

**I4I is hiring! We are looking to recruit a Copy editor (Economics Editing) to join the Editorial Team. The position is based in New Delhi. Application Deadline: 3 April 2016. Details [here](#).**



## How doorstep banking increased savings and income in Sri Lanka

**Posted On:** 30 Mar 2016

**Section:** Columns

**Topics:** Poverty & Inequality

**Tags:** Sri Lanka , banking , financial inclusion

Post Comment

Share [Tweet](#)  
#141



**Michael Callen**

Harvard Kennedy School  
[michael\\_callen@hks.harvard.edu](mailto:michael_callen@hks.harvard.edu)



**Suresh de Mel**

University of Peradeniya  
[sdemel@pdn.ac.lk](mailto:sdemel@pdn.ac.lk)



**Craig McIntosh**

University of California, San Diego  
[ctmcintosh@ucsd.edu](mailto:ctmcintosh@ucsd.edu)



**Christopher Woodruff**

University of Warwick  
[c.woodruff@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:c.woodruff@warwick.ac.uk)

*Recent findings in development economics indicate that microloans are likely to perform best when accompanied by financial education, insurance, and savings products. This column presents evidence from an experiment in Sri Lanka, which involved offering saving accounts with door-to-door deposit collection services to otherwise unbanked rural households. It suggests that the programme incentivised participants to increase savings by increasing their income.*

An emerging consensus in development economics argues that microloans are not likely to transform poor people's lives – and may not even significantly change their financial behaviour. Recent studies have suggested that the most we can ask of microloans is that they provide small improvements in recipients' lives and businesses. As a result, the financial inclusion conversation has started to ask if, instead of credit (or in addition to it) efforts should focus on insurance, financial education, and savings products.

A large-scale experiment our team recently completed in rural Sri Lanka, in line with a number of recent experiments, suggests that such a shift in

focus might be the right move ([Callen, De Mel, McIntosh and Woodruff 2014](#)). We offered savings accounts featuring weekly, door-to-door collection services to a random portion of a sample of otherwise unbanked individuals. We found that the programme dramatically increased savings. Furthermore, the frequency of our data collection allowed us to examine the mechanisms that underlie such an increase. The money did not come from changes in consumption or from giving less money to (or receiving more money from) relatives. Customers increased their savings deposits by increasing their income.

### A move toward savings

While access to formal banking has long been known to improve the lives of the poor by smoothing consumption and providing insurance against shocks, whether and how financial products can actually assist people in rising out of poverty is the subject of much research and intense debate. After the initial promise of microfinance, and its dramatic spread across the developing world, rigorous studies in a variety of contexts have shown that it has little effect on business creation, or on a number of development indicators such as health and women's empowerment ([Duflo et al. 2013](#), [Crépon et al. 2014](#)). A series of studies led by Erica Field and Rohini Pande show that, with contractual innovations, microfinance can have more beneficial effects on entrepreneurship and certain aspects of customers' lives such as social network formation. But they too question the poverty-relieving potential of microloans, especially absent government subsidies.

Meanwhile, providing access to standard savings accounts has consistently shown striking positive impacts on household expenditures ([Dupas and Robinson 2012](#), [Brune et al. 2013](#), [Prina 2013](#), [Schaner 2013](#)). Funding in this field reflects the development community's excitement. The [Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation pledged \\$500 million](#) between 2010 and 2015 to provide savings accounts to the world's poor.

Still, an important question remains: When people begin to use formal savings, what other behaviours in the household change to allow this liquidity to be deposited in a bank?

### Most Read

This Month

All Time

- ▶ **Tuberculosis control in India: More bang for bucks than simply saving lives**  
Ramanan Laxminarayan , Arindam Nandi
- ▶ **Education reform and frontline administrators: A case study from Bihar – II**  
Yamini Aiyar , Vincy Davis , Amrishi Dongre
- ▶ **Unleashing the full potential of India's 'Open Government Data'**

### Popular tags

public finance UID pollution  
China malnutrition  
right to food MNREGA PDS  
democracy monetary policy  
RBI rural India IT  
schooling inflation  
West Bengal Bihar  
cash transfers Bangladesh  
Andhra Pradesh  
manufacturing RTE  
land acquisition healthcare  
gender discrimination  
affirmative action Delhi  
Indian states  
exchange rates  
crime against women  
financial inclusion  
public service delivery cities  
water and sanitation  
inclusive growth GDP  
current account deficit energy  
electricity transport food security  
child health Gujarat  
Maharashtra Uttar Pradesh  
Haryana FDI  
Planning Commission  
fiscal policy

### Twitter Feed

Complicating this puzzle, several rigorous studies on the impact of savings accounts have found a 'magic income' effect – savings and household investment increase almost instantaneously after the customer opens the account, presumably too quickly for the usual explanations to hold.

Our team of researchers aimed to conduct a study with enough detailed data to allow us to provide answers to some of these riddles.

### Savings accounts at your doorstep

In 2008, Sri Lanka's National Savings Bank (NSB) offered a new remote deposit collection service targeted at business owners within one kilometre of the Banks' branches. For our project, they extended the service to rural households. These accounts were free, and bank agents came on motorcycles to collect deposits using wireless point of service (POS) terminals that could issue receipts showing the new account balance. So, customers were presented with a free and user-friendly way to save. Our study sample covered a total of 156 rural zones, randomly divided into treatment (those that received the intervention) and control groups (those that did not receive the intervention), with 389 individuals in the treatment and 406 individuals in the control group.

Starting five months before the savings account collections began and continuing 13 months afterward, we collected detailed high-frequency data on both sets of individuals – those offered the accounts, and those not. These data included income, expenditure, microenterprise, and labour market activity. Our results showed that treatment increased savings: The number of transactions with formal financial institutions per month quadrupled, the flow of savings into bank accounts almost doubled, and overall savings increased by more than 15% per month – about US\$7.

The treatment leads to a statistically significant and economically meaningful increase in total savings by the individual.

So, where did the money come from? While there is some evidence of the 'protection from self' channel (as depositors would have to travel to a branch to withdraw), the main source is a large increase in income. Personal and household income both surged in the months following the introduction of the treatment, by almost 1,000 LKR and 1,200 LKR, respectively per month, or about 5% of average monthly income in our sample. In keeping with the 'magic income' effect, the increase appears rapidly, within a month of being offered the account. This suggests that the mechanism at work was not the ability to make lumpy investments, which would appear over a longer time frame.

### Where, in turn, does the income increase come from?

- For the full sample of participants, we find an insignificant increase in the number of hours worked, but a significant increase in earnings.
- We also find a decrease in the rate of self-employment: just over 52% of households in the treatment group reported being self-employed in round 2; this fraction drops by 3.4 percentage points during the duration of the treatment.

Though this may not seem initially intuitive, it squares perfectly with predictions from standard macroeconomic models of intertemporal labour allocation (see [Blanchard and Fisher 1989](#)). These models suggest that when the effective interest rate changes – in this case by bringing secure formal savings accounts to a family's doorstep – the optimal amount of labour time should increase. Self-employment rates decrease and wage income increases after households gain access to the door-to-door savings accounts. (It is, of course, possible, we should add, that customers may re-invest savings into businesses over the longer run.) What is surprising about our results is that we reject the non-convex lumpy investment model and, yet, still find savings to have a transformative effect on income.

To summarise, after being offered a safe place to save their money, individuals increase their work hours, often at the expense of both their own leisure and investment in their business. While this is likely influenced by the high prevalence of active day labour markets in the study area, it adds a new perspective to the mounting literature on the channels linking new savings opportunities to income.

### Increased savings, formal and informal

One of the other possible sources of liquidity to increase savings is for the client to stop lending to friends and family. This possibility has long troubled financial inclusion practitioners because it could mean that the private benefit of those with a new formal savings account may imply a negative spillover to others within his/her informal network, and hence experiments not capturing this dynamic could lead to incomplete policy recommendations.

To tackle this issue empirically, we designed our experiment and data collection strategy to examine the interplay between our treatment and the rotating savings and credit associations (ROSCAs) in most of the world, and called seetus in Sri Lanka. Our experiment showed that the programme didn't divert subjects' contributions to seetus – surprisingly, it increased participation. Treatment on average increases the number of seetus in which a respondent participates by 0.293 over a base of 2, an increase of more than 10%.

Although these results must be interpreted with some caution, as the number of assignment units is small and the balance not perfect, they do suggest that far from posing a threat to them, bank-driven deposit collecting appears to be fortifying informal savings groups. This increasing participation in informal savings groups removes yet another of the usually cited channels for increased savings; it suggests that the accounts are not functioning as a way to hide savings from family members in this context.

### The power of the product

The results of our study, in line with standard macroeconomic models, suggest that the labour allocation

in wage work. Moreover, we find an increase in the income earned by the self-employed. Given that neither hours worked nor capital employed in the business increase, this suggests that the effort level of the self-employed may have increased.

Also, our results may serve as a balm to the often-burned financial inclusion practitioner. Perhaps the searching and refining is not in vain, and the right product can make a difference. A treatment offering nothing but an additional inducement to generate savings led to large enough increases in income that savings and expenditures both went up at the same time. This suggests that financial service innovation can have a major effect on the incentives for the poor to escape poverty.

A version of this column first appeared on [VoxEU](#).

#### Further Reading

- Banerjee, A, E Duflo, R Glennerster, and CG Kinnan (2013), '[The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation](#)', NBER working paper No. 18950.
- Blanchard, OJ and S Fischer (1989), [Lectures on Macroeconomics](#), MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Brune, L, X Gine, J Goldberg and D Yang (2011), '[Commitments to Save: A Field Experiment in Rural Malawi](#)', World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 5748.
- Callen M, S de Mel, C McIntosh and C Woodruff (2014), '[What are the headwaters of formal savings? Experimental evidence from Sri Lanka](#)', NBER Working Paper No. 20736.
- Crépon, B, F Devoto, E Duflo and W Pariente (2014), '[Estimating the Impact of Microcredit on Those Who Take It Up: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Morocco](#)', NBER Working Paper No. 20144.
- Dupas, P and J Robinson (2013), '[Why Don't the Poor Save More? Evidence from Health Savings Experiments](#)', *The American Economic Review*, 103:4, pp. 1138-1171.
- Feigenberg, B, E Field, R Pande, N Rigol and S Sarkar (2014), "Do Group Dynamics Influence Social Capital Gains among Microfinance Clients? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Urban India", *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(4): 932-949. Available at [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rpande/files/do\\_group\\_dynamics\\_influence\\_social\\_capital\\_gains\\_among\\_microfinance\\_clients\\_6.10.14.pdf?m=1412884196](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rpande/files/do_group_dynamics_influence_social_capital_gains_among_microfinance_clients_6.10.14.pdf?m=1412884196).
- Feigenberg, B, E Field and R Pande (2013), "[The Economic Returns to Social Interaction: Experimental Evidence from Microfinance](#)", *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(4): 1459-1483.
- Field, E, R Pande, J Papp and N Rigol (2013), "[Does the Classic Microfinance Model Discourage Entrepreneurship Among the Poor? Experimental Evidence from India](#)", *The American Economic Review*, 103:6: 2196-2226.
- Prina, S (2013), '[Banking the poor via savings accounts: Evidence from a field experiment](#)', Case Western Reserve University, Weatherhead School of Management Working Paper.
- Schaner, S (2013), '[The Persistent Power of Behavioral Change: Long-Run Impacts of Temporary Savings Subsidies for the Poor](#)', Dartmouth College Working Paper.

#### Readers' Comments

Ideas for India aims to promote more evidence-based policy debates. In keeping with this aim, we welcome analytical comments and responses from our readers.

We do ask, however, that your comments strive to better inform our readers. [Please review our comments policy](#).

#### Add a comment

#### Log in to post this comment



#### or Fill in your details:

<input type="text" value="Name"/>	<input type="text" value="Email"/>
Will be displayed	Will not be displayed
<input type="text" value="Location"/>	
Will be displayed	

Comments (0) Editor's Pick (0)

