

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/151759>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

1  
2  
3  
4 **The Effects of Retirement on Sense of Purpose in Life: Crisis or Opportunity?**  
5

6 **Running Head:** Retirement and Sense of Purpose in Life  
7

8  
9 **Word count:** 750 (excluding abstract and statement of relevance, methods and results, author  
10  
11 contributions and references)  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

**Abstract (Word Count: 149)**

Does retirement lead to an existential crisis or present an opportunity to experience a renewed sense of purpose in life? Prior research has documented a negative association between retirement and sense of purpose in life, suggesting that retirement could lead people to feel aimless and lost. We revisit these findings using a quasi-experimental approach and identify the causal impact of retirement on purpose in life. In a nationally representative panel of American adults ( $N = 8,113$ ), we apply an instrumental variable analysis and use the differences in the likelihood of retirement driven by Social Security retirement incentives in the US to find a sizable increase in purpose in life as an outcome of retirement. These improvements are driven by lower socioeconomic status individuals who retire from dissatisfying jobs. The findings suggest that retirement may provide an opportunity to experience a renewed sense of purpose, especially among socioeconomically disadvantaged populations.

**Statement of Relevance (Word Count: 143)**

Work provides people with a structure for living, goals, and a sense of identity; therefore, retirement is considered a developmental milestone that initiates significant changes in people's conceptions of self and life. However, it is unclear whether this important transition leads to an increase or a decrease in a general sense of purpose in life. While existing correlational evidence supports the idea that sense of purpose declines during retirement, our study uses rigorous quasi-experimental techniques to show that the effects of retirement on sense of purpose are *positive* and driven by lower socioeconomic status individuals who are dissatisfied with their work. The findings are important in the global context of aging populations and policy debates about increasing mandatory retirement ages to make older adults work longer. The findings suggest that policies that delay retirement may have adverse psychological impacts, especially on vulnerable populations.

## Introduction

For many people, work is more than a paycheck. Work provides a social role and identity (Froidevaux, Hirschi, & Wange, 2018) and is considered an essential source of purpose in life (Ward & King, 2017). In retirement, people lose the roles, goals, and structure provided by work, which can create an existential vacuum and cause people to feel aimless and lost.

Consistent with this hypothesis, a meta-analysis documented a negative correlation between retirement and sense of purpose in life ( $N = 2,858$ ) (Pinquart, 2002). More recent work found a positive link between retirement status and longitudinal declines in sense of purpose (Hill & Weston, 2017). However, these associations may not accurately reflect the causal impact of retirement on purpose in life; instead, they may capture the reverse relationship whereby retirement is driven by decreases in purpose. Or, the associations could be explained by unmeasured factors (e.g., illness, bereavement) that simultaneously change purpose while inducing the decision to retire.

To rule out these alternative explanations, we used a quasi-experimental approach that allowed us to estimate the causal impact of retirement on sense of purpose in life. Following prior studies (e.g., Charles, 2004; Gorry, Gorry, Slavov, 2018), our analysis took advantage of a variation in retirement that is driven by eligibility rules for Social Security retirement benefits in the US. Since benefits are offered to all citizens but only at specific ages (e.g., 62, 65), changes in Social Security eligibility status creates a variation in the likelihood of retirement independent of personal factors that could confound the relationship between retirement and purpose in life (e.g., bereavement, illness, or baseline levels of purpose). In a nationally representative longitudinal panel of Americans ( $N = 8,113$ ), we used an instrumental variable analysis to isolate

1  
2  
3 this policy-driven variation in retirement and uncovered a positive causal impact of retirement on  
4 sense of purpose in life over 4-8 years.  
5  
6

7 We also used these data to examine whether the effects of retirement differed over the short  
8 (1-4 years) or long-term (4-8 years) and to explore respondent characteristics driving our results.  
9  
10 The resource theory of retirement suggests that social, financial, and psychological resources  
11 could moderate the effects of retirement on well-being (Wang & Shi, 2014). Identity-based  
12 theories also highlight the possibility of *positive* changes in well-being upon retirement for those  
13 with lower work identification or higher job stress (Froidevaux et al., 2018). To address these  
14 theories, we documented for whom retirement may affect sense of purpose positively and why.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **Method**

### 25 *Participants*

26  
27 We tested our hypotheses in a sample recruited from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS)  
28 - a longitudinal, nationally representative study of aging in the US (Health and Retirement Study,  
29 2006-2016). In 2006 (Wave 1), 50% of the HRS panel were randomly chosen to complete a  
30 lifestyle questionnaire, which included questions about sense of purpose and included  
31 longitudinal follow-ups in 2010 and 2014. The remaining 50% of the sample completed this  
32 questionnaire in 2008 (Wave 2), with follow-ups in 2012 and 2016 (Sonnegg et al., 2014). Our  
33 initial sample included 14,275 individuals who completed the lifestyle questionnaire.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Since our hypotheses only apply to individuals who transitioned from work to retirement, we  
47 excluded 3,367 individuals who, at any wave, reported that they were out of the labor force,  
48 unemployed, or disabled. We excluded observations with missing data on sense of purpose or  
49 labor force status in any given wave. This led to the exclusion of 2,400 individuals. We dropped  
50 observations if individuals used a proxy in a given wave (e.g., their spouse or child responded on  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their behalf); this led to the exclusion of 58 individuals. After retaining participants who had at  
4  
5 least two observations for our panel data analysis, the analytic sample consisted of 8,113  
6  
7 individuals and 21,714 person-wave observations. The exclusion criteria and changes in sample  
8  
9 size are reported in detail in Table S1 and sample characteristics are described in Table S2.  
10  
11

## 12 **Measures**

13  
14  
15 **Purpose in Life.** Sense of purpose in life was assessed with a widely used seven-item scale  
16  
17 that measures the extent to which people have goals and aims that give direction and meaning to  
18  
19 their lives (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The scale includes questions such as “I have a sense of  
20  
21 direction and purpose in life” and “My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me”  
22  
23 (reverse scored) rated on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). By capturing  
24  
25 people’s degree of meaningful engagement with goals and daily activities, the sense of purpose  
26  
27 measure captures productive engagement with life and existential concerns, which are critical  
28  
29 issues at later stages of life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Sense of purpose was measured in all waves of the HRS data ( $M = 4.65$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ). The  
35  
36 scores for the items were averaged and the final measure showed strong reliability at all waves  
37  
38 ( $\alpha_{t1} = .74$ ;  $\alpha_{t2} = .77$ ;  $\alpha_{t3} = .77$ ). The variable was set to missing if respondents left more than three  
39  
40 items missing, which corresponded to less than .001% of the sample. The measure was  
41  
42 standardized ( $M = 0$ ,  $SD = 1$ ) to report the results in standard deviation units.  
43  
44

45  
46 **Retirement.** The HRS includes a battery of questions about retirement status. In one question,  
47  
48 individuals are asked: “At this time do you consider yourself to be completely retired, partly  
49  
50 retired, or not retired at all?”. Other questions ask about employment status in the respondents’  
51  
52 primary, second, and third jobs (e.g., working part-time, working full-time, retired, etc.). Using  
53  
54 HRS data, the RAND Institute for the Study of Aging created a new dataset whereby certain  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 variables, including the labor force status variable, were imputed and standardized (RAND HRS  
4  
5 Longitudinal File 2016 (V1), 2006). We used the labor force status variable in RAND HRS  
6  
7 Longitudinal data files to construct the retirement variable (Bugliari et al., 2019).  
8  
9

10 The labor status variable in the RAND data classified individuals as ‘fully retired’ if (i) they  
11 reported that they were retired in any of the questions included in the survey, and (ii) they  
12 reported that they were not looking for employment. If respondents reported part-time  
13  
14 employment and mention being retired, they were classified as partly retired. Individuals were  
15  
16 classified as working full time if they reported working 35+ hours per week. Any respondent  
17  
18 who worked less than this threshold were classified as working part-time. In the sample used in  
19  
20 our analysis ( $N = 8,113$ ), 56% were fully retired, 12% were partly retired, 26% were employed  
21  
22 full time, and 5% were employed part-time based on RAND data. To create a dummy variable  
23  
24 that measured retirement, we assigned a value of “1” to fully and partly retired and “0” to full-  
25  
26 time and part-time working respondents (for a similar operationalization, see Gorry et al., 2018).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Prior research has defined retirement as an active withdrawal from work, which is described  
34 as a behavioral change that occurs over time (Wang & Shi, 2014). Since retirement was  
35  
36 measured in all HRS waves, we could apply panel data methods to track changes in retirement  
37  
38 status over time: from 0 (part-time or full-time working) to 1 (partial or full-time retired). As an  
39  
40 exploratory analysis, we estimated the effects of transitioning from full-time work to full-time  
41  
42 retirement and from full-time work to partial retirement (for an explanation of the models and  
43  
44 results of this analysis, see Table S3).  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 **Covariates.** The panel data methods we applied focus on assessing within-person changes  
50 over time, which automatically controls for person-fixed factors that do not change over time.  
51  
52 Therefore, our regression models do not include person-fixed covariates like gender, race, and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 education. Instead, we include time-varying covariates which could change within-person over  
4  
5 time and that were measured in all waves of the data as follows: marital status, age, household  
6  
7 income, and perceived health. Across waves, marital status was coded as “1” if respondents were  
8  
9 married or partnered and “0” if they were divorced, widowed, spouse absent, or never married.  
10  
11 Age was measured in months, and age-squared and age-cubed were also used to account for any  
12  
13 potential non-linear relationships with age. Household income equaled the sum of pensions and  
14  
15 annuities, social security disability and retirement, unemployment and workers’ compensation,  
16  
17 other government transfers, and household capital income for the spouse and respondent in the  
18  
19 last calendar year. A single-item measure provided a global assessment of one’s health on a scale  
20  
21 from 1 (*poor*) to 5 (*excellent*).  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 ***Other Variables.*** We also examined the characteristics of the population that drove the  
27  
28 effects of retirement in the current analysis. We used the following sociodemographic variables:  
29  
30 gender (female = 1, male = 0), race (white = 1, other = 0), a person-fixed measure of education  
31  
32 (college graduate = 1, other = 0), and a baseline measure of marital status (married/partnered = 1,  
33  
34 other = 0). As economic variables, we used baseline measures of i) household income (see  
35  
36 above), ii) total wealth: the value of assets (e.g., residence, real estate, vehicles) owned by the  
37  
38 household minus debts (e.g., mortgage, home loans), and iii) labor income: the sum of the  
39  
40 respondent’s wage, bonuses, 2nd job or military earnings, professional practice, or trade income.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 We also used two work-related characteristics at the baseline. First, occupation was measured  
46  
47 based on 1980 US Census data. A respondent was coded as “1” if they were a “white-collar”  
48  
49 employee, working in managerial and professional occupations or technical, sales, and  
50  
51 administrative support occupations in their job with the longest tenure. All others (blue-collar  
52  
53 and service workers) were coded as “0”. Job satisfaction was constructed using the average  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 scores from nine questions that assessed satisfaction with various aspects of the job at the  
4  
5 baseline wave (e.g., support, freedom, recognition, security) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly*  
6  
7 *agree*) ( $\alpha = .80$ ) (Karasek, 1979). Finally, we also used baseline sense of purpose in life and  
8  
9 perceived health in understanding respondent characteristics.  
10  
11

### 12 ***Statistical Analysis***

13  
14  
15 ***Main Analysis.*** We used an instrumental variable (IV) approach to identify the causal impact  
16  
17 of retirement on sense of purpose in life. The IV is a commonly used statistical tool in economics  
18  
19 to enable causal inferences from observational data when random assignment of a treatment is  
20  
21 not feasible or ethical (Angrist & Pischke, 2008). The IV overcomes the limitations of  
22  
23 correlational analysis in observational data which also plague the analysis of retirement and  
24  
25 purpose in life. The associations between retirement and purpose in life may be driven by  
26  
27 decreasing levels of purpose inducing the decision to retire (reverse causality) or unmeasured  
28  
29 factors such as bereavement, illness, or retirement of loved ones that simultaneously lower sense  
30  
31 of purpose while increasing the likelihood of retirement (omitted variable problem). Since these  
32  
33 factors most likely yield opposing influences on retirement and purpose (the effects on purpose  
34  
35 are negative and the effects on retirement are positive), the association between retirement and  
36  
37 purpose could be biased towards zero, i.e., appear more negative than the true relationship  
38  
39 between retirement and purpose.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 The IV addresses these issues in correlational analysis by isolating an ‘exogenous’  
47  
48 variation in the likelihood of retirement, i.e., a variation that is created by an external factor  
49  
50 which is independent of the outcome (purpose in life) and other determinants of the outcome  
51  
52 (e.g., bereavement, illness). By using this exogenous variation in retirement and measuring its  
53  
54 impacts on sense of purpose in life, the IV rules out the possibility that this relationship between  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 retirement and sense of purpose in life may be driven by reverse causality or omitted variables,  
4  
5 and increases our confidence that the relationship will accurately capture the direct causal impact  
6  
7 of retirement on sense of purpose in life.  
8  
9

10 In IV, a third variable (an instrument) is used to measure the external factor that creates the  
11  
12 exogenous variation in the explanatory variable (retirement). Consistent with previous studies on  
13  
14 the causal effects of retirement in health economics (e.g., Charles, 2004; Gorry et al., 2018), we  
15  
16 used eligibility status for Social Security (SS) retirement benefits in the US as an instrument in  
17  
18 our analysis. The US retirement policy allows individuals to claim 80% of their retirement  
19  
20 benefits for the first time at age 62 or wait and claim 100% of benefits at the normal retirement  
21  
22 ages, which, depending on their birth cohort, varies between ages 65 and 67 ( $M = 66$ ,  $SD = .49$ ,  
23  
24 see Table S4). Prior studies have shown that SS eligibility is a strong determinant of retirement  
25  
26 behavior in the US population (Fitzpatrick & Moore, 2018; Gorry et al., 2018). In addition,  
27  
28 government-set retirement incentives apply to everyone who reaches a certain age; hence, one's  
29  
30 date of birth and government policy are the only determinants of SS eligibility. Factors such as  
31  
32 sense of purpose in life or other potential unobserved factors related to purpose should not have a  
33  
34 direct effect on the timing of SS eligibility. Therefore, SS eligibility is a valid instrument that  
35  
36 creates an exogenous variation in the likelihood of retirement enabling us to estimate the causal  
37  
38 impact of retirement on sense of purpose in life.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 In applying the IV analysis to current data, we first regressed retirement status on SS  
45  
46 eligibility to test whether crossing the SS age thresholds predicted within-person changes in  
47  
48 retirement over time (the first-stage regression). Here, SS eligibility was measured with two  
49  
50 dummy variables that indicated whether or not the respondents were eligible for early retirement  
51  
52 benefits (1 = age 62 or higher) and normal retirement benefits in a given wave (1 = ages 65-67 or  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 higher, see Table S4). We then used, in the second stage, the predicted values of retirement from  
4  
5 the first-stage as a predictor of changes in people's self-reported sense of purpose over time.

6  
7 Note that these two steps were estimated simultaneously rather than separately in a regression.  
8  
9

10 Note also that we applied the IV analysis in panel data, which enabled us to study within-  
11  
12 person changes in retirement and sense of purpose in life using individual fixed effects (FE). By  
13  
14 focusing on within-person changes, the FE method automatically controls for all factors that  
15  
16 remain stable over time for each individual. These include, but are not limited to, person-specific  
17  
18 factors such as early life experiences, personality, and genetic factors that are hard to observe  
19  
20 and measure. This method also removes the need to control for *any* of the observable person-  
21  
22 fixed determinants of purpose, including gender, race, and highest educational level.  
23  
24  
25

26 Even though a valid IV does not require including further controls to obtain unbiased  
27  
28 estimates, we also controlled for within-person changes in marital status, income, and perceived  
29  
30 health from all waves in our models as a further robustness check. Similarly, we included age,  
31  
32 age-squared, and age-cube from all waves to prevent the possibility that our model only captured  
33  
34 the effects of aging on purpose in life. Holding constant the effects of aging in general, it is  
35  
36 unlikely that these specific SS eligibility ages coincide with any abrupt changes in purpose  
37  
38 directly or initiate special life events (apart from retirement) that could change average levels of  
39  
40 purpose. This implies that changes in retirement status are likely the only channel through which  
41  
42 SS eligibility ages can induce within-person changes in purpose in life. We clustered standard  
43  
44 errors at the household level in all the models to control for potential non-independence of  
45  
46 responses across members of the same family – 47% of the unique individuals in the data had  
47  
48 another household member participating in the survey.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 We also estimated whether the effects of retirement on sense of purpose in life varied over  
4 time by replacing the retirement dummy with i) a dummy variable indicating being retired for 1  
5 to 4 years, and ii) a dummy variable indicating being retired for 4 to 8 years<sup>1</sup>. In this analysis,  
6 four instruments were used: dummy variables indicating being 1-4 years above the eligibility  
7 ages for early retirement (i) and normal retirement (ii), and 4-8 years above the eligibility ages  
8 for early retirement (iii) and normal retirement (iv).  
9

10  
11  
12 ***The Validity of the Instrumental Variables.*** We provided statistical evidence to support that  
13 SS eligibility dummies are valid instruments by showing that (i) they created meaningful  
14 changes in the explanatory variable (retirement), but (ii) they were not directly related to the  
15 outcome (purpose in life) or its unobserved determinants beyond their effects on retirement. As  
16 shown in Figure S1, the probability of retirement increased with age, and there was a noticeably  
17 sharp and large increase in retirement between the ages of 61 to 62 when individuals first  
18 become eligible for early retirement benefits. The graph also documented a steady increase in  
19 retirement at normal pension eligibility (65-67)<sup>2</sup>. Importantly, as revealed by the first-stage  
20 regression analysis (see Table S5), controlling for changes in income, perceived health, marital  
21 status, and linear and non-linear relationships with age, changes in retirement status were  
22 predicted by early retirement eligibility ( $\beta = 0.17$ , 95% CI = [0.142,0.191],  $p < .001$ ) and normal  
23 retirement eligibility ( $\beta = 0.10$ , 95% CI = [0.079,0.124],  $p < .001$ ). To validate the strength of the  
24 instruments, a common recommendation is that the F-statistic that tests the joint significance of  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50  
51 <sup>1</sup> These periods were chosen due to the four-year intervals between survey waves, which constitutes the period  
52 over which we can assess changes in this data.

53 <sup>2</sup> The graph is less informative for tracking jumps in retirement as a result of reaching normal retirement ages  
54 because pension incentives are available to participants at different points between the ages of 65 and 67 based on  
55 respondents' specific birth cohort (Table S4). It is therefore not possible to directly observe these jumps for specific  
56 birth cohorts in the graph; however, the increase in retirement at these ages are still evident, although more evenly  
57 spread out in the graph.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the instruments in the first-stage regression model should be above 10 (Stock, Wright, & Yogo,  
4 2002), which was supported in the current analysis ( $F(2, 6195) = 127.30, p < .001$ ).

5  
6  
7 We also tested whether the instruments were statistically independent of unobserved  
8 variables or the outcome in the data (Sargan, 1958), which requires that the null hypothesis that  
9 supports the independence assumption is not rejected in Sargan-Hansen test. The null hypothesis  
10 in Sargan-Hansen test was not rejected in the FE-IV model without covariates (Column 2, Table  
11 1) ( $J = .422; \text{chi-sq } P = .516$ ) or with covariates ( $J = .331; \text{chi-sq } P = .565$ ), providing evidence  
12 that the instruments were valid in enabling causal inferences. Altogether, these analyses provide  
13 support that our application of the instrumental variable analysis in the current data using SS  
14 eligibility dummies as IV is appropriate for estimating the causal impact of retirement on sense  
15 of purpose in life.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Complier Analysis.** The IV analysis is considered similar to randomized controlled trials  
29 where people are randomly assigned to a treatment condition, but not everyone complies or fully  
30 participates in the treatment. This is also the case in the current analysis where not everyone who  
31 is treated (who reached retirement eligibility ages) complied with the treatment (shifted into  
32 retirement). There were individuals who, despite turning 62 or 65-67, continued to work and  
33 retired at other, later ages. Hence, the IV method only estimates the local average treatment  
34 effect (LATE). This is the causal effect of retirement among individuals whose decision to retire  
35 was directly influenced by reaching the SS eligible ages – that is, among the compliers. An  
36 important question is to understand who these compliers are in the current analysis.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Following Angrist and Pischke (2008), we described complier characteristics using the  
50 coefficients of the eligibility age dummies from the first stage regression. When estimated in the  
51 full sample, these coefficients measured the probability of complying (moving into retirement) in  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 response to early and normal retirement eligibility ages for the general population. When  
4  
5 estimated in a restricted sample (e.g., college graduates), the coefficients measured the  
6  
7 probability of compliance in that subpopulation. By dividing the probability in the restricted  
8  
9 sample by the probability in the full sample, we are able to calculate the relative likelihood that a  
10  
11 complier of early or normal retirement eligibility is from a subgroup of the population (e.g., a  
12  
13 college graduate) compared to the full sample, which represents the general population (see  
14  
15 Table S6 in Supplementary Material).  
16  
17

18  
19 Note that any differences in pre-retirement characteristics between compliers vs. the full  
20  
21 sample determines ‘for whom’ the causal estimates apply but they do not threaten the internal  
22  
23 validity of the estimates (that the IV estimates measure unbiased causal relationships). Since the  
24  
25 timing of SS eligibility cannot be determined by individual characteristics, eligibility-driven  
26  
27 changes in the likelihood of retirement can be assumed to be independent of these factors.  
28  
29 Additionally, our application of within-person analysis prevents pre-retirement, person-fixed  
30  
31 factors from affecting our results.  
32  
33

34  
35 Because the IV estimates were based on the compliers’ responses to the instruments, one  
36  
37 question is whether our results can be generalized outside the context of our study. To answer  
38  
39 this question, it is useful to know that at least a third of the US population retires at the age of 62,  
40  
41 the age at which retirement benefits first become available (Fitzpatrick & Moore, 2018). In  
42  
43 addition, age-based rules for retirement eligibility are used many countries around the world.  
44  
45 Therefore, the age thresholds used as instruments in our analysis are relevant for large groups of  
46  
47 the population in the US and many other countries, lending further support for the external  
48  
49 validity of the IV estimates.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


1  
2  
3 For completeness, we discuss our empirical strategy in detail here. To replicate earlier  
4 findings in the literature which documented a negative association between retirement and sense  
5 of purpose in life (Hill & Weston, 2017; Pinqart, 2002), we first regressed sense of purpose in  
6 life on retirement in a standard ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis using cross-  
7 sectional data from the baseline wave (1). Next, we provided within-person estimates of the  
8 relationship between retirement and sense of purpose in life in an FE regression (2). We then  
9 combined the FE model with the IV approach to identify the causal effects of retirement on  
10 purpose in life which represent the main findings of the present research (3). We used this step-  
11 by-step analysis to document the biases in the correlational estimates and how these biases could  
12 be addressed through the application of more advanced models. We also explored whether being  
13 retired for shorter vs. longer periods of time differentially impacted sense of purpose (4) and  
14 examined the characteristics of the individuals whose sense of purpose has been impacted by  
15 changes in retirement status induced by pension eligibility ages (5).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **Results**

### 34 *Main Analysis: The Effects of Retirement on Sense of Purpose in Life*

35  
36  
37  
38  
39 Does retirement increase or decrease sense of purpose in life? To provide an initial test of  
40 this question, in Figure 1 we document the raw data relationship between sense of purpose in life  
41 and age using cross-sectional data from all waves. Consistent with previous work (Springer et  
42 al., 2011), Figure 1 shows that sense of purpose declined as a function of age among middle-  
43 aged and older adults, but the figure also demonstrated a noticeable increase in sense of purpose  
44 following the SS eligibility ages for early (62) and normal retirement (between 65 and 67 with an  
45 average of 66), which are demarked with vertical lines. This figure provides graphical evidence  
46 that the act of retirement may increase sense of purpose in life. Further, it highlights the  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

possibility that declines in sense of purpose over time (or factors related to this decline) may increase retirement behavior, creating a negative bias in the relationship between retirement and sense of purpose. By progressing from basic correlational analysis to more advanced methods that tackle these biases, we can observe whether the correlational estimates were indeed biased in the current data.



**Fig. 1.** Mean Levels of Sense of Purpose as a Function of Age. Vertical lines represent Social Security retirement eligibility ages in the US. Data was drawn from Health and Retirement Study (2006-2016).

We wanted to test if, in the absence of the FE-IV strategy, we could replicate earlier findings that have shown a negative association between retirement and sense of purpose (Hill & Weston, 2017; Pinquart, 2002). The standard OLS in regression analysis in baseline cross-sectional data has shown this possibility. As reported in Table 1, Column 1, there was a negative association between retirement and sense of purpose controlling for the effects from aging ( $\beta = -0.21$ , 95% CI = [-0.271, -0.152],  $p < .001$ ). Next, we studied the associations between within-person changes in retirement and purpose while holding constant person-specific confounding factors in



1  
2  
3 an FE model in panel data. As reported in Column 2, this also produced a negative coefficient for  
4 retirement ( $\beta = -0.08$ , 95% CI = [-0.120, -0.035],  $p < .001$ ) however the size of the association  
5 was smaller and *less* negative. This suggests that the initial correlations may have been biased  
6 towards zero due to the confounding factors unaccounted for in the model.  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 Next, we combined the IV analysis with FE to estimate the causal impact of retirement on  
13 sense of purpose. This method tackled the sources of bias that cannot be accounted for in the  
14 within-person analysis such as those that arise from reverse causality and unobserved factors that  
15 are not fixed at the individual level but vary over time (e.g., changes in health, bereavement). As  
16 reported in Columns 3 and 4 in Table 1, in the FE-IV model, retirement had a positive effect on  
17 sense of purpose ( $\beta = 0.32$ , 95% CI = [0.072, 0.574],  $p = .012$ ), even after controlling for  
18 changes in marital status, household income and perceived health ( $\beta = 0.29$ , 95% CI = [0.043,  
19 0.541],  $p = .021$ ). As shown in Column 5 in Table 1, the positive effects were larger in  
20 magnitude and more precisely estimated for people who had been retired for four years or less ( $\beta$   
21 = 0.37, 95% CI = [0.081, 0.664],  $p = .012$ ) vs. between four to eight years ( $\beta = 0.20$ , 95% CI = [-  
22 0.148, 0.554],  $p = .257$ ).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 The effects remained positive when we estimated the effects of shifting from full-time work  
39 to full-time retirement (Column 1, Table S3) and the effects of shifting from full-time work to  
40 part-time retirement (Column 2, Table S3). Nevertheless, the effects were not significant, likely  
41 due to the smaller sample size available.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Results continued to hold when i) we used survey weights to adjust the sample for  
48 representativeness; ii) we excluded individuals who returned to employment after retiring (2% of  
49 the sample), iii) we adjusted the model to include changes in spousal retirement status, which  
50 was not included in the main analysis due to a large number of missing data (see Columns 3-4 in  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table S3, Supplementary Material). Excluding individuals whose household income or full-time job earnings were above the 91<sup>st</sup> or 95<sup>th</sup> percentile did not change these findings in a meaningful way (Table S7, Supplementary Material).

**Table 1.** The Impact of Retirement on Sense of Purpose in Life

Model:	OLS	FE	FE-IV	FE-IV	FE-IV
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Purpose in Life	Purpose in Life	Purpose in Life	Purpose in Life	Purpose in Life
Retired	-0.21*** [-0.271, -0.152]	-0.08*** [-0.120, -0.035]	0.32** [0.072, 0.574]	0.29** [0.043, 0.541]	
Retired: 1-4 years					.37** [.081, .664]
Retired: 4-8 years					.20 [-.148, .554]
Age	0.01 [-0.008, 0.019]	0.00 [-0.012, 0.015]	0.01 [-0.009, 0.019]	0.00 [-0.009, 0.018]	-0.00 [-0.024, 0.020]
Age Squared	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]
Age Cube	-0.00	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]	-0.00 [-0.000, 0.000]
Married				0.03 [-0.026, 0.088]	
HH Income (log)				0.01* [-0.001, 0.023]	
Health				0.07*** [0.051, 0.090]	
Year FE	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Individual FE	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
R-squared	0.02	0.04	-	-	-
Observations	8,113	21,714	21,714	21,692	21,714

Note: The first regression model was estimated with ordinary least squares (OLS). The second model included individual fixed effects (FE). The third and fourth models were estimated with an instrumental variable (IV) method combined with individual fixed effects (FE). Three waves of data were drawn from two cohorts of the Health and Retirement Study (Cohort 1: 2006-2010-2014 and Cohort 2: 2008-2012-2016). Purpose in life and health measures were standardized ( $M = 0$ ,  $SD = 1$ ). Income was measured by total household income and logarithmically transformed. Being married was coded as a dummy variable. Age was measured in months. Errors were clustered at the household level in all models. 95% confidence intervals were reported in parenthesis. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

### ***Additional Analysis: Who Drives the Effects of Retirement on Sense of Purpose?***

We also shed light on the characteristics of the individuals whose retirement decision was impacted by the early and normal SS age cut-offs (compliers). The compliers were individuals whose retirement decision led to an improvement in their sense of purpose, according to the IV-FE estimates. Hence, the analysis provided an explanation for the average positive effect in our sample.

1  
2  
3 Our analysis of complier characteristics showed that, compared to the full sample, people  
4 who retired early (at age 62) were 44% less likely to have high satisfaction in their pre-retirement  
5 jobs. They were less likely to have a higher socioeconomic status; as indicated by a 36% lower  
6 likelihood of having a college degree, 16% lower likelihood of working in a white-collar  
7 occupation, 19% lower likelihood of having above-median wealth, and 48% lower likelihood of  
8 having above-median earnings among early retirement eligibility compliers compared to the full  
9 sample. There were no meaningful differences in demographics and perceived health, and  
10 notably, sense of purpose in life between compliers of early retirement eligibility and the full  
11 sample. Compliers of normal retirement eligibility were 20% more likely to be female compared  
12 to the full sample, but they did not differ meaningfully along the other critical dimensions. Full  
13 descriptive statistics are shown in Table S2 in Supplementary Material.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **Discussion**

30  
31 Consistent with previous research (Hill & Weston, 2017; Pinquart, 2002), we found a  
32 negative cross-sectional association between retirement and sense of purpose in life. However,  
33 after applying a quasi-experimental method addressing the limitations of correlational analysis,  
34 we observed a *positive* causal impact of retirement on purpose in life. This effect was  
35 concentrated over the first four post-retirement years and amongst lower-SES individuals who  
36 were dissatisfied in their jobs.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The findings suggest that retirement can foster well-being as a result of improved  
46 psychological resources from leaving a non-satisfactory job (Froidevaux, Hirschi, Wange, 2018)  
47 even when people have less financial resources available upon retirement (Wang & Shi, 2014).  
48 The results contribute to limited research on factors that causally increase sense of purpose in  
49 older ages, a period when sense of purpose tends to show a decline (Springer et al., 2011), yet  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 predicts positive health outcomes (Kim et al., 2017) and longevity (Hill & Turiano, 2014). Note  
4  
5 that sense purpose is considered a motivational factor that gives rise to a general sense of  
6  
7 meaning in life (Ward & King, 2017), so, the findings also shed light on what makes life  
8  
9 meaningful and for whom.  
10

11  
12 People associate work with low pleasure, despite finding it rewarding (White & Dolan,  
13  
14 2009). This implies that retiring may increase happiness but decrease purpose. Studies have  
15  
16 shown retirement-induced increases in life satisfaction (Gorry et al., 2018) and decreases in  
17  
18 depression (Charles, 2004). Yet, we did not find evidence of an asymmetric, negative impact on  
19  
20 purpose, possibly because work is not as strong a source of purpose for lower-SES, older adults.  
21  
22 Building upon our global assessment of purpose in life, future research can use domain-specific  
23  
24 measures to more directly examine the pleasure or purpose people may derive from work vs.  
25  
26 retirement activities (e.g., leisure).  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Overall, our analysis demonstrates that retirement, as a crucial developmental milestone, may  
32  
33 be something to be celebrated rather than feared for many people. In particular, the findings  
34  
35 suggest that the policies to increase mandatory retirement ages may have adverse impacts on the  
36  
37 well-being of socioeconomically vulnerable populations.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J.-S. (2008). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton University Press.
- Bugliari, D., Campbell, N., Chan, C., Hayden, O., Hayes, J., Hurd, M., ... & Moldoff, M. (2019). RAND HRS Longitudinal File 2016 (V1) Documentation. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Center for the Study of Aging.
- Charles, K. K. (2004). Is retirement depressing? Labor force inactivity and psychological well-being in later life. *Research in Labor Economics*, *23*, 269–299.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-9121\(04\)23008-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-9121(04)23008-4)
- Fitzpatrick, M. D., & Moore, T. J. (2018). The mortality effects of retirement: Evidence from Social Security eligibility at age 62. *Journal of Public Economics*, *157*, 121–137.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2017.12.001>
- Froidevaux, A., Hirschi, A., & Wang, M. (2018). Identity incongruence and negotiation in the transition from work to retirement: A theoretical model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *8*(4), 228–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386619830754>
- Gorry, A., Gorry, D., & Slavov, S. N. (2018). Does retirement improve health and life satisfaction? *Health Economics*, *27*(12). <https://doi.org/10.1002/hec.3821>
- Hill, P. L., & Turiano, N. A. (2014). Purpose in Life as a Predictor of Mortality Across Adulthood. *Psychological Science*, *25*(7), 1482–1486.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614531799>
- Hill, P. L., & Weston, S. J. (2017). Evaluating eight-year trajectories for sense of purpose in the health and retirement study. *Aging & Mental Health*, 1–5.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2017.1399344>

- 1  
2  
3 Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for  
4  
5 Job Redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285–306.  
6  
7 <https://doi.org/doi:10.2307/2392498>.  
8  
9  
10 Kim, E. S., Kawachi, I., Chen, Y., & Kubzansky, L. D. (2017). Association Between Purpose in  
11  
12 Life and Objective Measures of Physical Function in Older Adults. *JAMA Psychiatry*,  
13  
14 74(10), 1039–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.2145>  
15  
16  
17 Pinquart, M. (2002). Creating and Maintaining Purpose in Life in Old Age: A Meta-Analysis.  
18  
19 *Ageing International*, 27(2), 90–114. [https://doi-org.ezp-](https://doi-org.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/10.1007/s12126-002-1004-2)  
20  
21 [prod1.hul.harvard.edu/10.1007/s12126-002-1004-2](https://doi-org.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/10.1007/s12126-002-1004-2)  
22  
23  
24 RAND HRS Longitudinal File 2016 (V1). (2006). Produced by the RAND Center for the Study  
25  
26 of Aging, with funding from the National Institute on Aging and the Social Security  
27  
28 Administration. Santa Monica, CA.  
29  
30  
31 Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited.  
32  
33 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719)  
34  
35 [3514.69.4.719](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719)  
36  
37  
38 Sargan JD. (1958). The estimation of economic relationships with instrumental variables.  
39  
40 *Econometrica*, 26, 393–415.  
41  
42  
43 Sonnega, A., Faul, J. D., Ofstedal, M. B., Langa, K. M., Phillips, J. W., & Weir, D. R. (2014).  
44  
45 Cohort Profile: The Health and Retirement Study (HRS). *International Journal of*  
46  
47 *Epidemiology*, 43(2), 576–585. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyu067>  
48  
49  
50 Springer, K. W., Pudrovska, T., & Hauser, R. M. (2011). Does Psychological Well-Being  
51  
52 Change with Age?: Longitudinal Tests of Age Variations and Further Exploration of the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3           Multidimensionality of Ryff's Model of Psychological Well-Being. *Social Science*  
4  
5           *Research*, 40(1), 392–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.05.008>  
6  
7  
8 Stock, J. H., Wright, J. H., & Yogo, M. (2002). A survey of weak instruments and weak  
9  
10           identification in generalized method of moments. *Journal of Business & Economic*  
11  
12           *Statistics*, 20(4), 518-529.  
13  
14  
15 Wang, M., & Shi, J. (2014). Psychological Research on Retirement. *Annual Review of*  
16  
17           *Psychology*, 65(1), 209–233. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115131>  
18  
19 Ward, S. J., & King, L. A. (2017). Work and the good life: How work contributes to meaning in  
20  
21           life. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 37, 59–82.  
22  
23           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.001>  
24  
25  
26 White, M. P., & Dolan, P. (2009). Accounting for the Richness of Daily Activities.  
27  
28           *Psychological Science*, 20(8), 1000–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467->  
29  
30           9280.2009.02392.x  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60