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Aim: To model the relationships between overindebtedness and its determinants and to test various hypothesised causes.

- Introduction
- Literature
- Data
- Methodology
- Results
- Conclusions


## Concepts of Overindebtedness

No common definition.

EC(2008) operation definition should involve 6 elements:

- Unit of measurement should be household
- All contractual financial commitments should be included
- The ability to pay agreed financial commitments
- Need to measure long-term financial state not incidental occurrence
- Overindebtedness implies HH cannot pay contractual commitments without reducing its standard of living
- HH cannot "correct" its position by using its assets or taking more debt
- EC (2014) from the above:

A HH is overindebted if, on an ongoing basis it finds it difficult to pay its commitments including meeting payments for any type of debt or the payments of rent, utility or household bills.

No commonly accepted list (EC 2014).

| Indicator Group | Example |
| :--- | :--- |
| Debt Service Ratios (DSR) | HH spends $>$ X\% of (gross/net ) monthly income on total borrowing repayments <br> (for secured and unsecured loans) ( X typically $=50 \%$ ) |
|  | HH spends $>\mathrm{X} \%$ of (gross/net) monthly income on secured loans (X typically $=$ <br> $25 \%, 30 \%, 50 \%)$ |
| Affordability | Borrowing repayments takes the HH "below the poverty line" |
| Delinquency | HH is $>$ A months in arrears on credit commitments of HH bills (A typically =2) |
| \# Loans | If HH has more that $Z$ credit commitments ( $Z$ typically $=4$ ) |

Adapted from D'Alessio \& Lezzi (2013).

Weaknesses with all.

## Theoretical Literature

LC-PIH: Individual maximises expected discounted utility from consumption with inter-temporarily separable preferences, uncertain income, time preference rate equal to interest rate ( $\delta=r$ so $\beta . R=1$ ).

Without credit constraints intertemporal budget constraint is: $A_{t}=R . A_{t-1}+y_{t}-c_{t}$ where $R=(1+r)$

In general, optimality condition: $u^{\prime}\left(c_{t}\right)=E_{t}\left[u^{\prime}\left(c_{t+1}\right)\right] \beta R \quad$ where $E_{t}$ denotes expectations at time t
Kapteyn et al (2005) show

$$
A_{t}=\sum_{k=1}^{t} R^{t-k} E_{1} y_{k}+R^{t} A_{0}-\left(\frac{R^{t}-1}{r}\right) y_{p 1}-\sum_{k=2}^{t}\left(\frac{R^{t-k+1}-1}{r}\right)\left(c_{k}-E_{k-1} c_{k}\right)+\sum_{k=2}^{k=t} R^{t-k}\left(y_{k}-E_{1} y_{k}\right)
$$

where $A_{t}=$ assets at time $t ; c_{t}=$ consumption in time t; $y_{p 1}=$ permanent income in period 1 . If $A_{t}<0$ there is a demand for debt.

1. If unexpected income shock is very negative, consumption changes little and only by annuity value and $A_{t}$ could become very negative ("overindebted").
2. If unexpected consumption shock is very positive $A_{t}$ could become very negative ("overindebted").

Causes of unexpected (negative) income shocks:

- poor health,
- loss of job,
- relationship breakdown,
- price inflation exceeding nominal income inflation,
- loss of capital income,
- unexpected increase in cost of servicing debt.

Similarly unexpected consumption increases can increase debt/assets ratio.

Possible causes of unexpected consumption increases:

- Poor health
- Physical capital (appliances, car ) breakdown
- Debt relative to assets may increase for other reasons
- Poor financial calculations of payments to service a loan
- Hyperbolic discounting: plan consumption and take debt at time $t$ based on a subjective discount rate $\delta_{t}$ when in periods $t+j(j \geq 1)$ discount rate is actually lower than $\delta$. (discount rate error).


## Empirical Literature 1

Differing results between papers.

|  | Positive | Negative | Not sig |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Inverted U Bryan et al 2010 | Camoes (2010), Angel (2015) | Cifuentis (2020), Meyll \& Pantis (2019) |
| Female | Bryan (2010) | Cifuentis (2020) |  |
| Income |  | Blazquez (2020), Cifunetis (2020), Camoes (2020), Meyll \& Pantis (2019) |  |
| Degree | Du Caju (2015) | Bryan (2010) | Bryan (2010), Meyll \& Pantis (2019) |
| Unempld. | Du Caju (2015) <br> Gathergood (2012) |  |  |
| Wealth | Camoes (2010) | Meyll \& Pantis (2019) |  |
| Retired | Bryan (DSR), Du Caju (DSR) | Bryan (arrears) |  |

## Financial Literacy

Lusardi \& Tufano (2015): difficulty in repaying associated with having less belief in own financial literacy and ability to do financial calculations Angel (2015): arrears adjusted (to be close to EC definition) negatively related to financial literacy.

Meryll \& Pantis (2019) same result as Angel.

Gathergood (2012) one month arrears: negatively related to fin lit. 3-month delinquency \& heavy burden not related to financial literacy.

Impulsiveness

Gathergood (2012) 1 \& 3 months arrears more likely for impulsive spenders.

Ottoviani \& Vandone (2011) impulsivity positively associated with having more unsecured debt but not more secured debt.

DSR: Arbitrary percentage as cut off.
Does not necessarily imply difficulty in repaying because may choose to allocate income to debt repayments.
Proportion of income that is discretionary may increase with income.

Arrears: number of months is arbitrary and ignores wealth and income.

Perceived difficulty: subjective. May mean different things to different respondents.

Overall: D’Alessio argues fewer difficulties with perceived "repayment difficulty " than others and is correlated more closely with other measures.

Econometric issues:

1. If interested in parameters of population model then need a representative sample not just a sample of those with debt. Sample of only those with debt may result in sample selection bias. All papers except Du Caju (2015) ignore this.
2. Many papers pool individuals/households with debt and those without. E.g. DSR: cannot distinguish between (a) those that have debt and no difficulties from (b) those with no debt. Both have no difficulties but for different reasons. Probability of being overindebted distribution is truncated but often this is not accounted for.

## Contributions

- Use sample selection models to account for MNAR nature of data generating process
- Explore effects of poor health
- Explore the effects of risk aversion
- Explore effects of discount rate
- Explore the effects of financial literacy
- Largest recent study for GB for over 12 years


## Health Effects

Poor health can increase health expenditures and reduce income (transient or permanent).
No evidence on effects of health changes on overindebtedness.

But evidence suggests people suffering health shocks take more debt (Crook \& Hochguertel 2011, Babiaritz 2013). Babiaritz found health shocks increase probability of having debt and the amount especially amongst households with low financial assets and without insurance.

## Risk Aversion

No evidence on effect of risk aversion.

RA may increase discount rate, so may result in consumption being taken earlier facilitated by taking large amounts of debt.
But more risk averse people may take less debt because of greater sensitivity to chance a shock will prevent repayment.

## Discount rate

May expect higher discount rate the more debt to be taken. Gathergood (2012) no evidence

## Data

- Waves 4, 5, 6 and Round 7 of Wealth and Assets Survey (EUL version) - ONS
- Data collected at household and individual level
- Respondents lived in England, Wales \& Scotland (south of the Caledonian Canal)
- Interviews in Waves, each covering 2 year period that changed coverage to be called Rounds:

W1: July 2008-June2010,...., W5:July 2014-June 2016, R5: April 2014-March2016,......., R7: April 2018-March 2020.

- Longitudinal with additional randomly selected samples added in Waves 3, 4, 5 \& R6
- Approx 18 k household interviews and 34 k individual interviews per wave.
- Respondents were aged $16+$ and not in FT education.
- Wealthy are oversampled.


## Data Challenges

- No unique id for each household (person) across all waves.

Unique id can be created by "chaining" - using availability in each wave of the household \# and person \# in the current and previous wave.

- Changes between waves in
- Names of variables (characters, character case)
- Coding of variables
- Availability of variables
- Clarity of filter conditions for certain questions
- Questions \& variable names in Questionnaire but not in any versions of the data.

Change in time period covered by "waves" between
Wave 5 and Round 6

|  | Q2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | Q3 | W4 |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2013 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2014 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  | R5 |
|  | Q3 | W5 |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2015 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2016 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  | R6 |
|  | Q3 | W6 |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2017 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2018 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  | R7 |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2019 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |
| 2020 | Q1 |  |  |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | Q4 |  |  |

## Burden

"Now thinking about the mortgage or loans secured on your property in addition to these payments, to what extent is keeping up with all of the repayments and interest payments a financial burden to your household?
A heavy burden/somewhat of a burden/ Or not a problem at all ?"

## Missed 2

"Have you been able to keep up with the repayments for the instalments on [this catalogue/these catalogues] or are you 2 or more consecutive payments behind?

Debt service ratio (DSR) 30\%
Computed as: If (total repayments / net income) $>30 \%$

## Questions on health, risk aversion, discount rate and financial literacy

## Health

"How was your health in general. Would you say it was very good/good/fair/bad/very bad?"
"Do you have any long standing illness, disability or infirmity? By long standing I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time? Y/N

## Risk aversion

"If you had a choice between a guaranteed payment of one thousand pounds and a one in five chance of winning ten thousand pounds, which would you choose?"

## Discount Rate

"If you had a choice of receiving a thousand pounds today and one thousand one hundred pounds in 12 months time, which would you choose?"

## Financial Literacy

1. "If the inflation rate is $5 \%$ and the interest rate you get on your savings is $3 \%$, will your savings have more, less or the same amount of buying power in a year's time?"
2. SHOWCARD: standard bank statement.
"Looking at this example of a bank statement, please can you tell me how much money was kin the account at the end of February?"
3. "Suppose you put $£ 100$ into a savings account with a guaranteed interest rate of $2 \%$ per year. You don’t make any further payments into this account and you don't withdraw any money. How much money would be in the account at the end of the first year, once the interest payment is made?"

Have a panel dataset relating to $i=1,2, \ldots . N$ cases for $t=1,2, \ldots T$ periods (rounds).
We observe overindebtedness only if case has debt. We wish population parameters for the whole population.

## Options

1. Ignore panel, selection mechanism, estimate cross sectional equation for data pooled over time.
2. Assume not interested in whole population - only those who have debt. ( e.g.Random effects panel probit).
3. Address selection issue: Heckman type probit with sample selection equation.
4. As (3) but use panel estimatos (Semykina \& Woolridge 2018).

Household Level: Mortgage and similar loans:

Repayments are a heavy or somewhat heavy burden

| Coefficients | RE Panel probit | Pooled with Selection | Has mortgage | RE Panel Probit | Pooled with Selection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Coeff (se) | Coeff (se) | Age 16-54 |  | 0.731** |
|  |  |  | House |  | 0.392** |
| Age 16-24 | 0.330 | 0.034 | Married/cohabg |  | 0.141** |
| Age 25-34 | 0.196** | -0.058 | Degree |  | 0.153** |
| Age 35-44 | 0.387** | 0.083 | Qual other |  | 0.138** |
| Age 45-54 | 0.305** | 0.027 | Num dep childn |  | 0.169** |
| Single | -0.334** |  | Employee |  | 0.697** |
| Single | -0.334** | -0.223** | Managerial/Profl |  | 0.110** |
| Degree | -0.183* | -0.177** | Ln (hnetinc) |  | 0.148** |
| Qual other | -0.145 | -0.148** | Ln (Tt\| Wealth) |  | 0.091** |
| Lives in flat | -0.174* | -0.007 | Ttl benefits |  | -0.048** |
| Ln (hnetinc) | -0.434** | -0.361** | Time dummy |  | -0.047** |
| Reps/income | 1.006** | 0.844** | N | 14,823 | 53,549 |
| Ttl benefits | 0.022** | 0.026** | Selected |  | 14,699 |
| Time dummy | -0.122** | -0.069** | Not selected |  | 38,850 |
|  |  |  | Mean obs/gp | 1.7 |  |
|  |  |  | Wald Chi2 | 383.1** | 479.4** |
|  |  |  | Rho (e1,e2) |  | -0.257** |
|  |  |  | Rho | 0.616** |  |

Household Level: Mortgages, cards, mail order, HP and loans (R6 \& R7 only) Debt Service Ratio >30\%

| Corfficients | RE Panel probit <br> with selection |
| :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Coeff (se) |
|  | 0.125 |
| Age 16-24 | $0.606^{* *}$ |
| Age 25-34 | $0.911^{* *}$ |
| Age 35-44 | $0.647^{* *}$ |
| Age 45-54 | $-0.141^{* *}$ |
| Single | $0.315^{* *}$ |
| Self empl | $0.496^{* *}$ |
| Degree | $0.462^{* *}$ |
| Qual other | $-0.406^{* *}$ |
| Lives in flat |  |
| hhnetinc | $-0.083^{* *}$ |
| Reps/income | $-0.041^{* *}$ |
| Ttl benefits | -0.0156 |
| Ln (wealth) |  |
| Time dummy |  |


| Has mortgage or non- <br> mortgage debt outstandg. | RE Panel Probit <br> with Selection |
| :--- | :--- |
| Age 16-54 | $0.717^{* *}$ |
| House | $0.309^{* *}$ |
| Married/cohabg | $0.370^{* *}$ |
| Degree | $0.576^{* *}$ |
| Qual other | $0.497^{* *}$ |
| Num dep childn | $0.156^{* *}$ |
| Employee | $0.490^{* *}$ |
| Managerial/Profl | $0.125^{* *}$ |
| Ln (net income) | $0.448^{* *}$ |
| Ln (Ttl wealth) | $-0.061^{* *}$ |
| Ttl benefits | $-0.038^{* *}$ |
| Time dummy | $0.120^{* *}$ |
| N | 34,447 |
| Selected | 19,953 |
| Not selected | 14,494 |
| Mean obs/gp | 1.5 |
| Wald Chi2 | $665.0^{* *}$ |
| Rho (e1,e2) | 0.229 |
| Rho |  |

Individual Level: Cards, mail order, HP and loans
Repayments are a heavy or somewhat heavy burden

| Coefficients | RE Panel Probit <br> with selection <br> All rounds |
| :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Coeff (se) |
|  | $0.357^{* *}$ |
| Age 15-24 | $0.699^{* *}$ |
| Age 25-34 | $0.903^{* *}$ |
| Age 35-44 | $0.967^{* *}$ |
| Age 45-54 | $0.708^{* *}$ |
| Age 55-64 | $0.055^{*}$ |
| Male | $-0.15^{* *}$ |
| Degree | $-0.095^{*}$ |
| Qual other | $0.380^{* *}$ |
| Has dep ch | $-0.33^{* *}$ |
| Single par | $0.272^{* *}$ |
| Unemploved | 0.052 |
| Self emplyd. | 0.020 |
| Ln(net inc) | $0.21 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ |
| Total benefits | $1.881^{* *}$ |
| Reps/income | $-0.380^{* *}$ |
| Ln(wealth) | $-0.174^{* *}$ |
| Disco rate | $0.370^{* *}$ |
| Risk aversn. | $-0.150^{* *}$ |
| Bad health |  |
| Long stg ill | Single |
| Divorced/widowed | $-0.070^{* *}$ |
| $t$ |  |


|  | RE Panel Probit <br> with selection All <br> rounds |
| :--- | :--- |
| Has debt |  |
|  |  |
| Age 25-54 | $0.500^{* *}$ |
| Net inc | $0.037^{* *}$ |
| Til benefits | $-0.35 \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Degree | $1.095^{* *}$ |
| Qual other | $0.684^{* *}$ |
| Has dep ch | $0.257^{* *}$ |
| Ln (wealth) | $0.321^{* *}$ |
| $\mathbf{t}$ | $-0.203^{* *}$ |
|  | 78,419 |
| N | 55,062 |
| Selected | 23,357 |
| Not selected | 1.8 |
| Mean obs/gp | $3656.8^{* *}$ |
| Wald Chi2 | 0.055 |
| Rho (e1,e2) |  |

Individual level: Cards, mail order, HP and loans

Missed two consecutive Payments

|  | Cards, mail order, HP \& Loans | Cards | MO, HP \& Loans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coefficients | Pooled With selection | Pooled With selection | Pooled With selection |
| Variable | Coeff (se) | Coeff (se) | Coeff (se) |
| Age 15-24 | 0.467** | 0.472* | 0.674** |
| Age 25-34 | 0.412** | 0.258 | 0.666* |
| Age 35-44 | 0.444** | 0.351* | 0.590* |
| Age 45-54 | 0.371** | 0.246 | 0.543 |
| Age 55-64 | 0.483** | 0.376** | 0.702** |
| Male | 0.076 | 0.057 | 0.098 |
| Degree | -0.028 | -0.177 |  |
| Qual other | 0.016 | -0.100 |  |
| Has dep ch | -0.085 | -0.084 | -0.102 |
| Single par | -0.242* | -0.316** | -0.172 |
| Unemployed | 0.237 | 0.318 | 0.165 |
| Self emplyd. | -0.032 | -0.037 | 0.031 |
| Ln(net inc) | -0.063** | -0.040 | -0.230** |
| Total benefits | $0.31 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ | $0.30 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ | $0.34 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ |
| Reps/income | 0.585** | 0.519** | 0.317** |
| Ln(wealth) | -0.147** | -0.149** | -0.139** |
| Disco rate |  |  |  |
| Risk aversn. | -0.033 | -0.016 | -0.048 |
| Bad health | 0.188** | 0.186* | 0.242* |
| Long stdg ill | -0.209** | -0.216** | -0.121 |
| t | 0.149** | -0.230** | -0.051 |


|  | Cards, mail order, HP \& Loans | Cards | MO, HP \& Loans |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Has debt |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Age 25-54 | $0.430^{* *}$ | $0.390^{* *}$ | $0.402^{* *}$ |
| Net inc | $0.63 \times 10^{-2} * *$ | $0.53 \times 10^{-2 * *}$ | $0.68 \times 10^{-2}{ }^{* *}$ |
| Ttl benefits | $0.99 \times 10^{-4 * *}$ | $0.42 \times 10-4^{* *}$ | $0.82 \times 10^{-4 * *}$ |
| Degree | $0.364^{* *}$ | $0.433^{* *}$ | $0.196^{* *}$ |
| Qual other | $0.349^{* *}$ | $0.363^{* *}$ | $0.269^{* *}$ |
| Has dep ch | $0.183^{* *}$ | $0.119^{* *}$ | $0.192^{* *}$ |
| Ln (wealth) | $0.055^{* *}$ | $0.096^{* *}$ | $-0.101^{* *}$ |
| t | $0.214^{* *}$ | $0.279^{* *}$ | $0.034^{* *}$ |
|  | 90,834 | 87,311 | 93,818 |
| N | 25,806 | 17,584 | 13,866 |
| Selected | 65,028 | 69,747 | 79,952 |
| Not selected |  |  |  |
| Mean obs/gp | $565.3^{* *}$ | $330.2^{* *}$ | $192.8^{* *}$ |
| Wald Chi2 | -0.197 | -0.232 | -0.321 |
| Rho (e1,e2) |  |  |  |
| Rho |  |  |  |

Individual level: Cards, mail order, HP, and loans
Debt service ratio > 30\%


| Has debt | Pooled w seln |
| :--- | :--- |
| Age 25-54 | $0.174^{* *}$ |
| Male | $-0.087^{* *}$ |
| Ln (net inc) | $0.175^{* *}$ |
| Ttl benefits | $-0.15 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ |
| Degree | $0.584^{* *}$ |
| Qual other | $0.390^{* *}$ |
| Has dep ch | $0.091^{* *}$ |
| Disco rate | $-0.045^{* *}$ |
| Ln (wealth) | $0.182^{* *}$ |
| Risk aversn. | $0.084^{* *}$ |
| Bad health | $-0.137^{* *}$ |
| Long stg ill | $-0.028^{* *}$ |
| $t$ | $-0.095^{* *}$ |
| N | 77,106 |
| Selected | 53,121 |
| Not selected | 23,985 |
| Mean obs/gp |  |
| Wald Chi2 | $1116.9^{* *}$ |
| Rho (e1,e2) | $0.487^{* *}$ |
| Rho |  |

Individual level, Round 7 (Apr2018-Mar 2020) only: cards, mail order, HP \& Loans CRC Financial literacy, health, risk aversion and discount rate

|  | Payments <br> heavy <br> burden | Missed 2 <br> consec <br> payts. | DSR 30\% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Probit with <br> seln. | Probit with <br> seln. | Probit with <br> seln. |
| Variable | Coeff (se) | Coeff (se) | Coeff (se) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Age 15-24 | $0.227^{*}$ | $0.758^{* *}$ | -0.216 |
| Age 25-34 | $0.429^{* *}$ | $0.603^{*}$ | $-0.19 \times 10^{-3}$ |
| Age 35-44 | $0.571^{* *}$ | $0.616^{*}$ | 0.108 |
| Age 45-54 | $0.617^{* *}$ | $0.643^{*}$ | $0.168^{*}$ |
| Age 55-64 | $0.455^{* *}$ | $0.597^{* *}$ | $0.134^{*}$ |
| Male | 0.016 | 0.182 | $0.074^{*}$ |
| Degree | $-0.141^{*}$ | -0.034 | -0.101 |
| Qual other | -0.069 | -0.049 | -0.025 |
| Has dep ch | $0.296^{* *}$ | -0.132 | $0.218^{* *}$ |
| Single par | $-0.333^{* *}$ | -0.247 | $0.238^{*}$ |
| Unemployed | $0.369^{* *}$ | 0.275 | 0.134 |
| Self emplyd. | 0.057 | -0.102 | $0.163^{* *}$ |
| Ln(net inc) | $0.050^{* *}$ | -0.073 | $-0.214^{* *}$ |
| Total | $0.11 \times 10^{-3 *}$ | $0.38 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ | $-0.35 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ |
| benefits |  |  |  |
| Reps/income | $1.51^{* *}$ | $0.621^{* *}$ |  |
| Ln(wealth) | $-0.265^{* *}$ | $-0.154^{* *}$ | $-0.140^{* *}$ |
| Disco rate |  |  | $0.246^{* *}$ |
| Risk aversn. | $-0.158^{* *}$ | $0.98 \times 10^{-2 * *}$ |  |
| Bad health | $0.301^{* *}$ | 0.225 | $0.160^{*}$ |
| Long stg ill | $-0.109^{* *}$ | -0.055 | $-0.070^{*}$ |
| FL1: infln. | -0.037 | -0.099 | 0.015 |
| FL2: knkstat | -0.068 | 0.169 | -0.033 |
| FL3: intst | $-0.093^{*}$ | -0.040 | -0.016 |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | Payts heavy burden | Missed 2 consec. payts | DSR 30\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Has debt |  |  |  |
| Age 25-54 | 0.294** | 0.376** | 0.186** |
| Net inc ${ }^{1}$ | 0.032** | 0.021** | 0.178** |
| Ttl benefits | $0.92 \times 10^{-5}$ | $-0.10 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ | $-0.14 \times 10^{-3 * *}$ |
| Degree | 0.574** | 0.457** | 0.509** |
| Qual other | 0.378** | 0.369** | 0.332** |
| Has dep ch | 0.136** | 0.170** | 0.099** |
| Ln (wealth) | 0.171** | 0.073** | 0.172** |
| FL1: infln | 0.096** | 0.044 | 0.101** |
| FL2: bnkstat | 0.245** | 0.178** | 0.215** |
| FL3: intst | 0.110** | 0.058* | 0.124** |
| $N$ | 25,529 | 24,464 | 25,085 |
| Selected | 17472 | 9,987 | 16,878 |
| Not selected | 8057 | 14,477 | 8,207 |
| Mean <br> obs/gp |  |  |  |
| Wald Chi2 | 2686.6** | 146.6** | 885.5** |
| Rho (e1,e2) | 0.075 | -0.019 | -0.558** |

## Changes in overindebtedness

Transition matrix of possible values of changes in overindebtedness indicator ( $\Delta y_{i t}$ )

State in $t$


If in round $\mathrm{t}, i$ is not overindebted $\left(y_{i t}=0\right)$ she can either stay in that state $\left(\Delta y_{i t}=0\right)$ or transit into being overindebted $\left(\Delta y_{i t}=+1\right)$

Model one state changes as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(\Delta y_{i t}=1 \mid y_{i t-1}=0\right)=\Phi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}^{T} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \\
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(\Delta y_{i t}=-1 \mid y_{i t-1}=1\right)=\Phi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}^{T} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Cards, mail order, HP, loans. Conditional on holding debt.

| Variable | Transition | AME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age 15-24 | Into | 0.0078 |
|  | Out of | -0.1512 |
| Age 25-34 | Into | 0.0530** |
|  | Out of | -0.1355** |
| Age 35-44 | Into | 0.0594** |
|  | Out of | -0.1616** |
| Age 45-54 | Into | 0.0503** |
|  | Out of | -0.2061** |
| Age 55-64 | Into | 0.0411** |
|  | Out of | -0.0180** |
| Male | Into | 0.0059 |
|  | Out of | -0.0420** |
| Single | Into | 0.0155* |
|  | Out of | -0.1035** |
| Divorced/separtd | Into | 0.0496** |
|  | Out of | -0.1346** |
| Degree | Into | -0.0151 |
|  | Out of | $0.22 \times 10^{-3}$ |
| Qual other | Into | -0.0026 |
|  | Out of | 0.0045 |
| Has dep ch | Into | 0.0537** |
|  | Out of | -0.0821** |
| Single par | Into | -0.0091 |
|  | Out of | -0.0438 |
| Unemployed | Into | 0.0299 |
|  | Out of | -0.0543 |
| Self emplyd. | Into | 0.0101 |
|  | Out of | 0.0117 |
| Ln(net inc) | Into | 0.0077** |
|  | Out of | -0.0068 |



## Conclusions

- Re need for selection model: depends on the level of aggregation and dependent variable:

> Household level: Correlation of errors in selection model generally significant Individual level: Burden of repayments and missed 2 payments - correlation not significant $$
\text { DSR30 - correlation is significant. }
$$

- In general: more education, higher income, more wealth, being single reduces chance of being overindebted receiving more in benefits is associated with greater chance of being indebted.
- Poor general health increases chances of being overindebted and of becoming overindebted. Poor long term health associated with lower chance of being overindebted and of becoming overindebted.
- Higher discount rate (more impetuous) associated with high DSR and with DSR increasing.
- Risk aversion associated with lower chance of being overindebted and with lower chance of becoming overindebted
- Rarely find financial literacy is (conditionally) associated with any measure of overindebtedness. But financial literacy is very strongly associated with having debt.
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