International Journal of Finance and Commerce
www.commercejournals.com
Online ISSN: 2664-715X, Print ISSN: 2664-7141
Received: 29-08-2023, Accepted: 14-09-2023, Published: 30-09-2023
Volume 5, Issue 3, 2023, Page No. 98-103

Nudging towards savings: Behavioral interventions in financial decision-making

Dr. Sharmila Ahlawat
Associate Professor of Economics Government P. G. College Ambala Cantt, Haryana, India

Abstract
This paper examines the efficacy of behavioral interventions designed to increase personal savings rates across diverse demographic groups. Drawing upon field experiments, randomized controlled trials, and longitudinal data collected through 2022, we synthesize empirical evidence on the effectiveness of various "nudges" in improving financial decision-making related to savings. Our analysis identifies four key intervention categories with measurable impacts: default option manipulation, commitment devices, reminders/feedback mechanisms, and social norm messaging. Results indicate that properly designed behavioral interventions can increase savings rates by 4-12 percentage points on average, with heterogeneous effects based on income levels, age, and financial literacy. The paper concludes with policy recommendations and considerations for the ethical implementation of behavioral approaches in financial contexts.

Keywords: behavioral economics, financial decision-making, nudging, savings behavior, retirement planning

Introduction

The consistent under saving observed across populations poses significant challenges to individual financial security and broader economic stability. Despite widespread awareness of the importance of saving for emergencies, retirement, and other financial goals, a significant gap persists between intention and action. In the United States, the personal savings rate fluctuated between 7.5% and 33.8% from 2019 to 2022, with the historic spike during the COVID-19 pandemic representing an anomalous period driven by reduced consumption opportunities and government stimulus rather than sustainable behavioral changes (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2022) [10].

Traditional economic approaches to increasing savings have focused on financial incentives, such as tax benefits for retirement accounts or matched contributions. While effective for certain population segments, these approaches have not adequately addressed the savings gap across broader populations. Behavioral economics offers complementary strategies by identifying and addressing psychological barriers to optimal saving behaviors.

This paper examines the effectiveness of behavioral interventions—commonly referred to as "nudges"—designed to increase personal savings rates without restricting choice or significantly altering economic incentives. We define nudges, following Thaler and Sunstein (2008) [37], as "any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people's behavior in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives."

Our analysis includes data through 2022, encompassing both pre-pandemic savings behaviors and the evolving financial decision-making landscape during and after the COVID-19 crisis. We pay particular attention to the persistence of intervention effects and the potential for scaled implementation across diverse populations.

Theoretical Framework

1. Psychological Barriers to Saving

Several psychological mechanisms have been identified as barriers to optimal saving behavior

Present bias: Individuals systematically overvalue immediate rewards compared to future benefits, leading to time-inconsistent preferences (O'Donoghue & Rabin, 1999) [31]. This bias manifests as procrastination in savings decisions and preference for immediate consumption.

Limited attention: Cognitive limitations prevent individuals from consistently attending to long-term financial goals amid competing priorities (Karlan *et al*., 2016) [27]. Savings decisions often receive insufficient deliberative attention.

Status quo bias: People exhibit a strong tendency to maintain current states rather than make active changes, even when the changes would be beneficial (Samuelson &Zeckhauser, 1988) [32].

Choice overload: Excessive options can lead to decision paralysis, particularly in complex domains like retirement planning (Iyengar & Lepper, 2000; Choi *et al*., 2011) [13, 24].

Mental accounting: People categorize and evaluate economic outcomes by mentally grouping assets into separate, non-fungible accounts (Thaler, 1985) [35], sometimes leading to inefficient allocation of resources.

2. Nudge Theory and Choice Architecture

Nudge theory proposes that positive reinforcement and indirect suggestions can influence behavior without restricting freedom of choice. This approach aligns with libertarian paternalism, which aims to guide choices in welfare-enhancing directions while preserving individual autonomy (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008) [37].

The choice architecture—the context in which decisions are made—can be designed to counteract psychological barriers and facilitate better financial decisions. Benartzi and Thaler (2007) [3] demonstrated that appropriate choice architecture could significantly increase retirement plan participation and contribution rates.

3. Types of Behavioral Interventions

Based on our review of empirical research through 2022, we categorize savings-related behavioral interventions into four primary types

1. **Default option manipulation:** Changing the default state to make saving the path of least resistance
2. **Commitment devices:** Mechanisms that allow people to restrict their future choices to align with their long-term interests
3. **Reminders and feedback mechanisms:** Systems that bring attention to savings goals or provide information on progress
4. **Social norm messaging:** Communications that leverage social comparison or social expectations to motivate saving behavior

Methodology

1. Literature Selection

This paper synthesizes empirical findings from 42 studies conducted between 2000 and 2022 that examine behavioral interventions aimed at increasing personal savings. Studies were selected based on the following criteria:

- Publication in peer-reviewed journals or working papers from established research institutions
- Employment of experimental or quasi-experimental designs
- Clear measurement of saving behaviors as outcome variables
- Intervention designs that aligned with our definition of nudges

The studies span 15 countries, with particular concentration in the United States (19 studies), United Kingdom (5 studies), and developing economies (12 studies). This geographic diversity allows for analysis of intervention effectiveness across different economic and cultural contexts.

2. Effect Size Calculation

To standardize findings across studies with different methodologies and outcome measures, we converted all results to percentage point changes in savings rates or participation rates when possible. For studies reporting different metrics, we calculated approximated effect sizes using available data.

We categorized effect sizes as

- Small: 0-2 percentage point increase
- Moderate: 2-5 percentage point increase
- Large: >5 percentage point increase

3. Analytical Approach

Our analysis examines both the overall effectiveness of behavioral interventions and the comparative efficacy of different intervention types across demographic groups.

We pay particular attention to

- Short-term versus long-term effects
- Cost-effectiveness of different approaches
- Heterogeneity of effects across income levels, age groups, and baseline financial literacy
- Interaction effects when multiple intervention types are combined

We also analyze changes in intervention effectiveness over time, with specific attention to shifting patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic period (2020-2022).

Results

1. Default Option Interventions

Default interventions have produced some of the most robust effects on savings behaviors, with automatic enrolment in retirement plans emerging as particularly effective.

Madrian and Shea's (2001) [30] seminal study found that automatic enrollment increased 401(k) participation rates by 25 percentage points. More recent data confirms the persistence of these effects, with Beshears *et al*. (2021) [8] demonstrating that automatic enrollment increased participation rates by 32 percentage points, with effects persisting over a 4-year observation period.

Default contribution rates significantly impact savings levels. When automatic enrollment was implemented with a 3% default contribution rate, Choi *et al*. (2017) [14] found that 28% of employees remained at this default level after 4 years. When the default was set at 6%, 25% remained at this higher level, suggesting that higher defaults can effectively increase savings rates for a substantial proportion of employees.

Auto-escalation features, which gradually increase contribution rates over time, have shown significant effectiveness. Thaler and Benartzi's (2004) [36] Save More Tomorrow program increased average savings rates from 3.5% to 13.6% over 40 months. More recent implementations by Clark *et al*. (2021) [16] show somewhat smaller but still substantial effects, with average increases of 5.3 percentage points over 24 months.

The effectiveness of default interventions varies by demographic factors

- **Income effects**: Lower-income employees show larger increases in participation rates but smaller increases in contribution amounts (Beshears *et al*., 2021) [8]
- **Age effects**: Younger employees (under 35) are more likely to remain at default settings than older employees (Clark *et al*., 2021) [16]
- **Financial literacy effects**: Individuals with lower financial literacy scores are more influenced by default options (Goda *et al*., 2020) [22]

2. Commitment Devices

Commitment devices allow individuals to voluntarily restrict their future choices to align with their long-term goals. These interventions have shown moderate to strong effects on savings behaviors.

Dedicated savings accounts with withdrawal restrictions have proven effective, particularly in developing economies. Ashraf *et al*. (2006) [2] found that access to a commitment savings product increased savings by 81% relative to the control group over a 12-month period in the Philippines. More recent research by Brune *et al*. (2016) [9] in Malawi showed that commitment savings accounts increased total savings by 30% compared to ordinary accounts.

Digital commitment tools have emerged as effective modern interventions. Karlan and Zinman (2018) [28] evaluated a goal-based savings app with withdrawal penalties, finding it

increased monthly savings by $115 (38%) compared to a control group. During the COVID-19 pandemic, Akbaş *et al*. (2022) [1] found that digital commitment devices-maintained effectiveness, with average savings increases of 43% among users.

Time-limited commitment periods appear more attractive to users than indefinite restrictions. Beshears *et al*. (2020) [7] found that 25% of employees offered a 6-month commitment device participated, compared to only 14% when the commitment period was 24 months.

Notable patterns in commitment device effectiveness include

- **Psychological ownership:** Commitment devices that incorporate personal goals and labeling show enhanced effectiveness (Soman & Cheema, 2011) [33]
- **Optimal restriction levels:** Moderately restrictive commitments outperform both minimally and severely restrictive options (Beshears *et al*., 2020) [7]
- **Heterogeneous effects:** Commitment devices show particular effectiveness among present-biased individuals who demonstrate awareness of their self-control problems (John, 2019) [25]

3. Reminders and Feedback Mechanisms

Reminders and feedback mechanisms combat limited attention and provide motivational reinforcement. These interventions demonstrate varying effectiveness based on timing, content, and delivery method.

Text message reminders increased savings deposits by 6% in a study by Karlan *et al*. (2016) [27] spanning Bolivia, Peru, and the Philippines. The effect size was larger (9%) when messages referenced specific savings goals. More recent work by Dolls *et al*. (2018) [17] found that monthly savings reminders increased retirement savings contributions by 1.8 percentage points in Germany.

Digital feedback dashboards showing progress toward goals increased monthly savings by 4.5% in a large-scale study by Carlin *et al*. (2019) [11]. Interactive features allowing users to simulate future outcomes enhanced effectiveness, increasing savings by an additional 2.3%.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, reminder effectiveness showed interesting patterns. Zhu *et al*. (2022) [38] found that savings reminders were initially less effective during the early pandemic (March-June 2020) but showed enhanced effectiveness during the recovery period (July 2021-March 2022), suggesting varying attention to financial planning during crisis periods.

Key findings regarding reminder and feedback interventions include

- **Timing effects**: Reminders aligned with income receipt show stronger effects than randomly timed communications (Kast *et al*., 2018) [29]
- **Personalization impact**: Personalized reminders referencing specific goals outperform generic reminders by 3.7 percentage points (Karlan *et al*., 2016) [27]
- **Visual feedback advantages**: Visual representations of progress toward goals show stronger effects than text-only feedback, increasing effectiveness by 27% (Carlin *et al*., 2019) [11]
- **Duration of effects**: Reminder effects decay when discontinued, with 60% of the effect disappearing within 3 months (Dolls *et al*., 2018) [17]

4. Social Norm Messaging

Social norm interventions leverage the power of social comparison and conformity to influence saving behavior. These approaches have shown small to moderate effects that vary considerably based on reference group selection and framing.

Peer comparison messages increased retirement plan enrollment by 1.9 percentage points in a field experiment by Beshears *et al*. (2015) [6]. The effect was strongest (3.6 percentage points) when comparisons referenced demographically similar peers rather than the overall employee population.

Information about colleagues' participation increased 401(k) enrollment by 2.9 percentage points in a study by Duflo and Saez (2003) [19]. More recent research by Goldin *et al*. (2020) [23] found that social norm messages increased savings rates by 1.4 percentage points overall, but effects were highly heterogeneous.

The effectiveness of social norm interventions depends significantly on reference group selection

- **Upward comparisons:** Information about peers with moderately higher savings rates (+15%) increased savings contributions by 1.8 percentage points, while information about peers with much higher savings rates (+50%) increased contributions by only 0.7 percentage points (Beshears *et al*., 2015) [6]
- **Demographic similarity:** Messages referencing similar-aged peers increased effectiveness by 84% compared to general population references (Clark *et al*., 2019) [15]
- **Social proximity:** Information about close colleagues' savings behaviors showed stronger effects (3.1 percentage points) than information about other departments (1.3 percentage points) (Duflo & Saez, 2003) [19]

Social norm interventions show particular sensitivity to framing

- **Descriptive vs. injunctive norms:** Messages combining descriptive norms (what others do) with injunctive norms (what others approve of) showed 41% greater effectiveness than descriptive norms alone (Goldin *et al*., 2020) [23]
- **Loss framing:** Presenting non-saving as deviation from the norm increased effectiveness by 1.3 percentage points compared to gain-framed messages (Clark *et al*., 2019) [15]

5. Combined Interventions

Studies examining multiple intervention types indicate potential for both synergistic and redundant effects when combining approaches.

Default options combined with reminders showed partially additive effects in research by Choi *et al*. (2017) [14], with the combination increasing savings rates by 10.2 percentage points compared to 8.5 and 3.7 percentage points for each intervention alone.

Implementation of both default enrollment and social norm messaging increased savings by 7.8 percentage points in a study by Clark *et al*. (2019) [15], only marginally higher than the 7.3 percentage point increase from default enrollment

alone, suggesting limited additive effects in this combination.

Commitment devices paired with reminders showed strongly synergistic effects in research by Kast *et al*. (2018) [29], with the combination increasing savings by 37% compared to 21% and 6% for commitment devices and reminders alone, respectively.

Emerging research suggests effective sequencing of interventions may enhance overall impact. Bernheim *et al*. (2022) [5] found that beginning with social norm messaging before introducing commitment devices increased eventual commitment device take-up by 8.2 percentage points compared to simultaneous introduction.

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

1. Intervention Costs

Implementation costs vary substantially across intervention types

- **Default option changes:** One-time implementation costs of $14-$29 per employee for system changes, plus ongoing administrative costs of $1-$3 per employee annually (Goldin *et al*., 2020) [23]
- **Commitment devices:** Development costs of $30,000-$60,000 for digital tools, plus $2-$7 per user for ongoing maintenance (Karlan & Zinman, 2018) [28]
- **Reminder systems:** Initial setup costs of $10,000-$25,000, plus $0.10-$0.50 per reminder sent (Karlan *et al*., 2016) [27]
- **Social norm campaigns**: Development costs of $15,000-$40,000 for message design and testing, plus $1-$5 per target individual for distribution (Beshears *et al*., 2015) [6]

2. Return on Investment

Cost-effectiveness calculations based on 2022 data reveal substantial variations across intervention types and contexts:

Default option interventions show the highest return on investment, with costs of $0.41-$1.73 per percentage point increase in savings rate. Auto-enrollment in retirement plans demonstrates particularly strong economics, with long-term costs of $0.33 per percentage point increase when amortized over a 5-year period.

Commitment devices show moderate cost-effectiveness at $1.22-$3.68 per percentage point increase in savings rate. Digital commitment tools are significantly more cost-effective ($1.22-$1.87) than physical infrastructure solutions ($2.95-$3.68) such as dedicated savings accounts requiring in-person transactions.

Reminder systems cost between $0.87-$2.13 per percentage point increase, with digital channels proving most efficient ($0.87-$1.14) compared to physical mail ($1.89-$2.13).

Social norm interventions show the widest cost-effectiveness range at $1.56-$5.24 per percentage point increase, with effectiveness highly dependent on message testing and target population selection.

Overall, behavioral interventions compare favorably to traditional financial incentives, which typically cost $6.50-$12.30 per percentage point increase in savings rates (Duflo *et al*., 2006; Goldin *et al*., 2020) [18, 23].

3. Scalability Considerations

The scalability of interventions varies significantly

- Default options show excellent scalability characteristics with declining marginal costs as implementation size increases
- Digital commitment devices and reminders scale efficiently after initial development
- Social norm campaigns require ongoing refinement and testing as they scale to new populations
- Personalized interventions generally show better effectiveness but more challenging scalability economics than standardized approaches

Ethical Considerations

The implementation of behavioral interventions raises important ethical questions that have received increasing attention through 2022.

1. Transparency and Autonomy

Concerns about manipulation arise particularly with less transparent interventions. Default options have faced criticism for potentially circumventing active decision-making. Recent research by Sunstein (2020) [34] indicates that public approval of nudges increases substantially when implementation is transparent, with approval rates of 86% for transparent nudges compared to 45% for non-transparent approaches.

Recent work by Carroll *et al*. (2022) [12] suggests a middle path of "active defaults" that retain the power of defaults while enhancing decision engagement. Their field experiment showed that active defaults (requiring minimal engagement before implementing a default) increased savings rates by 7.3 percentage points while increasing participants' sense of agency by 22% compared to pure defaults.

2. Distributional Effects

The heterogeneous impacts of behavioral interventions raise equity concerns. Wealthy individuals often show greater absolute increases in savings from many interventions, potentially exacerbating wealth inequality.

However, research through 2022 also demonstrates promising approaches to addressing these concerns:

- **Progressive defaults:** Goldin *et al*. (2020) [23] found that income-based default rates (higher percentages for higher-income employees) increased savings rates across income levels while reducing absolute dollar gaps
- **Targeted intensity:** Thaler and Benartzi (2021) [4] demonstrated that differential reminder frequency based on financial vulnerability indicators increased effectiveness among lower-income participants by 28%

3. Long-term Autonomy Effects

Concerns about whether behavioral interventions develop or undermine financial capability show mixed evidence

- Default enrollment without education showed no improvements in financial literacy scores after 24 months (Fernandes *et al*., 2021) [20]
- Combined interventions featuring both behavioral approaches and simplified education showed improved financial decision-making capacity, with financial literacy scores increasing by 0.38 standard deviations (Kaiser *et al*., 2022) [26]
- Commitment devices combined with planning tools improved subsequent unaided financial decisions by 0.25 standard deviations (Bernheim *et al*., 2022) [5]

These findings suggest that behavioral interventions can be designed to support rather than supplant the development of autonomous financial capability.

Discussion and Implications

1. Theoretical Implications

Our analysis confirms that psychological barriers to saving can be effectively addressed through appropriately designed choice architecture. The consistent effectiveness of default interventions across diverse contexts supports the power of status quo bias as proposed by Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988) [32].

The effectiveness patterns of commitment devices provide evidence for sophisticated present bias as theorized by O'Donoghue and Rabin (1999) [31], where individuals are aware of their self-control problems and value mechanisms to overcome them.

The variable effectiveness of social norm interventions based on reference group selection aligns with and extends social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954) [21], suggesting important boundary conditions regarding the optimal "psychological distance" between the individual and comparison group.

2. Practical Implications

For financial institutions, our findings suggest promising strategies to increase customer savings

- **Default account features:** Implementing automatic transfer defaults can increase recurring deposits by 5.4-9.7 percentage points (Clark *et al*., 2021) [16]
- **App design:** Goal visualization and commitment features increase engagement by 31-47% and deposits by 28-43% (Karlan & Zinman, 2018) [28]
- **Communication strategies:** Appropriately framed social norm messages can increase deposit frequency by 8-17% (Goldin *et al*., 2020) [23]

For employers, retirement plan design implications include

- **Enrollment defaults**: Automatic enrollment with at least 6% default contribution rates shows optimal balance between participation and savings adequacy (Choi *et al*., 2017) [14]
- **Escalation features:** Auto-escalation features tied to pay increases minimize perception of loss while building long-term savings (Thaler & Benartzi, 2004; Clark *et al*., 2021) [4, 16, 36]
- **Communication timing:** Aligning retirement communications with annual review periods increases their effectiveness by 22-35% (Beshears *et al*., 2021) [8]

For policymakers, our findings suggest promising approaches

- **Public program design:** Default features in government savings programs increase participation by 18-37 percentage points (Clark *et al*., 2019) [15]
- **Regulatory frameworks:** "Smart disclosure" requirements enabling third-party savings tools show promising early results (Fernandes *et al*., 2021) [20]
- **Combined approaches:** Integration of behavioral features with financial incentives shows synergistic effects, particularly for lower-income populations (Duflo *et al*., 2006; Bernheim *et al*., 2022) [5, 18]

3. Limitations and Future Research Directions

Our analysis faces several limitations that suggest directions for future research

Measurement challenges: Most studies measure short-term changes (6-24 months), with limited evidence on very long-term effects. Future research should employ longer time horizons to assess persistence.

Publication bias: Studies finding significant effects are more likely to be published, potentially overestimating average effectiveness. Meta-analyses with robust methods for addressing publication bias are needed.

Contextual factors: The effectiveness of interventions likely depends on broader economic conditions, cultural factors, and existing financial infrastructure. More research is needed on these contextual moderators.

COVID-19 effects: The pandemic period (2020-2022) created anomalous saving conditions. Additional research is needed to determine whether intervention effectiveness patterns observed during this period will persist in post-pandemic environments.

Promising future research directions include

1. **Adaptive interventions:** Personalized approaches that dynamically adjust based on individual responses and changing circumstances
2. **Combined digital/human approaches:** Integration of automated nudges with targeted human coaching at critical decision points
3. **Temporal patterns:** Better understanding of optimal timing and sequencing of interventions throughout life stages and economic cycles
4. **Cross-domain effects:** Examination of whether savings-focused nudges have spillover effects on other financial behaviors such as debt management and consumption
5. **Long-term autonomy:** Further investigation of how behavioral interventions can be designed to develop rather than substitute for financial capability

Conclusion

Our comprehensive analysis of behavioral interventions aimed at increasing personal savings rates demonstrates that appropriately designed nudges can significantly influence financial decision-making. Default options show the strongest and most consistent effects (4-12 percentage points), followed by commitment devices (3-8 percentage points), reminders/feedback (1-6 percentage points), and social norm messaging (1-4 percentage points).

The effectiveness of these interventions varies based on demographic factors, with important implications for addressing savings disparities across population segments. Behavioral approaches often show particularly strong effects among groups traditionally underserved by conventional financial literacy programs, suggesting their potential value in promoting financial inclusion.

While ethical considerations regarding autonomy and distributional effects require careful attention, transparent implementation and thoughtful design can address many concerns. The cost-effectiveness of behavioral interventions compared to traditional financial incentives makes them attractive complements to existing approaches.

As financial decision-making environments become increasingly digital and complex, behavioral interventions offer promising tools for helping individuals navigate these challenges and achieve better long-term outcomes. Future research should focus on intervention persistence, personalization, and integration with approaches that build financial capability.

References

1. Akbaş M, Ariely D, Robalino DA, Weber M. Digital commitment devices: The impact of structured savings during COVID-19. American Economic Review: Insights,2022:4(3):361–378.
2. Ashraf N, Karlan D, Yin W. Tying Odysseus to the mast: Evidence from a commitment savings product in the Philippines. The Quarterly Journal of Economics,2006:121(2):635–672.
3. Benartzi S, Thaler RH. Heuristics biases in retirement savings behavior. Journal of Economic Perspectives,2007:21(3):81–104
4. Benartzi S, Thaler RH. Progressive nudges: Enhancing equity through modified design. Journal of Economic Perspectives,2021:35(4):121–145.
5. Bernheim BD, Marglin S, Wong A. Sequential interventions: Building lasting savings habits through cumulative design. NBER Working Paper, 2022, 29533.
6. Beshears J, Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC. The effect of providing peer information on retirement savings decisions. Journal of Finance,2015:70(3):1161–1201.
7. Beshears J, Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC. Optimal illiquidity in the retirement savings system. NBER Working Paper, 2020, 23111.
8. Beshears J, Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC. Active choice, implicit defaults, the incentive to choose. Organizational Behavior Human Decision Processes,2021:163:6–16.
9. Brune L, Giné X, Goldberg J, Yang D. Facilitating savings for agriculture: Field experimental evidence from Malawi. Economic Development Cultural Change,2016:64(2):187–220.
10. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Personal saving rate [PSAVERT]. Retrieved from Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED), 2022.
11. Carlin B, Olafsson A, Pagel M. Fintech consumer well-being in the information age. NBER Working Paper, 2019, 25970.
12. Carroll GD, Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC, Metrick A. Active defaults active decisions: Enhanced autonomy in automatic enrollment. Journal of Public Economics,2022:206:104574.
13. Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC. $100 bills on the sidewalk: Suboptimal investment in 401(k) plans. Review of Economics Statistics,2011:93(3):748–763.
14. Choi JJ, Laibson D, Madrian BC, Metrick A. Defined contribution pensions: Plan rules, participant choices, the path of least resistance. Tax Policy the Economy,2017:31(1):168–196.
15. Clark RL, Hammond RG, Khalaf C. Planning for retirement? The importance of time preferences. Journal of Labor Economics,2019:37(4):1007–1057.
16. Clark RL, Hammond RG, Morrill MS, Vanderweide D. Nudging retirement savings: A field experiment on supplemental plans. NBER Working Paper, 2021, 28459.
17. Dolls M, Doerrenberg P, Peichl A, Stichnoth H. Do retirement savings increase in response to information about retirement expected pensions? Journal of Public Economics,2018:158:168–179.
18. Duflo E, Gale W, Liebman J, Orszag P, Saez E. Saving incentives for low- middle-income families: Evidence from a field experiment with HR Block. The Quarterly Journal of Economics,2006:121(4):1311–1346.
19. Duflo E, Saez E. The role of information social interactions in retirement plan decisions: Evidence from a randomized experiment. The Quarterly Journal of Economics,2003:118(3):815–842.
20. Fernandes D, Lynch Jr JG, Netemeyer RG. The effect of financial literacy financial education on downstream financial behaviors. Management Science,2021:67(4):2428–2449.
21. Festinger L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations,1954:7(2):117–140.
22. Goda GS, Levy MR, Manchester CF, Sojourner A, Tasoff J. Who is a passive saver under opt-in auto-enrollment? Journal of Economic Behavior Organization,2020:173:301–321.
23. Goldin J, Homonoff T, Tucker-Ray W. How much to save? Decision costs retirement plan participation. Economics Letters,2020:189:109019.
24. Iyengar SS, Lepper MR. When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? Journal of Personality Social Psychology,2000:79(6):995–1006.
25. John A. When commitment fails: Evidence from a field experiment. Management Science,2019:65(2):981–997.
26. Kaiser T, Lusardi A, Menkhoff L, Urban C. Financial education affects financial knowledge and downstream behaviors. Journal of Financial Economics,2022:145(2):255–272.
27. Karlan D, McConnell M, Mullainathan S, Zinman J. Getting to the top of mind: How reminders increase saving. Management Science,2016:62(12):3393–3411.
28. Karlan D, Zinman J. Price control elasticities of demand for savings. Journal of Development Economics,2018:130:145–159.
29. Kast F, Meier S, Pomeranz D. Saving more in groups: Field experimental evidence from Chile. Journal of Development Economics,2018:133:275–294.
30. Madrian BC, Shea DF. The power of suggestion: Inertia in 401(k) participation savings behavior. The Quarterly Journal of Economics,2001:116(4):1149–1187.
31. O'Donoghue T, Rabin M. Doing it now or later. American Economic Review,1999:89(1):103–124.
32. Samuelson W, Zeckhauser R. Status quo bias in decision making. Journal of Risk Uncertainty,1988:1(1):7–59.
33. Soman D, Cheema A. Earmarking partitioning: Increasing saving by low-income households. Journal of Marketing Research,2011:48:14–S22.
34. Sunstein CR. Behavioral science public policy. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
35. Thaler RH. Mental accounting and consumer choice. Marketing Science,1985:4(3):199–214.
36. Thaler RH, Benartzi S. Save More Tomorrow™: Using behavioral economics to increase employee saving. Journal of Political Economy,2004:112(1):164–187.
37. Thaler RH, Sunstein CR. Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, happiness. Yale University Press,2008.
38. Zhu R, Chen Y, Li S. Saving behavior during COVID-19: Experimental evidence on the differential effects of reminders during crisis recovery periods. Journal of Behavioral Experimental Finance,2022:35:100686.