

BEHAVIOURAL ECONOMICS AND HOUSEHOLD SAVING DECISIONS

Prof. Sanket Mohapatra

Professor, Economics Area

Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad (IIMA)

Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Abstract

Household saving decisions are traditionally explained through income, wealth, life-cycle needs, expected returns, and precaution against future uncertainty. Although these factors remain important, they do not fully explain why households with comparable resources often save very differently. Behavioural economics extends conventional analysis by examining how psychological preferences, cognitive limits, social influence, and the design of financial choices shape saving behaviour. This paper examines the mechanisms through which behavioural factors influence the decision to set money aside for emergencies, education, housing, retirement, and other long-term goals.

The study adopts a structured review and conceptual analysis of major behavioural-economics contributions to household saving. It considers present bias, self-control problems, loss aversion, mental accounting, inertia, default effects, financial literacy, social norms, and commitment devices. The analysis also distinguishes between the intention to save and actual saving action, because many households report long-term financial goals but postpone or interrupt regular contributions when short-term spending pressures arise.

The review indicates that savings outcomes are strongly affected by the environment in which choices are made. Automatic enrolment, payroll deductions, labelled accounts, timely reminders, simplified options, and voluntary commitment arrangements can reduce procrastination and help households act on their own stated goals. At the same time, behavioural interventions must be designed carefully: a default contribution level can become an unintended anchor, and uniform solutions may not suit households facing unstable income, debt burdens, or limited access to secure financial services.

The paper concludes that effective household-saving policy should combine behavioural design with financial capability, consumer protection, accessible products, and flexibility for diverse household circumstances. A behavioural perspective does not replace economic fundamentals; rather, it explains how households translate income and intentions into repeated saving decisions. The findings provide a practical framework for researchers, financial institutions, employers, and policy makers seeking to strengthen household financial resilience.

Keywords: Behavioural Economics, Household Saving, Present Bias, Mental Accounting, Self-Control, Financial Literacy, Default Effects, Commitment Devices, Financial Resilience, Saving Behaviour

1. INTRODUCTION

Saving is a central household decision because it supports consumption smoothing, emergency preparedness, investment in education and housing, retirement security, and recovery from income shocks. Conventional economic models explain saving through expected lifetime income, interest rates, borrowing constraints, and uncertainty. These models provide an essential benchmark, yet observed behaviour often departs from their prediction that households will consistently allocate resources toward their long-term welfare. Many individuals who understand the importance of savings nevertheless postpone account opening, delay

regular contributions, or withdraw funds intended for future use.

Behavioural economics addresses this gap by incorporating realistic features of decision-making. Households may value immediate consumption more strongly than future consumption, face difficulty in exercising self-control, mentally separate money into non-fungible categories, respond to the presentation of choices, or follow defaults rather than actively compare alternatives. These mechanisms do not imply that households are irrational in every decision. Instead, they suggest that choices are made under limited attention, time pressure,

incomplete information, competing financial demands, and emotionally meaningful goals.

The distinction between saving intention and saving action is especially important. A household may intend to create an emergency fund, increase retirement contributions, or save for children's education, but an unexpected expense or a small procedural hurdle can interrupt this plan. Present bias and procrastination can make a future saving decision appear attractive while making the same action unattractive today. Inertia can sustain an existing contribution rate even when income changes, while mental accounting can make households reluctant to use one category of savings for another purpose even when doing so would be financially efficient.

Household saving also takes place in an institutional setting. Employers, banks, digital financial platforms, governments, and community organisations influence the menu of products, enrolment processes, fees, information, reminders, and withdrawal restrictions that households encounter. Evidence from retirement plans and commitment-savings products shows that design features such as automatic enrolment, payroll deductions, escalation rules, and goal-based accounts can alter participation and contribution behaviour. However, the impact of any intervention depends on household resources, financial knowledge, employment stability, trust, and access to suitable products. The objective of this paper is to examine how behavioural-economic mechanisms shape household saving decisions and to identify practical approaches that can convert saving intentions into sustained action. The paper synthesises theoretical and empirical literature, outlines the object of study, explains a review-based methodology, and discusses the implications for household financial resilience and saving-policy design.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF KEY LITERATURE ON BEHAVIOURAL ECONOMICS AND HOUSEHOLD SAVING

S. No.	Author(s) / Year	Behavioural Mechanism	Study Context	Key Contribution
1	Modigliani & Brumberg (1954)	Life-cycle model	Intertemporal consumption	Explains saving as a response to predictable income changes across life stages.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The foundations of household-saving theory are commonly associated with the life-cycle and permanent-income approaches, which emphasise that people plan consumption and saving across periods of changing income. Behavioural research does not reject these frameworks; it identifies systematic frictions that may prevent households from following their preferred long-term plan. The behavioural life-cycle hypothesis, for example, proposes that households use mental accounts and self-control rules to manage conflicts between current consumption and future saving.

A major theme in the literature is time inconsistency. Individuals may prefer saving when considering the future, but shift toward immediate consumption when a payment must be made today. This tendency is often described as present bias or hyperbolic discounting. Related research on inertia demonstrates that many saving-plan participants remain with a default option because active choice requires attention, information, and effort. Automatic enrolment and automatic escalation therefore have the potential to increase participation, although their effects may vary with the level and design of the default.

Another theme concerns the use of behavioural tools that support self-control. Commitment accounts, labelled savings goals, reminders, and simplified decision menus can reduce short-term temptation and make a future objective more salient. Financial literacy and planning capability remain important because households need to understand interest, inflation, risk, debt, and product features. The literature increasingly treats saving as the outcome of an interaction among economic capacity, psychological tendencies, product design, and social context.

S. No.	Author(s) / Year	Behavioural Mechanism	Study Context	Key Contribution
2	Kahneman & Tversky (1979)	Prospect theory	Risk and loss evaluation	Shows that losses and reference points can influence financial choices.
3	Shefrin & Thaler (1988)	Behavioural life-cycle	Self-control and accounts	Connects mental accounting with the challenge of preserving savings for future goals.
4	Thaler (1990)	Mental accounting	Fungibility of money	Demonstrates that households may treat money differently across labelled categories.
5	Laibson (1997)	Present bias	Intertemporal choice	Explains why immediate consumption can crowd out planned future saving.
6	Madrian & Shea (2001)	Inertia and defaults	Retirement plans	Finds that automatic enrolment materially changes participation and saving behaviour.
7	Duflo & Saez (2003)	Information and peers	Retirement choices	Shows that information and social interactions can influence plan participation.
8	Benartzi & Thaler (2004)	Commitment design	Save More Tomorrow	Uses future pay increases to support higher retirement contributions.
9	Ashraf, Karlan & Yin (2006)	Commitment saving	Goal-based accounts	Finds that voluntary restrictions can help households protect savings intentions.
10	Lusardi & Mitchell (2014)	Financial literacy	Household finance	Links financial knowledge to better planning and financial decision-making.
11	Karlan et al. (2016)	Reminders	Saving salience	Shows that timely reminders can increase attention to a saving goal.
12	Chetty et al. (2014)	Active vs. passive choice	Retirement saving	Highlights the importance of automatic contributions for passive savers.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The object of this study is household saving behaviour viewed through the lens of behavioural economics. The analysis focuses on the gap between a household's stated saving objectives and the financial actions that are taken over time. It considers saving for short-term protection, medium-term planned expenditure, and long-term needs such as retirement, education, and housing.

The study examines how behavioural mechanisms interact with economic conditions. The principal mechanisms include present bias, limited attention, mental accounting, loss aversion, inertia, framing, confidence, social influence, and self-control. Economic conditions include disposable income, income volatility, household

composition, debt obligations, access to financial products, and perceived exposure to risk.

In addition, the study considers how institutional and product-design features can support or weaken saving behaviour. These features include automatic deductions, contribution defaults, account labelling, commitment restrictions, reminders, information disclosures, digital nudges, and financial-education support. The aim is to identify a balanced framework that recognises both individual agency and the influence of the choice environment.

KEY POINTS OF OBJECT OF STUDY

- To examine how present bias and self-control influence the timing and consistency of saving.

- To analyse mental accounting and the role of labelled saving goals in household budgeting.
- To assess how defaults, automatic deductions, and commitment devices affect saving participation.
- To investigate the influence of financial literacy, planning capability, and confidence on saving choices.
- To consider how income volatility and liquidity constraints interact with behavioural frictions.
- To compare short-term emergency saving with long-term retirement and investment saving.
- To study the role of reminders, information, and digital interfaces in keeping saving goals salient.
- To evaluate the relevance of social norms, family experience, and peer influence in money-management practices.
- To identify safeguards that reduce the risk of harmful or unsuitable behavioural interventions.
- To develop a conceptual framework for policy and product design that strengthens financial resilience.

TABLE 2: OBJECT OF STUDY FRAMEWORK

S. No.	Study Component	Description	Purpose
1	Household Saving Behaviour	Regular contributions, balance retention, and goal completion	Understand actual saving action rather than intention alone
2	Present Bias and Self-Control	Short-term consumption pressure and procrastination	Explain delayed or inconsistent saving
3	Mental Accounting	Budget categories, earmarked funds, and labelled goals	Assess how household money categories influence saving
4	Choice Architecture	Defaults, automatic deductions, prompts, and simplification	Identify environmental features that support follow-through
5	Financial Capability	Knowledge, planning, confidence, and product comprehension	Evaluate decision readiness and informed participation
6	Income and Liquidity Conditions	Income level, volatility, debt, and emergency needs	Recognise material constraints on the ability to save
7	Social and Institutional Context	Family norms, peer effects, trust, and access to services	Understand external influences on saving choices
8	Financial Resilience Outcome	Emergency capacity and long-term security	Connect saving behaviour with household well-being

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper uses an explanatory and integrative review design. Rather than collecting a new household survey, it synthesises theoretical contributions, peer-reviewed empirical studies, policy-relevant research, and established evidence on behavioural saving interventions. The approach is appropriate because the research question concerns the mechanisms that connect behavioural factors with

household saving decisions across different institutional settings.

The review is organised around four analytical domains: individual preferences and self-control; cognitive framing and mental accounting; social and informational influences; and choice architecture in saving products. Sources are evaluated for their contribution to understanding saving behaviour, the type of household or financial

setting studied, the behavioural mechanism examined, and the implications for practical design. The analysis places particular attention on whether an intervention supports voluntary, informed, and sustainable saving rather than generating a short-lived response.

To preserve conceptual clarity, the paper distinguishes between evidence on participation, contribution levels, account balances, and longer-term net saving. A rise in enrolment or a change in one account does not automatically demonstrate an equivalent increase in total household saving, because households may alter debt repayment, other saving accounts, or spending. This distinction is essential when interpreting studies of automatic enrolment, matching incentives, and commitment products.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- Study Type: Explanatory and literature-based research.
- Approach: Integrative review and conceptual synthesis.
- Unit of Analysis: Household and individual saving decisions.
- Primary Behavioural Domains: Present bias, self-control, mental accounting, inertia, and framing.
- Economic Context Variables: Income, income volatility, debt, financial access, and perceived risk.
- Outcome Variables: Saving participation, regularity of contributions, goal persistence, and financial resilience.
- Ethical Position: No personal or human-subject data were collected for this study.

4.2 METHODOLOGICAL STEPS

- Step 1: Define household saving as a repeated decision involving short-term and long-term financial goals.
- Step 2: Identify major behavioural mechanisms that have been linked to saving behaviour in the literature.
- Step 3: Review empirical evidence from retirement plans, banking products, field experiments, and household-finance studies.
- Step 4: Classify interventions according to their mechanism, such as defaults, reminders, commitment, or information.

- Step 5: Compare the reported outcomes for participation, contribution persistence, and broader financial resilience.
- Step 6: Interpret findings in relation to household heterogeneity, especially income volatility and liquidity constraints.
- Step 7: Identify limitations, including the risk of overgeneralising results across countries and financial systems.
- Step 8: Develop policy and product-design implications that protect consumer choice while reducing avoidable friction.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on qualitative synthesis of the reviewed literature. The evidence is interpreted by tracing how a particular behavioural mechanism changes the probability that a household will start saving, increase a contribution, retain funds, or achieve a stated financial goal. The analysis does not report newly collected household observations; it consolidates established patterns and identifies the conditions under which these patterns are most likely to occur.

Across the reviewed studies, the most consistent message is that saving is not determined by motivation alone. Households benefit when the desired action is easy to start, visible at the relevant moment, compatible with cash-flow conditions, and protected from predictable self-control problems. The following sections organise the analysis around four mechanisms that are particularly influential in household saving decisions.

5.1 PRESENT BIAS AND SELF-CONTROL

Present bias describes a tendency to give disproportionate weight to immediate costs and rewards. In a saving context, transferring money to an account can feel like an immediate reduction in available spending, while the benefit of security or retirement appears distant. This mismatch can lead households to delay account opening, postpone automatic contributions, or choose a contribution rate that is lower than their own long-term preference.

Self-control mechanisms can reduce this gap by moving the saving decision away from the moment of temptation. Payroll deductions, scheduled transfers, and agreements to increase contributions after future pay rises are

examples of arrangements that make saving more automatic. The literature suggests that these tools are most useful when households retain the ability to opt out or adapt contributions in response to genuine financial hardship.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Immediate consumption pressure can weaken a household's willingness to save even when long-term goals are clear.
- Automatic transfers and future-dated commitments can help households act on previously stated preferences.
- Flexibility is important because rigid saving rules can be unsuitable for households with unstable income or urgent expenses.

5.2 MENTAL ACCOUNTING AND GOAL LABELLING

Mental accounting refers to the tendency to sort money into separate categories, such as rent, groceries, emergency funds, education, travel, or retirement. From a purely fungible-money perspective, such categories may appear inefficient. Behaviourally, however, they can be useful because a labelled account makes the purpose of a saving decision concrete and discourages unplanned spending from funds assigned to a valued goal.

Goal labelling can be particularly helpful for households who find a general instruction to save too abstract. A named emergency fund or education account provides a reference point against which progress can be monitored. The effect may be stronger when the goal is realistic, personally meaningful, and accompanied by a simple contribution plan. At the same time, too many fragmented accounts can complicate household financial management, so clarity and simplicity remain important.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Labelled accounts can increase the salience of future goals and support regular contributions.
- Visible progress toward a concrete target can strengthen motivation and financial discipline.
- Savings categories should remain understandable and should not obscure total household liquidity or debt obligations.

5.3 DEFAULTS, REMINDERS, AND COMMITMENT DEVICES

Defaults affect saving because choosing an alternative requires attention, information, and effort. In employer-sponsored plans, automatic enrolment can bring individuals into a saving arrangement who may otherwise delay participation. Contribution defaults and automatic escalation can also influence the amount saved. However, a default is not neutral: a low default contribution may be interpreted as a recommendation, while an aggressive default may lead some households to opt out or withdraw funds later.

Reminders and commitment devices work through different channels. A reminder increases attention at a moment when action is possible, while a commitment device allows a household to place voluntary limits on future access to funds. Both can support saving without removing choice. Their effectiveness depends on timing, trust, cost, ease of use, and whether households understand the implications of restrictions or withdrawal penalties.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Defaults reduce administrative friction and can increase participation among households that would otherwise remain inactive.
- Reminders are most relevant when they are timely, specific, and linked to a manageable action.
- Commitment products should be voluntary, transparent, and designed with clear options for genuine emergencies.

5.4 FINANCIAL LITERACY AND HOUSEHOLD HETEROGENEITY

Financial literacy is not a substitute for income, but it can improve the quality of saving decisions by helping households evaluate inflation, interest, fees, risk, debt, and the value of early contributions. Planning skills and confidence can also make it easier to compare products and set realistic goals. Nevertheless, low saving should not be interpreted only as a knowledge problem. Households facing low or volatile income, high debt, health expenses, or weak access to safe accounts may have limited practical capacity to save. A behavioural approach therefore requires segmentation rather than a

one-size-fits-all intervention. Households with stable salaried income may benefit from payroll automation, while households with irregular earnings may need flexible schedules, low-balance accounts, and easy re-entry after interruptions. Policy and product design should combine behavioural support with fair pricing, consumer protection, accessible account access, and opportunities to build financial capability.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Financial knowledge can improve planning and product choice, but it does not eliminate material constraints.
- Income stability, debt, and account accessibility affect whether a household can convert intent into actual saving.
- Behavioural interventions are more equitable when they offer flexibility, transparency, and meaningful choice.

6. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature demonstrates that household saving is jointly shaped by economic resources and behavioural processes. Traditional models remain useful for explaining why income, expected future needs, interest rates, and uncertainty matter. Behavioural economics adds an account of why households with similar resources may adopt different saving patterns and why good intentions often fail to become regular action. This combined perspective is particularly important in environments where households must manage complex financial products while dealing with daily spending demands.

Present bias, inertia, and limited attention are not merely individual traits; they interact with the design of financial systems. A form that requires multiple steps, an unclear fee structure, or a contribution decision that must be reconsidered every month can create friction that discourages saving. By contrast, automatic transfers, simple choices, and clearly labelled goals can lower the effort needed to follow through. These design features are most defensible when they support preferences that households have already expressed and when exit options are clear and workable.

Mental accounting illustrates an important balance. Categorising money can help a household preserve emergency or education

savings, yet fragmented categories can also obscure the household's overall financial position. Similarly, commitment products can protect savings from temptation, but excessive restrictions can create hardship when income falls unexpectedly. Effective design therefore requires proportionality: interventions should make desired choices easier without trapping households in unsuitable arrangements or exploiting inattention.

The discussion also highlights the need to measure outcomes carefully. Increased enrolment in a retirement plan, for example, is valuable, but it does not automatically establish a rise in total net saving or household welfare. Some households may reduce other saving, increase borrowing, or withdraw balances after job separation. Research and policy evaluations should therefore examine persistence, net financial position, distributional effects, and consumer understanding, rather than relying solely on participation statistics.

For policy makers and financial institutions, the practical implication is to combine behaviourally informed choice architecture with broader financial inclusion. Accessible accounts, transparent fees, reliable consumer protection, financial education, and income-support measures address constraints that nudges alone cannot solve. For households, the most effective arrangements are likely to be those that align with cash flow, create a specific and meaningful goal, automate routine contributions where possible, and preserve reasonable flexibility for emergencies.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examined household saving decisions through the framework of behavioural economics. The analysis shows that saving outcomes depend not only on income, expected returns, and future needs but also on present bias, self-control, mental accounting, attention, inertia, financial literacy, and the structure of financial choices. These factors help explain why households may want to save but fail to begin, contribute irregularly, or draw down balances intended for long-term goals.

The evidence reviewed in this paper indicates that automatic enrolment, scheduled transfers, future contribution commitments, labelled goals, reminders, and voluntary commitment

products can make saving more achievable. Their role is not to replace household choice, but to reduce predictable barriers between intention and action. Well-designed interventions must remain transparent, proportionate, and responsive to household differences in income stability, debt, access to services, and emergency needs.

The paper concludes that household financial resilience is best supported by an integrated

approach. Behavioural design can make good saving choices easier, while financial capability, fair products, consumer protection, and inclusive access provide the conditions under which households can sustain those choices. Future research should examine the long-term net effects of behavioural interventions across diverse income groups, informal workers, digital financial environments, and different cultural contexts.

8. REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, S., Driscoll, J. C., Gabaix, X., & Laibson, D. (2009). The age of reason: Financial decisions over the life cycle and implications for regulation. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2009(2), 51-117. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eca.0.0067>
2. Ainslie, G. (1975). Specious reward: A behavioral theory of impulsiveness and impulse control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 82(4), 463-496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076860>
3. Ameriks, J., Caplin, A., & Leahy, J. (2003). Wealth accumulation and the propensity to plan. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3), 1007-1047. <https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360698487>
4. Ashraf, N., Karlan, D., & Yin, W. (2006). Tying Odysseus to the mast: Evidence from a commitment savings product in the Philippines. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2), 635-672. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.635>
5. Benartzi, S., & Thaler, R. H. (2004). Save More Tomorrow: Using behavioral economics to increase employee saving. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(S1), S164-S187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/380085>
6. Bernheim, B. D., Skinner, J., & Weinberg, S. (2001). What accounts for the variation in retirement wealth among U.S. households? *American Economic Review*, 91(4), 832-857. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.4.832>
7. Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Leth-Petersen, S., Nielsen, T. H., & Olsen, T. (2014). Active vs. passive decisions and crowd-out in retirement savings accounts: Evidence from Denmark. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(3), 1141-1219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju013>
8. Choi, J. J., Laibson, D., Madrian, B. C., & Metrick, A. (2002). Defined contribution pensions: Plan rules, participant choices, and the path of least resistance. *Tax Policy and the Economy*, 16, 67-113. <https://doi.org/10.1086/tpe.16.1.20060613>
9. Duflo, E., & Saez, E. (2003). The role of information and social interactions in retirement plan decisions: Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3), 815-842. <https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360698469>
10. Dupas, P., & Robinson, J. (2013). Savings constraints and microenterprise development: Evidence from a field experiment in Kenya. *American Economic Review*, 103(1), 113-150. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.1.113>
11. Fernandes, D., Lynch, J. G., Jr., & Netemeyer, R. G. (2014). Financial literacy, financial education, and downstream financial behaviors. *Management Science*, 60(8), 1861-1883. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2013.1849>
12. Frederick, S., Loewenstein, G., & O'Donoghue, T. (2002). Time discounting and time preference: A critical review. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(2), 351-401. <https://doi.org/10.1257/002205102320161311>
13. Friedman, M. (1957). *A theory of the consumption function*. Princeton University Press.
14. Gabaix, X., & Laibson, D. (2006). Shrouded attributes, consumer myopia, and information suppression in competitive markets. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2), 505-540. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.505>
15. Hastings, J. S., Madrian, B. C., & Skimmyhorn, W. L. (2013). Financial literacy, financial education, and economic outcomes. *Annual Review of Economics*, 5, 347-373. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-082312-125807>

16. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-291. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185>
17. Karlan, D., McConnell, M., Mullainathan, S., & Zinman, J. (2016). Getting to the top of mind: How reminders increase saving. *Management Science*, 62(12), 3393-3411. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2296>
18. Laibson, D. (1997). Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 443-478. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555253>
19. Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (1992). Anomalies in intertemporal choice: Evidence and an interpretation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(2), 573-597. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2118482>
20. Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2007). Baby boomer retirement security: The roles of planning, financial literacy, and housing wealth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(1), 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2006.12.001>
21. Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5-44. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.52.1.5>
22. Madrian, B. C., & Shea, D. F. (2001). The power of suggestion: Inertia in 401(k) participation and savings behavior. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(4), 1149-1187. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355301753265543>
23. Modigliani, F., & Brumberg, R. (1954). Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data. In K. K. Kurihara (Ed.), *Post-Keynesian Economics* (pp. 388-436). Rutgers University Press.
24. O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (1999). Doing it now or later. *American Economic Review*, 89(1), 103-124. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.89.1.103>
25. Shefrin, H. M., & Thaler, R. H. (1988). The behavioral life-cycle hypothesis. *Economic Inquiry*, 26(4), 609-643. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1988.tb01520.x>
26. Soman, D. (2004). Framing, loss aversion, and mental accounting: An investigation of consumer response to product pricing. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(3), 175-199. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20005>
27. Thaler, R. H. (1990). Anomalies: Saving, fungibility, and mental accounts. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 4(1), 193-205. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.4.1.193>
28. Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.
29. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1991). Loss aversion in riskless choice: A reference-dependent model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4), 1039-1061. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937956>
30. Zhang, C. Y., & Sussman, A. B. (2018). Perspectives on mental accounting: An exploration of budgeting and spending. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 26, 130-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.06.003>