In: Advances in Psychology Research, Volume 22
Editor: Serge P. Shohov, pp. 123-136
ISBN 1-59033-652-6

Chapter 8

PERCEPTIONS OF FINANCIAL STABILITY IN RETIREMENT: DO AMERICANS REALLY KNOW WHAT TO EXPECT?

Joy M. Jacobs-Lawson and Douglas A. Hershey
Department of Psychology
Oklahoma State University

ABSTRACT

The majority of research on retirement income has focused on the level of support individuals receive (or can expect to receive) from pension programs, personal savings, and Social Security. This study was designed to complement that line of work by exploring the extent to which demographic factors (age, income gender, and educational background) are related workers' *perceptions* of financial stability in retirement. Results revealed that demographic variables were associated with individuals' perceptions of how difficult it will be to fund their retirement, and perceptions of the importance of income from personal savings, pension plans, Social Security, and family members. Findings are discussed in terms of how perceptions of income are related to income patterns experienced by current retirees. Taken together, the results suggest the need to develop public policy initiatives and tailored retirement intervention programs that meet the needs of subgroups of American workers.

Keywords: Retirement, Income, Perception, Financial

INTRODUCTION

The next 30 years will be a time of great change in the demographic structure of the United States. The number of individuals over the age of 65 is expected to nearly double during the next three decades, which will represent 20 percent of the population (U. S. Social Security Administration, 1997). As a result of this change, a substantially larger proportion of

Americans will be living in retirement than in the past. Although this in itself is not a problem, many of these individuals will find themselves ill-prepared to shoulder the financial burden that will accompany their departure from the workforce. This demographic shift suggests that researchers should begin to more thoroughly investigate the factors that influence retirement planning practices (Hudson, 1994), particularly in light of the significant role financial security plays in contributing to the retirement adjustment process (Coyle, 1990; MacEwen, Barling, Kelloway, & Higginbottom, 1995; Shouksmith, 1983). In this paper, we focus specifically on how demographic variables are related to workers' *perceptions* of financial stability and income in retirement.

It is well established that many workers fail to accumulate adequate savings to support themselves in retirement. For example, nearly 20 percent of Americans between the ages of 60 to 64 live in poverty, due largely to insufficient savings, and this number jumps to 40 percent for individuals 80 to 84 years of age (Lumsdaine, 1996). Consistent with this finding, Poterba (1996) reported that only a small percentage of individuals who reach retirement age have cumulative assets worth at least twice their annual pre-retirement income. These figures imply that a large proportion of workers wait too long to begin saving for old age. It is possible that some individuals have insufficient discretionary income to contribute to a retirement savings vehicle (Poterba, 1996). Another possibility, however, is that individuals may have biased perceptions of how challenging it will be to finance their retirement, as well as unrealistic expectations about how different sources of income will contribute to their future resource stream.

The majority of published studies on retirement income have focused on retirees' *actual* financial stability and the levels of support they receive from various sources. A smaller body of work has concentrated on how much future retirees can expect to receive from sources such as personal savings, job benefits, Social Security, and family members. Our goal was to contribute to this area of the literature by exploring how four demographic variables— age, income, gender, and educational background—are related to individuals' perceptions of how difficult it will be to achieve financial stability in retirement. We also examined how these four variables are related to individuals' perceptions of how important income from personal savings, pension plans, Social Security benefits, and family members will be in terms of financing their retirement.

Before turning to the details of the study, a selective review of the literature on the primary sources of retirement income is provided, highlighting what is known about how actual (not perceived) levels of support are related to age, gender, level of pre-retirement income, and educational attainment.

Personal Savings

Studies have shown that that age, income, gender, and educational level are all systematically related to individuals' saving behaviors. Devaney and Su (1997) reported that there is a tendency for younger individuals to "dissave" by going into debt. Furthermore, Warner (1996) found that among baby boomers, those between the ages of 45 to 51 were saving more than those between the ages of 32 to 41. Younger workers are not only less active savers (Mitchell & Moore, 1998), but they have also been shown to be more anxious about retirement than older workers (Hayslip, Bezerlein, & Nichols, 1997).

One's level of pre-retirement income also has an impact on retirement savings behaviors. Several studies have shown that savings tendencies are positively related to income (Basset, Fleming, & Rodrigues, 1998; Grable & Lytton, 1997; Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998a). Many younger individuals report they lack "extra" money to save for retirement (Devaney & Su, 1997), a finding that is consistent with the significant positive correlation between age and income (Hayslip et al., 1997). Moreover, less-educated individuals (Hayslip et al., 1997) and women (Rix, 1990) typically earn lower pre-retirement salaries than more-educated individuals and men, which limits the likelihood of contributory retirement savings among members of the former two groups. This implies that those with the lowest level of income (and thus, those who are the least likely to save) are young women with limited educational backgrounds. Income has also been linked to participation in employer-sponsored retirement savings programs (Basset et al., 1998; Gale & Scholz, 1994). Specifically, Francis (1998) found that those in lower income brackets can expect to receive minimal support from 401(k) plans, whereas those in the highest brackets can expect to receive substantial support from this source.

Studies on gender differences in retirement planning reveal that men are typically financially better prepared to leave the workforce than women (Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998a; 1998b). Beyond the economic factors that contribute to gender differences in savings, different psychological accounts have been advanced to explain why women are more poorly prepared. Specifically, compared to men, women tend to tolerate less risk when making financial decisions (Powell & Ansic, 1997; Sudin & Surette, 1998), and view the task of retirement planning as less important (Kragie, Gerstein, & Lichtman. 1989). Furthermore, it has been suggested that women often view financial planning as being a male's responsibility (Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998b).

Pension Plans

Wiatrowski (1993) estimated that the percentage of Americans supported by pension plans will increase from 55 percent in 1988, to 88 percent by the year 2018. This increase in coverage would appear to be a positive step toward improving the financial stability of many future retirees. It is important to note, however, that this predicted change in coverage is not because there will be an increase in the absolute number of pension programs available. Rather, the change will be due to an increase in coverage from existing pension programs as a result of an influx of women entering the workforce during that 30-year period (Wiatrowski, 1993). Because defined benefit pension programs typically determine payouts based on pre-retirement income levels and length of employment, individuals who change jobs (Wiatrowski, 1993) or have discontinuous work histories (Rix, 1990) can expect to receive smaller benefits. Therefore, women covered by these types of plans can expect to receive less in the way of pension income as compared to men, due to their lower pre-retirement earning levels and more discontinuous work histories (Talaga & Beehr, 1995). It has also been shown that income and educational level are related to the availability of employer-sponsored pension plans, as well as participation rates in those plans (Basset et al., 1998; Gale & Scholz, 1994; Grable & Lytton, 1997).

Social Security

Currently, most retirees receive more income from Social Security than from any other source (Kleinman, Anandarajan, & Lawrence, 1999). However, some segments of the population tend to be more dependent on Social Security than others. Devaney and Su (1997) reported that those most likely to depend on Social Security as a primary means of support are individuals who: (a) are older, (b) possess a high school education or less, and (c) have lower than average pre-retirement incomes. It is also clear that women are more likely to be dependent on Social Security as compared to men. In their review of the literature, Devaney and Su (1997) found that retired women received 57.2 percent of their income from Social Security, whereas men received 36.6 percent of their income from this source. Although women receive a greater proportion of their retirement income from Social Security than men, they receive less in the way of monthly benefits. As was the case with pensions, the lower level of Social Security benefits earned by women has been attributed to lower pay scales over the history of their careers, and often interrupted or intermittent work patterns (Block, 1984; Rix, 1990).

Support from Family Members

A source of retirement income that is often overlooked is support derived from children or other family members (Liebig, 1984). According to Kotlikoff and Morris (1989), 3.3 percent of retirees received regularly monthly assistance from their children; however, this number increased to 4.3 percent among retirees who were classified as very poor. These findings are consistent with other studies that have shown 3 to 4 percent of adult children provide financial assistance to their aged parents on a regular basis (Ferraro & Su, 1999). Indeed, relatively few retirees depend on resources from family members as a significant source of income.

Present Study

The above literature review indicates that demographic variables such as age, income, gender, and educational level are associated with individuals' *actual* retirement earnings. The present study extends this body of work by exploring the extent to which these same four demographic variables are related to workers' *perceptions* of income and financial stability in late life. From an applied perspective, understanding demographic differences in perceptions of future income should be informative not only to individuals who formulate public policy initiatives, but also for those who design retirement planning intervention programs. More will be said about these areas in the discussion section, below. This study also stands to make a theoretical contribution to the literature on retirement finances, which should make the findings useful for those who develop psychological models of financial planning (c.f., Grable, 2000; Hershey & Mowen, 2000). Specifically, the results of this investigation should help to reveal which segments of the population anticipate difficulties in making financial preparations for the future, and serve to clarify whether those perceptions are warranted in

light of previously published findings on the relationship between demographic indicators and retirement income.

METHOD

Participants

Respondents were randomly sampled as part of a large-scale national data collection effort.[1] The sample contained 1002 adults, including 550 men and 452 women, each of whom agreed to participate in a 30-minute telephone survey on health, retirement, and quality of life. The age range of the sample was 18-64 years (M = 37.8, SD = 11.1), the mean educational level was 14.0 years (SD = 2.3), and the average level of household income was \$46K (SD = \$31K). All respondents were employed at the time of testing.

Measurement Instrument

The five questions used in this study were drawn from a substantially larger pool of items that focused on issues related to health, retirement, and quality of life. The questions were as follows: (a) How difficult will it be for you to have enough money in retirement? (b) How much will income from personal savings help to fund your retirement? (c) How much will income from job benefits, such as pension plans, help to fund your retirement? (d) How much will income from Social Security help to fund your retirement? and (e) How much will income from family members help to fund your retirement? The response format for each item was based on a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all; 4 = a lot).

As indicated above, the independent variables in this study were age, current household income, gender, and educational level. For analysis purposes, age, income, and educational level were treated as dichotomous indicators. On the basis of their age, participants were either classified as distant pre-retirees (DPRs, age 18-41, n = 622) or near pre-retirees (NPRs, age 42-64, n = 380) on the basis of their age. Self-reported annual earnings were used to classify individuals as either low-income (less than \$40k per year, n = 493) or high-income (\$40k or more per year, n = 509). The educational attainment variable was used to classify individuals into those that were less educated (12 years of education or less, n = 353) and those who were more educated (completed at least some college, n = 649).

[1] Princeton Survey Research Associates collected these data on behalf of the Americans Discuss Social Security (ADSS) organization. ADSS, which is no longer in existence, was an advocacy group whose goal was to advance the public discussion of retirement issues in the United States. The data were collected using a random digit telephone methodology, and efforts were made to ensure an equal representation of respondents from across the nation.

RESULTS

A separate 2 (age) x 2 (gender) x 2 (income) x 2 (educational level) full-factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) model was calculated for each of the five survey items. This allowed for the examination of all possible main effects and higher-order interactions. Because each four-way ANOVA resulted in a rather large number of effects, in order to be clear and concise, mean scores and standard deviations are only reported in text for those outcomes that were statistically significant. *F*-scores, degrees of freedom, and *p*-values associated with each of the five ANOVAS are shown in the table; again non-significant outcomes were omitted in order to sharpen the focus of the findings.

Table: F-Ratios for Significant Main Effects and Interactions for Each of the Five ANOVAs.

Survey Question	*F*-Ratio	df
How difficult will it be for you to have enough money in retirement?		
Gender	12.28**	1, 983
Income	38.51**	1, 983
Education	33.56**	1, 983
Gender x Education	4.19*	1, 983
How much will income from personal savings help to fund your retirement?		
Age	15.87**	1, 986
Gender	5.74*	1, 986
Income	28.37**	1, 986
Age x Income	4.37*	1,986
How much will income from job benefits, such asPensions help to fund your retirement?		
Income	6.31*	1, 984
How much will income from Social Security help to fund your retirement?		
Age	29.08**	1, 983
Income	11.35**	1, 983
Education	16.15**	1, 983
How much will income received from family members help to fund your retirement?		
Age	6.54**	1, 983
Income	27.63**	1, 983

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

We first examined responses to the question: How difficult will it be for you to have enough money in retirement? Larger scores on this variable are associated with greater perceived levels of future financial difficulties. This analysis revealed statistically significant main effects for gender, income, and educational level (see Table). Findings revealed that women ($M = 2.63$, $SD = .88$) anticipated greater difficulties securing future retirement income than men ($M = 2.40$, $SD = .91$); low-income respondents ($M = 2.75$, $SD = .90$) anticipated

greater difficulties than high-income respondents (M = 2.27, SD = .85); and those with lower levels of education (M = 2.82, SD = .90) anticipated greater difficulties than those with higher levels of education (M = 2.34, SD = .87). In addition to these three main effects, the analysis revealed a significant two-way interaction between gender and education. A simple main effects analysis following from this interaction revealed that the mean score for less-educated women (M = 3.03, SD = .85) was significantly larger than the mean for less-educated men (M = 2.66, SD = .91). Similarly, the mean score for more-educated women (M = 2.44, SD = .84) was significantly larger than that of more-educated men (M = 2.25, SD = .88). The statistical significance of both simple main effects reveals that the difference between less-educated men and women (M_{diff} = 0.37) was larger than the difference between more-educated men and women (M_{diff} = 0.19).

The next analysis investigated differences in the perceived importance of personal savings as a means of ensuring late-life solvency. This ANOVA revealed statistically significant main effects for age, gender, and income, as well as a two-way interaction between age and income (see Table). Specifically, DPRs (M = 3.46, SD = .78) expected personal savings would be a more important source of retirement income than NPRs (M = 3.28, SD = .88); men (M = 3.46, SD = .79) anticipated personal savings would be more important than women (M = 3.31, SD = .86); and high-income individuals (M = 3.52, SD = .75) considered personal savings to be more important than low-income respondents (M = 3.26, SD = .88). To isolate the source of the two-way interaction between age and income, simple main effect analyses were conducted. These analyses revealed that the mean for high-income DPRs (M = 3.60, SD = .72) was significantly larger than the mean for low-income DPRs (M = 3.37, SD = .82) and the mean for high-income NPRs (M = 3.44, SD = .78) was significantly larger than the mean for low-income NPRs (M = 2.96, SD = .96). The two statistically significant simple main effects suggest that the difference between high and low income DPRs (M_{diff} = 0.23) was smaller than the difference between high and low income NPRs (M_{diff} = 0.48).

The analysis regarding the perceived importance of future pension benefits as a source of retirement income revealed only one statistically reliable main effect and no significant interactions (see Table). This finding revealed that low-income individuals (M = 2.92, SD = .94) perceived job benefits would be a less important source of retirement income than high-income individuals (M = 3.04, SD = .95).

Analysis of the perceived importance of future Social Security benefits revealed statistically significant main effects for age, income, and education. All interactions failed to obtain (see Table). NPRs (M = 2.39, SD = .82) anticipated that income from Social Security would be more important than DPRs (M = 2.04, SD = .87); low-income individuals (M = 2.25, SD = .92) expected Social Security to be more important than high-income individuals (M = 2.09, SD = .81); and less-educated respondents (M = 2.36, SD = .89) anticipated Social Security would be more important than those with higher levels of education (M = 2.07, SD = .84).

The final analysis, which examined the perceived importance of retirement income from family members, revealed significant main effects for age and income, and no significant interactions (see Table). It was found that DPRs (M = 1.83, SD =. 94) expected that income from family members would be more important than NPRs (M = 1.56, SD = .88); and low-income individuals (M = 1.94, SD = .98) anticipated resources from family would be more important than high-income respondents (M = 1.52, SD = .81).

DISCUSSION

The findings presented above reveal clear relationships between the four demographic variables under study and perceptions of financial stability in retirement. Not only do certain segments of the population differentially expect to encounter greater difficulty in funding their retirement, but perceptions of the importance of various future income sources differed as well.

Women, low-income respondents, and less-educated individuals perceived having sufficient funds in retirement to be more difficult than men, individuals with higher incomes, and respondents with higher levels of education. Furthermore, the interaction between gender and education revealed that less-educated women perceived the prospect of funding their retirement as more difficult than any other group and highly educated men perceived the least difficulty in this regard. The fact that low-income individuals perceived greater difficulty in accumulating sufficient retirement resources is not surprising, as members of this group would be the least likely to establish a life-long pattern of savings (Basset et al. 1998; Grable & Lytton, 1997). Similarly, less educated members of the workforce earn disproportionately lower wages (U. S. Census Bureau, 1999), and therefore, they too would be less likely to cultivate a sufficient resource base.

The reasons why women perceived greater difficulty than men in financing their retirement are complex, and likely stem from both economic and psychological factors. Certainly, women's perceptions are driven in part by economic considerations, in that they can expect to see a lower pattern of earnings over the course of their working lives than men (Rix, 1990). However, psychological factors may have also contributed to women's more negative perceptions of late life financial security. Houlihan and Caraballo (1990) found that financial stability in the post-retirement years is the most frequently cited concern of women between 40-60 years of age (see also Hershey, Brown, Jacobs, & Jackson, 2001 on this point). Certainly, some of this concern stems from the unique social and emotional issues women face during midlife, such as shifting family relationships, role changes, and economic pressures (Hayes, 1990; Szinovacz, 1991). Furthermore, many women view retirement planning as less important than men (Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998b), and women have greater concerns regarding caregiving responsibilities for both elders and children (Houlihan & Caraballo, 1990) which are likely to further drain already limited resources. Additionally, many women report that they lack a clear understanding of the financial aspects of retirement preparation (Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998a; 1998b). In this study, it was found that more-educated women expected less difficulty in funding their retirement than women with lower levels of education. This effect could presumably be explained, in part by the fact that women with higher levels of education would be more likely to work in positions that offer retirement benefits, and thus, they would have had greater exposure to the topic of financial planning in general. It is clear to see how these psychosocial and economic considerations, combined with a lack of meaningful gender appropriate pre-retirement counseling opportunities (Richardson, 1993), could result in women having a more pessimistic view of late life financial security.

Many of the same gender and income related issues raised in relation to the financial security question help to explain the effects identified in the second research question. The second question asked respondents to rate the importance of personal savings as a future

source of retirement income. The fact that women and low-income individuals tend to be less financially prepared for retirement (Rix, 1990), and receive less in the way of income from personal savings (Francis, 1998), helps to explain why both groups perceived personal savings as a less important source of income than men and high-income respondents. There was also a main effect of age for this question, which may have been driven partially by recent public debates regarding the future solvency of the Social Security system. That is, DPRs' perceptions of the importance of personal savings may have been greater than that of NPRs' based on the impression that the Social Security system will collapse or be unable to provide adequate levels of support when they retire. Interestingly, this effect fails to complement findings regarding actual savings behaviors, in which younger persons have been shown to be less likely to save than workers who are closer to retirement (Devaney & Su, 1997; Mitchell & Moore, 1998; Warner, 1996).

The observed main effects of age and income for the personal savings question, however, should properly be considered in light of the significant age by income interaction. High-income DPRs anticipated income from personal savings would be more important than high-income NPRs, low-income DPRs, and low-income NPRs. Across groups, low-income NPRs perceived personal savings to be least important. Logically, it would seem that NPRs should perceive savings to be more important than DPRs, because the former are more likely to be active savers. However, low-income individuals nearing retirement age may view personal resources as less important than members of the other groups because they may have little in the way of disposable income to allocate toward savings. Thus, most low-income NPRs are aware that they can not depend on a substantial portion of their post-employment income to come from this source. It was also interesting and in some ways troubling to find that high-income DPRs are aware of the importance of saving for retirement (as indicated by their high ratings for this question), given that they are at a stage of life where many of them are dissaving (Devaney & Su, 1997). This discrepancy between the perceived importance of personal savings by members of this group, and a weak or non-existent pattern of actual retirement savings behaviors, could lead to cognitive dissonance and the onset of what has been referred to as retirement anxiety (Hayslip et al., 1997).

The third research question asked respondents to judge the importance of employer pensions as a source of retirement income. As pointed out in the literature review, working men are likely to receive more income from pensions than working women. In light of this fact, we were surprised to find that there were no significant gender differences in perceptions of the importance of post-employment pension benefits. Furthermore, educational level was found to be unrelated to the perceived importance of pension benefits, and none of the higher-order interactions for this question were found to obtain. The only statistically significant finding for this question revealed that high-income individuals expected pension benefits would be more important than low-income individuals. Presumably, this was due to the fact that a disproportionate number of high-income individuals work in positions that carry pension programs (Bassett et al., 1998; Gale & Scholz, 1994; Grable & Lytton, 1997), thus contributing to the perception that employer benefits will constitute a significant source of support.

The fourth research question queried respondents about the role of Social Security as a source of retirement income. Perceptions regarding the importance of future Social Security benefits were strikingly similar to findings regarding actual funding patterns reported in previous studies. For instance, Devaney and Su (1997) pointed out that less-educated

individuals and those with lower pre-retirement incomes are among those who are the most likely to depend on Social Security. This study revealed that individuals with lower incomes and lower levels of education perceived Social Security to be more important than respondents with higher incomes and higher levels of education. We did not, however, find gender differences in perceptions of the importance of Social Security benefits, which is contrary to Block's (1984) and Rix's (1990) assertion that women are more dependent on this source of income than men. The main effect of age for this question, in which NPRs viewed income from Social Security as more important than DPRs, nicely parallels the finding reported above that DPRs expect personal savings to play a more important role in financing their retirement. Again, we suspect that DPRs' pessimism regarding the importance of Social Security benefits was influenced by recent discussions about the solvency of the federal support program.

As indicated in the introduction, very few retirees actually receive retirement income from family members. However, the data revealed that age and income were both related to participants' responses to the family support item. Specifically, low-income individuals and DPRs viewed the prospect of support from family members as appreciably more important than high-income individuals and NPRs. The fact that low income workers perceived income from family members as more important than high-income workers is not particularly surprising, given that individuals with low incomes are less likely to have accumulated personal savings (Basset et al. 1998), less likely to have a pension plan (Grable & Lytton, 1997), and more likely to rely on Social Security benefits (Devaney & Su, 1997). This suggests that individuals with low pre-retirement incomes are at a greater risk of experiencing poverty in old age, and thus, may have to rely on financial support from family members in order to make ends meet (Kotlikoff & Morris, 1989). The fact that DPRs indicated support from family members would conceivably be more important than NPRs could be rooted in the fact the DPRs are less likely to have saved for retirement, thus leading to the perception that they will have to rely on others. However, given that most retirees do not receive monetary support from family, this could be an unrealistic expectation.

These findings may offer some explanation as to why many financial intervention programs are generally ineffective. The majority of financial education programs employ a one-size-fits-all approach to intervention, failing to take into account how different segments of the population perceive the retirement planning process. Many programs promote personal savings as the key to financial solvency (Jones, Manion, & McIntire, 1983; Kamouri & Cavanaugh, 1986; Shouksmith, 1983); however, this is often not a viable solution, particularly for individuals at the lower end of the income spectrum. The fact that the financial education needs of many workers are not adequately being met (Siegel & Rees, 1992) has lead some researchers to call for the development of tailored intervention programs (Glass & Kilpatrick, 1998a; 1998b; Hershey & Mowen, 2000; Richardson, 1993) that address the unique needs of individuals with differing demographic backgrounds and psychological profiles.

The results of this study strongly suggest that tailored financial interventions are warranted. Specifically, customized programs should be developed to address the needs of low-income individuals, women, younger workers, and those with limited educational backgrounds. We believe that targeted interventions should be made a top educational priority, as members of these groups collectively represent a large majority of those who will fall below the poverty level during retirement. Interventions designed for members of

historically low-income groups should stress, among other things, postponement of departure from the workforce beyond the normal retirement age. This would help to balance resources against expenditures in two ways—by allowing for extra time to accumulate savings and by reducing the total number of years spent in retirement (thus, helping to reduce the requisite resource base).

The first National Summit on Retirement Savings was recently held in Washington D.C. (U.S. Department of Labor, 1998). The purpose of this policy forum was to gather individuals from the public and private sectors to discuss barriers to retirement planning, and offer solutions as to how those barriers might be overcome. One of the most commonly identified barriers was a lack of understanding on the part of individuals about the importance of saving for retirement. It was suggested, however, that this obstacle could be surmounted by increasing educational efforts designed to promote financial literacy, and by developing public policy initiatives that would promote personal savings practices. Proposed initiatives included (a) implementing new programs that would provide tax breaks for savings, (b) stimulating the private sector to encourage employees to save, (c) educating school children about the importance of saving for late-life, and (d) encouraging the media to focus on saving rather than spending.

The findings from this study suggest that each of the initiatives outlined above should be selectively targeted toward particular segments of the population in order to have a maximal impact on individuals' perceptions and savings behaviors. For example, differential tax incentives could be offered to savers in lower income brackets, workplace retirement education programs could be designed to address the special issues faced by women, and public service announcements and informational broadcasts could be aimed at younger individuals or those with lower levels of education. We firmly believe that targeted retirement planning communications and tailored educational programs promise to be more effective than current intervention efforts. Unfortunately, all too often American workers are treated as though they hold a common set of perceptions and motives when it comes to financial planning for retirement. However, the findings from the present study clearly suggest otherwise.

REFERENCES

Bassett, W. F., Fleming, M. J., & Rodrigues, A. (1998). How workers use 401(k) plans: The participation, contribution, and withdrawal decisions. *National Tax Journal, 51,* 263-289.

Block, M. R. (1984). Retirement preparation needs of women. In H. Dennis (Ed.), *Retirement preparation: What retirement specialists need to know* (pp. 35-41). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Coyle, J. M. (1990). Understanding female retirement: Future research needs. In C. Hayes and J. M. Deren (Eds.), *Pre-retirement planning for women: Program design and research* (pp. 151-162). New York: Springer.

Devaney, S. A. & Su, Y. (1997). Factors predicting the most important source of retirement income. *Compensation and Working Conditions, 2,* 25-31.

Ferraro, K. F. & Su,Y. (1999). Financial strain, social relations, and psychological distress among older people: A cross-cultural analysis. *Journals of Gerontology, 54B,* S3-S15.

Francis, D. (1998). Retirement assets will come largely from 401K plans. *The National Bureau of Economic Research*, 2.

Gale, W. G., & Scholz, J. K. (1994). IRA's and household saving. *The American Economic Review, 84,* 1233-1260.

Glass, J. C. & Kilpatrick, B. B. (1998a). Gender comparisons of baby boomers and financial preparation for retirement. *Educational Gerontology, 24,* 719-745.

Glass, J. C. & Kilpatrick, B. B. (1998b). Financial planning for retirement: An imperative for baby boomer women. *Educational Gerontology, 24,* 595-617.

Grable, J. E. (2000). Financial risk tolerance and additional factors that affect risk taking in everyday money matters. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14,* 625-630.

Grable, J. E., & Lytton, R. H. (1997). Determinates of retirement savings plan participation: A discriminant analysis. *Personal Finances and Worker Productivity, 1,* 184-189.

Hayslip, B., Bezerlein, M., & Nichols, J. (1997). Assessing anxiety about retirement: The case of academicians. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 44,* 15-36.

Hayes, C. L. (1990). Social and emotional issues facing midlife women: The important role of pre-retirement planning. In C. L. Hayes and J. M. Deren (Eds.), *Pre-retirement planning for women: Program design and research* (pp. 27-40). New York: Springer.

Hershey, D. A., Brown, C. A., Jacobs-Lawson, J. M., & Jackson, J. (2001). Retirees' perceptions of important retirement decisions. *The Southwestern Journal on Aging, 16,* 91-100.

Hershey, D. A. & Mowen, J. C. (2000). Psychological determinants of financial preparedness for retirement. *The Gerontologist, 40,* 687-697.

Houlihan, P. & Caraballo, E. (1990). Women and retirement planning: The development of Future Connections, Inc. In C. L. Hayes and J. M. Deren (Eds.), *Pre-retirement planning for women: Program design and research* (pp. 63-76). New York: Springer.

Hudson, R. B. (1994). The "graying" of the federal budget revisited. In D. Shenk and A. Achembaum (Eds.), *Changing perceptions of aging and the aged* (pp. 145-153). New York: Springer.

Jones, H. R., Manion, U. V., & McIntire, R. H. (1983). Developing community retirement planning services: An intervention technique. *Aging & Work, 6,* 291-300.

Kamouri, A. & Cavanaugh, J. C. (1986). The impact of pre-retirement education programs on workers' preretirement socialization. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 7,* 245-256.

Klienman, G., Anandarajan, A., & Lawrence, K. (1999). An analysis of the move towards defined contribution pension plans: Are the rewards commensurate with the risks? *Journal of Pension Planning and Compliance, 25,* 61-89.

Kotlikoff, L. J. & Morris, J. N. (1989). How much care do the aged receive from their children? A bimodal picture of contact and assistance. In D. Wise (Ed.), *The Economics of aging* (pp. 151-157). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kragie, E. R., Gerstein, M., & Lichtman, M. (1989). Do Americans plan for retirement? Some recent trends. *Career Development Quarterly, 37,* 232-239.

Liebig, P. S. (1984). The three-legged stool of retirement income. In H. Dennis (Ed.), *Retirement preparation: What retirement specialists need to know* (pp. 35-41). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Lumsdaine, R. L. (1996). Factors affecting labor supply decisions and retirement income. In E. A. Hanyshek and N. L. Maritato (Eds.), *Assessing knowledge of retirement behavior* (pp. 69-122). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

MacEwen, K. E., Barling, J. A., Kelloway, E. K., & Higginbottom, S. F. (1995). Predicting retirement anxiety: The roles of parental socialization and personal planning. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135,* 203-313.

Mitchell, O. S., & Moore, J. F. (1998). Can Americans afford to retire? New evidence on retirement savings adequacy. *The Journal of Risk Insurance, 65,* 371-400.

Poterba, J. M. (1996). Personal saving behavior and retirement income modeling: A research assessment. In E. A. Hanushek and N. L. Maritato (Eds.), *Assessing knowledge of retirement behavior* (pp. 123-148). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Powell, M. & Ansic, D. (1997). Gender differences in risk behavior in financial decision making: An experimental analysis. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 18,* 605-628.

Richardson, V. E. (1993). Retirement counseling: A handbook for gerontology practitioners. New York: Springer.

Rix, S. E. (1990). Who pays for what? Ensuring financial security in retirement. In C. Hayes and J. M. Deren (Eds.), *Pre-retirement planning for women: Program design and research* (pp. 5-26). New York: Springer.

Shouksmith, G. (1983). Changes in attitude to retirement following a short pre-retirement planning seminar. *The Journal of Psychology, 114,* 3-7.

Siegel, S. R. & Rees, B. Y. (1992). Preparing the public employee for retirement. *Public Personnel Management, 21,* 89-100.

Sudin, A. E. & Surette, B. J. (1998). Gender differences in the allocation of assets in retirement savings plans. *The American Economic Review, 88,* 207-211.

Szinovacz, M. (1991). Women and retirement. In B. B. Hess and E. W. Markson (Eds.), *Growing Old in America (4th ed.)* (pp. 293-303). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Talaga, J. & Beehr, T. (1995). Are there age differences in predicting retirement decisions? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 16-28.

United States Census Bureau. (1999). *Money income in the United States: Current population reports, consumer income 1998.* Report P60-206, U. S. Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Labor. (1998). *The National summit on retirement savings* (White House Conference Final Report). Internet Document: http://www.dol.gov/dol/pwba.

United States Social Security Administration. (1997). *Social security area population projections; 1997.* Actuarial Study # 112.

Warner, B. (1996). I miss Ike. *Brandweek, 37,* 20-23.

Wiatrowski, W. (1993). Factors affecting retirement income. *Monthly Labor Review, 116,* 25-35.

AUTHOR NOTES

We are indebted to Chris Condelusi with the Americans Discuss Social Security organization for his generosity in providing the dataset used in this study. We also acknowledge Kirstan A. Neukam and Adam L. Lawson for comments on an earlier draft of

this paper. Address correspondence to: Douglas A. Hershey, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078, or via email at hershey@okstate.edu.