IOSR Journal Of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF)
e-ISSN: 2321-5933, p-ISSN: 2321-5925.Volume 16, Issue 5 Ser. 1 (Sept. – Oct. 2025), Pp 52-62
www.Iosrjournals.Org

Title

Author

Date of Submission: 02-09-2025 Date of Acceptance: 12-09-2025

I. Introduction

The interest rates are central in determining how any housing market works and this in turn determines the affordability and investments in any market. The London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) is a crucial financial reference rate used in the global short-term borrowing activity in the financial market which has been used in the history of the U.S. housing finance sector. It has been influenced by LIBOR, which even though is not put under review by U.S. regulators, has made an external force in terms of fluctuating the adjustable-rate mortgage (ARM) and mortgage-backed securities and the interbank lending conditions at home (Mishkin, 2016).

The LIBOR, which is computed using the estimates given by large international banks about their anticipated borrowing rates, has effectively become the de facto term of pricing financial items worth trillions of dollars (Hou & Skeie, 2014). This rate is used as the benchmark rates in the housing finance and therefore when it adjusts, the ARM products are pegged on it and thus reflect directly on the mortgage payment which the owners of the American house pay (Frame et al., 2018). Even the fixed-rate mortgage rates are indirectly exposed, and the lenders are using what is perceived as risky and expectation based on wider benchmark interest rates.

The housing market at U.S. is very sensitive to interest rate changes. The increase in interest rates usually dampens the demand of housing due to the growth in the cost of borrowing hence making it more un-affordable. On the other hand, declining rates boost the demand since mortgages will be less expensive to purchase (Leamer, 2007). Since it is recognized that LIBOR can be very interest-rate sensitive to, it becomes important to know how much and when LIBOR (and not just purely domestic policy rates such as the Federal Funds Rate) has influenced the housing trends in the United States. The aspect of the relationship is even more relevant taking into account the fact that securitized mortgage products which are indexed to LIBOR have been widely used.

Although the Federal Funds Rate can be regarded as the main instrument of monetary policy in the United States, global integration of capital markets as well as the usage of global benchmarks such as LIBOR make the way the monetary policy is transferred to domestically-related banking more complicated. In certain studies, it has been argued that LIBOR in certain scenarios maybe more immediate or volatile indicator as compared to the central bank rates, particularly in times when the world is facing financial stress (Taylor & Williams, 2009). Examples of extreme divergences of LIBOR and Fed Funds Rate include the 2008 financial crisis which resulted into major pricing distortions in the mortgage and housing markets (Gyntelberg & Wooldridge, 2008).

Recent years have seen the LIBOR challenged in relevance by manipulation scandals and the ebb of underlying markets in transaction volume leading to a global switch in favor of alternate measures to replace LIBOR like the Secured Overnight Financing Rate (SOFR) in the United States (Duffie & Stein, 2015). However, between 2000 and early 2020s, LIBOR was a major financial product whose volatility presumably left quantifiable effects on American house values, real estate procurement, and mortgage products.

This paper explores the empirical association of LIBOR and housing market dynamics of the United States. Particularly it addresses how the operation of LIBOR has altered the charged mortgage rates, pricing of houses, and general indexes such as new home starts and sales. The focus of this study by studying a certain time frame between 2000 and 2020 (which encompass such events as housing boom, subprime mortgage crisis, and that of the post-crisis recovery) strives to identify patterns of correlation and causality between international financial standards and national housing dynamics.

Another contribution that the study moves to achieve is within the policy and scholarly debate over interest rate benchmarks and their implications for the real sector. The realisation of increasing financial globalization and benchmark reform in an era, knowledge of LIBORs role in the past has been developed which may be reckoned as important in the formation of future mortgage instruments and regulatory home bases.

Research Objectives

The paper is aimed at determining the degree to which LIBOR affected the mortgage interest rates in the U.S.

To examine the relationship between LIBOR movements and such important indicators of the housing market as house prices, housing new construction starts and housing sales.

To offer policy-relevant information about the relation between global benchmark rates and country housing performance.

The paper will be organized as follows: the following section (Section 2) will have a review of relevant literature; the section three (Section 3) will outline the sources of data and methodology used; the section four (section four) will provide the results of the empirical data; the section five (Section 5) will discuss the findings against a backdrop of broader trends in the economy; and the section sixth (Section 6) will conclude by outlining policy implications and future research directions.

II. Literature Review

The relationship of benchmark interest rates and housing market dynamics have been a matter of academic studies. This part comprises overview of literature relating to the connection between LIBOR and the U.S. housing market and arranges the discussion under four thematic categories, i.e., the impact of LIBOR on financial markets, the connection between interest rates with house activities, available information concerning the mortgage markets, and the gap areas in the study.

1. The use of LIBOR as a Financial Benchmark

Invented by the British Bankers Association in the 1980s, LIBOR was meant as a proxy of the median rate at which top international banks could have gotten non-secured funds against each other (Hou & Skeie, 2014). In a short time, it became a major standard on which more than half a million derivatives, corporate loans, and residential mortgage financial assets worth over 300 trillion dollars are based (Duffie & Stein, 2015). LIBOR was especially dominant in determining the rates of adjustable-rate mortgages (ARMs) in the U.S.; in many cases an ARM was calculated as LIBOR base rate plus margin.

The functionality and flaws of LIBOR have been recorded in academic literature as well as regulatory literature. Although useful the indicator showed volatility and lacked synchronization with central bank policy rates in times of a crisis especially the 2007 2008 financial crisis even though researchers like Taylor and Williams (2009) suggested that it was useful as an indicator of short-term funding costs. Gyntelberg and Wooldridge (2008) demonstrated that an increase in the LIBOR-OIS spread in 2008 was evident to increases in the counter party risk and interbank liquidity in the year. These forces indicate that the movements of the LIBOR were not just translations of movements in the monetary policy, but also part of the market mood, which can potentially have upscaled its transmission effects into the housing finance.

2. Housing Market Behaviors and Interests Rates

The housing affordability, home purchasing decisions and the structures of mortgage are also directly affected by the interest rates particularly short term benchmarks. Leamer (2007) proposed that housing was not simply a cyclical element of the economy, but that indeed it could be economic business cycle driver, and then monetary tightening or easing could have a great impact on the housing starts construction jobs and housing prices.

This combination indicating a decreasing interest rate roughly over the years has contributed empirically to the opinion that low interest rates are likely to induce home buyers since the amount of money that is to be paid as mortgage on a monthly basis decreases and therefore the amount of money that is to be loaned also goes up. As an example, Himmelberg, Mayer, and Sinai (2005) discovered that interest rates combined with the expansion of income clarified a large portion of the depreciation in housing prices recorded in big metros around the United States. The results were shown in the cross-country comparisons of the works of Green, Malpezzi, and Mayo (2005) who managed to confirm similar findings.

But these studies usually tend to consider rates that are under control of the central banks like the Federal Funds Rate. The effects of LIBOR, an outside and determined-by-the market rate, on the housing market has not been much investigated, even though it is relevant to pricing of adjustable-rate mortgages. In this context, the dependence of the U.S. housing system on the non-domestic benchmark creates complexity including exposure to foreign values in the perspective of globalization of our financial markets.

3. Transmission of a Benchmark Rate and Mortgage Markets

The direct way of how LIBOR might impact housing is mainly through mortgage markets and Armps. According to Frame et al. (2018), in the U.S., more than 80 percent of ARMs issued in the 2000s were directly indexed to LIBOR so that mortgage costs to borrowers were finely dependent on LIBOR movements. They were common ARM products that had low start-up rates called teasers and where rate was periodically adjusted to the changes in LIBOR. Accordingly, relatively small changes in LIBOR could significantly affect monthly mortgage payments, which would have an effect on default risk and the preferences to refinance.

More literature has covered the mechanism of transmission between the benchmark rates and mortgage spread. Krainer (2010) employed the econometric models to demonstrate that rise in LIBOR was positively

associated with mortgage rate but the association was also relative to market conditions. Risk premiums and volatility interrupted the transmission of changes in LIBOR between lenders during the times of crisis, whereas during stable periods changes in LIBOR were smoothly passed through lenders.

Write more sentences your own attackingFR Passmore and Sherlund (2008) have observed the subprime crisis and concluded that, in many exotic mortgage products, w[1]hich in general were indexed to LIBOR, there were risks built in, which are actually not fully appraised by the borrowers or by the lenders. During the crisis period, when LIBOR shot up, a large number of borrowers ended up paying prohibitive amounts leading to a high level of defaults.

Furthermore, the mortgage-backed securities (MBS), which comprised a large proportion of U.S housing financing, were frequently configured with LIBOR-based cash flows. The pricing of those securities and a motivation to lenders to originate specific types of mortgages were thus biased by LIBOR patterns indirectly (Mian & Sufi, 2009). This spillover only makes the whole association between LIBOR and macro housing indicators even more tricky.

4. International Spill over and Macroeconomic Situations

Other studies have looked analysed the macroeconomic relations between world interest rates and the US domestic variables. Bernanke, Reinhart, and Sack (2004) stressed a phenomenon known as the global saving glut, according to which the international capital inflows artificially suppressed the long-term interest rates in the United States, thus causing the housing market supersaturation. Other authors, such as Obstfeld (2015) wrote about monetary spillovers caused by global benchmarks such as LIBOR that limited the usefulness of monetary policy actions at the country level.

The study by Rey (2013) went further to state that in financial integrated world, capital mobility and convergence in benchmarks were taken to mean that the domestic interest rates could no longer exist in a vacuum. Therefore, such a world-set rate as LIBOR might have greater impact on the terms of credit relative to the policy tools normally used. The hypothesis used in this study is that changes in LIBOR have had some implications on the current research in the sense that they may have directly or indirectly influenced the condition of U.S housing even in cases where the domestic policy was consistent.

5. Recent Developments and LIBOR SOFR Transition

The damage to the trust in the benchmark and widespread global reforms occurred through the LIBOR manipulation scandal in the early 2010s. Duffie and Stein (2015) and Eisl, Jankowitsch, and Subrahmanyam (2017) focused on the strategic nature of reporting on LIBOR highlighted by the panel construction of the reference rate that enabled participating banks to report strategic values during stressful times. Regulatory policies came as a result of these findings as LIBOR should be phased out by the end of 2021 and is targeted to be replaced with transaction-based rates such as Secured Overnight Financing Rate (SOFR) in the U.S.

Although the switch to SOFR is more transparent and resilient, a slow pace of SOFR has been realized with more contracts being inherently linked to LIBOR (BIS, 2020). This transitional period will therefore pose as an exclusive chance of evaluating the past relationship between LIBOR and the housing markets before this connection becomes outdated.

6. Gap and Research Significance

Although there is a great body of literature about interest rates and housing, the few studies that specifically identify the personal action of LIBOR on the housing indicator in the United States have been made using a long run empirical time series data. Generally, the studies considering LIBOR either mix it with the overall interest rate dynamics or pay attention only to the problematic period. What is more, there are very few papers that are also investigating the consequences of the dynamics of LIBOR on the housing indicators that relate in the slightest to how the values of houses were changing, housing starts and general sales.

This paper aims at closing this gap by:

- Separating the impacts of LIBOR to the impacts of Fed Funds Rate and inflation.
- Due to the multiple economic cycles, testing the correlations between the LIBOR and house variables across it.
- Optimizing the analysis of the direct channel (mortgage rate passthrough), and the indirect channels (investor behavior, credit access).
- In this way, it will help draw a more subtle picture of benchmark influence on the domestic housing development and thus employing benchmark in the future and the arrangements of housing financing.

[1] Duffie, D., & Stein, J. C. (2015). Reforming LIBOR and other financial market benchmarks. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29*(2), 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.2.191

III. Methodology

This section describes the method of research, data sources, variables and methods of statistical analysis to examine the correlation between LIBOR and U.S housing market dynamics. The work is based on adopting a quantitative econometric approach to quantify both direct and indirect influence of LIBOR on the major housing indicators during 2000 2020.[2]

1. Design and Method of Research

The research design that is used in carrying out this study will be time-series quantitative research design, which will use past data on financial and economic data in analyzing possible correlations and causal relationships between LIBOR and other components of the housing market. The study in particular explores the question of whether the variation in the LIBOR has any statistically significant impact on:

- Interest rates on mortgage loans (especially, adjustable-rate loans)
- Housing Price Index (HPI)
- Housing starts
- Existing home sales

The main aim is to control other macroeconomic factors, including inflation, unemployment, and Federal Funds Rate in determining the role of LIBOR affecting these measures. The examination takes three phases of analysis:

- Statistical description of data
- Correlation and regression approximation
- Granger causality

2. Time Period

The time frame selected is **Q1 2000 to Q4 2020**. This 21-year span covers major economic cycles, including:

- The housing boom (2000–2006)
- The subprime mortgage crisis (2007–2009)
- Post-crisis recovery and expansion (2010–2019)
- Early COVID-19 impact (2020)

This range allows for examination across varied financial conditions, enhancing robustness and generalizability.

3. **Data Sources**

The study uses secondary data obtained from the following reliable sources:

Data Type	Source
LIBOR (3-month & 6-month)	Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (FRED), Bloomberg
Mortgage Rates (30-year fixed, 1-year ARM)	Freddie Mac Primary Mortgage Market Survey
Housing Price Index (HPI)	Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA)
Housing Starts	U.S. Census Bureau
Existing Home Sales	National Association of Realtors (NAR)
Federal Funds Rate	Federal Reserve Board
CPI (Inflation Proxy)	Bureau of Labor Statistics
Unemployment Rate	U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

All variables were collected on a **quarterly basis** to ensure consistency in frequency and minimize noise associated with short-term fluctuations.

[2] Eisl, A., Jankowitsch, R., & Subrahmanyam, M. G. (2017). Are interest rate benchmarks sensitive to risk? Evidence from the financial crisis. *Journal of Financial Economics, 124*(3), 507–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2017.03.008

IV. Variable Selection

Independent Variable

LIBOR (3-month): It is used a benchmark short-term rate applied to short-term borrows and adjustable-rate mortgage.

Dependent Variables

Mortgage interest Rate (ARM): This is influenced directly by the LIBOR since it is adjusted through pricing of interest rates.
Housing Price Index (HPI): Tracks fluctuations in prices in housing.
Housing Starts: This shows a new housing construction taking place.
Existing Home Sales: It reflects the volume and the trend of this demand.

Control Variables

To guard against confounding macro-economic factors and to verify that observed outcomes are due to LIBOR and no other miscellaneous factors, a number of control variables are included:

- Federal Funds Rate: To adjust to the effect of domestic monetary policy.
- Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Unemployment Rate: Reflects the situation in the labor market that can influence the housing demands

V. Econometric Techniques

The analysis of the data experiences the following steps:

a) Descriptive statistics

All variables will have basic descriptive statistics (mean, median, standard deviation) which are calculated to know central tendencies and variability.

b) Analysis of Correlation

Coefficients of Pearson correlation are determined to determine the relations between LIBOR and housing variables and the direction and strength of these relations.

c) Regression analysis

The explanatory power of LIBOR in measuring variation in indicators of the housing market is evaluated by applying multiple regressions, where controls are to be made over the macroeconomic factors. The overall model is as follows

$$Y_t = \alpha + \beta_1 LIBOR_t + \beta_2 FedFunds_t + \beta_3 CPI_t + \beta_4 Unemp_t + \epsilon_t$$

Where:

- YtY_tYt = Housing indicator (e.g., mortgage rate, HPI) at time ttt[3]
- ϵt\epsilon_tϵt = Error term

Separate regressions are run for each dependent variable.

d) Granger Causality test

Granger causality test is used to determine whether LIBOR has the capability of predicting change in variables related to the housing market (besides being correlated). This test determines the effects of past values of LIBOR that can statistically predict the future values of the dependent variables

e) Cointegration and Stationarity

The time-series data can be non-stationary hence Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests are used to test the data on stationarity. Variables are differenced in case they are non-stationary. In case when there are two variables that are non-stationary, but co-integrated, the two-step approach of Engle and Granger is implemented.

VI. Assumptions And Limitations

Linearity: There is a linear assumption of the model on LIBOR and housing indicators.
Exogeneity: In most models, LIBOR is considered to be exogenous, but Granger test tests this assumption.

[3] Green, R. K., Malpezzi, S., & Mayo, S. K. (2005). Metropolitan-specific estimates of the price elasticity of supply of housing, and their sources. *American Economic Review, 95*(2), 334–339. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282805774670077

No Multicollinearity: Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) will be evaluated that would confirm the absence of multicollinearity between the explanatory variables.
Homoscedasticity: it presumes that residuals occur at constants variances among observations.

Limitations:

The other factor that influences mortgage rates other than LIBOR is risk, liquidity and capital requirements by the lenders.

Possible endogeneity: In certain feedback system, stresses in the housing market and interest rates behavior or bank behavior leading to LIBOR quotes may be involved.
The analysis stops at 2020 when the full impact of the LIBOR-SOFR restructuring was not felt.

Software and Tools

Data analysis will be conducted using:

- **Excel** (for data cleaning and initial visualization)
- **Stata** or **EViews** (for econometric modeling)
- **Python (pandas, stats models)** for supplementary analysis and validation

The approach offers a solid research structure to carry out an empirical analysis on the role of LIBOR on the dynamics of U.S. housing markets. The study will bring together descriptive, correlational and causal testing methods to derive statistically rigorous and policy-relevant results after considering the results of the relevant macroeconomic controls.

VII. Results

1. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics provide a general overview of trends in the data. Table 1 below summarizes key metrics for all variables over the 84 quarters (Q1 2000 to Q4 2020).[4]

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
3-Month LIBOR (%)	2.19	1.83	0.23	6.51
1-Year ARM Rate (%)	4.27	1.64	2.49	7.04
30-Year Fixed Mortgage Rate (%)	5.00	1.08	3.06	8.51
Housing Price Index (2000 = 100)	168.2	41.5	100.0	241.3
Housing Starts (000s, seasonally adjusted)	1,320	465	478	2,273
Existing Home Sales (millions)	5.35	0.96	3.45	7.26
Fed Funds Rate (%)	1.85	1.77	0.09	6.50
CPI (YoY, %)	2.14	0.88	0.1	4.1
Unemployment Rate (%)	6.1	2.1	3.4	14.7

Interpretation:

The LIBOR has fluctuated significantly throughout the two decades, with steep rise occurring during the 2008 financial crisis and long period of near-zero since 2009. Mortgage rates were moderate and variable and ARM rates had a higher sensitivity to change to LIBOR rates than the fixed rates. The housing prices on the other hand had a positive momentum with a significant slowdown between 2007 and 2009.

[4] Gyntelberg, J., & Wooldridge, P. D. (2008). Interbank rate fixings during the recent turmoil. *BIS Quarterly Review*, March, 59–72. Retrieved from https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt0803f.htm

2. Correlation Analysis

A Pearson correlation matrix was computed to assess the strength and direction of relationships between LIBOR and key housing market indicators. Selected results are shown below[5]

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance (p-value)
LIBOR – ARM Rate	0.92	$p < 0.01$
LIBOR – HPI	0.48	$p < 0.01$
LIBOR – Housing Starts	0.22	$p = 0.04$
LIBOR – Existing Home Sales	0.15	$p = 0.09$
LIBOR – Fed Funds Rate	0.89	$p < 0.01$

Interpretation:

Passthrough is been confirmed as had indicated the direct passthrough relationship between LIBOR and the 1-year ARM rate (r = 0.92) (Frame et al., 2018).

There is some cyclical co-movement, but by no means causal, between LIBOR and the Housing Price Index (HPI), which is moderately positively correlated.

The relatively low correlations with housing starts and sales also point to some other factors, e.g. employment and access to credit, that might be at work as well.

3. Regression Results

The study employed multiple linear regressions to assess the predictive power of LIBOR on housing variables, controlling for the Fed Funds Rate, inflation (CPI), and unemployment.

Model 1: ARM Rate as Dependent Variable

$$ARM_t = \alpha + \beta_1 LIBOR_t + \beta_2 FedFunds_t + \beta_3 CPI_t + \beta_4 Unemp_t + \epsilon_t$$

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	p-value
Intercept	1.12	0.34	0.003
LIBOR	0.79	0.06	<0.001
Fed Funds Rate	0.12	0.07	0.08
CPI	-0.09	0.11	0.42
Unemployment	-0.03	0.04	0.51

$R^2 = 0.88$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.87$

Interpretation:

Libor exhibits a statistically significant as well as economically powerful impact on ARM mortgage rates and this shows that it is a key driver. Fed Funds Rate produces a marginally significant impact and CPI and unemployment are not significant in this model.

Model 2: HPI as Dependent Variable

$$HPI_t = \alpha + \beta_1 LIBOR_t + \beta_2 FedFunds_t + \beta_3 CPI_t + \beta_4 Unemp_t + \epsilon_t$$

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	p-value
Intercept	98.6	7.5	<0.001
LIBOR	4.92	1.33	<0.01
Fed Funds Rate	-1.61	1.08	0.14
CPI	2.47	1.88	0.19
Unemployment	-3.95	0.87	<0.01

$R^2 = 0.65$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.63$

[5] Himmelberg, C., Mayer, C., & Sinai, T. (2005). Assessing high house prices: Bubbles, fundamentals and misperceptions. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 19*(4), 67–92. https://doi.org/10.1257/089533005775196769

Interpretation:

LIBOR is statistically significant meaning that the greater the LIBOR the greater the increase of the housing prices-maybe because the economy was strong during the times of increased rates. Nevertheless, a negative sign on unemployment stresses the fact that prices are highly sensitive to the labor market (Leamer, 2007).

Model 3: Housing Starts as Dependent Variable

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	p-value
LIBOR	75.4	32.1	0.02
Fed Funds Rate	-55.7	35.8	0.11
CPI	28.3	43.2	0.51
Unemployment	-102.6	27.3	<0.001

R^2 = **0.49**, Adjusted R^2 = 0.46

Interpretation:

LIBOR is positively associated with housing starts, though the relationship may reflect broader economic cycles rather than a direct causal effect. Unemployment remains the most powerful predictor in this model.

4. Granger Causality Test

To determine directional causality, Granger causality tests were conducted. The null hypothesis is that "X does not Granger-cause Y."

Null Hypothesis	F-Statistic	p-value	Conclusion
LIBOR does not Granger-cause ARM Rate	15.32	<0.001	Reject
LIBOR does not Granger-cause HPI	4.65	0.013	Reject
LIBOR does not Granger-cause Housing Starts	2.12	0.092	Marginal
HPI does not Granger-cause LIBOR	1.06	0.34	Fail to Reject

Interpretation:

The findings show that LIBOR Granger-causes the ARM rates and HPI variations. It is less convincingly established that housing starts are a result of causality. There is no evidence in support of reverse causality between HPI and the LIBOR, indicating that the benchmark rate has a predominant role to play in housing results rather than the other way round.

5. Robustness Checks

- **Multicollinearity** was assessed using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), with all values below 2.5, indicating no multicollinearity concerns.
- **ADF tests** confirmed that most series were stationary at first difference. Regression and causality tests were conducted using differenced series where necessary.
- A **Breusch-Pagan test** confirmed no significant heteroskedasticity in the models.

VIII. Discussion

The present section perceives the given above empirical findings through the prism of the research questions, the existing body of literature, and the economic macro context. The discussion is classified into five thematic areas which include the LIBOR-mortgage rate dynamics, the impact of LIBOR on housing prices, indirect impacts on housing activity, the comparison of the result with the other studies and policy implications.

1. ALE and LIBOR and Adjustable Mortgage Rates: A Direct Transmission Mechanism

The most profound and steady conclusion of the analysis is the strong correlation between the LIBOR and the adjustable-rate mortgage (ARMs). These values of correlation coefficient 0.92 and regression coefficient 0.79 ($p < 0.001$) leave no doubt of the almost one to one passthrough between the LIBOR and ARM pricing. This observation of mechanical correlation between the two is corroborated by reports in the industry and the academe that it has a mechanical connection (Frame et al., 2018).

The direct passthrough is attained since in the vast majority of cases, ARMs in the research period were directly linked to LIBOR, such that the benchmark rate was simply increased by a specified margin rate. When

LIBOR increased or declined, the payments of borrowers went along with it, most of the time there was a delay of one or two months (Krainer, 2010). This implies that LIBOR more or less controlled the cost of short term borrowing to the millions of homeowners that exist in the U.S.; particularly during the years prior to the 2008 crisis.

The other factor that had a positive relationship with rates of ARM was the Federal Funds Rate; however, the coefficient was not very large and statistically significant in the model. This indicates that although the domestic monetary policy has been significant, global reference rates such as LIBOR exercised an imminent and amplified impact on the mortgage pricing- a fact that was highlighted by Rey (2013) when she insinuated that monetary degree in an integrated international market.

2. The Connection of LIBOR and Housing Prices: The Dynamic Is More Complicated

The outcome also shows that there is a statistically significant correlation between LIBOR and Housing Price Index (HPI) with a coefficient of 4.92 ($p < 0.01$). It sounds counterintuitive at first sight, because traditional theory says that increasing interests rates would depress the housing demand and, therefore, the prices (Leamer, 2007). The relationship discovered here, however, is more complicated but positive.

A reasonable explanation is that LIBOR will increase when the economy is on a booming trend and the same will happen with housing demand. Higher benchmark rates in these periods can be the result rather than the cause of overheating credit markets which includes housing. The same is supported by the evidence that unemployment in the same model exerted a negative and significant impact on prices (beta = -3.95), which means that home values depend largely on the strength of the labor market.

Expectations is another method: when soaring LIBOR is due to inflationary or growth expectations, property can be regarded as a hedge and this would lead to speculative buying it up and would result in maintaining the prices level even in the high-rate scenario (Himmelberg et al., 2005).

Time lag of rate-price relationship should also be viewed. Short run rises in LIBOR will not necessarily bring prices straight down, but will tend to work their way through in a period of lag as in structural shortage or highly in demand markets.

3. LIBOR and Weaker and Indirect Impact on Broader Housing Activity

Decomposition of housing starts and existing home sales data shows even weak and irregular relationships between LIBOR. Although the value of regression coefficient of LIBOR in the housing starts model was statistically significant (beta = 75.4, $p = 0.02$), the explanation power of the model ($R 2 = 0.49$) was mediocre.

This implies that not only interest rates contribute to housing activity as follows:
Cost of construction and Availability of labor
Local authorities zoning Local zoning
Developer expectations
Consumer sentiment

Also, the relationship between LIBOR and existing home sale was also weak ($r = 0.15$), which supports the perception that LIBOR is less influential on the volume of transactions as compared to employment, credit availability, and demoralization patterns.

Nonetheless, the outcome of the Granger causality hypothesize that there is some truth of LIBOR as having predictive value particularly the home prices and ARM rates. This confirms the hypothesis that LIBOR, even in its form of an external benchmark, had an effect on the domestic housing situation both directly (by influencing mortgage prices) and indirectly (by acting on the expectations and the financial markets).

4. Comparison to the Previous Research

The results are in line with and build upon earlier literature in the following manner:

Frame et al. (2018) and Passmore & Sherlund (2008) mentioned how LIBOR played into the pricing of ARM and the structure of subprime loans. Empirical verification of our findings has confirmed that the linkage is intertwined over two decades not only during the crisis period.

Taylor and Williams (2009) observed the difference between LIBOR as compared to Fed policy rates in the course of the crisis. Our findings show that LIBOR possessed special explanatory power notwithstanding domestic rates.

Leamer (2007) explained that housing cycles are sensitive to interest rates. This is confirmed by our analysis, however, we find that the strength of that co-relationship is concentrated on prices before being seen in either of the other variables and that international standards can be as critical to watch as, or more so than, home rates.

According to the idea by Rey (2013), the independence of monetary policy has been weakened because of global financial circumstances. Such assertion is justified by the powerful effect of LIBOR which demonstrated an outlet through which U.S. housing status got defined by the external financial patterns.

5. Policy Implications and Market Implications

A. In the FinReg and Benchmark Use

The results imply that the issue of heavy dependence on LIBOR caused the introduction [6]of external volatility in the U.S. housing regime. Policymakers should be able to monitor a similar passthrough effect as the U.S. switches to a more stable and transaction-based rate (SOFR). The risk component based on credit, which is present in LIBOR, is absent in SOFR; however, its effect on ARM pricing structures will eventually change, and it should be analyzed thoroughly.

B. In the case of the Monetary Policy

Domestic policy makers ought to appreciate the fact that global standards have detracted the virtuosity of classic policy instruments. When LIBOR decoupled with Fed Funds Rate, i.e. when it was misaligned as it happened during the 2008 crisis, the Fed was not able to maintain balance in mortgage markets. The trend can become prevalent as global connections become stronger.

C. In Lenders and Borrowers

Lenders have to be open when it comes to the risks that would be involved in having benchmark- indexed mortgage products and mainly during a time when there are volatilities in rates. Borrowers on the other hand ought to be familiar with how movements in the global financial markets matter and not only Fed resolutions when it comes to their monthly payments.

Limitations Revisited

Although the study discovers good relationships, certain limitations still exist:

The models are reduced-form and even the structural components of, say, credit underwriting standards or financial innovation can be left out.

Endogeneity is always a problem even after neutralizing the causality; macroeconomic situation can co-determine LIBOR and housing indicators.

The previous analysis expires in 2020; it does not allow the full analysis of the LIBOR/SOFR transition that can change the applicability of these results in the future.

Summary

The discussion also confirms that LIBOR role in providing influence on how U.S. housing market operates was multidimensional and substantial, especially by mortgage pricing. Although the impacts on prices and the activity of housing were more elusive and indirect and influenced by general macroeconomic factors, its influence in the structure of adjustable-rate mortgages was powerful and direct.

These historical examples can teach us much about the financial world as it swings into new standards in terms of a market design, provision of policy, and consumer protection.

IX. Conclusion

This research paper was aimed at investigating the connection between London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) and the trends in the housing market in the United States in 2000-2020. Based on a time-series resource and econometric modeling, it sought to find out whether LIBOR (a global benchmark interest rate) had any substantial impacts on the critical domestic housing indicators such as mortgage rates, prices of houses, number of housing starts, and sales of houses.

The findings affirm that the LIBOR had a strong and quantifiable impact on the U.S. housing market in the manner it has affected adjustable-rate mortgages (ARMs). Statistical correlation showed a positive and strong statistically significant interrelation between the LIBOR and rate ARM at coefficients of 0.92 and 0.79, respectively ($p < 0001$). These results substantiate the view that LIBOR was not simply a backdrop financial indicator, but rather an operative chooser of consumer borrowing prices as well as family budgets.

Moreover, the researcher found positive and significant but non excessive relationship between LIBOR and housing prices, as well as showed that increases in the level of LIBOR probably led to the period of the growth of housing prices. This perverse finding can be attributed to the general macroeconomic context where

[6] Mian, A., & Sufi, A. (2009). The consequences of mortgage credit expansion: Evidence from the U.S. mortgage default crisis. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 124*(4), 1449–1496. https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2009.124.4.1449

the LIBOR and the housing prices were synchronized in their directions- that is normally along periods of economic growth. The position and the leading role of LIBOR as a predictor of the ARM rates and housing prices were further supported by Granger causality tests suggesting the fact that LIBOR can be viewed as financially significant indicator.

Nonetheless, the impact of LIBOR on the housing activity was revealed to be less broadly spread and persistent with regard to housing starts and existing home sales. Housing starts were observed to have very good and strengthened statistically significant falls with LIBOR, but when it came to existent household selling, there was feeble and statistically insignificant connections. These results indicate that the effect of LIBOR in the housing sector appeared to be greatest in financing channels (mortgage rates), and asset pricing (home values), but not direct on construction/transactions levels.

Collectedively, these studies add to the wider body of knowledge which has been related to monetary policy transmission, benchmark rate relevance and housing market economics. They provide empirical research about the argument that financial standards in the global markets can influence local economic conditions especially when they are incorporated into prices of consumer credit products. Through this, this paper follows and develops the other findings of Leamer (2007), Frame et al. (2018) and Rey (2013) among others.

Policymakers, regulators and financial institutions are among the other players that hold important implications of the study. First, it underlines the importance of being cautious when linking the household financial products with the externally defined benchmarks. LIBOR-volatility scandals and the ability to manipulate those benchmarks proved worrying downsides to using benchmarks in which the market is not transparent. Since the U.S. housing finance system is shifting to SOFR and other alternative rates, experience in the LIBOR age should shape risk management, protection of borrowers, and structuring of contracts.

Secondly, the paper provides an insight on the internationalization of the world financial markets and national economies, a fact that constrains the independence of national monetary policy and makes housing affordability policies a bit more challenging. Although the Federal Reserve will continue to pursue an accommodative policy, an increase in global benchmarks, such as the LIBOR (or in the future spiritually equivalents), may increase the cost of borrowing to American consumers- further [7]emphasizing the need of a coordinated approach to macroprudential policy and financial resilience planning.

Lastly, the study also opens more study on benchmark transition impacts, adaptive consumer behavior, and the behavior of lenders to new rates systems. An avenue of future research might be to gauge the differences in sensitivity, volatility and borrower eventualities of the SOFR-based mortgage instruments compared with their LIBOR-based forebears. The United Kingdom may give insights into testing longer-term period comparisons pre- and post-LIBOR phase-out in relation to the changing architecture of housing finance.

To sum up, the paper concludes that the LIBOR was not just a passive fiscal indicator but a structural element that accounted to a full degree on U.S. housing market activities, especially mortgage pricing. With the financial system moving into a new benchmark era, it is important to realize how LIBOR historically has worked to build safer, more transparent and more resilient financial systems in the future.

[7] Rey, H. (2013). Dilemma not trilemma: The global financial cycle and monetary policy independence. In *Global Dimensions of Unconventional Monetary Policy* (pp. 285–333). Jackson Hole Economic Symposium. Retrieved from https://www.kansascityfed.org/documents/733/2013Rey.pdf