

Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Staff Reports

Measuring Student Debt and Its Performance

Meta Brown
Andrew Haughwout
Donghoon Lee
Joelle Scally
Wilbert van der Klaauw

Staff Report No. 668
April 2014



This paper presents preliminary findings and is being distributed to economists and other interested readers solely to stimulate discussion and elicit comments. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and are not necessarily reflective of views at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System. Any errors or omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

Measuring Student Debt and Its Performance

Meta Brown, Andrew Haughwout, Donghoon Lee, Joelle Scally, and Wilbert van der Klaauw
Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports, no. 668

April 2014

JEL classification: D12, I22, D14

Abstract

Studies continue to indicate that higher education is frequently a worthwhile investment for individuals and that it raises the productivity of the workforce as a whole. While the rising cost of post-secondary education has not eliminated this “college premium,” it has raised new questions about how growing numbers of students can make these investments. One solution to this problem is student loans, which have come to play an increasingly important role in financing higher education. Yet, despite its importance, educational debt is not well understood. Among the reasons is that there exist few central repositories of information on the characteristics and performance of all student loans, which currently include loans made by both government and private lenders. In this paper, we bring a new data set to bear on this important issue and present a brief analysis of the historical and current levels of student debt and how those loans are performing. We also briefly discuss the implications of student loans for borrowers and the economy.

Key words: student debt, household debt

Brown, Haughwout, Lee, Scally, van der Klaauw: Federal Reserve Bank of New York (e-mail: meta.brown@ny.frb.org, andrew.haughwout@ny.frb.org, donghoon.lee@ny.frb.org, joelle.scally@ny.frb.org, wilbert.vanderklaauw@ny.frb.org). The authors are grateful to Brian Cadena and Raven Molloy for helpful comments. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York or the Federal Reserve System.

I. Introduction

Studies continue to indicate that higher education is frequently a worthwhile investment for individuals (Goldin and Katz 2008), and raises the productivity of the workforce as a whole (Moretti 2004). While the rising cost of post-secondary education has not eliminated this “college premium,” it has raised new questions about how a growing numbers of students can make these investments (Archibald and Feldman 2010, Dynarski and Kreisman 2013). One solution to this problem is student loans, which have come to play an increasingly important role in financing higher education. Yet in spite of its importance, educational debt is not well understood. Among the reasons for this is the fact that the currently outstanding stock of student debt includes loans made by both government and private lenders, and there exist few central repositories of information on the characteristics and performance of all student loans. In this paper, we bring a new dataset to bear on this important issue, and present a brief analysis of the historical and current levels of student debt and how those debts are performing. We also briefly discuss the implications of student loans for borrowers and the economy.

II. Data

Our analysis is based on data drawn from the FRBNY Consumer Credit Panel (CCP). The CCP represents a 5 percent random sample of U.S. individuals with credit files as well as all of their household members.¹ In all, the entire data set includes anonymous credit files on more than 15 percent of the population, or nearly 40 million individuals. The panel includes information from the credit reports for those individuals for each quarter during the last fourteen years, and we use data for this analysis through December 2012. While the CCP commences in 1999, irregularities in student

¹ See Avery et al. (2003) for a detailed discussion of the contents, sources, and quality of credit report data.

loan reporting prior to 2004 suggest dropping the 1999-2003 data and we thus begin our analysis in 2004.

The sampling exploits randomness in the last two digits of individuals' Social Security numbers.² The procedure ensures that the panel is dynamically updated in each quarter to reflect new entrants into credit markets. In addition, Equifax, the data provider, matches the primary individual's mailing address to all records in the data in order to capture information about other members of the primary individual's household. While these individuals are added to the overall CCP sample, in this paper we focus on the 5% primary sample members.

The data set includes detailed data on individual student loans and individual mortgage loans such as:

- month and year the account was opened
- current balance and payment status
- origination balance
- whether the account is individual or joint
- scheduled monthly payment
- narrative codes giving details of the account such as the payment is deferred, etc.
- industry code indicating the type of the servicer

In addition, the data set includes somewhat more aggregated data on individuals' other loans, including credit cards, auto loans such as:

- total number of each type of account (for example, the total number of credit cards),
- credit limit on each type of account (for example, the combined credit limit on all credit cards),

² See Lee and van der Klaauw (2010) for further details about the sample design and content of the FRBNY Consumer Credit Panel.

- total balance on each type of account in each status (for example, the total credit card balance that is current, thirty-days delinquent, and so on).

More general information regarding the borrower on the credit report includes the following:

- residential location of the borrower at the census block level and also zipcode level
-
- birth year of the borrower
- indicators for whether the individual has a foreclosure or bankruptcy within the last twenty-four months, and ever, on the report,
- indicators for whether the individual has any accounts in collection and the amount of collection,
- a consumer credit score that is analogous to the well-known FICO score.

The data are completely anonymous, and stripped of all personal identifiers.


Unfortunately, while the vast majority of student loan servicers report to credit bureaus, these data do not distinguish between private and federal loans. Outside reports suggest that private loans account for approximately 15% of aggregate student debt. Although a number of reports have pointed to differences in the growth, size and performance of private and federal loans, this limitation of our data will require a focus on the total student debt burden.

III. Growth of Student Debt

Between 2004 and 2012, the total student debt in the United States nearly tripled from \$364 billion in 2004 to \$966 billion in 2012; see Figure 1. Expressed in annual terms, this means student debt increased by an average of 14% per year. As of the end of 2012, about two-thirds of this debt is owed by borrowers under 40, with about one-third of the total being


owed by borrowers under 30. Americans above 40 also have student debt, but their share is much smaller, with 17% held by borrowers in their 40s, 12% held by borrowers in their 50s, and the remainder held by borrowers 60 and older.

Figure 1: Total student loan balances by age group




Among the various types of household debt, student debt is unique. While balances on all other forms of household debt -- including mortgages, credit cards, auto loans, and home equity lines of credit -- declined during and after the Great Recession, student debt has steadily risen, as shown in Figure 2 (see Brown, et al. 2013 for a discussion of dynamics of other kinds of household debts during the 2000s). In 2010, student debt surpassed credit cards to become the second largest form of household debt after mortgages whereas prior to 2008, the student debt was the smallest of household debts.

Figure 2: Non-mortgage balances reported on consumer credit reports




What accounts for the rapid increase of the aggregate student debt in this period? Our research shows that increases in number of borrowers and the average debt per person equally contributed to the growth of total student debt. Between 2004 and 2012, the number of borrowers increased by 70% from 23 million borrowers to 39 million. In the same period, average debt per borrower also increased by 70%, from about \$15,000 to \$25,000.

Figure 3: Number of borrowers and average balances per borrower




Note, however, that there is actually a great variation in balances among borrowers, as shown in Figure 4. Of the 39 million borrowers, about 40% have balances of less than \$10,000. Approximately another 30% owe between \$10,000 and \$25,000. Only 3.7% of borrowers have balances of more than \$100,000, with 0.6%, or roughly 230,000 borrowers nationwide, having more than \$200,000 of debt.

Figure 4: Distribution of student loan balances in 2012 Q4



With respect to the rise in the number of borrowers, Figure 5 shows that a steadily increasing share of younger people are taking out student loans: in 2004, only about 27% of 25 year olds had student debt while 8 years later, in 2012, the proportion of 25 year olds with student debt increased to about 43%.

Figure 5: Share of 25 year olds with student debt



There are several explanations for these increases. First, more people are attending college, adding to the number of borrowers (NCES 2012). Second, students are staying in college longer and attending graduate school in greater numbers, and loans to finance graduate study have become more readily available (Gonzales et al., 2013). Third, it has become cheaper for parents to take out student loans to help finance their children's education (see Finaid.org: <http://www.finaid.org/loans/parentloan.phtml>; last accessed 2/8/14.). Fourth, the cost of a college education has continued to grow sharply during the period (College Board, 2013).

If student borrowers complete their education, and quickly start repaying their debt, then the increase in the number of borrowers and in the total amount of student debt would in part be offset by the outflow. However, as we will discuss in the next section, the repayment rate on student loans is low. This is because many borrowers delay payments through continuing education, deferrals, forbearance, and through income-based repayment plans. Some borrowers also have difficulty making required payments and become delinquent on their debt and ultimately default, which for federal loans is defined as falling 270 days behind on payments. In addition, discharging student debt is very difficult and the delinquent debt stays with the borrower, and the high rate of inflow and the low rate of outflow contribute to the increase in the total student debt outstanding.

IV. Student Loan Delinquency

Some student loan borrowers have difficulty in repaying their debt and there has been an increase in payment difficulties over the past eight years. The most common measure of inability to meet the debt obligation is the proportion of borrowers 90 days or more past due on their payments. We will refer to this as the “measured delinquency rate.”

As of the 4th quarter of 2012, about 17%, or 6.7 million borrowers, were 90 days or more delinquent on their student loan payments; see the left panel of Figure 6. This measured delinquency rate is higher among borrowers aged 30 to 49 than it is among younger or older borrowers, which is unexpected since typically younger borrowers have higher delinquency rates. There was a strongly increasing trend in delinquency between 2004 and 2012 among

all age groups, with measured delinquency rising from an overall rate of less than 10% in 2004 to 17% in 2012.


The measured delinquency rate on student debt is currently the highest of any consumer debt product, although for most of the last decade credit card delinquency was even higher.³ Nonetheless, the measured delinquency rate is somewhat misleading, and the *effective* delinquency rate as we define below, on student debt is even higher. As noted above, in 2012 the measured delinquency rate among the 39 million borrowers was 17%. But many of the remaining 83% in fact were not paying down their loan balances. While 39% did reduce their balance from the previous quarter by at least one dollar, 14% of borrowers had the same balance as the previous quarter. A full 30% of borrowers actually saw an increase in their balance. In other words, 44% of borrowers were neither delinquent nor paying down their loans.

Those borrowers whose balance did not decline are likely not yet in the repayment cycle, meaning that they were either still in school, in deferral, or in a forbearance period delaying their regular payments. This group may also include some borrowers who participate in income-based repayment plans and make only small payments, which are often insufficient to cover the accumulated interest. In order to have a more accurate picture of the delinquency rate, we calculate the “effective delinquency rate” by excluding this 44% of borrowers not in repayment; the result is shown in the right-hand panel of Figure 6. This effective delinquency rate is nearly double the measured delinquency rate, with almost one third of borrowers in repayment being delinquent on their debt. Interestingly, borrowers under 30, who previously

³ See FRBNY’s Quarterly Report on Household Debt and Credit, where delinquency rates are reported as a percentage of outstanding balances rather than as a percentage of borrowers. Available at <http://www.newyorkfed.org/microeconomics/data.html>; Last accessed 2/10/14. ⁴

appeared to have a lower measured delinquency rate than the 30 to 49 group, are now shown to have the highest effective delinquency rate. The fact that fewer of these younger borrowers are in the repayment cycle masks high effective delinquency rates among those who are.

Figure 6: Delinquency rates for borrowers overall and for those in repayment




It is important to note that because of the unique character of student debt, an increasing delinquency rate defined either way does not necessarily imply that a greater percentage of new borrowers are falling behind on repayment. Borrowers who became delinquent in the past and remain so are included in the delinquency rate. Some may also default, which, again, is defined as being more than 270 days past due in the case of federal loans. Because student debt is not generally dischargeable, even in bankruptcy, the

delinquency rate may continue to increase even when the percentage of borrowers becoming newly delinquent remains constant.

We address this issue in Figure 7, which depicts the proportion of borrowers in repayment who became newly delinquent on a quarterly basis. Here we see that in 2005 about 6% of non-delinquent borrowers in repayment transitioned into delinquency each quarter, on average. By 2012, that rate had increased to 9%. This confirms that indeed there was an increasing trend of borrowers becoming newly delinquent over time.

Figure 7: Quarterly transition rate into delinquency, borrowers in repayment




V. Student debt's role on the household balance sheet

An advantage of our data is that they allow us to look at all the liabilities on each individual's balance sheet and to put educational debt and delinquencies into the broader context of household debt. In this section, we refer to non-student loan debt as "other debt."

Figure 8 reports on other debts for borrowers aged 25 to 30 in 2005 (left panel) and 2012 (right), by their levels of student debt outstanding. In 2005 the average amount of other debt held by student loan borrowers aged 25 to 30 exceeded student loan debt, which was \$18,200. Interestingly, there was a positive association between student debt and other debt, such as mortgages, credit cards and auto loans. Borrowers with higher student loan balances used to have more other debt compared to those with lower or no student debt. After all, student debt has historically been an indicator that the borrower has some level of higher education and thus a higher permanent income, so it is perhaps unsurprising to see this reflected in the balances on other debts.

Figure 8: Average non-student loan balances, borrowers aged 25-30




Following the general trend of household deleveraging outside of student debt in the aftermath of the financial crisis (Brown et al., 2013), other debt balances declined for all borrowers between 2005 and 2012. But they declined much more for borrowers with student loans, so that student loan borrowers now have lower other debt at around \$20,000, on average. Meanwhile the average student debt among student loan borrowers increased to \$26,500 for those who were between 25 and 30 in 2012. The decline in other debt was especially visible among those with high levels student debt. As a result, the previous positive association between student and other debts has disappeared.

The shift we observe is an outcome of the interplay between supply and demand factors, and it is difficult to disentangle them. Borrowers with higher student loan balances

may have become less confident about their future labor market and income prospects, and therefore reduced their demand for credit. On the other hand, lenders may have become more conservative in supplying loans to high balance student loan borrowers. Likely, both demand and supply factors played a significant role in the sharp reduction in the accumulation of other debt by high student loan borrowers.

Brown and Caldwell (2013) discuss the implications of student debt and delinquencies on access to other forms of credit such as auto and mortgage financing. Figure 9 complements that analysis. In 2005, many young student debt borrowers, even those with a balance of more than \$100,000, were able to finance a home purchase. The fact that more of these high student loan borrowers did so than those with lower or no student loan balances most likely reflects differences in income and higher postgraduate degree attainments (including holders of professional degrees with good labor market prospects). However, the large homeownership gap between high, low and no student loan borrowers has since declined considerably.

Figure 9: Mortgages among student loan borrowers age 25-30




Again, it is difficult to distinguish demand and supply factors, but it appears likely that the sharp decline in mortgage originations among the high student debt borrowers in part reflects a tightening of mortgage eligibility, for example through maximum debt to income ratio requirements. Brown and Caldwell (2013) provide further evidence of a decline in access to credit by student loan borrowers, showing that while student loan borrowers aged 25 (or 30) used to have average credit scores comparable to those without student debt, by 2012 they had considerably lower average credit scores. In part this may be attributable to the high student debt delinquency rate.

Delinquent student loan borrowers, shown in the red line, have (perhaps not surprisingly) always been much less likely – or able -- to borrow for a home purchase. There are now many more delinquent borrowers than in 2005. In light of the increasing student debt burden and the growth in the delinquency rate, especially among young borrowers,

student debt is likely to have an important influence on borrowers' use of other types of credit, particularly, mortgage credit.

Figure 10 addresses the association between delinquencies on student debt and other debt. Not surprisingly, delinquent student loan borrowers are more likely to also be delinquent on other debts. Delinquent student loan borrowers are delinquent on 17% of their auto loan balances, on 35% of their credit card balances, and on 28% of their mortgage balances, and these rates are much higher compared to those with no delinquent student debt.

Figure 10: Student loan and other debt delinquency, 25-30 year olds, 2012:Q4



VI. Conclusion

Higher education is an important investment among younger individuals to equip them for better job prospects and higher income potential, but over the last several years it has been accompanied by a growing student debt burden. Total student loan balances almost tripled

between 2004 and 2012 due to increasing numbers of borrowers and higher balances per borrower; educational debt is now the second largest liability on household balance sheets, after mortgages. Nearly one third of the borrowers in repayment are delinquent on student debt, a fact that is masked by the large numbers of borrowers who are in either deferment or grace periods. While we did not establish causality, it appears that the higher burden of student loans and the associated high delinquency rate negatively affect borrowers' home purchases, other debt payments and access to credit.

References

- Archibald, Robert B., and David H. Feldman. "Why does college cost so much?." *OUP Catalogue* (2010).
- Avery, Robert B., Paul S. Calem, and Glenn B. Canner. 2003. "An Overview of Consumer Data and Credit Reporting." *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, February: 47-73.
- Brown, Meta, Andrew Haughwout, Donghoon Lee, Maricar Mabutas and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2012. "Grading Student Loans," *Liberty Street Economics*, available at <http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/03/grading-student-loans.html>
- Brown, Meta and Sydney Caldwell. 2013. "Young Student Loan Borrowers Retreat from Housing and Auto Markets," *Liberty Street Economics*, available at <http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2013/04/young-student-loan-borrowers-retreat-from-housing-and-auto-markets.html>; last accessed 2/8/14.
- Brown, Meta, Andrew Haughwout, Donghoon Lee and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2013. "The Financial Crisis at the Kitchen Table: Trends in Household Debt and Credit," *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, Volume 19, Number 2.
- Goldin, Claudia Dale, and Lawrence F. Katz. *The race between education and technology*. Harvard University Press, 2009.
- College Board, 2013. *Trends in College Pricing*. Last accessed 2/9/14.
<https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/college-pricing-2013-full-report.pdf>
- Dynarski, Susan and Daniel Kreisman. 2013. "Loans for Educational Opportunity: Making Borrowing Work for Today's Students," *Hamilton Project Discussion Paper 2013-05*, October.
- Lee, Donghoon, and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2010. "An Introduction to the FRBNY Consumer Credit Panel." Federal Reserve Bank of New York *Staff Reports*, no. 479, November.
- Moretti, Enrico. "Estimating the social return to higher education: evidence from longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional data." *Journal of econometrics* 121, no. 1 (2004): 175-212.
- Gonzales, Leila, Jeffrey R. Allum and Robert S. Sowell. 2013. *Graduate Enrollment and Degrees: 2002 to 2012*. Council of Graduate Schools. September. Available at: http://www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/GEDReport_2012.pdf . Last accessed 2/8/14.
- Hunt, Robert M. 2002. "The Development and Regulation of Consumer Credit Reporting in America." Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia *Working Paper* no. 02-21, November.