A Comprehensive Personal Financial Health Index for Measuring Individual Financial Well-Being

John Kanalakis

Abstract

This paper proposes a Financial Health Index (FHI) designed to encapsulate multiple dimensions of an individual's financial status into a single, concise metric. The FHI combines widely accepted measurements, such as net worth, savings rate, debt-to-income ratio, and investment status, into a single 0-100 scale. This consolidated measure aims to address limitations in existing financial indicators that tend to focus on a narrow set of risk factors or a single aspect of personal finance. By integrating data from various sources, including credit profiles, employment records, and investment portfolios, the FHI offers a more holistic snapshot of financial well-being. Preliminary findings suggest that the FHI provides actionable insights for both policymakers and individuals aiming to improve their long-term financial health.

Introduction

Quantifying individual financial well-being is a longstanding challenge in economics and personal finance. Traditional metrics, such as credit scores (FICO or VantageScore), net worth, or simple debt-to-income ratios, fail to comprehensively capture the complexity of an individual's overall financial situation. In practice, these indicators each focus on a singular dimension, such as credit history, assets, or liabilities.

This paper introduces the Financial Health Index (FHI), a composite metric that synthesizes multiple dimensions of an individual's financial profile into a single 0–100 score. The FHI, by virtue of its multi-factor composition, captures aspects of short-term liquidity (e.g., emergency savings), medium-term stability (e.g., manageable debt levels), and long-term growth (e.g., investment accumulation). Designed to be intuitive and user-friendly, the FHI provides both an at-a-glance overview of financial well-being and a framework for systematic improvements over time.

Literature Review

Existing Metrics in Personal Finance

1. Credit Scores: Widely used by lenders, credit scores primarily incorporate payment history, credit utilization, account history length, types of credit, and new credit inquiries. While pivotal for assessing credit risk, these scores do not incorporate savings behavior, investments, or broader net worth.

2. Debt-to-Income (DTI) Ratios: DTI ratios reflect the proportion of monthly income devoted to debt obligations. Although essential for evaluating short-term debt repayment capacity, DTI ratios are insufficient as a standalone measure because they ignore total asset accumulation, investment stability, and liquid savings.

3. Net Worth Calculations: Net worth—defined as total assets minus total liabilities—is a valuable snapshot of financial position. However, fluctuations in asset values and the absence of a standard benchmark for optimal net worth at different life stages limit its standalone use.

Limitations of Existing Measures

Each standard indicator serves a specific purpose but omits key elements of personal financial health:

- Credit scores neglect liquidity and do not directly incorporate savings or net worth.
- DTI ratios focus on monthly debt obligations but fail to account for long-term investment strategies and wealth-building.
- Net worth does not consider the timing of inflows and outflows, and it can fluctuate significantly with market conditions.

Against this backdrop, the economic literature calls for a more nuanced and composite approach to measuring financial well-being. The proposed Financial Health Index aims to fill this gap by incorporating multiple dimensions into one easily interpretable scale.

Methodology

Overview of the Financial Health Index (FHI)

The FHI aims to place individuals on a 0-100 scale, where 0 indicates severe financial distress, and 100 indicates exemplary financial stability and growth potential. Several sub-scores, each measuring a critical aspect of personal finance, are first generated and normalized to a 0-100 range. These sub-scores are then aggregated via a weighted average to produce the final FHI score.

1. Score Range: 0 to 100 (higher is better)
2. Key Components:
    - (N_{worth}) Normalized net worth sub-score
    - (R_{D2I}) Debt-to-income ratio sub-score
    - (S_{rate}) Savings rate sub-score (percentage of income saved)
    - (I_{invest}) Investment health sub-score (value of investments relative to income or age-based targets)
    - (E_{emerg}) Emergency fund stability sub-score (months of expenses saved)
    - (X_{misc}) Other relevant factors sub-score (e.g., insurance coverage, job security, etc.)

Sub-Score Definitions

Net Worth Sub-score (N_{worth})

- Metric:

$$\text{Net Worth} = \text{Total Assets} - \text{Total Liabilities},$$

- Normalization:

$$N_{\text{worth}} = \min\left(\max(\frac{\text{Net Worth}}{\alpha \times \text{Annual Income}} \times 100, 0), 100\right),$$

  where α\alpha is an age-based or life-stage-based "target multiple" (e.g., a middle-aged individual might aim for 2–3 times annual income in net worth). Values are capped at 100 to minimize outlier effects.

Debt-to-Income Ratio Sub-score (R_{D2I})

- Metric:

$$\text{DTI} = \frac{\text{Monthly Debt Payments}}{\text{Monthly Gross Income}} \times 100\%$$

- Normalization:

$$R_{\text{D2I}} = 100 - \min\left(\text{DTI}, 100\right)$$

  A lower DTI is more favorable, so 10% DTI yields a sub-score of 90, while 50% DTI yields 50, etc.

Savings Rate Sub-score (S_{rate})

- Metric:

$$\text{Savings Rate} = \frac{\text{Monthly Savings}}{\text{Monthly Gross Income}} \times 100\%$$

- Normalization:

$$S_{\text{rate}} = \min(\text{Savings Rate}, 100)$$

Higher savings rates lead to higher sub-scores, capped at 100.

Investment Health Sub-score (I_{invest})

- Metric:

$$\text{Investment Ratio} = \frac{\text{Total Investment Value}}{\beta \times \text{Annual Income}},$$

where β is another age-based target for adequate investment accumulation.

- Normalization:

$$I_{\text{invest}} = \min\Big(\max(\text{Investment Ratio} \times 100, 0), 100\Big)$$

This ensures an upper limit of 100 points for extremely high investment values.

Emergency Fund Sub-score (E_{emerg})

- Metric:

$$\text{Months of Expenses Saved} = \frac{\text{Emergency Fund}}{\text{Monthly Expenses}}$$

- Normalization:

$$E_{\text{emerg}} = \min\left(\frac{\text{Months of Expenses Saved}}{6} \times 100, 100\right)$$

A target of 6 months is common in personal finance literature; thus, 6 months of reserves yields a sub-score of 100.

Miscellaneous Factors Sub-score (X_{misc})

- Metric: This category includes subjective or intangible elements such as:
    - Insurance coverage (health, life, disability)
    - Job stability (contract vs. permanent employment)
    - Additional factors pertinent to financial security
- Normalization:

$$X_{\text{misc}} = \text{Weighted average of intangible metrics} \in [0, 100]$$

  Each underlying factor is scored individually, and the scores are combined into a single sub-score.

Weighting

Each sub-score is multiplied by a user-defined weight based on its perceived importance. For instance:

$$w1 = 0.20, w2 = 0.15, w3 = 0.15, w4 = 0.15, w5 = 0.20, w6 = 0.15,$$

where

$$w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 + w_6 = 1$$

Final Index Calculation

Combining all sub-scores via weighted average:

$$\text{FHI} = w_1 \times N_{\text{worth}} + w_2 \times R_{\text{D2I}} + w_3 \times S_{\text{rate}} + w_4 \times I_{\text{invest}} + w_5 \times E_{\text{emerg}} + w_6 \times X_{\text{misc}}$$

Data Sources

Constructing the Financial Health Index relies on multiple data inputs, which may be drawn from both public and private records, including:

1. Credit Bureau Data:
    - Monthly debt payments, credit utilization, and credit inquiries.
2. Financial Institutions:
    - Transaction histories from banks and credit unions to confirm monthly income, savings, and expenses.
    - Investment account statements for total investment values.
3. User-Provided Information:
    - Self-reported net worth (or assets and liabilities), especially when not captured in institutional datasets.
    - Emergency fund amounts and additional intangible factors (e.g., job stability, insurance coverage).

4. Public Datasets and Benchmarks:
    - Age-based net worth targets, relevant guidelines, or broader demographic data to benchmark both net worth sub-scores and investment ratios.

By synthesizing these data sources, the FHI covers both traditional credit factors and more holistic financial dimensions such as emergency savings and job security.

Results

Illustration with a Hypothetical Individual

Consider a hypothetical individual with the following financial profile:

- Annual Gross Income: $60,000
- Net Worth: $100,000
- Monthly Debt Payments: $500
- Monthly Savings: $750 (15% of monthly income)
- Total Investment Value: $30,000
- Emergency Fund: 3 months of essential expenses
- Miscellaneous Factors: moderate insurance coverage, stable job, overall intangible score: 80 out of 100

Sub-scores are calculated as follows:

- N_{worth}: $N_{\text{worth}} = \frac{100{,}000}{1 \times 60{,}000} \times 100 \approx 166.66 \quad \text{(capped at 100)}$
- R_{D21}: $\text{DTI} = \frac{500}{5000} \times 100 = 10\% \quad \Longrightarrow 100 - 10 = 90$
- S_{rate}: 15
- I_{invest}: $\frac{30{,}000}{1 \times 60{,}000} \times 100 = 50 \quad \text{(not exceeding 100)}$
- E_{emerg}: $\frac{3}{6} \times 100 = 50$
- X_{misc}: 80

After applying example weights:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{FHI} &= 0.20 \times 100 + 0.15 \times 90 + 0.15 \times 15 \\ &\quad + 0.15 \times 50 + 0.20 \times 50 + 0.15 \times 80 \\ &= 65.25 \approx 65\end{aligned}$$

This individual's resulting FHI is approximately 65, indicating relatively robust net worth and manageable debt, though savings rate and emergency fund reserves could improve to raise the score further.

Discussion

Strengths

1. Holistic View: By unifying net worth, debt servicing capability, savings behavior, and intangible stability factors, the FHI reflects a broader definition of financial well-being than many existing metrics.
2. Actionable Insights: The sub-score breakdown reveals which areas are lacking (e.g., insufficient emergency fund, limited investments) and offers clear opportunities for targeted improvement.
3. Benchmarking Over Time: Individuals and policymakers can track the FHI at regular intervals (monthly, quarterly, or annually) to observe trends, measure intervention outcomes, or adjust policy guidelines.

Limitations and Future Research

1. Data Availability: Comprehensive data sourcing can prove challenging. Not all individuals have fully documented or centralized financial records, and intangible factors often require self-reported data.
2. Subjective Weighting: Different users or policy analysts may assign varying degrees of importance to each dimension. Further research could employ machine learning or statistical models to empirically derive optimal weight distributions.
3. Dynamic Benchmarks: The references α\alpha and β\beta used to normalize net worth and investment sub-scores need periodic recalibration to accommodate changing economic conditions, median income shifts, and demographic variations.

Conclusion

The Financial Health Index (FHI) offers a comprehensive, multi-factor method for assessing personal financial well-being. By integrating conventional measures, such as debt-to-income ratio and net worth, with savings behavior, investment progress, emergency reserves, and intangible stability factors, the FHI presents a single, unified figure on a 0-100 scale. Preliminary evidence suggests that it furnishes clear, actionable feedback and illustrates how distinct financial choices contribute to an individual's overarching stability and growth.

Future work should formalize data collection practices to ensure consistent and reliable input streams. Researchers might also explore econometric approaches to refine the weighting scheme, making the FHI more accurately predictive of real-world financial resilience. Ultimately, the FHI's unique capacity to generate an accessible and encompassing representation of financial health holds substantial promise for guiding both individual decision-making and broader policy endeavors.

References

- Avery, R.B., Calem, P.S., & Canner, G.B. (2004). Credit report accuracy and access to credit. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, 90(3), 297–322.
- Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2019). *Report on the Economic Well-Being of U.S. Households.* Washington, DC: Federal Reserve.
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O.S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44.
- Modigliani, F., & Brumberg, R. (1954). Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data. In *Post-Keynesian Economics* (pp. 388–436). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.