

Will They Take the Money and Work? People's Willingness to Delay Claiming Social Security Benefits for a Lump Sum

Against the backdrop of global population aging, policymakers around the world are actively seeking ways to reform their nations' old-age benefit systems, often by encouraging delayed retirement. Many countries have done so by requiring raising retirement ages and cutting benefit payouts, but this is often a politically fraught process.¹ By contrast, the present paper explores an alternative approach to encourage delayed claiming: by offering people a lump sum if they claim later. That is, we investigate whether exchanging the U.S. Social Security delayed retirement credit -- currently paid in form of an increased annuity benefit -- for an actuarially fair lump sum payment would induce people to voluntarily delay claiming and work longer.

Under the *Status Quo*, an eligible individual can claim retirement benefits as early as age 62 or as late as age 70. His monthly benefit paid for life depends on his earnings history and his claiming age, with a reduction if he claims prior to his Full Retirement Age (FRA), and an increment for deferring claiming after that age. For someone born in 1960 or later, for example, deferring the benefit from age 62 to his FRA of 67 would entitle him to an increase in monthly benefits of around 43 percent (see Table 1 below).² In particular, delaying claiming to age 70 would imply a 77 percent increase in lifetime monthly benefits.

Despite these substantial financial rewards for delayed retirement, a large share of Americans – about 37 percent of retirees in 2014 – still claims benefits around age 62 (Social Security (SSA 2015), Table 6.B5).³ Suggestions for inducing delayed retirement and extending

¹ See Brown (2012) and Turner (2009) for a survey of pension retirement age and benefit adjustments around the world.

² When these rules were legislated, the Social Security delayed retirement credit was intended to be actuarially fair. Hence the benefit increment was consistent with average mortality tables at the time, as well as a 2.9% real assumed interest rate. In this paper we assume the same real interest rate. Current low interest rates imply that the delayed retirement credit is actually better than fair for most people at present, thus embodying additional incentives to defer retirement (see Shoven and Slavov, 2014). For additional information on the *Status Quo* benefit formula, see <http://www.ssa.gov/retirement/retirement.htm>.

³ Several studies have examined retirement or claiming patterns under existing Social Security rules (e.g., Coile, Diamond, Gruber, and Jouston 2002; Gustman and Steinmeier 2005, 2015; Hubener, Maurer, and Mitchell 2013; Shoven and Slavov 2014). Brown, Kapteyn, Luttmer, and Mitchell (2013) have taken a behavioral finance perspective to examine whether people might be willing to give up some of their benefit stream in exchange for a lump sum, but they do not link that question to continued labor force participation as we do here. Chai, Maurer, Mitchell, and Rogalla (2013) develop a theoretical model of rational consumers who might delay claiming their retirement benefits if offered the chance to receive the credits as a lump sum payment, instead of an increase in lifetime annuity benefits. However that study did not undertake an empirical analysis, as we do here.

the work life include increasing financial incentives and changing benefit generosity (e.g., Laitner and Silverman 2012; Kostøl and Mogstad 2014). Other proposals are based on insights from behavioral economics, as it has been shown that retirement patterns are subject to behavioral biases (see, for example, Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell 2013; Behaghel and Blau 2012). Moreover, some research has examined how providing prospective retirees with additional information might enhance peoples' understanding of Social Security claiming rules (Liebman and Luttmer 2015; Mastrobuoni 2011).

When people claim benefits early, they give up an attractive deferred annuity, a behavior reminiscent of the annuity puzzle. This puzzle refers to the observation that many individuals are reluctant to voluntarily exchange a lump sum for a lifelong income stream, despite the strong theoretical appeal of longevity insurance for most households (Yaari 1965; Davidoff, Brown, and Diamond 2005). Recent empirical research supporting the preference for non-annuitized assets includes, among others, Inkmann, Lopes, and Michaelides (2011), which showed using data from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing that only 5.9% of retired households voluntarily participated in the private annuity market. Warner and Pleeter (2001) estimated personal discount-rates using data from the separation benefit packages offered to 65,000 U.S. military personnel which included a choice between a lifelong annuity benefit and a lump sum payment. Despite the fact that the implied break-even discount rate for the lump sum was around 18%, the majority of the enlisted personnel favored the lump sum payment over the lifelong annuity benefit. (One reason may have been unwillingness to trust the government's lifetime payment promise.) Explanations for the low annuitization includes bequests (Bernheim 1991), behavioral factors like framing (Hu and Scott 2007; Brown et al. 2008), market fictions resulting from asymmetric information (Mitchell, Poterba, Warshawsky, Brown 1999), liquidity needs resulting from health cost shocks (Peijnenburg, Nijman, and Werker 2013), and stochastic survival probabilities (Reichling and Smetters 2015).

The present paper utilizes this insight to explore a new path to reform Social Security: namely, we evaluate whether people might delay claiming benefits and retire later in exchange for an actuarially fair lump sum. We extend the empirical literature by evaluating whether (and which) people would defer claiming and work longer, if they were given a lump sum in lieu of a higher monthly payment for life.

To do so, we developed and fielded a nationally representative survey of U.S. residents in the American Life Panel (ALP), and we use it to assess how people might respond to having access to the present value of the benefit increases resulting from longer work lives. In this setting, we first computed each respondent's anticipated monthly Social Security benefit if he were to claim at each age from 62 to 70, which are, respectively, the earliest and the latest claiming ages under the *Status Quo* system rules. Given this information, we asked each individual to report his expected claiming age (i.e., the *Status Quo claiming age*). Next, we presented each respondent with two alternative scenarios, and we again asked him to report his expected claiming age under both options. In one case, he was told to assume that he would receive lifelong monthly income in the amount of his age-62 Social Security benefit from his claiming date forward, irrespective of when he actually claimed. This benefit is paired with a lump sum payable as of his claiming date (i.e., the *Lump Sum claiming age*), where the amount is equal to the actuarial present value of his delayed retirement credit. Thus the lump sum is equal to the increase in lifetime retirement benefits generated by claiming after the age of 62. In another case, he was told to assume that his monthly benefit would be adjusted upward for delayed claiming until his FRA, as under the *Status Quo*. For claiming ages later than that, his monthly benefit would be fixed at the FRA level, and he would receive a lump sum payable as of his claiming date (i.e., the *Delayed Lump Sum claiming age*) equal to the present value of the delayed retirement credit after the Full Retirement Age.⁴ Moreover, in each scenario we asked the respondent to record how much additional work he would engage in, given the new options.

Our results show that people would indeed work longer voluntarily if they were offered an actuarially fair lump sum instead of a delayed retirement annuity under Social Security. These delays in claiming are reasonably large, of about half a year on average if the lump sum is paid on claiming after age 62, and about two-thirds of a year if the lump sum is paid only for those claiming after their Full Retirement Age. Moreover, those who are most responsive to these incentives turn out to be those who would have claimed early under the *Status Quo*. We also find that people would voluntarily work longer, by about one-third of the extra time until claiming in

⁴ This scenario is not the same as the "File and Suspend" approach permitted under Social Security rules until 2015 (www.socialsecurity.gov/retire2/suspend), where a worker could file for a benefit at or after the FRA, and suspend his payment. Later, he could retroactively begin his benefit payment as of the filing date and receive a lump sum for benefits foregone. This approach, now ruled out in the U.S. Congress' 2015 Budget Agreement, is not equivalent to our scenario because the "File and Suspend" lump sum was backward-looking and hence unrelated to the delayed claiming adjustment that we focus on here.

the *Lump Sum* scenario and almost half of the additional time in the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario. To the extent that workers can be incentivized to voluntarily delay retirement in exchange for lump sums, they will also pay Social Security payroll taxes for additional years, which could modestly enhance the system's solvency. Moreover, there is some evidence suggesting that continued labor force participation results in improved physical and mental health among the elderly (Rohwedder and Willis 2010), which could improve both individual quality of life as well as the financial status of healthcare systems such as Medicare and Medicaid (Sahlgren 2013; National Research Council 2012).

In the Social Security context, we are not the first to suggest that lump sum benefits could be used to replace the delayed retirement credit under Social Security (Orszag 2001; Fetherstonhaugh and Ross 1999). Yet no prior study has examined experimentally which individuals might be more likely to change behavior given the opportunity to take a lump sum, nor is there any natural experiment to evaluate how the claiming decision would differ from the work effort decision. Here we do both, using a nationally representative sample of the American population to test hypotheses.

Study Design

We implement our field experiment in the ALP, a nationally representative sample of 6,000 households regularly interviewed over the Internet.⁵ We designed and implemented our module on a subset of 2,451 respondents, age 40-70, in which we asked them several questions regarding their economic and demographic status. We also took the respondents through a set of earnings history questions and fed these into a benefit calculator provided by the Social Security Administration (SSA).⁶ This generated each individual's "Primary Insurance Amount" (PIA), or his monthly benefit amount for life (adjusted for inflation) that he would receive if he were to claim at his FRA. To compute benefits for earlier or later claiming ages, we applied SSA's

⁵ One of many advantages the ALP has over other online panels is that it provides respondents who lack Internet access with either a laptop and Internet access, or a so-called WebTV that allows them to use their television to participate in the survey. That improves the nationally representative nature of the panel. More on how ALP respondents are recruited is available on the American Life Panel website: <https://mmicdata.rand.org/alp/index.php/>.

⁶ Specifically, we ask the respondent his age when he started working and divided the span of his work life into sub-periods; in each of these, we asked average earnings and years when the respondent did not work for pay. This generated a constructed earnings history which we feed into the SSA calculator on the SSA's website at <http://www.socialsecurity.gov/OACT/anypia/anypia.html>. For additional details see Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell (2013).

actuarial adjustment factors. Specifically, claiming prior to the FRA results in a benefit reduction of 5/9 percent per month for the first 36 months, and 5/12 percent per month thereafter until age 62. Claiming after the FRA boosts benefits by 8/12 percent per month up to age 70.⁷ One's FRA depends on one's birth year: it is age 66 for workers born 1943-1954, rising gradually to age 67 for the 1960 and later birth cohorts. Table 1 depicts the impact of claiming age on Social Security benefits for someone with a FRA of age 67.

Table 1 here

Having done so, we ask each individual the following question to survey his expected claiming behavior under the *Status Quo* rules:⁸

In the next few questions, we are going to ask you to make a number of choices about Social Security benefits. Please assume that all amounts shown are after tax (that is, you don't owe any tax on any of the amounts we will show you). Think of any dollar amount mentioned in this survey in terms of what a dollar buys you today (because Social Security will adjust future dollar amounts for inflation).

For the sake of these questions, **assume that you are currently age 62 and single**. You are thinking about when to claim your Social Security benefit.

The Social Security system allows you to claim your benefit anytime between age **62** and **70**. On average, the Social Security system will neither lose nor make money no matter when people claim their benefit. If you claim your benefit at age **62**, you will receive an estimated monthly amount of $\{\text{SocSec62benest}\}$ ⁹ for life.

Please answer the following questions about the choice you would make. Now imagine you have the following choice:

Either

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that \$ $\{\text{SocSec62benest}\}$ monthly payment for life.

Or

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive a **higher monthly payment** from that age on for life.

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit. Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit?

⁷ That is, the delayed retirement credit computation stops after age 69. This abstracts from benefit recomputation that might occur if the individual were to work after that age (see http://www.socialsecurity.gov/OP_Home/handbook/handbook.07/handbook-0722.html)

⁸ See Figures A1-A4 in the Appendix for screenshots of the questions as presented to the participants.

⁹ The variable $\{\text{SocSec62benest}\}$ represents our estimate of each respondent's estimated lifelong monthly social security benefit when claimed at age 62. We calculate this by adjusting the PIA back to age 62 from his FRA, using the appropriate adjustment factors which depend on his year of birth (see <http://www.ssa.gov/oact/quickcalc/earlyretire.html>).

The respondent is asked to click his mouse on a scale that represents the alternative claiming ages in monthly steps from age 62 to age 70. When he clicks on the scale, he is then shown his selected claiming age as well as the corresponding monthly benefit he will receive for life from age onward. Finally, he has the opportunity to change that selected claiming age or submit his response.¹⁰

Subsequently, we ask each respondent about his expected claiming ages under the two alternative monthly benefit/lump sum scenarios described above. To this end, we compute what his benefits would be at alternative claiming ages, along with the actuarially fair lump sums.¹¹ In the *Lump Sum case*, if the individual were to defer claiming from age 62, he would receive a lump sum at his claiming date plus monthly benefits in the amount of his age-62 benefit from that date onward for life. Each respondent is asked the following question to elicit his claiming age under this scenario:

Next we would like to show you some different questions about Social Security claiming choices. As before, please assume that all amounts shown are after tax, and think of any dollar amount in terms of what a dollar buys you today. Again, on average, the Social Security system will neither lose nor make money no matter when benefits are claimed.

Please continue to assume that you are currently age 62 and single. You are still thinking about when to claim your Social Security benefit.

Now, imagine that you had the following choice:

Either

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that \$ $\{\text{SocSec62benef}\}$ monthly payment for life.

Or

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive the same monthly payment of \$ $\{\text{SocSec62benef}\}$ from that age on for life, **plus an additional lump sum payable at that later claiming age.**

¹⁰ If a respondent indicated he believed he would never receive Social Security because of a short earnings history (fewer than 10 years), we used HRS data to impute to him a PIA for someone with similar age, sex, and education, and marital status (following Brown, Kapteyn, Luttmmer, and Mitchell 2013). If the respondent indicated he thought that the system would not be around to pay him benefits, we asked him to assume it would for the purposes of the analysis.

¹¹ Specifically, the lump sum is calculated as the actuarial present value at the claiming age of the increase in lifelong monthly retirement benefits - based on cohort-specific FRA factors according to the current Social Security rules - over the lifelong benefits received when claiming at age 62 (or at the FRA in case of the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario). Annuity factors are derived using the mortality probabilities used in the Social Security's Trustees Report (SSA 2013). These are transformed into unisex rates assuming 1,000 females for 1,050 males in every birth cohort (Bell, Bye, and Winters 2008). We convert yearly to monthly rates assuming constant number of deaths per months (i.e. uniform distribution of deaths). The interest rate to discount future payments is 2.9% p.a. in compliance with the interest rate of the intermediate cost scenario in the Social Security's Trustees Report (SSA 2013).

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit. Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit?

Again, the respondent is shown the monthly benefit and the lump sum amount corresponding to the claiming age selected, and he can change or submit his selection.

For the *Delayed Lump Sum case*, the respondent is told he would be entitled to *Status Quo* benefit increments if he delays claiming to his Full Retirement Age. If he defers claiming beyond that age, he will receive both the FRA benefit stream for life plus a lump sum equivalent to the actuarial present value of the delayed retirement credit under the *Status Quo* scenario. The specific language used to evaluate the claiming age in this case is as follows:

Next we would like to show you some different questions about Social Security claiming choices. As before, please assume that all amounts shown are after tax, and think of any dollar amount in terms of what a dollar buys you today. Again, on average, the Social Security system will neither lose nor make money no matter when benefits are claimed.

Please continue to assume that you are currently age 62 and single. You are still thinking about when to claim your Social Security benefit.

Now, imagine that you had the following choice:

Either

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that \$ $\{\text{SocSec62benest}\}$ monthly payment for life.

Or

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive **a higher monthly payment** from that age onward for life. This benefit will rise as you delay claiming up to a maximum of $\{\text{SocSecFRAbenest}\}$ ¹² if you claim at your full retirement age. However, if you claim your benefit after your full retirement age, you will receive that monthly payment of $\{\text{SocSecFRAbenest}\}$ for life, **plus an additional lump sum payable at your later claiming age.**

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit. Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit?

As before, the respondent is shown the monthly benefit and the lump sum amount corresponding to the claiming age selected, and he can change or submit his final selection.

An illustrative case of benefit/lump sum combinations attainable under the *Status Quo* scenario and the two Lump Sum alternatives appears in Table 2. Here the monthly benefit payable to a respondent who will claim at age 62 is assumed to be \$1,500. Under the *Status Quo* scenario (column 1), delaying claiming to age 63 will boost monthly benefits to \$1,607. If he

¹² The variable $\{\text{SocSecFRAbenest}\}$ represents our estimate of the respondent's lifelong monthly Social Security benefit when claimed at the FRA.

defers until age 70, monthly benefits will mount to \$2,657. By contrast, under the *Lump Sum* scenario (column 2), claiming at age 63 will result in the same monthly benefit of \$1,500, along with a lump sum equal to \$20,208 at age 63. In this scenario, when deferring to age 70, the monthly benefit would continue to remain constant at \$1,500. The lump sum payable at age 70, however, would amount to almost \$178,000. The *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative for the same illustrative individual is presented in Column 3. As claiming is delayed, monthly benefits increase as under the *Status Quo* (Column 1) up to the Full Retirement Age, while the lump sum payment is zero. When claiming at age 70, the individual receives monthly benefits equal to the FRA benefits of \$2,143 plus a lump sum of around \$79,000.

Table 2 here

In each case we also ask how much the respondent would work under that claiming alternative. Specifically, the wording is as follows:

Given that choice, about how many hours per week, on average, would **you plan to work** from age **62** to your claiming age at $\{ClaimAgeString_Del_LSFRA\}$ ¹³?

Once more, the respondent is asked to click his mouse on the scale representing the average weekly work hours to his claiming age. On clicking, the respondent is shown his selected weekly work effort, as well as the corresponding number of months of full-time work until his claiming age; we compute months of full-time work by multiplying the weekly hours by the number of months until his selected claiming age and then dividing by 40 hours (thus assuming full-time employment entails 40 work hours a week). As before, the respondent can change his selection before submitting his final answer.

In the survey, each respondent is first asked to select a claiming age under the *Status Quo* scenario. Next we randomly assign respondents in terms of whether they first see the *Lump Sum* or the *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative. Randomization in this form allows us to compare how claiming ages would change across the *Status Quo* and both lump sum scenarios, as well as to control for anchoring or framing effects across respondents.¹⁴

Results for Changes in Claiming Ages

¹³ The variable $\{ClaimAgeString_Del_LSFRA\}$ represents the claiming age under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario chosen by the respondent.

¹⁴ For more on how framing affects peoples' perceptions of claiming ages, see Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell (2013) and Brown, Kling, Mullainathan, and Wrobel (2008).

Next we describe respondents' claiming ages under the *Status Quo* scenario, and also under the two alternatives. In each case, we report how many months after age 62 the individual selected as his target. The distribution of reported claiming ages is depicted in Figure 1, where box plots denote the 25th and 75th percentiles, with the intermediate lines in each case reflecting the median; the dots indicate the mean claiming age. Claiming ages under the *Status Quo* (top bar) range from 24 and 71 months beyond age 62; the mean is 45 months (or age 65.75). This outcome is comparable to Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell (2013) who report an expected claiming age of 65.44. We note that, in the past, actual claiming ages were lower: for instance, the mean claiming age in 2014 for men (women) was 64.4 (64.2) (Social Security (SSA 2015): Table 6.B5) versus 65.9 (65.7) reported by our (relatively young) ALP sample. Yet there has been an upward time trend in claiming ages (Munnell and Chen 2015), suggesting that our respondents are likely to be reporting their expectations accurately. Moreover, Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell (2013) confirm that expectations and actual claiming behavior are highly correlated in the Health and Retirement Study (HRS).

Figure 1 here

Allowing people to receive part of their benefit as a lump sum instead of monthly payments shifts the claiming age distribution to the right, as shown by the second bar in Figure 1. Now people would claim 49.6 months beyond age 62 on average, and the difference to the mean claiming age under *Status Quo* is statistically significant at the 1% level. Moreover, the claiming age distribution is compressed on the left, implying that those who would have previously claimed quite young are also most likely to delay claiming with the lump sum available. Less change is evident on the right side of the bar, suggesting that those claiming later under the *Status Quo* would change their behavior less. The final bar illustrates the pattern of claiming ages when the lump sum is available only to those who claim after their Full Retirement Age. The mean again rises, now to 53.3 months past age 62, with the difference vs. the *Lump Sum* scenario being significant at the 1% level. In other words, both scenarios induce delayed claiming, while the most substantial behavioral change in claiming ages occurs if people were to be given benefit increments up to the FRA, as now, and post-FRA, a lump sum instead of monthly benefit increments.

To provide an idea of the sizes of the lump sums involved, Figure 2 reports the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles along with the mean values of lump sums payable given peoples' desired

claiming age patterns. Under the *Lump Sum* scenario, the mean lump sum would be \$73,000, with a median of \$64,500; at the 25th percentile, this amount would almost equal \$32,000, and the 75th percentile value exceeds \$105,000. Under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario, because people who delay receive higher monthly benefits, the lump sums payable for deferring past the FRA are lower, averaging \$22,500, with a median of about \$1,600. At the 25th percentile the value is zero, and it is just over \$37,500 at the 75th percentiles. All of these values reflect the actuarially neutral calculations computed for each individual's desired claim age.

Figure 2 here

Table 3 provides additional detail on claiming ages for the *Status Quo* and our two lump sum alternatives, analyzing average claiming behavior for different demographic groups. Factors we use to differentiate respondents are proxies for their anticipated longevity including age, sex, and marital status (Smith and Waitzman 1997; Zick and Smith 1991); education (Brown, Hayward, Karas Montez, Hummer, Chiu, and Hidajat 2012); and subjective life expectancy (Hurd and McGarry 2002).¹⁵ As discussed above, our respondents indicate that they intend to claim 45 months post age-62 in the *Status Quo* setting, on average. Splitting the sample by demographics, we find that men, singles, those younger than age 62, and the better-educated all select higher claiming ages than their counterparts. Additionally, people with optimistic estimates of their remaining life expectancy compared to standard mortality tables also select later claiming ages.¹⁶ Such claiming patterns under the *Status Quo* are in line with prior empirical studies using HRS data, such as Shoven and Slavov (2012) and Hurd, Smith, and Zissimopoulos (2004). Results for the two lump sum scenarios tell the same story, where all groups indicate they would boost their claiming ages. Moreover, claiming is consistently the latest under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario.

Table 3 here

Thus far, we have analyzed how claiming ages change as a function of the treatments seen and demographic characteristics. It is also of interest to explore the distribution of how claiming patterns change. To do so, we calculate for each sample member the difference between his *Status Quo* claim age, and that under the *Lump Sum* and *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative. We then split the sample of those who altered their claiming behavior under the *Lump Sum* or

¹⁵ While respondents' current health status can also proxy for longevity expectations, we do not include this in our list of controls as it is highly correlated with subjective life expectancy in our dataset.

¹⁶ Variable descriptions are provided in Table A1 of the Online Appendix.

Delayed Lump Sum scenarios into claimants with a positive (negative) difference; i.e. they claimed later (earlier) compared to the *Status Quo*. For the two subgroups, we compute the relative frequencies and average delay in months. We calculate these measures for the overall sample and by Status Quo claiming age groups.

Table 4 reports the results, where we see that 38 percent of all respondents react to the *Lump Sum* incentive with a positive delay averaging 22.7 months, compared to the *Status Quo*. Interestingly, 22 percent of respondents claim earlier than under the *Status Quo*, by 18.1 months on average. The remaining 40 percent do not change behavior under the *Lump Sum* alternative. Moreover, around one-fifth of the sample, 490 respondents, indicate they would claim around age 62 under the *Status Quo*, but half of these are quite enthusiastic about the *Lump Sum* alternative, delaying their claiming age by almost three years. Those respondents that say they would claim around the Full Retirement Age (age 65-67) under the *Status Quo* would delay further given the *Lump Sum* alternative. For example, 47 percent of the relatively large group of respondents electing a 65-age claiming age under the *Status Quo* would delay more, by around 20 months, when offered the lump sum. For those that would claim after the FRA under the *Status Quo*, the lump sum becomes less attractive, in that the percentage of respondents with negative delays exceeds those with positive delays. In particular, 34 percent of those respondents that indicated a claiming age of 70 under the *Status Quo* say they would claim earlier under the *Lump Sum*, by an average of about 2.5 years (31.3 months).

Table 4 here

It is also worth noting that offering a *Delayed Lump Sum* results in even later claiming ages, along both the extensive and intensive margins. Accordingly, 43 percent of our sample claim later compared to the *Status Quo* with an average delay of 25.2 months, and only 18 percent claim earlier by 13.3 months. Furthermore, the *Delayed Lump Sum* treatment remains attractive to the early claimers under the *Status Quo*: 37 percent of those who would otherwise claim benefits early under current rules would defer claiming under the *Delayed Lump Sum* treatment, and the average delay is 42.7 months. This is lower than the 50 percent of the early claimers moving to later ages under the simple *Lump Sum* scenario, since the *Delayed Lump Sum* is constructed such that the latter's incentive differs only after the FRA. Accordingly, one must delay claiming by at least three years (depending on the respondent's individual FRA) to receive the cash benefit.

In sum, the *Delayed Lump Sum* has a strong impact on respondents that would have elected a claiming age around the FRA under the *Status Quo*. And most of these select a positive delay, on average between 18 – 25.5 months. Moreover, for *Status Quo* claiming ages around the FRA, the percentage of people choosing a negative delay under the *Lump Sum* is significantly less than under the *Lump Sum*, e.g. 14 percent compared to 23 percent at the *Status Quo* claiming age of 66.

To more easily highlight how people with particular characteristics might change their behavior under the two lump sum policy alternatives, we adopt a multivariate regression framework. Results are presented in Table 5. The three left columns report patterns for the change in claiming ages (in months) when people see the *Lump Sum* scenario versus the *Status Quo*; the right three columns compare claiming ages from the *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative versus the *Status Quo*. For each dependent variable, the first model (columns 1 and 4) includes only those factors summarized in Table 3 (sex, marital status, age, education, and whether the individual is optimistic regarding his life expectancy). The second model (columns 2 and 5) adds a control for the respondent's claiming age selected under the *Status Quo* scenario. This permits us to test whether the lump sum policy alternatives are likely to incentivize early versus late claimers under the current scenario to delay claiming. In the third model (columns 3 and 6), we add an additional control for whether the respondent sees the *Lump Sum* treatment first (versus the *Delayed Lump Sum* treatment), as well as economic covariates: wealth (French 2005); our estimate of the respondent's age-62 Social Security benefit; whether the respondent had some other annuity; an indicator for long job tenure; and a dummy variable indicating the respondent had liquidity constraints (*High Debt*). Additionally we have indicators of peoples' attitudes and preferences including risk aversion, planning horizon, financial literacy, and an indicator that the respondent was confident in the Social Security system's sustainability (c.f., Lusardi and Mitchell 2007, and Brown, Kapteyn, and Mitchell 2013).¹⁷

Table 5 here

Turning to results in column 1, respondent age is positive and statistically significant, meaning that a 60-year old would claim about three months later (20×0.134) when the lump sum is available, compared to a 40-year old (*ceteris paribus*). This finding is compatible with empirical evidence for time-inconsistent discounting noted by Dohmen, Falk, Huffman, and

¹⁷ Table A1 in the Online Appendix describes how we constructed these controls in greater detail.

Sunde (2010, 2012), who showed that people facing a short time horizon are more impatient than those facing payoffs in a more distant time period. This effect becomes insignificant in column 2, however, when we control on respondents' claiming age under the *Status Quo*. This is partly because peoples' ages and claiming ages are correlated (0.14). But interestingly, the Claiming Age SQ term is highly significant and negative, implying that those who claim early under the *Status Quo* would delay claiming the most under the new policy. Column 2 also shows a positive and significant relationship between the difference in claiming ages and peoples' optimism regarding their life expectancy: that is, people who expect to live longer will claim later, since they are more likely to live to receive the lump sum at the later age. On average our respondents underestimate their probability of living to later ages by 14% compared to life tables;¹⁸ accordingly, a respondent who predicted his probabilities accurately would be anticipated to claim about one month later (0.14×7.142).¹⁹

Overall, our estimated effects are robust to the inclusion of the additional controls in column 3 of Table 5. There we show that the order by which the two lump sum alternatives are shown to the respondent has significant impact on the claiming ages chosen, indicating a potential anchoring effect. If the respondent first sees the *Lump Sum* scenario, the difference between his expected claiming ages under the *Lump Sum* alternative and the *Status Quo* scenario is almost four months less than when the *Lump Sum* scenario was shown second. This change in claiming ages is comparable in magnitude to the average *Status Quo* versus *Lump Sum* difference. The *Lump Sum* scenario provides a substantial lump sum relatively early. Consequently, the respondent might delay claiming by only a bit. By contrast, those who see the *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative first tend to anchor initially on a higher claiming age and smaller lump sum amount. Accordingly, when presented with the regular *Lump Sum* scenario second, the respondent delays claiming more, although not as long as in the *Delayed Lump Sum* setup.

We also find that persons reporting being debt-constrained say they will defer claiming by almost two months given the *Lump Sum* alternative (42 percent of the mean *Status Quo* versus *Lump Sum* difference). Respondents who indicate they are more risk averse also claim later, by about a month per standard deviation above the mean risk aversion level. This might be due to a

¹⁸ See Table A1 of the Online Appendix.

¹⁹ Interestingly, the system's finances could benefit under the *Lump Sum* scenario, since people expecting to live longer than average indicate that they would delay claiming instead of taking an early lifetime annuity based on population rather than optimistic mortality tables (holding all else constant). It must be recalled that, in this analysis, people may not choose between the *Status Quo* versus the *Lump Sum* scenario.

preference for a larger lump sum of known amount compared to a higher annuity with an uncertain length of payment. Financial literacy is statistically significant, positive, and quantitatively important: that is, when presented with the *Lump Sum* option, someone with no financial knowledge would delay claiming less than the most financially literate individual, by about 3.288 months. This finding is compatible with results in Brown, Kapteyn, Luttmer, and Mitchell (2013), who showed that financially illiterate persons have a difficult time comparing annuities versus lump sums.²⁰ Turning to the Political Trust variable, those having the most confidence in the Social Security system defer claiming less (by 2.556 months), a sensible finding in that they value the lump sum less than their more skeptical peers, who seek to cash out of the Social Security system as much as possible and as early as possible.

The next three columns of Table 5 replicate the previous analysis, but this time the dependent variable measures the change in claiming age from the *Status Quo* to that selected in the *Delayed Lump Sum* alternative. Interestingly, age is no longer significant in column 4. Since most respondents in our sample are younger than the FRA, they tend to more heavily discount the lump sum that will be paid far in the future under the *Delayed Lump Sum* option. By contrast, when they were offered early lump sum payments in the previous scenario, they were more impatient. This is compatible with the time-inconsistent discounting referred to above (Dohmen, Falk, Huffman, and Sunde 2012). Other results in columns 5 and 6 are quite comparable in terms of signs, significance levels, and magnitudes of estimated coefficients, though financial literacy now has a somewhat larger impact.

Overall, we conclude that offering people lump sums in lieu of higher annuity payments from Social Security would induce reasonably substantial delays in claiming ages, by about half a year on average if the lump sum were paid on claiming, and by about two-thirds of a year if the lump sum were only payable for benefits claimed after the Full Retirement Age. Those who would delay claiming the longest, under both scenarios, are also those who would take their Social Security benefits early under the *Status Quo* scenario. Interestingly, only a few factors seem to differentiate those particularly sensitive to the lump sum offers, including financial literacy which is associated with a larger claiming delay, and confidence in the program's sustainability. Additionally, the most indebted would also delay claiming to obtain the lump

²⁰ Several prior studies have examined the links between cognitive abilities and financial decision making; see Fang, Keane, and Silverman (2008) for Medigap purchase; Agarwal and Mazumder (2013) on the use of credit; and McArdle, Smith, and Willis (2011) and Banks, O'Dea, and Oldfield (2010) on retirement wealth accumulation.

sums. Finally, people's delayed claiming patterns do not differ by wealth levels, the presence of other annuities, Social Security benefit amounts, planning horizons, or expected investment returns.

Our results are robust to alternative specifications of the sample (dropping all respondents over the age of 62), and alternative specifications of the statistical relationship (i.e., Tobit models for the change in claiming age and Logit models for the probability that there is a positive delay).²¹

Results for Changes in Work Effort

Having established that people will delay claiming more under both lump sum alternatives than under the *Status Quo* scenario, we next turn to an examination of whether people will simply delay their benefit take-up dates, or whether they will continue to work in the interim. To this end, we report in Figure 3 the distribution of full-time work effort under the *Status Quo* versus the two lump sum scenarios. As before, the box plots represent the 25th and 75th percentiles, with the intermediate line in each case reflecting the median; the dots reflect the mean months of full-time work post-age 62 under each case. The top bar, representing full-time work months beyond age 62 under the *Status Quo*, ranges from 2 to 53 months (median 32). The mean is 34.8 months. The second bar, by contrast, shows that the distribution shifts to the right under the *Lump Sum* scenario, when people can receive part of their benefit stream as a lump sum instead of as a monthly payment. Now, on average, people indicate they will work 36.2 full-time months (median 35) beyond age 62; this difference of 1.4 months is significant at the 10% level. Moreover, the work effort distribution is now compressed on the left, implying that those who would work least under the *Status Quo* are also most likely to work more when the lump sum becomes available. Less change is evident on the right side of the bar, indicating that individuals who would have worked more under the *Status Quo* case would exhibit smaller increments in work effort. The final bar illustrates the pattern of work effort under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario, where a lump sum is available only to those who claim after their FRA. Mean work effort again rises, now to 39 months post-age 62, 3.9 months more than under the *Status Quo* and 2.5 months more than under the *Lump Sum* case. These differences are significant at the 1% level.

²¹ Results appear in Table A2 of the Online Appendix.

Figure 3 here

Additional detail on work patterns under the *Status Quo* and two lump sum cases is provided in Table 6, where we again report the number of months of full-time work post age-62 overall (row 1), and also by respondents' demographic characteristics, i.e. sex, marital status, age, education, and whether people were optimistic regarding self-assessed life expectancy. A first point to note is that, under the *Status Quo*, men, singles, those younger than age 62, and the better-educated all spend more time working than their counterparts. Moreover, those who are optimistic about their life expectancy would also elect to expend more work effort. Second, results under both lump sum scenarios are similar, where all groups boost their work effort. Moreover, work effort is consistently the highest under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario.

Table 6 here

To illustrate the distribution of labor supply adjustments and how this outcome varies with the respondents' *Status Quo* claiming ages, Table 7 presents the difference in months of full-time work under the Lump Sum/ Delayed Lump Sum versus the *Status Quo*. We then group respondents who would change their behavior into subcategories of those who would increase their work effort, and those who would decrease effort. Within each subgroup, we calculate relative frequencies and the average change in months of full-time work. We calculate these measures for the overall sample and by *Status Quo* claiming age groups.

Table 7 here

When presented with the Lump Sum scenario, 34 percent of respondents overall would work longer compared to the *Status Quo*. The average increase amounts to 16.5 months, yet 27 percent of respondents stated that they would work less than under the *Status Quo*. Nevertheless, the reactions are heterogeneous when differentiated by *Status Quo* claiming age. Of those who initially would claim at age 62 under the *Status Quo*, 42 percent would work longer under the *Lump Sum* policy, and their average increase in work effort is of two full years. Even at later *Status Quo* claiming ages, people who would increase their labor supply would work an additional 9-17 months, on average. Yet, the majority of those who would claim late under the *Status Quo* (at or after age 67) indicate they would work less.

Similar conclusions can be drawn from the *Delayed Lump Sum* experiment. Under this scenario, 38 percent of respondents indicate they would increase their work effort, by 1.5 years on average, while 23 percent would decrease it by a year, on average. The remaining 39 percent

would not adjust their labor supply. The *Delayed Lump Sum* motivates fewer respondents to change plans among the earliest claimers, but those who do alter their plans boost their work effort substantially, by an average of 2.5 years. And for those that previously indicated that they would claim at their Full Retirement Age, most will also work more when offered the *Delayed Lump Sum* policy. For them, the average increase in work effort is also substantial, of 14-18 months. The policy change is less influential for those that who would have claimed after the FRA under the *Status Quo*; here we observe decreases in labor supply under the *Delayed Lump Sum*.

Claiming and working are highly correlated in our experimental setup. For instance, of the respondents who would delay claiming in the LS scenario, most (838 of 939 respondents in Table 7) would also keep working until the later claiming age. Similarly, under the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario, most respondents (925 of 1049) who would delay would also work longer. In other words, around 90 percent of those indicating they would delay would also boost work effort under both alternatives.

Turning to a multivariate regression framework, results in Table 8 help us test whether respondents having particular characteristics differentially change their work patterns under the two policy alternatives, holding other factors constant. The three left-hand columns in Table 6 report estimates of the impact of factors shaping changes in work effort (in full-time months) when people see the *Lump Sum* versus the *Status Quo* scenarios; the three right columns compare work effort in the *Delayed Lump Sum* versus the *Status Quo* scenarios. For each dependent variable, the first model (columns 1 and 4) includes only those factors summarized in Table 6 (sex, marital status, age, education, and whether the individual is optimistic regarding his life expectancy). The second model (columns 2 and 5) adds a control for the respondent's work effort selected under the *Status Quo* scenario. This permits us to test whether and which lump sum policies will incentivize people exerting modest work effort under the current system to devote more effort to employment. In the third model (columns 3 and 6), we add an additional control for whether the respondent saw the *Lump Sum* treatment first (versus the *Delayed Lump Sum* treatment), as well as economic covariates (wealth, age 62 benefit, whether the respondent had some other annuity, an indicator for long job tenure, and a dummy variable indicating the respondent had high debt). As before, we also control for indicators of attitudes and preferences, including risk aversion, planning horizon, financial literacy, and an indicator that the respondent

was confident in the Social Security system's sustainability (see Table A1 in the Online Appendix for further detail).

Table 8 here

Results in column 1 show that respondent age is positive and significant; the estimated coefficient implies that a 60-year old would work three months longer (20×0.153) than a 40-year old (*ceteris paribus*). The age effect loses significance in columns 2 and 3, however, after we control on the *Status Quo* work level. The Total Work SQ term is negative and highly statistically significant, indicating that those who quit work earlier under the *Status Quo* would work more under the new policy, and the coefficient is robust to the inclusion of our additional controls in column 3. We also see that, if the respondent is first presented with the *Lump Sum* scenario entitling him to a substantial lump sum relatively early, his work effort is 1.6 months less than when he sees the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario first. This confirms our earlier finding that respondents shown the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario first are incentivized to work more.

The other results in column 3 confirm many of the findings from the equivalent column in Table 5, in that only a few factors differentiate people who are most sensitive to the lump sum offers. Once again, given a lump sum, respondents who are very confident in the program's sustainability increase their work effort less than those who distrust the system. Wealthy individuals will also exert less additional work effort, but the risk averse and the debt-constrained increase work more when offered a lump sum versus the base case. Finally, people's change in work effort patterns do not differ depending on the presence of other annuities, Social Security benefit amounts, planning horizons, or expected investment returns. Results are rather similar in columns 4-6 of the table, but often coefficient magnitudes are somewhat smaller while having similar signs and significance levels. Those with most wealth are least likely to increase their work effort in the *Delayed Lump Sum* case, as they can self-finance the waiting period before claiming the lump sum.

Overall, then, providing a lump sum option in lieu of higher annuity payments from Social Security would induce respondents to work more: by about 1.4 months when the lump sum is paid for claiming after age 62, and by 3.9 months if the lump sum is payable only for benefits claimed after the Full Retirement Age. Relating these estimates to the findings in the previous section, we conclude that people would voluntarily work about one-third of the

additional months of delayed claiming time in the *Lump Sum* scenario vs. the *Status Quo*, and half the additional delay time in the *Delayed Lump Sum* scenario vs. the *Status Quo*.

Our results are robust to alternative specifications of the sample (dropping all respondents over the age of 62), and alternative specifications of the regression model (Tobit models for the change in claiming age and Logit models for the probability that there is a positive delay).²²

Conclusions and Implications

The primary contribution of this paper is to evaluate how individuals would respond to the chance to exchange part of their Social Security annuities for a lump sum. In our nationally representative sample of Americans who undertake an elicited preference experiment, we show that people will voluntarily work longer, on average, if they are offered an actuarially fair lump sum instead of a delayed retirement annuity under Social Security.

Specifically, we find that giving people lump sums in lieu of higher annuity payments from Social Security will induce reasonably substantial delays in claiming ages, by about half a year on average if the lump sum is paid for claiming after age 62, and by about two-thirds of a year if the lump sum is payable only for claiming after the Full Retirement Age. Interestingly, those most responsive to these incentives are also those who plan to claim early under the *Status Quo*. Moreover, financial literacy and mistrust in the retirement program's sustainability are associated with greater claiming delays. Also those in debt would similarly delay claiming to obtain the lump sums. Claiming delays do not differ across wealth levels, whether people have other annuities, the level of their Social Security benefit amounts, their risk aversion or planning horizons, or the investment returns they expect on investments. Additionally, we show that people report that they would work one-third to one-half of the additional months, compared to the *Status Quo*.

These findings should interest policymakers seeking ways of reforming Social Security without raising costs or cutting benefits, while enhancing the incentives to delay retirement, inasmuch as our policy experiment was designed to be cost-neutral to the Social Security system. As such, our approach has the virtue of not imposing additional solvency concerns on the system, nor requiring wealth transfers from the next generation. Future research can evaluate

²² For a complete set of these results see the Online Appendix, Table A3

whether people might also be willing to delay claiming and work longer for smaller-than-actuarially-fair lump sums, which could enhance the system's sustainability.


References

- Agarwal, S. and B. Mazumder. (2013). "Cognitive Abilities and Household Financial Decision Making." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5 (1): 193-207.
- Banks, J., C. O'Dea, and Z. Oldfield. (2010). "Cognitive Function, Numeracy and Retirement Saving Trajectories." *Economic Journal*, 120 (548): F381-F410.
- Behaghel, L. and D.M. Blau (2012). "Framing Social Security Reform: Behavioral Responses to Changes in the Full Retirement Age." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 4(4). 41–67.
- Bell, F., K.M. Bye, and A. Winters. (2008). "Unisex Life Expectancies at Birth and Age 65." Actuarial Note 2008.2 SSOACT.
- Bernheim, B.D. (1991). "How Strong are Bequest Motives? Evidence based on Estimates of the Demand for Life Insurance and Annuities." *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(5): 899-927.
- Brown, D.C., M.D. Hayward, J. Karas Montez, R.A. Hummer, C. Chiu, and M.M. Hidajat. (2012). "The Significance of Education for Mortality Compression in the United States." *Demography*, 49 (3): 819-40.
- Brown, E.H. (2012). "The Takeaway: 14 Countries Raising Retirement Age." aarp.com, 07/12. <http://blog.aarp.org/2012/07/12/europe-pension-reform-retirement-age-increases/>.
- Brown, J., A. Kapteyn, and O. S. Mitchell. (2013) "Framing and Claiming: How Information-Framing Affects Expected Social Security Claiming Behavior." *Journal of Risk and Insurance*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1539-6975.2013.12004.x.
- Brown, J., A. Kapteyn, E. Luttmer, and O.S. Mitchell. (2013). "Complexity as a Barrier to Annuitization: Do Consumers Know How to Value Annuities?" NBER Working Paper No. 19168.
- Brown, J., J. Kling, S. Mullainathan, and M. Wrobel. (2008). "Why Don't People Insure Late Life Consumption? A Framing Explanation of the Under-Annuitization Puzzle." *American Economic Review*, 98 (2): 304-309.
- Chai, J., R. Maurer, O.S. Mitchell, and R. Rogalla. (2013). "Exchanging Delayed Social Security Benefits for Lump Sums: Could This Incentivize Longer Work Careers?" NBER Working Paper No. 19032.
- Coile, C., P. Diamond, J. Gruber, and A. Jouten (2002): "Delays in Claiming Social Security Benefits." *Journal of Public Economics*, 84(3): 357–385.
- Davidoff, T., Brown, J. R., and Diamond, P. A. (2005). "Annuities and Individual Welfare." *American Economic Review*, 95(5): 1573-1590.
- Dohmen, T., A. Falk, D. Huffman, and U. Sunde. (2010). "Are Risk Aversion and Impatience Related to Cognitive Ability?" *American Economic Review*, 100 (3): 1238–1260.
- Dohmen, T. A. Falk, D. Huffman, and U. Sunde. (2012). "Interpreting Time Horizon Effects in Inter-Temporal Choice." IZA Discussion paper 6385.
- Fang, H., M. Keane, and D. Silverman. (2008). "Sources of Advantageous Selection: Evidence

- from the Medigap Insurance Market.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 226 (2): 303-350.
- Fetherstonhaugh, D. and L. Ross. (1999). “Framing Effects and Income Flow Preferences in Decisions about Social Security.” In *Behavioral Dimensions of Retirement Economics*. H.J. Aaron, ed. Washington DC. Brookings Institution Press, 187-209.
- French, E. (2005). “The Effects of Health, Wealth, and Wages on Labour Supply and Retirement Behaviour.” *Review of Economic Studies* 72 (2): 395-427.
- Gustman, A.L. and T.L. Steinmeier. (2005). “The Social Security Early Entitlement Age in a Structural Model of Retirement and Wealth.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 89 (1-2): 441– 463.
- Gustman, A.L. and T.L. Steinmeier. (2015). “Effects of Social Security Policies on Benefit Claiming, Retirement and Saving”. *Journal of Public Economics*, 129: 51-62.
- Hu, W.-Y., Scott, J.S. (2007). “Behavioral Obstacles in the Annuity Market.” *Financial Analysts Journal* 63, 71–82.
- Hubener, A., R. Maurer, and O.S. Mitchell (2013). “How Family Status and Social Security Claiming Options Shape Optimal Life Cycle Portfolios.” NBER Working Paper No.19583.
- Hurd, M. and K. McGarry. (2002). “The Predictive Validity of Subjective Probabilities of Survival.” *The Economic Journal*, 112 (482): 966-985.
- Hurd, M., J.P. Smith and J.M. Zissimopoulos. (2004). “The Effects of Subjective Survival on Retirement and Social Security Claiming.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 19 (6): 761-775.
- Kostøl, A. R. and M. Mogstad. (2014). “How Financial Incentives Induce Disability Insurance Recipients to Return to Work.” *The American Economic Review*, 104(2): 624–655.
- Laitner, J. and D. Silverman. (2012). “Consumption, Retirement and Social Security: Evaluating the Efficiency of Reform that Encourages Longer Careers.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 96(7): 615-634.
- Liebman, J.B. and E.F.P. Luttmer (2015). “Would People Behave Differently if They Better Understood Social Security? Evidence from a Field Experiment.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 7(1): 275-299.
- Lusardi, A. and O.S. Mitchell. (2007). “Baby Boomer Retirement Security: The Roles of Planning, Financial Literacy, and Housing Wealth.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54 (1): 205-224.
- Mastrobuoni, G. (2011). “The Role of Information for Retirement Behavior: Evidence Based on the Stepwise Introduction of the Social Security Statement.” *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7): 913-925.
- McArdle, J., J.P. Smith, and R. Willis. (2011). “Cognition and Economic Outcomes in the Health and Retirement Survey.” In *Explorations in the Economics of Aging*. D. Wise, Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 209–233.
- Mitchell, O.S., J. Poterba, M. Warshawsky, and J. Brown. (1999). “New Evidence on the Money Worth of Individual Annuities.” *American Economic Review*: 89, 1299-1318.


- Munnell, A. and A. Chen. (2015). "Trends in Social Security Claiming." RRC Working Paper 15-8. Boston College.
- National Research Council. (2012). *Aging and the Macroeconomy: Long-Term Implications of an Older Population*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Orszag, P.R. (2001). "Should a Lump-Sum Payment Replace Social Security Delayed Retirement Credit?" Issue Brief No. 6 April 2001, Center for Retirement Research at Boston College.
- Peijnenburg, K., T. Nijman, and B. Werker. (2013). „Health Cost Risk: A Potential Solution to the Annuity Puzzle“, Working Paper.
- Reichling, F. and K. Smetters. (2015). "Optimal Annuitization with Stochastic Mortality and Correlated Medical Costs." *American Economic Review*, 105(11): 3273-3320.
- Rohwedder, S. and R. Willis. (2010). "Mental Retirement." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1): 119-138.
- Sahlgren, G. (2013). "Work Longer, Live Healthier – The Relationship between Economics Activity, Health, and Government Policy." IEA Discussion Paper No. 46.
- Shoven, J.B. and S.N. Slavov. (2012). "The Decision to Delay Social Security Benefits: Theory and Evidence." NBER Working Paper No. 17866.
- Shoven, J. B. and S.N. Slavov. (2014). "Does it Pay to Delay Social Security?" *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance*, 13 (2): 121-144.
- Smith, K.R. and N.J. Waitzman. (1997). "Effects of Marital Status on the Risk of Mortality in Poor and Non-poor Neighborhoods," *Annals of Epidemiology*, 7 (5): 343-349.
- Social Security Administration. (SSA 2013). *Trustees Report*. www.ssa.gov.
- Social Security Administration. (SSA 2015). *Annual Statistical Supplement to the Social Security Bulletin, 2015* (Table 6.B5).
- Turner, J. (2009). "Social Security Financing: Automatic Adjustments to Restore Solvency." AARP Public Policy Institute Paper. #2009-01.
- Yaari, M. (1965). "Uncertain Lifetime, Life Insurance, and the Theory of the Consumer." *Review of Economic Studies*, 32: 137-150
- Zick, C.D. and K.R. Smith. (1991). "Marital Status, Poverty, and Gender Differences in Mortality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53 (2): 327-336.

Figure 1: Distribution of Claiming Ages: Status Quo vs. Two Lump Sum Alternatives




Notes: Boxes represent the 25% and the 75% quantiles of claiming ages, with the intermediate lines at the medians. Black dots represent the mean claiming ages, with differences between the means in the two Lump Sum alternatives and the mean in the Status Quo scenario significant at the 1% level.

Figure 2: Distribution of Lump Sum Payments under Two Lump Sum Alternatives



Notes: Boxes represent the 25% and the 75% quantiles of lump sum payments at the claiming ages, with the intermediate lines at the medians. Black dots represent the mean lump sums.

Figure 3: Distribution of Total Work Effort: Status Quo vs. Two Lump Sum Alternatives



Notes: Boxes represent the 25% and the 75% quantiles of months of fulltime work (after age 62), with the intermediate line at the median. Black dot represents the mean number of months of fulltime work, with differences between the mean in the Lump Sum (Delayed Lump Sum) alternative and the mean in the Status Quo scenario significant at the 10% (1%) level.

Table 1: Delayed Claiming Boosts Monthly Social Security Benefits: Status Quo Scenario

Claiming Age	Monthly Benefit: (% of PIA)	Boost with 1 year delay (%)	Cumulative boost compared to age 62 (%)
62	70		
63	75	7.14	7.14
64	80	6.67	14.29
65	86.67	8.34	23.81
66	93.33	7.70	33.33
67	100	7.15	42.86
68	108	8	54.29
69	116	7.41	65.71
70	124	6.90	77.14

Notes: Full Retirement Age (FRA): 67; PIA = Primary Insurance Amount. Source: www.ssa.gov.

Table 2: Illustrative Benefit Impact of Delayed Claiming: Status Quo vs. Two Lump Sum Scenarios

Claiming Age	(1) Status Quo	(2) Lump Sum			(3) Delayed Lump Sum		
	Monthly Benefit	Monthly Benefit	+	Lump Sum	Monthly Benefit	+	Lump Sum
62	1,500	1,500	+	0	1,500	+	0
63	1,607	1,500	+	20,208	1,607	+	0
64	1,714	1,500	+	39,382	1,714	+	0
65	1,857	1,500	+	63,887	1,857	+	0
66	2,000	1,500	+	86,963	2,000	+	0
67	2,143	1,500	+	108,589	2,143	+	0
68	2,314	1,500	+	133,427	2,143	+	28,090
69	2,486	1,500	+	156,480	2,143	+	54,428
70	2,657	1,500	+	177,723	2,143	+	78,988

Notes: Full Retirement Age (FRA): 67, Assumed Social Security Benefit at Age 62: \$ 1,500. Status Quo refers to the current Social Security system (column 1). Lump Sum (column 2) holds the monthly benefits constant at all claiming ages; the lump sum amount payable at the claiming age in that row is the actuarial present value of the difference in monthly benefits between the Status Quo and those paid in the Lump Sum scenario. Delayed Lump Sum (column 3) increases monthly benefits to the FRA with no lump sum payment; thereafter monthly benefits are constant and the lump sum is the actuarial present value of the difference in monthly benefits between the Status Quo and the FRA benefit. Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 3: Mean Claiming Ages (Months after Age 62) under Status Quo and Two Lump Sum Scenarios

	%	(1) Status Quo	(2) Lump Sum	(3) Delayed Lump Sum
Overall Sample	100	45.0	49.6	53.3
Sex				
Male	41.1	46.2	50.2	53.7
Female	58.9	44.0	49.2	53.0
Marital Status				
Married	60.0	43.7	48.8	52.3
Non Married	40.0	46.8	50.7	54.8
Age				
< 62	72.5	46.6	50.7	54.8
62-70	27.5	40.7	46.7	49.4
Education				
HS Dropout	4.2	39.8	45.8	47.6
HS Graduate	16.1	34.8	40.0	44.1
More than HS	79.7	47.3	51.7	55.4
Life Expectancy Assessment				
Optimistic	33.5	53.9	57.5	60.7
Pessimistic	66.5	40.4	45.6	49.6

Notes: For variable descriptions see Appendix. N = 2451. Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 4: Changes in Claiming Ages for the Lump Sum and Delayed Lump Sum Scenarios (compared to the *Status Quo*)

SQ Claiming Age	N	Lump Sum				Delayed Lump Sum			
		Positive Delay		Negative Delay		Positive Delay		Negative Delay	
		%	Months	%	Months	%	Months	%	Months
62	490	50	35.7	5	1.5	37	42.7	6	1.7
63	94	59	19.9	14	5.5	48	27.2	24	5.8
64	96	54	16.5	22	13.0	56	28.0	19	11.8
65	571	47	20.0	18	13.1	57	25.5	16	11.3
66	291	43	20.4	23	15.1	59	21.4	14	10.9
67	268	35	17.2	32	16.3	52	18.0	19	13.0
68	185	32	14.3	40	12.9	43	14.1	31	11.7
69	58	36	10.3	45	24.7	38	10.7	26	14.8
70	398	5	1.4	34	31.3	7	1.2	30	21.2
Total	2451	38	22.7	22	18.1	43	25.2	18	13.3

Notes: This table documents changes in claiming behavior under the two lump sum alternatives compared to the Status Quo for the full sample (“Total”) and grouped by Status Quo (SQ) claiming age. We show claiming age frequencies under the Status Quo (“N”), the percentage of people reacting with a positive or negative delay to the Lump Sum/ Delayed Lump, and the average conditional (on the direction) delay in months.

Table 5: Multivariate Analysis of Changes in Expected Claiming Ages given Two Lump Sum Scenarios (compared to the *Status Quo*)

	Lump Sum			Delayed Lump Sum		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Demographic</i>						
Male	-1.25 (0.916)	-0.89 (0.836)	-1.478* (0.888)	-1.441 (0.899)	-1.153 (0.849)	-1.690* (0.902)
Married	1.436 (0.920)	-0.055 (0.842)	-0.581 (0.877)	0.973 (0.903)	-0.216 (0.855)	-0.382 (0.892)
Age	0.134** (0.055)	-0.056 (0.051)	0.016 (0.056)	0.07 (0.054)	-0.082 (0.052)	0.007 (0.057)
Education (yrs)	-0.235 (0.181)	0.243 (0.167)	0.081 (0.185)	-0.237 (0.178)	0.144 (0.169)	0.071 (0.188)
Optimistic Life Exp.	-2.127 (1.872)	7.142*** (1.759)	7.074*** (1.783)	-1.795 (1.839)	5.603*** (1.786)	6.288*** (1.813)
<i>Experimental</i>						
Claiming Age SQ		-0.298*** (0.013)	-0.306*** (0.014)		-0.238*** (0.014)	-0.246*** (0.014)
Saw Lump Sum First			-3.772*** (0.806)			-2.223*** (0.820)
<i>Economic</i>						
Wealth 50-100K			1.037 (1.381)			-0.686 (1.404)
Wealth 100K+			-0.267 (1.081)			-1.627 (1.099)
Other Annuity			-0.384 (0.887)			-0.933 (0.902)
Benefit at Age 62			0.374 (1.074)			0.902 (1.092)
Long Tenure (10y+)			-0.499 (1.720)			-2.369 (1.749)
High Debt			1.925** (0.894)			1.859** (0.909)
<i>Attitudes/Preferences</i>						
Risk Aversion			1.074** (0.426)			0.936** (0.433)
Long Term Planner			0.868 (0.877)			-0.11 (0.892)
Risky Investing			-0.226 (1.320)			-0.631 (1.342)
High Expected Return			1.351 (1.258)			-0.273 (1.279)
High Spending			-0.048 (1.203)			0.408 (1.223)
Financial Literacy			3.288** (1.527)			4.708*** (1.553)
High Political Trust			-2.556*** (0.860)			-3.020*** (0.874)
R-squared	0.005	0.172	0.192	0.004	0.114	0.133

Notes: The dependent variable in the OLS regressions is the difference between the claiming ages in the Lump Sum vs. the Status Quo scenario (in months). Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. N = 2451. Missing values controlled. See Appendix for variable descriptions. Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 6: Mean Months of Fulltime Work (after Age 62) under Status Quo and Two Lump Sum Scenarios

	%	(1) Status Quo	(2) Lump Sum	(3) Delayed Lump Sum
Overall Sample	100	34.8	36.2	38.7
Sex				
Male	41.1	38.5	40.0	42.3
Female	58.9	32.2	33.6	36.1
Marital Status				
Married	60.0	32.7	34.8	36.9
Non Married	40.0	37.9	38.4	41.3
Age				
< 62	72.5	35.9	36.5	39.5
62-70	27.5	32.0	35.4	36.6
Education				
HS Dropout	4.2	29.5	33.5	34.9
HS Graduate	16.1	27.3	28.3	30.9
More than HS	79.7	36.6	38.0	40.4
Life Expectancy Assessment				
Optimistic	33.5	43.5	44.7	46.5
Pessimistic	66.5	30.4	32.0	34.7

Notes: Variable Descriptions see Appendix. N = 2451. Source: Authors' calculations.

Table 7: Changes in Months of Work for the Lump Sum and Delayed Lump Sum Scenarios by Age (compared to the Status Quo)

SQ Claiming Age	N	Lump Sum				Delayed Lump Sum			
		More Work		Less Work		More Work		Less Work	
		%	Months	%	Months	%	Months	%	Months
62	490	42	24.3	2	1.7	31	30.7	3	1.9
63	94	53	11.6	17	5.2	48	14.3	24	5.5
64	96	46	12.0	31	6.6	53	17.8	21	6.8
65	571	41	14.2	23	10.3	49	17.7	21	9.7
66	291	37	17.6	32	10.9	49	18.3	24	7.8
67	268	29	14.1	39	15.7	42	14.0	29	13.5
68	185	30	11.8	45	13.2	39	11.1	39	13.5
69	58	29	8.9	52	24.6	31	9.2	40	14.4
70	398	11	11.5	40	25.0	13	10.8	33	20.5
Total	2451	34	16.5	27	15.4	38	18.2	23	12.8

Notes: This table documents changes in working behavior under the two lump sum alternatives compared to the Status Quo for the full sample (Total) and grouped by Status Quo (SQ) claiming age. We show claiming age frequencies under the Status Quo, the percentage of people reacting with an increase/ decrease in labor supply to the Lump Sum/ Delayed Lump, and the average conditional (on the direction) change in months of full-time work.

Table 8: Multivariate Analysis of Changes in Months of Work given Two Lump Sum Scenarios (compared to the *Status Quo*)

	Lump Sum			Delayed Lump Sum		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Demographic</i>						
Male	-0.129 (0.728)	1.048 (0.689)	0.632 (0.733)	-0.164 (0.710)	0.718 (0.689)	0.281 (0.728)
Married	1.620** (0.731)	0.096 (0.695)	0.125 (0.725)	0.954 (0.713)	-0.188 (0.695)	0.084 (0.720)
Age	0.153*** (0.044)	0.052 (0.042)	0.121 (0.046)	0.097** (0.043)	0.021 (0.042)	0.109** (0.046)
Education (yrs)	-0.261* (0.144)	-0.028 (0.136)	-0.039 (0.152)	-0.317** (0.140)	-0.142 (0.136)	-0.112 (0.151)
Optimistic Life Exp.	0.39 (1.488)	6.052*** (1.439)	6.598*** (1.467)	-0.01 (1.451)	4.232*** (1.439)	5.082*** (1.456)
<i>Experimental</i>						
Total Work SQ		-0.201*** (0.011)	-0.207*** (0.012)		-0.151*** (0.011)	-0.159*** (0.012)
Saw Lump Sum First			-1.614** (0.665)			-1.432** (0.660)
<i>Economic</i>						
Wealth 50-100K			-0.413 (1.138)			-2.203* (1.130)
Wealth 100K+			-1.947** (0.892)			-3.214*** (0.886)
Other Annuity			0.170 (0.732)			-0.414 (0.727)
Benefit at Age 62			1.135 (0.886)			1.358 (0.880)
Long Tenure (10y+)			-1.153 (1.419)			-3.114** (1.409)
High Debt			1.576** (0.737)			1.755** (0.732)
<i>Attitudes/Preferences</i>						
Risk Aversion			0.827** (0.350)			1.036*** (0.348)
Long Term Planner			0.454 (0.723)			0.500 (0.718)
Risky Investing			0.137 (1.087)			-1.195 (1.080)
High Expected Return			0.540 (1.037)			-0.312 (1.030)
High Spending			0.649 (0.993)			0.233 (0.986)
Financial Literacy			0.994 (1.259)			2.855** (1.250)
High Political Trust			-1.701** (0.709)			-2.027*** (0.704)
R-squared	0.008	0.119	0.133	0.005	0.071	0.098

Notes: The dependent variable in the OLS regressions is the difference between the number of months of fulltime work in the Lump Sum vs. the Status Quo scenario. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. N = 2451. See Appendix for variable descriptions. Source: Authors' calculations.

Online Appendix – Tables and Figures

Table A1: Variable Descriptions

Variable Name	Variable Description	Mean	Median
Claiming Age SQ	Claiming Age in Status Quo scenario (in months after age 62)	45.0	38
Claiming Age LS	Claiming Age in Lump Sum scenario (in months after age 62)	49.6	48
Claiming Age DLS	Claiming Age in Delayed Lump Sum scenario (in months after age 62)	53.3	60
Diff LSSQ	Difference between claiming age in Lump Sum and Status Quo scenario (Claiming Age LS - Claiming Age SQ)	4.6	0
Diff DLSSQ	Difference between claiming age in Delayed Lump Sum and Status Quo scenario (Claiming Age DLS - Claiming Age SQ)	8.4	0
Lump Sum LS	Lump sum payment (in \$) R receives in Lump Sum scenario at claiming age (Claiming Age LS)	73026	64498
Lump Sum DLS	Lump sum payment (in \$) R receives in Delayed Lump Sum scenario at claiming age (Claiming Age DLS)	22449	1596
Work Hours SQ	Weekly work hours in Status Quo scenario (0 for Claiming Age SQ = 0)	24.5	30
Total Work SQ	Months of fulltime work in Status Quo scenario (0 for Claiming Age SQ = 0)	34.8	32
Work Hours LS	Weekly work hours in Lump Sum scenario (0 for Claiming Age LS = 0)	24.8	27
Total Work LS	Months of fulltime work in Lump Sum scenario (0 for Claiming Age LS = 0)	36.2	35
Work Hours DLS	Weekly work hours in Delayed Lump Sum scenario (0 for Claiming Age DLS = 0)	24.2	25
Total Work DLS	Months of fulltime work in Delayed Lump Sum scenario (0 for Claiming Age DLS = 0)	38.7	36
Diff LSSQ Work	Difference between months of full-time work in Lump Sum and Status Quo scenario (Total Work LS - Total Work SQ)	1.4	0
Diff DLSSQ Work	Difference between months of full-time work in Delayed Lump Sum and Status Quo scenario (Total Work DLS - Total Work SQ)	3.9	0
Male	= 1 if R is male; 0 else	0.41	0
Married	= 1 if R is married; 0 else	0.60	1
Age	R's age	55.6	56
Education (yrs)	R's years of education	14.6	14
Optimistic Life Exp.	Difference between R's subjective and his objective ²³ probability of living to target age [75, 80, 85], for Rs age [<65 , 65-69, 69+]	-0.14	-0.109
Saw Lump Sum First	= 1 if R saw Lump Sum alternative first; 0 if R saw Delayed Lump Sum alternative first	0.50	1
Wealth 50-100K	= 1 if R's household financial wealth is between \$50,000 and \$100,000; 0 else	0.11	0
Wealth 100K+	= 1 if R's household financial wealth is above \$100,000; 0 else	0.42	0
Other Annuity	= 1 if R is/will be receiving any pension other than Social Security now/in the future; 0 else	0.51	1
Benefit at Age 62	R's estimated monthly Social Security benefit at age 62 (\$ '000)	1.194	1.153
Long Tenure (10y+)	= 1 if R worked for pay more than 10 yrs; 0 else	0.93	1
High Debt	= 1 if R would use 50%+ of additional \$10,000 to pay off credit card/other debt; 0 else	0.37	0
Risk Aversion	Standardized (mean 0, std 1) risk aversion index, calculated as described in the online appendix of Brown/Kapteyn/Luttmer/Mitchell (2013).	0.0	-0.007
Long Term Planner	= 1 if R makes financial plans for next 5 yrs and more; 0 else	0.40	0
Risky Investing	= 1 if R would invest 50%+ in stocks/real estate; 0 else	0.89	1
High Expected Return	= 1 if R expects investment return of 7%+; 0 else	0.12	0
High Spending	= 1 if R would use 50%+ of additional \$10,000 to spend; 0 else	0.15	0
Financial Literacy	Percentage of financial literacy questions answered correctly	0.75	1
High Political Trust	= 1 if R is somewhat/very confident in the Social Security system's sustainability; 0 else	0.55	1

²³ Objective survival probability based on the Alternative 2 mortality probabilities used in the SSA's 2013 Trustees Report (Social Security Administration 2013).

Table A2: Robustness Check: Multivariate Analysis of Changes in Claiming Ages Under Two Lump Sum Scenarios (compared to the *Status Quo*)

	Lump Sum			Delayed Lump Sum		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Demographic</i>						
Male	-1.709* (1.021)	-2.047 (1.613)	-0.037 (0.023)	-1.254 (1.060)	-5.196*** (1.720)	-0.091*** (0.023)
Married	0.033 (1.000)	-0.434 (1.606)	-0.004 (0.023)	-0.483 (1.013)	-0.160 (1.676)	-0.002 (0.022)
Age	-0.094 (0.078)	-0.072 (0.102)	-0.003* (0.001)	-0.032 (0.077)	-0.006 (0.106)	-0.001 (0.001)
Education (yrs)	0.007 (0.221)	0.134 (0.339)	0.001 (0.005)	0.062 (0.221)	-0.196 (0.353)	-0.002 (0.005)
Optimistic Life Exp.	7.052*** (2.218)	8.216** (3.335)	0.077* (0.046)	6.401*** (2.252)	8.682** (3.439)	0.107** (0.046)
<i>Experimental</i>						
Claiming Age SQ	-0.296*** (0.018)	-0.492*** (0.028)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.244*** (0.017)	-0.387*** (0.029)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Saw Lump Sum First	-3.816*** (0.917)	-7.896*** (1.453)	-0.099*** (0.021)	-3.207*** (0.942)	-4.230*** (1.537)	-0.057*** (0.021)
<i>Economic</i>						
Wealth 50-100K	0.575 (1.463)	0.824 (2.344)	0.017 (0.034)	-0.737 (1.383)	-2.555 (2.485)	-0.026 (0.035)
Wealth 100K+	-0.649 (1.246)	-0.515 (1.935)	-0.008 (0.028)	-2.141* (1.266)	-4.258** (2.014)	-0.055** (0.028)
Other Annuity	-0.413 (1.016)	-1.535 (1.598)	-0.021 (0.023)	-1.258 (1.010)	-0.767 (1.674)	-0.001 (0.023)
Benefit at Age 62	0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)
Long Tenure (10y+)	-1.533 (2.280)	-2.959 (3.236)	-0.017 (0.044)	-3.346 (2.071)	-3.867 (3.116)	-0.034 (0.043)
High Debt	2.108** (1.005)	2.709* (1.602)	0.027 (0.023)	2.706*** (1.041)	2.937* (1.688)	0.030 (0.023)
<i>Attitudes/Preferences</i>						
Risk Aversion	0.833* (0.489)	1.156 (0.775)	0.010 (0.011)	0.519 (0.495)	1.430* (0.806)	0.016 (0.011)
Long Term Planner	0.104 (0.988)	1.959 (1.571)	0.027 (0.022)	0.074 (1.004)	-0.059 (1.667)	0.017 (0.022)
Risky Investing	1.899 (1.656)	-1.137 (2.455)	-0.003 (0.034)	0.681 (1.642)	0.103 (2.673)	0.026 (0.034)
High Expected Return	-0.378 (1.287)	0.187 (2.374)	-0.023 (0.032)	-0.777 (1.403)	-0.561 (2.449)	-0.019 (0.032)
High Spending	-0.783 (1.457)	0.461 (2.166)	0.008 (0.031)	0.708 (1.399)	0.525 (2.300)	0.019 (0.031)
Financial Literacy	3.928** (1.663)	5.866** (2.795)	0.057 (0.039)	5.568*** (1.714)	5.939** (2.842)	0.014 (0.038)
High Political Trust	-3.403*** (0.926)	-4.579*** (1.532)	-0.051** (0.022)	-3.220*** (0.966)	-4.205*** (1.630)	-0.033 (0.022)

Notes: Columns (1) and (4): OLS restricted sample (everyone over age 62 dropped); Columns (2) and (5): marginal effects from a Tobit model; Columns (3) and (6): marginal effects from a Logit model. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. N = 2451. Missing values controlled. See Appendix Table A1 for variable descriptions. Source: Authors' calculations.

Table A3: Robustness Check: Multivariate Analysis of Changes in Months of Work given Two Lump Sum Scenarios (compared to the *Status Quo*)

	Lump Sum			Delayed Lump Sum		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Demographic</i>						
Male	0.412 (0.878)	1.034 (1.373)	-0.004 (0.022)	0.549 (0.875)	-1.040 (1.425)	-0.078*** (0.023)
Married	0.736 (0.860)	0.250 (1.391)	0.011 (0.021)	0.378 (0.852)	-0.056 (1.433)	-0.007 (0.022)
Age	-0.012 (0.064)	0.084 (0.086)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.072 (0.062)	0.130 (0.088)	0.000 (0.001)
Education (yrs)	-0.110 (0.188)	-0.214 (0.295)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.107 (0.176)	-0.390 (0.290)	-0.004 (0.005)
Optimistic Life Exp.	5.364*** (1.824)	7.864*** (2.841)	0.062 (0.043)	3.841** (1.815)	7.220** (2.905)	0.094** (0.045)
<i>Experimental</i>						
Claiming Age SQ	-0.203*** (0.017)	-0.260*** (0.025)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.160*** (0.015)	-0.184*** (0.024)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Saw Lump Sum First	-1.826** (0.744)	-4.529*** (1.222)	-0.068*** (0.020)	-2.312*** (0.752)	-3.132** (1.267)	-0.058*** (0.021)
<i>Economic</i>						
Wealth 50-100K	-0.063 (1.246)	-1.988 (1.972)	-0.020 (0.033)	-2.192* (1.201)	-4.007* (2.056)	-0.026 (0.035)
Wealth 100K+	-1.986* (1.063)	-4.424*** (1.684)	-0.072*** (0.026)	-3.097*** (1.033)	-6.764*** (1.728)	-0.064** (0.028)
Other Annuity	-0.029 (0.819)	-0.216 (1.331)	-0.010 (0.022)	-0.774 (0.805)	-0.649 (1.372)	-0.001 (0.023)
Benefit at Age 62	0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002 (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)
Long Tenure (10y+)	-0.957 (1.785)	-0.774 (2.874)	0.038 (0.042)	-3.344** (1.610)	-5.405** (2.630)	-0.024 (0.043)
High Debt	1.982** (0.832)	2.531* (1.355)	0.037* (0.022)	-2.302*** (0.834)	3.239** (1.387)	0.031 (0.023)
<i>Attitudes/Preferences</i>						
Risk Aversion	0.432 (0.419)	1.152* (0.656)	0.015 (0.010)	0.670* (0.407)	1.714** (0.676)	0.013 (0.011)
Long Term Planner	0.194 (0.794)	0.582 (1.314)	0.022 (0.021)	0.456 (0.777)	0.102 (1.369)	0.013 (0.022)
Risky Investing	1.265 (1.317)	-0.312 (2.051)	-0.005 (0.032)	-0.431 (1.348)	0.156 (2.307)	0.021 (0.034)
High Expected Return	0.336 (1.082)	-0.711 (2.012)	-0.027 (0.031)	-0.193 (1.125)	-0.496 (1.996)	-0.020 (0.032)
High Spending	0.998 (1.161)	1.830 (1.771)	0.044 (0.029)	1.327 (1.136)	0.654 (1.872)	0.016 (0.031)
Financial Literacy	1.286 (1.430)	2.449 (2.391)	0.037 (0.036)	3.551** (1.392)	2.199 (2.382)	0.013 (0.038)
High Political Trust	-2.182*** (0.755)	-3.012** (1.272)	-0.036* (0.021)	-2.212*** (0.776)	-3.245** (1.338)	-0.031 (0.022)

Notes: Columns (1) and (4): OLS restricted sample (everyone over age 62 dropped), Columns (2) and (5): marginal effects from a Tobit model; Columns (3) and (6): marginal effects from a Logit model. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. N = 2451. Missing values controlled. See Appendix Table A1 for variable descriptions. Source: Authors' calculations.

Figure A1: Online Survey Screen Shot – Claiming Age under Status Quo

Now imagine you have the following choice:

Either


- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that **\$1,500** monthly payment for life.

OR

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive a **higher monthly payment** from that age on for life.

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit.


Please click your mouse on the scale below to see what the monthly benefit would be for different claiming ages. **You may pick a different point if you wish to change your previous click.** Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit? Please press NEXT when finished.




Claiming Age

Monthly benefit: \$

Age: Months:





Notes: Exemplary screen shot of survey as seen by respondent after selecting his claiming age (here 67 and 7 months) in the Status Quo scenario. Prior to selecting an age, the text boxes for monthly benefits, age and months show no entry and the red arrow on the scale is not shown.

Figure A2: Online Survey Screen Shot – Claiming Age under Lump Sum Scenario

Next we would like to show you some different questions about Social Security claiming choices. As before, please assume that all amounts shown are after tax, and think of any dollar amount in terms of what a dollar buys you today. Again, on average, the Social Security system will neither lose nor make money no matter when benefits are claimed.

Please continue to assume that you are currently age 62 and single. You are still thinking about when to claim your Social Security benefit.

Now, imagine that you had the following choice:

Either


- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that **\$1,500** monthly payment for life.

OR

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive the same monthly payment of **\$1,500** from that age on for life, **plus an additional lump sum payable at that later claiming age.**

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit.

Please click your mouse on the scale below to see what the monthly benefit and the lump sum payment would be for different claiming ages. **You may pick a different point if you wish to change your previous click.** Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit? Please press NEXT when finished.



Monthly benefit: \$1500 + Lump Sum: \$ 123305

Age: Months:

Notes: Exemplary screen shot of survey as seen by respondent after selecting his claiming age (here 67 and 7 months) in the Lump Sum scenario. Prior to selecting an age, the text boxes for lump sum, age and months show no entry and the red arrow on the scale is not shown.

Figure A3: Online Survey Screen Shot – Claiming Age under Delayed Lump Sum Scenario

Next we would like to show you some different questions about Social Security claiming choices. As before, please assume that all amounts shown are after tax, and think of any dollar amount in terms of what a dollar buys you today. Again, on average, the Social Security system will neither lose nor make money no matter when benefits are claimed.

Please continue to assume that you are currently age 62 and single. You are still thinking about when to claim your Social Security benefit.

Now, imagine that you had the following choice:

Either


- You can claim your Social Security benefit at age **62** and receive that **\$1,500** monthly payment for life.

OR

- You can claim your Social Security benefit at a later age and receive a **higher monthly payment** from that age onward for life. This benefit will rise as you delay claiming up to a maximum of \$2,143 if you claim at your full retirement age (67 years). However, if you claim your benefit after your full retirement age (67 years), you will receive that monthly payment of **\$2,143** for life, **plus an additional lump sum payable at your later claiming age.**

Assume that you are free to choose your work effort (hours per week) until you claim your benefit.

Please click your mouse on the scale below to see what the monthly benefit and the lump sum payment would be for different claiming ages. **You may pick a different point if you wish to change your previous click.** Based on this information, at what age would you plan to claim your Social Security benefit? Please press NEXT when finished.



Monthly benefit: \$ 2143 + Lump Sum: \$ 16599

Age: Months:

<<Back Next>>


Notes: Exemplary screen shot of survey as seen by respondent after selecting his claiming age (here 67 and 7 months) in the Delayed Lump Sum scenario. Prior to selecting an age, the text boxes for lump sum, age and months show no entry and the red arrow on the scale is not shown.

Figure A4: Online Survey Screen Shot – Work Effort under Status Quo Scenario

You indicated that you would be willing to claim your Social Security benefit at age **67 and 7 months** and receive a monthly payment of **\$2,243** from that age onward for life.

Given that choice, about how many hours per week, on average, **would you plan to work** from age **62** to your claiming age of **67 and 7 months**?



Please click your mouse on the scale at the mark corresponding to your choice of average weekly work hours. You may pick a different point if you wish to change your previous click.



Work Hours Per Week

24

Based on your choice of work hours per week, you would be willing to work the equivalent of about 40 months of fulltime work until claiming to receive this benefit. If this is correct, press the Next button. |

Notes: Exemplary screen shot of survey as seen by respondent after selecting his work effort (24 hours per week) in the Status Quo scenario (after having selected a claiming age of 67 years and 7 months on the previous screen). Prior to selecting a work effort, the text boxes show no entry and the red arrow on the scale is not shown. The corresponding question regarding work effort in the two lump sum alternatives had equal wordings and design.