In this study, experimental subjects are asked to review four S&P 500 index fund prospectuses and then allocate $10,000 across those funds. Because the four funds invest in an identical portfolio of stocks (the S&P 500 index), they should have a nearly identical investment return except for the mutual fund fee. The four funds had different mutual fund fees. Some of the subjects were given only the fund prospectuses (with fee information imbedded in a very long document). Others were given a one-page summary of fund fees, along with the prospectuses. A third group was given a summary sheet showing each index fund’s annualized return since inception—a largely irrelevant document, because of the different dates of inception listed, and the identical underlying portfolio of fund investments. Those receiving the fee summary sheet chose lower-cost index funds on average. But even with the summary sheet, over 80% still failed to minimize the fees on their investment. Those receiving the return since inception summary sheet chose funds with inception dates suggesting a higher historical return. In fact, in chasing the historical returns, the subjects were choosing the higher fee funds which would have done worse (after fees) over any common historical time period. These results support a growing body of evidence that individual investors are not well equipped to make optimal asset allocation choices in the current regulatory environment; and that policymakers should evaluate carefully how to select the fund options in a personal account component of the Social Security system.