

# Prices or Knowledge? What Drives Demand for Financial Services in Emerging Markets?

Shawn Cole, Thomas Sampson, and Bilal Zia\*

April 2010<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

Financial development is critical for growth, but its micro-determinants are not well understood. We test competing theories of low demand for financial services in emerging markets, combining novel survey evidence from Indonesia and India with a field experiment. We find a strong correlation between financial literacy and behavior. However, a financial education program has modest effects, increasing demand for bank accounts only for those with low levels of education or financial literacy. In contrast, small subsidies greatly increase demand. A follow-up two years later confirms these findings, and demonstrates that financial literacy combined with subsidies led to greater savings.

---

\*Harvard Business School (scole@hbs.edu), Harvard University (tsampson@fas.harvard.edu) and the World Bank (bzia@worldbank.org), respectively.

<sup>†</sup>We thank the World Bank Jakarta office for their assistance and support throughout this project. We thank seminar participants at Oxford University, the NEUDC Tufts Conference, the World Bank Global Seminar on Financial Literacy and Consumer Protection, the World Bank Finance Seminar, and the OECD Indonesia International Conference on Financial Education, and Anna Lusardi, David McKenzie, and Jeremy Tobacman for helpful comments. Financial support from the World Bank and HBS Division of Research and Faculty Development is greatly appreciated.

Financial development is widely recognized as an important determinant of economic growth, with a large literature examining the determinants of the supply of banking and financial intermediation services (Levine, 2005). Yet, the determinants of the demand for financial services are much less well understood, particularly in emerging market countries.

An important feature of emerging markets is the size of the informal sector. Recent estimates place the size of the informal economy as 14% of GDP in China, 23% in Indonesia and 24% in India, against 8% in the U.S. (Buehn and Schneider, 2009). In 76 emerging market countries, the average size of the informal sector is almost 36% of GDP<sup>1</sup>. Arguably, drawing these individuals and firms into the formal financial sector would be one of the fastest ways to foster financial development in emerging markets.

Two views may explain limited demand for formal financial services. First, because these services are expensive to provide, involving high fixed costs, it may simply be that low income individuals do not demand formal financial services at market prices. Indeed, there is evidence that informal savings, credit, and insurance markets function reasonably well in emerging markets<sup>2</sup>, and the benefits of formal financial market participation may simply not exceed the relatively large fixed transactions costs associated with such products (Beck, Demirguc-Kunt, and Peria, 2007). An alternative view argues that limited financial literacy serves as an important barrier to demand for services: if individuals are not familiar or comfortable with products, they will not demand them.

These two views have significantly different implications for the development of financial markets around the world, and would suggest quite different actions for financial institutions, governments, and international organizations seeking to expand financial services use.

This paper aims to test the above theories. To do so, we conduct novel surveys in India and Indonesia, measuring household financial literacy and demand for financial services. The survey in Indonesia represents the first nationally representative household survey on financial literacy in a developing country.

---

<sup>1</sup>Our baseline surveys find that 55% of the rural sample from India has savings in a non-bank institute and 64% borrow from informal sources. Similarly, nationally representative figures from Indonesia show that 51% of the population saves in non-bank institutes and 52% borrows informally; nearly 20% of households in Indonesia borrow and save exclusively in the informal sector.

<sup>2</sup>See, for example, Besley, Coate, and Louny (1993), and Townsend (1994).

We supplement this survey data with a randomized field experiment among unbanked households in Indonesia, to directly test the role and relative importance of financial literacy and prices in determining demand for banking services. An intervention offering a financial education program on bank accounts is randomly assigned to half of 564 unbanked households identified by our survey team. Orthogonal to this treatment, individuals are randomly offered small subsidies, ranging from \$3 to \$14, for opening a bank account. The design therefore allows us to directly compare the effect of financial literacy education to price subsidies.

We find that financial literacy education has no effect on the probability of opening a bank savings account for the full population, although it does have an impact among those with low initial levels of education and financial literacy. Modest financial subsidies, in contrast, have large effects, significantly increasing the share of households that open a bank savings account within the subsequent two months. Specifically, an increase in subsidy from \$3 to \$14 increases the share of households that open a bank savings account from 3.5% to 12.7%, an almost three-fold increase.

Follow-up analysis conducted two years after the intervention shows that bank accounts are “sticky”—those who were originally offered the high subsidies are, two years later, significantly more likely to have used bank accounts in the past year to deposit, withdraw, send or receive funds. These long run findings confirm our main short-run findings: financial literacy education alone does not lead to greater demand for financial services in the general population, as the share of individuals who opened a bank account in the two years since the intervention is no different in the treatment versus the control group. However, we do find that the combination of financial literacy education and subsidies increases the probability that households have savings by 21%. These results suggest that the combination of financial literacy and incentives can provide the necessary impetus to improve household financial habits.

This paper proceeds as follows. The next section discusses the motivation for the study, and the context in which the field experiment takes place. The subsequent section describes how we measure financial literacy and details the levels of financial literacy in our samples. In section 3 we explore what factors predict financial literacy, and in section 4, we describe how financial literacy is related to use of, and demand for, financial services. Sections 5 and 6 describe the design and results, respectively, of the experiment, and Section 7 discusses our follow-up survey

results. We then conclude.

## 1 Motivation and Context

The role of financial literacy has garnered increasing attention in both the developed and developing world. In January 2008, the United States government set up a President’s Advisory Council on Financial Literacy, charged with promoting programs that improve financial education at all levels of the economy and helping increase access to financial services<sup>3</sup>. In the developing world, the Indonesian government declared 2008 “the year of financial education.” with a stated goal of improving access to and use of financial services by increasing financial literacy<sup>4</sup>. Similarly, in India, the Reserve Bank of India launched an initiative in 2007 to establish Financial Literacy and Credit Counseling Centers throughout the country which would offer free financial education and counseling to urban and rural populations<sup>5</sup>.

Much of this attention is motivated by a compelling body of evidence, based on household surveys in developed countries, that demonstrates a strong association between financial literacy and household well-being. Households with low levels of financial literacy tend not to plan for retirement (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2007a), borrow at higher interest rates (Lusardi and Tufano, 2008; Stango and Zinman, 2006), acquire fewer assets (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2007b), and participate less in the formal financial system relative to their more financially-literate counterparts (Alessie, Lusardi and van Rooij, 2007; Hogarth and O’Donnell, 1999). In response to this evidence, financial literacy programs have been advanced as a low-cost intervention with the potential to improve household financial decision making and ultimately increase savings and welfare.

The first substantive contribution of this paper is to measure the level and predictors of financial literacy, and its relationship to demand for financial services, in two of the most populous countries of the world. We conduct two large household surveys in India and Indonesia,

---

<sup>3</sup>See: <http://www.treasury.gov/offices/domestic-finance/financial-institution/fin-education/council/index.shtml> [accessed February 11, 2009]. As an indication of the United States government’s resolve to improve financial literacy, it named April 2008 Financial Literacy Month.

<sup>4</sup>See: [http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_34853\\_40660803\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_34853_40660803_1_1_1_1,00.html) [accessed February 11, 2009].

<sup>5</sup>See: <http://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/PublicationDraftReports.aspx?ID=526> [accessed February 11, 2009].

and find strong relationships between financial literacy and financial behavior.

Yet, as with any observational study, it is always possible that other factors explain some or all of the observed relationships. For example, individuals with lower levels of financial literacy may have lower levels of education, be less interested in financial matters, be poorer, or have different discount rates.

To measure causal relationships, we implement a field experiment in Indonesia. We study use of one of the most basic, but perhaps most valuable financial services, bank savings accounts. We choose to study savings accounts for several reasons. For households, a bank savings account can be an efficient savings technology, secure from theft and often paying interest, as well as a means of sending and receiving payments. A savings account allows customers to build a relationship with the bank, potentially facilitating eventual access to credit and other financial services. This may in turn improve household welfare. Indeed, in the United States, the federal government and individual states have passed legislation intended to draw individuals into the banking system by establishing “lifeline” savings accounts, and by providing incentives to retail banks to operate in underserved areas (Washington, 2006). Transactions and savings accounts are the first and most obvious way in which household participation in the formal financial sector begins.

We conduct our study in a setting, Indonesia, in which financial literacy may be one of the most important barriers to access. This may in part be explained by low educational expenditures: measured as a share of GDP, education expenditures in Indonesia are the lowest in the world (UNESCO, 2007). However, and in contrast to many developing countries where access to banking infrastructure is difficult, the Indonesian banking system has a wide geographical reach. Moreover, Indonesian banks have traditionally offered savings accounts with low minimum deposits designed to serve the needs of low income customers. The minimum deposit to open a savings account is the nation’s largest bank, Bank Rakyat Indonesia (BRI) is only 53 U.S. cents, and interest is paid on balances greater than U.S. \$1.06<sup>6</sup>. This compares to a per-capita income of approximately \$1,918. Yet, only 41% of the total population and 32% of rural Indonesia households have a bank savings account.

---

<sup>6</sup>See: <http://www.bri.co.id/english/layanan/simpanan.aspx?id=12> for terms of the savings product [accessed February 11, 2009].

To evaluate the importance of financial literacy, we randomly select half of the unbanked households in our sample and offer them a two-hour financial literacy education session on how banks work and the benefits of opening a bank savings account. To understand cost sensitivity, we offer unbanked households subsidies ranging in value from US \$3 to \$14 if they open a bank savings account.

While financial literacy has received increasing attention worldwide, our paper is the first to systematically test the impact of a financial literacy training program in the developing world using randomized evaluation. In the developed world, the most convincing evidence on the role of financial education using a randomized evaluation comes from Duflo and Saez (2003), who conducted an experiment at a United States university. The authors sent letters (at random) to staff, encouraging the staff to attend an employee benefit fair. The authors find that enrollment in retirement plans increased significantly in the departments in which letters were received. The size of the effect, however, is quite small, an increase of approximately 1.25 percentage points. A related paper by Karlan and Valdivia (2008) studies the efficacy of offering a business training program to female microentrepreneur clients of a bank in Peru. While the content of the course falls outside the standard definitions of financial literacy, the spirit was similar: provide education for individuals making household decisions. They find that the treatment resulted in higher repayment and client retention rates but had no impact on business income or assets. Similarly, Bertrand and Morse (2009) look at the effect of financial literacy education intended to suppress demand for payday lending in the United State: they find that a treatment that emphasizes the dollar cost of repeated borrowing is effective in reducing the probability an individual renews a payday loan.

This paper is also related to the literature on financial market development, surveyed in great detail by Beck, Demirguc-Kunt and Honohan (2008). Most closely related to the present study, Beck, Demierguc-Kunt, and Peria (2007) study household and firm use of banking services around the world, finding GDP, institutional quality, and ownership structure as important predictors of the use of financial services.

## 2 Measuring Financial Literacy and Financial Decisions

In this section we describe the Indonesian and Indian household surveys from which we obtain our measures of financial literacy. We describe how we measure financial literacy and present summary statistics from the surveys. Both surveys focus on households' financial sector participation and were custom-designed by the authors in conjunction with partner organizations. To the best of our knowledge the Indonesian results are the first nationally representative measure of financial literacy in a developing country.

The Indonesian data were collected as part of the World Bank's Access to Finance survey conducted in collaboration with the World Bank Jakarta office. The Access to Finance survey is a nationally representative household survey designed to measure use of, and attitudes towards, financial services in Indonesia. Stratified sampling was used to select 112 villages and from each village 30 households were randomly selected to participate in the survey, giving a total sample size of 3,360 households. All Indonesian survey statistics reported in this paper are corrected for appropriate sampling weights. The survey took place between July and December 2007. Summary statistics are provided in Appendix Table I.

We complement the Indonesian survey results with data from India, using questions from a household survey administered in the state of Gujarat in 2006. Because we designed both survey instruments, the questions are comparable across countries. Despite the strikingly different context (India is far poorer than Indonesia), we find notable similarities, both in what predicts financial literacy, and in the relationship between financial literacy and demand for financial products.

The survey in India was undertaken as a baseline survey for a study on weather insurance, in March and April of 2006. The survey covers 15 households in each of 100 villages, located in three districts of India around Ahmedabad, the capital of Gujarat<sup>7</sup>, and focused primarily on poor, subsistence agricultural laborers. While the sample was not representative of India or Gujarat, the selected households live in similar circumstances and have comparable educational backgrounds to households throughout much of rural India.

Both surveys measure financial literacy, in a manner consistent with methodology that

---

<sup>7</sup>The survey served as a baseline for Cole et al. (2008), which studies a weather insurance intervention. The survey was conducted prior to any intervention.

has been used in the United States, by adapting three questions used by Lusardi and Mitchell (2006). We ask: (i) “Suppose you borrow Rupiah 100,000 from a money lender at an interest rate of 2 percent per month, with no repayment for three months. After three months, do you owe less than Rupiah 102,000, exactly Rupiah 102,000, or more than Rupiah 102,000?” (ii) “If you have Rupiah 100,000 in a savings account earning 1% interest per annum, and prices for goods and services rise 2% over a one-year period, can you buy more than, less than, or the same amount of goods in one year as you could today, with the money in the account?” (iii) “Is it riskier to plant multiple crops or one crop?” We also added one new question: (iv) “Suppose you need to borrow Rupiah 500,000. Two people offer you a loan. One loan requires you to pay back Rupiah 600,000 in one month. The second loan requires you to pay back in one month Rupiah 500,000 plus 15% interest. Which loan represents a better deal for you?”<sup>8</sup>

Table I presents these results. Measured financial literacy is low, especially in India. The mean share of correct answers was 52% in Indonesia, and 34% in India. In the United States, the average share of the first three questions answered correctly was 65%. The corresponding shares for Indonesia and India were 55% and 38%, respectively.

In addition to financial literacy, the surveys also capture other household characteristics that may be important determinants of financial behavior. Cognitive ability was evaluated with a series of eight mathematics questions: the mean share answered correctly was 81% in Indonesia and 62% in India. Almost all respondents could answer the simplest question (“what is  $4+3$ ”) while many more had difficulty with multiplication (“3 times 6”) and division (“one-tenth of 400”). Since respondents were not allowed to ask their friends or neighbors for help, it is reasonable to think that in situations where collaboration is possible they will perform better when answering these questions. The scores from the US are quite comparable to those reported for Indonesia and India, in particular, 84% of US respondents performed a percentage calculation correctly, while 56% could correctly divide proceeds from a lottery among 5 winners (Lusardi, 2008).

Household discount rates were proxied by eliciting the minimum amount a household would be willing to accept in one month in lieu of a Rupiah 80,000 payment today.<sup>9</sup> Consistent

---

<sup>8</sup>For the Indian survey the amounts used were Rs. 100 for questions (i) and (ii) and Rs. 500 for question (iv).

<sup>9</sup>Discount rates were calculated using answers to hypothetical questions of the form: “Would you prefer to receive Rupiah 80,000 today, or Rupiah X in one month.” For India the ordering was reversed and respondents



with other evidence, respondents reported relatively high discount rates: the average elicited monthly discount rate was 36% in Indonesia, and 21% in India. To measure risk aversion we follow Binswanger (1980) and use actual lotteries, for real (and substantial) amounts of money. In Indonesia respondents were offered a choice between receiving Rupiah 2,000 for certain or playing a lottery that paid Rupiah 5,000 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  and Rupiah 0 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Thirty-six percent of households chose the safe bet. We code these households as being risk averse.<sup>10</sup> In India respondents are coded as risk averse if they opt to receive Rs. 2 for certain, rather than playing a lottery that paid Rs. 5 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  and Rs. 0 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ . 19% of Indian households met this definition of risk aversion.

The surveys also allow us to proxy the extent to which respondents view events as being outside of their control. In Indonesia, fatalism is measured as the proportion of the following statements with which the respondent either agrees or strongly agrees: (i) “I have little control over what will happen to me in my life.” (ii) “Good things tend to happen to other people, not to me or my family.” (iii) “I have a hard time saving money, even though I know I want to save money.” The average value of fatalism is 60%. In India fatalism is measured using the extent to which respondents agreed with the first two of these statements. The average value is 53%.

Finally, the surveys collected standard data on household demographics and wealth. Appendix Table I demonstrates that Indian households are more rural, less educated and much poorer than the Indonesian sample. The average household size in the Indian sample is 5.9, twice as large as in Indonesia. In India the entire sample is rural, compared to 58% in Indonesia. Though low by developed country standards, the Indonesian sample exhibits substantially higher levels of education than the Indian sample. In Indonesia 80% of respondents completed primary school compared to 41% in India. In the Indian sample mean monthly per capita household expenditure (which includes consumption, but not investment spending) is less than  $1/3^{rd}$  the Indonesian level, while average annual reported household income is US\$674 in India and US\$1,315 in Indonesia.

In Appendix Table II we present summary statistics on households’ use of financial services. Bank accounts are uncommon in both locations. Only 12% of Indian, and 41% of

---

were asked to choose between Rs. X today and Rs. 10 in one month.

<sup>10</sup>This test is also a test of a behavioral anomaly, “small-stakes risk aversion,” described by Rabin and Thaler (2001).

Indonesian households report having a bank account. However, 29% of Indonesian households that do not currently have a bank account used to have an account at some point in the past. 51% of Indonesian households have savings with a non-bank institution, but only 13% have advanced savings instruments, such as Certificates of Deposit (CDs) or mutual funds. In total 68% of Indonesian households own a savings product of some form.

On the loan side, 25% of Indonesian households have a formal sector loan, while 13% of the Indian sample did. Informal credit was more common, with 64% of Indian households, and 52% of Indonesian households, having loans from microfinance institutions, money-lenders or other informal sources. The most common source of informal loans in Indonesia was family and friends.

One surprising result is the familiarity with, and use of, insurance in the Indian sample. Two-thirds of households have some form of insurance policy. This is likely attributable to the fact that SEWA, a local MFI in Gujarat oriented towards helping poor women, makes health insurance policies available to its members. In contrast, crop insurance, which must be separately obtained, is comparatively rare. Even in Indonesia, almost half of the households report having an insurance policy. One third of the population have health insurance, while 26% have asset or homeowner's insurance.

### **3 What Predicts Financial Literacy?**

A breakdown of financial literacy performance by household expenditure and cognitive ability is given in Table I. It should be noted that all questions were multiple choice, two with two possible answers, and two with three possible answers. Thus, random guessing would yield an average score of 1.66, which is in fact higher than the average score in India, though not in Indonesia. (In India, many respondents answered 'Do not know' rather than guess).

Within samples, the share of the population answering each question correctly showed substantial variation by wealth and cognitive ability. Splitting the samples by household expenditure per capita we see that the richer halves of the samples did significantly better than the poorer halves on most questions. Similarly, dividing the samples by cognitive ability, we find that the upper half of the distribution did significantly better on all questions. In fact, the

differences between the low and high cognitive ability sub-samples are on average more than twice as large as the differences between the wealthy and poor sub-samples, suggesting that cognitive ability may play an important role in determining financial literacy. This finding is consistent with Cole and Shastry (2009), which finds close relationships between cognitive ability and financial behavior in the United States.

While the connection between wealth and financial literacy has been long documented, the relationship between cognitive ability and financial literacy, though not surprising, is less well understood. Christelis et. al (2007) describe the relationship between cognitive ability and portfolio choice in European households, finding that higher cognitive ability households are more likely to invest directly in stocks.

In Table II we take a more systematic approach, regressing our measure of financial literacy on a variety of individual characteristics. This confirms that both greater wealth and higher human capital, as measured by either level of schooling or cognitive ability, are associated with significantly higher levels of financial literacy in Indonesia. We also find that rural households and households with a female head exhibit lower levels of financial literacy, while households that own a non-farm enterprise have higher financial literacy. With respect to age, financial literacy is quadratic and peaks at around 40 years old. Neither discount rates nor risk aversion predict financial literacy.

Household per-capita expenditure and cognitive ability are also positively correlated with financial literacy in India, but, surprisingly, there is no systematic relationship between education and financial literacy. As in Indonesia, age is quadratic and peaks at around 45 years old.

The regressions also allow us to quantify effects, and in particular compare the effects of per-capita expenditure and cognitive ability, two of the most important predictors of financial literacy. The estimates from column (2) indicate that in our Indian sample a one standard deviation increase in household per capita expenditure predicts a 0.05 standard deviation increase in the financial literacy score. In contrast, a one standard deviation increase in cognitive ability is associated with a 0.50 standard deviation increase in the financial literacy score. In Indonesia, the corresponding magnitudes, based on the estimates in column (6), are 0.05 and 0.37 standard deviations, respectively. In both samples, cognitive ability has a substantially

stronger association with financial literacy than does household expenditure.

## 4 What Does Financial Literacy Predict?

A compelling body of evidence demonstrates a strong association between financial literacy and household well-being in developed countries. Appendix Table III shows how use of financial services varies with household characteristics in our Indian and Indonesian samples. Higher household expenditure predicts greater use of bank accounts and formal credit in both countries, but predicts increased use of informal credit and insurance in Indonesia only. The results for human capital are mixed. Education is positively associated with use of bank accounts and formal credit in both countries and with insurance in Indonesia, but is negatively associated with informal credit use in both countries. Higher cognitive ability predicts greater insurance use in both countries and greater use of formal credit in Indonesia, but is otherwise insignificant.

In both countries none of the household preference indicators consistently predicts use of financial services. In Indonesia a high discount factor is associated with lower use of both formal and informal credit, while risk averse households are more likely to have a bank account or a formal loan. Fatalism is associated with lower use of bank accounts in Indonesia, but higher use of insurance in India.

Higher financial literacy is significantly associated with greater use of bank accounts in Indonesia and insurance in India. The coefficients on the loan-side regressions are positive but insignificant. Although financial literacy is a significant predictor of use of bank accounts in Indonesia, the magnitude of the estimates suggest it is a less important predictor than wealth. The estimates from column (2) indicate that a one standard deviation increase in financial literacy is associated with a 2.2 percentage point increase in the probability of having a bank account, while a one standard deviation increase in household expenditure is associated with a 14.9 percentage point increase.

### 4.1 Demand for Financial Products

In Table III, we explore demand for financial products. Data for this section and the remainder of the paper is available for the Indonesian sample only. Respondents were asked if they were

interested in three financial products that have been identified as potentially beneficial in increasing household savings. First, we asked about a commitment savings product, similar to the one described in Ashraf, Karlan, and Yin (2006a). This product allows clients to deposit money at any time, but to withdraw only after a certain savings target has been met, or a specified time period has passed. Christmas savings clubs in the United States are one example of this product. Approximately 43% of households expressed interest in such a product.

Second, we asked about whether the household would be interested in deposit collection services. Deposit collection services have been shown to increase savings in the Philippines (Ashraf, Karlan, and Yin, 2006b). Interest in this product was lower, at 25%. Finally, we asked if households were interested in retirement savings accounts: 50% of households said yes.

To better understand barriers to use of bank accounts, respondents were asked whether they would open a bank account if account fees were reduced. Of the unbanked, 37% reported that they would open a bank account if fees were halved; that figure rose to 58% if fees were eliminated.

Panel B of Table III explores which household characteristics predict interest in the three financial products. Interest in all three products is increasing in financial literacy and household expenditure, thus financial literacy does indeed strongly predict demand for financial services. There is no evidence of a robust effect of human capital on interest levels for any of the products. Households that have a bank account are less interested in deposit collection services and more interested in retirement savings, but their interest in the commitment savings product is not significantly different. Demand for the commitment savings and deposit collector products are higher among households that are more patient and are not risk averse. Demand for all three products is higher from households that have a fatalistic outlook, are interested in financial matters and report saving enough for the future.

Appendix Table IV examines self-reported attitudes towards use of financial services. The most common reasons cited for having a bank account are: security (53%); for predicted future needs (42%); to transfer money (37%), and; for emergency needs (31%). Only 17% of respondents see having a transactions account as a step towards borrowing from the bank.

When asked their reasons for not having a bank account 92% of unbanked households report that they do not have enough money. The second most common answer, not knowing how

a bank operates, was only cited by 32% of households. Interestingly, 29% of currently unbanked households did have an account at some point in the past. Among these households 71% report that they stopped using the account because they did not have enough money.

Just over half of households (54%) reported they were saving enough for the future. Of those who answered “no,” lack of money was the most frequently cited reason for insufficient savings (76%), with irregular income (31%) and failure to control spending (23%) the second and third most common reasons.

We also asked about household demand for insurance. Among those without insurance, not enough money was again the most frequent reason given (59%), followed by not knowing about any insurance products (38%). Only 6% of households said that they did not have insurance because premiums were too expensive.

Finally, households were asked to describe the three most important financial risks they faced. Illness was the most common risk (79%) followed by loss of employment (56%), and loss of dwelling (33%). Conditional on owning a non-farm enterprise 52% of households reported concern about business risk. Interestingly, many of the risks (health, property loss, death, and vehicle damage) were insurable, though most households chose not to insure them.

The data in Table III and Appendix Table IV provides support for the notion that a financial literacy training intervention could increase the share of households possessing a bank account. Lack of knowledge of how a bank works is the second most common reason for not having a bank account and is cited by approximately one-third of households. The fact that only 31% of the population reports knowing the requirements to open a bank account suggests that knowledge may be a barrier to opening an account. Finally, 74% of households without a bank account expressed interest in attending a free financial literacy training session.

## 5 Experiment Design

This section describes the intervention we conducted in Indonesia to test whether financial literacy acts as a barrier to opening a bank account. The results of the experiment are analyzed in Section 6.

## 5.1 Financial Literacy Intervention

To study whether financial literacy training could stimulate demand for financial services, we worked with an international non-profit organization in Jakarta, Microfinance Innovation Center for Resources and Alternatives (MICRA). MICRA provides consulting and training programs to banks and microfinance organizations in Indonesia.

MICRA developed a customized training session on bank accounts, using material adapted from a curriculum developed by a consortium of Microfinance Opportunities, Citigroup Foundation and Freedom from Hunger. The curriculum was designed for unbanked individuals, with the specific goal of teaching households about bank accounts.

Working with MICRA, we identified individuals to serve as trainers who had previous experience in financial sector work or education. The trainers were given two days of specialized training relating to the curriculum prior to the start of the experiment. MICRA provided the training of the trainers. The salary offered for the trainers was relatively high (200,000 INR/hour); thus, the quality of delivery of this intervention is likely to be as good or better than any other large-scale intervention.

The financial literacy experiment took place in the 64 Access to Finance survey villages that were on the island of Java. Thirty households were sampled in each village making a total of  $64 \times 30 = 1,920$  households. Of these, 1,173 households did not have a bank account at the time of the survey. After completing the Access to Finance survey each of these unbanked households was offered the opportunity to participate in the experiment. Once a respondent agreed to participate, he or she was subsequently randomly assigned a financial incentive level, and a financial literacy training invitation status. The financial incentives offered were Rupiah 25,000, 75,000 and 125,000, with equal probability, for opening a bank account within two months of the intervention. To receive the incentive, the household was required to fill out a postage-paid mail-in form, indicating the participant's name and bank account number. Upon receipt of this card, the survey firm transferred the appropriate incentive amount to the respondent's account.

At the time of the study, the Bank Rakyat Indonesia, the country's largest bank, offered a "SIMPEDES" account which required a minimum deposit of Rp. 10,000, and charged no fees, as long as an individual deposited or withdrew money no more than 4 times per month). This account paid no interest for deposit levels below Rp. 100,000, and increasing interest rates for

balances higher than this amount.

Independent of the incentive level, households were assigned to either treatment or control for the financial literacy training program. Treatment households received from the surveyor a written invitation to attend a two hour financial literacy training session, to be held in the village on a weekend. Households that did not agree to participate in the experiment were eligible to receive invitations to the financial literacy training, but since we do not know if these households decided to open a bank account they do not form part of our experimental sample. Half of the households (again randomly assigned) receiving a financial literacy invitation were allowed to invite a friend to accompany them to the session.<sup>11</sup>

In each of the 64 villages a financial literacy training session was held within one month of the date the survey was conducted. Invited households were reminded about the training the day before it occurred.

Unfortunately, 23 villages had to be dropped from the sample because of evidence that the surveyors were collaborating with households to ensure households received high incentives.<sup>12</sup> This left a sample of 1,230 households, of which 736 did not have bank accounts.

The outcome of interest is whether a household opened a bank account. We measure this based on financial incentive claims. After verifying the identity of the claimant and the existence of a bank account we were left with 49 claims that came from eligible households that had indeed opened a bank account.

## 5.2 Summary Statistics and Checks of Randomization

Summary statistics for the experimental group are presented in Web Appendix Table III. Column (1) gives the mean value for all unbanked households who agreed to participate in our experiment;

---

<sup>11</sup>The experimental plan initially called for a range of invitations designed to elicit the importance of peer effects. Operational limitations precluded any peer invitations in the first 14 villages surveyed. In the subsequent villages, half of the treatment sample was offered an invitation for a friend.

<sup>12</sup>The survey was conducted in two waves. During wave one, which covered 48 villages, the size of the incentive for participating households was chosen by the surveyor drawing one of three colored balls from a bag. For four surveyors a Pearson Chi-squared test rejected the hypothesis that the allocation of incentives was random. The 23 villages visited by these surveyors have been dropped from the sample. During wave two incentive amounts were pre-assigned to households. There is no evidence that the incentive amount affected households' participation decisions (Table VIII).



column (2) present summary statistics for unbanked households who declined to participate. We of course could not compel participation. Fortunately, the take-up rate was relatively high: 564 out of 736 households without bank accounts chose to participate in the experiment (77%): households made this decision prior to learning the precise details of the survey, including the size of the incentive and whether they would receive a literacy invitation. We find that rural households, older and unmarried household heads are less likely to participate in the experiment, whereas more educated, more financially literate household heads and those more interested in financial matters are more likely to participate.

Turning to summary statistics, slightly more than half of our experiment sample households are rural, half are female headed, household heads are on average in their early 40s, are overwhelmingly married, are Muslim and have attended some school. About 70% are employed and 70% own their homes. The average financial literacy score, as measured by questions asked in the Access to Finance Survey, is 50% though 70% of the sample claim they are interested in financial matters.

Panel B of Table IV provides a test of the randomization. We first present mean differences between those invited to financial literacy training (274 out of 564) and those who were not (290 out of 564), and then for those who were offered the low (170), middle (190), or high (204) incentive. Column (3) tests the hypothesis of equality of means between the invited and non-invited group, while column (7) tests for equality of means across the assigned incentives. By and large, the randomization appears successful, as baseline characteristics do not vary systematically by treatment status.

## 6 Experimental Results

The main experimental results are presented in Table V. Since the assignment of incentives and invitations to financial literacy training were randomly determined, unbiased estimates of the causal impact of each can be obtained by estimating the following simple equations<sup>13</sup>:

$$Open_i = \alpha + \beta * LitInvite_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>13</sup>We chose a linear probability model because the coefficients are simple to interpret. We obtain very similar results from a marginal effects probit model.

where  $Open_i$  is a dummy variable indicating whether a household has opened a bank account, and  $LitInvite_i$  a dummy variable for whether the household was invited to attend the training session. We focus initially on the reduced-form relationship because it is difficult to compel people to attend a training session; thus, the intention-to-treat estimate may be of greatest interest. Equation (1) is therefore the reduced form.

The point estimate on  $LitTraining_i$  in Equation (1) is -0.02, with a standard error of .027. Thus, the financial literacy program we offered appears to have no effect on the likelihood a client opens a bank account. Column (2) presents the same results, but includes a set of household controls available from our survey<sup>14</sup>.

Similarly, to determine the effect of incentives on opening an account, we estimate:

$$Open_i = \alpha + \gamma_M * MidPay_i + \gamma_H * HiPay_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (2)$$

where  $MidPay_i$  indicates whether the household received an incentive of Rp. 75,000, and  $HiPay_i$  indicating whether the household received an incentive of Rp. 125,000. The omitted category is the small incentive, of Rp. 25,000. Standard errors in all specifications are clustered at the village level.

The point estimates on  $MidPay_i$  and  $HiPay_i$  in Equation (2) are large and statistically significant. These estimates suggest that incentives have a large effect on households opening a bank account. A household receiving the middle incentive is 5.4 percentage points more likely to open a bank account than a household receiving a low incentive. This represents a 150% increase over the group offered the low incentive, of whom 3.5 percent opened accounts. The effect of  $HiPay$  is even greater: the point estimate of 9.2 percentage points represents a 260% increase in probability of opening a bank account compared to the group receiving Rp. 25,000.

This effect is large. For example, we saw in Table V that a one standard deviation increase in log household expenditure is associated with a 14.9 percentage point increase in the likelihood of having a bank account. Moving from the low to the high incentive has an effect

---

<sup>14</sup>The controls include household/household head location, gender, age, marital status, religion, family size, schooling, consumption, employment status, financial literacy score, cognitive ability and expressed interest in financial matters.

equivalent to increasing household expenditure by two-thirds of a standard deviation.

Finally, we explore the possibility that there is an interaction between financial literacy training and financial incentives, with the following regression:

$$\begin{aligned} Open_i = & \alpha + \beta * LitInvite_i + \gamma_M * MidPay_i + \gamma_H * HiPay_i + \\ & + \theta_M * (MidPay_i * LitInvite_i) + \theta_H * (HiPay_i * LitInvite_i) + \varepsilon_i, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Columns (5) and (6) of Table IX report results. We find no interaction effect: the interaction point estimates are relatively imprecisely estimated, but statistically indistinguishable from zero. The main effect of incentives is unchanged.

## 6.1 Heterogeneous Treatment Effects

While there is no effect on the general population, it is possible that financial literacy training is effective for particular subsets of the population. Because the experiment was conducted in conjunction with the survey, we did not stratify by education or levels of financial literacy when assigning treatment levels. There is, however, strong reason to believe effects of financial education may vary based on individuals' characteristics. Limited financial literacy is likely a larger constraint for household heads with low levels of formal or financial education, as information acquisition may be costlier or more difficult for those who cannot read. Similarly, because the program was designed for individuals with low levels of financial literacy, it may have been most effective among this group.

In Table VI, we therefore split the sample, exploring the possibility of heterogeneous treatment effects. In columns (1) and (2), we interact  $LitInvite_i$ ,  $MidPay_i$ , and  $HiPay_i$  with a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent reports having no formal schooling:

$$\begin{aligned} Open_i = & \alpha + \delta * NoSchool_i + \beta * LitInvite_i + \theta * (NoSchool_i * LitInvite_i) + \\ & \gamma_M * MidPay_i + \gamma_H * HiPay_i + \\ & \kappa_M * (NoSchool * MidPay_i) + \kappa_H * (NoSchool_i * HiPay_i) + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We find, as before, that for literate households, the invitation has no effect: the point estimate

of  $\gamma$  is  $-.032$ , indistinguishable from zero. However, for households that report having received no schooling, we find that the financial literacy training program has a substantial effect: the sum  $(\beta + \theta)$  is equal to 12.3 percentage points (column 1); an F-test for the joint significance of  $(\beta + \theta)$  yields a p-value of 0.07. Approximately one tenth of the sample is illiterate. The coefficients  $\kappa_M$  and  $\kappa_H$  are negative, with  $\kappa_M$  weakly statistically significant. Testing the hypotheses  $(\gamma_M + \kappa_M) = 0$  and  $(\gamma_H + \kappa_H) = 0$  cannot be rejected at standard levels of significance, suggesting that for this subgroup, the financial incentives were not important determinants of behavior.

As a second way of cutting the data, we test whether the effect varies with initial levels of financial literacy. Columns (3) and (4) estimate equation 4, with a main effect and interactions for whether or not an individual obtained a score below the median score in the baseline financial literacy test replacing the schooling schooling terms. The point estimate of the effect of an invitation on those with above average financial literacy is negative but statistically indistinguishable from zero, at  $-4.9$  percentage points. The estimate of the effect of the program on low financial literacy households  $(\beta + \theta)$  is  $5.1\%$ . The hypothesis that this sum is zero can only be rejected at the  $15\%$  significance level. The incentives have an effect for both subgroups: the point estimate of the sum  $\gamma_H + \kappa_H$  is  $7.6$  percentage points, significant at the  $10\%$  level.

These results suggest that the intervention delivered to the general population will not produce significant effects. However, a training program targeted at individuals with low levels of education and financial literacy can increase demand for financial services.

## 6.2 Treatment on Treated

Approximately  $69\%$  of respondents invited to attend the program in fact attended the training. An alternative method of estimating Equation (1) is to use the invitation for the program as an instrument for the endogenous indicator of whether the individual attended<sup>15</sup>. Under reasonable assumptions, this provides the effect of treatment on the treated, also known as the local average treatment effect (Imbens and Angrist, 1994). These results are reported in Table VII.

Given that there was no reduced-form relationship between the training invitation and opening a bank account (Table V), it is not surprising that the IV estimate of the effect of

---

<sup>15</sup>There is no need to instrument the incentives offered, as there was no endogenous take-up of the incentives.

training is also zero (Columns 1 and 2). The size of the standard error increases somewhat, but we can still comfortably rule out an effect size equivalent to the large incentive. Columns (3)-(4) examine heterogeneous treatment effects, using invited as an instrument for attending, and (Invited \* Unschooled) as an instrument for (Attended \* Unschooled). The treatment effect for unschooled is still positive, though no longer statistically significant. In column (5)-(6) we repeat this exercise for respondents above and below the median level of financial literacy. Here, we continue to find large marginal effects of attending the financial literacy education program: an individual is twenty percentage points more likely to open a bank account within two months if she or he is invited to a financial literacy session.

## 7 Follow-Up Results

In January 2010, approximately two years after our intervention, we conducted a brief follow-up survey to investigate whether households still had their bank accounts open and whether households had improved their savings habits. Importantly, we were interested in studying whether these behaviors were correlated with any of our treatments.

### 7.1 Follow-Up Sample Characteristics

Our primary purpose of conducting a follow-up survey was to verify whether households who opened bank accounts immediately following our initial intervention were still using them two years later, or whether they had simply allowed them to lapse after collecting the subsidy. While it would have been preferable to visit all households, budget constraints prevented this. As a compromise, we chose to conduct brief interviews of all households in villages in which at least one household had opened a bank account in response to our initial study. Thus, from the baseline sample of 564 households in 40 villages, our follow-up sample comprises 394 households from 27 of the 40 villages<sup>16</sup>. Since the initial treatments were randomly assigned within the village, we are assured (and we confirm) that we achieve a balanced sample in the follow-up: treatment

---

<sup>16</sup>Much of the cost of surveying is the fixed travel and accommodation of visiting a village, hence it made sense to interview all study households in villages that were visited.

status is not correlated with observable socio-economic or demographic characteristics<sup>17</sup>.

In the 27 follow-up villages, we were able to re-interview 349 out of the 394 households. The attrition is not correlated with any of the treatments or with whether a bank account was opened previously. No attrition was due to household refusal to answer: eighty-five percent occurred because the household had moved permanently, while the remainder was due to death or debilitating illness. It is unlikely that our intervention affected mortality rates.

## 7.2 Long-Run Effects

Regression results from the follow-up survey are reported in tables VIII through X. Table VIII investigates whether those household that reported opening a bank account following our intervention still have their accounts open, two years later. The results confirm households that received the highest incentive are significantly more likely to have their accounts open, as compared to those with the lowest incentive. These results are statistically indistinguishable from the results from the short-run follow-up. Further survey questions reveal that of the households that have their accounts still open, 62% have used their account in the last year to deposit, withdraw, send or receive money.

A necessary feature of our study was that the subsidy payment offered for opening a bank account following the study be time-limited. In a separate set of regressions, we use as a dependent variable whether the household opened a bank account at any point in the two years between the initial treatment, and the follow-up survey. The point estimates on financial literacy invitation range from 1 percentage point to 7.6 percentage points, but are not statistically significant (results available in the web appendix).

Table IX next measures whether the heterogeneous effects of bank account opening are present in the long run. We find that the impact of financial literacy training remains significant for households below the median level of initial financial literacy<sup>18</sup>. The results based on schooling status are no longer significant, though the point estimates are for the most part similar to the short-run estimates. In this regression, the coefficient on (Unschooling \* High

---

<sup>17</sup>In an estimation model of bank accounts with village fixed effects, the omitted 13 villages would not contribute to the identification of any parameters of interest.

<sup>18</sup>The F-test of the sum of the Financial Literacy Invitation and (Below Median Financial Literacy \* Invitation) is significant at the 10 percent level for the specification without household controls.

Incentive) is negative and statistically significant even with household controls<sup>19</sup>, suggesting that uneducated households simply took advantage of the financial incentive and subsequently closed their bank accounts. This result has important implications for the desirability of subsidies as a tool to expand financial access: financial incentives alone may not be sufficient to draw uneducated households into the financial system as these households may simply claim the incentives without actually using the financial services.

### 7.3 Effect on Savings Decision

An advantage of examining banking status is that it is easy to measure. However, financial education often promotes asset accumulation as well. In fact, one of the key messages in our financial literacy seminars was to highlight the importance of savings for future expected and unexpected needs.

Our follow-up analysis examines household savings behavior, which was elicited by the question “Do you currently have any savings?” We also asked households to report the level of savings, however, this variable is reported with significantly more noise (and refusals to answer) than the simple question of whether the household has any savings.

Regression results in Table X show that while there is no direct effect of financial literacy, interestingly, there is also no direct effect of the subsidies, suggesting that (relatively small) “high subsidies” were dissaved by the households over the past two years. However, the interaction of high incentive with financial literacy is large and statistically significant. Compared to households that received the low incentive and no financial literacy invitation, households receiving both a high incentive and financial literacy are more than 20 percentage points more likely to report having savings, off a base of 36 percentage points. Further follow-up questions show that of the households that report savings, 61% report that they save for emergencies, 34% for school fees and 12% for business investment. These findings indicate that financial literacy and incentives together can provide the necessary impetus to improve household financial habits.

---

<sup>19</sup>The F-test of the sum of High Incentive and (Unschooling \* High Incentive) is not statistically significant.

## 8 Conclusion

Using two new surveys from two of the most populous countries in the world, this paper presents compelling new evidence that financial literacy is an important predictor of financial behavior in emerging market countries. These correlations, well-documented in developed countries, have spurred governments, non-profits, and firms to promote financial literacy as a means of expanding the depth and breadth of the financial system.

The benefits of better financial literacy may be great. On a personal level, individuals may save more, and better manage risk, by purchasing insurance contracts. There may even be general equilibrium effects: increased demand by households for financial services may improve risk-sharing, reduce economic volatility, improve intermediation, and speed overall financial development. This in turn could facilitate competition in the financial services sector, and ultimately more efficient allocation of capital within society.

Despite the potential benefits of financial literacy, there is to date no credible evidence on the effects of financial literacy programs. This paper reports the first randomized evaluation of a carefully-designed and delivered financial literacy training program. We find that the education program has modest effects, stimulating demand for bank accounts among uneducated and less financially literate households. A second intervention providing small subsidies for opening an account demonstrates that, given proper incentives, many individuals could open accounts, even without financial literacy training.

A follow-up study conducted two years after the initial intervention shows that those who were originally offered the high incentives are significantly more likely to have used bank accounts in the past year to deposit, withdraw, send or receive funds. Perhaps most promisingly, financial literacy education combined with incentives has a large effect on the share of households with savings.

Where does this study leave us? On the one hand, the survey data from Indonesia and India demonstrate that financial literacy is an important correlate of household financial behavior, and household well-being. Further, our experimental results show that the combination of financial literacy and financial incentives can change savings behavior. These results provide evidence that financial literacy is important, and that educated consumers will make better



financial decisions.

Yet, our experimental results show that this financial education program is not an effective tool for promoting the use of bank accounts. It is useful to think about a simple cost-benefit analysis. Even if targeted to those for whom the intervention is most effective, the program is not cost effective. The literacy training cost approximately US \$17 per head to deliver. Among those with low levels of initial financial literacy (i.e. below median score on baseline financial literacy assessment), the training program increased the share opening a bank savings account by approximately 5 percentage points. Thus, inducing the opening of one bank account cost  $\$17/.05=\$340$ . In contrast, for this same sub-sample, increasing the subsidy from US \$3 to \$14 led to an increase in probability of opening a bank savings account of 7.6 percentage points, suggesting a cost per bank savings account opened of  $\$11/0.076=\$145$ . Thus, subsidies are almost two-and-one-half times more cost effective than financial literacy education.

Of course, financial literacy may have additional value if it promotes asset accumulation – a buffer stock of savings may be far more important than simply having a bank account. Nevertheless, our evidence does not support the view that low financial literacy is a severe impediment to demand for formal financial services. Our study clearly demonstrates that prices matter for both opening of bank accounts and for savings, and that individuals who open bank accounts in response to incentives do keep them open for the long term. This finding is consistent with the common practice in United States banks, whereby banks offer cash incentives or other gifts to those opening a new account.

Ultimately, our results suggest that financial deepening may be more easily achieved through measures designed to reduce the price of financial services, such as promoting competition or low-cost technological solutions like mobile banking, than through large-scale financial literacy education. A carefully designed, focused and targeted financial literacy program, one that is more cost effective than a large-scale effort, may serve as a valuable complement to such financial reform.

## 9 References

- Ashraf, Nava, Dean Karlan, and Wesley Yin, 2006a. "Tying Odysseus to the Mast: Evidence from a Commitment Savings Product in the Philippines." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2): 635-672.
- , 2006b. "Deposit Collectors." *Advances in Economic Analysis & Policy*, 6(2): 1-22.
- Beck, Thorsten, Asli Demirguc-Kunt, and Maria Soledad Martinez Peria, 2007. "Reaching out: Access to and use of banking services across countries," *Journal of Financial Economics* 85: 234-266.
- Beck, Thorsten, Asli Demirguc-Kunt, and Patrick Honohan, 2008. "Finance for All?" World Bank Policy Research Report. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Bertrand, Marianne and Adair Morse, 2009. "Information Disclosure, Cognitive Biases and Payday Borrowing," Working Paper, University of Chicago Booth School of Business.
- Besley, Timothy, Stephen Coate, and Glenn Loury, 1993. "The Economics of Rotating Savings and Credit Associations," *American Economic Review* 83(4): 792-810.
- Binswanger, H.P. 1980. "Attitudes toward Risk: Experimental Measurement in Rural India." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 62: 395-407.
- Buehn, Andreas and Friedrich Schneider, 2009. "Shadow Economies and Corruption All Over the World: Revised Estimates for 120 Countries." *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*, Vol. 1, 2007-9 (Version 2). <http://www.economics-ejournal.org/economics/journala>
- 9
- Christelis, Dimitris, Tullio Jappelli, and Mario Padula, 2006. "Cognitive Abilities and Portfolio Choice." CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5735.
- Cole, Shawn, and Kartini Shastry, 2009. "Smart Money: The Effect of Education, Cognitive Ability, and Financial Literacy on Financial Market Participation," Harvard Business School Working Paper 09-071.

- Duflo, Esther and Emmanuel Saez, 2003. "The Role of Information and Social Interactions in Retirement Plan Decisions: Evidence From a Randomized Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118: 815-842.
- Hogarth, J. M., and K. H. O'Donnell, 1999. "Banking Relationships of Lower-Income Families and the Governmental Trend Toward Electronic Payment," *Federal Reserve Bulletin* 86 (January): 459-473.
- Karlan, Dean and Martin Valdivia, 2008. "Teaching Entrepreneurship: Impact of Business Training on Microfinance Clients and Institutions." Working Paper.
- Levine, Ross, 2005. "Finance and Growth: Theory and Evidence." in Philippe Aghion and Steven Durlauf, eds. *Handbook of Economic Growth*. The Netherlands: Elsevier Science.
- Lusardi, Annamaria, 2008. "Financial Literacy: An Essential Tool for Informed Consumer Choice?" June 2008 Working Paper, Dartmouth College.
- Lusardi, Annamaria and Olivia S. Mitchell, 2006. "Financial Literacy and Planning: Implications for Retirement Wellbeing." Pension Research Council Working Paper No. 1.
- Lusardi, Annamaria, and Olivia S. Mitchell, 2007a. "Financial Literacy and Retirement Preparedness: Evidence and Implications for Financial Education." *Business Economics*, 42(1): 35-44.
- Lusardi, Annamaria, and Olivia S. Mitchell, 2007b. "Baby Boomer Retirement Security: The Roles of Planning, Financial Literacy, and Housing Wealth." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(1): 205-24.
- Lusardi, Annamaria and Peter Tufano, 2008. "Debt Literacy, Financial Experience and Overindebtedness." Working Paper.
- Lusardi, Annamaria, Maarten van Rooji, and Rob Alessie, 2007. "Financial Literacy and Stock Market Participation." MRRC Working Paper No. 2007-162.
- Osili, Una Okonkwo, and Anna Paulson, 2008, "Institutions and Financial Development: Evidence from International Migrants in the United States" *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Volume 90(3):498-517.

Rabin, Matthew, and Richard Thaler, 2001. "Anomalies: Risk Aversion." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(1):219-232.

Stango, Victor and Jonathan Zinman, 2009. "Exponential Growth Bias and Household Finance." *Journal of Finance*, forthcoming.

Townsend, Robert, 1994. "Risk and Insurance in Village India." *Econometrica*, 62(3): 539-591.

UNESCO, 2007. "Global Education Digest," <http://www.uis.unesco.org>, accessed May 2009.

Washington, Ebonya Lia, 2006. "The Impact of Banking and Fringe Banking Regulation on the Number of Unbanked Americans." *Journal of Human Resources*, 41(1).

**Table I: Financial Literacy, Cognitive Ability, and Discount Rates**

This table reports levels of financial literacy among households surveys respondents in India and Indonesia. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative. The means are given for households above and below mean per capita expenditure, and for households above and below measured cognitive ability. The column to the right of the comparison columns indicates whether the difference in means is statistically significant. \*\*\* indicates that the difference is statistically significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

		India					Indonesia				
		All	Per Capita Expenditure		Cognitive Ability	All	Per Capita Expenditure		Cognitive Ability		
			Below Median	Above Median	Below Median	Above Median	Below Median	Above Median	Below Median	Above Median	
Compound interest	% Correct	59%	55%	63% ***	33%	80% ***	78%	69%	86% ***	56%	89% ***
	% Do not know	30%					15%				
If savings earns 1% and inflation is 2%, after one year is buying power greater, less, or the same?	% Correct	25%	21%	28% ***	14%	33% ***	61%	51%	70% ***	37%	74% ***
	% Do not know	38%					16%				
Is one crop safer than multiple crops?	% Correct	31%	30%	32%	26%	34% ***	28%	24%	31% ***	23%	30% ***
	% Do not know	6%					4%				
Borrowing 500,000, repaying 600,000 versus paying 15 percent interest	% Correct	24%	24%	23%	11%	34% ***	44%	39%	49% ***	30%	52% ***
	% Do not know	24%					14%				
All questions taken together	% Correct	34%	33%	36%	21%	45% ***	52%	46%	59%	37%	61% ***
All questions taken together	Avg. Score (out of 4)	1.38	1.31	1.45 ***	0.83	1.80 ***	2.10	1.83	2.36 ***	1.46	2.45 ***
N		1,496	749	747	622	843	3,360	1,680	1,680	1,412	1,948

**Table II: Predictors of Financial Literacy**

This table reports the results from regressions predicting measured financial literacy among households surveys respondents in India and Indonesia. Financial literacy is measured by a series of questions about compounding, interest rates, and risk diversification. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative, and weighted by sampling weights. The Indian regressions are unweighted. Only select coefficients are shown here; full regression results are available in the web appendix. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

Dependent variable:	Financial Literacy Score							
	India				Indonesia			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Per capita expenditure	0.073 *	0.079 *	0.080 *	0.051	0.074 *	0.087 **	0.071 *	0.100 **
	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.047)
Rural household					-0.152 ***	-0.195 ***	-0.196 ***	
					(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.053)	
Female	-0.077	-0.090	-0.096	-0.074	-0.110 **	-0.123 **	-0.130 **	-0.135 ***
	(0.059)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.051)
Age	0.022 **	0.027 **	0.027 **	0.020 *	0.021 **	0.020 **	0.022 **	0.012
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
HH has non-farm enterprise	-0.065	-0.040	-0.041	-0.096	0.112 **	0.129 **	0.136 ***	0.114 **
	(0.105)	(0.108)	(0.107)	(0.108)	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.050)	(0.054)
Married	-0.030	-0.040	-0.046	-0.032	-0.079	-0.111	-0.094	-0.075
	(0.080)	(0.082)	(0.083)	(0.080)	(0.076)	(0.079)	(0.076)	(0.077)
Muslim	0.048	0.076	0.074	0.187 *	-0.073	0.010	0.010	-0.104
	(0.094)	(0.096)	(0.097)	(0.104)	(0.102)	(0.109)	(0.106)	(0.155)
Completed primary school	-0.007	-0.034	-0.035	0.143 **	0.165 **	0.127 *	0.128 *	0.070
	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.071)
Completed high school	0.201	0.254	0.253	0.148	0.022	-0.019	-0.020	-0.072
	(0.228)	(0.243)	(0.239)	(0.196)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.069)	(0.071)
Cognitive ability	0.223 ***	0.226 ***	0.225 ***	0.187 ***	0.234 ***	0.233 ***	0.224 ***	0.191 ***
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Risk averse			-0.037	0.026			-0.075	-0.062
			(0.068)	(0.065)			(0.055)	(0.056)
Interested in financial matters							0.022	0.050
							(0.062)	(0.062)
Saves enough (self-reported)							-0.057	-0.101 *
							(0.050)	(0.052)
Village fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
N	1450	1369	1369	1369	3057	2818	2818	2818

**Table III: Demand for Financial Products, Indonesia**

This table reports demand for financial products by households surveys respondents in Indonesia. The sample is nationally representative. Panel A gives average reported demand for each service, while Panel B reports OLS regressions relating individual characteristics to product demand. Only select coefficients are shown here; full regression results are available in the web appendix. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

<b>Panel A: Summary Statistics</b>								
	<b>Indonesia</b>							
	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>					
Demand for savings products								
Interested in commitment savings product	All	43%	3360					
Interested in using deposit collector	All	25%	3359					
Interested in retirement savings product	All	50%	3360					
Open account if fees cut 50%	No bank account	37%	2153					
Open account if fees cut 100%	No bank account	58%	2153					
Would attend financial literacy training	No bank account	74%	2153					

  

<b>Panel B: Determinants of Demand for Financial Products</b>								
<b>Demand for:</b>	<b>Commitment savings</b>		<b>Deposit Collector</b>		<b>Retirement savings</b>		<b>Literacy training</b>	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Financial literacy score	0.028 *** (.010)	0.025 ** (.010)	0.024 *** (.009)	0.026 *** (.010)	0.037 *** (.010)	0.033 *** (.011)	0.019 * (.010)	0.014 (.011)
HH has bank account	-0.012 (.026)	-0.018 (.026)	-0.051 ** (.020)	-0.065 *** (.021)	0.087 *** (.025)	0.074 ** (.029)		
Per capita expenditure	0.058 *** (.015)	0.043 *** (.016)	0.030 ** (.014)	0.025 (.015)	0.073 *** (.017)	0.067 *** (.019)	0.061 *** (.021)	0.051 ** (.021)
Female	0.007 (.019)	0.009 (.021)	-0.021 (.018)	-0.013 (.017)	0.031 (.020)	0.030 (.019)	-0.022 (.019)	-0.025 (.020)
Age	0.005 (.004)	0.005 (.004)	0.003 (.003)	0.004 (.003)	0.003 (.004)	0.002 (.004)	0.010 ** (.004)	0.007 * (.004)
HH has non-farm enterprise	0.012 (.020)	0.010 (.020)	0.025 (.018)	0.021 (.019)	-0.044 ** (.018)	-0.048 ** (.02)	-0.022 (.022)	-0.025 (.021)
Married	0.091 *** (.024)	0.085 *** (.024)	-0.014 (.026)	-0.034 (.028)	0.005 (.025)	-0.008 (.024)	0.029 (.034)	0.021 (.035)
Muslim	0.025 (.049)	0.021 (.047)	-0.020 (.036)	-0.008 (.036)	0.038 (.046)	0.049 (.046)	-0.042 (.059)	-0.050 (.052)
Completed primary school	0.027 (.025)	0.029 (.025)	0.015 (.024)	0.011 (.025)	0.021 (.028)	0.022 (.027)	0.024 (.025)	0.017 (.025)
Completed high school	-0.017 (.024)	-0.023 (.025)	-0.057 ** (.026)	-0.066 ** (.026)	0.008 (.026)	-0.006 (.026)	0.028 (.030)	0.015 (.032)
Cognitive ability	0.007 (.006)	0.002 (.007)	-0.007 (.007)	-0.010 (.008)	-0.006 (.007)	-0.012 * (.007)	0.005 (.007)	0.003 (.007)
Risk averse		-0.037 * (.020)		-0.027 * (.016)		-0.030 (.023)		-0.038 (.024)
Interested in financial matters		0.121 *** (.026)		0.096 *** (.023)		0.154 *** (.024)		0.070 ** (.033)
Saves enough (self-reported)		0.097 *** (.022)		0.102 *** (.020)		0.108 *** (.024)		0.092 *** (.021)
Village fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	3057	2818	3057	2818	3057	2818	1876	1737

**Table IV: Experimental Sample, Indonesia**

This table reports sample summary statistics and tests of random treatment assignment for an experiment testing the effect of offering financial literacy training and financial incentives on respondents' decision to open a bank account. Panel A gives sample size and the mean of the outcome group by treatment status. Panel B provides tests of random assignment. The p-values column reports the statistical significance of a test for difference between the mean of invited and non-invited individuals; the p-values for incentive level corresponds to a joint test of significant differences between medium and low, and high and low, categories. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the village level. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

**Panel A: Summary Statistics**

	N	Percent	Opened Bank Account	
			N	Percent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Surveyed Individuals	1230			
Of whom, No Bank Account	736	60%		
Of whom, participated in experiment	564	77%	49	9%
Incentive Treatment				
Low Incentive (\$3)	170	30%	6	4%
Medium Incentive (\$8)	190	34%	17	9%
High Incentive (\$14)	204	36%	26	13%
Literacy Treatment				
Invited to Financial Literacy Training	274	49%	21	8%
Not Invited to Financial Literacy Training	290	51%	28	10%

**Panel B: Test of Random Assignment**

	Invited	Not Invited	p-value	Low	Medium	High	p-value
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Rural Household	0.58	0.53	0.053 *	0.57	0.53	0.55	0.591
Female	0.55	0.50	0.287	0.54	0.50	0.53	0.681
Age	41.84	40.55	0.302	40.76	40.72	41.95	0.554
Married	0.87	0.85	0.529	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.710
Muslim	0.97	0.99	0.102	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.662
Family Size	2.73	2.82	0.446	2.73	2.76	2.82	0.756
Attended School	0.90	0.90	0.916	0.89	0.93	0.88	0.134
Log of Consumption Expenditure	17.26	17.32	0.332	17.18	17.33	17.35	0.213
Employed	0.68	0.69	0.792	0.65	0.67	0.72	0.367
Financial Literacy Score	0.46	0.51	0.039 **	0.49	0.49	0.48	0.821
Cognitive / Math Skills Score	0.79	0.80	0.408	0.78	0.80	0.79	0.727
Believe Household Saves Enough	0.43	0.49	0.101	0.45	0.47	0.47	0.846
Interested in Financial Matters	0.72	0.72	0.867	0.69	0.73	0.73	0.626



**Table V: Experimental Results: The Effect of Financial Literacy Education and Incentives on Bank Account Opening**

This table reports the results from a randomized experiment measuring the effect of offering financial literacy training and financial incentives on respondents' decision to open a bank account. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the respondent opened a bank account. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	-0.020 (0.027)	-0.022 (0.028)			0.022 (0.028)	0.029 (0.034)
Incentive==75000			0.054 ** (0.024)	0.048 * (0.026)	0.065 * (0.036)	0.066 * (0.037)
Incentive==125000			0.092 *** (0.026)	0.088 *** (0.029)	0.136 *** (0.036)	0.137 *** (0.033)
(Incentive==75000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.021 (0.047)	-0.036 (0.052)
(Incentive==125000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.090 (0.057)	-0.101 (0.062)
Constant	0.097 *** (0.017)	-0.444 (0.306)	0.035 ** (0.014)	-0.447 (0.308)	0.024 (0.017)	-0.455 (0.303)
Household Controls		YES		YES		YES
Observations	564	564	564	564	564	564
R-squared	0.001	0.068	0.018	0.082	0.023	0.089

**Table VI: Experimental Results: Heterogeneous Effects of Financial Literacy Education and Incentives on Bank Account Opening**

This table reports the results from a randomized experiment measuring the effect of offering financial literacy training and financial incentives on respondents' decision to open a bank account. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the respondent opened a bank account. Columns (1) and (2) include main effects and interaction terms for households who initially scored below the median level of financial literacy. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	-0.032 (0.029)	-0.031 (0.030)	-0.049 (0.034)	-0.048 (0.036)
Incentive==75000	0.061 ** (0.028)	0.057 ** (0.029)	0.06 (0.039)	0.051 (0.040)
Incentive==125000	0.099 *** (0.027)	0.091 *** (0.030)	0.1 *** (0.030)	0.098 *** (0.034)
Unschoolled	-0.055 (0.050)	-0.067 (0.068)		
Unschoolled * Financial Literacy Invitation	0.155 ** (0.068)	0.139 * (0.071)		
Unschoolled * Incentive==75000	-0.135 * (0.071)	-0.131 * (0.072)		
Unschoolled * Incentive==125000	-0.062 (0.084)	-0.036 (0.093)		
Below Median Financial Literacy			-0.076 ** (0.037)	-0.056 (0.050)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Financial Literacy Invitation			0.100 ** (0.044)	0.087 ** (0.043)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==75000			-0.016 (0.060)	-0.008 (0.058)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==125000			-0.024 (0.049)	-0.031 (0.055)
Constant	0.05 ** (0.020)	-0.377 (0.325)	0.067 ** (0.027)	-0.377 (0.331)
Household Controls		YES		YES
Observations	564	564	564	564
R-squared	0.029	0.09	0.03	0.089

**Table VII: Instrumental Variable Estimates of Experiment and Heterogeneous Treatment Effects**

This table reports instrumental variable estimates of the effect of offering financial literacy training and financial incentives on respondents' decision to open a bank account. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the respondent opened a bank account. Financial Literacy Attendance is instrumented for with assignment of a financial literacy invitation. Columns (1) and (2) include main effects. Columns (3) and (4) include main effects and interaction terms for households who initially scored below the median level of financial literacy. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Attended Financial Literacy Program	-0.033 (0.049)	-0.036 (0.051)	-0.056 (0.050)	-0.059 (0.053)	-0.081 (0.056)	-0.078 (0.057)
Incentive==75000	0.053 ** (0.024)	0.047 * (0.025)	0.06 ** (0.027)	0.051 * (0.029)	0.057 (0.039)	0.049 (0.038)
Incentive==125000	0.092 *** (0.026)	0.088 *** (0.027)	0.099 *** (0.026)	0.089 *** (0.029)	0.103 *** (0.030)	0.101 *** (0.034)
Unschooling			-0.159 (0.154)	-0.166 (0.153)		
Unschooling * Attended Financial Literacy Program			0.544 (0.468)	0.489 (0.403)		
Unschooling * Incentive==75000			-0.168 (0.113)	-0.149 (0.103)		
Unschooling * Incentive==125000			-0.199 (0.125)	-0.149 (0.107)		
Below Median Financial Literacy					-0.115 ** (0.058)	-0.084 (0.060)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Attended Financial Literacy Program					0.206 ** (0.104)	0.172 * (0.094)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==75000					-0.013 (0.059)	-0.006 (0.056)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==125000					-0.027 (0.053)	-0.032 (0.056)
Constant	0.05 ** (0.024)	-0.404 (0.312)	0.058 ** (0.026)	-0.426 (0.331)	0.077 ** (0.032)	-0.391 (0.317)
Household Controls		YES		YES		YES
Observations	564	564	564	564	564	564

**Table VIII: Follow-Up Results: Long-Run Persistence of Financial Literacy Education and Incentives on Bank Account Opening**

This table reports results from a follow-up survey two years after the financial literacy education and incentives intervention, conducted among participants in villages where a household opened a bank account immediately after the intervention. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether a respondent who opened a bank account immediately after the intervention still has the bank account two years later. The sample includes all households which were visited for the follow-up survey, excluding those respondents who opened a bank account immediately after the intervention but attrited. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	-0.041 (0.028)	-0.044 (0.029)			0.011 (0.032)	0.019 (0.041)
Incentive==75000			0.043 (0.031)	0.058 * (0.034)	0.063 (0.048)	0.09 * (0.048)
Incentive==125000			0.092 *** (0.032)	0.088 ** (0.035)	0.127 *** (0.046)	0.123 *** (0.047)
(Incentive==75000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.041 (0.069)	-0.068 (0.074)
(Incentive==125000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.083 (0.061)	-0.086 (0.068)
Constant	0.094 *** (0.019)	-0.831 ** (0.319)	0.028 * (0.015)	-0.872 *** (0.300)	0.021 (0.021)	-0.866 *** (0.300)
Household Controls		YES		YES		YES
Observations	349	349	349	349	349	349
R-squared	0.006	0.1	0.02	0.111	0.028	0.119

**Table IX: Long-Run Persistence: Heterogenous Effects of Incentives and Financial Literacy Education on Bank Account Opening**

This table reports results from a follow-up survey two years after the financial literacy education and incentives intervention, conducted among participants in villages where a household opened a bank account immediately after the intervention. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether a respondent who opened a bank account immediately after the intervention still has the bank account two years later. Columns (1)-(4) include main effects and interaction terms for households who initially scored below the median level of financial literacy. Columns (1)-(2) include all households which were successfully interviewed in the follow-up survey. Columns (3)-(4) include respondents who opened a bank account immediately after the intervention but attrited in the follow-up survey, and assume that they still have the bank account two years later. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	-0.042 (0.03)	-0.038 (0.03)	-0.076 * (0.04)	-0.071 * (0.04)
Incentive==75000	0.05 (0.04)	0.065 * (0.04)	0.055 (0.05)	0.058 (0.05)
Incentive==125000	0.103 *** (0.03)	0.096 *** (0.04)	0.082 ** (0.04)	0.073 * (0.04)
Unschoolled	-0.006 (0.05)	0.003 (0.06)		
Unschoolled * Financial Literacy Invitation	0.1 (0.07)	0.058 (0.07)		
Unschoolled * Incentive==75000	-0.125 (0.08)	-0.101 (0.09)		
Unschoolled * Incentive==125000	-0.158 ** (0.06)	-0.122 * (0.07)		
Below Median Financial Literacy			-0.081 * (0.04)	-0.106 * (0.06)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Financial Literacy Invitation			0.14 ** (0.06)	0.114 * (0.06)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==75000			-0.056 (0.06)	-0.018 (0.06)
Below Median Financial Literacy * Incentive==125000			-0.003 (0.06)	0.009 (0.07)
Constant	0.045 * (0.02)	-0.793 ** (0.31)	0.072 ** (0.03)	-0.733 ** (0.32)
Household Controls		YES		YES
Observations	349	349	349	349
R-squared	0.037	0.119	0.044	0.126

**Table X: Long-Run Effects of Financial Literacy Education and Incentives on Savings**

This table reports results from a follow-up survey two years after the financial literacy education and incentives intervention, conducted among participants in villages where a household opened a bank account immediately after the intervention. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the household currently has any savings. The sample includes all households which were successfully interviewed in the follow-up survey. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	0.008 (0.040)	0.041 (0.044)			-0.104 (0.064)	-0.037 (0.061)
Incentive==75000			0.031 (0.060)	-0.011 (0.059)	-0.023 (0.068)	-0.016 (0.069)
Incentive==125000			0.007 (0.057)	-0.03 (0.061)	-0.105 (0.083)	-0.116 (0.078)
(Incentive==75000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					0.092 (0.094)	0.013 (0.100)
(Incentive==125000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					0.231 ** (0.116)	0.205 ** (0.105)
Constant	0.311 *** (0.047)	-0.888 (0.590)	0.303 *** (0.053)	-0.851 (0.586)	0.362 *** (0.070)	-0.92 (0.612)
Household Controls		YES		YES		YES
Observations	349	349	349	349	349	349
R-squared	0.000	0.177	0.001	0.176	0.011	0.188

**Appendix Table I: Summary Statistics**

This table reports summary statistics on demographics and wealth for participants in two household surveys conducted by the authors, one in India, one in Indonesia. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative, while the Indian survey consists of a study of rural farmers in the state of Gujarat.

	India				Indonesia						
	Median	Mean	Sd	N	Median	Unweighted		N	Weighted		
						Mean	Sd		Mean	Sd	
<b>Household Characteristics</b>											
Household Size	6.0	5.9	2.5	1,500	3.0	3.0	1.4	3,360	2.9	1.3	
Household Rural		100%		1,500		59%		3,360	58%		
Household head years of schooling	3.0	3.7	4.0	1,492							
Household has phone		14%		1,497		70%		3,360	81%		
Household has non-farm enterprise		6%		1,499		39%		3,360	39%		
<b>Respondent Characteristics</b>											
Bahasa speaker						79%		3,360	74%		
Female		54%		1,498		51%		3,360	50%		
Married		88%		1,499		83%		3,360	83%		
Muslim		9%		1,499		87%		3,360	93%		
Age	40.0	41.2	11.7	1,497	40.0	42.2	14.3	3,360	43.3	14.3	
Attended school		58%		1,497		91%		3,360	89%		
Completed primary school		41%		1,493		79%		3,057	80%		
Completed high school		3%		1,493		33%		3,057	33%		
Beyond high school education		2%		1,493		9%		3,057	10%		
Employed		61%		1,498		75%		3,360	73%		
Discount factor	0.73	0.79	0.14	1,486	0.80	0.64	0.32	3,076	0.64	0.31	
Risk averse		19%		1,493		35%		3,360	36%		
Fatalist	0.50	0.53	0.25	1,433	0.67	0.62	0.29	3,360	0.60	0.30	
Interested in financial matters						78%		3,360	74%		
Saves enough (self-reported)						53%		3,360	54%		
Mean cognitive ability score (out of 8)	5.0	4.9	2.4	1,468		6.3	1.8	3,360	6.5	1.8	
<b>Household Wealth and Income</b>											
Monthly per capita Expenditure (USD, 2007)	\$21	\$30	\$39	1,499	\$58	\$89	\$103	3,360	\$90	\$106	
Main income from agriculture		64%		1,500		40%		2,504	36%		
Main income from wage labor		23%		1,500		43%		2,504	49%		
Main income from own enterprise		4%		1,500							
Total Annual Household Income (USD, 2007)	\$484	\$674	\$698	1,499	\$399	\$1,282	\$3,700	3,359	\$ 1,315	\$3,798	
Household owns land		48%		1,499		84%		3,360	84%		
Household has electricity		72%		1,491		94%		3,360	98%		
Household has tap water		47%		1,499		19%		3,360	23%		
Household has livestock, cattle, birds etc.		62%		1,497		94%		3,360	42%		

**Appendix Table II: Household Financial Situation**

This table reports data on use of financial services and household assets and liabilities for households surveys respondents in India and Indonesia. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative. For each country, the table gives the mean response to each question, as well as the mean for households who exhibit below median financial literacy, and the mean of households who exhibit above the median level of financial literacy. Figures in parentheses indicate standard deviation. The final column gives the difference between the two groups. \*\*\* indicates that the difference is statistically significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	India				Indonesia			
	All	Financial Literacy			All	Financial Literacy		
		Below Median	Above Median	Difference		Below Median	Above Median	Difference
Household has a bank account	12%	5%	15%	10% ***	41%	24%	47%	23% ***
Household has advanced savings instruments (e.g. CDs, mutual fund)					13%	5%	20%	***
Household has savings with non-bank institution	55%	51%	60%	9% ***	51%	38%	62%	25% ***
Total household savings (USD, 2007)	31 (151)	15 (40)	41 (213)	26 **				
Household has a formal sector loan	13%	10%	15%	5% **	25%	13%	29%	16% ***
Household has an informal loan	64%	62%	66%	4%	52%	45%	56%	11% ***
Total household indebtedness (USD, 2007)	906 (8,899)	448 (818)	1303 (13,154)	855	875 (5,761)	310 (2,599)	1177 (6,328)	867 ***
Mean Household Indebtedness/Annual Income	1.7 (10.2)	1.3 (2.7)	2.1 (14.8)	0.9	4.0 (90.9)	1.9 (48.0)	3.7 (58.0)	1.8
Household has any insurance program	64%	60%	69%	9% ***	49%	37%	53%	16% ***
Household has health insurance	61%	59%	65%	7% **	34%	26%	37%	11% ***
Household has crop insurance	3%	1%	5%	4% ***				0%
Household has asset/homeowner's insurance	57%	56%	59%	3%	26%	14%	31%	17% ***
N	1,496	384	1,112		3,360	1,104	2,256	



**Appendix Table III: Predictors of Financial Participation**

This table reports the results from estimating which household characteristics predict use of financial services by households surveys respondents in India and Indonesia. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

Household has:	Bank account		Formal Loan		Informal Loan		Insurance	
	India	Indonesia	India	Indonesia	India	Indonesia	India	Indonesia
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Financial literacy score	0.000 (.011)	0.020 ** (.008)	0.019 (.012)	0.002 (.006)	0.012 (.016)	0.014 (.009)	0.032 ** (.016)	0.000 (.009)
Per capita expenditure	0.027 * (.015)	0.187 *** (.018)	0.066 *** (.017)	0.096 *** (.012)	0.018 (.025)	0.064 *** (.016)	0.031 (.024)	0.093 *** (.015)
Bahasa		0.049 ** (.023)		0.017 (.021)		0.009 (.031)		0.028 (.030)
Female	0.014 (.021)	0.047 *** (.017)	0.032 (.025)	0.025 * (.014)	-0.008 (.034)	-0.016 (.022)	0.031 (.032)	0.005 (.021)
Age	0.002 (.004)	0.001 (.003)	0.014 *** (.005)	0.002 (.002)	0.006 (.006)	-0.006 * (.003)	0.005 (.007)	-0.006 (.004)
Age squared	0.0000 (0.0000)	0.0000 (0.0000)	-0.0001 ** (0.0000)	0.0000 (0.0000)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	0.0000 (0.0000)	0.0000 (0.0000)	0.0001 * (0.0000)
Non-farm enterprise	0.006 (.035)	0.050 *** (.019)	0.019 (.046)	0.042 *** (.015)	-0.045 (.060)	0.022 (.022)	0.058 (.058)	0.018 (.020)
Married	0.055 ** (.022)	-0.001 (.022)	0.014 (.034)	0.027 (.018)	-0.045 (.045)	0.071 ** (.029)	-0.009 (.048)	0.005 (.026)
Muslim	-0.055 * (.031)	0.053 (.050)	0.084 (.053)	0.068 * (.040)	-0.156 *** (.060)	0.028 (.052)	-0.052 (.064)	0.030 (.060)
Household size	0.007 (.005)	0.060 *** (.007)	0.022 *** (.005)	0.033 *** (.006)	0.007 (.006)	0.019 ** (.008)	0.000 (.007)	0.054 *** (.007)
Completed primary school	0.070 *** (.026)	0.038 ** (.019)	0.043 * (.023)	0.026 * (.015)	-0.065 * (.037)	-0.044 (.027)	0.018 (.038)	0.031 (.026)
Completed high school	0.063 (.102)	0.161 *** (.024)	0.173 (.108)	0.049 *** (.017)	-0.289 *** (.106)	-0.025 (.024)	0.276 *** (.080)	0.107 *** (.021)
Beyond high school education	0.093 (.137)	0.145 *** (.032)	-0.032 (.129)	0.161 *** (.033)	0.050 (.140)	-0.064 * (.035)	-0.156 * (.094)	0.151 *** (.037)
Cognitive ability	0.005 (.006)	0.006 (.005)	0.004 (.005)	0.011 *** (.004)	0.000 (.008)	-0.004 (.007)	0.016 * (.008)	0.011 * (.006)
Discount factor	-0.048 (.064)	0.011 (.026)	-0.044 (.070)	-0.046 ** (.022)	-0.064 (.104)	-0.055 * (.029)	0.081 (.104)	0.025 (.024)
Risk averse	0.011 (.023)	0.032 * (.016)	-0.013 (.021)	0.028 * (.015)	0.031 (.034)	0.007 (.020)	0.007 (.037)	0.021 (.017)
Fatalist	0.035 (.044)	-0.083 *** (.029)	0.029 (.042)	-0.010 (.022)	0.014 (.059)	0.051 (.034)	0.093 * (.052)	-0.041 (.032)
Interested in financial matters		0.015 (.019)		0.012 (.016)		0.092 *** (.027)		0.010 (.022)
Village fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	1365	2818	1369	2818	1369	2818	1363	2818

**Appendix Table IV: Attitudes towards Bank Accounts and Use of Financial Services, Indonesia**

This table reports attitudes towards use of financial services, and how these attitudes are correlated with financial literacy levels, among households surveys respondents in Indonesia. The sample is nationally representative. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	Sample	Mean	Correlation with Financial Literacy
Reasons for having bank account	Has bank account (N=1207)		
Security		53%	0.06 **
For predicted future needs		42%	0.02
Transfer money		37%	0.02
For emergency needs		31%	0
Access other financial services		26%	0.15 ***
To be able to borrow money		17%	-0.05 *
Reasons for not having bank account	No bank account (N=2153)		
Not enough money		92%	0
Do not know how bank operates		32%	-0.07 ***
Do not have a job		20%	-0.04 *
No advantage to having bank account		16%	0.1 ***
Bank staff rude or unhelpful		15%	0.1 ***
Household used to have bank account	No bank account (N=2153)	29%	0.23 ***
Reason stopped using bank account	Used to have account (N=544)		
Not enough money		71%	0.05
Became unemployed		10%	-0.13 ***
No advantage to having bank account		4%	0.03
Know location of nearest bank branch	No bank account (N=2152)	76%	0.31 ***
Know requirements to open bank account	No bank account (N=2153)	31%	0.24 ***
Does household save enough for the future?	All (N=3360)	54%	0.15 ***
Limits on household's ability to save	Not save enough (N=1574)		
Claims of relatives		0%	0.01
Failure to control spending		23%	0.14 ***
Debts to pay		10%	0.07 ***
No money to save		76%	-0.1 ***
Prefer to purchase assets		2%	0.05 *
Irregular income		31%	0.02 *
Reasons for not having any insurance	No insurance (N=1460)		
Insurance term too long		1%	0.06 **
Premium too expensive		6%	0.08 ***
Do not know about any insurance product		38%	-0.09 ***
Do not think need it		23%	0.02
Not enough money		59%	-0.04 *
Most important risks to financial well being	All (N=3360)		
Illness		79%	-0.07 ***
Loss of formal/informal employment		56%	0.06 ***
Loss of/damage to dwelling		33%	-0.01
Business perform poorly		30%	0.08 ***
Death		28%	0.01
Harvest fails		26%	-0.17 ***
Natural disaster		24%	0.11 ***
Loss of/damage to vehicle		12%	0.05 ***
Loss of/damage to cattle		6%	-0.11 ***

**Web Appendix Table I: Predictors of Financial Literacy (Full Regression Results)**

This table reports the results from regressions predicting measured financial literacy among households surveys respondents in India and Indonesia. Financial literacy is measured by a series of questions about compounding, interest rates, and risk diversification. The Indonesian sample is nationally representative, and weighted by sampling weights. The Indian regressions are unweighted. Only select coefficients are shown here; full regression results are available in the web appendix. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

Dependent variable:	Financial Literacy Score							
	India				Indonesia			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Per capita expenditure	0.073 *	0.079 *	0.080 *	0.051	0.074 *	0.087 **	0.071 *	0.100 **
	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.047)
Bahasa					0.073	0.075	0.080	0.033
					(0.055)	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.067)
Rural household					-0.152 ***	-0.195 ***	-0.196 ***	
					(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.053)	
Female	-0.077	-0.090	-0.096	-0.074	-0.110 **	-0.123 **	-0.130 **	-0.135 ***
	(0.059)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.050)	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.051)
Age	0.022 **	0.027 **	0.027 **	0.020 *	0.021 **	0.020 **	0.022 **	0.012
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
Age squared	-0.0002 **	-0.0003 **	-0.0003 **	-0.0002 *	-0.0002 **	-0.0002 **	-0.0003 **	-0.0002 *
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
HH has non-farm enterprise	-0.065	-0.040	-0.041	-0.096	0.112 **	0.129 **	0.136 ***	0.114 **
	(0.105)	(0.108)	(0.107)	(0.108)	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.050)	(0.054)
Married	-0.030	-0.040	-0.046	-0.032	-0.079	-0.111	-0.094	-0.075
	(0.080)	(0.082)	(0.083)	(0.080)	(0.076)	(0.079)	(0.076)	(0.077)
Muslim	0.048	0.076	0.074	0.187 *	-0.073	0.010	0.010	-0.104
	(0.094)	(0.096)	(0.097)	(0.104)	(0.102)	(0.109)	(0.106)	(0.155)
Household size	0.013	0.014	0.013	0.013	-0.016	-0.020	-0.024	-0.001
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Completed primary school	-0.007	-0.034	-0.035	0.143 **	0.165 **	0.127 *	0.128 *	0.070
	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.064)	(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.071)
Completed high school	0.201	0.254	0.253	0.148	0.022	-0.019	-0.020	-0.072
	(0.228)	(0.243)	(0.239)	(0.196)	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.069)	(0.071)
Beyond high school education	-0.230	-0.291	-0.301	-0.059	0.352 ***	0.370 ***	0.329 ***	0.264 **
	(0.267)	(0.283)	(0.275)	(0.243)	(0.101)	(0.106)	(0.103)	(0.106)
Cognitive ability	0.223 ***	0.226 ***	0.225 ***	0.187 ***	0.234 ***	0.233 ***	0.224 ***	0.191 ***
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Discount factor			-0.146	-0.034			0.002	0.012
			(0.185)	(0.184)			(0.076)	(0.077)
Risk averse			-0.037	0.026			-0.075	-0.062
			(0.068)	(0.065)			(0.055)	(0.056)
Fatalist			-0.268 ***	-0.232 **			-0.398 ***	-0.377 ***
			(0.100)	(0.099)			(0.084)	(0.084)
Interested in financial matters							0.022	0.050
							(0.062)	(0.062)
Saves enough (self-reported)							-0.057	-0.101 *
							(0.050)	(0.052)
Village fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
N	1450	1369	1369	1369	3057	2818	2818	2818

**Web Appendix Table II: Demand for Financial Products, Indonesia (Full Regression Results)**

This table reports demand for financial products by households surveys respondents in Indonesia. The sample is nationally representative. Panel A gives average reported demand for each service, while Panel B reports OLS regressions relating individual characteristics to product demand. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistically significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

**Panel A: Summary Statistics**

	Indonesia		
	Sample	Mean	N
Demand for savings products			
Interested in commitment savings product	All	43%	3360
Interested in using deposit collector	All	25%	3359
Interested in retirement savings product	All	50%	3360
Open account if fees cut 50%	No bank account	37%	2153
Open account if fees cut 100%	No bank account	58%	2153
Would attend financial literacy training	No bank account	74%	2153

**Panel B: Determinants of Demand for Financial Products**

Demand for:	Commitment savings		Deposit Collector		Retirement savings		Literacy training	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Financial literacy score	0.028 *** (.010)	0.025 ** (.010)	0.024 *** (.009)	0.026 *** (.010)	0.037 *** (.010)	0.033 *** (.011)	0.019 * (.010)	0.014 (.011)
Has bank account	-0.012 (.026)	-0.018 (.026)	-0.051 ** (.020)	-0.065 *** (.021)	0.087 *** (.025)	0.074 ** (.029)		
Per capita expenditure	0.058 *** (.015)	0.043 *** (.016)	0.030 ** (.014)	0.025 (.015)	0.073 *** (.017)	0.067 *** (.019)	0.061 *** (.021)	0.051 ** (.021)
Bahasa	0.072 ** (.034)	0.078 ** (.037)	0.001 (.030)	0.000 (.030)	0.027 (.036)	0.012 (.040)	0.040 (.036)	0.017 (.038)
Female	0.007 (.019)	0.009 (.021)	-0.021 (.018)	-0.013 (.017)	0.031 (.020)	0.030 (.019)	-0.022 (.019)	-0.025 (.020)
Age	0.005 (.004)	0.005 (.004)	0.003 (.003)	0.004 (.003)	0.003 (.004)	0.002 (.004)	0.010 ** (.004)	0.007 * (.004)
Age squared	-0.0001 ** (0.0000)	-0.0001 *** (0.0000)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	-0.0001 * (0.0000)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	-0.0002 *** (0.0000)	-0.0001 *** (0.0000)
HH has non-farm enterprise	0.012 (.020)	0.010 (.020)	0.025 (.018)	0.021 (.019)	-0.044 ** (.018)	-0.048 ** (.02)	-0.022 (.022)	-0.025 (.021)
Married	0.091 *** (.024)	0.085 *** (.024)	-0.014 (.026)	-0.034 (.028)	0.005 (.025)	-0.008 (.024)	0.029 (.034)	0.021 (.035)
Muslim	0.025 (.049)	0.021 (.047)	-0.020 (.036)	-0.008 (.036)	0.038 (.046)	0.049 (.046)	-0.042 (.059)	-0.050 (.052)
Household size	0.017 ** (.007)	0.017 *** (.007)	0.011 (.007)	0.012 (.007)	0.013 * (.007)	0.013 * (.007)	0.015 (.010)	0.015 (.010)
Completed primary school	0.027 (.025)	0.029 (.025)	0.015 (.024)	0.011 (.025)	0.021 (.028)	0.022 (.027)	0.024 (.025)	0.017 (.025)
Completed high school	-0.017 (.024)	-0.023 (.025)	-0.057 ** (.026)	-0.066 ** (.026)	0.008 (.026)	-0.006 (.026)	0.028 (.030)	0.015 (.032)
Beyond high school education	0.026 (.032)	0.030 (.034)	-0.016 (.031)	-0.010 (.034)	0.053 * (.032)	0.048 (.033)	0.036 (.075)	0.030 (.082)
Cognitive ability	0.007 (.006)	0.002 (.007)	-0.007 (.007)	-0.010 (.008)	-0.006 (.007)	-0.012 * (.007)	0.005 (.007)	0.003 (.007)
Discount factor		0.076 ** (.030)		0.076 *** (.026)		0.030 (.033)		0.054 * (.032)
Risk averse		-0.037 * (.020)		-0.027 * (.016)		-0.030 (.023)		-0.038 (.024)
Fatalist		0.082 ** (.038)		0.113 *** (.033)		0.065 * (.040)		0.095 ** (.037)
Interested in financial matters		0.121 *** (.026)		0.096 *** (.023)		0.154 *** (.024)		0.070 ** (.033)
Saves enough (self-reported)		0.097 *** (.022)		0.102 *** (.020)		0.108 *** (.024)		0.092 *** (.021)
Village fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	3057	2818	3057	2818	3057	2818	1876	1737

**Web Appendix Table III: Determinants of Participation in Field Experiment**

This table reports household characteristics of households who elected to participate in the randomized experiment, and those who chose not to participate. Household characteristics are from the household survey that was offered prior to the invitation to participate in the study. \*\*\* indicates that the difference is statistically significant at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Non-Participants</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Rural Household	0.55	0.73	0.17 **
Female	0.52	0.53	0.01
Age	41.19	44.85	3.66 **
Married	0.86	0.76	-0.10 ***
Household Size	2.77	2.82	0.05
Attended School	0.90	0.78	-0.12 ***
Log of Consumption Expenditure	17.29	17.15	-0.14
Employed	0.68	0.70	0.02
Own House	0.72	0.77	0.05
Financial Literacy Score	0.48	0.39	-0.09 ***
Cognitive / Math Skills Score	0.79	0.67	-0.12 ***
Consistent Preferences	0.73	0.71	-0.02
Believe Household Saves Enough	0.47	0.35	-0.11 **
Interested in Financial Matters	0.72	0.62	-0.09 **

**Web Appendix Table IV: Long-Run Effects of Financial Literacy Education and Incentives on Opening of Bank Accounts**

This table reports results from a follow-up survey two years after the financial literacy education and incentives intervention, conducted among participants in villages where a household opened a bank account immediately after the intervention. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the respondent opened a bank account within two years of the intervention. The sample includes all households which were successfully interviewed in the follow-up survey. A linear probability model is used. Standard errors, clustered at the village level, are given in parentheses beneath each point estimate. \*\*\* indicates statistical significance at the 1 percent level, \*\* at the 5 percent level, and \* at the 10 percent level.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Financial Literacy Invitation?	0.009 (0.044)	0.021 (0.048)			0.066 (0.074)	0.076 (0.085)
Incentive==75000			0.054 (0.052)	0.06 (0.042)	0.093 (0.068)	0.103 (0.069)
Incentive==125000			0.121 *** (0.046)	0.102 ** (0.043)	0.156 ** (0.061)	0.134 ** (0.065)
(Incentive==75000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.068 (0.111)	-0.074 (0.110)
(Incentive==125000) * Financial Literacy Invitation					-0.061 (0.096)	-0.046 (0.100)
Constant	0.222 *** (0.030)	-1.297 ** (0.519)	0.165 *** (0.033)	-1.25 ** (0.517)	0.128 *** (0.044)	-1.335 ** (0.553)
Household Controls		YES		YES		YES
Observations	349	349	349	349	349	349
R-squared	0.000	0.13	0.014	0.139	0.016	0.142