

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Theoretical context | 1 |
| 1.1.1 | Financial wellbeing and why it matters | 1 |
| 1.1.2 | Role of behavioural science | 4 |
| 1.2 | Objectives and research questions | 5 |
| 1.3 | Chapter summaries | 6 |
| 1.4 | Contribution | 6 |
| 1.5 | Limitations and directions for further research | 6 |
| 2 | Conclusion | 8 |
| 2.1 | Summary | 8 |
| 2.2 | Discussion | 8 |
| | Bibliography | 10 |

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Theoretical context

1.1.1 Financial wellbeing and why it matters

Financial wellbeing is a state in which a person can make ends meet in the present, can feel comfortable about their financial future, can feel comfortable about money, and has the financial freedom to make choices that allow for the enjoyment of life. This includes having control over ones day-to-day and month-to-month finances, not having to borrow to meet ongoing obligations, being free of debt or being in control of it, having the capacity to meet unexpected expenses, and – for a working-age individual – being on track to build enough savings for retirement.¹

Financial wellbeing is important because a lack of it can have severe consequences both in the short-term and in the long-term. In the short-term, low financial wellbeing means a constant struggle to make ends meet, being overwhelmed by debt, having circumstances dictate ones of and approach to money, a higher likelihood of experiencing material hardship – which (CFPB 2017) defines as running out or worrying about running out of food, not being able to afford medical treatment or a place to live, or have utilities turned off – and the need to cut back on essentials for ones children.² All of these experiences

¹The US Consumer Financial Protection Bureau defines financial wellbeing as “a state of being wherein a person can fully meet current and ongoing financial obligations, can feel secure in their financial future, and is able to make choices that allow enjoyment of life” (CFPB 2015). The UK’s Money and Pension service defines current financial wellbeing as “being able to pay the bills and feel comfortable about money” and longer-term financial security as “having the savings to deal with the expected, the unexpected and the longer-term; or having some form of loss protection such as home contents or life insurance” (MPS 2018). Both organisations also differentiate some aspects of financial wellbeing depending on whether an individual is in their working or retirement age. Throughout, this discussion, as well as in the analysis in the following chapters, I focus on working age individuals.

²For more detailed descriptions about the consequences of financial hardship, see CFPB

can cause a decline in physical and mental health, a loss of productivity, and an overall deterioration in the quality of life.

In the long-term, the danger is that the situation is not only self-sustaining but leads to a vicious circle that becomes increasingly hard to escape. This can happen purely because having to borrow for regular expenses like food and bills – as, the Money and Pension service estimates, about 9 million adults in the UK do (MPS 2018) – can lead to a situation where an increasing amount has to be spent on servicing debt and thus increases monthly expenses and the borrowed amounts required to cover them. In addition, however, this could happen because of increasingly impaired decision making. A literature on mental scarcity documents that our minds tend to focus on what is scarce and neglect what is not, concentrating our mental resources where they are most needed but reducing cognitive bandwidth in other domains, which can lead to poorer decision making.³ For instance, Mani et al. (2013) find that low-income shoppers in New Jersey perform worse on cognitive tasks when first prompted to think about their financial situation while the same prompts had no effect for wealthier shoppers, and sugarcane farmers in India perform worse on similar cognitive tasks shortly before the annual harvest (when money is scarce) than shortly thereafter (when money is plentiful). Hence, if the anxiety caused by having little money to cover current expenses makes it harder for individuals to engage in rational planning for the future – how to reduce spending, how to build skills that would help find a higher-paying job, how to transition to a healthier lifestyle that would help them feel and perform better physically and mentally – then low financial wellbeing in the present might beget low financial wellbeing in the future.

The determinants of financial wellbeing are a combination of circumstantial and external factors as well as the capabilities, beliefs, and behaviours of the individual. MPS (2018) provides a useful categorisation that sees financial wellbeing as a function of four broad factors: external factors that include economic conditions, demographics, and other external factors such as a person’s social environment; enablers that include financial confidence and numeracy, a sense of control, one’s spending and savings mindset, and one’s engagement with money, advice, and technology; day-to-day behaviours like managing the use of credit, avoiding to borrow for everyday spends, active saving, keeping track of and making adjustments to one’s spending, and shopping around; and, finally, planning ahead behaviours like building financial resilience through saving and planning for retirement.⁴

(2017), MPS (2018), and Step Change (2017).

³See Shah et al. (2012), Mullainathan and Shafir (2013), and Haushofer and Fehr (2014) for excellent summaries of the literature.

⁴The US Consumer Financial Protection Bureau uses a similar classification in its definition

While no one factor is deterministic for financial wellbeing, research from the US (CFPB 2017) and the UK MPS (2018) agrees that, as expected, external economic factors such as access to education and higher paying jobs are important. In the UK, for instance, individuals with an annual income of £20,000 or below account for 41 percent of the working age population but for 69 percent of those with less than £100 of savings. Similarly, 50 percent of people who borrow to cover everyday expenses earn less than £17,000. So, clearly, a search for and support of effective economic and social policy measures should be an important part of any effort to improve societal financial wellbeing. But the same research also shows that higher incomes are not sufficient. In the UK, 18 percent of individuals with less than £100 in savings have a household income of £30,000 or higher, and 20 percent of those who borrow to cover everyday expenses have an income of £50,000 or higher. In the US, too, there is large variation in the characteristics of individuals at each level of financial wellbeing; the financial wellbeing of the top quarter of people with a high-school degree, for instance, is higher than that of the bottom half of those with graduate degrees.

In both countries, research shows that the level of savings is a key contributor to financial wellbeing. In the US, it is the one factor that discriminates between different levels of financial wellbeing better than any other examined factor (CFPB 2017). In the UK, it is, together with behaviour towards credit, the strongest predictor of financial wellbeing (MPS 2018). In fact, research by a UK charity suggests that having £1,000 in liquid savings could reduce the probability of being in debt by almost half. In particular, having a habit of saving regularly – even more so than the amounts saved – has been found to be a key determinant. Other factors that are positively associated with higher financial wellbeing are confidence in one's ability to achieve one's financial goals, not using debt to cover everyday expenses, paying one's bills on time, staying within one's budget and spending plan, paying credit card balances in full, and checking bank statements for errors.⁵

But many people struggle with these behaviours. For instance, in the UK, 21 percent of the working-age population (10.7 million adults) report to rarely or never save, and 22 percent of the population have less than £100 in savings, with those holding that amount in a formal savings account being even lower. Unsurprisingly, then, one in four adults could not pay an unexpected bill of £300 from their own money. In the US, the situation is similar, with 30 percent of adults saying they would be unable to cover a bill of \$400. This is problematic because

of financial wellbeing (CFPB 2015).

⁵For details on contributors to financial wellbeing see (CFPB 2017) for the US and MPS (2018) for the UK.

many households do face unexpected financial shocks over the course of a year. Also, many households experience high income volatility: in the US between 2013 and 2018, the median month-to-month change in household income was 36 percent, with low-income households experiencing more frequent and larger income dips (Chase 2019). The same research finds that while families need roughly six weeks of take-home income in liquid assets to weather a simultaneous income dip and expenditure shock, 65 percent of households lack such a buffer. In line with these findings, Roll and Despard (2020) find that during the coronavirus pandemic, households with liquid assets of above \$2,000 had significantly lower risk to experience financial distress (indicators like skipping essential bills, being behind on credit card debt, being in overdraft) than households with lower savings.

Managing debt is similarly challenging for many. 9 million people in the UK also borrow to cover expenses for food and bills (MPS 2018), and many struggle to stay on top of their credit card debt: 2 million cards were in arrears or default, another 2 million carried persistent debt, and for another 1.6 million cards, owners were persistently making minimum payments only. Altogether, the study found that 5 million accounts (9 percent of the total) that were active in January 2015 would, under their current repayment pattern and without further borrowing, take 10 years to repay their balance (FCA 2016).

1.1.2 Role of behavioural science

Behavioural science can contribute to higher financial wellbeing in three ways. First, as a discipline, we understand a fair amount about systematic tendencies in human behaviour that often makes it hard for people to achieve their own goals, and we have tested and refined some solutions that can help people do that. Second, a large body of research has used a subset of these insights and solutions to help people save more for retirement, and we have learned important lessons from that endeavour, at least some of which translate to other behaviours that promote financial wellbeing. Third, behavioural science might be able to help understand and – ultimately – circumvent the barriers that stand in the way of economic and social policies that shape the financial wellbeing of many people to a large degree but is largely outside of their control. Here, I will discuss them in turn.

- Retirement planning: among working age, 14 pct report to have done substantial amount of retirement planning, 44 pct at least a good amount. Among those between 45-65, this is 47 percent. 20 pct of that latter group have no plan at all.

- buyalskaya2021golden for opportunities of new data for social research
- stachl2020predicting show that using sensor and log data from smartphones to predict peoples' Big Five personality traits is about as accurate as using social media footprints.

- montjoye2013predicting also predict personality (big five) from mobile log data and find predictions to be considerably better than random.

- Current applications: simpler dashboards (Monzo, Money Dashboard), robo advising (philippon2019fintech, dacunto2021frontiers)
- Challenges: what is good advise (sabat2019rules)
- Adaptation in financial sector (boe2019machine)
- McKenzie and Liersch (2011) find that people systematically underestimate the exponential growth, and that showing them difference in long term outcome from regular savings left to compound makes them more motivated to save more for retirement. This is something fintech apps can easily help with by showing projections - or offering to show them - what is my wealth if I save x, or y, or z.
- Soman and Cheema (2011) find that earmarking part of salary as savings increases savings rates. Fintech apps could suggest automatically transferring fixed amount into labelled savings pot.
- De Montjoye et al. (2015) find that it's easy to reidentify users based on credit card metadata.

Exception: Philipps et al. (2021) - Automatic payroll deduction seems to be valued by employees and has helped people from the squeezed and struggling segments

This is why I'm focusing on it... Discuss in next section.

1.2 Objectives and research questions

- I use a single dataset, provided by Money Dashboard, for all three papers.
- The data presented a number of challenges.
- Handling data of this size.
- Secure storage with easy remote access (AWS).
- Consistent and efficient preprocessing (my process).

- Open science contribution: all work available on Github, code available for preprocessing from beginning to end.

Motivation: My experience as a researcher in well-known academic and private-sector institutions has made clear to me over the years that careful, reliable, and replicable data preprocessing is undervalued in many settings.

The result are plain data errors that overturn results (Reinhard and Rogoff) and replication issues (see Ariely controversies). Given my experience, I'd think that all we know is the tip of the iceberg.

In the vast majority of empirical research projects there is no good reason to not make the code public, even when the data is proprietary. And yet, for the vast majority of papers, there is no code available to replicate findings and check precise implementation details, which often matter but are not described in papers.

All of this harms science - the quality of it and the trust in it.

I have dedicated a lot of time during my PhD to ensure that I can rectify at least some of those issues.

The code for all my projects is available online and includes scripts that can be used to easily run the entire analysis.

1.3 Chapter summaries

There is a lot more work to be done in characterising spending profiles. From entropy paper: There are a number of alternative ways to characterise spend profiles. We could calculate profiles based on the distribution of transaction values rather than counts. We could also calculate profiles based on inter-temporal rather than intra-temporal distributions, focusing on consistency of purchasing behaviour over time rather than on predictability at any given time (Krumme et al. 2013). Further, we could focus on time-based rather than category-based measures, focusing, for instance, on whether purchases of the same type tend to occur on the same day of the week (Guidotti et al. 2015). Finally, one could also create composite measures based on principal component analysis, an approach used in Eagle et al. (2010). We leave these extensions for future research.

1.4 Contribution

1.5 Limitations and directions for further research

Data - Sample representativeness

- Can often only use small fraction of users for study because of incomplete data for many. One reason: mps2018building points out that many people use budgeting tools to achieve short term goals. Hence, no intention of long-term use.

Chapter 2

Conclusion

This thesis consists of three independent research studies on ...

In the first part of this conclusion, I will summarise the three chapters, before discussing challenges...

2.1 Summary

The two applied studies presented in Chapters 1 and 2 are purely exploratory. A natural next step to exploring their generalisability is a pre-registered replication on new data (Van den Akker et al., 2019). We did not pre-register any studies presented here since many analysis decisions were taken conditional on the data observed. It is a well-known problem that such data-dependent decisions can affect the conclusions drawn from the research (Simmons, Nelson, and Simonsohn, 2011; Gelman and Loken, 2014). The studies are thus a useful first step in exploring the questions of ethnic bias and domestic abuse and will require further, pre-registered analyses.

2.2 Discussion

Bibliography

- CFPB, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (2015). “Financial well-being: the goal of financial educaion”. Tech. rep. URL: https://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201501_cfpb_report_financial-well-being.pdf.
- (2017). “Financial Well-being in America”. Tech. rep. URL: <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/data-research/research-reports/financial-well-being-america/>.
- Chase, J.P. Morgan (2019). “Weathering Volatility 2.0”. Tech. rep. URL: <https://www.jpmorganchase.com/content/dam/jpmc/jpmorgan-chase-and-co/institute/pdf/institute-volatility-cash-buffer-report.pdf>.
- De Montjoye, Yves-Alexandre, Laura Radaelli, Vivek Kumar Singh, and Alex “Sandy” Pentland (2015). “Unique in the shopping mall: On the reidentifiability of credit card metadata”. In: *Science* 347.6221, pp. 536–539.
- Eagle, Nathan, Michael Macy, and Rob Claxton (2010). “Network diversity and economic development”. In: *Science* 328.5981, pp. 1029–1031.
- FCA, Financial Conduct Authority (2016). “Credit card market study - final findings report”. Tech. rep. URL: <https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/market-studies/ms14-6-3-credit-card-market-study-final-findings-report.pdf>.
- Guidotti, Riccardo, Michele Coscia, Dino Pedreschi, and Diego Pennacchioli (2015). “Behavioral entropy and profitability in retail”. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, pp. 1–10.
- Haushofer, Johannes and Ernst Fehr (2014). “On the psychology of poverty”. In: *Science* 344.6186, pp. 862–867.
- Krumme, Coco, Alejandro Llorente, Manuel Cebrian, Alex Pentland, and Esteban Moro (2013). “The predictability of consumer visitation patterns”. In: *Scientific reports* 3.1, pp. 1–5.
- Mani, Anandi, Sendhil Mullainathan, Eldar Shafir, and Jiaying Zhao (2013). “Poverty impedes cognitive function”. In: *science* 341.6149, pp. 976–980.

- McKenzie, Craig RM and Michael J Liersch (2011). “Misunderstanding savings growth: Implications for retirement savings behavior”. In: *Journal of Marketing Research* 48.SPL, S1–S13.
- MPS, Money and Pension Service (2018). “Building the Financial Capability of UK Adults”. Tech. rep. URL: <https://moneyandpensionsservice.org.uk/2019/02/06/adult-financial-capability-building-the-financial-capability-of-uk-adults-survey/>.
- Mullainathan, Sendhil and Eldar Shafir (2013). *Scarcity: Why having too little means so much*. Macmillan.
- Philipps, Jo, Annick Kuipers, and Will Sandbrook (2021). “Supporting emergency savings: early learnings of the employee experience of workplace sidecar savings”. Tech. rep.
- Roll, Stephen and Mathieu Despard (2020). “Income loss and financial distress during COVID-19: The protective role of liquid assets”. In: *Available at SSRN* 3733862.
- Shah, Anuj K, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Eldar Shafir (2012). “Some consequences of having too little”. In: *Science* 338.6107, pp. 682–685.
- Soman, Dilip and Amar Cheema (2011). “Earmarking and partitioning: Increasing saving by low-income households”. In: *Journal of Marketing Research* 48.SPL, S14–S22.
- Step Change (2017). “Strengthening the saving safety net”. Tech. rep. URL: <https://www.stepchange.org/Portals/0/documents/media/reports/strengthening-the-saving-safety-net-stepchange-debt-charity-response-paper-to-the-pensions-policy-institute.pdf>.