

# Student Debt Cancellation: Evidence from Credit Reporting Panel Data \*

Eduard Nilaj<sup>†</sup>    Laura Beamer<sup>‡</sup>    Sultana Fouzia<sup>§</sup>    Jack Landry<sup>¶</sup>  
Mike Pierce<sup>||</sup>    Sérgio Pinto<sup>\*\*</sup>    Marshall Steinbaum<sup>††</sup>

September 11, 2025

We estimate the economic impact of student debt cancellation on borrower financial outcomes using a nationally-representative credit panel and a staggered difference-in-differences/event study framework, comparing cohorts of borrowers whose student loans were canceled in 2021–2024 to a control group consisting of borrowers with active student loans. We estimate a 1.4 percentage point increase in homeownership, a 16 point increase in credit score, a \$648 increase in auto debt, and a 1.5 percentage point reduction in credit utilization, among other outcomes. Our findings shed light on the effect of student debt holding constant educational attainment, variation in which confounds most estimates.

---

\*We have departed from the alphabetic norm for author order in acknowledgment of Eduard Nilaj's efforts on this project, which have unanimously earned him priority of authorship. We thank the California Policy Lab for hosting, documenting, and facilitating access to the University of California Consumer Credit Panel.

<sup>†</sup>The New School and Jain Family Institute.

<sup>‡</sup>Jain Family Institute.

<sup>§</sup>Jain Family Institute

<sup>¶</sup>Jain Family Institute.

<sup>||</sup>Student Borrower Protection Center.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), DINAMIA'CET, Lisbon, Portugal, and Jain Family Institute.

<sup>††</sup>University of Utah and Jain Family Institute.

Following the Biden administration’s proposal to cancel between \$10,000 and \$20,000 in outstanding student debt for all borrowers in 2022, interest in the topic of student debt forgiveness has grown among academics, policymakers, and the public. Despite this heightened interest, there is limited empirical evidence on the economic impact of loan cancellation, leading to a lack of consensus as evidenced by the 2023 Supreme Court ruling in *Biden v. Nebraska*. This paper addresses a gap in the literature by analyzing the financial outcomes of borrowers whose loans were canceled between 2021 and 2024. Our analysis compares borrowers whose loans were canceled with a control group of borrowers whose loans remained active.

This paper’s primary contribution is providing comprehensive empirical evidence on how student loan cancellation impacts a range of financial outcomes, including homeownership, home equity loan debt, and auto loan debt, as well as credit card debt, credit limits, utilization rates, and credit scores. Using credit panel data, we track individual borrowers’ financial outcomes before and after loan cancellation to identify causal effects. We address the challenges of evaluating staggered policy interventions by employing a cohort-specific difference-in-differences (DiD) design, drawing on the estimator developed by Sun and Abraham (2021). By adopting a staggered DiD approach, we estimate the causal effects of loan cancellation across cohorts and time periods more accurately, mitigating potential issues in traditional two-way fixed effects models, which may yield biased estimates when treatments are implemented at different times across individuals or groups and hence have heterogeneous effects (Goodman-Bacon, 2021).

Our findings reveal improvements in borrowers’ financial outcomes following student loan cancellation, as measured by the average treatment effects (ATEs) and cohort-specific average treatment effects (CATEs). Overall, we find that borrowers who had at least one student loan canceled experience increased homeownership and first-time homeownership rates, higher auto and credit card debt levels, higher credit limits, lower credit utilization rates, and significantly higher credit scores, compared to those whose loans remained active. On average, homeownership rates increase by an estimated 1.4 percentage points across all cancellation co-

horts relative to borrowers with active loans. This effect is largest for the 2021 cohort, with a CATT of 5.1 percentage points. To contextualize these effects, the 1.4 percentage point increase represents 5 percent of the baseline homeownership rate for all treated cohorts in 2020, while the 5.1 percentage point increase for the 2021 cohort corresponds to 29.8 percent of their baseline. Borrowers in the cancellation cohorts also saw notable improvements in their credit scores, with an ATT of 16.1 points across all cohorts. These credit score improvements partly reflect pre-treatment (i.e., pre-cancellation) trends coinciding with the federal repayment pause since borrowers treated by cancellation also benefited from the repayment pause, while control group borrowers did not (explained in detail below). However, the sharp and immediate increase in credit score following cancellation suggests a significant and independent effect of cancellation.

Although borrowers with canceled loans saw increases in certain types of debt, particularly for the 2021 cohort, which saw a CATT of \$466 for credit card debt and \$2,011 for auto loans, these increases were offset by significant reductions in home equity loan balances, with a CATT of -\$2,901 for the same cohort. Finally, loan cancellation improved borrowers' access to credit, as evidenced by an ATT of \$1,314 in increased credit limits and a reduction in credit card utilization rates by 1.5 percentage points. This pattern suggests that borrowers with canceled student loans—particularly those who already owned homes—were able to pay down certain debts while incurring new ones. Alternatively, some of these borrowers may have leveraged their improved creditworthiness to increase borrowing, whereas others used the financial relief to reduce outstanding obligations.

This paper is organized as follows: Section I provides a brief review of the literature on the financial impacts of student loan burdens and the potential effects of debt forgiveness. Section II details the dataset used in this study, including the process for identifying federal loan cancellations, and presents cohort summary statistics. Section III describes the empirical strategy and presents the main regression estimates. Section IV interprets these results and places them in the context of existing research on student debt and financial health. Finally,

Section V summarizes the findings and implications. All tables and figures are included at the end of the paper.

## I Literature Review

This paper is one of the first to explore the effects of large-scale student loan cancellation occurring between 2021 and 2024. Our study is closely related to Dinerstein et al. (2024), who also analyze credit reporting data to estimate the effects of student loan forgiveness. However, our paper differs in three significant ways. First, while Dinerstein et al. (2024) focus on short-term impacts up to six months post-cancellation, we examine outcomes over a longer horizon of up to three years, capturing medium-term financial adjustments that provide a more comprehensive picture of borrowers' financial trajectories. Second, we employ a more conservative methodology for identifying student loan cancellations, ensuring robustness by applying stricter criteria to minimize misclassification while potentially increasing the frequency of false negatives. Finally, our analysis incorporates a carefully defined control group of borrowers with active student loans during the repayment pause (when most of the cancellation studied in both papers was implemented), matched to the treatment group of borrowers with canceled loans. This approach generates a counterfactual for canceled borrowers that we believe is informative about what their outcomes would have been in the absence of the repayment pause, to the degree that is possible in the credit reporting data when the pause affected the vast majority of student borrowers.<sup>1</sup>

Maggio, Kalda and Yao (2019) examine a private loan forgiveness program and find that participants experience improvements in financial stability. However, public student loan forgiveness programs may differ in their impact due to differences in borrower profiles and the

---

<sup>1</sup>Dinerstein, Yannelis and Chen (2024) explore the effects of the student loan repayment pause on borrowers' credit outcomes, providing evidence that even temporary relief measures can positively affect credit scores and financial health. They also find that the repayment pause enabled affected borrowers to take on additional consumer debt, including auto loans and credit card balances, motivating the refinement of our control group to estimate a 'clean' cancellation effect. Collier et al. (2024a) and Collier et al. (2024b) come to broadly similar conclusions using a range of methodologies and, additionally, measuring borrower subjective wellbeing.

scale of the programs. A more recent study by Catherine and Yannelis (2023) looks at the prospective distributional effect of student loan forgiveness under the assumption that borrowers eligible for income-driven repayment programs effectively have no student debt.

Beyond cancellation specifically, the financial impact of student debt has received increasing attention from researchers as rising debt levels have become a key issue for policymakers and the public. Findings tend to fall into two groups: those that use variation in access to student debt to estimate the effect of debt on outcomes find it has a positive effect (Black et al., 2023), while findings that use variation in the cost of attendance to vary the amount of student debt find it has negative effects (Mezza et al., 2020; Bleemer et al., 2021). The likely omitted variable in both cases is educational attainment: increased access to debt causes increased attainment, which may be positive for borrower financial outcomes, while increased cost of attendance reduces attainment while increasing debt, making it difficult to disentangle the two channels. However, Pinto and Steinbaum (2023) show that increased attainment doesn't necessarily benefit borrowers.

In this paper we are able to vary the amount of student debt (through permanent cancellation) while holding attainment constant. We find that eliminating student debt is beneficial to borrowers.

## II Data

For this study, we use data from the University of California Consumer Credit Panel (UC-CCP), a longitudinal dataset covering the period from 2004 to the present (though our study period concludes in 2024). The UC-CCP provides anonymized credit records for a 2 percent nationally representative sample of U.S. adults with credit histories. It includes detailed demographic and geographic information, credit scores, and tradeline-level data on loans and credit, such as payment history, credit limits, balances, and loan statuses.

We restrict the dataset to borrowers with student loan tradelines between 2010 and 2024. We exclude any individual who is ever flagged as "deceased," because death discharges auto-

matically zero out loan balances and eliminate the possibility of observing post-discharge economic outcomes, which would confound our cancellation measures. Although the UC-CCP is available quarterly, we primarily rely on the June (Q2) archives to manage the computational demands of such a large dataset. We choose the Q2 archives specifically because they fall mid-calendar-year, avoiding year-end reporting anomalies linked to tax offsets, loan consolidations, and academic-year originations that become visible in Q3 and Q4. To trace balance dynamics that help identify potential loan discharges, we still pull quarterly archives from 2019 onward and construct variables that track changes in student loan balance 3, 6, 9, and up to 24 months before each Q2 archive between 2021 and 2024.

This section proceeds as follows: we first describe the major federal loan cancellation programs implemented since 2021. We then outline our approach to identifying canceled loans and defining treatment and control groups, essential for constructing a credible counterfactual. Finally, we present baseline characteristics and trends for these groups, focusing on key outcomes such as student debt balance, homeownership rate,<sup>2</sup> and credit score.

#### *A. Federal Student Loan Cancellation Programs*

Since 2021, several federal programs have facilitated student loan cancellation, targeting borrowers based on their repayment history, employment, or institutional factors. The Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program cancels the remaining balance on federal Direct Loans for borrowers who have made 120 qualifying monthly payments under an Income-Driven Repayment (IDR) plan while working full-time for a qualifying public service employer (Federal Student Aid, 2024b; Student Borrower Protection Center, 2024). Borrower Defense to Repayment forgives loans for borrowers who were defrauded by their educational institution or misled into taking out loans under false pretenses. This program has primarily provided relief to borrowers from for-profit institutions accused of deceptive practices (Federal Student

---

<sup>2</sup>Since homeownership status is not directly observable in the credit bureau data, we infer it based on the presence of an open mortgage account or an open home equity line of credit account.

Aid, 2024a). The Closed-School Discharge program provides loan forgiveness to borrowers whose educational institutions closed while they were enrolled or shortly thereafter, preventing them from completing their degrees (Smith, 2021).

While we cannot directly observe how individual borrowers in our sample received loan forgiveness, the financial characteristics of the treatment cohorts presented in Table 1 offer insight into the likely pathways through which forgiveness occurred. For example, the 2021 and 2024 cohorts exhibit financial characteristics indicative of Borrower Defense or Closed-School Discharge, as these programs often target borrowers from for-profit institutions or those facing significant financial distress. In contrast, the 2022 and 2023 cohorts are more likely to be PSLF beneficiaries, given their comparatively higher credit scores and homeownership rates prior to cancellation. Overall, borrowers with canceled loans were in worse financial positions before cancellation than those who repaid their loans.

### *B. Identifying Canceled Loans and Constructing Comparison Groups*

To analyze the impact of student loan cancellation on financial outcomes, we first need to identify canceled loans. To do so, for each Q2 archive in 2021–2024, we classify each student loan held by sampled borrowers as either a zero-balance or positive-balance loan. We assign each zero-balance loan to one of three primary categories: (1) discharged in bankruptcy or charged off, (2) repaid, or (3) canceled. We assign these categories based on a detailed classification process that uses the borrower’s loan history and loan status indicators in the two years prior to the archive in which it is observed as having a zero balance.

Loans discharged in bankruptcy include those legally expunged or written off by creditors. Although charged-off loans differ legally from those discharged through bankruptcy, with distinct impacts on the borrower’s credit record, the financial characteristics of the loans and the borrowers in both cases are sufficiently similar that we group them together for the purposes of this study. Zero-balance loans are categorized as repaid if they display balances declining smoothly to zero, show stagnant balances near origination levels, or record significant pay-

ments. Unlike Dinerstein et al. (2024), we do not rely on observed payments to classify a loan as repaid rather than canceled.<sup>3</sup>

Identifying canceled loans is particularly complex due to the COVID-19 repayment pause. Under the pause, most federal student loans were subject to zero-percent interest, and payments were voluntary, resulting in stagnant balances even for borrowers on track for forgiveness under programs like PSLF. To address this, we assign a zero-balance loan to the canceled category if it meets one of four specific sets of criteria based on balance trends, distress flags, and pre-zero balance amounts in the two years preceding the zero balance. First, a loan is deemed canceled if its individual balance and the borrower's total student loan balance both rise (or at least never decrease) in every archive up to the first observation of a zero balance, and the loan shows a current or past-due distress flag. Second, in the absence of a distress flag, a loan is classified as canceled if its pre-zero balance (the last positive balance observed) exceeded its origination amount, which we take to be indicative of IDR enrollment. Third and fourth, for the 2022Q2 and 2023Q2 data vintages, we treat loans with flat balances through the sampling date as canceled if they carry a distress flag or if their last positive balance is above origination, on the premise that absent the repayment pause these balances would have continued to rise. This schema is deliberately conservative, with some true cancellations likely going undetected as such due to loans not displaying unequivocal signs of distress before their balance was written down to zero.<sup>4</sup>

For borrowers with multiple loans reaching zero balance in the same year, all loans must have reached zero simultaneously, with the youngest loan at least five years into repayment, to be classified as canceled. Additionally, any borrower with a zero-balance loan and an overall student loan balance (aggregating across loans) that equals or exceeds the prior year's balance

---

<sup>3</sup>Actual payments are recorded incompletely in credit panels since not all servicers report payments made, so we cannot assume that reported payments reflect all payments that are actually made. Nonetheless, we believe that the payments that are observed are accurate, and so when we observe them we infer that the reason for the zero balance was those payments. We assign loans whose pre-zero balance is stagnant and which show no other signs of distress to the repaid category recognizing that some student loans are interest-only and they may be paid off with a "waterfall" payment when the loan comes due.

<sup>4</sup>By conservative we mean our methodology minimizes false-positive cancellations.

is excluded from the repaid or canceled categories, since this likely reflects a refinancing of the loan observed to have a zero balance.

These zero-balance categories (bankrupt/discharged, repaid, and canceled) are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive. Loans that do not meet the criteria for any category—approximately 25–30 percent of zero-balance loans in our panel—are categorized as “unknown” and excluded from the cancellation analysis. In cases where loans meet the criteria for more than one category (about 1 percent), we apply a hierarchy: discharge takes precedence over repaid, which takes precedence over canceled. We interpret “unknown” loans as likely refinanced or transferred, though no replacement loan was found in the borrower’s credit record. This categorization approach results in a lower prevalence of canceled loans in our panel than the Department of Education’s aggregate statistics would suggest.<sup>5</sup> The single most important reason our estimates of aggregate loan cancellation are lower than the DOE’s data is that we require loans to evince signs of distress to be classified as canceled so as not to erroneously classify repaid and refinanced loans as canceled, whereas many canceled loans were probably not distressed before being canceled.

Having established a method for identifying canceled loans, we next define our treatment and control groups to allow for a comparison that quantifies the effects of loan cancellation through a staggered difference-in-differences (DiD) approach. The treatment group includes all borrowers whose loans are classified as “canceled” in any of the 2021Q2, 2022Q2, 2023Q2, and 2024Q2 data archives, while the control group consists of borrowers with active loans during the same period. Importantly, borrowers with zero-balance loans which we do not classify as discharged, repaid, or canceled are excluded from both the treatment and control groups, ensuring we do not erroneously include treated individuals in the control group. Accordingly, our analyses reflect the effects of cancellation for borrowers whose cancellations are most clearly manifested in credit files under our conservative rules. A possible side effect of

---

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix A for a comparison with DOE cumulative totals and why our methodology captures a smaller share of student loan cancellations in 2023–2024.

our approach is that the borrowers we identify as having their loans canceled are, on average, more constrained by their student debt than the average cancellation beneficiary, and therefore could benefit more from that policy. Consequently, the estimates we obtain in section B. can be interpreted as an upper bound for the effect of student debt cancellation. To improve comparability, we also limit the control group to borrowers whose most recent loans originated in 2013 or earlier, aligning them more closely with the treatment group’s characteristics prior to cancellation.

### *C. Summary Statistics and Trends by Cancellation Cohort*

Next, we present baseline characteristics and trends for the treatment and control groups. Table 1 provides an overview of the demographic and financial profiles of borrowers in 2020, before the initiation of student loan cancellation. Overall, borrowers with canceled loans were, on average, financially worse-off than those whose loans remained active. The treatment group exhibited higher median student loan balances, lower credit scores, higher credit utilization rates, and lower homeownership rates compared to the control group. For instance, the median student debt balance in the 2023 cohort reached \$65,444, compared to \$15,946 for the control group. Likewise, the median credit score among treatment cohorts ranged from 601 to 667, in contrast with a higher median score of 689 for the control group. Homeownership rates were substantially lower for borrowers in the treatment group, particularly for those in the 2021 cancellation cohort.

We emphasize that the difference-in-differences (DiD) approach we employ does not require identical baseline levels between the treatment and control group. Our identification strategy relies on the assumption of parallel trends: in the absence of loan cancellation, the treatment and control groups would have evolved similarly over time. Under this assumption, the control group serves as a meaningful benchmark for the treatment group, allowing us to assess the causal impact of loan cancellation on financial outcomes, even with differences in baseline characteristics.

Figure 1 depicts trends in financial outcomes over time, observing trends in student loan balances, monthly loan payments, homeownership, and consumer credit scores from 2015 to 2024. Each panel depicts five groups: four treatment cohorts representing borrowers whose loans were forgiven in 2021–2024 and a control group of borrowers who did not experience loan cancellation and whose loans remained active.

Borrowers in the treatment cohorts show steadily increasing student loan balances in the pre-cancellation period. Post-cancellation, their balances drop sharply to zero or near-zero and remain there, validating our methodology for identifying canceled loans. By contrast, the control group exhibits a gradual decline in balances over time, which gets slightly more pronounced following the repayment pause. These findings are complemented by the top-right panel highlighting payment trends. Borrowers in the treatment group made lower monthly payments pre-cancellation than the control group, likely due to enrollment in Income-Driven Repayment (IDR) plans. During the repayment pause, average monthly payments fell to zero or near-zero for the treatment groups, while payments for the control group also declined, but remained notably higher in comparison.

Among treatment cohorts, the 2021 cohort exhibits the largest increase in homeownership between 2020 and 2024, indicating the length of time the effects of loan cancellation on homeownership take to materialize, as homebuying often requires financial stability and accumulation of savings. This may also reflect the 2021 cohort's comparatively disadvantaged pre-cancellation economic status, consistent with Borrower Defense rather than PSLF as the program resulting in cancellation. In contrast, the impact of cancellation on credit scores is immediate: borrowers in all treatment cohorts experienced sizable credit score improvements in the same year their loans were forgiven. Meanwhile, the control group exhibited steadier trends for both homeownership and credit scores, lacking the sharp inflection points observed among treatment cohorts, illustrating the direct benefits of loan forgiveness.

While these descriptive patterns suggest a relationship between loan cancellation and improved financial outcomes, causal interpretation requires further analysis. In the following

section, we employ a staggered difference-in-differences (DiD) approach to formally estimate the causal impact of student loan cancellation on these outcomes, controlling for baseline differences and addressing potential confounding factors.

### III Results: Financial Outcomes of Loan Cancellation

In this section, we examine the effects of student loan cancellation on financial outcomes such as homeownership, credit access, and overall debt burden, utilizing an event study and a difference-in-differences (DiD) approach designed for staggered interventions. We begin by detailing the empirical specification used to estimate the causal effects of loan cancellation. Next, we present the model estimates and describe the event-study plots, which quantify the impact of loan cancellation on financial outcomes.

#### *A. Empirical Specification*

Our empirical strategy employs a staggered difference-in-differences (DiD) design to estimate the effects of student loan cancellation on borrower outcomes. This approach leverages variation in the timing of loan cancellations across multiple cohorts from 2021 to 2024, allowing us to capture the dynamic effects of loan forgiveness.

Traditional two-way fixed effects (TWFE) models in staggered treatment settings have been shown to produce biased estimates when treatment effects vary over time or across cohorts (Goodman-Bacon, 2021). To address this, we adopt the method developed by Sun and Abraham (2021), which accounts for heterogeneity in treatment timing and dynamic treatment effects. This approach enables us to estimate cohort-specific average treatment effects on the treated (CATT) for each cancellation cohort, while correcting for biases that arise in TWFE models.

The generalized model is specified as follows:

$$(1) \quad y_{it} = \sum_{\tau} \beta_{\tau} \cdot (Cancellation_i \times Post_{t,\tau}) + \alpha_i + \delta_{d,t} + \epsilon_{it}$$

where  $y_{it}$  represents the outcome of interest for individual  $i$  at time  $t$ , and  $\tau$  indexes time relative to the loan cancellation event. The coefficients  $\beta_{\tau}$  capture the dynamic effects of loan cancellation at different points in time, where  $\tau = 0$  corresponds to the period of cancellation,  $\tau < 0$  represents pre-cancellation periods, and  $\tau > 0$  represents post-cancellation periods.

The variable  $Cancellation_i$  is an indicator equal to 1 if the individual's loan was canceled, and  $Post_{t,\tau}$  is a set of indicator variables equal to 1 for the period  $\tau$  relative to the cancellation event. The model includes individual fixed effects ( $\alpha_i$ ) to control for time-invariant borrower characteristics, as well as fixed effects for the 2019 student loan payment decile interacted with year ( $\delta_{d,t}$ ), which are computed across all borrowers in both the treatment and control groups. Finally,  $\epsilon_{it}$  is the error term.

The inclusion of 2019 payment-decile-by-calendar-time fixed effects ensures that borrowers with canceled loans are compared to others at similar stages of their economic life cycles. Borrowers with canceled student loans may differ significantly from those without, due to factors like whether they attended college before or after the Great Recession (Pinto and Steinbaum, 2023), their resulting labor market earnings, and the degree to which they relied on student loans to finance their education. Without controlling for these differences, the estimated effects of loan cancellation could be confounded by these pre-existing disparities, violating the parallel trends assumption. Interacting the payment deciles with calendar time captures distinct economic trends for borrowers at various stages in their financial lives, enabling a clearer estimation of the true impact of loan cancellation among borrowers with similar *ex ante* payment obligations, whom we interpret as comparable in terms of their pre-treatment student debt burden.

### B. *Estimated Impact of Loan Cancellation*

Figure 2 plots event-study estimates of equation 1 for eight financial outcomes. Table 2 reports average treatment effects (ATTs) across all cancellation cohorts, as well as cohort-specific average treatment effects on the treated (CATTs) for each cancellation year from 2021 to 2024. The event study plots track changes in outcomes from five years before to three years after cancellation ( $\tau = -5$  to  $\tau = 3$ ), with the year before cancellation ( $\tau = -1$ ) serving as the reference point. The dashed vertical line indicates the cancellation year, while shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals. While the event-study design offers insights into the timing of effects, caution is warranted in interpreting the coefficients, particularly for the +3 period (three years post-cancellation), as it is estimated solely from the 2021 cancellation cohort, whereas earlier coefficients draw on data from multiple cohorts.

Homeownership-related outcomes show substantial improvements following loan cancellation. Across all cohorts, loan cancellation increases homeownership rates by 1.4 percentage points, with the largest effect observed for the 2021 cohort (5.1 percentage points). Overall homeownership rates rise steadily, with the most pronounced effects observed two to three years post-cancellation. We find that having a student loan canceled increases the likelihood of homeownership by nearly four percentage points two years post-treatment, increasing to over 8 percentage points three years post-treatment. First-time homeownership shows similarly positive effects, with an ATT of roughly 1 percentage point and larger impacts for the 2021 and 2022 cohorts, 2.3 and 1.3 percentage points, respectively. However, the timing exhibits a different trajectory, with earlier and more gradual increases compared to overall homeownership. This pattern suggests that the overall homeownership indicator loosely aggregates first-time homeownership gains over time.

Trends in home equity loan balances and auto loan balances exhibit more nuanced patterns. Home equity loan balances show a modest initial increase in the first year post-cancellation, followed by declines into negative territory, suggesting that borrowers use their improved finan-

cial positions to pay down existing housing-related debt two to three years post-cancellation. The ATT across all cohorts indicates a modest increase of \$593, though this estimate is not statistically significant. Notably, the 2021 cohort shows a larger but negative cohort-specific impact of -\$2,901. This pattern may reflect heterogeneity in how earlier-treated borrowers managed their housing-related debt post-cancellation, potentially using improved financial stability to pay down existing home equity loans. Auto loan balances, in contrast, show a steady increase, rising to approximately \$1,000 by the first year post-cancellation and remaining at that level in subsequent years. The overall ATT for auto loan balances is \$648. The largest cohort-specific impact is observed for the 2021 cohort (\$2,011), suggesting that earlier-treated borrowers leveraged their improved credit access to finance vehicle purchases.

Credit outcomes, detailed in the second part of Figure 2, exhibit pronounced and immediate improvements. Credit scores exhibit the most consistent and immediate improvements following loan cancellation, with an average increase of 16.1 points across all cohorts. The largest gains are observed for the 2021 and 2022 cohorts, at 20.0 and 18.6 points. We find a sharp increase in credit score immediately following loan cancellation, with gains observed across all treatment cohorts starting in the year of cancellation. While credit card balances increase modestly (ATT = \$122), credit limits show a substantial rise (\$1,314). Notably, the increase in credit limits outpaces the growth in balances, leading to a small decline in credit utilization rates (ATT = -1.5 percentage points). The rise in credit card balances likely indicates improved financial flexibility, while the more pronounced growth in credit limits demonstrates greater access to credit among borrowers. Importantly, the increase in credit limits exceeds the rise in balances, leading to a reduction in credit utilization rates, a standard metric for financial health. This decline suggests a meaningful alleviation of financial strain, as borrowers hold a larger share of unused credit relative to their obligations.

However, it is important to caveat our event study results for the credit score and credit limit outcomes because they exhibit pre-trends across specifications. We interpret the pre-trends as caused by the student loan repayment pause, which affected the treatment group

more than it did the control group since canceled loans had to be eligible for it, and which other research has shown improved credit conditions for its beneficiaries. Hence, the overall pattern of convergence we estimate between the treatment group and the control group, part of which happens pre-cancellation (as can be seen in Figure 1), should be regarded as jointly caused by cancellation as well as the repayment pause. Our methodology precludes a precise causal attribution for the observed credit score improvement. We can only distinguish between the pre-cancellation ( $\approx 5$  points) and post-cancellation ( $\approx 20$  points) gains, and we stress that this temporal division does not imply causation.

While the main results demonstrate significant overall impacts of loan cancellation, further analysis reveals some differences across demographic subgroups, particularly for the home-ownership outcome. For event study plots and treatment effect estimates by race and gender, see Appendix B.

#### IV Discussion

Our results contribute to and expand the existing research on the financial impact of student debt and of student debt relief, offering new insights into the effects of large-scale federal loan cancellation, which varies student indebtedness while holding educational attainment fixed. The results build on and clarify prior studies, providing a deeper understanding of how loan forgiveness influences various financial outcomes.

Consistent with prior studies highlighting the credit-enhancing effects of debt relief, such as those by Dobbie and Song (2015) and Maggio, Kalda and Yao (2019), we find that student loan cancellation produces immediate and substantial improvements in credit scores. Borrowers across all cohorts experience gains in creditworthiness beginning in the year of cancellation, with average increases of up to 18 points observed two years post-cancellation. Our results also refine the understanding of how borrowers utilize improved credit access. While prior research suggested that the repayment pause allowed borrowers to take on additional consumer debt, including auto loans and credit card balances (Dinerstein, Yannelis and Chen, 2024), we find

that credit limits increase simultaneously (whether due to the repayment pause or the cancellation) at a rate that outpaces increases in balances, resulting in reduced credit utilization rates. Hence, insofar as those authors conclude the forbearance had ambiguous effects on borrower financial status since the borrowers who benefited took on more debt, by considering credit utilization we show their financial position improved notwithstanding.

The relationship between student debt and homeownership has been a central focus in the literature, with prior research highlighting the constraints that student loans impose on wealth accumulation and housing market entry (Mezza et al., 2020; Bleemer et al., 2021). Our findings extend this literature by demonstrating that loan cancellation leads to measurable improvements in homeownership outcomes. Three years post-cancellation, overall homeownership rates increase by nearly eight percentage points, while first-time homeownership also registers notable gains. These results indicate that loan forgiveness reduces vital financial obstacles to homeownership, including difficulties in saving for a down payment and meeting mortgage qualification criteria.

Importantly, our results reveal that student debt cancellation enables previously hampered borrowers to substitute secured loans, such as mortgages or auto loans, for the unsecured student debt removed from their balance sheets. This substitution reflects the significant financial constraints that borrowers face while their student debt remains outstanding. The removal of these constraints enables borrowers to advance through their economic life cycles, with potential downstream effects on household composition, career choices, and asset accumulation. In this sense, student debt cancellation facilitates social reproduction, counteracting the economic stasis imposed by otherwise unresolvable debt overhangs.

We uncover significant heterogeneity in borrowers' responses to loan forgiveness, echoing prior findings that larger discharges and demographic differences influence outcomes (Maggio, Kalda and Yao, 2019; Collier et al., 2024b). Consistent with these findings, we observe that the 2021 cohort, facing the greatest financial constraints at baseline, experiences the largest gains in homeownership rates, credit scores, and credit access. These results suggest that stu-

dent debt cancellation disproportionately benefits economically disadvantaged borrowers by directly alleviating their financial vulnerabilities. The fact that the 2021 cohort was the worst-off ex-ante and experienced the greatest relative gain in status indicates that this cohort was comprised primarily of beneficiaries of the latter two programs, which target students who attended for-profit institutions because they are segregated out of traditional higher education. Future research could explore these dimensions of heterogeneity to refine our understanding of how debt cancellation affects different borrower subgroups. A treatment-intensity framework, examining variation in outcomes based on the amount of debt canceled or its relative share of borrowers' total liabilities, could further illuminate the mechanisms through which debt relief shapes financial behavior and inform more effective policy design.

Our results also underscore the fundamental distinction between temporary relief measures, such as income-driven repayment (IDR) plans or the COVID-19 repayment pause, and the principal reductions achieved through loan cancellation. While temporary measures may alleviate immediate financial pressure, they do not address the underlying economic impairments caused by unresolved debt. For instance, neither IDR nor the repayment pause enabled borrowers to make significant asset purchases relative to their counterfactual scenarios, as evidenced by the absence of pre-trends in key outcomes such as homeownership in Figure 2, as well as previous studies like Collier et al. (2024b), who find modest-to-nonexistent effects of the repayment pause on these outcomes. These results suggest that only permanent reductions in outstanding student debt balances can fully mitigate the long-term financial constraints that thwart wealth accumulation.

Finally, these findings shed light on the economic impact of financing higher education through individually-held debt. Attempts to study the effect of a debt-financed higher education system against some sort of counterfactual are typically stymied by the fact that indebtedness and educational attainment are jointly determined in a debt-financed system; hence, it is difficult to establish a counterfactual holding educational attainment constant while varying the amount of debt. Here we accomplish that by studying a reduction in student debt that

was plausibly exogenous for individuals who had (largely) already determined their level of educational attainment, a unique opportunity to adjust one variable while holding the other fixed. As a result, we provide suggestive evidence that a higher education system that does not feature student debt leaves students financially better off than one that does.

Policymakers should take these distinctions into account when designing debt relief policies. While temporary measures can provide important short-term relief, our findings highlight the transformative potential of principal reduction in fostering economic mobility. To maximize the impact of loan forgiveness, policymakers should also consider pairing debt relief with complementary measures, such as affordable housing initiatives, to address broader structural barriers to wealth accumulation and promote long-term economic security.

## **V Conclusion**

This study provides comprehensive evidence on the financial impacts of federal student loan cancellation, demonstrating its role in alleviating financial constraints and improving borrowers' economic outcomes. Overall, we demonstrate that loan forgiveness leads to immediate improvements in credit scores, credit access, and financial flexibility, as well as measurable gains in homeownership over time. These effects are most pronounced among borrowers facing significant financial challenges, highlighting the potential of loan cancellation to enhance economic mobility and stability.

## References

- Black, Sandra E., Jeffrey T. Denning, Lisa J. Dettling, Sarena Goodman, and Lesley J. Turner.** 2023. "Taking It to the Limit: Effects of Increased Student Loan Availability on Attainment, Earnings, and Financial Well-Being." *American Economic Review*, 113(12): 3357–3400.
- Bleemer, Zachary, Meta Brown, Donghoon Lee, Katherine Strair, and Wilbert Van Der Klaauw.** 2021. "Echoes of rising tuition in students' borrowing, educational attainment, and homeownership in post-recession America." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 122: 103298.
- Catherine, Sylvain, and Constantine Yannelis.** 2023. "The distributional effects of student loan forgiveness." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 147(2): 297–316.
- Collier, Daniel, Dan Fitzpatrick, Chloe Fann, Frederick Engram, Carol Bruzzano, and Mecca Keyes.** 2024a. "Pause and Effect: Examining the Dynamics of the Student Loan Pause and the Challenge of Resuming Payments for Public Service Loan Forgiveness Borrowers." *SSRN Journal*.
- Collier, Daniel, Marshall Steinbaum, Dalié Jiménez, Jonathan Glater, Chloe Fann, and Axel Morales Sanchez.** 2024b. "Student Loan Borrowers and Pandemic-Era Interventions in California."
- Dinerstein, Michael, Constantine Yannelis, and Ching-Tse Chen.** 2024. "Debt Moratoria: Evidence from Student Loan Forbearance." *American Economic Review: Insights*, 6(2): 196–213.
- Dinerstein, Michael, Dmitri Koustas, Constantine Yannelis, and Samuel Earnest.** 2024. "Student Loan Forgiveness."
- Dobbie, Will, and Jae Song.** 2015. "Debt Relief and Debtor Outcomes: Measuring the Effects of Consumer Bankruptcy Protection." *American Economic Review*, 105(3): 1272–1311.

- Federal Student Aid.** 2024a. "Borrower Defense Loan Discharge." [Online; accessed 2024-12-12].
- Federal Student Aid.** 2024b. "Public Service Loan Forgiveness." [Online; accessed 2024-12-12].
- Goodman-Bacon, Andrew.** 2021. "Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing." *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2): 254–277.
- Maggio, Marco Di, Ankit Kalda, and Vincent Yao.** 2019. "Second Chance: Life without Student Debt."
- Mezza, Alvaro, Daniel Ringo, Shane Sherlund, and Kamila Sommer.** 2020. "Student Loans and Homeownership." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 38(1): 215–260.
- Pinto, Sérgio, and Marshall Steinbaum.** 2023. "The Long-Run Impact of the Great Recession on Student Debt." *Labour Economics*.
- Smith, Robyn.** 2021. "Revisiting Relief for Students Harmed by School Closures." *Student Borrower Protection Center Research Paper, Forthcoming*.
- Student Borrower Protection Center.** 2024. "Accessing Public Service Loan Forgiveness."
- Sun, Liyang, and Sarah Abraham.** 2021. "Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects." *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2): 175–199.

TABLE 1. 2020 SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION COHORTS AND CONTROL GROUP

	Cancellation Cohorts				Control Group
	2021	2022	2023	2024	
Number of Individuals	509	2,172	2,607	3,101	277,771
Average Age	41.1	43.3	42.7	43.3	40.6
Share Female	51.9%	55.2%	61.9%	65.4%	53.8%
Share Male	42.6%	39.7%	31.8%	29.6%	41.6%
Share White	57.2%	57.6%	57.3%	54.1%	62.1%
Share Non-White	33.8%	31.0%	32.6%	36.7%	27.0%
Share Homeowners	17.1%	28.3%	39.7%	23.3%	34.8%
Share New Homeowners	1.4%	1.6%	2.9%	2.1%	2.5%
Median Student Debt Balance	\$25,180	\$32,987	\$65,444	\$41,203	\$15,946
Median Auto Loan Balance	\$18,094	\$15,810	\$15,890	\$14,873	\$15,144
Median Credit Card Balance	\$860	\$1,883	\$2,846	\$1,856	\$1,949
Median Credit Card Limit	\$4,775	\$10,240	\$13,910	\$6,400	\$13,050
Median Credit Card Utilization	26.8%	28.4%	32.4%	46.1%	22.6%
Median Credit Score	602	619	667	601	689

*Notes:* This table compares the financial and demographic characteristics of different student loan cancellation cohorts and a control group in 2020, one year before any loans were canceled.




FIGURE 1. TRENDS IN STUDENT LOAN BALANCE, PAYMENT, HOMEOWNERSHIP, AND CREDIT SCORE BY CANCELLATION COHORT AND CONTROL GROUP (2015–2024)

*Notes:* This figure presents the trends from 2015 to 2024 in average student loan debt, monthly student loan payments, homeownership rate, and credit scores, disaggregated by cancellation cohort and control group. The line charts depict five groups: four cancellation cohorts, each representing different years of loan forgiveness (2021–2024), and a control group of borrowers who did not experience loan cancellation.







FIGURE 2. EVENT STUDY ESTIMATES OF THE FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION




FIGURE 2. EVENT STUDY ESTIMATES OF THE FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION (CONT.)

*Notes:* This figure presents event study estimates for the financial impacts of student loan cancellation on borrower outcomes, computed by estimating equation 1. Each panel displays the estimated change in an outcome—such as homeownership rate—relative to the year before cancellation. The time axis spans from five years before to three years after loan cancellation, with the dashed vertical line indicating the period right before cancellation. Shaded areas around the estimates represent 95% confidence intervals.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE TREATMENT EFFECTS BY OUTCOME AND COHORT

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>All Cohorts</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>
Homeownership Rate	0.014 (0.004) [0.000]	0.051 (0.016) [0.001]	0.015 (0.006) [0.020]	0.009 (0.005) [0.086]	-0.004 (0.003) [0.288]
First-time Homeownership	0.009 (0.002) [0.000]	0.023 (0.007) [0.001]	0.013 (0.004) [0.000]	0.004 (0.004) [0.310]	0.000 (0.003) [0.972]
Total Home Equity Balance	592.796 (589.667) [0.315]	-2,900.675 (1,973.495) [0.142]	657.364 (1,392.86) [0.637]	1,271.631 (597.575) [0.033]	549.737 (604.149) [0.363]
Total Auto Loan Balance	648.002 (298.372) [0.030]	2,011.457 (1,344.602) [0.135]	308.828 (581.273) [0.595]	800.457 (437.083) [0.067]	193.314 (357.409) [0.589]
Credit Score	16.098 (0.626) [0.000]	20.015 (2.585) [0.000]	18.633 (1.064) [0.000]	11.594 (0.983) [0.000]	15.931 (1.023) [0.000]
Total Credit Card Balance	122.366 (95.031) [0.198]	466.298 (346.986) [0.179]	-136.621 (181.272) [0.451]	428.726 (152.255) [0.005]	-156.498 (132.407) [0.237]
Total Credit Limit	1,313.749 (154.606) [0.000]	2,616.523 (587.408) [0.000]	1,514.071 (307.184) [0.000]	1,359.888 (233.344) [0.000]	99.793 (183.039) [0.586]
Credit Utilization Rate	-0.015 (0.004) [0.000]	0.001 (0.017) [0.956]	-0.036 (0.007) [0.000]	-0.005 (0.006) [0.424]	-0.006 (0.007) [0.365]
Observations	3,138,777				

*Notes:* This table displays the average treatment effects (ATT) across all cancellation cohorts, as well as the cohort-specific average treatment effects on the treated (CATT) for individual cohorts treated from 2021 to 2024. Standard errors are in parentheses, and p-values are in square brackets. Fixed effects include individual and 2019 student loan payment decile interacted with calendar time.

# Appendix

## A Reported vs. Estimated Cumulative Cancellation

To gauge whether our method of loan cancellation identification aligns with external benchmarks, we compare our panel-based cumulative-dollar series (scaled to a national frame) with the U.S. Department of Education’s (DOE) announced totals.




FIGURE A.1. CUMULATIVE STUDENT LOAN DEBT CANCELLATION, 2021–2024

*Notes:* This figure benchmarks our conservative loan-cancellation classification against the U.S. Department of Education’s announced totals. The purple line represents DOE-reported cumulative cancellations, while the teal line shows our scaled credit-panel-based estimates. DOE totals are sourced from press releases; a consolidated list of the original press-release URLs was compiled by the Center for American Progress for its “Tracker: Student Loan Debt Relief Under the Biden–Harris Administration” (PDF). If an original DOE link no longer resolves, copy its URL into <https://web.archive.org/> to view an archived version.

Our cumulative-dollar series is intentionally conservative, and two features of 2023–2024 make it sit below the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) totals. First, after the repayment

pause ended and payments/interest resumed, many genuine discharges exhibit small pre-zero-balance declines (posted payments, interest/servicer adjustments, corrections), which violate our pre-zero monotonicity screens; these cases are therefore excluded rather than counted as cancellations. Second, PSLF cancellations, which were more prevalent in 2023–2024, are systematically harder to capture with our rules. Many PSLF borrowers rarely show distress flags; balances often do not exceed origination after pause-era adjustments (so they miss our IDR proxy); consolidation/servicer transfers can create replacement tradelines and non-simultaneous zeroing across loans; and some closures are coded as “unknown” rather than “canceled.” As a result, our series tracks the timing of inflection points but lies below DOE cumulative dollars, most notably in 2023 and 2024. We exclude any zero-balance loans that do not pass our screening from both the treatment and control groups. This ensures we don’t compare borrowers who received a loan cancellation to those whose loans were simply misclassified. Therefore, our findings apply specifically to borrowers whose cancellations are most clearly documented in their credit files under our strict rules.

## B Loan Cancellation Effects by Race and Gender

This appendix provides additional analyses exploring the heterogeneous effects of student loan cancellation on financial outcomes based on race and gender. The event study plots presented below are constructed in the same methodology as Figure 2 in the main text, which examines the overall effects of loan cancellation on various financial outcomes over time. Here, the sample is split by race (White / Non-White) and gender (Men / Women) to investigate potential disparities in how different demographic groups experience the impacts of loan cancellation. The credit panel directly reports individual borrowers' gender, which we believe is imputed using an algorithm based on first names (which are known to the credit bureau but not available to researchers). Race is reported as a probability distribution over race categories estimated from last names and addresses. We assign the race group (either White or Non-White) based on the plurality of those probabilities.

### *Analysis by Gender*

Figure B.1 illustrates the effects of loan cancellation by gender. Across outcomes, we find that men tend to experience larger financial improvements compared to women:

- **Homeownership:** We estimate a 2.2 percentage point increase in homeownership for men, compared to an increase of 1.1 percentage points for women. In contrast, the changes in first-time homeownership are approximately equal between men and women (1.0 percentage points).
- **Credit Score and Credit Limit:** Both women and men experience significant increases, with women showing slightly larger improvements in credit scores three years after cancellation, and men experiencing larger increases in credit limits.



FIGURE B.1. FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION BY GENDER




FIGURE B.1. FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION BY GENDER (CONT.)

*Notes:* This figure shows event study estimates of the financial impacts of student loan cancellation on borrower outcomes, derived from equation (1). Each panel tracks changes in outcomes—such as homeownership rate—relative to the year preceding cancellation. The horizontal axis spans five years before to three years after cancellation, with a dashed vertical line marking the pre-cancellation period. Separate lines represent subgroup estimates (Men vs. Women), with error bars reflecting 95% confidence intervals.

### *Analysis by Race*

Figure B.2 depicts the effects of loan cancellation by race. We observe notable differences between White and Non-White borrowers across outcomes: White borrowers experience significant improvements in homeownership rates and debt balances, while the impacts for Non-White borrowers are more muted or negative in some cases. However, improvements in credit scores and credit limits are substantial and comparable across both groups. Specifically:

**Homeownership:** The estimated average treatment effect (ATT) on homeownership shows a 1.7 percentage point increase for White borrowers, while Non-White borrowers exhibit a 0.6 percentage point change. **Credit Score and Credit Limit:** Both White and Non-White borrowers experience significant improvements in credit scores and credit limits following loan cancellation. The ATT for credit scores is 15.3 points for White borrowers and 16.6 points for Non-White borrowers. Credit limits increase by \$1,294 for White borrowers and \$1,664 for Non-White borrowers, indicating cancellations had a more pronounced impact on expanding credit access for Non-White borrowers. **Debt Balances:** White borrowers see increases in credit card balances (\$192.23) and auto loan balances (\$856.50), while Non-White borrowers show smaller fluctuations (\$73.56 for credit card balances and \$644.66 for auto loan balances, both non-significant). For home equity balances, White borrowers experience an increase of \$445.69, whereas Non-White borrowers see one of \$202.59 (both again non-significant).




FIGURE B.2. FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION BY RACE




FIGURE B.2. FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF STUDENT LOAN CANCELLATION BY RACE (CONT.)

*Notes:* This figure shows event study estimates of the financial impacts of student loan cancellation on borrower outcomes, derived from equation (1). Each panel tracks changes in outcomes—such as homeownership rate—relative to the year preceding cancellation. The horizontal axis spans five years before to three years after cancellation, with a dashed vertical line marking the pre-cancellation period. Separate lines represent subgroup estimates (White vs. Non-White), with error bars reflecting 95% confidence intervals.