

---

# DETECTING CONSUMERS' FINANCIAL VULNERABILITY USING OPEN BANKING DATA: EVIDENCE FROM UK PAYDAY LOANS

---

A PREPRINT

✉ Victor Medina-Olivares

Chair of Uncertainty Quantification and Statistical Learning  
Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security (UA Ruhr)  
Department of Statistics (TU Dortmund)  
Joseph-von-Fraunhofer-Str. 25  
44227 Dortmund, Germany  
victor.medina@tu-dortmund.de

✉ Raffaella Calabrese

Chair of Data Science Business School  
The University of Edinburgh  
29 Buccleuch Place  
Edinburgh EH8 9JS, UK

## ABSTRACT

Behind the *debt trap* concept is the rationale that payday loans exacerbate consumers' financial vulnerability. To investigate this relationship, we propose a Mixed Poisson Hidden Markov approach to model the number of payday loans a borrower obtains in each period. Given the lack of agreement in the literature on financial vulnerability, we introduce financial distress as an unobserved binary variable using a hidden Markov process (vulnerable and non-vulnerable). Using data from 90,523 anonymised transactions for 1,817 UK consumers, we find that the effect of certain time-varying covariates depends greatly on the borrower's hidden state. For instance, luxury expenses and non-recurring income increase the need for payday loans when financially vulnerable, but the opposite is true when not vulnerable. Additionally, we demonstrate that almost 60% of payday loan borrowers remain vulnerable for 12 or more consecutive weeks, with two-thirds experiencing consistent financial difficulties. Finally, our analysis underscores the need for a nuanced approach to payday lending that recognises the varying levels of vulnerability among borrowers, which can prove helpful for policymakers and lenders to enhance responsible lending practices.

**Keywords** Open Banking · Payday loans · Hidden Markov model · financial vulnerability · responsible lending

## 1 Introduction

A payday loan is a short-term loan typically taken for a small amount. According to Gathergood et al. (2019), the United Kingdom has the world's second-largest payday loan market after the United States. In 2016/7, the UK payday loan market was valued at approximately £220 million (BBC, 2017). However, due to stricter regulations, the industry has experienced a significant decline from its £2.5 billion valuation in 2013. Payday loan borrowers often face difficulties repaying the total balance and have to renew their loans upon maturity, incurring high fees that exacerbate their financial conditions (Carter et al., 2022).

This repeated usage of payday loans over an extended period is commonly known as the *debt trap* (CFPB, 2016). To address this problem, regulators have implemented different measures. In the US, payday loan bans, mandatory minimum intervals between consecutive loans, and prohibition of renewals or limited loans per year are some of the regulatory responses (Desai and Elliehausen, 2017). In the UK, the Financial Conduct Authority established a maximum

cap of 0.8% a day of the borrowed amount. The introduction of the price cap in 2015 has reduced by 45% the number of borrowers seeking advice on payday loan issues (CitizenAdvice, 2016). This regulation has also led to many customer compensation claims, which caused Wonga, the UK's largest payday lender, to declare bankruptcy in 2018.

The debt trap thesis implies that payday lending is a factor that worsens borrowers' financial vulnerability. The term *financial vulnerability* covers a broad range of financial difficulties, including late essential payments, credit delinquencies, and defaults. However, several empirical studies examining payday lending markets in the US and UK present contradictory results on the relationship between payday lending and financial vulnerability. Most studies focus on US data. For example, Melzer (2011) shows that payday loans inhibit borrowers' ability to pay important bills, such as mortgage, rent and utility. In addition, low-income payday loan customers exhibit higher delinquency on child support payments, higher requests for food benefits and greater financial hardship, prioritising payday loan payments over child support (Melzer, 2018).

Nevertheless, Desai and Elliehausen (2017) found insignificant changes in delinquencies after capping the fees or banning US payday loans in Oregon, North Carolina, and Georgia. Interestingly, the consumer survey respondents in Oregon were more likely to self-assess exacerbating financial vulnerability than respondents in Washington State not affected by the payday loan ban (Zinman, 2010). In contrast, Morgan et al. (2012) discovered that Chapter 13 bankruptcy filings significantly decreased after the ban. Moreover, in the UK market, Gathergood et al. (2019) analysed nearly all UK payday loans in 2012-13, revealing that although these loans provide consumers with short-term liquidity, they encourage long-term credit dependency, resulting in increased defaults and overdraft limit breaches.

To investigate the link between financial vulnerability and payday lending, in this study, we consider a new source of data provided by an Open Banking (OB) platform. OB is a financial ecosystem that offers open access to transactions, consumer banking and financial data. This revolution started on the 14th of April 2016 with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which ensured that the natural person, and not the financial institution, is the owner of consumer data and has the right to decide how their data are to be used. On the 13th of January 2018, the Second Payment Services Directive (PSD2) required financial institutions to grant qualified third-party providers (TPPs) automated access to customer banking data covering both retail (individuals and small businesses) and corporate customers through the use of application programming interfaces (APIs). OB stands to benefit consumers, foster innovation and competition for financial services and boost the development of new financial products.

Using OB data offers a significant advantage in obtaining a comprehensive understanding of the financial situation of payday loan borrowers. For example, the OB platform employed here analysed data from 70 UK financial institutions, offering a broader picture of borrowers' financial circumstances. Another crucial benefit of using OB data is the accuracy of the financial information provided. In contrast, some previous studies on payday loans rely on surveys and self-reported data, which may be less precise (Zinman, 2010).

## Main Contributions

We contribute to the field by not only providing high-quality data but also introducing a novel approach to analysing the relationship between payday lending and financial vulnerability. To account for the various aspects and definitions of financial vulnerability, we introduce financial distress as an unobserved variable represented by a two-state hidden Markov process. Our approach is based on the premise that payday loans could benefit some consumers, especially those with good credit histories, to offset, for example, costs associated with unexpected economic setbacks (Gathergood et al., 2019). However, evidence also suggests that payday loans can harm consumers' financial well-being (Chen and Livermore, 2020; Bolen et al., 2020).

We assume that the number of payday loans within each period, conditional on the hidden state, is Poisson distributed, yielding a hidden Markov model (HMM, Robert J. Elliott, 2014). While HMMs are typically used to model individual stochastic processes, our longitudinal framework considers multiple processes simultaneously. We account for inter-borrower differences by incorporating explanatory variables and random effects in the model's latent and conditional components. To achieve this, we use a Mixed Hidden Markov Model (MHMM) approach, which relaxes the assumption that observations are independent given the latent states (Altman, 2007).

Our approach offers several advantages. First, we can use customers' transactional behaviour to identify a state of financial vulnerability in a data-driven manner. Second, we can associate each financial vulnerability state with specific covariates that impact the need for loans. This allows us to determine the underlying factors linked to customers' financial distress. For instance, consider the number of transactions related to non-recurring income. Our study shows that the relationship between the number of payday loans and non-recurring income is negative when the borrower is financially stable. This means the chance of requesting loans decreases as the borrower receives unscheduled inflows. However, the opposite trend occurs when the borrower is in a vulnerable financial state. The probability of taking out

payday loans increases as the borrower receives unscheduled inflows. These advantages can be particularly valuable for policymakers and lenders in making informed decisions and enhancing responsible lending practices.

Additionally, we examine the sequence of hidden states that are most likely responsible for producing the observed data using the Viterbi algorithm (Viterbi, 1967). This enables us to introduce a monitoring policy that identifies individuals who have spent a prolonged period (12 weeks) in a vulnerable state. This duration corresponds to approximately three months, commonly used to define credit default events (BSBS, 2004). Our analysis reveals that nearly 60% of total payday loan borrowers have been in 12 or more consecutive weeks in a vulnerable state, where two-thirds of them (40% of the total) are consistently experiencing financial hardship, resembling the concept of *debt trap*.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we outline the methodology and estimation procedure of the MHMM. In Section 3, we describe the data. Section 4 presents the empirical results, including the estimated parameters, transition probabilities and comparisons with a relevant benchmark. Lastly, Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Methodology

Let  $Y_{it}$  be the number of payday loans granted to borrower  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) in week  $t$  ( $t = 1, \dots, T_i$ ), and denote by  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  its associated vector of covariates. Therefore, we are interested in modelling a sequence of count data  $Y_{it}$  concerning time-varying covariates  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$ . One appealing approach is to assume a Poisson model with mixed effects that represents a Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM, Stroup, 2012). The main advantages of GLMMs over Generalised Linear Models (GLMs, Dobson and Barnett, 2018) are that they do not assume an equal mean and variance, and they can address heterogeneity among borrowers through the random effects.

As we are interested in analysing the relationship between obtaining payday loans and financial vulnerability, we assign to each borrower two hidden states that represent whether the customer is in financial distress. In other words, rather than choosing a specific definition of financial vulnerability, we use a latent variable to address this issue in a data-driven approach. Unfortunately, we cannot include an unobserved state that measures financial vulnerability in a GLMM.

To incorporate financial vulnerability as a latent state, we consider Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) that can handle overdispersed sequential data (Ghahramani, 2001). Nevertheless, HMMs are commonly used in individual sequences, not in panel or longitudinal data, as in our empirical analysis. Therefore, we combine mixed effects, represented by random and fixed effects, and the HMM framework. As a result, we obtain a mixed HMM approach (MHMM, Altman, 2007). By including mixed effects, these models can capture the differences (random effects) and the similarities (fixed effects) between the borrowers' sequences.

Hence, let  $Z_{it}$  denote the hidden state of borrower  $i$  at time  $t$ , where  $Z_{it} \in \{1, 2\}$ . Moreover, suppose  $\{Z_{it} | \mathbf{u}_i\}_{t=1}^{T_i}$  is a Markov chain where  $\mathbf{u}_i$  is the random effects associated to borrower  $i$ . Additionally, assume  $Z_{it} | \mathbf{u}_i$  is independent of  $Z_{jt} | \mathbf{u}_j$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $\forall t$ . The proposed model has homogeneous transition probabilities dependent on the borrower with a conditional distribution given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it} | Z_{it} = k, \mathbf{u}_i &\sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_k(\mathbf{x}_{it}, \mathbf{u}_i)) \quad k = 1, 2, \quad t = 1, \dots, T_i \\ \lambda_k(\mathbf{x}_{it}, \mathbf{u}_i) &= \exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k + \mathbf{d}_{it}^\top \mathbf{u}_i), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{d}_{it}$  is the design vector of the random effects  $\mathbf{u}_i$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$  is the coefficient vector of the covariates  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  associated to state  $k$ .

**Estimation** Assume that the transition probabilities of the hidden processes are homogeneous for borrower  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ), i.e.  $p(Z_{it} = k | Z_{i,t-1} = \tilde{k}, \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{k}k}^{(i)}$ , and denote the initial probabilities as  $p(Z_{i1} = k | \mathbf{u}_i) = \pi_k^{(i)}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\phi}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N^\top)^\top$  be the complete vector of model parameters and random effects, respectively. Then, the full likelihood follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{u}) p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{u}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z}} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} p(y_{it} | z_{it}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{u}_i) \right\} \times \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N \pi_{z_{i1}}^{(i)} \prod_{t=2}^{T_i} \mathcal{P}_{z_{i,t-1}, z_{it}}^{(i)} \right\} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \left\{ \sum_{z_i} \pi_{z_{i1}}^{(i)} p(y_{i1} | z_{i1}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{u}_i) \times \prod_{t=2}^{T_i} \mathcal{P}_{z_{i,t-1}, z_{it}}^{(i)} p(y_{it} | z_{it}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{u}_i) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $z_i \in \{1, 2\}^{T_i}$  and  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1^\top, \dots, z_N^\top)^\top$ . Hence, calculating the likelihood requires marginalising over all possible sequences of  $z_i$ , which grows exponentially with the number of observations  $T_i$ . However, for a given

observed sequence  $\{y_{it}\}_{t=1}^{T_i}$ , we can efficiently estimate the posterior distribution of the hidden states using the so-called Forward algorithm (see Rabiner, 1989). This is a dynamic programming-based algorithm that uses the conditional independence assumption of the HMM to perform inference recursively. For that purpose, we defined the quantity  $\alpha_t^{(i)}(z_{it}) = p(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{it}, z_{it} | \phi, \mathbf{u}_i)$ , which can be written as  $\alpha_t^{(i)}(z_{it}) = p(y_{it} | z_{it}, \phi, \mathbf{u}_i) \sum_{z_{i,t-1}} \mathcal{P}_{z_{i,t-1}, z_{it}}^{(i)} \alpha_{t-1}^{(i)}(z_{i,t-1})$ . Hence, computing the contribution of borrower  $i$  to the likelihood is obtained by  $p(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{i,T_i}) = \sum_{z_{i,T_i}} p(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{i,T_i}, z_{i,T_i}) = \sum_{z_{i,T_i}} \alpha_{T_i}^{(i)}(z_{i,T_i})$ . Moreover, for  $t = 1$ , we have  $\alpha_1^{(i)}(z_{i1}) = p(y_{i1} | z_{i1}, \phi, \mathbf{u}_i) \pi_{z_{i1}}^{(i)}$ , where  $\sum_{z_{i1}} \pi_{z_{i1}}^{(i)} = 1$ .

We implement the MHMM for count data in the platform for statistical modelling *Stan* (Stan Development Team, 2023) via Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC). The code for this work can be found in the supplementary material. Once posterior samples of the model parameters  $\phi$  and random effects  $\mathbf{u}$  are obtained, we can compute a point estimate of the sequence of states that represents the most likely state sequence to have generated the observed data  $\{y_{it}\}_{t=1}^{T_i}, \forall i$ . This can be accomplished through the Viterbi algorithm (Viterbi, 1967), which computes the maximum a posteriori probability estimate (MAP) of  $\{z_{it}\}_{t=1}^{T_i}$ . Figure 3 in Section 4 illustrates some borrowers’ most likely state sequence.

### 3 Data description

A UK OB platform provided the data on 90,523 anonymised transactions weekly recorded for 1,817 UK payday customers in 2017 and 2018. This dataset represents comprehensive information on the financial behaviour of borrowers as transaction records are across 70 financial institutions in the UK. On average, nine payday loans are granted to each borrower, and the average performance period is around 50 weeks, similar to other relevant datasets (Lawrence and Elliehausen, 2008; Bertrand and Morse, 2011).

We use the OB categorisation method to classify all transactions into eight categories: basic, discretionary, and luxury expenses; basic, discretionary, and non-recurrent transfers; and recurrent and non-recurrent income. From this categorisation, we derive 16 covariates, which include the total amount and number of transactions for each category mentioned above.

Table 1 shows the weekly average and standard deviation of the 16 covariates. The average for discretionary expenses is nearly twice that of basic expenses, and, as expected, discretionary expenses exhibit a higher variability than basic expenses. Surprisingly, the average recurrent income is lower than non-recurrent income, with a higher standard deviation. This may be due to the exclusion of the primary bank account from the OB account to which the recurrent income is transferred.

Category	Amount (£)		N_Transactions	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Basic expenses	499.34	184.21	13.50	2.34
Discretionary expenses	988.93	266.42	19.73	2.51
Non-recurrent income	1049.17	273.47	5.57	0.38
Basic transfers	17.24	2.50	0.68	0.07
Discretionary transfers	90.64	18.98	1.34	0.10
Non-recurrent transfers	112.19	33.16	0.63	0.10
Recurrent income	479.09	372.86	0.67	0.23
Luxury expenses	38.76	8.35	1.19	0.19

**Table 1:** Mean and standard deviation (SD) of weekly transaction volume and frequency across eight categories.


### 4 Empirical results

As described in Section 2, we are interested in modelling the number of payday loans granted in time as a function of time-varying covariates and studying how this association relates to the state of financial vulnerability of the borrower. For comparison purposes, besides the MHMM for count data (called *ME-Poisson-HMM*), we estimate a Mixed Effect Poisson model and denote it as *ME-Poisson*. The covariates and the random effects specifications are the same for both models.

Results of the parameter associated with each covariate are shown in Figure 1. For the *ME-Poisson-MHMM*, the estimations are reported for states 1 and 2, labelled in the y-axis. The dots are the posterior medians of the parameter distributions for their corresponding state, and the inner and outer horizontal segments are the 75% and 90% credible

intervals, respectively. Moreover, the red vertical lines represent the posterior median of the *ME-Poisson* parameters. Unlike the *ME-Poisson-MHMM*, the *ME-Poisson* does not account for hidden states, so only one parameter per covariate exists.

State 2 is identified as the financially vulnerable state. The first observation is that the *ME-Poisson* seems to be more closely related to the parameter estimates of this state rather than the non-vulnerable one. Moreover, three covariates differ in sign between the states: the number of transactions of non-recurrent income, the number of discretionary transfers, and the number of transactions of luxury expenses. For the first one, the number of transactions of non-recurrent income, we observe that the effect is negative when the borrower is in the non-vulnerable state (state 1), i.e. more transactions of non-recurrent income are associated with a lower number of payday loans. On the contrary, when the borrower is vulnerable (state 2), we observe that more of these non-scheduled inflows are linked to the need for more payday loans. Similar is the case with discretionary outflows, where more is not necessarily associated with more payday loans when the borrower is in state 1 but is when the borrower is financially vulnerable. Finally, the interpretation of the number of luxury expense transactions associated with each state is analogous.




**Figure 1:** Posterior estimates of the coefficients for the two states: financial vulnerability and stability. The dots represent the medians, and the inner and outer segments the 75% and 90% intervals, respectively. The red vertical lines represent the coefficients associated with the mixed-effect Poisson model.

When compared to the coefficients obtained by the *ME-Poisson* indicated by the red vertical line in Figure 1, we note that, in general, the median of effects calculated by *ME-Poisson* is positioned in between the median associated with both states. However, this pattern is not observed for basic expenses and the number of non-recurrent income and luxury expense transactions. In this case, the median of effects estimated by the GLMM is greater than the medians related to the vulnerable state. Thus, the model without hidden states, on the whole, estimates lower effects that are linked to the covariates while compensating for this with basic expenses and the number of transactions for non-recurrent income and luxury expenses.

Regarding the  $N$  two-by-two matrices representing the transition probabilities between states for each borrower, we can focus on studying the diagonal elements, which indicate the probability of transitioning to the same state between consecutive periods. To better understand the overall distribution of the posterior samples for each matrix, we created Figure 2. This figure displays the 75% and 90% intervals of the joint set of posterior samples for the diagonal elements

of all  $N$  matrices, with dots indicating the corresponding medians. Additionally, we selected six borrowers, identified by labelled numbers in the figure, and showed the medians of their posterior samples.



**Figure 2:** Posterior distributions of transition probabilities between same states, represented by the 75% and 90% intervals. The dots correspond to the overall medians of the posterior samples, while the labelled numbers indicate the medians of transition probabilities for six selected borrowers.


Our findings indicate that the probability of transitioning to a different state in consecutive periods is generally lower compared to remaining in the same state. Additionally, we observed that the probability of staying in a non-vulnerable state is more concentrated and slightly skewed to the right compared to the vulnerable state. Thus, we anticipate that, in general, borrowers are more likely to persist in a non-vulnerable state over time. Nonetheless, our analysis reveals that certain borrowers, e.g. numbered three and six in the figure, exhibit a relatively high probability of remaining financially vulnerable once they have transitioned into this state. As we will see below, this pattern bears similarities to the notion of a *debt trap*.

We present Figure 3 for ease of interpretation, which displays the most probable sequence of states responsible for generating the observed data for the same six borrowers described earlier. As expected, borrowers three and six are associated with state 2. Borrowers one and four probably began in a vulnerable state, but as their need for additional payday loans reduced, they transitioned to status 1. Conversely, borrower five initially obtained only one payday loan within the first 30 weeks but was granted four in the subsequent 20 weeks. Additionally, the sequence associated with borrower two, where the vulnerable state appears whenever a payday loan is issued, does not yield significant insights. Nevertheless, it motivates establishing a more robust monitoring policy to identify consistently vulnerable borrowers.


With the estimation of the most likely sequence of each borrower's unobserved financial vulnerability state, we can establish a monitoring policy to identify borrowers who have sustained a vulnerable state for at least 12 consecutive weeks. This duration corresponds to approximately three months, a time frame often utilised in defining default events within the context of credit risk (BSBS, 2004). As shown in Figure 4, applying this policy reveals that nearly 38% of payday loan borrowers are consistently experiencing financial hardship over time.

Moreover, Figure 5 illustrates the flow of borrowers between different financial conditions during the entire study period. We define *Default* as a borrower having spent at least 12 consecutive weeks in state 2. *Recovered* indicates a borrower transitioning back to state 1, while *Non-Recovered* means that a borrower never returned to state 1 once in *Default*. Finally, *Non-Default* identifies borrowers who did not spend more than 12 consecutive weeks in a financially vulnerable state. It is worth noting that around 60% of the total borrowers spent 12 or more consecutive weeks in a financially vulnerable state, and only one-third transitioned back to a non-vulnerable one. These findings support the idea that most consumers of these lending instruments remain trapped in debt.


Finally, we evaluated the performance of our models in predicting the number of payday loans granted over time by computing two commonly used metrics: mean absolute error (MAE) and mean squared error (MSE). Figure 6 shows, on



**Figure 3:** Evolution in time of the predictive states for the six selected borrowers. The dots represent the number of payday loans granted.



**Figure 4:** Estimated proportion of payday loan borrowers in financial distress over time.




**Figure 5:** Flow of borrowers across different financial conditions over the whole period of study.

the left, the MAE over time, where each dot represents the result for the corresponding week, while the right side shows the related results for the MSE. The horizontal lines in both plots denote the overall average across the study period. Note that the *ME-Poisson-HMM* model consistently outperformed the *GLMM* model, with lower values observed for both metrics each week.

## 5 Conclusions

The focus of this paper is on the issue of the debt trap associated with payday lending. Specifically, we aim to investigate the link between the number of payday loans a borrower acquires and their level of financial vulnerability. Payday loans are easily accessible but come with a high cost. Therefore, frequent reliance on them may lead to a rollover cycle that adversely affects a borrower's financial well-being. However, some borrowers may only use these loans to deal with unforeseen expenses, indicating the presence of vulnerable and non-vulnerable consumers.

To analyse this issue, we present two models: the *ME-Poisson-HMM* and the *ME-Poisson*. The former is a Mixed Poisson Hidden Markov model that accounts for consumer heterogeneity through random effects and represents financial vulnerability as a latent binary state, eliminating the need to define financial distress explicitly. In contrast, the



**Figure 6:** Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Mean Squared Error evaluated in time for the Mixed Effects Poisson Model (ME-Poisson) and the Mixed Effects Poisson HMM (ME-Poisson-HMM). The horizontal lines represent the total mean.

*ME-Poisson* is a Mixed Effects Poisson model that incorporates random effects to account for heterogeneity but does not consider hidden states. Both models are implemented using the statistical modelling platform *Stan*<sup>1</sup>.

We apply these approaches to a comprehensive dataset containing 90,523 anonymised transactions for 1,817 UK payday loans granted between 2017 and 2018. Our findings reveal that the *ME-Poisson* model is more closely related to the parameter estimates of the vulnerable state. Additionally, certain explanatory variables have opposite effects between the two hidden states. For instance, when the consumer is in a non-vulnerable state, more non-recurrent income and discretionary transactions are associated with fewer payday loans. In contrast, they are associated with more payday loans in a vulnerable state. Furthermore, we observe that when financially vulnerable, transactions related to luxury expenses are linked to a greater need for payday loans, but this is not the case in the non-vulnerable state.

Furthermore, using the Viterbi algorithm, we investigate the sequence of hidden states that are most likely to have generated the observed data. As a result, we can devise a monitoring policy to identify individuals who have remained vulnerable for 12 consecutive weeks. This duration corresponds to approximately three months, commonly used to define credit default. Our analysis demonstrates that nearly 60% of payday loan borrowers have been vulnerable for 12 or more consecutive weeks. Moreover, of these borrowers, two-thirds are consistently undergoing financial difficulty (debt trap).

Ultimately, our study sheds light on the complex relationship between financial vulnerability and payday lending. Our findings highlight the need for a more nuanced approach to responsible lending that recognises the different levels of vulnerability among borrowers. By understanding the factors contributing to the debt trap associated with payday loans, policymakers and lenders can mitigate the risks and provide better support to those who need it most.

## References

Altman, R. M. (2007). Mixed hidden markov models: an extension of the hidden markov model to the longitudinal data setting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):201–210.

<sup>1</sup>The supplementary material provides the code for our analysis.



- BBC (2017). Ban on unarranged overdraft charges considered by FCA. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-40770012>.
- Bertrand, M. and Morse, A. (2011). Information disclosure, cognitive biases, and payday borrowing. *The Journal of Finance*, 66(6):1865–1893.
- Bolen, J. B., Elliehausen, G., and Miller Jr, T. W. (2020). Do consumers need more protection from small-dollar lenders? historical evidence and a roadmap for future research. *Economic Inquiry*, 58(4):1577–1613.
- BSBS (2004). International convergence of capital measurement and capital standards: a revised framework. Technical report, Bank for International Settlements.
- Carter, S. P., Liu, K., Skiba, P. M., and Sydnor, J. (2022). Time to repay or time to delay? the effect of having more time before a payday loan is due. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 14(4):91–126.
- CFPB (2016). Consumer Financial Protection Bureau proposes rule to end payday debt traps. <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/about-us/newsroom/consumer-financial-protection-bureau-proposes-rule-end-payday-debt-traps/>.
- Chen, Z. and Livermore, M. (2020). The negative association between alternative financial services usage and financial well-being: Variations by income. *Social Work Research*, 44(3):183–195.
- CitizenAdvice (2016). Payday loans: An improved market? Technical report, CitizenAdvice.
- Desai, C. A. and Elliehausen, G. (2017). The effect of state bans of payday lending on consumer credit delinquencies. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 64:94–107.
- Dobson, A. J. and Barnett, A. G. (2018). *An Introduction to Generalized Linear Models*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Gathergood, J., Guttman-Kenney, B., and Hunt, S. (2019). How do payday loans affect borrowers? Evidence from the UK market. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 32(2):496–523.
- Ghahramani, Z. (2001). An introduction to hidden markov models and bayesian networks. *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, 15(01):9–42.
- Lawrence, E. C. and Elliehausen, G. (2008). A comparative analysis of payday loan customers. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 26(2):299–316.
- Melzer, B. T. (2011). The real costs of credit access: Evidence from the payday lending market. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(1):517–555.
- Melzer, B. T. (2018). Spillovers from costly credit. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 31(9):3568–3594.
- Morgan, D. P., Strain, M. R., and Seblani, I. (2012). How payday credit access affects overdrafts and other outcomes. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 44(2-3):519–531.
- Rabiner, L. R. (1989). A tutorial on hidden markov models and selected applications in speech recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 77(2):257–286.
- Robert J. Elliott, R. M. (2014). *Hidden Markov Models in Finance Further Developments and Applications*, volume 2. Springer.
- Stan Development Team (2023). Stan modeling language users guide and reference manual, version 2.31. <https://mc-stan.org>.
- Stroup, W. W. (2012). *Generalized Linear Mixed Models: Modern Concepts, Methods and Applications*. CRC press.
- Viterbi, A. (1967). Error bounds for convolutional codes and an asymptotically optimum decoding algorithm. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory*, 13(2):260–269.
- Zinman, J. (2010). Restricting consumer credit access: Household survey evidence on effects around the oregon rate cap. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 34(3):546–556.