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Monetary Policy’s Last-Mile Problem

- Monetary policy can create financial slack but needs real accomplices
- Especially take-up from demand and velocity of lenders’ interest rate passthrough
  ⇒ Any frictions that inhibit demand response weaken MP (e.g., Gormsen and Huber, 2022)
- **Attention** likely culprit given lack of active choice across a wide-range of financial decisions (e.g., insurance, retirement savings, shopping for credit, mortgage refinancing)

→ This paper: target inattention as key friction and show treatment that worked in field. Estimate treatment effects on inattention ⇒ new monetary/fiscal tool
Less monetary policy pass-through to *outstanding* mortgage rates in US

\[ \Delta FFR \text{ has } R^2 \text{ of 0.35 for new mortgage } \Delta r, \text{ 0.05 for outstanding } \Delta r \]
Could direct communication overcome inattention to refinancing?

- Maybe not?
  - Fed publications college reading level (Haldane and McMahon, 2018)
  - 2/3 consumers unaware FOMC announcements (Lamla and Vinogradov, 2019)
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  - Improving financial literacy improves communication usefulness (Binder et al., 2022)
  - Send reminders? (Adams et al., 2015; Karlan et al., 2016)

- If so, potentially useful tool, especially at zero lower bound or in monetary union
  → This paper: test for communication effects with RCT of optimized disclosures, reminders
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Failure to Refinance in Ireland

- Failure to refinance documented in many countries
  (Campbell, 2006; Keys et al., 2016; ACCC, 2018; Bajo & Barbi, 2018; Johnson et al., 2019; FCA, 2019; Andersen et al., 2020)
- Both external and internal refinancing in Ireland similarly infrequent.
- Low pass-through of ECB policy rate to Irish variable-rate mortgages
- Yet 60% Irish mortgages could save €1,000 in year #1 (Byrne et al., 2020)
Structure of Irish Mortgages

Three flavors of residential mortgages in Ireland, ~25-30 year terms typical

1. Fixed rate mortgages
   - ~UK fixed rate, ~US ARM. Fixed for 1-5 years
   - Convert to variable rate after the fixed-rate period
   - Prepayment penalty of ~2% of balance

2. Variable-rate mortgages
   - Not indexed; 100% discretionary, limited pass through
   - Internal refinances without increasing term easy, basically no fee

3. Tracker mortgages
   - ECB rate + ~100 bp
Lots of potential to improve monetary policy delivery
Attempt to address low pass-through with disclosure regulation

Provision 6.5(g) of the Ireland Consumer Protection Code 2012 Amended 2016

At least annually, must provide variable rate mortgage holders with statement disclosing:

1. **summary of bank’s other products that could save the consumer € at that time**
2. how the personal consumer can obtain further information on these mortgage products
3. statement that the consumer should review other options that could provide savings
4. link to CCPC website on switching lenders or changing mortgage type
5. reminder that the bank’s Provision 4.28a summary statement is online
6. whether and how consumer can qualify for lower rate if appraisal finds lower LTV
7. if not, notification that consumer can switch to other provider using new appraisal
Field Trial Details

- Partner with large Irish bank to vary design of their mandatory disclosure letters
- Test whether optimized disclosures support refinancing
- Estimate a model of inattention to refinancing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplification + Personalized € + Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ Color + Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ Headline + Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ Headline + Gain-frame + Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+ Headline + Loss-frame + Reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ Headline + Loss-frame + Process + Reminder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Representative sample, N ~ 12,000. 12 treatment groups + control
- Letter mailed February 2020, reminder 4-6 weeks later, track refinancing June + Dec
Mortgage Account Number: 1234567

You may be able to save money on your mortgage

Dear John,

This letter supplements the information we sent with your annual mortgage loan statement in the leaflet called “Information about your mortgage (You may be able to save money on your mortgage)”.

The standard variable interest rate we currently charge you on your mortgage loan is 4.34%. However, we want to make sure you are getting the best deal and we may have a lower interest rate for your mortgage.

What rates are available?
The lowest interest rate currently available to you is a one or two-year fixed rate of 2.9%. We also offer fixed rates for periods of three, five and ten years. The ten-year rate varies depending on your Loan to Value (LTV). We explain Loan to Value at the end of this letter.

Explaining the tables below
These tables show you the interest rates along with the Annual Percentage Rate of Charge (APRC). We explain APRC at the end of this letter.

### Fixed interest rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed interest rate options</th>
<th>Loan to Value Up to 60%</th>
<th>Loan to Value 61-80%</th>
<th>Loan to Value over 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.2% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.4% APRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.3% APRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year</td>
<td>3% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (4.1% APRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>3.2% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (4.0% APRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year</td>
<td>3.5% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.5% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.7% (4.0% APRC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treatment Group #2 Letter

Mortgage Account Number: 1234567

You may be able to save money on your mortgage

Dear John,

Your current mortgage interest rate is a standard variable rate of 4.25%. We want to make sure you are getting the best deal and we may have a lower interest rate for your mortgage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current monthly repayment at 4.25%:</th>
<th>€717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential monthly repayment at 2.9% fixed:</td>
<td>€586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated difference in monthly repayments:</td>
<td>-€131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential difference over the year:</td>
<td>-€1,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We have a range of interest rates that could save you money.
- Our lowest rate is a fixed rate of 2.9%, which could result in an immediate monthly saving to you of about €131. Over the course of a full year, that’s approximately €1,572 in savings.
- Below, we outline the full range of interest rate options currently available, along with the next steps to take if you wish to choose one of these alternative options.

Explaining the tables below
These tables show you the interest rates along with the Annual Percentage Rate of Charge (APRC). We explain APRC at the end of this letter. The rates may vary by Loan to Value (LTV) ratio. We also explain LTV at the end of this letter.

### Fixed interest rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed interest rate options</th>
<th>Loan to Value Up to 60%</th>
<th>Loan to Value 61-80%</th>
<th>Loan to Value over 80%</th>
<th>Difference in monthly repayments</th>
<th>Difference over the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.2% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.4% APRC)</td>
<td>-€131</td>
<td>-€1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.3% APRC)</td>
<td>-€131</td>
<td>-€1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year</td>
<td>3% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (4.1% APRC)</td>
<td>-€123</td>
<td>-€1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>3.2% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>-€108</td>
<td>-€1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year</td>
<td>3.5% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.5% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.7% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>-€84</td>
<td>-€1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.2% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.4% APRC)</td>
<td>-€131</td>
<td>-€1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>2.9% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>2.9% (4.3% APRC)</td>
<td>-€131</td>
<td>-€1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year</td>
<td>3% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (3.9% APRC)</td>
<td>3% (4.1% APRC)</td>
<td>-€123</td>
<td>-€1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>3.2% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.2% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>-€108</td>
<td>-€1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year</td>
<td>3.5% (3.7% APRC)</td>
<td>3.5% (3.8% APRC)</td>
<td>3.7% (4.0% APRC)</td>
<td>-€84</td>
<td>-€1,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reminder letters sent 4-6 weeks later to 1/2 treatment group

Mortgage Account Number: 1234567

**REMINDER: You may be able to save money on your mortgage**

Dear X,

We recently wrote to you about the availability of lower mortgage interest rate options and the potential for savings on your monthly mortgage repayments.

This is a reminder to take action to avail of one of these options.

If you wish to take up a lower interest rate for which you are eligible, you can go online at websiteaddress.com/mortgages, call us on 01 XXX XXXX, or visit a branch.

Yours sincerely,

Firstname Secondname
Head of Mortgages
### Experiment balanced on observables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment Reminder</th>
<th>Treatment No Reminder</th>
<th>Market (Variable Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin indicator</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower age</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time buyer</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage balance (€)</td>
<td>84,212</td>
<td>83,587</td>
<td>83,587</td>
<td>104,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(84,141)</td>
<td>(93,700)</td>
<td>(93,700)</td>
<td>(96,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years to maturity</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-year savings (€)</td>
<td>1,056.7</td>
<td>1,053.7</td>
<td>1,053.7</td>
<td>1,033.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,013.9)</td>
<td>(1,126.4)</td>
<td>(1,126.4)</td>
<td>(1,176.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covid forbearance</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>220,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Refinancing Rates Without Reminder

The Last Mile of Monetary Policy Treatment Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Refinancing Rate 95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8.9, 10.6, 9.6, 11.5, 12.0, 10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized (V1)</td>
<td>10.6, 11.5, 12.0, 10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color (V2)</td>
<td>9.6, 11.5, 12.0, 10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headline (V3)</td>
<td>11.5, 12.0, 10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains (V4)</td>
<td>12.0, 10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses (V5)</td>
<td>10.9, 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process (V6)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Refinancing Rate** represents the average internal refinancing rate for each Treatment Group.
- **95% Confidence Interval** is indicated by the vertical bars.
Refinancing Rates With Reminder

The Last Mile of Monetary Policy Treatment Effects
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### Pooled Treatment Effect Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure Redesign Treatment</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>0.040***</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
<td>0.022***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure Treatment × Reminder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>0.035***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.089***</td>
<td>-0.311***</td>
<td>0.089***</td>
<td>-0.307***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Last Mile of Monetary Policy Treatment Effects

Role of Covid?

- Might reminder effectiveness simply be Covid?
- Letters sent Feb 2020, reminders March/April 2020, outcomes measured June/Dec 2020

→ All the more reason to have a RCT!
→ Not much heterogeneity by most-affected group: Covid forbearance
→ Why didn’t treatment alone have an effect if Covid causes attention?
  …seems something special about reminders
→ No 2020-1 trends at other banks/external refinancing vs. 2019
→ Splits by employment sector don’t show any strong heterogeneity 411
Treatment Effects Summary

- Best treatment + reminder had a +80% (6.9 pp) effect on refinancing
- Average redesign w/o reminder had a 2 pp effect
Treatment Effects Summary

- Best treatment+reminder had a +80% (6.9 pp) effect on refinancing
- Average redesign w/o reminder had a 2 pp effect

- No effects on external refinancing
- Somewhat underpowered for disclosure redesign effect heterogeneity, but precise zeroes for reminder effect heterogeneity
- Suggests reminders were effective at getting through to borrowers
- Simple, unexpected, reinforce procrastinated task
- No heterogeneity by work from home industry, Covid forbearance, etc.
Treatment Effects Summary

- Best treatment+reminder had a +80% (6.9 pp) effect on refinancing
- Average redesign w/o reminder had a 2 pp effect
- No effects on external refinancing
- Somewhat underpowered for disclosure redesign effect heterogeneity, but precise zeroes for reminder effect heterogeneity
- Suggests reminders were effective at getting through to borrowers
- Simple, unexpected, reinforce procrastinated task
- No heterogeneity by work from home industry, Covid forbearance, etc.

- What does this imply for effect on Pr(attention), relative effectiveness of ∆rates?
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Andersen et al. (2020) mixture model of inattentive refinancing

- Inattentive households never refi. Attentive households refinance if

\[ e^{\beta \text{Incentive}_i} + \epsilon_i > 0 \]

- Agarwal Driscoll Laibson (2013) optimal exercise of refinancing option

\[ \text{Incentive}_{it} = (r_{it}^{\text{old}} - r_{it}^{\text{new}}) - O^*_t(x_i, \theta) \]

- Assume \( \epsilon_i \sim T1EV \Rightarrow \Pr(\text{refinancing}_i = 1|\text{attentive}_i = 1) = \Lambda(e^{\beta \text{Incentive}_i}) \)
Extend to allow for treatment effects on attention

- Attention depends on observables and attention shock $\eta_i \sim T1EV$

- Inattentive if
  $$\delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Treatment}_i + \delta_2 \text{Reminder}_i + \eta_i > 0$$
  $$\Pr(\text{inattentive}_i|\delta) = \Lambda(\delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Treatment}_i + \delta_2 \text{Reminder}_i)$$

  $$\Rightarrow \Pr(\text{refinancing}_i = 1|x_i, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = \Pr(\text{attentive}_i|\delta) \Pr(\text{refinancing}_i = 1|\text{attentive}_i, \beta, \gamma)$$

- Estimated $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ quantify attention treatment effects, allow counterfactuals
- Interpretation of $\delta_0$ less clear (beliefs, constraints, private information, etc.)
Refinancing Increasing in ADL Incentive
Maximum Likelihood Estimation

Maximum likelihood

$$L(\beta, \delta, \gamma | x, refi) = \prod_{refi=1} (1 - w_i(x_i, \delta))\Lambda(e^\beta Incentive(x_i, \gamma)) \times \prod_{refi=0} w_i(x_i, \delta) + (1 - w_i(x_i, \delta))\Lambda(-e^\beta Incentive(x_i, \gamma))$$

where $w_i$ is the probability $i$ is inattentive

$$w_i \equiv \Pr(inattentive_i | x_i, \delta) = \Lambda(\delta_0 + \delta_1 Treatment_i + \delta_2 Reminder_i)$$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Sensitivity ($\beta$)</td>
<td>-125.48***</td>
<td>-1.61***</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-1.58***</td>
<td>-1.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Cost of Refinancing ($\gamma_0$)</td>
<td>13.15***</td>
<td>6.43***</td>
<td>8.71***</td>
<td>8.71***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattention Constant ($\delta_0$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28***</td>
<td>1.13***</td>
<td>1.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment on Inattention ($\delta_1$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder on Inattention ($\delta_2$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Cost Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreting Marginal Effects

- Once allowing for unobservable fixed costs, \( \exp(\hat{\beta}) \) implies a 50 bp response in \( \Pr(\text{refinancing} \mid \text{awake}) \) for 10 bp decrease in rates.

- Fixed costs estimates implausibly high (~€514k) w/o allowing for inattention.
- Still high (~€6k) even allowing for inattention, consistent w/ pessimistic process beliefs (Adams Hunt Palmer Zaliauskas, 2021).

- Estimates imply 76% probability of being inattentive.
- Treatment + reminder reduces inattentive probability by 16 pp to 60%.
Back-of-envelope cost-effectiveness high as stimulus tool

- Mean year 1-year savings by average refiner: €1,210
  - MPC out of UK mortgage interest savings (Anderson et al., 2014) ~ 0.5 ⇒ $C_{\text{refi}} \uparrow €605$

- Cost effectiveness: if average letter costs €1 to send and generates €605 × 7% = €42 in additional mortgagor consumption
  ⇒ multiplier is €42 per €1 of spending

- n.b., effect on aggregate consumption less if bank equity domestic

- Tool available to competition authorities, consumer protection authorities, policymakers in a currency union or at zero-lower bound.
Benchmarking to conventional monetary tools

- How does effectiveness of communication compare to changing $r$?
- Model implied change in refinancing rate if incentive to refinance moves 100 → 200 bp

$$\Delta \% \text{Refinancing} = \left(1 - \Lambda(\hat{\delta}_0)\right) \frac{\left(\Lambda(2e^{\hat{\beta}}) - \Lambda(e^{\hat{\beta}})\right)}{\Pr(\text{attentive}) \Delta \Pr(\text{refi} | \text{attentive})}$$

(note that this would require extraordinary monetary stimulus)

- Use model estimates for Ireland
- Andersen et al. (2020) estimates for Denmark
- Estimate non-experimental model on CRISM data for the US in 2019
Reminders outperform 100 bp decrease in rates (ceteris paribus)
Reminders outperform 100 bp decrease in rates (ceteris paribus)
Reminders outperform 100 bp decrease in rates (ceteris paribus)

Experimental Effects
Model Effects
95% Confidence Interval
Reminders outperform 100 bp decrease in rates (ceteris paribus)
Caveats

1. Communication may depend on trust in the discloser (send letters from gov’t?)
2. More responsive refinancing could raise rates in GE (Berger et al., 2022)
3. Effects on aggregate consumption less if bank equity domestic
4. Reminders more effective when rates have fallen (complementary)
5. Treatment likely more effective when status-quo disclosure worse (undoes obfuscation)
6. Repeated reminders more/less effective (dynamic selection, lose salience, peer effects)
Conclusion

- Consumer inattention to optimization is common in many settings
- Inattention is a significant source of refinancing inertia, weakens MP refinancing channel
- Remedy! Targeted communication reminders can reduce inattention, stimulate refinancing

- Direct communication has potential to help solve last-mile problem in monetary policy
- Complementary and possibly more effective than monetary policy for household sector
Competition unlikely to discipline rate-setting discretion

Variable rate setting could be disciplined by competition, but...

1. Irish banking highly concentrated.
   - Top 3 banks have 73% market share for residential mortgage lending

2. Refinancing is infrequent.
   - 6% of Irish mortgages switched provider in 2019
   - In our sample, 9% refinance internally
   - Close to EU, US average
   - 60% Irish mortgages could save €1,000 in year #1 (Byrne et al., 2020)
Three flavors of residential mortgages in Ireland, 25-30 year terms

1. **Variable-rate mortgages**
   - Not indexed; 100% discretionary, limited pass through
   - Internal refinances without increasing term easy, basically no fee

2. **Fixed rate mortgages**
   - ~UK fixed rate, ~US ARM. Fixed for 1-5 years
   - Convert to variable rate after the fixed-rate period
   - Prepayment penalty of ~2% of balance

3. **Tracker mortgages**
   - ECB rate + ~100 bp
## Employment Sector Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working from home (WFH)</th>
<th>Business as usual (BAU)</th>
<th>At home not working (AHNW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform. and communication</td>
<td>Agric., forestry, fishing</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance</td>
<td>Electricity, gas supply</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profess., scientific, technical</td>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>Wholes. retail trade, vehicle repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Treatment effects similar by Covid employment sector
ADL Appropriateness Abroad

- ADL assumes US fixed-rate mortgages refinancing onto US fixed-rate mortgages
- In UK, Australia, Ireland, etc. “fixed rate mortgages” only fixed for a (relatively) short fixation period 1-5 years (as in US ARMs)
- Suggests ADL refinancing threshold might be too low
- Given that cost of refinancing is incurred for a much shorter duration of locked rates, might not be worth refinancing but for very large $\Delta r$

⇒ Model might be misattributing too much to inattention
- (OTOH, typical IE mortgage duration ~ 10 years, similar to US FRMs)
How would attentive people exercise refinance option?

- Agarwal Driscoll Laibson (2013) solve optimal exercise of FRM refinancing option in closed form under simplifying assumptions
- Threshold to refinance: minimum decrease in interest rates $O_{it}$

$$O_{it} = \frac{1}{\psi_{it}} [\phi_{it} + W(-\exp(-\phi_{it}))]$$

$$\psi_{it} = \frac{\sqrt{2(\rho + \lambda_{it})}}{\sigma}$$

$$\phi_{it} = 1 + \psi_{it}(\rho + \lambda_{it}) \frac{\kappa(m_{it})}{m_{it}(1 - \tau)}$$

- $\rho$ discount rate, $\sigma$ volatility of $r$, $\tau$ is marginal tax rate, $m$ is mortgage balance, $\kappa(m)$ is refinancing costs, $\lambda$ is expected rate of decline in real principal
- Implies incentive to refinance $Incentive_{it} = (r_{it}^{old} - r_{it}^{new}) - O_{it}$
- Robust to using $Incentive_{it} = (r_{it}^{old} - r_{it}^{new})$
## Model Parameters $\theta$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>$\pi$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Average IE inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real discount rate</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal interest rate volatility</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>CBI monthly interest rate series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal tax rate for interest deduction</td>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eliminated in Ireland in 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exogenous Pr(termination)</td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Microdata from partner bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived fixed costs of refinancing (€)</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Usual cost is zero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Be agnostic about the location of the optimal refinancing threshold. Model the incentive as $Incentive_{it} = (r_{it}^{old} - r_{it}^{new})$ instead of $(r_{it}^{old} - r_{it}^{new}) - O_{it}$

Hack ADL to mimic the pressures of a shorter fixation period with exogenous $\Pr(\text{prepayment}) \mu = 0.5 \Rightarrow$ borrowers expect to face market rates every two years
Similar results with alternative ADL parameterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Sensitivity ($\beta$)</td>
<td>-125.48***</td>
<td>-1.44***</td>
<td>-1.63***</td>
<td>-1.63***</td>
<td>-1.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Cost of Refinancing ($\gamma_0$)</td>
<td>9.66***</td>
<td>8.05***</td>
<td>8.04***</td>
<td>9.01***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattention Constant ($\delta_0$)</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>1.05***</td>
<td>0.78***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment on Inattention ($\delta_1$)</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder on Inattention ($\delta_2$)</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>