, P., Jordan, J., Petrie, R. (2011). The today and tomorrow of kids: Time preferences and educational outcomes of children. *Journal of Public Economics* 95: 1377-1385.
- Castillo, M., Jordan, J.L., Petrie, R. (2018). Discount rates of children and high school graduation. *Economic Journal* 129(619): 1153-1181.
- Castillo, M., List, J.A., Petrie, R., Samek, A. (2020). Detecting drivers of behavior at an early age: Evidence from a longitudinal field experiment. *NBER Working Paper* 28288.
- Chabris, C., Laibson, D., Morris, C., Schuldt, J., Taubinsky, D. (2008). Individual laboratory-measured discount rates predict field behavior. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 37: 237-269.
- Charness, G., Gneezy, U. (2010). Portfolio choice and risk attitudes: an experiment. *Economic Enquiry* 48: 133-146.
- Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U. (2010). Are risk aversion and impatience related to cognitive ability? *American Economic Review* 100(3): 1238-1260.
- Dustmann, C. (2004). Parental background, secondary school track choice, and wages. *Oxford Economic Papers* 56(2): 209–230.
- Dustmann, C., Puhani, P.A., Schönberg, U. (2017). The long-term effects of early track choice. *Economic Journal* 127(603): 1348-1380
- Epper, T., Fehr-Duda, H. (2019). Risk in time: The intertwined nature of risk taking in time discounting. Working Paper at the University of St. Gallen.

- Falk, A., Becker, A., Dohmen, T., Enke, B., Huffman, D., & Sunde, U. (2018). Global evidence on economic preferences. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133(4): 1645-1692.
- Falk, A., Kosse, F., Pinger, P. (2020). Mentoring and schooling decisions: Causal evidence. *IZA Discussion Paper* 13387.
- Figlio, D., Giuliano, P., Özek, U., Sapienza, P. (2019). Long-term orientation and educational performance. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 11(4): 272-309.
- Gneezy, U., Potters, J. (1997). An experiment on risk taking and evaluation periods. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112(2): 631–645.
- Golsteyn, B.H.H., Grönqvist, H., Lindahl, L. (2014). Adolescent time preferences predict lifetime outcomes. *Economic Journal* 124(580): 739-761.
- Hanushek, E.A., Kinne, L., Lergetporer, P., Woessmann, L. (2020). Culture and Student achievement: The intertwined roles of patience and risk-taking. *NBER Working Paper* 27484.
- Hanushek, E.A., Schwerdt, G., Woessmann, L., Zhang, L. (2017). General education, vocational education, and labor-market outcomes over the life-cycle. *Journal of Human Resources* 52(1): 48-87.
- Hanushek, E.A., Woessmann, L. (2006). Does early tracking affect educational inequality and performance? Differences-in-differences evidence across countries. *Economic Journal* 116(510): C63-C76.
- Heckman, J., Lochner, L.J., Todd, P.E. (2006). Earnings functions, rates of return and treatment effects: The Mincer equation and beyond. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, eds. E.A. Hanushek, F. Welch: 307–458. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Heckman, J., Humphries, J.E., Mader, N.S. (2011). The GED. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, Vol. 3, eds. E.A. Hanushek, S. Machin, L. Woessmann: 423-484. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Heckman, J., Moon, S.H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P.A., Yavitz, A. (2010). The rate of return to the high scope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics* 94(1–2): 114–128.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Khwaja, A., Silverman, D., Sloan, F. (2007). Time preference, time discounting, and smoking decisions. *Journal of Health Economics* 26(5): 927-949.

- Kosse, F., Pfeiffer, F. (2012) Impatience among preschool children and their mothers. *Economics Letters* 115(3): 493-495.
- Lergetporer, P., Werner, K., Woessmann, L. (2021). Does ignorance of economic returns and costs explain the educational aspiration gap? Representative evidence from adults and adolescents. *Economica*, forthcoming.
- Meier, S., Sprenger, C. (2010). Present-biased preferences and credit card borrowing. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 2: 193–210.
- Mincer, J. (1958). Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy* 66(4): 281-302.
- Mischel, W., Ebbesen, E.B., Raskoff Zeiss, A. (1972). Cognitive and attentional mechanisms in delay of gratification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 21(2): 204-218.
- Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., Rodriguez, M.I. (1989). Delay of gratification in children. *Science* 244(4907): 933-938.
- Mühlenweg, A., Puhani, P.A. (2010). The evolution of the school entry age effect in a school tracking system. *Journal of Human Resources* 45(2): 407-438.
- OECD (2020), *PISA 2018 Results* (Volume V): Effective policies, successful schools, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Pekkala Kerr, S., Pekkarinen, T., Uusitalo, R. (2013). School tracking and development of cognitive skills. *Journal of Labor Economics* 31(3): 577–602.
- Pekkarinen, T., Uusitalo, R., Kerr, S. (2009). School tracking and intergenerational income mobility: Evidence from the Finnish comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Public Economics* 93(7-8): 965-973.
- Piopiunik, M. (2014). The effects of early tracking on student performance: Evidence from a school reform in Bavaria. *Economics of Education Review* 42: 12-33.
- Puhani, P.A. (2018). Do boys benefit from male teachers in elementary school? Evidence from administrative panel data. *Labour Economics* 51, 340-354.
- Raven, J., Raven, J., Court, J.H. (2004). *Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales*. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment.
- Resnjanskij, S., Ruhose, J., Wiederhold, S., Woessmann, L. (2021). Can mentoring alleviate family disadvantage in adolescence? A field experiment to improve labor-market prospects. CESifo Working Paper 8870.

- Shoda, Y., Mischel, W., and Peake, P. K. (1990). Predicting adolescent cognitive and self-regulatory competencies from preschool delay of gratification: Identifying diagnostic conditions. *Developmental Psychology* 26(6):978.
- Sutter, M., Kocher, M., Glätzle-Rützler, D., Trautmann, S. (2013). Impatience and uncertainty: Experimental decisions predict adolescents' field behavior. *American Economic Review* 103: 510-531.
- Sutter, M., C. Zoller and D. Glätzle-Rützler (2019). Economic behavior of children and adolescents – a first survey of experimental economics results. *European Economic Review* 111: 98-121.
- Wölfel, O., Heineck, G. (2012). Parental risk attitudes and children's secondary school track choice. *Economics of Education Review* 31(5): 727-743.

Main Tables

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

	Whole sample			Known track choice		Unknown track choice		p-value (two-sided)
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
<i>Experimental patience measure</i>								
Tokens invested in future	2.245	1.657	493	2.305	449	1.636	44	0.011
<i>Covariates</i>								
Exact age	8.917	1.145	493	8.938	449	8.698	44	0.185
Female (=1)	0.448	0.498	493	0.457	449	0.364	44	0.237
Migration background (=1)	0.152	0.360	493	0.127	449	0.409	44	0.000
Experimental risk measure	2.360	1.176	491	2.351	447	2.455	44	0.579
Alternative patience measure	1.412	0.979	493	1.399	449	1.545	44	0.343
Parental earnings	1769.532	382.853	453	1774.575	416	1712.838	37	0.348
Raven score (cognitive ability)	21.109	4.294	485	21.348	442	18.651	43	0.000
<i>Education data</i>								
Grade Point Average (GPA)	8.012	1.024	412	8.015	408	7.75	4	0.608
Vocational track	0.158	0.365	449					
Academic technical school (Fachoberschule)	0.548	0.498	449					
Academic high school	0.294	0.456	449					

Notes: Parental earnings are computed as the mean earnings of the mother and the father of the child. In case earnings for one parent are missing, parental earnings represent the earnings of the parent whose earnings are known. Columns 1 to 3: means, standard deviations (SD), and number of observations for the whole sample of primary-school children in grades two through five in the school year 2012/2013. Columns 4 and 5: Analytical sample for a subset of children with known educational-track choice. Columns 6 and 7: Subset of children with missing information about educational-track choice. Column 8: p-values of two-sided tests (t-tests or χ^2 tests) between children with known and unknown educational-track choice. For a description of the variables see section 3.

Table 2: Relationship between academic track choice and experimental patience measure

	Academic track choice			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Time-investment decision	0.027** (0.011)	0.032*** (0.011)	0.030*** (0.011)	0.028** (0.011)
Exact age		-0.039** (0.016)	-0.081 (0.049)	-0.049 (0.049)
Female (=1)		0.036 (0.034)	0.034 (0.035)	0.039 (0.035)
Migration background (=1)		0.030 (0.052)	0.024 (0.051)	0.039 (0.052)
Grade-level fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School-class fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes
Constant	0.779*** (0.033)	1.096*** (0.144)	1.406*** (0.360)	1.066*** (0.392)
Observations	449	449	449	449
R^2	0.015	0.031	0.053	0.135

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Table 3: Accounting for attrition in the dependent variable

	Academic track choice		
	Inverse-probability weighting	Imputation of missing values	
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Time-investment decision	0.027** (0.011)	0.025** (0.010)	0.030** (0.012)
Exact age	-0.050 (0.049)	-0.048 (0.044)	-0.064 (0.050)
Female (=1)	0.041 (0.035)	0.027 (0.032)	0.061 (0.037)
Migration background (=1)	0.040 (0.051)	0.066 (0.043)	-0.079 (0.058)
Grade-level fixed effects	No	No	No
School fixed effects	No	No	No
School-class fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	1.065*** (0.405)	1.096*** (0.349)	1.079*** (0.392)
Observations	449	493	493
R^2	0.138	0.122	0.191

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Column 1: Inverse-probability weighting based on predictions using children's time-investment decision, age, gender, and migration background. Column 2: Missing values imputed with academic track choice. Column 3: Missing values imputed with non-academic track choice. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Table 4: Robustness analysis

	Academic track choice						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Time-investment decision	0.028** (0.011)	0.027** (0.011)	0.031*** (0.011)	0.023** (0.011)	0.023** (0.011)	0.021* (0.012)	0.024** (0.012)
Exact age	-0.049 (0.049)	-0.047 (0.049)	-0.049 (0.049)	-0.041 (0.051)	-0.036 (0.049)	-0.028 (0.052)	-0.030 (0.049)
Female (=1)	0.039 (0.035)	0.041 (0.035)	0.037 (0.035)	0.042 (0.037)	0.038 (0.035)	0.044 (0.037)	0.038 (0.034)
Migration background (=1)	0.039 (0.052)	0.037 (0.053)	0.036 (0.052)	0.049 (0.057)	0.047 (0.054)	0.051 (0.059)	0.048 (0.056)
Risk-investment decision		0.012 (0.016)				0.023 (0.019)	0.015 (0.017)
Alternative patience measure			-0.014 (0.019)			-0.020 (0.020)	-0.020 (0.019)
Parental earnings				0.056 (0.056)		0.041 (0.055)	0.041 (0.054)
Raven score (cognitive ability)					0.015*** (0.006)	0.014** (0.006)	0.016*** (0.006)
Imputation dummies	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
School-class fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	1.066*** (0.392)	1.032** (0.400)	1.090*** (0.390)	0.889** (0.444)	0.726* (0.402)	0.574 (0.461)	0.610 (0.432)
Observations	449	447	449	416	442	410	449
R2	0.135	0.136	0.137	0.142	0.153	0.160	0.160

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Table 5: Middle-school GPA as mediating factor?

	Middle-school GPA		Academic track choice		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Time-investment decision	0.078*** (0.030)	0.052* (0.031)	0.018* (0.011)	0.021* (0.011)	0.024** (0.011)
Exact age		-0.229* (0.129)		-0.021 (0.052)	-0.025 (0.048)
Female (=1)		0.609*** (0.103)		-0.042 (0.039)	-0.016 (0.037)
Middle-school GPA			0.093*** (0.017)	0.109*** (0.020)	0.098*** (0.020)
Migration background (=1)		-0.516*** (0.147)		0.107** (0.050)	0.085* (0.051)
Imputation dummy	No	No	No	No	Yes
School-class fixed effects	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Constant	7.838*** (0.086)	8.830*** (1.038)	0.056 (0.149)	0.150 (0.459)	0.177 (0.423)
Observations	408	408	408	408	449
R^2	0.015	0.250	0.080	0.221	0.188

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Online Appendix – not intended for publication

Appendix A: Additional Figures and Tables

Figure A1: Depiction of the school system of South Tyrol (Italy)




Table A1: Number of subjects included in the analysis, by age and gender

Grade level (age group)	Female	Male	Total
2 (7/8 years)	44	62	106
3 (8/9 years)	54	74	128
4 (9/10 years)	70	71	141
5 (10/11 years)	53	65	118
<i>All</i>	221	272	493

Table A2: Relationship between academic track choice and experimental patience measure (Probit)

	Academic track choice			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Time-investment decision	0.116** (0.046)	0.141*** (0.049)	0.137*** (0.049)	0.141*** (0.050)
Exact age		-0.165** (0.068)	-0.330 (0.205)	-0.246 (0.223)
Female (=1)		0.144 (0.146)	0.130 (0.150)	0.187 (0.162)
Migration background (=1)		0.136 (0.219)	0.108 (0.222)	0.193 (0.228)
Grade-level fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School-class fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes
Constant	0.753*** (0.119)	2.106*** (0.619)	3.388** (1.519)	2.231 (1.703)
Observations	449	449	449	365

Notes: Probit regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table A3: Robustness analysis (Probit)

	Academic track choice						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Time-investment decision	0.141*** (0.050)	0.139*** (0.051)	0.161*** (0.053)	0.111** (0.053)	0.116** (0.052)	0.116** (0.058)	0.138** (0.055)
Exact age	-0.246 (0.223)	-0.239 (0.225)	-0.247 (0.223)	-0.219 (0.231)	-0.157 (0.223)	-0.150 (0.234)	-0.145 (0.226)
Female (=1)	0.187 (0.162)	0.206 (0.161)	0.187 (0.163)	0.202 (0.170)	0.185 (0.162)	0.222 (0.172)	0.203 (0.164)
Migration background (=1)	0.193 (0.228)	0.180 (0.228)	0.185 (0.229)	0.225 (0.250)	0.234 (0.240)	0.241 (0.260)	0.238 (0.251)
Risk-investment decision		0.074 (0.073)				0.102 (0.080)	0.063 (0.075)
Alternative patience measure			-0.085 (0.086)			-0.110 (0.092)	-0.127 (0.091)
Parental earnings				0.283 (0.270)		0.192 (0.265)	0.206 (0.270)
Raven score (cognitive ability)					0.066*** (0.024)	0.057** (0.025)	0.069*** (0.024)
Imputation dummies	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
School-class fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	2.231 (1.703)	2.023 (1.740)	2.395 (1.695)	1.487 (1.868)	0.513 (1.780)	0.159 (1.947)	0.141 (1.870)
Observations	365	365	365	341	361	337	361

Notes: Probit regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Dummy variable coded 1 if the child is enrolled in academic high-school track, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table A4: Relationship between track choice and experimental patience measure

	Track choice (three-point scale)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Time-investment decision	0.054*** (0.019)	0.064*** (0.019)	0.056*** (0.019)	0.048** (0.020)
Exact age		-0.084*** (0.028)	-0.165** (0.082)	-0.114 (0.086)
Female (=1)		-0.087 (0.061)	-0.086 (0.062)	-0.096 (0.065)
Migration background (=1)		0.041 (0.091)	0.038 (0.091)	0.045 (0.096)
Grade-level fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No
School-class fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes
Constant	2.011*** (0.056)	2.779*** (0.249)	3.383*** (0.604)	2.891*** (0.689)
Observations	449	449	449	449
R^2	0.018	0.043	0.072	0.152

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Ordinal variable coded 1-3 for enrollment in the vocational track, technical schools, and academic high schools respectively, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight). For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table A5: Robustness analysis: Track choice (three-point scale) as the dependent variable

	Track choice (three-point scale)						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Time-investment decision	0.048** (0.020)	0.047** (0.021)	0.047** (0.021)	0.042** (0.021)	0.034* (0.020)	0.029 (0.023)	0.031 (0.022)
Exact age	-0.114 (0.086)	-0.111 (0.087)	-0.114 (0.087)	-0.081 (0.094)	-0.075 (0.085)	-0.038 (0.092)	-0.063 (0.085)
Female (=1)	-0.096 (0.065)	-0.094 (0.064)	-0.096 (0.065)	-0.083 (0.068)	-0.102 (0.064)	-0.083 (0.067)	-0.097 (0.063)
Migration background (=1)	0.045 (0.096)	0.049 (0.098)	0.045 (0.096)	0.093 (0.105)	0.069 (0.098)	0.109 (0.107)	0.080 (0.100)
Risk-investment decision		0.015 (0.029)				0.036 (0.032)	0.026 (0.029)
Alternative patience measure			0.003 (0.035)			-0.016 (0.036)	-0.014 (0.034)
Parental earnings				0.198** (0.100)		0.153 (0.096)	0.149 (0.095)
Raven score (cognitive ability)					0.042*** (0.009)	0.041*** (0.009)	0.042** *
Imputation dummies	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
School-class fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	2.891*** (0.689)	2.835*** (0.699)	2.885*** (0.691)	2.302*** (0.790)	1.908*** (0.694)	1.339* (0.789)	1.534** (0.726)
Observations	449	447	449	416	442	410	449
R2	0.152	0.153	0.152	0.169	0.197	0.212	0.205

Notes: OLS regressions. *Time-investment decision*: incentivized decision on how many (of five) tokens to invest into the future, elicited when children were in primary school (grades two to five). Dependent variable: Ordinal variable coded 1-3 for enrollment in the vocational track, technical schools, and academic high schools respectively, elicited at the end of middle school (grade eight), 0 otherwise. For a description of the other covariates see section 3. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Appendix B: Supplementary Material

Experimental instructions (translated from German)

Note: *Italic font* is used for the instructions to the experimenter.

Time-investment task

Good morning. My name is ... Today's game works as follows:

In the beginning, you will receive 5 tokens (*please place the 5 tokens in front of the child*). You have to decide how many of these 5 tokens you want to put in the box labeled NOW (*point to the left box*) and how many tokens you want to put in the box labeled "4 WEEKS" (*point to the right box*). You will receive the tokens that you put in the box "NOW" immediately after the game and you can use these tokens for buying presents in our present shop. You can take these presents home today. Each token that you put in the box "4 WEEKS" will be doubled and you will receive the presents that you choose with these tokens in 4 weeks only.

Let's consider an example: If you, for instance, want to receive two tokens today, what do you have to do? (*Answer of the child: "I have to put 2 tokens in the left box"*) And what happens with the other 3 tokens? (*Answer: I have to put these tokens in the right box"; please let the child demonstrate this*) How many tokens will be added to this box? (*point to the right box; the answer of the child: "3"; please demonstrate!*) How many tokens are in the box in total? (*Answer: 6*). When will you receive the presents which you can choose with these 6 tokens? (*Answer: in 4 weeks*). And what happens if you put 5 tokens in that box? (*point to the left box; Answer: then I will receive 5 tokens immediately after the game and I can choose presents with these 5 tokens which I can take home today*). And what happens if you put all 5 tokens in that box? (*point to the right box; Answer: then these tokens will be doubled and I can choose presents with the 10 tokens which I will receive only in 4 weeks.*) Could you please repeat the rules of the game?

Please take your decision now. You have to put the tokens which you want to receive today in this box (*point to the left box*) and the tokens with which you can buy presents which you will receive in 4 weeks in that box (*point to the right box*). Take as much time as you need for your decision. In the meantime, I will turn around so I don't disturb you. Just call me when you are done.

Figure B1 Decision sheet for the time-investment task (translated from German)

NOW	4 WEEKS

Risk-investment task

Good morning. My name is ... Today's game works as follows:


In the beginning, you will receive 5 tokens (*please place the 5 tokens in front of the child*). You have to decide how many of these 5 tokens you want to keep for sure and with how many of these tokens you want to play the “treasure”-game. You have to put the tokens you keep for sure in this box (*point to the left box*). Likewise, you must put the tokens with which you want to play the treasure-game in that box (*point to the right box*). Each token that you put in the treasure-game will be doubled. The rules of the treasure-game are as follows: Here I have two cards. On this card, you see a full treasure chest and on the other card, there is an empty treasure chest (*show the respective cards*). I will mingle the two cards under the table and then I will put the cards on the table upside down (*please demonstrate; Attention: you have to mingle the cards, such that the child is not able to see the picture on the respective card*). Then you can draw one of the cards. If you, for example, draw the full treasure chest, (*point to the full treasure chest on the decision sheet*), then you will receive all the tokens from this box. On the other hand, if you draw the empty treasure chest (*point to the empty treasure chest on the decision sheet*) then you will lose all the

tokens from this box. In the end, you will receive the tokens that you keep for sure (*point to the left box*) and the tokens that you win in the treasure game (*point to the right box*).

Let's consider an example: If you, for instance, want to keep one token for sure and play the treasure-game with the other 4 tokens, what do you have to do? (*Answer of the child: "I have to put 1 token in the left box and 4 tokens in the right box"; please let the child demonstrate this*) How many tokens will be added to this box? (*point to the right box; the answer of the child: "4"; please demonstrate!*) What happens next? How does the treasure-game work? (*Child has to repeat the rules of the game*). How many tokens will you win if you draw the full treasure chest? (*Answer of the child: "8 tokens"*). And how many tokens will you receive in total? (*Answer of the child: "9"*). Exactly. You will receive 8 tokens from the treasure-game plus 1 additional token which you kept for sure. What happens if you draw the empty treasure chest? (*Answer of the child: "I lose all the tokens of the treasure-game"*) Exactly. How many tokens will you receive in total? (*Answer of the child: "1"*) Exactly. This was only an example. Let's consider another example: Could you please explain the rules of the game if you want to keep 4 tokens for sure and play the treasure-game with 1 token? (*The child has to recapitulate the game with the new example*). What happens if you, for instance, put all your 5 tokens in this box? (*point to the right box; let the child recapitulate the game*) What happens if you, for instance, put all your 5 tokens in this box? (*point to the left box; let the child recapitulate the game*). Could you please repeat the rules of the game?

Please take your decision now. You have to put the tokens which you want to keep for sure in this box (*point to the left box*) and the tokens with which you want to play the treasure-game have to be put in that box (*point to the right box*). Take as much time as you need for your decision. In the meantime, I will turn around so I don't disturb you. Just call me when you are done.

Figure B2: Decision sheet for the risk-investment task (translated from German)



Proxying parental earnings

To get a measure for earnings we asked the children to state their parent's profession as precisely as possible. The children's answers were categorized with the use of the Public Employment Service Austria (AMS). They provide information on the average gross starting salary per month of almost 1,800 different types of professions. If a child could only give information on the company the parent works at, we used the most common profession within the same company. We used the Austrian Public Employment Service (AMS) classification because the information provided there, on different types of professions is much more detailed than the information provided by the census bureau in South Tyrol (ASTAT). However, the average gross starting salary provided by both the AMS and the ASTAT have a highly significant positive correlation. Note that we did not get information about parents' professions for all children participating in our experiment.

University of Innsbruck - Working Papers in Economics and Statistics

Recent Papers can be accessed on the following webpage:

<https://www.uibk.ac.at/eeecon/wopec/>

- 2021-17 **Silvia Angerer, Jana Bolvashenkova, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, Philipp Lergetporer, Matthias Sutter:** [Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data](#)
- 2021-16 **Daniel Gründler, Eric Mayer, Johann Scharler:** [Monetary Policy Announcements, Information Shocks, and Exchange Rate Dynamics](#)
- 2021-15 **Sebastian Bachler, Felix Holzmeister, Michael Razen, Matthias Stefan:** [The Impact of Presentation Format and Choice Architecture on Portfolio Allocations: Experimental Evidence](#)
- 2021-14 **Jeppe Christoffersen, Felix Holzmeister, Thomas Plenborg:** [What is Risk to Managers?](#)
- 2021-13 **Silvia Angerer, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, Christian Waibel:** [Trust in health care credence goods: Experimental evidence on framing and subject pool effects](#)
- 2021-12 **Rene Schwaiger, Laura Hueber:** [Do MTurkers Exhibit Myopic Loss Aversion?](#)
- 2021-11 **Felix Holzmeister, Christoph Huber, Stefan Palan:** [A Critical Perspective on the Conceptualization of Risk in Behavioral and Experimental Finance](#)
- 2021-10 **Michael Razen, Alexander Kupfer:** [Can increased tax transparency curb corporate tax avoidance?](#)
- 2021-09 **Changxia Ke, Florian Morath, Anthony Newell, Lionel Page:** [Too big to prevail: The paradox of power in coalition formation](#)
- 2021-08 **Marco Haan, Pim Heijnen, Martin Obradovits:** [Competition with List Prices](#)
- 2021-07 **Martin Dufwenberg, Olof Johansson-Stenman, Michael Kirchler, Florian Lindner, Rene Schwaiger:** [Mean Markets or Kind Commerce?](#)
- 2021-06 **Christoph Huber, Jürgen Huber, and Michael Kirchler:** [Volatility Shocks and Investment Behavior](#)
- 2021-05 **Max Breitenlechner, Georgios Georgiadis, Ben Schumann:** [What goes around comes around: How large are spillbacks from US monetary policy?](#)
- 2021-04 **Utz Weitzel, Michael Kirchler:** [The Banker's Oath And Financial Advice](#)

- 2021-03 **Martin Holmen, Felix Holzmeister, Michael Kirchler, Matthias Stefan, Erik Wengström:** Economic Preferences and Personality Traits Among Finance Professionals and the General Population
- 2021-02 **Christian König-Kersting:** On the Robustness of Social Norm Elicitation
- 2021-01 **Laura Hueber, Rene Schwaiger:** Debiasing Through Experience Sampling: The Case of Myopic Loss Aversion.
- 2020-34 **Kai A. Konrad, Florian Morath:** The Volunteer's Dilemma in Finite Populations
- 2020-33 **Katharina Momsen, Markus Ohndorf:** Expressive Voting vs. Self-Serving Ignorance
- 2020-32 **Silvia Angerer, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, Christian Waibel:** Monitoring institutions in health care markets: Experimental evidence
- 2020-31 **Jana Friedrichsen, Katharina Momsen, Stefano Piasenti:** Ignorance, Intention and Stochastic Outcomes
- 2020-30 **Esther Blanco, Alexandra Baier, Felix Holzmeister, Tarek Jaber-Lopez, Natalie Struwe:** Substitution of social concerns under the Covid-19 pandemic
- 2020-29 **Andreas Hackethal, Michael Kirchler, Christine Laudénbach, Michael Razen, Annika Weber:** On the (ir)relevance of monetary incentives in risk preference elicitation experiments
- 2020-28 **Andrej Gill, Matthias Heinz, Heiner Schumacher, Matthias Sutter:** Trustworthiness in the Financial Industry
- 2020-27 **Matthias Sutter, Michael Weyland, Anna Untertrifaller, Manuel Froitzheim:** Financial literacy, risk and time preferences - Results from a randomized educational intervention
- 2020-26 **Rene Schwaiger, Jürgen Huber, Michael Kirchler, Daniel Kleinlercher, Utz Weitzel:** Unequal Opportunities, Social Groups, and Redistribution
- 2020-25 **Roman Inderst, Martin Obradovits:** Competitive Strategies when Consumers are Relative Thinkers: Implications for Pricing, Promotions, and Product Choice
- 2020-24 **Martin Obradovits, Philipp Plaickner:** Price-Directed Search and Collusion
- 2020-23 **Helena Fornwagner, Oliver P. Hauser:** Climate action for (my) children
- 2020-22 **Esther Blanco, Natalie Struwe, James M. Walker:** Incentivizing public good provision through outsider transfers: experimental evidence on sharing rules and additivity requirements
- 2020-21 **Loukas Balafoutas, Helena Fornwagner, Rudolf Kerschbamer, Matthias Sutter, Maryna Tverdostup:** Diagnostic Uncertainty and Insurance Coverage in Credence Goods Markets

- 2020-20 **Anna Ulrichshofer, Markus Walzl:** Customer Disputes, Misconduct, and Reputation Building in the Market for Financial Advice
- 2020-19 **Anna Ulrichshofer, Markus Walzl:** Social Comparison and Optimal Contracts in the Competition for Managerial Talent
- 2020-18 **Martin Obradovits, Philipp Plaickner:** Searching for Treatment
- 2020-17 **Jun Honda:** The Gender-Punishment Gap revisited
- 2020-16 **Jun Honda:** The Relation between Rankings and Risk-Taking in the Labor Market for Financial Advice
- 2020-15 **Christina Bannier, Eberhard Feess, Natalie Packham, Markus Walzl:** Differentiation and Risk-Aversion in Imperfectly Competitive Labor Markets
- 2020-14 **Felix Holzmeister, Rudolf Kerschbamer:** oTree: The Equality Equivalence Test
- 2020-13 **Parampreet Christopher Bindra, Graeme Pearce:** The effect of priming on fraud: Evidence from a natural field experiment
- 2020-12 **Alessandro De Chiara, Marco A. Schwarz:** A Dynamic Theory of Regulatory Capture
- 2020-11 **Christoph Huber, Jürgen Huber, Michael Kirchler:** Market shocks and professionals' investment behavior - Evidence from the COVID-19 crash
- 2020-10 **Elisabeth Gsottbauer, Daniel Müller, Samuel Müller, Stefan T. Trautmann, Galina Zudenkova:** Social class and (un)ethical behavior: Causal versus correlational evidence
- 2020-09 **Parampreet Christopher Bindra, Rudolf Kerschbamer, Daniel Neururer, Matthias Sutter:** Reveal it or conceal it: On the value of second opinions in a low-entry-barriers credence goods market
- 2020-08 **Robert Steiger, Eva Posch, Gottfried Tappeiner, Janette Walde:** Effects of climate change on tourism demand considering individual seasonal preferences
- 2020-07 **Fang Liu, Alexander Rasch, Marco A. Schwarz, Christian Waibel:** The role of diagnostic ability in markets for expert services
- 2020-06 **Matthias Stefan, Jürgen Huber, Michael Kirchler, Matthias Sutter, Markus Walzl:** Monetary and Social Incentives in Multi-Tasking: The Ranking Substitution Effect
- 2020-05 **Michael Razen, Jürgen Huber, Laura Hueber, Michael Kirchler, Matthias Stefan:** Financial Literacy, Economic Preferences, and Adolescents' Field Behavior
- 2020-04 **Christian König-Kersting, Johannes Lohse, Anna Louisa Merkel:** Active and Passive Risk-Taking

- 2020-03 **Christoph Huber, Jürgen Huber:** Bad bankers no more? Truth-telling and (dis)honesty in the finance industry
- 2020-02 **Dietmar Fehr, Daniel Müller, Marcel Preuss:** Social Mobility Perceptions and Inequality Acceptance
- 2020-01 **Loukas Balafoutas, Rudolf Kerschbamer:** Credence goods in the literature: What the past fifteen years have taught us about fraud, incentives, and the role of institutions

University of Innsbruck

Working Papers in Economics and Statistics

2021-17

Silvia Angerer, Jana Bolvashenkova, Daniela Glätzle-Rützler, Philipp Lergetporer, Matthias Sutter

Children's patience and school-track choices several years later: Linking experimental and field data

Abstract

We present direct evidence on the link between children's patience and educational-track choices years later. Combining an incentivized patience measure of 493 primary-school children with their high-school track choices taken at least three years later at the end of middle school, we find that patience significantly predicts choosing an academic track. This relationship remains robust after controlling for a rich set of covariates, such as family background, school-class fixed effects, risk preferences, and cognitive abilities, and is not driven by sample attrition. Accounting for middle-school GPA as a potential mediating factor suggests a direct link between patience and educational-track choice.

ISSN 1993-4378 (Print)

ISSN 1993-6885 (Online)