Testing the Effectiveness of Consumer Financial Disclosure: Experimental Evidence From Savings Accounts

Paul Adams AFM Stefan Hunt CMA

Christopher Palmer MIT, NBER, and J-PAL Redis Zaliauskas Lloyds Banking Group

March 2020

Disclaimer (disclosure!)

The views expressed are the personal views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Financial Conduct Authority, the Competition and Markets Authority, the Autoriteit Financiele Markt, or Lloyds Banking Group.

Motivation behind financial disclosure

- Invisible hand under imperfect information is imperfect
- Goods, services, investments are complex, costly and imprecise to evaluate

Motivation behind financial disclosure

- Invisible hand under imperfect information is imperfect
- Goods, services, investments are complex, costly and imprecise to evaluate
- Popular solution: disclosure
- SEC filings, health warnings, fine print, false advertising laws, GDPR...
- Doesn't take a stand on the "right" choice, just inexpensively provides information

Motivation behind financial disclosure

- Invisible hand under imperfect information is imperfect
- Goods, services, investments are complex, costly and imprecise to evaluate
- Popular solution: disclosure
- SEC filings, health warnings, fine print, false advertising laws, GDPR...
- Doesn't take a stand on the "right" choice, just inexpensively provides information
- Classical view: with ample options + info, market discipline sufficient
- substandard product? people will simply switch providers/products

Limits to Disclosure

- But sophistication of disclosure user matters
- Consumer inertia can inhibit market discipline, make choices sticky
- \bullet Understand disclosure's effectiveness \Rightarrow optimize design, reliance

Limits to Disclosure

- But sophistication of disclosure user matters
- Consumer inertia can inhibit market discipline, make choices sticky
- Understand disclosure's effectiveness \Rightarrow optimize design, reliance
- Different causes of switching costs \Rightarrow different policy prescriptions



What we ask in this study

- 1 How much does design of consumer financial disclosure matter?
- 2 What limits disclosure's effectiveness?
- **3** Why are deposits sticky?

Disclosure Design

• Some acknowledgement that disclosure design matters...

...but mandated disclosers still have many degrees of freedom

- Many ways to obfuscate: placement, font size, wording, disclose more...
- Motivates standardization: SEC filings, HUD settlement forms, CARD Act, etc.
- Other settings rely on courts to catch bad-faith disclosers

Our context: testing prospective regulation

- Proposal in parliament to mandate disclosure of best available interest rate
- Goal: address % savings accounts earning below-market rates
- FCA was allowed to test effectiveness with randomized-controlled trials
- Put out a call for banks to partner with FCA to test disclosure effectiveness

Randomized Controlled Trials with 5 UK banks

	Sample	Treatment versions	
1 Better rates (letter front page)	63,000	4	+ survey
2 Better rates (letter reverse page)	13,000	4	+ survey
3 Better rates (letter front) + return form	4,000	1	
4 Rate drop reminder (email or SMS)	24,000	2	
5 Rate drop reminder (SMS)	30,000	4	
	>124,000 customers in total Average gain £123/year (~\$190)		

Why a field experiment?

- Identification: Disclosure law changes concurrent with other changes
- Lab experiments can overstate disclosure effectiveness participants not representative of overloaded consumer
- For policy we need to know *real*-world effectiveness: in the context policy would actually find itself, competing with other priorities
- Solution: large-scale field experiment with real stakes

UK Savings Market Background



Joint-Hypothesis Problem

Problem judging disclosure effectiveness: need to define "right" decision.

- Complex in the real world, where, e.g., high-cost debt could be optimal (Medina, 2017)
- Optimal refinancing decision complex function of private information + beliefs

Joint-Hypothesis Problem

Problem judging disclosure effectiveness: need to define "right" decision.

- Complex in the real world, where, e.g., high-cost debt could be optimal (Medina, 2017)
- Optimal refinancing decision complex function of private information + beliefs

Savings accounts are a promising simple setting

- Optimality of savings account choice easier to segment from other considerations
- One dimensional differentiation: interest rate, can personalize to £s
- UK savings account market large (>\$1tn), many customers on below-market interest rates
- Limitations: branch network, app quality, bank reputation, synergies across accounts
- Solution: "internal switching" option holds everything fixed except r

Context in Literature(s)

- Rich disclosure literature in accounting, marketing, psychology
- Consumer fin. disclosure effectiveness: lab experiments or joint-hypothesis problem
- Many obstacles to disclosure
 - Inattention, financial literacy, switching costs, procrastination, choice overload, ostrich effect, endogenous complexification response by firms
 - Choice is sticky literature: retirement plan defaults, heath insurance plans, cell phone plans, gym memberships, electricity providers
- Sticky deposits
- Consumer financial mistakes

ightarrow First to test design of consumer-facing disclosure where optimality easier to define.

Outline

1 Motivation and Background

Q RCT Design and Data

- **3** Treatment Effects
- **4** Survey Evidence on Mechanisms
- **5** Conclusion and Policy Implications

Trial 1 design: Better rates on front page

Important Information for you

Check your account is still right for you.

You've had your carcounts) for a little while now, and we know how important it is to make the most of your savings. So now might be a good time to consider if it's still the best option, or whether there's another savings account our three that could pow snoe impress, or sail you better.

Your caccount> currently offers

- · An interest rate of kealth> variable
- <conditions in relation to minimum deposit,
- * withdrawals, and frequency of interest payments>
- ٠

How this account compares,

A of 10th August the savings account with the most similar features that we can offer is our caccount with an interest rate of < 17,1796 s₀ but there may be other suitable accounts within our range.

Taking a look at the wider taxings market, the three highest-paying easy access accounts across the market on 10th August offered an average rate of **3.05% variable**. You can find out more about these options at wave, moneyspermarket care





Trial 2 design: Better rates on reverse page



open an cA/C names account you must be 16 or over, and have a current account with us.

Trial 2 design: Better rates on reverse page



Calculations based on interest rates at 26 May 2015 and show interest earned prior to appropriate tax deductions. dependent on your individual circumstances and your current tax status. Rates are variable and subject to change. To open an sA/C names account you must be 16 or over, and have a current account with us

would earn £X.XX this year.

£Y.YY in total (or £A.AA more) a year.

Average of three of the highest paying accounts on the market: <fxx.xx> in total (or more) a vear.

To move your money to <alternative with firm> simply call us on <phone>, visit <weblink> or visit us in branch to find out more. To move your money to an account offered by an alternative provider, open a

Trial 3 design: Better rates + return switching form

Dear +Solutatione>

Get a better rate of interest on your savings.

We are writing to be you know that process get a lattice rule of interest are your savings. Not many a on conversion is a second names, which goes an interest rule of **Savin** Social PANIOS and provides may assess, making process without writing without sharps. By moding is another of our savings assessing assess rune a lattice and of interest and make your saving works harden for pro-

How does my savings account compare?

Anal value 2013, the highest interest rate available from discussion as a comparable account is VIPUS. Gross FA/MDR on our fraccount names

These of the high-six passing-easy access seconds offered by other banks and building anderies offer an average rate of Via Grant RAUER. Price comparison websites can president-dermation on takes affered by other previders.

How much more could Learn in interest?

To make it restor to compare the association in following mamples all can an associat indexer of \$1,000 haund on a finess interest rate.

- 1-43,000 features in your mainting canonical narration datase per year
- > £5,890 belance in our raccount names \$25,990 per year
- > #5,000 behavior in one of the overage 3 highest paying accounts on the market vd> per year



If you would like to open an approximation planar planar contact us. If you have a positional remember to end to an an well.

<authorisation details>

I would like to switch my savings to the <account name> account

<Deposit account> <Account number>

<title><initial><surname><and><title><initial><surname>

<title><initial><surname><and><title><initial><surname>

How much would you like to transfer?

Either choose "Transfer all" or fill in the amount you want to transfer from your <deposit account>.



Transfer part of my savings



How would you like your interest paid? Annually

Monthly

Interest will be paid to the same account as the interest from your <deposit account>. If you would like to change this, please tell us in writing.

	<declaration details=""></declaration>
Signature(s)	Date

Trials 4 & 5 design: Rate drop reminders



RCT Design

	Trial	Treatment details	Rate change	Customer tenure
1	Front-page switching box	Comparison with market rates on front page of annual statement	None	Long
2	Reverse-page switching box	Comparison with market rates on back of rate-change notification letter	Yes, 60 days after treatment to all customers	Mixed
3	Return switching form	Tear-off form pre-filled to switch to higher rate-paying account with same provider	None	Long
4	Digital reminder	Rate decrease reminder via email or SMS	Yes, end of individual bonus period seven weeks before to eight weeks after treatment	Short
5	SMS reminder	Rate decrease reminder via SMS	Yes, one week before to one week after treatment to all customers	Mixed

Administrative Data on Consumers

		Reverse	Return	Digital	SMS
Trial	Front page	page	form	reminder	reminder
Age	59.2	53.2	64.4	52.9	42.4
	(16.58)	(17.23)	(15.92)	(16.15)	(13.92)
Male	0.42	0.41	0.45	0.48	0.52
	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)
Checking Account	0.25	0.80	0.06	0.77	0.98
	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.24)	(0.42)	(0.16)
Account Balance (£)	8,436	7,407	6,812	37,939	24,162
	(20,788)	(22,862)	(18, 156)	(88,633)	(78,574)
Potential Gain (£)	70.02	82.96	76.29	230.56	198.13
	(172.54)	(256.05)	(203.35)	(538.50)	(644.31)
Account Age (years)	13.7	6.7	16.1	1.0	4.7
	(10.86)	(1.25)	(3.99)	(0.09)	(2.45)
# products with provider	1.6	4.6	1.6	4.6	5.4
	(0.88)	(1.88)	(1.28)	(2.55)	(2.86)
Online Banking	0.09	0.58	-	0.84	0.90
	(0.28)	(0.49)	-	(0.37)	(0.29)
Mobile Banking	0.09	0.29	-	0.22	0.30
	(0.29)	(0.45)	-	(0.42)	(0.46)
Observations	61,879	13,261	4,003	15,487	30,202

(Dis)Advantages of multiple banks

- Only one bank: less external validity, still don't know about other contexts
- Practicality: hard to implement significantly different designs @ same bank
- Also hard to implement same design @ different banks

(Dis)Advantages of multiple banks

- Only one bank: less external validity, still don't know about other contexts
- Practicality: hard to implement significantly different designs @ same bank
- Also hard to implement same design @ different banks
- ... but finding one design to be more effective conflated by bank effects
- Less of a concern when effects are similar across designs anyway despite heterogeneity in customer mix, etc.

(Dis)Advantages of multiple banks

- Only one bank: less external validity, still don't know about other contexts
- Practicality: hard to implement significantly different designs @ same bank
- Also hard to implement same design @ different banks
- ... but finding one design to be more effective conflated by bank effects
- Less of a concern when effects are similar across designs anyway despite heterogeneity in customer mix, etc.
- Experiment provides internally valid causal estimates.
- Comparison across settings and customer mixes checks context importance

Randomization Balanced

	Observations	Age	Balance	Male	Checking	Acct age	Joint test
	I. Front-Page Switching Box						
Control	12,723	59.33	8,685	0.42	0.25	13.76	
Treatment	49,156	59.20	8,371	0.42	0.24	13.71	
Equality p-value		[0.45]	[0.13]	[0.89]	[0.12]	[0.66]	[0.20]
			II. Revers	e-Page Swit	ching Box		
Control	2,659	53.93	7,359	0.41	0.80	6.74	
Treatment	10,602	53.01	7,419	0.41	0.80	6.71	
Equality p-value		[0.01]	[0.90]	[0.94]	[0.99]	[0.31]	[0.11]
			<i>III</i> .	Switching F	Form		
Control	1,999	64.65	6,749	0.44	0.06	16.00	
Treatment	2,004	64.22	6,874	0.46	0.06	16.12	
Equality p-value		[0.40]	[0.83]	[0.22]	[0.80]	[0.35]	[0.72]
	IV. Digital Reminder						
Control	5,180	51.86	37,957	0.48	0.79	0.96	
Treatment	10,307	52.02	36,801	0.48	0.78	0.96	
Equality p-value		[0.57]	[0.43]	[0.56]	[0.51]	[0.31]	[0.66]
	V. SMS Reminder						
Control	10,200	42.69	25,046	0.53	0.97	4.62	
Treatment	20,002	42.22	23,711	0.51	0.98	4.70	
Equality p-value		[0.01]	[0.16]	[0.00]	[0.70]	[0.01]	[0.00]

Outline

- 1 Motivation and Background
- 2 RCT Design and Data
- **③** Treatment Effects
- **4** Survey Evidence on Mechanisms
- **5** Conclusion and Policy Implications

Measuring Disclosure Effectiveness

Two primary measures

- close/substantially empty their account (other switching)
- whether switch to internal account (internal switching)

External Switching + Internal Switching := Any Switching

Treatment Effects

Measuring Disclosure Effectiveness

Two primary measures

- close/substantially empty their account (other switching)
- whether switch to internal account (internal switching)

```
External Switching + Internal Switching := Any Switching
```

- Differentiation across banks besides interest rates makes classification of "wrong" decisions problematic
- Solution: study any switching given internal switching option. Can take a stronger stand even though smaller rate gain
- Key: Hard to rationalize preference to stay with dominated easy-access savings product at the same bank (apart from switching frictions)

Results: Overall Effects Modest

%-point increase in switching



Only Modest Effects Across Designs

Trial	Front-page switching box annual statement		Reverse-page switching box		Digital reminder rate decrease	
Switching type	Any	Internal	Any	Internal	Any	Internal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Call to Action	0.009***	0.005***				
	(0.002)	(0.001)				
Best Internal Rate	0.029***	0.025***	-0.0002	0.002		
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.001)		
Best Internal and Competitor Rates	0.018***	0.017***	-0.004	0.0005		
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.001)		
Best Internal and Competitor Rates	0.021***	0.020***				
+ Graph	(0.002)	(0.002)				
Best Internal Rate, Personalized			-0.006	0.001		
			(0.007)	(0.001)		
Best Internal and Competitor Rates,			-0.002	0.001		
Personalized			(0.007)	(0.001)		
Email					0.053***	0.051***
					(0.009)	(0.009)
SMS					0.042***	0.037***
					(0.009)	(0.008)
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Control-Group Mean	0.026	0.009	0.077	0.026	0.400	0.267
Treatment Effect Equality p-value	0.000	0.000	0.873	0.722	0.228	0.114
Observations	61,879	61,879	13,261	13,261	15,487	15,487

Who responds best to disclosure?

- Maybe just not worth it for average consumer?
- Rich measures of heterogeneity: age, balance, number of products with same provider, account age, gender, etc.
 - Low disclosure effectiveness not driven by specific demographic
- Perhaps the gains just aren't enough to care about?
 - \rightarrow Treatment effects similar for large balances (lots to gain), retirees (lower opp cost time)
- Perhaps I like my bank: have my checking account there, trust the brand, find ATMs convenient, automatic transfers set up?
 - $\rightarrow\,$ Focus on internal switching to reduce impact of bank brand

Who responds best to disclosure?

	Front page	Reverse page	Return form	Digital reminder	SMS reminder
Treatment Indicator	0.01*	-0.028	0.065**	0.026	0.016
	(0.006)	(0.018)	(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Treatment $ imes$					
Age 40-60 yrs	-0.0003	0.004	-0.006	0.046**	-0.004
	(0.006)	(0.016)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.010)
Age 60-80 yrs	0.009	0.002	0.036	0.055**	-0.000
	(0.006)	(0.017)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.013)
Age $>$ 80 yrs	0.029***	-0.022	0.017	0.031	0.007
	(0.008)	(0.024)	(0.032)	(0.058)	(0.053)
Gain £50-100	0.006	0.020	0.022	0.026	-0.007
	(0.005)	(0.015)	(0.036)	(0.025)	(0.013)
Gain £100-500	0.003	0.015	0.032	0.001	-0.029***
	(0.005)	(0.012)	(0.023)	(0.020)	(0.010)
${\sf Gain}>{\tt \pounds500}$	0.007	-0.007	0.005	-0.029	-0.006
	(0.013)	(0.024)	(0.056)	(0.029)	(0.016)
Checking Acct	0.005	0.026*	0.011	-0.02	0.015
	(0.004)	(0.014)	(0.036)	(0.020)	(0.022)
Main Effect Controls	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Equality p-value	0.0002	0.44	0.27	0.10	0.21
Observations	61,879	13,261	4,003	15,487	30,202

Outline

- 1 Motivation and Background
- **2** RCT Design and Data
- **3** Treatment Effects
- **4** Survey Evidence on Mechanisms
- **5** Conclusion and Policy Implications

Why disclosure so ineffective? Survey Results

- Caveats: N = 738, just trials 1-2, 10% response rate
- Many can't recall getting or noticing disclosure (40%)
- Those that did, many did not read beyond front page or skimmed the letter (60-75%)
- Many that remember the letter are unaware higher available interest rates (US: most mortgagors think they got best rate)
- Those that switched report being satisfied
- Most expected switching process to be more onerous than it turned out to be (~15 minutes)
- \rightarrow Beliefs about costs/benefits inhibiting attention

Why are deposits so sticky?

- Strong brand preference given that when people do respond to financial incentives to reoptimize savings, most is internal switching
 - Consistent with endogenous differentiation response of banks
- Tremendous degree of inattention
 - o Rational? Equally inattentive when Return on Attention higher
- Consistent with model that has fixed cost of opening up reoptimization decision
- · Backdrop is pessimistic beliefs about costs and benefits of switching
- Driven by years of fine print, paperwork, differentiation

Lessons for Disclosure Design

- Trigger events: Effects strongest when tied to a nearby salient event, i.e., impending/recent rate change.
 - $\rightarrow\,$ Disclose at point of decision, not after
- Graphical depiction of disclosure: no benefit
- Burying the disclosure on last page: undoes any benefit of disclosure
- · Process improvements: facilitating internal switching strongest effect
- Myriad of ways to nullify effects of disclosure (or modestly improve)
- Suspicion of motives when sent by current bank. Standardized gov't form?
- Magic disclosure design out there?
- Inattention probably rational given the importance of average consumer disclosure. "Alarm fatigue" in consumer protection?

Implications for Policy

Way forward?

- New products (e.g. Target-date Mutual Funds; Switchcraft)
- Prioritize among disclosures, avoid Nash Equilibrium of fine print overload (Plain English campaign)
- Other types of interventions in addition to (or sometimes instead of) mandated disclosure

Conclusion

- Tested informational consumer disclosure + process simplification w/ RCTs for 124,000
- Design matters, but even best designs have modest effects
 Even for those who can easily switch internally + have large balances
- Why are deposits sticky? Pessimistic beliefs about switching benefits and costs
- Little evidence regulators could mandate some magic optimal design that facilitates attentiveness and action, calling into question policy reliance on disclosure for retail sector