University of Groningen

Dispositional optimism and stock investments

Angelini, Viola; Cavapozzi, D.

Published in:
Journal of Economic Psychology

DOI:
[10.1016/j.joep.2017.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.01.006)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Angelini, V., & Cavapozzi, D. (2017). Dispositional optimism and stock investments. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 59, 113-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.01.006>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Dispositional optimism and stock investments

Viola Angelini^{a,b}, Danilo Cavapozzi^{c,b,*}

^a University of Groningen, Faculty of Economics and Business, Economics, Econometrics and Finance, Nettelbosje 2, 9747AE Groningen, The Netherlands

^b Netspar, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands

^c Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Department of Economics, Fondamenta San Giobbe, Cannaregio 873, 30121 Venezia, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 September 2015

Received in revised form 6 December 2016

Accepted 23 January 2017

Available online 21 February 2017

JEL classification:

D14

G02

G11

Keywords:

Dispositional optimism

Household finance

Saving behavior

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the relationship between dispositional optimism and stock investments, controlling for cognitive skills and personality traits such as trust, social interactions and risk aversion. We use data from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) on investors aged 50+ in twelve European countries. Our results show that dispositional optimism and personality matter for financial decisions. Optimism is positively and significantly related to both the ownership of stocks and the share of gross financial wealth invested in these assets and its role is especially relevant for risk tolerant investors and investors with little trust in others.

© 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Population ageing and increasing longevity imply that individuals must make careful and skillful use of financial resources, which should support their consumption over a much longer retirement period than a few decades ago. Therefore, understanding how older individuals make their financial and investment decisions is a question of central importance for economists and policy makers. Although there is a growing literature showing that individual investment decisions are affected by behavioral and personality traits, only few empirical studies analyze the role that these factors play in the portfolio decisions of older individuals.

In this paper we use data from the second wave of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) to investigate how portfolio decisions of older Europeans are affected by dispositional optimism, defined as having generalized positive expectations regarding future events (Scheier & Carver, 1985). From an empirical point of view, one of the key issues is how to measure dispositional optimism in the population. Puri and Robinson (2007) draw data from the US Survey of Consumer Finances to develop a novel indicator of dispositional optimism based on the difference between self-reported life-expectancy and that implied by actuarial life-tables. They use this index of life-expectancy miscalibration to investigate the relationship between optimism and a wide range of economic outcomes, including investment behavior. They find that optimism is significantly and positively related to the participation in the equity market and the amount of wealth invested in stocks, even controlling for health and socio-economic status.

* Corresponding author at: Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Department of Economics, Fondamenta San Giobbe, Cannaregio 873, 30121 Venezia, Italy.
E-mail addresses: v.angelini@rug.nl (V. Angelini), danilo.cavapozzi@unive.it (D. Cavapozzi).

We study the relationship between optimism and financial behavior for a sample of older individuals (aged 50+) living in twelve European countries by focusing both on the ownership and the share of financial wealth invested in stocks. We use the same approach as in [Puri and Robinson \(2007\)](#) to measure optimism but we extend their contribution along three important dimensions. First, we explicitly control for cognitive skills. Individuals endowed with higher cognitive skills might be better able to estimate their survival probability. Hence, some of the sample variability in the life-expectancy miscalibration index might be due to heterogeneity in cognitive functioning rather than to expectations regarding the future. At the same time, cognitive skills are also related to financial market participation. [Christelis, Jappelli, and Padula \(2010\)](#) find that cognitive abilities have a positive and significant effect on the probability of investing in information-intensive assets, such as stocks, which have a higher degree of sophistication and whose proper use requires higher abilities to process contextual information related to financial markets. Therefore, not controlling for cognitive functioning might bias the results. Second, we take advantage of the richness of the SHARE data to control for three additional personality traits that have been proven to be relevant predictors of financial behavior: trust, social interactions, and risk aversion (see [Campbell, 2006](#); [Guiso, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2008](#); [Hong, Kubik, & Stein, 2004](#)). As these factors are also related to the optimism of investors, our approach allows us to disentangle the role played in shaping financial decisions by having positive expectations about the future (dispositional optimism) from that played by the trust of investors about the reliability and the fairness of financial markets, their propensity to establish social interactions with other people and their willingness to take financial risks. Our findings show that taking into account these additional personality traits substantially decreases but does not nullify the effect of optimism on stock market participation. While on average optimism seems to encourage risk taking behavior, risk aversion, low levels of trust and not having social interaction discourage it. Third, we also analyze the interplay between dispositional optimism and the other personality traits in explaining financial behavior. We find that optimism matters especially for risk tolerant investors, while risk averse individuals are in general unlikely to invest in stocks independently of whether they are very pessimistic or very optimistic. In addition, having positive expectations about the future encourages stock investments of individuals with no or little trust in other people. The effect of optimism does not vary instead with the level of social interaction. Overall, our results suggest that the behavioral characteristics of individuals, such as personality and preferences, play an important role in explaining financial decisions. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the data and the definition of the main variables of interest in our analysis. Section 3 explains the empirical strategy adopted and our findings. Finally, Section 4 concludes.

2. Data

In this paper we use data from the second wave of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE).¹ SHARE collects extensive information on current demographics, health, employment, income, assets, social activities and expectations of individuals aged 50 and over living in several European countries, ranging from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. Our sample includes 17,450 households. For each household we selected the financial respondent, who is the person in charge of answering the financial and asset questions on behalf of the household. Descriptive statistics of all the variables included in our empirical analysis are presented in [Table 1](#) for the pooled sample and in [Table 2](#) separately by country.

Our empirical analysis crucially depends on the availability of complete information on the economic resources available to households. As common in household surveys, information on wealth is often missing (in SHARE information on wealth is incomplete for about 47% of the sample). Excluding observations with missing values from the analysis would reduce the sample size and, most importantly, might introduce sample selectivity issues, leading to biased results. To deal with this issue, SHARE uses the method of multiple imputation. For each missing observation, SHARE provides 5 imputed values in order to reflect the stochastic nature of the imputation process. This approach is then aimed at providing (some points of) the distribution of the missing value instead of deriving a single prediction for it (see [Christelis, 2008, 2011](#), for details about the imputation procedure). In our empirical analysis we take into account the variability associated with the imputation process by following [Little and Rubin \(1987\)](#), who explicitly control for the variance of the estimates both within and between each set of imputation.

2.1. Financial market participation

We analyze financial market participation by looking at the total ownership of stocks, which includes not only direct ownership but also ownership through mutual funds and individual retirement accounts.² In our sample, 31% of households hold stocks either directly or indirectly through retirement accounts and mutual funds. [Table 2](#) shows that stock ownership is relatively high in Sweden, Denmark, Belgium and Switzerland, where financial markets and institutions are more developed. In Austria, the Southern countries (Italy, Spain and Portugal) and Eastern Europe, financial market participation is less widespread, although in Czech Republic stock ownership is relatively common, probably due to individual retirement accounts. Poland is the

¹ See [Börsch-Supan et al. \(2005, 2008, 2013\)](#).

² In SHARE respondents who declare to have money in mutual funds or managed investment accounts are asked whether these are mostly stocks, mostly bonds or half stocks and half bonds.

Table 1

Summary statistics of the variables used in the regressions.

Variable	Definition	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
total stock own.	Ownership of stocks	0.307	0.465	0	1
share of total stock own.	Share of financial wealth invested in stocks	0.106	0.207	0	0.999
living better	Chances of living better 5 years from now	26.779	28.669	0	100
living worse	Chances of living worse 5 years from now	38.286	32.14	0	100
good health	Excellent, very good or good health	0.651	0.477	0	1
optimism	Survival probability miscalibration	0.48	0.156	0	0.998
Lot	Life Orientation Test	17.48	4.282	0	28
SE	Living in Sweden	0.1	0.3	0	1
DK	Living in Denmark	0.089	0.285	0	1
NL	Living in The Netherlands	0.093	0.291	0	1
BE	Living in Belgium	0.11	0.313	0	1
FR	Living in France	0.088	0.284	0	1
CH	Living in Switzerland	0.056	0.23	0	1
AT	Living in Austria	0.048	0.215	0	1
ES	Living in Spain	0.06	0.237	0	1
IT	Living in Italy	0.096	0.295	0	1
PL	Living in Poland	0.086	0.281	0	1
CZ	Living in Czech Republic	0.085	0.278	0	1
female	The respondent is female	0.534	0.499	0	1
age	Age	64.467	10.059	24	100
age2	Age squared	4257.149	1347.67	576	10,000
hhsz	Number of household members	2.122	1.086	1	14
number of children	Number of children	2.166	1.405	0	16
medium education	Medium education (ISCED = 3)	0.312	0.468	0	1
high education	High education (ISCED = 4, 5, 6)	0.237	0.429	0	1
employed	The respondent is employed	0.291	0.454	0	1
retired	The respondent is retired	0.529	0.499	0	1
hh income	IHS transf. of household income	10.541	1.347	0	14.536
hh net financial wealth	IHS transf. of household net wealth	7.791	7.564	−15.361	17.154
adl	Limited with activities of daily living	0.097	0.296	0	1
iadl	Limited with instrumental adl	0.07	0.254	0	1
chronic	Number of chronic diseases	1.626	1.512	0	10
symptoms	Number of symptoms of poor health	1.795	1.881	0	11
mother dead	Mother is dead	0.763	0.425	0	1
father dead	Father is dead	0.905	0.293	0	1
numeracy	Results of the numeracy test	3.482	1.104	1	5
fluency	Results of the verbal fluency test	19.827	7.532	0	100
recall	Results of the recall test	3.634	1.994	0	10
trust	Level of trust in other people	5.713	2.529	0	10
social interaction	Taken part in social activities last month	0.51	0.5	0	1
risk aversion	No willingness to take any financial risk	0.738	0.441	0	1

country with the lowest stock market participation (2.9%) but also the one with the lowest average level of income and financial wealth.

We also compute the share of (gross) financial wealth invested in stocks. Gross financial wealth is defined as the amount of wealth invested in bank accounts, government and corporate bonds, stocks, mutual funds, individual retirement accounts, contractual savings for housing and life insurance policies. Our measure for the share is then equal to the amount of wealth invested in stocks divided by gross financial wealth.³

If we restrict our attention to the households who own stocks (directly or indirectly via mutual funds or individual retirement accounts), the average share of their gross financial wealth invested in these assets is 30%. If we consider all the households in the sample, the average share falls to 11%.

2.2. Cognitive skills

The SHARE questionnaire includes an entire section devoted to the measurement of cognitive abilities. In line with Christelis et al. (2010), we use three indicators that are likely to influence financial investments: numeracy, planning and executive function (fluency) and memory (recall). The definition of the cognitive ability indicators used in our analysis is carefully explained by Christelis et al. (2010).

The indicator of numeracy is based on the answers to four questions in which respondents have to perform simple calculations, such as finding the 10% of a number. The numeracy indicator ranges from 1 to 5. The sample average is 3.48: it is

³ The share of gross financial wealth invested in stocks and bonds cannot be defined for households whose gross financial wealth is 0. This leads to the exclusion from the sample of about 2,100 households.

Table 2

Sample averages by country.

Variables	SE	DK	DE	NL	BE	FR
total stock own.	0.688	0.601	0.276	0.251	0.358	0.312
share of total stock own.	0.25	0.198	0.076	0.08	0.115	0.093
living better	31.083	31.596	17.952	30.396	22.126	17.518
living worse	32.489	21.748	45.743	37.094	35.234	51.458
good health	0.722	0.772	0.632	0.714	0.722	0.663
optimism	0.479	0.54	0.475	0.498	0.475	0.464
lot	18.836	19.553	18.229	17.919	18.043	16.88
female	0.506	0.493	0.511	0.534	0.501	0.539
age	65.374	63.976	64.688	63.31	64.62	63.844
age2	4371.291	4203.27	4273.604	4103.518	4282.606	4184.411
hhsiz	1.895	1.838	1.997	2.023	1.992	1.988
number of children	2.292	2.193	1.955	2.305	2.107	2.157
medium education	0.188	0.412	0.534	0.243	0.269	0.33
high education	0.329	0.385	0.312	0.253	0.284	0.234
employed	0.406	0.413	0.287	0.332	0.257	0.309
retired	0.548	0.477	0.552	0.371	0.522	0.544
hh income	10.847	10.802	10.755	10.99	10.634	10.803
hh net financial wealth	7.718	9.273	8.72	9.518	9.614	7.941
adl	0.078	0.068	0.085	0.054	0.118	0.092
iadl	0.048	0.062	0.05	0.047	0.079	0.069
chronic	1.569	1.682	1.52	1.269	1.593	1.485
symptoms	1.602	1.603	1.649	1.371	1.852	1.864
mother dead	0.765	0.756	0.766	0.765	0.75	0.693
father dead	0.901	0.903	0.908	0.905	0.907	0.866
numera	3.77	3.734	3.777	3.828	3.5	3.378
fluency	23.456	22.327	21.63	20.806	20.613	20.452
recall	4.284	4.405	3.908	4.198	3.551	3.431
trust	6.58	7.32	5.342	6.371	5.28	4.625
social interaction	0.724	0.69	0.511	0.677	0.598	0.543
risk aversion	0.627	0.551	0.729	0.731	0.705	0.763
Number of observations	1744	1553	1537	1626	1923	1538
Variables	CH	AT	ES	IT	PL	CZ
total stock own.	0.448	0.14	0.143	0.093	0.029	0.217
share of total stock own.	0.132	0.042	0.049	0.038	0.015	0.055
living better	26.15	22.28	36.024	33.411	27.169	26.072
living worse	30.916	40.028	39.27	37.953	42.452	45.674
good health	0.835	0.688	0.56	0.578	0.384	0.559
optimism	0.492	0.49	0.485	0.498	0.456	0.419
lot	19.882	19.571	18.32	17.794	15.887	16.681
female	0.522	0.56	0.561	0.516	0.577	0.621
age	64.331	67.263	65.541	65.215	63.271	63.505
age2	4245.695	4616.034	4409.085	4342.478	4103.275	4128.421
hhsiz	1.94	1.754	2.576	2.452	2.951	2.03
number of children	2.032	2.006	2.4	2.045	2.52	1.93
medium education	0.354	0.444	0.094	0.198	0.411	0.314
high education	0.305	0.243	0.108	0.09	0.125	0.147
employed	0.429	0.141	0.225	0.185	0.171	0.292
retired	0.436	0.71	0.379	0.57	0.601	0.654
hh income	11.005	10.561	10.06	10.203	9.656	10.1
hh net financial wealth	9.647	7.769	6.904	6.71	3.113	6.322
adl	0.051	0.11	0.111	0.093	0.217	0.079
iadl	0.029	0.085	0.078	0.072	0.155	0.06
chronic	1.116	1.574	1.744	1.874	2.123	1.827
symptoms	1.255	1.817	1.81	1.851	2.682	2.069
mother dead	0.736	0.854	0.771	0.788	0.771	0.778
father dead	0.858	0.944	0.904	0.914	0.93	0.923
numera	3.9	3.69	2.619	3.03	2.954	3.543
fluency	21.312	20.56	14.563	15.475	15.601	19.844
recall	3.997	3.981	2.621	3.038	2.748	3.32
trust	6.477	5.653	5.589	4.692	5.113	5.747
social interaction	0.642	0.451	0.256	0.302	0.213	0.396
risk aversion	0.67	0.833	0.925	0.847	0.905	0.667
Number of observations	981	845	1041	1681	1505	1476

Note: For each variable we tested the null hypothesis of absence of cross-country differences in the average. The null hypothesis is rejected at any conventional significance level.

the lowest in Spain and the highest in Switzerland. For fluency, the respondent has one minute to name as many different animals as she can think of. The fluency score is equal to the total number of animals mentioned. Any member of the animal kingdom, real or mythical is scored correct, except repetitions and proper nouns. On average, our respondents named 20 animals. Finally, memory is measured through a recall test. The interviewer reads a list of 10 words and the respondent has up to one minute to tell as many words as she can recall.⁴ On average, respondents were able to recall 4 words.

2.3. Trust

To make sure that our measure of optimism is not just a proxy for trust, we also include a control for trust in our regressions. More optimistic individuals might be more likely to trust other people since they have more positive expectations about other people's behavior and respect of social norms. At the same time, Guiso et al. (2008) have provided evidence of a strong association between trust and financial market participation. To measure trust we use a question asked in the second wave of SHARE:

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

The wording of the question is the same as in the World Values Survey questionnaire and as used by Guiso et al. (2008). The only difference is that in SHARE respondents have to answer on a scale that goes from 0 to 10, where 0 means you can't be too careful and 10 means that most people can be trusted, while in the World Values Survey the answer can only be Yes or No. The average level of trust of SHARE respondents is 5.71: it is particularly high in Sweden and Denmark, while it is low in France and Italy. About 6% of respondents declare a level of trust equal to 0 and a further 6% selects the highest level on the trust scale.

2.4. Social interaction

The SHARE questionnaire asks respondents whether they have been involved in social activities in the last months. The question text is reported below.

Have you done any of these activities in the last month?

The available answering categories are: 1. Done voluntary or charity work; 2. Cared for a sick or disabled adult; 3. Provided help to friends or neighbors; 4. Attended an educational or training course; 5. Gone to a sport, social or other kind of club; 6. Taken part in activities of a religious organization (church, synagogue, mosque, etc.); 7. Taken part in a political or community-related organization. Respondents can select more than one activity. We define a social interaction indicator which is equal to 1 if the respondent was involved in at least one of these activities in the last month, and 0 otherwise. Overall, almost 51% of respondents in our sample have done at least one of these activities in the last month. The most selected activities are voluntary or charity work (15%), the provision of help to friends or neighbors (20%) and the attendance of a club (23%).

2.5. Risk aversion

As an indicator for risk aversion, we use the self-reported answer to a question on portfolio allocation between riskless and risky assets. The question reads as follows:

Which of the following statements comes closest to the amount of financial risk that you are willing to take when you save or make investments?

The available options are: 1. Take substantial financial risks expecting to earn substantial returns; 2. Take above average financial risks expecting to earn above average returns; 3. Take average financial risks expecting to earn average returns; 4. Not willing to take any financial risks. As about 75% of the answers are concentrated in option 4, the variable that we include in the specification is a dummy equal to 1 if the individual declares not to be willing to take any financial risk.

2.6. Dispositional optimism

Following Puri and Robinson (2007), we measure dispositional optimism as the difference between self-assessed and actuarial survival probabilities. We elicit respondents' self-assessed survival probabilities from the question:

What are the chances that you will live to be age T or more?

The target age T depends on the age of the respondent at the time of the interview. It is equal to 75 for respondents aged 50–65, 80 for those aged 66–70, 85 for those aged 71–75, 90 for those aged 76–80, 95 for those aged 81–85, 100 for those aged 86–95, 105 for those aged 96–100, and 110 for those aged 101–105. We then follow Peracchi and Perotti (2010) and use the information available in the Human Mortality Database (see <http://www.mortality.org>) by gender, country and year of

⁴ The list includes the following words: butter, arm, letter, queen, tickets, grass, corner, stone, book, stick.

birth to compute actuarial probabilities of survival to the same target age T . Our measure of dispositional optimism is equal to the difference between the self-assessed probability of survival and that obtained from the actuarial life tables,

$$\text{Optimism}_i = \text{Subjective_survival}_i - \text{Actuarial_survival}_i$$

Fig. 1 reports the cumulative distribution function of the dispositional optimism indicator in our sample. The indicator has been standardized to lie between 0 and 1. This standardization is needed to define clear benchmarks to indicate the most pessimistic and most optimistic individuals. Higher levels of optimism correspond to higher levels of this indicator.

The figure shows that in our sample the first quartile of the dispositional optimism indicator is 0.37, the median is 0.48 and the third quartile is 0.58.

Fig. 2 provides *prima facie* evidence of a positive correlation between dispositional optimism and stock market participation, even if at descriptive and aggregate levels. On average, in countries where individuals tend to be more optimistic, stock market participation is higher. Optimism and stock ownership are the highest in Denmark and the lowest in Eastern Europe.

The top-left panel of Fig. 3 shows that the correlation between our indicators of dispositional optimism and risk aversion is negative. At a pure descriptive level, individuals who are not willing to take any financial risks are also more pessimistic about their probability of survival. This suggests that the unwillingness to take financial risks is correlated with a more general pessimistic disposition towards evaluating uncertain events. Vice versa, the relationships between trust and optimism and social interaction and optimism are positive and the R -squared values of the regressions interpolating the points in the graph reveal a much stronger link than in the risk aversion case. Cognitive skills are positively correlated with optimism, especially when we consider the recall test.

Differences between subjective and actuarial survival probabilities might be unrelated with optimism but just be due to the fact that individuals have more accurate information about their longevity than demographers (Perozek, 2008). For instance, individuals might be better informed about their health status, life-style, economic resources devoted to health care and the presence of genetic diseases among family members. For this reason, Puri and Robinson (2007) conduct an extensive series of tests to validate life expectancy miscalibration as a measure of optimism, showing that it correlates both with positive expectations about future economic conditions and with psychometric tests of optimism. In what follows, we also carry out several tests to validate our measure of dispositional optimism within our sample by comparing it with other outcomes arguably related to a positive attitude towards life. In the SHARE data, we have information on respondents' expectations about their future standards of living. As long as overestimating their own probability of survival reflects higher levels of dispositional optimism, we expect a positive correlation between the two, *ceteris paribus*.

SHARE respondents are asked to assess the chances (on a scale from 0 to 100) that in the next five years their standard of living will improve. The sample average is around 27. We estimate an OLS regression of this outcome on our measure of dispositional optimism and the whole set of covariates that will be used in our main analysis. They include country of residence, gender, a second order polynomial of age, household size, number of children, education, employment status, household income, wealth, health, parental longevity, cognitive abilities indicators, risk preferences and trust. The results are shown in column 1 of Table 3. The coefficient on the dispositional optimism indicator is positive and statistically significant (p -value = 0.000). This result suggests a strong correlation between these two indicators in the expected direction. Everything else constant, the higher the dispositional optimism, the higher the probability that individuals think that their standard of living will improve in the future. Moving from extreme pessimism to extreme optimism improves the chances of living better by 38 percentage points. A similar question asks respondents to rate the chances that in the next five years their standard of living will get worse. On average our respondents believe that the chances that things will get worse in the future amount to 38%. Consistently with our previous results, the OLS regression of this outcome on the dispositional optimism indicator shows that the coefficient is negative and statistically significant (see column 2 of Table 3). Individuals are less prone to think that their standard of living will get worse if they are more optimistic. On average, the self-assessed probability of experiencing a deterioration of the standard of living for extremely pessimistic individuals is 16 percentage points higher than the one of their extremely optimistic counterparts.

We also look at the correlation between dispositional optimism and self-assessed health. In our sample 65% of respondents declare that their health is good, very good or excellent, as opposed to fair or poor. Crucially, our specification controls for more objective health indicators based on limitations with (instrumental) activities of daily living, number of chronic diseases and number of symptoms of poor health. In particular, we define a dummy variable, *adl*, which is equal to 1 if the respondent has at least one limitation with activities of daily living, which include dressing (including putting on shoes and socks), walking across a room, bathing or showering, eating (such as cutting up your food), getting in and out of bed, using the toilet (including getting up or down). The dummy *iadl* is equal to 1 if the individual reports at least one limitation with instrumental activities of daily living, namely using a map to figure out how to get around in a strange place, preparing a hot meal, shopping for groceries, making telephone calls, taking medications, doing work around the house or garden, managing money (such as paying bills and keeping track of expenses). We also control for the number of chronic diseases that have been diagnosed by a doctor⁵ and for the number of symptoms of poor health.⁶ Our hypothesis is that, conditional on

⁵ The list includes high blood pressure, high cholesterol, heart attack, stroke, diabetes or high blood sugar, asthma, arthritis, osteoporosis, cancer, ulcer, Parkinson, cataracts, fractures and dementia.

⁶ Symptoms of poor health are pain in back or joints, heart trouble, breathlessness, persistent cough, swollen legs, sleeping problems, falling down or fear of falling down, dizziness or faints, stomach or intestine problems, incontinence and fatigue.

Fig. 1. Cumulative distribution function of the dispositional optimism indicator.

Fig. 2. Stock market participation and dispositional optimism.

objective health indicators and socioeconomic status, higher dispositional optimism makes individuals more likely to rate their health status as good or even better. Our results show that the correlation between our indicator of optimism and self-reported health is actually positive and significant (see column 3). The magnitude of the coefficient shows that everything else constant, extremely optimistic individuals are 34 percentage points more likely than extremely pessimistic individuals to define their health as at least good. Obviously given our definition of optimism, there is strong reverse causality between self-assessed health and life expectancy miscalibration and these results should be interpreted with caution.

Finally, we analyze the correlation between our indicator of optimism based on survival probability miscalibration and the Life Orientation Test (LOT) implemented in the second wave of SHARE. LOT has been introduced and validated by [Scheier and Carver \(1985\)](#) and [Scheier, Carver, and Bridges \(1994\)](#) as an indicator of dispositional optimism. In LOT respondents are asked to rate their agreement with a set of sentences designed to measure their positive attitude towards life according to a numerical scale. The value of the LOT score for each respondent comes from the summation of her so-coded answers and ranges from 0 to 28.⁷ The fourth column of [Table 3](#) shows that on average the LOT score of respondents

⁷ The sentences proposed in LOT are “I pursue my goals with lots of energy”, “In uncertain times, I usually expect the best”, “I’m always optimistic about my future”, “I hardly ever expect things to go my way”, “I still find ways to solve a problem if others have given up”, “I rarely count on good things happening to me”, “Given my previous experiences I feel well prepared for my future”. For each sentence, positive attitudes of respondents are coded on a scale ranging from 0 (lowest optimism) to 4 (highest optimism).

Table 3

Validation of the dispositional optimism indicator.

	Living better	Living worse	Good health	Lot
optimism	38.214*** (1.493)	−16.119*** (1.814)	0.340*** (0.023)	5.146*** (0.447)
SE	12.591*** (0.958)	−12.517*** (1.225)	0.055*** (0.014)	0.273 (0.309)
DK	9.210*** (1.052)	−21.701*** (1.206)	0.089*** (0.014)	−0.069 (0.361)
NL	9.442*** (0.977)	−7.160*** (1.239)	0.027* (0.014)	−0.569** (0.279)
BE	3.948*** (0.878)	−9.900*** (1.200)	0.127*** (0.013)	−0.538 (0.521)
FR	−0.610 (0.890)	5.792** (1.294)	0.063*** (0.014)	−1.104*** (0.282)
CH	6.143*** (1.099)	−13.483*** (1.344)	0.116*** (0.014)	1.219*** (0.260)
AT	6.449*** (1.071)	−5.308*** (1.432)	0.093*** (0.017)	1.141* (0.661)
ES	17.566*** (1.101)	−5.724*** (1.387)	0.043** (0.017)	0.596 (0.450)
IT	15.048*** (0.968)	−7.620*** (1.226)	0.051*** (0.015)	0.175 (0.296)
PL	8.775*** (0.989)	−4.411*** (1.261)	−0.036** (0.016)	−0.862*** (0.272)
CZ	9.163*** (0.940)	−0.792 (1.274)	0.011 (0.015)	−0.745*** (0.252)
female	0.185 (0.442)	−1.334** (0.522)	0.060*** (0.006)	0.298** (0.132)
age	−2.116*** (0.296)	2.445*** (0.317)	0.008** (0.004)	0.054 (0.077)
age2	0.010*** (0.002)	−0.018*** (0.002)	−0.000** (0.000)	−0.001 (0.001)
hhsize	0.951*** (0.218)	−0.416* (0.242)	0.001 (0.003)	0.111** (0.054)
number of children	−0.052 (0.143)	−0.304* (0.178)	0.001 (0.002)	0.114** (0.047)
medium education	−0.781 (0.516)	0.619 (0.611)	0.011 (0.008)	−0.106 (0.148)
high education	0.335 (0.602)	0.255 (0.707)	0.034*** (0.008)	0.556*** (0.176)
employed	−0.196 (0.734)	2.850*** (0.815)	0.092*** (0.010)	0.134 (0.202)
retired	−1.508** (0.630)	−2.110*** (0.754)	0.032*** (0.010)	0.305 (0.201)
hh income	0.106 (0.172)	−0.334 (0.209)	0.005* (0.003)	0.174** (0.078)
hh net financial wealth	−0.060 (0.041)	−0.152*** (0.043)	0.001 (0.001)	0.030*** (0.010)
adl	0.196 (0.730)	1.092 (0.971)	−0.105*** (0.013)	−0.154 (0.246)
iadl	−0.781 (0.807)	1.525 (1.144)	−0.065*** (0.014)	−1.094*** (0.321)
chronic	−0.134 (0.163)	0.208 (0.203)	−0.066*** (0.003)	−0.051 (0.049)
symptoms	−0.575*** (0.135)	0.831*** (0.171)	−0.064*** (0.002)	−0.279*** (0.040)
mother dead	−0.913 (0.594)	0.634 (0.639)	−0.026*** (0.008)	−0.048 (0.151)
father dead	0.196 (0.818)	−0.742 (0.855)	−0.011 (0.010)	0.285 (0.195)
numeracy	−0.207 (0.225)	0.613*** (0.262)	0.015*** (0.003)	0.159** (0.066)
fluency	0.009 (0.034)	−0.042 (0.040)	0.003*** (0.000)	0.025*** (0.009)
recall	0.226* (0.125)	0.168 (0.145)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.131*** (0.036)
trust	0.334*** (0.086)	−0.466*** (0.105)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.101*** (0.025)
social interaction	−0.646 (0.447)	−0.477 (0.523)	0.052*** (0.007)	0.454*** (0.127)

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

	Living better	Living worse	Good health	Lot
risk aversion	−2.647*** (0.517)	0.891 (0.587)	−0.028*** (0.007)	−0.202 (0.136)
Constant	94.565*** (10.234)	−23.177** (11.028)	0.142 (0.141)	10.511*** (2.656)
Number of observations	17,450	17,450	17,450	4394

Note: Linear regression models estimated by OLS and based on 5 sets of multiply-imputed data combined according to [Little and Rubin \(1987\)](#).

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

resources in risky assets if they plan to leave an inheritance. The optimism coefficient is positive and significant, even when we add socio-economic controls (column 2).

As discussed earlier, one potential criticism against our optimism measure is that the miscalibration in the probability of survival might just reflect the fact that individuals have more information about their health and genetics than the demographers do when computing the life tables. To address this issue, in column 3 we augment our model with four objective measures of health, namely limitations with activities of daily living, limitations with instrumental activities of daily living, number of chronic diseases, number of symptoms of poor health and information on parental longevity, that is whether the mother and the father of the respondent are still alive or not at the time of the interview. The results show that, even controlling for health and genetic factors, optimism still plays a significant role in explaining stock market participation.

Further, the effect of survival probability miscalibration might be explained by the fact that the accuracy of respondents' assessments concerning their survival probability might depend on the level of their cognitive abilities, which have also been shown to be relevant determinants of stock market participation ([Christelis et al., 2010](#)). In the fourth column of [Table 4](#) we report the results obtained when a set of cognitive ability indicators is included in the specification. All the three indicators are statistically significant and suggest that individuals with higher cognitive abilities are more likely to hold stocks. However, the coefficient on the dispositional optimism indicator remains positive and significant.

Next, we include in our specification three further explanatory variables describing personality traits: trust, social interaction and risk aversion. The first indicator measures the level of trust in other people: respondents who have less trust in institutions might be less likely to establish contact or ask services from them and therefore to participate in the financial markets. The social interaction indicator measures the involvement of respondents in social activities during the last month. As pointed out by [Hong et al. \(2004\)](#), individuals involved in social interactions might be more likely to be informed about the state of financial markets by talking about it with their peers. The third indicator is needed to assess whether the correlation captured by the parameter on the miscalibration term is due to a generic positive attitude of individuals towards risk in uncertain contexts. Column 5 of [Table 4](#) shows that the effect of optimism remains statistically significant, although the coefficient decreases from 0.069 to 0.048. Moving from the lowest to the highest level of optimism is now associated with an increase in total stock-holding by 4.8 percentage points. This effect is economically significant if compared to those induced by changes in other key determinants of stock-ownership. It is more than half of the one associated with moving from low education to high education (7.6 percentage points) and higher than the one induced by moving from the lowest to the highest level of our numeracy skills indicator (3.19 percentage points). An immediate implication of these comparisons is that the detrimental effect on stock ownership exerted by moving from the highest to the lowest level of dispositional optimism can be offset by investments in education and numeracy skills, which are outcomes easier to target for policy makers. Moreover, both trust and social interactions have a positive and significant effect on the total holding of stocks, while risk aversion discourages stock market participation. The effect we find for trust is in line with the hypothesis that individuals with a higher level of trust in financial institutions are more likely to use the services offered by financial intermediaries and include stocks in their portfolios.

Finally, we are interested in studying the degree of complementarity (or substitution) between optimism and the other personality traits in explaining financial behavior. While optimism encourages risk taking behavior, risk aversion, low levels of trust and not having social interactions discourage it. Therefore, we test whether the relationship between dispositional optimism and stock-holding is affected by the degree of trust, social interaction and risk aversion. To do this, we add to our specification interaction terms between dispositional optimism and the other personality traits (column 6). While the role of optimism in explaining stock ownership does not seem to vary with the level of trust and social activities, the interaction term between optimism and risk aversion turns out to be statistically significant and negative. The results show that the large, positive effect of optimism is mainly driven by risk tolerant investors, while it is small and not significant for risk averse individuals.¹⁰ For risk tolerant individuals with no trust in other people and no social interactions, the difference in the probability of holding stocks between extremely optimistic and extremely pessimistic individuals is equal to 16.1 percentage points.

¹⁰ Our results are confirmed even if we remove the interactions of our optimism indicator with trust and social interactions. The results are reported as supplementary material in an online appendix.

Table 4

Total stock market participation.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
optimism	0.163*** (0.022)	0.087*** (0.021)	0.078*** (0.021)	0.069*** (0.021)	0.048** (0.020)	0.161** (0.064)
SE	0.423*** (0.015)	0.440*** (0.015)	0.440*** (0.015)	0.427*** (0.015)	0.386*** (0.015)	0.387*** (0.015)
DK	0.317*** (0.017)	0.300*** (0.016)	0.301*** (0.016)	0.299*** (0.016)	0.247*** (0.016)	0.247*** (0.016)
NL	−0.030** (0.015)	−0.028* (0.015)	−0.029* (0.015)	−0.032** (0.015)	−0.041*** (0.014)	−0.041*** (0.014)
BE	0.086*** (0.016)	0.094*** (0.015)	0.095*** (0.015)	0.099*** (0.015)	0.083*** (0.014)	0.083*** (0.014)
FR	0.040** (0.016)	0.071*** (0.016)	0.071*** (0.016)	0.079*** (0.016)	0.077*** (0.015)	0.078*** (0.015)
CH	0.172*** (0.019)	0.153*** (0.019)	0.152*** (0.019)	0.150*** (0.018)	0.131*** (0.018)	0.131*** (0.018)
AT	−0.112*** (0.016)	−0.078*** (0.016)	−0.078*** (0.016)	−0.081*** (0.016)	−0.067*** (0.015)	−0.068*** (0.015)
ES	−0.126*** (0.016)	−0.027* (0.016)	−0.027* (0.016)	0.006 (0.016)	0.024 (0.015)	0.024 (0.015)
IT	−0.189*** (0.013)	−0.084*** (0.014)	−0.084*** (0.014)	−0.060*** (0.014)	−0.056*** (0.013)	−0.055*** (0.013)
PL	−0.256*** (0.012)	−0.093*** (0.013)	−0.090*** (0.013)	−0.064*** (0.013)	−0.050*** (0.013)	−0.050*** (0.013)
CZ	−0.050*** (0.015)	0.040*** (0.015)	0.040*** (0.015)	0.043*** (0.015)	0.005 (0.015)	0.006 (0.015)
female	−0.064*** (0.007)	−0.040*** (0.006)	−0.039*** (0.006)	−0.039*** (0.007)	−0.020*** (0.006)	−0.019*** (0.006)
age	0.013*** (0.004)	0.019*** (0.004)	0.017*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.012*** (0.004)	0.011*** (0.004)
age2	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)
hhsiz	0.017*** (0.003)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.009*** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.003)
number of children	−0.014*** (0.002)	−0.005** (0.002)	−0.005** (0.002)	−0.005** (0.002)	−0.004* (0.002)	−0.004* (0.002)
medium education		0.054*** (0.008)	0.053*** (0.008)	0.038*** (0.008)	0.025*** (0.008)	0.025*** (0.008)
high education		0.142*** (0.009)	0.141*** (0.009)	0.114*** (0.009)	0.076*** (0.009)	0.076*** (0.009)
employed		0.053*** (0.011)	0.051*** (0.011)	0.045*** (0.011)	0.034*** (0.010)	0.034*** (0.010)
retired		−0.014* (0.009)	−0.016* (0.009)	−0.019** (0.009)	−0.014* (0.008)	−0.014* (0.008)
hh income		0.029*** (0.002)	0.029*** (0.002)	0.027*** (0.002)	0.021*** (0.002)	0.021*** (0.002)
hh net financial wealth		0.015*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.001)
adl			−0.012 (0.011)	−0.006 (0.011)	−0.005 (0.010)	−0.005 (0.010)
iadl			−0.011 (0.012)	0.003 (0.012)	−0.001 (0.011)	−0.002 (0.011)
chronic			−0.002 (0.002)	−0.002 (0.002)	−0.000 (0.002)	−0.000 (0.002)
symptoms			−0.001 (0.002)	−0.001 (0.002)	−0.001 (0.002)	−0.001 (0.002)
mother dead			0.002 (0.009)	0.004 (0.009)	0.007 (0.009)	0.007 (0.009)
father dead			0.002 (0.012)	0.004 (0.012)	0.007 (0.012)	0.007 (0.012)
numeracy				0.017*** (0.003)	0.008** (0.003)	0.008** (0.003)
fluency				0.003*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)
recall				0.005*** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.002)
trust					0.003** (0.001)	0.006 (0.003)
social interaction					0.038*** (0.006)	0.035* (0.019)

(continued on next page)

Table 4 (continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
risk aversion					−0.257*** (0.008)	−0.205*** (0.026)
optimism × trust						−0.006 (0.007)
social interaction × optimism						0.006 (0.038)
risk aversion × optimism						−0.107** (0.051)
Constant	0.023 (0.127)	−0.756*** (0.140)	−0.710*** (0.144)	−0.788*** (0.143)	−0.403*** (0.139)	−0.448*** (0.141)
Number of observations	17,450	17,450	17,450	17,450	17,450	17,450

Note: Linear regression models estimated by OLS and based on 5 sets of multiply-imputed data combined according to Little and Rubin (1987).

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

3.2. Share of financial wealth invested in stocks

We now focus on the relationship between dispositional optimism and how much households invest in stocks overall by estimating standard Tobit models via maximum likelihood. Our estimating equation is:

$$y_i = \max(0, \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Optimism}_i + \text{Cognitive_Skills}_i' \beta_2 + \text{Personality}_i' \beta_3 + X_i' \beta_4 + u_i)$$

where y_i is the observed share of financial wealth invested in stocks by the household of individual i , the control factors X_i included in the right-hand-side of the equation are the same as those used in the previous subsection and u_i is a stochastic component following a normal distribution with zero mean and unknown variance σ^2 . The parameters in the Tobit specification make it possible to assess the effect of the explanatory variables on the average share of financial wealth invested in stocks by stock owners, $E[y|x, y > 0]$, and by all individuals in the sample, $E[y|x]$. The results in Table 5 confirm the pattern previously found for the total ownership of stocks. If we look at the most parsimonious specification, the response of stock owners to a discrete change in our optimism indicator is to increase the share of financial wealth held in stocks by 5.07 percentage points (6 percentage points if we consider all investors). In the specification with the full set of control variables, the coefficient on dispositional optimism is still significant. The share of financial wealth invested in stocks by extremely pessimistic stock-owners is on average 1.53 percentage points lower than the one held by their extremely optimistic counterparts. If we look at the variation induced in the share of wealth held in stocks by all agents, this is equal to 1.76 points. As in the ownership case, these effects are not only statistically but also economically significant if compared to those associated with moving from the lowest to the highest levels of education and numeracy. If we focus on stock-owners, the variation in the share of wealth invested in stocks induced by moving from extreme pessimism to extreme optimism is more than two thirds than the differential between low and high educated individuals (2.44 percentage points) and equivalent to the differential between individuals with the lowest and the highest levels of our numeracy indicator (1.72 percentage points).¹¹ Risk aversion, trust and social interactions remain important determinants of stock market investment.

If we include interaction terms in our model, we can predict the response of the share of financial wealth invested in stocks to variations in optimism for different profiles of stock-owners defined according to the personality traits considered in our models. We consider eight profiles of stock owners defined by combining the lowest and the highest achievable levels of our indicators for trust, social interaction and risk aversion. We find that, regardless of the degree of social interaction, risk tolerant stock owners, who do not trust others and move from extreme pessimism to extreme optimism, increase by about 9 percentage points the share of financial wealth invested in stocks. Instead for risk averse stock-owners, the same change in optimism is not associated with any significant variation, regardless of the levels of social interactions and trust. These patterns parallel our findings for stock market participation and reinforce the importance of analyzing the interplay between dispositional optimism and other personality traits in explaining financial behavior. The role of dispositional optimism varies with personality traits and it is found to be stronger for risk tolerant agents who do not trust other people. For this group of agents, the negative beliefs with respect to stock investments induced by lack of trust can be offset by an increase in dispositional optimism.¹²

¹¹ Looking at the share of wealth invested in stock by all agents provides similar results. The differential between low and high education individuals amount to 2.81 percentage points, the one between agents with low and high numeracy levels is 1.96 percentage points.

¹² We obtain similar results when looking at the share of wealth invested in stocks by all investors. In particular, it increases by about 11 percentage points for risk tolerant agents who do not trust other people, regardless of their social interactions. Instead, this variation is statistically not significant for risk averse individuals.

Table 5

Share of gross financial wealth invested in total stock ownership.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
optimism	0.175*** (0.031)	0.111*** (0.030)	0.094*** (0.031)	0.085*** (0.031)	0.052* (0.030)	0.231*** (0.083)
SE	0.417*** (0.017)	0.448*** (0.018)	0.447*** (0.018)	0.433*** (0.018)	0.389*** (0.017)	0.389*** (0.017)
DK	0.309*** (0.018)	0.295*** (0.018)	0.296*** (0.018)	0.295*** (0.018)	0.246*** (0.018)	0.247*** (0.018)
NL	−0.009 (0.019)	0.001 (0.019)	−0.002 (0.019)	−0.003 (0.019)	−0.014 (0.019)	−0.013 (0.019)
BE	0.114*** (0.019)	0.135*** (0.019)	0.136*** (0.019)	0.146*** (0.019)	0.122*** (0.018)	0.123*** (0.018)
FR	0.057*** (0.019)	0.095*** (0.019)	0.096*** (0.019)	0.109*** (0.019)	0.109*** (0.018)	0.109*** (0.018)
CH	0.179*** (0.020)	0.160*** (0.019)	0.156*** (0.019)	0.156*** (0.019)	0.138*** (0.019)	0.139*** (0.019)
AT	−0.154*** (0.025)	−0.124*** (0.025)	−0.124*** (0.025)	−0.127*** (0.025)	−0.110*** (0.024)	−0.110*** (0.024)
ES	−0.134*** (0.025)	−0.010 (0.024)	−0.011 (0.024)	0.034 (0.025)	0.064*** (0.024)	0.065*** (0.024)
IT	−0.240*** (0.022)	−0.142*** (0.023)	−0.143*** (0.023)	−0.112*** (0.023)	−0.104*** (0.022)	−0.104*** (0.022)
PL	−0.419*** (0.033)	−0.289*** (0.033)	−0.281*** (0.033)	−0.248*** (0.033)	−0.219*** (0.032)	−0.219*** (0.032)
CZ	−0.022 (0.021)	0.068*** (0.021)	0.067*** (0.021)	0.068*** (0.021)	0.021 (0.020)	0.022 (0.020)
female	−0.078*** (0.009)	−0.049*** (0.009)	−0.048*** (0.009)	−0.044*** (0.009)	−0.019** (0.008)	−0.019** (0.008)
age	0.030*** (0.005)	0.027*** (0.005)	0.022*** (0.006)	0.019*** (0.006)	0.014*** (0.005)	0.014*** (0.005)
age2	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)	−0.000*** (0.000)
hhsz	0.020*** (0.005)	0.002 (0.005)	0.002 (0.005)	0.003 (0.005)	0.006 (0.005)	0.006 (0.005)
number of children	−0.020*** (0.003)	−0.012*** (0.003)	−0.012*** (0.003)	−0.013*** (0.003)	−0.012*** (0.003)	−0.012*** (0.003)
medium education		0.087*** (0.010)	0.085*** (0.010)	0.068*** (0.011)	0.051*** (0.010)	0.051*** (0.010)
high education		0.159*** (0.011)	0.157*** (0.011)	0.123*** (0.011)	0.083*** (0.011)	0.083*** (0.011)
employed		0.023 (0.014)	0.017 (0.014)	0.011 (0.014)	0.006 (0.014)	0.006 (0.014)
retired		0.004 (0.014)	0.000 (0.014)	−0.004 (0.014)	0.001 (0.013)	0.001 (0.013)
hh income		0.070*** (0.006)	0.069*** (0.006)	0.065*** (0.006)	0.049*** (0.005)	0.049*** (0.005)
hh net financial wealth		0.017*** (0.001)	0.017*** (0.001)	0.016*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.001)
adl			−0.037** (0.018)	−0.028 (0.018)	−0.027 (0.018)	−0.026 (0.018)
iadl			−0.057** (0.024)	−0.038 (0.024)	−0.040* (0.023)	−0.041* (0.023)
chronic			−0.002 (0.003)	−0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)
symptoms			−0.004 (0.003)	−0.004 (0.003)	−0.004 (0.003)	−0.004 (0.003)
mother dead			0.002 (0.011)	0.004 (0.011)	0.008 (0.010)	0.008 (0.010)
father dead			0.013 (0.014)	0.016 (0.014)	0.018 (0.013)	0.018 (0.013)
numeracy				0.027*** (0.005)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.004)
fluency				0.004*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)
recall				0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)
trust					0.003* (0.002)	0.012** (0.005)
social interaction					0.034*** (0.008)	0.031 (0.028)

(continued on next page)

Table 5 (continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
risk aversion					–0.253*** (0.008)	–0.197*** (0.028)
optimism $\times$ trust						–0.019* (0.010)
social interaction $\times$ optimism						0.005 (0.055)
risk aversion $\times$ optimism						–0.115** (0.056)
Constant	–1.021*** (0.175)	–1.995*** (0.192)	–1.817*** (0.200)	–1.927*** (0.200)	–1.392*** (0.193)	–1.470*** (0.195)
sigma	0.402*** (0.005)	0.383*** (0.004)	0.382*** (0.004)	0.380*** (0.005)	0.361*** (0.004)	0.361*** (0.004)
Number of observations	15,357	15,357	15,357	15,357	15,357	15,357

Note: Tobit regression models estimated by maximum likelihood and based on 5 sets of multiply-imputed data combined according to [Little and Rubin \(1987\)](#).

* $p < 0.1$.

** $p < 0.05$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

3.3. Robustness analysis

We perform several checks for the robustness of our results.¹³ First, one potential objection is that past success in the stock market might drive today's optimism and financial market participation, causing endogeneity issues. In this respect, it should be noted that we use a broad definition of optimism that has to do with general positive expectations about the future, not only about the financial market, and as such should be less subject to this criticism. In addition, if the relationship between optimism and financial behavior we observe is driven by past success in the stock market, we should not find any correlation between optimism and our dependent variables for individuals who have never invested in the stock market before. To test for this, we use information from the retrospective life-history data collected in the third wave of SHARE (SHARELIFE)¹⁴ on the year in which the respondent invested in the stock market for the first time. The second wave of SHARE we use in our analysis has been run between 2006 and 2007. We then re-estimate our models on a sample including only the respondents who take part in SHARELIFE and did not invest in the stock market before 2006. The sample size reduces to 8,866 and 7,555 individuals for the linear probability model and tobit specifications respectively. Our optimism indicator is still found to be positively and significantly correlated with stock ownership and the share of financial wealth invested in this asset.

Second, we test whether dispositional optimism has an effect also on other financial choices that are particularly relevant for older European workers, such as retirement planning. Unfortunately in SHARE we do not have direct information on whether individuals are planning for retirement. Therefore, we use as indicator for retirement planning a dummy that is equal to one if the respondent holds individual retirement accounts (independently of whether they are invested mostly in stocks, mostly in bonds or half in stocks and half in bonds) and we restrict our sample only to workers ($N = 5075$). The results confirm the importance of dispositional optimism for financial behavior: extremely optimistic individuals are 8.95 percentage points more likely to be planning for retirement than extremely pessimistic individuals.

Third, we test whether the effect of dispositional optimism on financial market participation varies by country by estimating a more flexible specification in which we interact our optimism indicator with the country dummies. For stock ownership, the F -test for the stability of the optimism coefficient across countries rejects the null hypothesis at the 5% level but not at the 1% level (p -value = 0.024). However, the significance of the joint test is driven by two countries only, namely France and Spain, for which the effect of optimism is higher. For the share of wealth invested in stocks, we do not detect cross-country differences in the optimism coefficient at any conventional significance level (p -value = 0.115). These results are consistent with the findings by [Christelis et al. \(2010\)](#), who also do not reject the null hypothesis of the stability of coefficients across countries. As a further sensitivity, we check the robustness of our results to the contribution of a specific country. The estimates and the statistical significance we obtain re-estimating the model excluding one country at the time does not alter the main findings.

Finally, it might be argued that the role of optimism we find is driven by unobserved health heterogeneity which is not captured by the battery of health indicators included in our specification. As a sensitivity analysis, we include respondents' self-assessed health among the set of covariates in our specifications as this is a more general health measure. Our results are overall confirmed. However, we prefer to exclude self-assessed health from our main specification as it is a subjective measure. Conditional on the presence of limitations with (instrumental) activities of daily living, chronic diseases and symptoms, heterogeneity in health self-assessments might capture differences in optimism levels of respondents in rating the severity of their health problems (see [Bago d'Uva, Van Doorslaer, Lindeboom, & O'Donnell, 2008](#)).

¹³ All the results discussed in this section are included in an appendix as [supplementary material](#).

¹⁴ See [Börsch-Supan, Brandt, Hank, and Schröder \(2005\)](#) and [Schröder \(2011\)](#).

4. Conclusions

We draw data from the second wave of SHARE to analyze the relationship between dispositional optimism and stock market participation in twelve European countries. Following Puri and Robinson (2007), we develop an indicator of dispositional optimism based on the miscalibration between subjective and objective survival probabilities. We analyze total stock market participation, which also include stocks held in mutual funds and individual retirement accounts, at both the extensive and the intensive margin. Our paper extends the previous literature by estimating the relationship between dispositional optimism and financial investments in stocks controlling not only for a rich set of demographic and socio-economic characteristics but also for cognitive skills and personality traits, namely risk aversion, trust and social interactions. We find that optimism is significantly and positively related to both the probability of stock ownership and the share of wealth invested in stocks. If we focus on the ownership of stocks, we find that dispositional optimism mainly matters for risk tolerant agents, for whom being extremely optimistic rather than extremely pessimistic is associated with a statistically and economically significant increase in the probability of holding stocks of about 16 percentage points. However, for risk averse agents dispositional optimism plays a negligible role on financial behavior. If we look at the share of wealth invested in stocks, for risk tolerant investors with no trust in other people, being extremely optimistic rather than extremely pessimistic is associated with an increase of about 9 percentage points in the total share of wealth that they invest in stocks. These empirical findings provide support for the development and the calibration of theoretical models of financial behavior that incorporate standard economic determinants with the behavioral characteristic of agents. Pessimistic individuals might develop unattractive beliefs of the actual costs of trading and managing stocks and decide not to participate in the market, even if they are not risk averse. However, our results suggest that investing in their education and numeracy might offset the impact of their negative attitude towards life and lower barriers to financial market participation.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Editor and two anonymous referees for extremely useful comments and suggestions. This paper uses data from SHARE waves 1 and 2 release 2.6.0, as of November 29 2013, and wave 3 release 1.0.0, as of November 24 2010 (DOI: 10.6103/SHARE.w1.260, 10.6103/SHARE.w2.260 and 10.6103/SHARE.w3.100). The SHARE data collection has been primarily funded by the European Commission through the 5th Framework Programme (project QLK6-CT-2001-00360 in the thematic programme Quality of Life), through the 6th Framework Programme (projects SHARE-I3, RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE, CIT5-CT-2005-028857, and SHARELIFE, CIT4-CT-2006-028812) and through the 7th Framework Programme (SHARE-PREP, N 211909, SHARE-LEAP, N 227822 and SHARE M4, N 261982). Additional funding from the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01 AG09740-13S2, P01 AG005842, P01 AG08291, P30 AG12815, R21 AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG BSR06-11 and OGHA 04-064) and the German Ministry of Education and Research as well as from various national sources is gratefully acknowledged (see www.share-project.org for a full list of funding institutions).

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.01.006>.

References

- Bago d'Uva, T., Van Doorslaer, E., Lindeboom, M., & O'Donnell, O. (2008). Does reporting heterogeneity bias the measurement of health disparities? *Health Economics*, 17(3), 351–375.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brandt, M., Hank, K., & Schröder, M. (Eds.). (2005). *The individual and the welfare state. Life histories in Europe*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brandt, M., Hunkler, C., Kneip, T., Korbacher, J., Malter, F., ... Zuber, S. (2013). Data resource profile: The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE). *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 42(4), 992–1001.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brügiavini, A., Jürgens, H., Kapteyn, A., Mackenbach, J., & Siegrist, J., et al. (Eds.). (2008). *Health, aging and retirement in Europe (2004–2007). Starting the longitudinal dimension*. Mannheim: MEA.
- Börsch-Supan, A., Brügiavini, A., Jürgens, H., Mackenbach, J., Siegrist, J., & Weber, G. (Eds.). (2005). *Health, aging and retirement in Europe – First results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe*. Mannheim: MEA.
- Campbell, J. Y. (2006). Household finance. *Journal of Finance*, 61(4), 1553–1604.
- Christelis, D. (2008). Item non-response in share wave 2. In A. Börsch-Supan, A. Brügiavini, H. Jürgens, A. Kapteyn, J. Mackenbach, & J. Siegrist, et al. (Eds.), *Health, aging and retirement in Europe (2004–2007). Starting the longitudinal dimension*. Mannheim: MEA.
- Christelis, D. (2011). *Imputation of missing data in waves 1 and 2 of SHARE*. CSEF working paper series 278. Centre for Studies in Economics and Finance (CSEF), University of Naples, Italy.
- Christelis, D., Jappelli, T., & Padula, M. (2010). Cognitive abilities and portfolio choice. *European Economic Review*, 54(1), 18–38.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2008). Trusting the stock market. *Journal of Finance*, 63(6), 2557–2600.
- Hong, H., Kubik, J. D., & Stein, J. C. (2004). Social interaction and stock-market participation. *Journal of Finance*, 59(1), 137–163.
- Little, R. J., & Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Statistical analysis with missing data* (1st ed.). Wiley.
- Peracchi, F., & Perotti, V. (2010). *Subjective survival probabilities and life tables: Evidence from Europe*. EIEF working papers series 1016. Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance (EIEF).
- Perozek, M. (2008). Using subjective expectations to forecast longevity: do survey respondents know something we don't know? *Demography*, 45(1), 95–113.
- Puri, M., & Robinson, D. T. (2007). Optimism and economic choice. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 86(1), 71–99.

- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4 (3), 219–247.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the life orientation test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(1), 132–139.
- Schröder, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Retrospective data collection in the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe. SHARELIFE methodology*. Mannheim: MEA.