Are Borrowers Paid to Repay? Payday Effect in FinTech Lending

Discussion By: Shashwat Alok, Indian School of Business

Brief Summary

- Research Question: Can contract design affects borrowers' repayment behavior?
 - Aligning loan due day with salary payday improves repayment behavior
- Experimental Design
 - A field experiment conducted in Indonesia using a large online lending platform.
 - Sample of approved loans to control for selection bias
 - Randomly selected borrowers receive loan extensions to align due dates with payday
 - Placebo subjects included to capture income effect only
 - Policy Relevant: How can FIs alter contract design to expand credit access and lower defaults?

Main Findings

- Aligning loan maturity date with salary payout reduces the likelihood of overdue loans.
 - Treatment effects on overdue rates: 5.6% reduction for loans overdue, 4.3% reduction for overdue by one day, and 5.9% reduction for loans overdue by 1-7 days
- Payday Effect on Repayment Dates: Loans maturing after borrowers' actual salary payout dates are 27% more likely to receive repayment
- Heterogeneous Effects of Payday Alignment
 - Stronger treatment effects for small-sized loans, low credit rating borrowers, and those with past overdue records
 - Repeated borrowers respond more strongly to payday alignment.

Research Design

Panel A: Match Group



Research Design

Difference-in-differences setup:

 $y_{l,t} = +\alpha_t + \beta \text{Treatment}_{lt} \times \text{Match}_l + \gamma \text{Treatment}_{lt} + \zeta \text{Match}_l + X'_l + \epsilon_{l,t}$

Why should extending the loan maturity date beyond salary payday affect repayment?

- "Income effect" Interest-free increase in the loan term
- "Liquidity effect" Borrowers have cash at the time of loan maturity
- Match Group: Income effect + Liquidity effect
- Placebo Group: Income effect
- Match Placebo = Liquidity effect

Theoretical underpinnings?

- Why should aligning loan maturity with salary payday affect repayment behavior?
- Let's assume that all borrowers are liquidity constrained
 - Both control and treatment pay back when they receive a paycheck
 - The control group will be 1 day overdue
 - The treatment group will be 0 days overdue
 - But this is just mechanical due to the extension of the loan
- Other than the mechanical effect, why should control and treatment differ?
 - Both control and treatment should eventually pay all else equal
 - Saliency and self-control issues?
- Nailing the theoretical mechanisms can help guide the appropriate counterfactual.



Understanding Main Results



- So, the treatment effect is primarily driven by the liquidity effect which may be mechanical.
 - Should we expect any effect if individuals are not liquidity constrained?
- Placebo Group Does not effectively control for the mechanical effect
 - Individuals can only repay when they receive salary
- Potential Solution
 - Net out the mechanical effect while defining loans overdue
 - For control define the loan as overdue only if the days overdue >1
 - Alternatively, compare the treatment effect for DPD1 and DPD2

More analysis of Match Group

• Would be useful to understand the determinants of treatment effect for the match group

• Table A 3		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
TUDIC AJ		Overdue	DPD1	DPD1t7	EarlyRepa	W No difference between DBD1 and
	Treatment	-0.068***	-0.086***	-0.083***	0.203***	
		(-2.83)	(-4.50)	(-4.00)	(6.05)	DPD7
	,	<u> </u>				
		(1)	(2)	(3)		
T		DPD1	DPD2	DPD1t7		
• Table IA7	Extend2D*Match	0.008	-0.038	-0.050		No incremental effect of extending
		(0.24)	(-1.47)	(-1.09)		No incrementar effect of extending
	Extend1D*Match	0.075***	0.075*** -0.033** 0.029 loan by 2 days ys 1	loan by 2 days ys 1 day?		
		(5.67)	(-2.59)	(0.90)		
T	د	(1			(2)	
 Table IA8 		()	l)	(2)	(3)	
		Early Repay		ERI	ER2	
	Extend2D*Match	0.01	100	0.0569	0.0200	
		(0.09)		(0.94)	(0.64)	Reconcile with evidence in Tables 5 and 6
	Extend1D*Match	h -0.0197 (-0.23)		0.0288	-0.00832	
	_			(0.47)	(-0.22)	

Role of Saliency of Loan Due Date?

- Individuals repay when they have cash, and the loan repayment date is salient.
- If loan repayment is not salient individuals may spend their salary before the due date
- Alternate Match Group: Extend loans for some individuals by 7-14 days post the salary payday
- Compare behavior with Treated individuals in Match group
 - Loan due date is extended to be on or 1 day after salary payday
- Lack of Self-Control/Saliency implies
 - Greater likelihood of repayment for Match group vs. alternate match group?
- Examine at what point in time does the treatment effect dissipate?
 - Loans due 1, 2, 3,....14 days after salary payday

Other Comments and Clarification

- If loans are repaid early, does it come as a cost of other, more important consumption?
 - How do we assess if the loan term redesign is welfare-enhancing?
- A loan maturing one day before the salary payday is also
 - 13 days after the previous salary payday if the salary is paid biweekly
 - 6 days after the previous salary payday if the salary is paid weekly
 - How should one think about this?
- Does the treatment affect the likelihood of default?
- Why focus on individuals with past loans?
- What is the definition of "targeted payday"?

Overall

- The role of loan contract design on credit outcome is an important question
 - How can FIs alter contract design to expand credit access and lower defaults?
- This paper a step in that direction
- This is the first early draft of the paper
- Pinning down the theoretical mechanism underlying the question will enrichen the analysis.
- Look forward to the revised version!