



Quick Guide to CSA Research

An Overview of Evidence on
Children's Savings Accounts

Fall 2018

Shira Markoff, Rebecca Loya, and Jessica Santos

Introduction and Overview

Children’s Savings Account programs (CSAs) are an increasingly popular strategy to improve children’s educational attainment and long-term economic wellbeing, with benefits starting in early childhood and potentially lasting throughout the life course. The evidence base for CSAs has grown tremendously in recent years, with promising findings on interim and long-term outcomes related to education, health, equity, and economic mobility. Researchers have also begun to examine the effects of different CSA design features on outcomes for children and families. However, these research findings vary in both the type of data used and the strength of the evidence. This guide summarizes current research on CSAs’ effects and outcomes, offering a quick reference to the types of research backing each finding. While this guide is not exhaustive, it aims to give an accurate picture of the evidence base for CSAs today. Part 1 focuses on the interim and long-term effects of CSAs on education, health, equity, and economic mobility. Part 2 examines the effects of CSA design features on participation, savings, and account accumulation.

Table of Contents

Part 1: Effects of CSAs on Education, Health and Wellbeing, Equity, and Economic Mobility

Overview	<u>2</u>
Postsecondary Education	<u>3</u>
Health and Wellbeing	<u>4</u>
Equity	<u>5</u>
Economic Mobility and Financial Capability	<u>6</u>

Part 2: Effects of CSA Design Features on Participation, Savings, and Account Accumulation

Overview	<u>7</u>
Design features	<u>8</u>
References	<u>10</u>

CSA Field Resources

For an overview of how the field is growing, see the [*Timeline of CSAs from 1991-2019*](#)

For more information on current CSA programs see [*The Movement Takes Off: The State of the Children’s Savings Field 2017*](#)

For more information on CSA design, see [*Investing in Dreams: A Blueprint for Designing Children’s Savings Account Programs*](#)

PART 1: Effects of CSAs on Education, Health and Wellbeing, Equity, and Economic Mobility

CSA programs have been associated with positive outcomes for children and parents across a range of domains, including access to and success in postsecondary education; improved health and wellbeing; economic and racial equity, and improved economic mobility and financial capability. This section summarizes the research on the interim and long-term effects in each of these domains. Table 1 offers a visual summary of this section, including the strength of evidence in each domain. The strongest evidence comes from randomized controlled trials, which minimize the risk of bias. Other kinds of evidence include findings from quasi-experimental, qualitative, and survey research; program evaluations; and studies of secondary data, such as national data sets that are not specifically about CSAs.

Table 1. Overview of Effects of CSAs on Education, Health, Equity, and Economic Mobility

Domain	Interim Effects	Long-term Impact
Postsecondary Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Savings for postsecondary education ➤ Parents' educational expectations + Children's educational expectations + Academic achievement 	+ Postsecondary enrollment and completion
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mothers' psychological wellbeing + Positive parenting behaviors + Youth psychological wellbeing ➤ Child development and social-emotional functioning 	⊕ Long-term health outcomes
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Inclusion of low- and moderate-income (LMI) families ➤ Universal, automatic CSAs reduce disparities in account holding and savings + Progressive incentives reduce inequities in college savings + Reduce the college savings gap between poor and non-poor families 	+ Potential to reduce racial wealth gap
Economic Mobility and Financial Capability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Reduced student loan debt ⊕ Workforce development + Increased financial capability ➤ Connections to mainstream financial institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊕ Economic mobility ⊕ Workforce development + Higher savings and account ownership in young adulthood

Strength of Evidence:

Strong Positive Evidence



Strong Negative Evidence



Some Positive Evidence



Some Negative Evidence



Inconclusive/ Not Yet Tested



Postsecondary Education



Interim Effects of CSAs

Savings for Postsecondary Education

- Universal, automatic CSAs increase likelihood of children having college savings accounts and having higher account balances (R¹)
- CSA ownership increases likelihood of parents opening and contributing to their own college savings accounts for their children (R¹)

Parents' Educational Expectations

- Increased expectations for children's postsecondary education (R², Q³)
- Parents place more importance on a college education (Q⁴)
- Increased support for children's academic efforts (Q³)

Children's Educational Expectations

- Participating youth are more likely to plan to attend college (Q⁵)
- Having savings in childhood is correlated with having a college-bound identity (S⁶)

Academic Achievement

- Higher school attendance rates (Q⁵)
- Improvements in academic achievement, such as standardized tests and grades (Q⁷, S⁸)

Long-Term Impact of CSAs

Postsecondary Enrollment and Completion

- No direct research yet on CSA programs' impact on postsecondary outcomes
- Analyses of secondary data (i.e., on general college savings, not CSAs) show:
 - Low-income children with \$1-499 in college savings are three times more likely to enroll in and four times more likely to complete college (S⁹)
 - Among children who expect to go to college, those with a savings account are six times more likely to attend than those with no account (S¹⁰)

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

Health and Wellbeing



Interim Effects of CSAs

Mothers' Psychological Wellbeing

- Decreased symptoms of depression; effect size greater for mothers with lower income and education (R¹¹)
- Effect of CSAs on maternal depression is both direct and mediated by child's social-emotional development (R¹¹)
- Increased "sense of security" and "better outlook" (Q¹²)

Parenting

- Decreased frequency of parents screaming at children (R¹³)
- Among Native Americans, parents whose children have CSAs *may* play with and praise children more than those with no CSAs (R¹³)

Youth Psychological Wellbeing

- Increased sense of security; "able to worry less" (Q¹⁴)
- Youth who saved more had positive effects on self-perception; felt "proud, confident, happy" (Q¹⁴)
- Youth with less savings had lower self-esteem, higher concern and anxiety (Q¹⁴)

Child Development and Social-emotional Functioning

- Increased children's social-emotional functioning, with similar effect size to Early Head Start (R¹¹)
- Having a CSA lessens negative effects of material hardship on child development (R¹⁵)

Long-Term Impact of CSAs

- No direct evidence from CSA programs yet

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

Equity



Interim Effects of CSAs

College Savings Gaps

- In 2013, only 0.3% of households in the bottom half of the wealth distribution had traditional 529 accounts, compared to more than 11% of those in the top five percent (S¹⁶); low income families participate in CSA programs (both opt-in and opt-out) at higher rates than traditional 529 accounts (Q⁷)
- Racial disparities in deposits and account accumulation occur in CSAs, with Latinos, Native Americans, and African Americans falling behind white and Asian participants (Q^{4,17,18})
- By including every child, universal and automatic CSAs reduce racial and income disparities in account holding and savings (R¹⁹)
- Progressive incentives can help reduce inequities; for example, San Francisco K2C's progressive seed deposit helped students in high-poverty schools and low-poverty schools to have equivalent total asset values in their accounts in years 1-3 (Q⁷)
- CSAs reduce the college savings gap between poor and non-poor families (Q⁷)

Racial Wealth Gap

- No direct interim evidence from CSAs yet

Long-Term Impact of CSAs

College Savings Gaps

- No long-term evidence from CSAs yet

Racial Wealth Gap

- Modeling the effect of a national CSA with a large initial deposit shows that a universal, progressive design could close the black/white and Latino/white wealth gaps by 23% and 28%, respectively (S²⁰)
- Modeling the effect of universal, progressive CSAs with matched savings for Illinois predicts black and Latino families would see greater wealth gains; CSAs with these features more likely to close racial wealth gaps (S²¹)

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

Economic Mobility and Financial Capability



Interim Effects of CSAs

Economic Mobility

- Having parental savings for college is associated with lower student loan debt, an important factor in economic wellbeing (S^{22, 52})

Workforce Development

- No direct evidence from CSAs yet

Financial Capability

- Pairing CSAs with financial education is associated with increased financial capability among elementary school students (Q²³)
- Parents whose kids have CSAs save more for kids' futures (Q²⁴)
- CSAs boost connections to mainstream financial institutions (R²⁵, Q²⁶)

Long-Term Impact of CSAs

Economic Mobility

- No direct evidence from CSAs yet

Workforce Development

- No direct evidence from CSAs yet

Financial Capability

- No direct evidence from CSAs yet
- Analysis of secondary data shows that savings account ownership in childhood is associated with increased account ownership and higher savings amounts in young adulthood (S²⁷)

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

PART 2: Effects of CSA Design Features on Participation, Savings, and Account Accumulation

Though all CSA programs share common elements, each program is customized to meet identified local priorities and to work within available resources. As a result, CSA programs have used different enrollment processes, account structures, and financial incentives. This section summarizes the research on how each of several individual design features—enrollment method, account type, initial deposit, savings match, and benchmark incentives—affects the following key outcomes:

- **Participation:** Enrollment of eligible children in the CSA program
- **Savings engagement:** Families’ deposits into their CSAs
- **Account accumulation:** Total account balance, including incentives and savings contributed by families

We also make note of the type of research that supports each finding. The strongest evidence comes from randomized controlled trials, which minimize the risk of bias. Other kinds of evidence derive from quasi-experimental, qualitative, and survey research; program evaluations; and studies of secondary data (e.g., national data sets that are not specifically about CSAs). Table 2, which provides a visual summary of this section, shows that much work remains to fully disentangle the effects of individual design components.

Table 2. Overview of Effects of Design Features on Participation, Savings, and Account Accumulation

Design Features	Effects on Participation	Effects on Savings Engagement	Effects on Account Accumulation
Universal, Automatic Enrollment <i>(compared to opt-in)</i>	+	-	?
Account Type: 529 <i>(compared to savings account)</i>	?	?	+
Initial deposit (seed)	+	+	+
Savings match	+	+	?
Benchmark Incentives	?	?	+

Strength of Evidence:

Strong Positive Evidence



Strong Negative Evidence



Some Positive Evidence



Some Negative Evidence



Inconclusive/
Not Yet Tested



Design Features



Effects on Participation

Universal, Automatic Enrollment

- Key to achieving near-universal participation (R²⁸, Q^{18,29,30})
- Ensures participation by low- and moderate-income families (R²⁸, Q²⁹)

Account Type

529s

- Effects on participation are inconclusive
- Barriers include requiring SSN (or ITIN) for individual accounts, complex paperwork, minimum deposit/fees, and less familiarity in LMI communities (S³¹, Q^{32,33})

Savings accounts

- Familiar to families, but effects on participation not yet determined (Q³⁴)
- Certain types of accounts allow for automatic enrollment without paperwork or SSN (Q³⁵)

Effects on Savings Engagement

- Savings rates generally lower in opt-out programs (8-30%) than in opt-in programs (40-46%) because opt-in participants may enroll if they are able and willing to save. However, opt-out CSAs broadly encourage saving by providing information and incentives to all families (Q⁷)
- CSAs have higher rates of saving by LMI families than regular 529s (Q³⁶⁻³⁸)

- Usually only allow deposit by check, electronic transfer, or payroll deduction, which can be burdensome for low- and moderate-income families (Q³⁰)
- Specific effects on savings engagement, controlling for other factors, have not been tested

- Deposit options include in-person, in cash, which may be more accessible to LMI families (Q³⁴, Q³⁹)
- Specific impact on savings engagement, controlling for other factors, has not been tested

Effects on Account Accumulation

- Impact on account accumulation, controlling for other factors, has not been tested.

- Performance of 529s vary by plan, but overall, 529s generally have significantly higher rate of return than savings accounts, leading to substantially higher account accumulations (S³⁵)

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

Design Features



Effects on Participation

- Motivates families to enroll in program (Q^{40, 45})

Initial Deposit (Seed)

Effects on Savings Engagement

- Families value initial deposit as savings tool (Q⁴⁴)
- No association between seed deposit amount and participant savings (Q⁴⁶)
- Families save more in months after initial deposit (Q⁴⁷)

Effects on Account Accumulation

- Strong positive association between initial deposit and accumulation (R⁵¹, Q⁴⁶)
- Reduces “investment earnings gap” between low- and high-income families (Q⁷)

Savings Match

- Participants are motivated by match (Q⁴¹⁻⁴⁴)
- Higher match rate *may* encourage participation (Q⁴²)

Savings Match

- Motivates continued saving and significantly more deposits (Q⁴⁸)
- Annual matching grant associated with deposits above amount needed to secure match (Q⁴¹)

Match Rate

- Higher match may foster engagement (Q⁴²)

Match Cap (maximum matching dollars that can be earned)

- Small, positive effect on savings (Q⁴⁶)

- Research isolating the impact of savings match on account accumulation is limited
- Higher match cap has a weak, non-significant effect on accumulation (Q¹⁷)

Benchmark Initiatives

- No evidence that benchmark incentives affect enrollment

- Effects on family savings are inconclusive (Q^{34,45,46,49})
- Improves participation in incentivized activity (e.g., signing up for direct deposit) (Q^{34,50})

- Associated with increased account accumulation (Q⁴⁶)

R= Randomized control trials on CSA programs

Q= Quasi-experimental, qualitative (e.g., interviews), surveys, evaluations, and mixed-method studies of CSA programs

S= Analyses of secondary data (i.e., data from nationally representative data set, not a CSA program)

References

1. Beverly, S. D., Clancy, M., & Sherraden, M. (2016). [*Universal accounts at birth: results from SEED for Oklahoma kids*](#). St.Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
2. Kim, Y., Sherraden, M., Huang, J., & Clancy, M. (2015). Child Development Accounts and parental educational expectations for young children: Early evidence from a statewide social experiment. *Social Service Review* 89(1).
3. Hashmi, J. (2014). *Examining the role of parent involvement in college access for low-income students: A mixed methods study of the FUEL Program* [Doctoral dissertation]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Education.
4. Marks, E. L., Rhodes, B., Engelhardt, G., Scheffler, S., & Wallace, I. (2009). [*Building assets: An impact evaluation of the MI SEED Children's Savings Program*](#). Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
5. Long, B. T. (2016). [*The Impact of Parent Engagement on Student Outcomes: Analysis of the FUEL Education Model*](#). Boston, MA: Inversant.
6. Elliott, W., Choi, E. H., Destin, M., & Kim, K. H. (2011). The age old question, which comes first? A simultaneous test of children's savings and children's college-bound identity. *Children and Youth Services Review* 33(7): 1101-1111.
7. Elliott, W. (2018). [*Lessons learned from Children's Savings Account programs: Tools to leverage spending to facilitate saving among low-income families*](#). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center on Assets, Education & Inclusion.
8. Elliott, W., Jung, H., & Friedline, T. (2010). Math achievement and children's savings: Implications for Child Development Accounts. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 31(2): 171-184.
9. Elliott, W., Song, H., & Nam, I. (2013). Small-dollar Children's Savings Accounts and children's college outcomes by income level. *Children and Youth Services Review* 35(3): 560-571.
10. Elliott, W., & Beverly, S. G. (2011). The role of savings and wealth in reducing 'wilt' between expectations and college attendance. *Journal of Children and Poverty* 17(2): 165-185.
11. Huang, J., Sherraden, M., & Purnell, J. Q. (2014). Impacts of Child Development Accounts on maternal depressive symptoms: Evidence from a randomized statewide policy experiment. *Social Science & Medicine* 112: 30-38.
12. Gray, K., Clancy, M., Sherraden, M. S., Wagner, K., & Miller-Cribbs, J. (2012). [*Interviews with mothers of young children in the SEED Oklahoma Kids college savings experiment*](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
13. Nam, Y., Wikoff, N., & Sherraden, M. (2016). Economic intervention and parenting: A randomized experiment of statewide Child Development Accounts. *Research on Social Work Practice* 26(4): 339-349.
14. Scanlon, E., & Adams, D. (2008). Do assets affect well-being? Perceptions of youth in a matched savings program. *Journal of Social Service Research* 35(1): 33-46.
15. Huang, J., Kim, Y., & Sherraden, M. (2017). Material hardship and children's social-emotional development: Testing mitigating effects of Child Development Accounts in a randomized experiment. *Child: Care, Health and Development* 43(1): 89-96.
16. Hannon, S. M., Moore, K. B., Schmeiser, M., & Stefanescu, I. (2016). [*Saving for college and Section 529 plans*](#). FEDS Notes.
17. Mason, L. R., Nam, Y., Clancy, M., Loke, V., & Kim, Y. (2009). [*SEED account monitoring research*](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
18. Elliott, W., Lewis, M., O'Brien, M., Licalsi, C., Brown, L., Tucker, N., & Sorensen, N. (2017). [*Kindergarten to College: Contribution activity and asset accumulation in a universal Children's Savings Account program*](#). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.

19. Beverly, S. G., Kim, Y., Sherraden, M., Nam, Y., & Clancy, M. (2015). Can Child Development Accounts be inclusive? Early evidence from a statewide experiment. *Children and Youth Services Review* 53: 92-104.
20. Sullivan, L., Meschede, T., Shapiro, T. M., Asante-Muhammed, D., & Nieves, E. (2016). [*Equitable investments in the next generation: Designing policies to close the racial wealth gap*](#). Waltham, MA: Institute on Assets and Social Policy and CFED.
21. Buitrago, K., & Mullany, L. (2017). [*Building brighter futures: Children's Savings Accounts in Illinois*](#). Chicago, IL: Heartland Alliance.
22. Elliott, W., Lewis, M., Grinstein-Weiss, M., & Nam, I. (2014). Student loan debt: Can parental college savings help? *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* 96(4): 331-358.
23. Sherraden, M. S., Johnson, L., Guo, B., & Elliott, W. (2011). Financial capability in children: Effects of participation in a school-based financial education and savings program. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 32(3): 385-399.
24. Lewis, M., O'Brien, M., Jones-Layman, A., O'Neil, E. A., & Elliott W. (2017). Saving and educational asset building within a community-driven CSA Program: The case of Promise Indiana. *Poverty & Public Policy* 9(2): 188-208.
25. Huang, J., Nam, Y., & Sherraden, M. S. (2013). Financial knowledge and Child Development Account policy: A test of financial capability. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 47: 1-26.
26. Elliott, W., & Lewis, M. K. (2015). [*Transforming 529s into Children's Savings Accounts \(CSAs\): The Promise Indiana model*](#). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas , Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.
27. Friedline, T. (2014). The independent effects of savings accounts in children's names on their savings outcomes in young adulthood. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* 25(1): 69-89.
28. Beverly, S. D., Sherraden, M., & Clancy, M. (2016). [*The early positive impacts of Child Development Accounts*](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
29. Clancy, M., & Sherraden, M. (2014). [*Automatic deposits for all at birth: Maine's Harold Alford College Challenge*](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
30. Clancy, M., & Beverly, S. (2017). [*Statewide Child Development Account policies: Key design elements*](#). St Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
31. Government Accountability Office [GAO]. (2012). [*Higher education: A small percentage of families save in 529 plans*](#). Washington, D.C.: GAO.
32. Lewis, M. K., Elliott, W., O'Brien, M., Jung, E., Harrington, K., & Jones-Layman, A. (2016). [*Saving and educational asset-building within a community-driven CSA program: The case of Promise Indiana*](#). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.
33. Imboden, B. A. (2012). [*The case for and the design of an incentivized saving program for Massachusetts*](#). Boston, MA: The Boston Foundation.
34. Imboden, B. A., & Shuang, Y. (2015). [*Building a CSA program that empowers families to invest in higher education*](#). Boston, MA: Inversant.
35. Elliott, W., Lewis, M. K., Poore, A., & Clarke, B. (2015). [*Moving toward a policy agenda for improving Children's Savings Account delivery systems*](#). Boston, MA: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.
36. O'Brien, M., Lewis, M., Jung, E., & Elliott, W. (2018). [*Savings patterns and asset accumulation in the Promise Indiana Children's Savings Account \(CSA\) program: 2017 Update*](#). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.
37. O'Brien, M., Lewis, M., Jung, E., & Elliott, W. (2017). [*Harold Alford College Challenge \(HACC\) 2017 savings report for households who opted-in to the program from 2008 to 2013*](#). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.

38. O'Brien, M., Lewis, M., Jung, E., & Elliott, W. (2018). [Savings patterns and asset accumulation in New Mexico's Prosperity Kids Children's Savings Account \(CSA\) program: 2017 Update](#). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.
39. Bevans, J. S., & Chiem, N. (2012). [Saving for higher education in the US: Parents' beliefs, behaviors, and preferences](#). San Francisco, CA: EARN Research Institute.
40. Huang, J., Beverly, S. D., Clancy, M., Lassar, T., & Sherraden, M. (2013). Early program enrollment in a statewide Child Development Account program. *Journal of Policy Practice* 12(1): 62-81.
41. Clancy, M., Han, C.-K., Mason, L. R., & Sherraden, M. (2006). Inclusion in college savings plans: Program features and savings. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Taxation and Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the National Tax Association* 99:385-393.
42. Government of Canada. (2016). [Canada education savings program: Annual statistical review 2015](#). Edmonton, Canada: Employment and Social Development Canada.
43. Lewis, M. K., O'Brien, M., Jung, E., Elliott, W., Harrington, K., & Crawford, M. (2016). [Latino immigrant families saving in Children's Savings Account program against great odds: Prosperity Kids](#). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center on Assets, Education, and Inclusion.
44. Sherraden, M. S., Peters, C., Wagner, K., Guo, B., & Clancy, M. (2013). Contributions of qualitative research to understandings savings for children and youth. *Economics of Education Review* 32: 66-77.
45. Sherraden, M. S., Johnson, L., Elliott, W., Porterfield, S., & Rainford, W. (2007). School-based children's saving accounts for college: The I Can Save program. *Children and Youth Services Review* 29(3): 294-312.
46. Mason, L. R., Nam, Y., Clancy, M., Kim, Y., & Loke, V. (2010). Child Development Accounts and saving for children's future: Do financial incentives matter? *Children and Youth Services Review* 32(11): 1570-1576.
47. Guo, B., Sherraden, M. S., & Johnson, L. (2009). [Seed deposit, match cap, and net savings patterns: An assessment of institutional incentives in the I Can Save Program](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
48. Clancy, M., Han, C.-K., Mason, L. R., & Sherraden, M. (2006). [Inclusion in college savings plans: Participation and saving in Maine's Matching Grant Program](#). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
49. Sherraden, M., & Stevens, J. (2010). [Lessons from SEED, a national demonstration of Child Development Accounts](#). Washington, DC: CFED.
50. Humphrey, L. (2007). [Rewarding savers: Lessons about using "benchmark" incentives to encourage savings](#). *Growing Knowledge from SEED*.
51. Clancy, M., Beverly, S. G., Sherraden, M., & Huang, J. (2016). Testing universal Child Development Accounts: Financial effects in a large social experiment. *Social Service Review* 90(4): 683-708.
52. Fry R. (2014). [Young Adults, Student Debt and Economic Well-Being](#). Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.