Discussion of:
Shopping for Consumer Credit

Kenneth P. Brevoort
Federal Reserve Board

FDIC 2nd Annual Consumer Research Symposium
Arlington, Virginia
September 28, 2012

The views expressed are those of the presenter and do not necessarily represent those of the Federal Reserve Board or its staff.

Session on “Consumer Shopping” but…

- Both papers share a common theme of being about instances were more information may be bad

- **Ko & Williams**: “Mandating disclosure can decrease welfare, whether measured by the total surplus that accrues to all consumers or the welfare of unsophisticated consumers.”

- **Bos & Nakamura**: “Credit arrear removal is welfare enhancing.”

- Discussion will focus on understanding why

Ko & Williams

- “The Effects of Regulating Penalty Fees for Consumer Financial Products”
- Paper looks at a LOT of stuff
  - In many cases, mandatory disclosure either has no effect on welfare or increases welfare
- I am going to focus on one narrow case where mandatory disclosure reduces welfare
  - Homogenous valuation model

What Drives Decline in Welfare?

	Informed	Informable	Uninformed

What Drives Decline in Welfare?

	Informed	Informable	Uninformed
Voluntary Disclosure (with shrouding):	Pay On Time	Pay late	Pay Late
	$-\alpha p$	$(1-\alpha)p$	$(1-\alpha)p$

What Drives Decline in Welfare?

	Informed	Informable	Uninformed
Voluntary Disclosure (with shrouding):	Pay On Time	Pay late	Pay Late
	$-\alpha p$	$(1-\alpha)p$	$(1-\alpha)p$
Mandatory Disclosure (with shrouding):	Pay On Time	Pay On Time	Pay Late
	$-\alpha(1-\lambda)p$	$-\alpha(1-\lambda)p$	$(1-\alpha+\alpha\lambda)p$

What Drives Decline in Welfare?

	Informed	Informable	Uninformed
Voluntary Disclosure (with shrouding):	Pay On Time	Pay late	Pay Late
	$-\alpha p$	$(1-\alpha)p$	$(1-\alpha)p$
Mandatory Disclosure (with shrouding):	Pay On Time	Pay On Time	Pay Late
	$-\alpha(1-\lambda)p$	$-\alpha(1-\lambda)p$	$(1-\alpha+\alpha\lambda)p$
Welfare Change	Negative	Positive	Negative

Mandatory disclosure….

The Federal Reserve Board

- Reduces cross subsidization
  - But this does not affect welfare
- Causes “informable” consumers to become informed
  - Realizing the high cost of paying late, they now pay on time
  - The loss in benefit from paying late decreases welfare
- Policy “seems” to work, though it results in a loss of welfare

What else might the paper do?

- In optimal world, everyone would pay late (informed, uninformed, informable)
- Competitive market means any revenue gains from high late fees are passed on to consumers
  - Are these results robust to imperfectly competitive markets?

Bos & Nakamura

- "Should Defaults be Forgotten? Evidence from Legally Mandated Removal"

- Exploits an exogenous source of variation on reporting using Swedish data
  - Went from removing at end of calendar year to removal three years after the arrear

- Allows a comparison of results for people with 3 year removal times and people with longer lag times

What Does the Paper Do?

The Federal Reserve Board

- Treatment Group: Arrear from January to August 2000
  - Arrear removed in October 2003
- Control Group: Arrear from September 2000 to June 2001
  - Arrear removed after three years
- Looks at how removal affects
  - Credit scores
  - Loan applications
  - Acquisition of new credit
  - New arrears after removal

Is this Really What We Need to Know?

The Federal Reserve Board

- Only look at people with arrearages

- “Forgetting” credit history, however, will affect *everyone*
  - A proper welfare analysis should look at all individuals

- More fundamental question: What does the removal of this information do to model predictiveness?
  - More accurate models should expand credit availability

Summary

The Federal Reserve Board

- These are both very interesting papers
- Remind us that requiring more disclosure may be harmful and that requiring the retention of less information may improve market outcomes