# Are Retirement Planning Tools Substitutes or Complements to Financial Capability?

Gopi Shah Goda<sup>1</sup> Matthew R. Levy<sup>2</sup> Colleen Flaherty Manchester<sup>3</sup> Aaron Sojourner<sup>4</sup> Joshua Tasoff<sup>5</sup> and Jiusi Xiao<sup>6</sup>

April 2023

<sup>1</sup>Stanford University and NBER
 <sup>2</sup>London School of Economics
 <sup>3</sup>University of Minnesota
 <sup>4</sup>W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
 <sup>5</sup>Claremont Graduate University
 <sup>6</sup>Claremont Graduate University

Defined contribution (DC) plans play an increasingly important role in retirement savings in the U.S. and largely place the responsibility of saving on individuals

Defined contribution (DC) plans play an increasingly important role in retirement savings in the U.S. and largely place the responsibility of saving on individuals

However, determining how much to save is a complex problem. A large body of evidence indirectly suggests that saving behavior is not optimal

- Low rate of understanding financial concepts (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2014)
- Large reliance on defaults (Madrian and Shea, 2001; Beshears et al., 2009)
- Exponential Growth Bias (EGB), present bias, and low financial literacy contribute to low retirement savings (Goda et al., 2014; Brown and Previtero, 2014; Goda et al., 2019; Lusardi and Mitchell, 2011).

Potential approaches to guiding people towards optimal decisions:

- Nudges or choice architecture
- Informational interventions
- Peer effects

Potential approaches to guiding people towards optimal decisions:

- Nudges or choice architecture
- Informational interventions
- Peer effects

Key questions that need to be answered:

What factors determine who will respond to the intervention?

Potential approaches to guiding people towards optimal decisions:

- Nudges or choice architecture
- Informational interventions
- Peer effects

Key questions that need to be answered:

- What factors determine who will respond to the intervention?
- How do people respond to the intervention on average?

Potential approaches to guiding people towards optimal decisions:

- Nudges or choice architecture
- Informational interventions
- Peer effects

Key questions that need to be answered:

- What factors determine who will respond to the intervention?
- How do people respond to the intervention on average?
- Why are people responding to the intervention?

## Our approach

We conduct a randomized control trial (RCT)\* to determine how a treatment that helps people convert retirement balances and contributions into a retirement income stream affects saving behavior at a federal agency.

We investigate:

- Who uses the online tool?
- What is the effect of the treatment on average?
- How do the effects of the treatment vary based on measured characteristics known to influence retirement saving behavior?

\*Registered with AEA Social Science Registry AEARCTR-0002129.

### Preview of Results

- Who uses the online tool?
  - ▶ 48% of the employees (67% of survey respondents) select into using the tool
  - The selection is correlated with pre-intervention contributions, but not with other observable characteristics

#### Preview of Results

- Who uses the online tool?
  - ▶ 48% of the employees (67% of survey respondents) select into using the tool
  - The selection is correlated with pre-intervention contributions, but not with other observable characteristics
- What is the effect of the treatment on average?
  - We measure the treatment on the treated (TOT), which measures the effect of the treatment relative to an active control among tool users
  - ▶ The treatment increased average annual retirement contributions by \$174 (2.3 percent)

### Preview of Results

- Who uses the online tool?
  - ▶ 48% of the employees (67% of survey respondents) select into using the tool
  - The selection is correlated with pre-intervention contributions, but not with other observable characteristics
- What is the effect of the treatment on average?
  - We measure the treatment on the treated (TOT), which measures the effect of the treatment relative to an active control among tool users
  - The treatment increased average annual retirement contributions by \$174 (2.3 percent)
- How do the effects of the treatment vary based on measured characteristics known to influence retirement saving behavior?
  - The tool's effect is significantly greater for those with higher financial literacy, higher education and a higher financial-capability factor
  - There are no significant differences in the effect of the tool by EGB, present bias, pre-intervention contributions, or other factors

#### Related literature

- Extensive evidence documenting the effects of retirement saving interventions [e.g., automatic enrollment (Madrian and Shea 2001; Choi, Laibson, Madrian, Metrick 2004); retirement income projections (Goda, Manchester, Sojourner 2014); commitment devices (Thaler and Benartzi 2004); peer information (Duflo and Saez 2003; Beshears, Choi, Laibson, Madrian and Milkman 2014); reducing complexity (Beshears, Choi, Laibson, Madrian 2013; Choi, Laibson, Madrian 2006; Sethi-Iyengar, Huberman, Jiang 2004); anchoring (Choi, Haisley, Kurkoski, and Massey 2012)]
- Evidence of financial education interventions designed to address low financial literacy (e.g., Bernheim, Garrett, and Maki 2001; Bernheim and Garrett 2003; Lusardi 2008; Gale and Levine 2011; Hastings, Madrian and Skimmyhorn 2012; Fernandes, Lynch Jr., and Netemeyer 2014; Percy and Arnott-Hill, 2014)
- Evidence of selection into take-up among low-need populations in other contexts [health wellness (Jones, Molitor, Reif 2019); Rx plan selection (Bundorf, Polyakova, Tai-Seale 2022); SNAP take-up (Finkelstein and Notowodigdo 2019); cancer screenings (White, Adams and Heywood 2009)]

#### Contributions

- We find that helping people convert balances and contributions into a retirement income stream leads to a modest increase in savings on average
- Survey combined with administrative data allows examination of potential mechanisms
- Find evidence of positive selection into take-up of online tool and complementarities between financial capability and treatment effects

**Policy implications:** Online retirement savings tools are less likely to increase savings among low-saving/low-financial literacy populations

#### Behavioral and Perceptual Biases

## Exponential-Growth Bias

Individuals neglect compounding and view the value of assets as growing less than exponentially.



### EGB and the Budget Constraint

Let  $p(\vec{\imath}, t; \alpha)$  be the agent's perception of the value of a dollar invested at time t at period T > t:

$$p(\vec{i},t;\alpha) = \prod_{s=t}^{T-1} (1+\alpha i_s) + \sum_{s=t}^{T-1} (1-\alpha) i_s$$
(1)

- $\blacktriangleright \alpha = 1$ : individual correctly perceives growth to be exponential
- ▶  $\alpha = 0$ : individual incorrectly perceives growth to be linear
- ▶  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ : individual perceptions in between

EGB affects the intertemporal budget constraint:

$$\sum_{s=0}^{T} \hat{c}_s \cdot p(\vec{i}, s; \alpha_i) \le \sum_{s=0}^{T} y_s \cdot p(\vec{i}, s; \alpha_i)$$
(2)

### Present Bias: Quasi-hyperbolic Discount Function

We assume individual *i* has quasi-hyperbolic utility (Laibson, 1997) over a vector of consumption  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{T-t+1}$  of the form:

$$U_{i,t}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv u_i(\mathbf{x}_t) + \beta_i \sum_{\tau=t+1}^T \delta_i^{\tau-t} u_i(\mathbf{x}_\tau)$$
(3)

δ<sub>i</sub> is long-run discount factor (i.e. tradeoffs between future dates)
 Individual use β<sub>i</sub> × δ<sub>i</sub> when considering tradeoffs involving today
 1 − β<sub>i</sub> is degree of present bias (β = 1 is not present biased)

## Experimental Design and Data

# Thrift Savings Plan (TSP)

Benefits-eligible federal employees can participate in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP), in addition to a mandatory defined benefits plan

- Base TSP contribution = 1 percent of pay
- Agency matches each dollar of an employee's first 3 percent of pay and \$0.50 on the dollar for the next two percent
- Maximum contribution limit set by IRS; \$18,000 in 2017
- Can elect to invest contributions in five different funds or a lifecycle fund

Default provisions

- Employees hired before August 1, 2010 had to opt-in
- Employees hired on or after August 1, 2010 were automatically enrolled at a 3 percent contribution rate

## **OPM** and Thrift Savings Plan

Partnership with the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM)

- > Agency that provides human resources, leadership and support to most federal agencies
- ▶ 5,472 employees as of April 2017 located primarily in DC, MD, PA and VA

Linked administrative and survey data

- Administrative data from HR records and TSP contribution elections
- Online survey fielded March-April 2017 with 26 percent response rate to elicit biases known to affect retirement savings

Survey Selection

### Elicitation of Biases

#### Exponential Growth Bias ("Alpha"): adapted from Levy and Tasoff (2015)

- ► 3-question elicitation
- "An asset has an initial value of \$100 and grows at an interest rate of 10% each period. What is the value after 20 periods?"

► For each person *i* and question *k*:  $Alpha_{i,k} = \arg \min_{\alpha \in [-1,3]} |a_k(\alpha) - a_{i,k}|$ 

• Average across questions: 
$$\overline{Alpha_i} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \frac{Alpha_{i,k}}{3}$$

# Elicitation of Biases (cont.)

Time preference parameter elicitation ("Delta" and "Beta"): adapted time-staircase procedure from Falk et al. (2014)

- Present-Future staircase: "Would you rather receive \$100 today or \$[X] in 12 months?"
- Future-Future staircase: "Would you rather receive \$120 in 12 months or \$[Y] in 24 months?"
- 5 questions for each staircase; different base values for each set
- Also analogous questions for 6-month periods
- ▶ For each person *i* and time interval *k*: construct measures of Beta<sub>i,k</sub> and Delta<sub>i,k</sub> from implied indifference points

• Average across questions: 
$$\overline{Beta_i} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} \frac{Beta_{i,k}}{2}$$
;  $\overline{Delta_i} = \sum_{k=1}^{2} \frac{Delta_{i,k}}{2}$ 

# Financial Literacy (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2014)

- 1. Imagine that the interest rate on your savings account was 1% per year and inflation was 2% per year. After 1 year, how much would you be able to buy with the money in this account?
  - More than today
  - Exactly the same
  - Less than today
- 2. True or False: Buying a single company stock usually provides a safer return than a stock mutual fund.
  - True
  - False
- 3. Suppose you had \$100 in a savings account and the interest rate was 2% per yer. After 5 years, how much do you think you would have in the account if you left the money to grow?
  - More than \$102
  - Exactly \$102
  - Less than \$102

# Financial Literacy (cont.)

- 4. True or False: A 15-year mortgage typically requires higher monthly payments than a 30-year mortgage, but the total interest paid over the life of the loan will be less.
  - True
  - False
- 5. If interest rates fall, what should happen to bond prices?
  - They should rise
  - They should fall
  - They should stay the same
  - There is no relationship between bond prices and the interest rate

Other Survey Measures

# Other Survey Measures

- Background: household size, financial head of household, education, total household income
- Retirement: total retirement savings, expected retirement age, expected rate of return, desired replacement rate
- Risk aversion: set of unfolding questions to find indifference point between sure payment and lottery
- Attitudes towards Federal Government benefits

Back

#### Intervention

Together with OPM leaders, we designed both a treatment and an active control version of a new online retirement savings tool

- Treatment: provides employees with a projected retirement income based on TSP balances, contributions, Social Security, and defined benefit plan relative to goal
- Active control: provides employees with a projected retirement income based on Social Security and defined benefit plan relative to goal; does not convert TSP contributions and balances into retirement income
- Both versions allow users to adjust inputs and dynamically view how results change, and provide summary of current and new saving plan, with a way to print the output and make adjustments

**Key difference:** treatment tool removes the need to convert balances and contributions into a retirement income stream

Hypothesis: treatment tool relative to active control can help mediate EGB

# Active Control Condition

Ballpa Are you savi	More Info	Reset Data and Start Again		
Step 1 🕨 Step 2 🕨	Step 3 🕨 Step 4	▶ Ship 5 ▶ Ship 6 ▶ Rasults > ▶ What to Do Next		
		Are you on track to meet your goal?		
		FERS + Social Security: \$3,147 per month Joal Income in Reference: 15,2,593 per month Difference: \$2,240 per month		
d	Foal: \$5,593/month	his tool calculates that you are \$2,446 below your goal based just on your FERS benefits and Social Security inco	me.	
		SP is designed to <b>make up any difference</b> between FERS and Social Security income and your retirement goals.		
TSP	2	our TSP Contribution		
FERS + Social Security	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ou are currently saving 5% of your salary, and currently have a TSP balance of \$300,000.		
\$3,147/month		to you think this will be enough to make up the difference?		
	¢	ansider whether you need to adjust your TSP contribution rate to meet your goal income in retirement. If you would ext step find out how.	like to adjust your TSF	' contributions, proceed to

All estimates are in today's dollars

**A** 

#### **Treatment Condition**



All estimates are in today's dollars



### Timeline



### Factor Analysis

- Reduce the dimensionality of the heterogeneity using Principal Component Analysis
- Retain factors with the eigenvalue greater than 1 Parallel Analysis
- Examine the factor loads to give meaning to the latent factors

Note: This analysis was not pre-registered

# Factor Loading Matrix

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Factor5	Factor6	Uniqueness
	Demographics	Seniority	Financial Capability	Time Preference	HH Size	Hispanic Factor	
Age	-0.0753	0.6838	0.0146	0.0648	-0.2091	-0.07	0.4738
Male	0.2269	-0.0046	0.3806	0.046	0.5064	0.0223	0.5446
Years of Schooling	-0.0993	-0.1911	0.7269	-0.0084	-0.1586	0.1145	0.3869
Race = White	0.925	-0.0198	-0.0022	0.0105	-0.0082	-0.2718	0.0699
Race = Hispanic	-0.0756	-0.0451	0.024	0.0178	-0.025	0.9097	0.1632
Race = Black	-0.9478	0.0585	-0.0297	-0.0367	-0.0067	-0.1584	0.071
Household Size	-0.0492	-0.0578	-0.0828	-0.0419	0.8686	-0.0349	0.2299
Tenure(in years)	-0.0802	0.8116	-0.131	0.0262	0.063	-0.0457	0.311
Is Supervisor	0.0577	0.4178	0.3047	-0.0493	0.2453	0.2889	0.5832
Tenure Description $=$ Permanent	-0.0107	0.6444	-0.02	-0.0151	-0.0988	-0.012	0.5741
Std. Alpha	0.0448	0.1002	0.349	-0.0211	0.0972	-0.3106	0.7598
Std. Beta	0.0349	-0.0148	-0.0841	0.8349	-0.074	-0.0388	0.2875
Beta-Delta	0.0313	0.0673	0.1772	0.7921	0.0388	0.0725	0.3289
Financial Literacy	0.1299	0.0207	0.7042	0.1154	0.0648	-0.0656	0.4649
Eigenvalue	2.07686	1.75206	1.50360	1.31937	1.05755	-0.0656 1.04191	0.4649

# Results

### Selection into Tool Use

- Among survey responders, 67% use the online tool
- We estimate a logit regression with tool use as the dependent variable, including EGB, present bias, financial literacy, demographics, job characteristics and prior TSP contributions

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Tool Use}_{i}^{*} = \alpha + \mathbf{X}_{i,t} \Lambda + u_{i} \\ \text{Tool Use}_{i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Tool Use}_{i}^{*} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{array}$$

# Selection into Tool Use

- Among survey responders, 67% use the online tool
- We estimate a logit regression with tool use as the dependent variable, including EGB, present bias, financial literacy, demographics, job characteristics and prior TSP contributions

$$egin{array}{lll} {\sf Tool} \; {\sf Use}_i^* = lpha + {\sf X}_{i,t} {\sf A} + u_i \ {\sf Tool} \; {\sf Use}_i > 0 \ 0 \; \; {\sf Otherwise} \end{array}$$

#### Findings:

- We do not find evidence that EGB, present bias, financial literacy, demographics, or job characteristics influence tool use
- However, a 1 S.D. increase in TSP annual contributions (\$5,705) increases the likelihood of using the tool by 32% (p <0.01)</p>



#### Treatment on the Treated

We estimate treatment-on-the-treated (TOT) effects, which represent the differences in contributions between the treatment and active control group within the subsample of individuals who interact with the tool.

TSP Amount<sub>*i*,*t*</sub> =  $\alpha + \beta \text{Post}_t + \delta \text{Post}_t \times \text{Full Tool}_i + y_t + m_t + \phi_i + u_{i,t}$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$   $\delta$  represents the TOT estimate of the treatment effect for the full treatment relative to the active control
- Post<sub>t</sub> equals 1 after the rollout of the tool (does not vary by actual time of tool use)
- Controls include year fixed effects, month fixed effects and individual fixed effects
- We investigate heterogeneity by attribute  $A_i$  by including interactions between  $A_i$  and  $\{\text{Post}_t, \text{Post}_t \times \text{Full Tool}_i\}$

### Treatment on the Treated

	(1) Overall Sample	(2) Survey Sample
$Post \times Full Tool$	174.184** (75.621)	120.979 (129.646)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Mean DV Permutation P Value R-squared Observations	Yes Yes 7078.012 0.001 0.089 151.732	Yes Yes 7577.489 0.335 0.089 57.744
## Treatment on the Treated - Heterogeneity

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	TSP Amount per year pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher
Post $ imes$ Full Tool	$114.466 \\ (129.537)$	118.969     (129.367)	132.774 (129.607)	$308.069^{*}$ (174.319)	$^{-210.650}_{(195.251)}$
Post $\times$ Attribute	-63.461 (84.566)	120.159 (108.571)	-166.267 (102.292)	0.073*** (0.018)	-179.543 (201.044)
$Post \times Full \; Tool \times Attribute$	122.769 (106.152)	-152.713 (131.581)	328.038** (130.793)	-0.022 (0.024)	496.098* (257.274)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Yes Mean DV R-squared Observations	Yes Yes 7577.489 0.089 57,744	Yes Yes 7577.489 0.089 57,744	Yes Yes Yes 7577.489 0.090 57,744	Yes Yes Yes 7577.489 0.096 57,744	Yes Yes 7577.489 0.090 57,744

→ ITT → SD of TSP Amount → TSP Rate

Assumptions

# Treatment on the Treated - Heterogeneity by PCA Factors

	(1) Demographics	(2) Seniority	(3) Financial Capability	(4) Time Preference	(5) Big Daddy	(6) Hispanic Factor
Post × Factor	-105.760 (95.464)	-293.914*** (99.988)	-126.354 (97.740)	164.910     (109.860)	46.222 (104.020)	-81.289 (93.459)
$Post\timesFullTool$	141.889 (130.840)	75.229 (130.527)	$ \begin{array}{r} 151.798\\ (131.326) \end{array} $	137.219 (130.473)	173.534 (135.362)	133.807 (131.544)
$Post \times Full \; Tool \times Factor$	149.497 (128.685)	-38.885 (137.083)	$411.633^{***}$ (132.631)	-180.815 (133.436)	-101.637 (128.338)	89.919 (108.988)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Mean DV F-Statistic P-Value R-squared Observations	Yes Yes 7579.859 1.350 0.246 0.089 56,131	Yes Yes 7579.859 0.080 0.777 0.094 56,131	Yes Yes 7579.859 9.632 0.002 0.093 56,131	Yes Yes 7579.859 1.836 0.176 0.092 56,131	Yes Yes 7579.859 0.627 0.429 0.092 56,131	Yes Yes 7579.859 0.681 0.410 0.092 56,131

# Summary of Results

- One SD higher pre-intervention contributions  $\rightarrow$  32% increase in the likelihood a person engaged with the online tool
- Overall, providing information regarding the conversion between balances, contributions and a retirement income stream led to higher contributions
  - Average annual retirement contributions increased by \$174 (2.3 percent)
  - Comparable to effect of static retirement income disclosures (\$85 per year, 3.6 percent; Goda et al. (2014))
- Heterogeneity analysis shows that one SD higher financial literacy is associated with a \$328 higher treatment effect; similar results from PCA (exploratory)

# **Policy Implications**

Online decision support tools are unlikely to serve the needs of populations that may be saving less than optimal or populations that have low levels of financial literacy

- Reach of the tool may be limited to high-saving populations
- Complementarities with various measures of financial capability

Examining heterogeneity by individual-level characteristics can offer some insights into mechanisms

Addressing behavioral and perceptual biases known to affect saving decisions (like EGB, present bias) remains an important objective

Dealing with one issue at a time may not be sufficient to move behavior

# Bibliography I

- Beshears, John, James J. Choi, David Laibson, and Brigitte C. Madrian, "The Importance of Default Options for Retirement Savings Outcomes: Evidence from the United States," in "Social Security Policy in a Changing Environment," Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Brown, Jeffrey and Alessandro Previtero, "Procrastination, Present-Biased Preferences, and Financial Behaviors," August 2014. Working Paper.
- **Goda, Gopi Shah, Colleen Flaherty Manchester, and Aaron Sojourner**, "What Will My Account Really Be Worth? Experimental Evidence on How Retirement Income Projections Affect Saving," *Journal of Public Economics*, 2014, *119*, 80–92.
- \_ , Matthew Levy, Colleen Flaherty Manchester, Aaron Sojourner, and Joshua Tasoff, "Predicting Retirement Savings Using Survey Measures of Exponential-Growth Bias and Present Bias," *Economic Inquiry*, 2019, *57* (3), 1636–1658.
- Lusardi, Annamaria and Olivia S Mitchell, "Financial literacy and planning: Implications for retirement wellbeing," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2011.
- and Olivia S. Mitchell, "The Economic Importance of Financial Literacy: Theory and Evidence," *Journal of Economic Literature*, March 2014, 52 (1), 5–44.

# Bibliography II

Madrian, Brigitte C. and Dennis F. Shea, "The Power of Suggestion: Inertia in 401(k) Participation and Savings Behavior," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2001, *116* (4), 1149–1525.

# Additional Results



#### Let's get started

What is your date of birth?	Month:	 0	Year:	 0
When did you start working for the Federal government? (Service Computation Date)	Month:	 0	Year:	 0
Current Annual Salary \$				
Expected Retirement Age	62		3	





#### What lifestyle would you like in retirement?

Select your desired lifestyle in retirement. This will set your retirement income goal.



27 ROST







#### What is your Retirement System?

• FERS CSRS CSRS Offset

As a Federal employee, you fall into one of three retirement systems: FERS, CSRS, CSRS Offset. Most people hired after 1984 are in FERS, which represents over 90 percent of Federal employees.





#### What are your current retirement savings?

Federal employees can save additional income for retirement through the Thrift Savings Program (TSP).



#### **Annual TSP Catch-up Contribution**

Min: 0

Enter Additional Retirement Savings Balance \$ 0



5.0

6000





#### Do you have other sources of retirement income?

I expect to receive Social Security benefits.

Enter Expected Monthly Social Security Benefits \$ 0 Need help? (Cestimate my Social Security Denefit)

□ I expect to work after retirement.

□ I expect an additional pension.





## Active Control Condition



All estimates are in today's dollars

## **Treatment Condition**







53 / 42



54 / 42



Report Issue





Here is a summary of your Current Saving Plan and your proposed New Saving Plan based on using this tool:



Frim this plan to keep for your records (16 1)

#### Change your ISP contribution now! Here's how:

5 guinte year expressive de trocke payred system and selve the "The Th Sovieg: Place" action. You can contribute a parameters of your solvry or a fixed defar annual.

If your approx down't have an electronic system you can also complete form TSF-1 and used 1 to your approxill at barefits office



In Section II, enter IC% in Box 6 or Box 8 on the TSP-1.

Coll TSF of 1477/965/0778 and choose option 3 for help, or visit the TSP Wabele, https://www.tag.org/forms/index.html (Select TSF-1) & inducted a short video

Repts Long

4 b



## Exponential-Growth Bias Elicitation

- "An asset has an initial value of \$100 and grows at an interest rate of 5% each year. How much do you think this asset is worth after 50 years?"
- "An asset has an initial value of \$100 and grows at an interest rate of 7% each year. How much do you think this asset is worth after 30 years?"

◀ Back

# Survey Sample

	(1)	(2)	(2)	(4)
	Aii	Survey Non-Completers	Survey Completer	Difference
TSP Amount (\$/year)	6274.0	5939.1	7205.4	-1266.219***
	(5724.1)	(5537.6)	(6119.9)	(175.365)
SD Change in TSP Amount	1.107	1.048	1.271	-0.223***
	(1.010)	(0.977)	(1.080)	(0.031)
Final TSP Rate	6.895	6.568	7.801	-1.233***
	(5.465)	(5.268)	(5.885)	(0.167)
Total Pay (in Thousand)	85.99	85.30	87.90	-2.598**
	(31.62)	(31.60)	(31.60)	(0.973)
Age	45.73	45.18	47.24	-2.052***
	(10.70)	(10.65)	(10.69)	(0.328)
Gender	0.429	0.424	0.442	-0.018
	(0.495)	(0.494)	(0.497)	(0.015)
Bachelor or Higher	0.654	0.651	0.663	-0.013
	(0.476)	(0.477)	(0.473)	(0.015)
White	0.658	0.642	0.704	-0.062***
	(0.474)	(0.479)	(0.457)	(0.015)
Observations Chi-Sqaured P-Value	5,426	3,991	1,435	5,426 62.39 0.00

Back

## Selection into Survey Sample

	Logit				
	(1) In Survey Sample	(2) In Survey Sample			
In Survey Sample Age	-0.003""" (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)			
Male	0.355*** (0.017)	0.356*** (0.017)			
White	0.351*** (0.037)	0.359*** (0.037)			
Hispanic	-0.106** (0.048)	-0.077 (0.049)			
Black	0.202*** (0.039)	0.254*** (0.040)			
Some College or Associate	0.503*** (0.028)	0.492*** (0.029)			
Bachelor	0.105*** (0.021)	0.103*** (0.023)			
Post-Bachelor	0.315*** (0.024)	0.300*** (0.027)			
Household Size	0.054*** (0.006)	0.061*** (0.007)			
Total Pay		-0.002*** (0.000)			
Tenure in Years		-0.019*** (0.001)			
Team Leader		0.133*** (0.047)			
Supervisor or Manager		-0.001 (0.031)			
Conditional - Tenure Group 2		-0.459*** (0.069)			
Permanent - Tenure Group 1		-0.104* (0.063)			
Part-Time		1.421*** (0.186)			
Full-Time		1.572*** (0.169)			
Constant	0.807*** (0.059)	-0.490*** (0.188)			
Mean DV Observations	0.806 103,607	0.806 103,607			



# Sample Diagram



Note: I - the number of unique individuals in the corresponding node. N - the number of observations, the unit of observation is bimonthly paychecks for each individual. Survey Non-Completers include individuals who did not answer all five questions as well as individuals who did not participate in the survey at all.

Back

# Random Assignment

	(1) All	(2) Partial	(3) Full	(4) Difference
TSP Amount (\$/year)	6274.8	6287.8	6262.0	25.803
	(5721.6)	(5783.8)	(5660.6)	(155.366)
SD Change in TSP Amount	1.107	1.109	1.105	`0.005´
	(1.009)	(1.020)	(0.998)	(0.027)
Final TSP Rate	6.899	6.899	6.898	0.000
	(5.467)	(5.611)	(5.323)	(0.148)
Mean Alpha	0.483	0.472	0.493	-0.021
	(0.826)	(0.813)	(0.838)	(0.042)
Mean Beta	1.007	1.005	1.008	-0.003
<b>•</b> • <b>•</b> • • • •	(0.0865)	(0.0854)	(0.0875)	(0.004)
Std. Financial Literacy	-0.0753	-0.0844	-0.0664	-0.018
	(1.019)	(1.023)	(1.015)	(0.053)
Total Pay (in Thousand)	85.99	86.08	85.90	0.180
	(31.62)	(31.74)	(31.50)	(0.859)
Age	45.73	45.80	45.65	0.144
	(10.70)	(10.69)	(10.70)	(0.290)
Gender	0.429	0.428	0.429	-0.001
	(0.495)	(0.495)	(0.495)	(0.013)
Bachelor or Higher	0.654	0.659	0.649	0.010
XA (1. 1.	(0.476)	(0.474)	(0.477)	(0.013)
White	0.658	0.653	0.664	-0.011
	(0.474)	(0.476)	(0.473)	(0.013)
Observations	5,426	2,696	2,730	5,426
Chi-Squared				2.42
P-value				0.97

# Selection into Tool Use

		Logit					
	(1)	(2)	(3)				
	Tool Participation	<b>Tool Participation</b>	<b>Tool Participation</b>				
Tool Participation							
Mean Alpha	0.111	0.107	0.085				
	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.073)				
Mean Beta	0.393	0.368	0.233				
	(0.683)	(0.699)	(0.697)				
Std. Financial Literacy	0.078	0.044	-0.009				
-	(0.056)	(0.061)	(0.063)				

# Selection into Tool Use (cont.)

Age	-0.001	-0.009
	(0.006)	(0.006)
Male	-0.031	-0.059
	(0.121)	(0.125)
White	0.018	0.215
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(0.292)	(0.307)
Hispanic	-0.323	-0.171
	(0.390)	(0.408)
Black	-0.240	-0.015
	(0.312)	(0.325)
Some College or Associate	0.282	0 191
Some conege of resociate	(0.198)	(0.202)
		3
Bachelor	0.240	0.008
	(0.168)	(0.177)
Post-Bachelor	0.186	-0.108
	(0.182)	(0.202)

63 / 42

# Selection into Tool Use (cont.)

Total Pay			0.003
			(0.003)
Tenure in Years			-0.006
			(0.009)
Team Leader			0.222
			(0.368)
Supervisor or Manager			0.415*
			(0.247)
Conditional - Tenure Group 2			0.577
2			(0.494)
Permanent - Tenure Group 1			0.657
			(0.454)
Part-Time			0.845
			(0.882)
TSP Amount Pre-Rollout (\$1,000/year)			0.048***
A 61 078 A			(0.013)
Constant	0.252	0.096	-0.575
	(0.690)	(0.849)	(1.007)
Mean DV	0.667	0.668	0.668
Observations	1,435	1,393	1,392

▶ Back

# TSP Amount: ITT

	ITT	Main		ITT Heterogeneity			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Overall Sample	Survey Sample	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	TSP Amount per year pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher
Post $\times$ Full Tool	(48.990)	134.103 (100.994)	(131.192) (100.774)	134.080 (100.901)	151.680 (101.817)	285.584** (135.674)	-89.439 (148.638)
$Post\timesAttribute$			41.775 (74.787)	30.028 (73.575)	-125.891* (75.388)	0.081*** (0.014)	
$Post \times Full \; Tool  \times  Attribute$			80.896 (92.855)	21.494 (92.759)	238.383** (99.264)	-0.021 (0.020)	
$Post \times Attribute{=}1$							-90.545 (147.613)
$Post \times Attribute{=}1 \times Full \ Tool$							337.035* (198.862)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Mean DV F-Statistic P-Value	Yes Yes Yes 6188.494	Yes Yes Yes 7016.741	Yes Yes 7016.741 0.759 0.384	Yes Yes 7016.741 0.054 0.817	Yes Yes 7016.741 5.767 0.016	Yes Yes 7016.741 1.089 0.297	Yes Yes Yes 7016.741 2.872 0.090
FDR Sharpened Q-Value R-squared Observations	0.463 0.069 318,873	0.463 0.072 85,974	0.471 0.073 85,974	0.594 0.072 85,974	0.131 0.073 85,974	0.463 0.081 85,974	0.372 0.073 85,974

▲ back

# SD Change in TSP Amount: TOT

	тот	Main		TOT Heterogeneity				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	Overall Sample	Survey Sample	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	ISP Amount per year pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher	
$Post \times Full Tool$	0.031** (0.013)	0.021 (0.023)	0.020 (0.023)	0.021 (0.023)	0.023 (0.023)	0.054* (0.031)	-0.037 (0.034)	
Post $\times$ Attribute			-0.011 (0.015)	0.021 (0.019)	-0.029 (0.018)	0.000*** (0.000)	-0.032 (0.035)	
$Post \times Full \; Tool \times Attribute$			0.022 (0.019)	-0.027 (0.023)	0.058** (0.023)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.088* (0.045)	
Year F.E. Month F.F.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Individual F.E. Mean DV	Yes 1.248533	Yes 1.336639	Yes 1.336639	Yes 1.336639	Yes 1.336639	Yes 1.336639	Yes 1.336639	
Permutation P-Value FDR Sharpened Q-Value R-squared Observations	0.000 0.081 0.089 151,732	0.348 0.259 0.089 57,744	0.248 0.089 57,744	0.248 0.089 57,744	0.081 0.090 57,744	0.259 0.096 57,744	0.1 0.090 57,744	

# SD Change in TSP Amount: TOT

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	SD Change in TSP Amount						
Post × Full Tool	0.025	0.013	0.027	0.024	0.031	0.024	0.005
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.024)
Post × Demographics	-0.019						-0.019
	(0.017)						(0.017)
Post × Full Tool × Demographics	0.026						0.028
	(0.023)						(0.022)
Post × Seniority		-0.052***					-0.051***
		(0.018)					(0.018)
Post × Full Tool × Seniority		-0.007					-0.012
		(0.024)					(0.024)
Post × Financial Capability			-0.022				-0.020
			(0.017)				(0.017)
Post of Full Text of Floor dat Count lite			0.072***				0.064
Post × Full Tool × Financial Capability			(0.023)				(0.022)
			(0.023)				(0.023)
Post × Time Preference				0.029			0.031
				(0.019)			(0.019)
Dest of Full Test of Time Defenses				0.022			0.022
Post × Full Tool × Time Preference				-0.032			-0.032
				(0.024)			(0.023)
Post $\times$ Big Daddy					0.008		0.010
					(0.018)		(0.018)
Desta - Edit Testa - Dis Desta					0.010		0.020
Post × Full Tool × Big Daddy					-0.018		-0.020
					(0.023)		(0.022)
Post × Hispanic Factor						-0.014	-0.014
						(0.016)	(0.015)
Description of the second second						0.016	0.010
Post × Full Tool × Hispanic Factor						0.016	(0.019)
Year F F	Ves						
Month F.E.	Yes						
Individual F.E.	Yes						
Mean DV	1.337	1.337	1.337	1.337	1.337	1.337	1.337
F-Statistic	1.350	0.080	9.632	1.836	0.627	0.681	
P-Value	0.246	0.777	0.002	0.176	0.429	0.410	
FDK Sharpend Q-Value	0.694	0.966	0.025	0.094	0.910	0.910	0.107
R-squared Observations	0.089	0.094	0.093	0.092	0.092	0.092	0.107
Observations	50,131	50,131	50,131	50,131	50,131	50,131	50,131

# SD Change in TSP Amount: ITT

	ITT Main		ITT Heterogeneity					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	Overall Sample	Survey Sample	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	TSP Amount per year pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher	
Post $\times$ Full Tool	0.011	0.024	0.023	0.024	0.027	0.050**	-0.016	
	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.026)	
$Post\timesAttribute$			0.007 (0.013)	0.005 (0.013)	-0.022* (0.013)	0.000**** (0.000)		
Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ Attribute			0.014 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.042** (0.018)	-0.000 (0.000)		
$Post \times Attribute{=}1$							-0.016 (0.026)	
$Post \times Attribute{=}1 \times Full \ Tool$							0.059* (0.035)	
Year F.E.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Month F.E.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Individual F.E.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mean DV	1.092	1.238	1.238	1.238	1.238	1.238	1.238	
F-Statistic			0.759	0.054	5.767	1.089	2.872	
P-Value			0.384	0.817	0.016	0.297	0.090	
FDR Sharpend Q-Value	0.463	0.463	0.471	0.594	0.131	0.463	0.372	
R-squared	0.069	0.072	0.073	0.072	0.073	0.081	0.073	
Observations	318,873	85,974	85,974	85,974	85,974	85,974	85,974	

back

# TSP Rate: TOT

	тот	Main	TOT Heterogeneity					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	Overall Sample	Survey Sample	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	ISP Amount per year pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher	
Post $ imes$ Full Tool	0.145 (0.088)	$\binom{0.119}{(0.162)}$	$\binom{0.112}{(0.163)}$	0.116 (0.163)	0.130 (0.162)	0.453* (0.233)	-0.372 (0.289)	
$Post\timesAttribute$			-0.061 (0.106)	0.130 (0.157)	-0.325** (0.136)	0.000** (0.000)	-0.667** (0.291)	
$Post \times Full \; Tool  \times  Attribute$			0.125 (0.128)	-0.175 (0.175)	0.412** (0.171)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.727** (0.349)	
Year F.E. Month F.F.	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Individual F.E. Mean DV	Yes 7.687612	Yes 8.166443	Yes 8.166443	Yes 8.166443	Yes 8.166443	Yes 8.166443	Yes 8.166443	
Fermutation P Value FDR Sharpened Q-Value R-squared Observations	0.051 0.206 0.023 151,732	0.452 0.363 0.024 57,744	0.314 0.024 57,744	0.314 0.024 57,744	0.127 0.025 57,744	0.314 0.026 57,744	0.127 0.025 57,744	

# TSP Rate: TOT

	(1) Final TSP Rate	(2) Final TSP Rate	(3) Final TSP Rate	(4) Final TSP Rate	(5) Final TSP Rate	(6) Final TSP Rate	(7) Final TSP Rate
Post × Full Tool	0.148	0.010	0.136	0.133	0.166	0.145	-0.070
	(0.164)	(0.167)	(0.167)	(0.164)	(0.166)	(0.165)	(0.181)
$Post \times Demographics$	-0.075						-0.079
$Post \times Full \; Tool \times Demographics$	0.147 (0.142)						0.163 (0.141)
$Post \times Seniority$		-0.456*** (0.149)					-0.428*** (0.146)
$Post \times Full \; Tool  \times  Seniority$		0.078 (0.190)					0.025 (0.186)
$Post \times Financial \ Capability$			-0.375** (0.148)				-0.357** (0.145)
$Post \times Full \ Tool \times Financial \ Capability$			0.517*** (0.187)				0.465** (0.180)
$Post \times Time \; Preference$				0.178 (0.151)			0.203 (0.151)
$Post \times Full \; Tool \; \times \; Time \; Preference$				-0.183 (0.171)			-0.202 (0.172)
$Post \times Big \; Daddy$					0.153 (0.119)		0.152 (0.114)
$Post \times Full \; Tool \times Big \; Daddy$					-0.200 (0.147)		-0.190 (0.142)
$Post \times Hispanic \; Factor$						-0.097 (0.096)	-0.083 (0.084)
$Post \times Full \; Tool  \times  Hispanic \; Factor$						0.070 (0.118)	0.031 (0.111)
Year F.E.	Yes						
Month F.E.	Yes						
Moon DV	Yes 9 176	res 9.176	res 9.176	res 9.176	res 9.176	res 9.176	Yes 9.176
F-Statictic	1.078	0.169	7.665	1 141	1.845	0.349	0.170
P-Value	0.299	0.682	0.005	0.286	0.175	0.549	
FDR Sharpened Q-Value	0.599	0.816	0.065	0.599	0.599	0.816	
R-squared	0.024	0.029	0.027	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.038
Observations	56,131	56,131	56,131	56,131	56,131	56,131	56,131

70 / 42

# TSP Rate: ITT

	ITT Main		ITT Heterogeneity					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	Overall Sample	Survey Sample	Std. Alpha	Std. Beta	Std. Financial Literacy	pre Rollout	Bachelor or Higher	
Post $ imes$ Full Tool	0.033 (0.055)	0.103 (0.122)	0.101 (0.122)	0.103 (0.123)	0.126 (0.122)	0.402** (0.173)	-0.238 (0.206)	
$Post\timesAttribute$			0.051 (0.089)	0.037 (0.104)	-0.266*** (0.098)	0.000*** (0.000)		
$Post \times Full \ Tool \times Attribute$			0.073 (0.108)	0.018 (0.120)	0.319*** (0.123)	-0.000 (0.000)		
$Post \times Attribute{=}1$							-0.499** (0.203)	
$Post \times Attribute{=}1 \times Full \ Tool$							0.515** (0.256)	
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Mean DV F-Statistic P-Value FDR Sharpened Q-Value R-squared	Yes Yes 6.848 0.568 0.014	Yes Yes 7.707 0.568 0.016	Yes Yes 7.707 0.454 0.501 0.568 0.016	Yes Yes 7.707 0.023 0.879 1 0.016	Yes Yes Yes 7.707 6.723 0.010 0.072 0.017	Yes Yes 7.707 2.399 0.122 0.255 0.019	Yes Yes 7.707 4.055 0.044 0.153 0.017	

▲ back

## TSP Amount by Assumptions: TOT

TSP Amount (\$/year)         TSP Amount (\$/year) <tht>TSP Amount (\$/year)         TSP Amount (\$/year)</tht>		111	[2]	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post × LR-HL Full Tool 227/964** (131.79) Post × HR-HL Full Tool 3.140		TSP Amount (\$/year)				
(131.179) Post × HR-HI Full Tool 3.140	Post × LR-HL Full Tool	287.964**				
Post × HR-HI Full Tool 3 149		(131.179)				
	Post v HR-HI Full Tool	3 149				
(104.879)	Toat A There Full Tool	(104.879)				
()		()				
Post × LR-LL Full Tool 211,459*	Post × LR-LL Full Tool	211.459*				
(118.889)		(118.889)				
Post × HR-LL Full Tool 211 512	Post × HR-LL Full Tool	211 512				
(129.502)		(129.502)				
		( , , , , ,				
Post × LR-HL Partial Tool 50.926	Post × LR-HL Partial Tool		50.926			
(105.181)			(105.181)			
Post × LR-HL Full Tool 314.025**	Post × LR-HL Full Tool		314 025**			
(142.692)			(142.692)			
Post × HR-HL Full Tool 29.210	Post $\times$ HR-HL Full Tool		29.210			
(118.974)			(118.974)			
Post × LR-LL Full Tool 237 520*	Post × LB-LL Full Tool		237 520*			
(131.488)	TOT A LIVE FUR TOO		(131.488)			
Post × HR-LL Full Tool 237.573*	Post × HR-LL Full Tool		237.573*			
(141.156)			(141.156)			
Post × Full Tool 248 594*** 211 489** 280 937***	Post × Full Tool			248 594***	211 489**	280 937***
(95.801) (95.195) (107.046)				(95.801)	(95,195)	(107.046)
				(,	(	( ,
Post × Full Tool × High Return -147.862 -144.777	Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ High Return			-147.862		-144.777
(108.815) (109.623)				(108.815)		(109.623)
Post × Full Tool × High Lifestyle -73 336 -66 632	Post × Full Tool × High Lifestyle				-73 336	-66 632
(108.891) (109.658)	Tost A Tur Tool A Tigh Encatyle				(108.891)	(109.658)
Year F.E. Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Year F.E.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Month F. L. Yes	Month F.E.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Omitted All Partial LR-LL Partial All Partial LL Partial LR-LL Partial	Omitted	All Partial	LR-LL Partial	All Partial	LL Partial	LR-LL Partial
Assumptions Type Separating Separating Pooling Pooling Pooling Pooling	Assumptions Type	Separating	Separating	Pooling	Pooling	Pooling
Mean DV 7078.012 7078.012 7078.012 7078.012 7078.012 7078.012	Mean DV	7078.012	7078.012	7078.012	7078.012	7078.012
R-squarea 0.090 0.089 0.089 0.090 Observations 151732 151732 151732 151732 151732	A-squared Observations	0.090	0.090	0.089	0.089	0.090

▲ back
## SD Change in TSP Amount by Assumptions: TOT

	(1) SD Change in TSP Amount	(2) SD Change in TSP Amount	(3) SD Change in TSP Amount	(4) SD Change in TSP Amount	(5) SD Change in TSP Amount
Post $\times$ LR-HL Full Tool	0.051** (0.023)	bb change in 151 Amount	ob change in Tor Amount	ob change in Tor Amount	ob change in For Amount
Post $\times$ HR-HL Full Tool	0.001 (0.019)				
Post $\times$ LR-LL Full Tool	0.037* (0.021)				
Post $\times$ HR-LL Full Tool	0.037 (0.023)				
Post $\times$ LR-HL Partial Tool		0.009 (0.019)			
Post $\times$ LR-HL Full Tool		0.055** (0.025)			
Post $\times$ HR-HL Full Tool		0.005 (0.021)			
Post $\times$ LR-LL Full Tool		0.042* (0.023)			
Post $\times$ HR-LL Full Tool		0.042* (0.025)			
$Post \times Full \; Tool$			0.044*** (0.017)	0.037** (0.017)	0.050*** (0.019)
Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ High Return			-0.026 (0.019)		-0.026 (0.019)
Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ High Lifestyle				-0.013 (0.019)	-0.012 (0.019)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Omitted Assumptions Type Mean DV R-squared	Yes Yes All Partial Separating 1.249 0.090	Yes Yes LR-LL Partial Separating 1.249 0.090	Yes Yes All Partial Pooling 1.249 0.089	Yes Yes LL Partial Pooling 1.249 0.089	Yes Yes LR-LL Partial Pooling 1.249 0.090

## TSP Rate by Assumptions: TOT

	(1) Final TSP Rate	(2) Final TSP Rate	(3) Final TSP Rate	(4) Final TSP Rate	(5) Final TSP Rate
Post × LR-HL Full Tool	0.300* (0.159)				
Post $\times$ HR-HL Full Tool	-0.060 (0.119)				
Post $\times$ LR-LL Full Tool	0.218* (0.128)				
Post $\times$ HR-LL Full Tool	0.139 (0.139)				
Post $\times$ LR-HL Partial Tool		0.010 (0.131)			
Post $\times$ LR-HL Full Tool		$0.305^{*}$ (0.172)			
Post $\times$ HR-HL Full Tool		-0.055 (0.136)			
Post $\times$ LR-LL Full Tool		0.223 (0.144)			
Post $\times$ HR-LL Full Tool		0.144 (0.154)			
$Post\timesFullTool$			0.258** (0.112)	0.180* (0.105)	0.286** (0.118)
Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ High Return			-0.225* (0.119)		-0.222* (0.121)
Post $\times$ Full Tool $\times$ High Lifestyle				-0.070 (0.119)	-0.059 (0.120)
Year F.E. Month F.E. Individual F.E. Omitted Assumptions Type Mean DV R-squared Observations	Yes Yes All Partial Separating 7.688 0.024 151,732	Yes Yes LR-LL Partial Separating 7.688 0.024 151,732	Yes Yes All Partial Pooling 7.688 0.024 151,732	Yes Yes LL Partial Pooling 7.688 0.024 151,732	Yes Yes Yes LR-LL Partial Pooling 7.688 0.024 151,732

## Parallel Analysis



→ Back