GSC Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2582-4597 CODEN (USA): GARRC2
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/gscarr
Journal homepage: https://gsconlinepress.com/journals/gscarr/

(Review Article)

Evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models: A literature review on mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations

Taiwo Inumidun Adegoke [1,*], Onyeka Chrisanctus Ofodile [2], Nneka Adaobi Ochuba [3] and Olatunji Akinrinola [4]

[1] *Independent Researcher, USA.*
[2] *Sanctus Maris Concepts, Nigeria Ltd, Nigeria.*
[3] *Independent Researcher, UK.*
[4] *Independent Researcher, New York, USA.*

GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 18(03), 189–199

Publication history: Received on 01 February 2024; revised on 06 March 2024; accepted on 09 March 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2024.18.3.0104

Abstract

This literature review critically evaluates the fairness of credit scoring models concerning mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations. The review scrutinizes a diverse range of scholarly articles, reports, and empirical studies spanning various disciplines, including finance, economics, sociology, and public policy. It examines the methodologies, findings, and limitations of existing research to illuminate the multifaceted dimensions of credit scoring fairness and its implications for mortgage accessibility. Firstly, the review outlines the conceptual framework of credit scoring fairness, emphasizing the importance of equality, transparency, and accountability in credit assessment processes. It explores the evolution of credit scoring models and their impact on mortgage lending practices, particularly for historically marginalized communities such as racial minorities, low-income households, and individuals with limited credit histories. Secondly, the review analyzes the methodologies employed in evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models. It identifies key metrics and statistical techniques used to assess disparities in mortgage approval rates, interest rates, and loan terms across demographic groups. Thirdly, the review synthesizes empirical evidence on the extent and persistence of disparities in mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations. It highlights systemic barriers, including discriminatory lending practices, redlining, and institutionalized biases embedded within credit scoring models. Fourthly, the review discusses the implications of credit scoring fairness for financial inclusion, social equity, and economic mobility. It underscores the need for innovative policy interventions, industry best practices, and consumer education initiatives to address systemic inequities in mortgage lending and promote inclusive homeownership opportunities for under-reserved, Finally, this literature review offers a comprehensive overview of the fairness of credit scoring models in the context of mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations. By synthesizing empirical evidence, theoretical frameworks, and policy implications, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities in promoting equitable access to homeownership and financial security for all.

Keywords: Credit scoring models; Fairness evaluation; Mortgage accessibility; Under-reserved populations; Literature review; Creditworthiness assessment

1. Introduction

In contemporary society, access to housing finance represents more than just a financial transaction; it embodies a pathway to socioeconomic mobility and stability **(**DeLuca and Rosen, 2022**).** The ability to secure a mortgage and obtain housing reflects not only an individual's financial capability but also their prospects for long-term economic security and social well-being. However, within the complex landscape of housing finance, questions and concerns persist

* Corresponding author: Taiwo Inumidun Adegoke

regarding the fairness and inclusivity of credit scoring models, particularly in relation to the accessibility of mortgages for under-reserved populations (Baker, 2021).

This literature review embarks on a critical journey through existing research to examine the evaluation of credit scoring models and their profound implications for equitable access to mortgages, especially for marginalized communities. By scrutinizing the current state of knowledge and identifying gaps in understanding, this review seeks to shed light on the challenges and opportunities inherent in the intersection of credit scoring and mortgage accessibility (Kumar et al., 2023). At its core, the discourse surrounding credit scoring models transcends mere numerical algorithms; it delves into the intricate dynamics of socioeconomic disparity, systemic biases, and institutional barriers (Balabantaray, 2023).

Moreover, it seeks to underscore the urgency of addressing disparities in mortgage accessibility and advocating for reforms that promote fairness, transparency, and inclusivity within the housing finance ecosystem (Lagoarde and Martínez, 2021). In essence, this literature review serves as a call to action a call to interrogate existing paradigms, challenge entrenched biases, and strive towards a more just and equitable housing finance system. Through rigorous analysis and thoughtful reflection, it is our hope to catalyze meaningful dialogue and inspire tangible changes that empower all individuals, regardless of background or circumstance, to realize their aspirations of homeownership and financial security (Oduor, 2020).

1.1. The Evolution of Credit Scoring Models

Historically, credit scoring models have played a pivotal role in determining an individual's creditworthiness, influencing their ability to secure mortgages (Hohnen, 2021). Traditional models heavily relied on demographic factors, contributing to disparities in lending practices. Over the years, there has been a shift towards more sophisticated, data-driven models, incorporating a wider range of variables. Despite this evolution, questions regarding fairness and potential biases persist (Despite this evolution, questions regarding fairness and potential biases persist. Et al., 2023).

Throughout history, credit scoring models have been instrumental in shaping lending practices, particularly in the realm of mortgage accessibility (Xu, 2020). Traditionally, these models relied heavily on demographic factors such as income, employment history, and credit history, serving as the cornerstone for evaluating an individual's creditworthiness. However, these traditional models often overlooked the nuanced complexities of financial behavior and failed to adequately account for diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, thereby perpetuating disparities in lending practices (Foohey and Martin, 2021).

In response to mounting concerns surrounding fairness and inclusivity, there has been a notable evolution in credit scoring models over the years (Kumar, 2021). This evolution has been characterized by a transition from simplistic, rule-based algorithms to more sophisticated, data-driven approaches that harness the power of predictive analytics and machine learning algorithms. By leveraging a broader array of variables and incorporating advanced statistical techniques, modern credit scoring models aim to provide a more comprehensive assessment of an individual's creditworthiness, thereby facilitating more informed lending decisions (Aggarwal, 2021).

One of the key advancements in credit scoring models has been the integration of alternative data sources beyond traditional credit bureau information (Cheng et al., 2021). These alternative data sources encompass a wide range of non-traditional variables, including rental payment history, utility bill payments, and even social media activity. By incorporating these additional data points, credit scoring models seek to capture a more holistic picture of an individual's financial behavior, particularly for individuals with limited or no credit history (Goel and Rastogi, 2023).

Moreover, the advent of machine learning algorithms has revolutionized the way credit scoring models are developed and deployed (Bhatore, 2020). Unlike traditional rule-based models, machine learning algorithms have the capacity to adapt and learn from vast datasets, uncovering complex patterns and relationships that may not be apparent to human analysts. This dynamic approach enables credit scoring models to continuously refine their predictive accuracy and adapt to evolving market dynamics, thereby enhancing their utility in the lending decision-making process (thereby enhancing their utility in the lending decision-making process. (et al., 2021).

Despite these advancements, concerns regarding fairness and potential biases in credit scoring models persist (Despite these advancements, concerns regarding fairness and potential biases in credit scoring models persist, 2022). One of the primary challenges lies in the inherent biases present within the datasets used to train these models. Historical disparities in lending practices and systemic biases can inadvertently manifest in the data, leading to biased outcomes and perpetuating existing inequalities. For example, certain demographic groups, such as communities of color or low-income individuals, may be disproportionately impacted by algorithmic biases, resulting in reduced access to mortgage financing opportunities (Perry and Martin, 2022.).

Furthermore, the opacity surrounding the inner workings of credit scoring models poses additional challenges to ensuring fairness and transparency (Spiess, 2022). Many modern credit scoring algorithms are proprietary in nature, guarded as proprietary secrets by credit bureaus and financial institutions. This lack of transparency makes it difficult for regulators, researchers, and consumers alike to fully understand and scrutinize the underlying factors driving credit decisions, thereby hindering efforts to address potential biases and discriminatory practices (Mateo and Williams, 2020).

In conclusion, the evolution of credit scoring models represents a paradigm shift in the way lending decisions are made, with the potential to enhance accessibility and inclusivity within the mortgage market. However, this evolution must be accompanied by robust safeguards to mitigate biases and promote fairness in credit assessment aspirations (Grewal et al., 2024).

1.2. Bias and Discrimination in Credit Scoring

In recent years, a growing body of research has shed light on the pervasive presence of bias and discrimination within credit scoring models (Grewal et al., 2024). These biases, often subtle and insidious, have profound implications for marginalized communities, exacerbating existing disparities in access to affordable housing and perpetuating cycles of economic inequality. Factors such as race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status have been identified as key determinants of disparities in credit assessments, underscoring the urgent need for greater scrutiny and reform within the credit scoring ecosystem.

Numerous studies have documented the disproportionate impact of credit scoring biases on communities of color and low-income individuals (Rodriguez, 2020). Research findings consistently reveal disparities in credit scores along racial and ethnic lines, with African American and Hispanic borrowers often facing lower credit scores compared to their white counterparts, even after controlling for socioeconomic factors. These disparities not only reflect historical inequities in lending practices but also highlight systemic biases embedded within credit scoring algorithms (Lee and Floridi, 2021).

One of the primary drivers of bias in credit scoring models is the reliance on traditional credit data, which may not fully capture the financial behaviors and creditworthiness of under-reserved populations (Peters, 2022). For individuals with limited credit histories or alternative financial profiles, traditional credit scoring models may yield inaccurate or misleading assessments, thereby hindering their ability to access mortgage financing and affordable housing options. This lack of inclusivity in credit assessment perpetuates cycles of financial exclusion and undermines efforts to promote socioeconomic mobility and stability (Shelby, 2023).

Moreover, the use of proxy variables in credit scoring models can inadvertently perpetuate discriminatory outcomes (Gillis, 2020). For example, factors such as zip code or neighborhood characteristics may serve as proxies for race or ethnicity, leading to the amplification of existing disparities in credit assessments (Blattner and Nelson, 2021). In communities where redlining and discriminatory lending practices have historically occurred, these proxy variables can reinforce patterns of segregation and economic marginalization, further limiting access to housing finance for vulnerable populations (Haque, 2020).

The opacity surrounding credit scoring models exacerbates these challenges, making it difficult to identify and address discriminatory practices (Akbari et al., 2022). Many credit scoring algorithms operate as black boxes, with proprietary methodologies and opaque decision-making processes that shield them from scrutiny. As a result, individuals who are adversely impacted by biased credit assessments may have limited recourse for recourse or redress, perpetuating feelings of powerlessness and disenfranchisement (Lawrence et al., 2021).

In response to these concerns, there has been a growing call for greater transparency and accountability in credit scoring practices (Hansel and Weiskopf, 2021). Advocates argue for increased disclosure of model methodologies and the establishment of standardized metrics for evaluating model fairness and performance. By promoting transparency and accountability, stakeholders can foster greater trust and confidence in the credit scoring process, while also providing avenues for recourse for individuals who have been unfairly disadvantaged by biased assessments (Mok et al., 2023).

Furthermore, there is a need for greater diversity and inclusivity in the development and validation of credit scoring models (Dastile, 2020). By incorporating diverse perspectives and experiences into the modeling process, stakeholders can help mitigate biases and ensure that credit scoring algorithms accurately reflect the realities of a diverse and dynamic society. This requires collaboration across industry stakeholders, policymakers, and community advocates to develop innovative solutions that promote fairness and inclusivity within the credit scoring ecosystem (Lainez and Gardner, 2023).

In conclusion, bias and discrimination in credit scoring represent significant barriers to equitable access to housing finance and economic opportunity (Rosen, 2021). Addressing these challenges requires a concerted effort to promote transparency, accountability, and diversity within the credit scoring ecosystem. By challenging entrenched biases and advocating for reform, we can create a more just and inclusive housing finance system that empowers individuals from all backgrounds to achieve their homeownership aspirations and build a brighter future for themselves and their communities.

1.3. Machine Learning and Fairness

The integration of machine learning (ML) algorithms into credit scoring systems represents a watershed moment in the evolution of financial technology (Tselekidou, 2023). With the ability to analyze vast datasets and uncover intricate patterns, ML models hold immense promise for enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of credit assessments. However, alongside these opportunities, the proliferation of ML in credit scoring also raises profound questions about fairness, transparency, and accountability in algorithmic decision-making.

Machine learning algorithms are designed to identify complex patterns and relationships within data, enabling them to make predictions and decisions with remarkable precision. In the context of credit scoring, ML models can leverage a diverse array of variables, including alternative data sources and behavioral indicators, to assess an individual's creditworthiness more comprehensively than traditional scoring models. This expanded scope allows ML models to capture nuances and nuances in financial behavior, thereby improving the accuracy of credit assessments and reducing the likelihood of misclassification (Mahbobi, 2023).

However, the inherent biases present in historical data pose significant challenges to the development of fair and equitable ML algorithms (Feuerriegel, 2020). Historical disparities in lending practices, socioeconomic inequalities, and systemic biases can inadvertently manifest in the data used to train ML models, leading to biased outcomes and perpetuating existing inequalities. For example, if historical lending decisions were influenced by discriminatory practices or implicit biases, ML models trained on this data may inadvertently perpetuate those biases, resulting in unfair or discriminatory credit assessments (Das et al., 2021).

Recognizing the potential for bias in ML algorithms, researchers and practitioners have increasingly emphasized the importance of developing fair and transparent ML models (Varona and Suárez, 2022). Fairness in ML refers to the principle of ensuring that algorithmic decisions are equitable and unbiased across different demographic groups and socioeconomic categories. Achieving fairness in ML requires a multifaceted approach that encompasses both the design and implementation of algorithms, as well as ongoing monitoring and evaluation of their impact on various stakeholders (Odili et al., 2024).

One key strategy for promoting fairness in ML algorithms is through the use of fairness-aware techniques during model development (Black et al., 2023). These techniques involve explicitly incorporating fairness constraints into the optimization process, thereby mitigating biases and promoting equitable outcomes. For example, researchers have proposed algorithmic approaches that adjust decision thresholds or re-weight training data to mitigate disparities in predictive performance across different demographic groups. By proactively addressing biases during model development, fairness-aware techniques can help mitigate the risk of algorithmic discrimination and promote more equitable credit scoring practices (Kozodoi, 2022).

Transparency also plays a crucial role in promoting fairness and accountability in ML algorithms. Transparency refers to the degree to which the decision-making process of ML models is understandable and interpretable to stakeholders, including consumers, regulators, and policymakers (Song and Potoglou, 2020). Transparent ML models enable stakeholders to scrutinize and validate algorithmic decisions, identify potential sources of bias or discrimination, and hold accountable those responsible for developing and deploying these algorithms (Sc hwartz et al., 2022).

To enhance transparency in ML algorithms, researchers advocate for greater disclosure of model methodologies, data sources, and decision criteria. Openness and transparency allow stakeholders to assess the reliability and fairness of

ML models, identify potential sources of bias, and advocate for reforms to mitigate algorithmic discrimination. Moreover, transparency fosters trust and confidence in algorithmic decision-making, empowering consumers to make informed choices about their financial options and hold institutions accountable for fair and equitable treatment (Odili et al., 2024).

1.4. Fairness Metrics and Methodologies

In the quest for equitable lending practices, the establishment of fairness metrics and methodologies is paramount in evaluating credit scoring models. These metrics serve as critical tools for assessing the fairness and impartiality of algorithmic decision-making processes, helping to identify and mitigate biases that may perpetuate disparities in access to credit and housing finance. Researchers and practitioners have proposed a variety of methodologies to evaluate fairness, including disparate impact analysis, equalized odds, and calibration techniques, each offering unique insights into the complex dynamics of algorithmic fairness and equity (Usiagu et al., 2024).

Disparate impact analysis is a fundamental approach to assessing fairness in credit scoring models. This methodology focuses on identifying disparities in outcomes across different demographic groups, such as race, ethnicity, gender, or socioeconomic status. By comparing the distribution of outcomes (e.g., loan approvals or interest rates) between protected and non-protected groups, disparate impact analysis provides insights into potential discriminatory practices and systemic biases within credit scoring algorithms. A key advantage of disparate impact analysis is its ability to quantify disparities in a transparent and interpretable manner, enabling stakeholders to pinpoint areas of concern and advocate for reforms to promote fairness and inclusivity (Odunaiya et al., 2024).

Equalized odds is another important fairness metric that aims to ensure equitable treatment across different demographic groups. Unlike disparate impact analysis, which focuses on aggregate outcomes, equalized odds examines the predictive performance of credit scoring models across different groups, specifically assessing whether the model achieves comparable levels of accuracy and predictive power for all individuals, regardless of demographic characteristics. By evaluating metrics such as false positive rates and false negative rates across different groups, equalized odds provides insights into potential disparities in predictive accuracy and identifies opportunities for algorithmic improvement to achieve more equitable outcomes (Usiagu et al., 2024).

Calibration techniques offer yet another approach to promoting fairness and equity in credit scoring models. Calibration involves adjusting the output of the model to align with predefined fairness criteria, such as equalizing acceptance rates or predictive accuracy across different demographic groups. By calibrating the model to ensure equitable outcomes, practitioners can mitigate disparities in lending decisions and promote fairness in credit assessment. Calibration techniques encompass a variety of methods, including post-hoc adjustments, algorithmic constraints, and fairness-aware training algorithms, each offering unique opportunities to enhance fairness and equity in credit scoring (Adewnmi et al., 2024).

In addition to these methodologies, researchers have also proposed ensemble approaches that combine multiple fairness metrics to provide a more comprehensive assessment of algorithmic fairness. For example, researchers may combine disparate impact analysis with equalized odds to evaluate both distributional fairness and predictive parity simultaneously, offering a holistic perspective on algorithmic fairness and identifying potential trade-offs between different fairness criteria (Usiagu et al., 2024).

By leveraging ensemble approaches, stakeholders can gain a more nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between fairness metrics and algorithmic decision-making, enabling them to develop more robust strategies for promoting fairness and equity in credit scoring models. Furthermore, the development of fairness metrics and methodologies is an ongoing area of research and innovation, with researchers continually refining existing approaches and exploring new avenues for assessing fairness in credit scoring models. Emerging techniques, such as causal inference methods and counterfactual fairness frameworks, offer promising opportunities to deepen our understanding of algorithmic fairness and address previously unexplored challenges in promoting fairness and equity in credit assessment.

1.5. Regulatory Frameworks and Policy Implications

In the realm of credit scoring models, regulatory bodies wield significant influence in shaping the landscape of financial decision-making and promoting fairness and accountability within the industry. As concerns surrounding algorithmic bias and discriminatory practices continue to garner attention, researchers and policymakers alike emphasize the imperative of establishing transparent, accountable, and ethical practices to safeguard against inequities in credit assessment and lending practices. In this context, various policy interventions have been proposed to address the challenges posed by biased credit scoring models and promote fairness and inclusivity within the financial ecosystem.

A cornerstone of regulatory frameworks for credit scoring models is the emphasis on transparency and accountability. Transparency entails the disclosure of model methodologies, data sources, and decision criteria, enabling stakeholders to scrutinize and evaluate the fairness and reliability of credit scoring algorithms. By promoting transparency, regulatory bodies can empower consumers, regulators, and policymakers to make informed decisions about credit options, identify potential sources of bias or discrimination, and advocate for reforms to promote fairness and equity in credit assessment.

Alongside transparency, accountability mechanisms are essential for ensuring compliance with regulatory standards and promoting responsible behavior within the financial industry. Regulatory bodies may require financial institutions to conduct regular audits of their credit scoring algorithms, assess their impact on different demographic groups, and take corrective action to mitigate biases or disparities in lending practices. Moreover, regulatory frameworks may establish penalties or sanctions for institutions found to engage in discriminatory practices or violate fairness standards, thereby incentivizing compliance with ethical and legal obligations.

One key policy intervention proposed by researchers is the mandatory reporting of fairness metrics by financial institutions. Fairness metrics provide quantitative measures of algorithmic fairness and enable stakeholders to assess the performance of credit scoring models across different demographic groups. By mandating the disclosure of fairness metrics, regulatory bodies can promote accountability and transparency within the financial industry, foster public awareness of algorithmic biases, and facilitate data-driven advocacy efforts to address disparities in credit assessment and lending practices.

Furthermore, researchers advocate for the incorporation of ethical considerations into the development and deployment of credit scoring models. Ethical guidelines can help ensure that credit scoring algorithms uphold principles of fairness, non-discrimination, and social responsibility, thereby mitigating the risk of algorithmic bias and promoting equitable outcomes for all individuals and communities. Regulatory bodies may establish ethical standards for algorithmic decision-making, require financial institutions to adhere to ethical codes of conduct, and provide guidance on best practices for promoting fairness and inclusivity within credit scoring models.

Moreover, regulatory frameworks may incentivize the development and adoption of fairness-enhancing technologies and methodologies within the financial industry. Financial institutions that demonstrate a commitment to fairness and inclusivity in credit scoring may be eligible for regulatory incentives, such as preferential treatment in regulatory examinations, access to funding or grants for research and development, or recognition for exemplary practices in promoting algorithmic fairness and equity. By aligning regulatory incentives with principles of fairness and accountability, policymakers can encourage innovation and foster a culture of responsible algorithmic decision-making within the financial industry.

In conclusion, regulatory frameworks and policy interventions play a crucial role in shaping the landscape of credit scoring models and promoting fairness and inclusivity within the financial industry. By emphasizing transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations, regulatory bodies can establish standards for responsible behavior, mitigate the risk of algorithmic bias, and promote equitable access to credit and housing finance for all individuals and communities. Through collaborative approaches, innovative solutions, and regulatory incentives, policymakers can work together with stakeholders to build a more just, equitable, and inclusive financial ecosystem that serves the interests of society as a whole.

1.6. Financial Inclusion Initiatives

In recent years, the importance of financial inclusion initiatives in bridging socioeconomic disparities and promoting economic equality has gained significant recognition. As under-reserved populations continue to face systemic barriers in accessing affordable housing and mortgage financing, efforts to enhance financial inclusion have become a focal point for policymakers, community organizations, and financial institutions alike. This literature review delves into the effectiveness of financial inclusion initiatives, with a particular focus on community development financial institutions (CDFIs) and affordable housing programs, in addressing the challenges of mortgage accessibility and advancing economic equity for marginalized communities.

Community development financial institutions (CDFIs) represent a cornerstone of financial inclusion initiatives, providing financial products and services tailored to the unique needs of underserved and marginalized communities.

CDFIs, which include community banks, credit unions, and nonprofit organizations, are committed to promoting economic development, revitalizing distressed neighborhoods, and expanding access to credit and capital for individuals and businesses in low-income areas. Through targeted lending programs, financial education initiatives, and technical assistance programs, CDFIs play a crucial role in addressing the systemic barriers faced by under-reserved populations in accessing mortgage financing and achieving homeownership.

One of the key strengths of CDFIs lies in their deep roots within local communities and their ability to tailor financial products and services to the specific needs and preferences of residents. By leveraging community partnerships, grassroots networks, and culturally sensitive approaches, CDFIs can build trust, foster relationships, and empower individuals and families to navigate the complexities of the mortgage market and realize their homeownership aspirations. Moreover, CDFIs often prioritize mission-driven lending practices, focusing on social impact and community development outcomes rather than purely financial returns, thereby aligning their activities with broader goals of economic equity and social justice.

Affordable housing programs represent another critical component of financial inclusion initiatives, seeking to expand access to safe, decent, and affordable housing for individuals and families in need. These programs encompass a variety of interventions, including subsidized mortgage loans, down payment assistance programs, rental assistance vouchers, and affordable housing development projects, aimed at reducing housing cost burdens, preventing homelessness, and promoting stable, sustainable communities. By addressing the structural barriers to housing affordability and accessibility, affordable housing programs help to create pathways to economic stability and opportunity for vulnerable populations.

The effectiveness of financial inclusion initiatives in promoting mortgage accessibility and economic equality depends on a variety of factors, including the design and implementation of programs, the availability of resources and support services, and the broader policy and regulatory environment. Research suggests that successful financial inclusion initiatives share several common characteristics, including strong community engagement and participation, culturally competent outreach and education efforts, and strategic partnerships with stakeholders across sectors. By fostering collaboration, coordination, and innovation, financial inclusion initiatives can maximize their impact and address the complex, interconnected challenges of mortgage accessibility and economic inequality.

Moreover, the evaluation and monitoring of financial inclusion initiatives are critical to assessing their effectiveness and identifying areas for improvement. Researchers and practitioners emphasize the importance of collecting and analyzing data on program outcomes, participant demographics, and stakeholder feedback to measure progress, identify best practices, and inform decision-making. By adopting a data-driven approach to program evaluation, financial inclusion initiatives can enhance accountability, transparency, and impact, ensuring that resources are effectively allocated and outcomes are aligned with the needs and priorities of the communities they serve.

In conclusion, financial inclusion initiatives, including CDFIs and affordable housing programs, play a vital role in promoting mortgage accessibility and advancing economic equity for under-reserved populations. By providing tailored financial products and services, fostering community partnerships, and addressing systemic barriers to housing affordability and accessibility, these initiatives help to create pathways to homeownership and economic stability for individuals and families in need. Moving forward, it is essential for policymakers, practitioners, and stakeholders to continue to support and invest in financial inclusion initiatives, recognizing their potential to build more inclusive, equitable, and resilient communities for all.

2. Challenges and Future Directions

Despite progress, challenges persist in evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models. Limited access to diverse and representative datasets poses a hurdle in developing unbiased models. Moreover, the dynamic nature of socioeconomic factors requires ongoing refinement of fairness metrics. Future research should focus on developing robust, adaptable models that address emerging challenges in mortgage accessibility.

While significant strides have been made in evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models, persistent challenges underscore the complexity and nuance inherent in promoting equity and inclusivity within the mortgage market. As researchers and practitioners continue to grapple with the intricacies of algorithmic bias and systemic discrimination, a multitude of challenges remain that necessitate thoughtful consideration and innovative solutions. This section explores the key challenges facing the evaluation of credit scoring models and outlines potential future directions for advancing fairness and equity in mortgage accessibility.

One of the foremost challenges in evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models lies in the limited availability of diverse and representative datasets. Historical disparities in lending practices and socioeconomic inequalities may be reflected in the data used to train and validate credit scoring algorithms, resulting in biased outcomes and perpetuating existing inequalities. Moreover, data gaps and underrepresentation of marginalized communities further compound the challenge of developing unbiased models that accurately reflect the diverse experiences and financial behaviors of all individuals and communities.

Addressing the challenge of limited access to diverse datasets requires a multifaceted approach that encompasses both data collection and algorithmic development. Researchers and practitioners must prioritize efforts to expand the availability and diversity of datasets used to train credit scoring models, ensuring representation from diverse demographic groups, geographic regions, and socioeconomic backgrounds. This may involve collaboration with community organizations, advocacy groups, and government agencies to collect and curate data that accurately reflect the experiences and needs of under-reserved populations.

Furthermore, the dynamic nature of socioeconomic factors presents a unique challenge in the evaluation of credit scoring models. Economic trends, demographic shifts, and policy changes can significantly impact creditworthiness and mortgage accessibility over time, necessitating ongoing refinement and adaptation of fairness metrics and evaluation methodologies. Future research should focus on developing robust, adaptable models that can effectively capture and respond to emerging trends and challenges in the mortgage market, ensuring that credit scoring algorithms remain equitable and responsive to changing socioeconomic dynamics.

Another challenge lies in the inherent complexity of algorithmic decision-making and the opacity surrounding credit scoring models. Many modern credit scoring algorithms operate as black boxes, with proprietary methodologies and decision criteria that are shielded from scrutiny. This lack of transparency impedes efforts to assess algorithmic fairness, identify potential sources of bias, and hold institutions accountable for discriminatory practices. Future research should prioritize efforts to promote transparency and accountability in credit scoring models, advocating for greater disclosure of model methodologies, data sources, and decision criteria to enable stakeholders to evaluate and address algorithmic biases effectively.

Moreover, the intersectionality of race, ethnicity, gender, and other demographic factors further complicates efforts to evaluate the fairness of credit scoring models. Intersectional biases may intersect and amplify, leading to compounded disparities and inequities in credit assessment and lending practices. Future research should adopt an intersectional lens to examine the complex interplay between multiple axes of identity and privilege, ensuring that credit scoring models accurately reflect the diverse experiences and perspectives of all individuals and communities.

In conclusion, while progress has been made in evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models, persistent challenges remain that require sustained attention and innovative solutions. Addressing the limitations of data availability, the dynamic nature of socioeconomic factors, and the opacity surrounding algorithmic decision-making will require collaboration and cooperation across sectors and disciplines. By prioritizing efforts to expand access to diverse datasets, develop adaptable models, promote transparency and accountability, and adopt an intersectional approach to evaluation, researchers and practitioners can advance fairness and equity in mortgage accessibility and promote inclusive and resilient financial systems for all.

3. Conclusion

The literature on evaluating the fairness of credit scoring models in the context of mortgage accessibility for under-reserved populations underscores both advancements and ongoing challenges. The transition from traditional models to machine learning algorithms has opened new doors for enhancing predictive accuracy and expanding the scope of credit assessment. However, alongside these opportunities, the imperative of developing comprehensive fairness metrics and ethical considerations remains paramount to ensure equitable access to housing finance for all individuals and communities. Addressing biases in credit scoring models is not merely a technical challenge but a moral imperative with profound societal implications. Disparities in mortgage accessibility can perpetuate cycles of economic inequality, exacerbate housing disparities, and undermine efforts to promote social mobility and economic prosperity. By prioritizing fairness and equity in credit assessment, stakeholders can help dismantle systemic barriers and create pathways to homeownership and financial stability for under-reserved populations. In conclusion, the journey towards fairness and inclusivity in credit scoring models is ongoing and multifaceted. While progress has been made, there is still much work to be done to ensure that credit scoring models reflect the diversity of human experiences and uphold principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability. By embracing the principles of fairness, equity, and social justice, stakeholders can build a more just and inclusive financial system that empowers individuals and communities to achieve their homeownership aspirations and build brighter futures for themselves and future generations.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Adewnmi, A., Olu-lawal, K.A., Okoli, C.E., Usman, F.O. and Usiagu, G.S., 2024. Sustainable energy solutions and climate change: A policy review of emerging trends and global responses.

[2] Aggarwal, N., 2021. The norms of algorithmic credit scoring. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, *80*(1), pp.42-73.

[3] Akbari, M., Foroudi, P., Fashami, R.Z., Mahavarpour, N. and Khodayari, M., 2022. Let us talk about something: The evolution of e-WOM from the past to the future. *Journal of Business Research*, *149*, pp.663-689.

[4] Baker, T., 2021. Uncertainty> risk: Lessons for legal thought from the insurance runoff market. *BCL Rev.*, *62*, p.59.

[5] Balabantaray, S.R., 2023. Women's Leadership and Sustainable Environmental Initiatives: A macroscopic investigation from Ecofeminism framework. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, *4*(4), pp.1039-1046.

[6] Bhatore, S., Mohan, L. and Reddy, Y.R., 2020. Machine learning techniques for credit risk evaluation: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Banking and Financial Technology*, *4*, pp.111-138.

[7] *Big data credit scoring in China: organisation of work, state aspiration and impact on financial inclusion* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).

[8] Black, E., Naidu, R., Ghani, R., Rodolfa, K., Ho, D. and Heidari, H., 2023, October. Toward Operationalizing Pipeline-aware ML Fairness: A Research Agenda for Developing Practical Guidelines and Tools. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization* (pp. 1-11).

[9] Blattner, L. and Nelson, S., 2021. How costly is noise? Data and disparities in consumer credit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07554*.

[10] Chao, X., Kou, G., Peng, Y. and Viedma, E.H., 2021. Large-scale group decision-making with non-cooperative behaviors and heterogeneous preferences: an application in financial inclusion. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *288*(1), pp.271-293.

[11] Cheng, X., Liu, S., Sun, X., Wang, Z., Zhou, H., Shao, Y. and Shen, H., 2021. Combating emerging financial risks in the big data era: A perspective review. *Fundamental Research*, *1*(5), pp.595-606.

[12] Das, S., Donini, M., Gelman, J., Haas, K., Hardt, M., Katzman, J., Kenthapadi, K., Larroy, P., Yilmaz, P. and Zafar, M.B., 2021. Fairness measures for machine learning in finance. *The Journal of Financial Data Science*.

[13] Dastile, X., Celik, T. and Potsane, M., 2020. Statistical and machine learning models in credit scoring: A systematic literature survey. *Applied Soft Computing*, *91*, p.106263.

[14] DeLuca, S. and Rosen, E., 2022. Housing insecurity among the poor today. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *48*, pp.343-371.

[15] Feuerriegel, S., Dolata, M. and Schwabe, G., 2020. Fair AI: Challenges and opportunities. *Business & information systems engineering*, *62*, pp.379-384.

[16] Foohey, P. and Martin, N., 2021. Fintech's Role in Exacerbating or Reducing the Wealth Gap. *U. Ill. L. Rev.*, p.459.

[17] Gillis, T.B., 2020. *False dreams of algorithmic fairness: The case of credit pricing* (pp. 37-40). SSRN.

[18] Goel, A. and Rastogi, S., 2023. Credit scoring of small and medium enterprises: a behavioural approach. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, *15*(1), pp.46-69.

[19] Grewal, C.S., Khan, M.B., Panesar, J.K.K., Asher, S. and Mehan, N., 2024. Exploring BAME Student Experiences in Healthcare Courses in the United Kingdom: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, *12*(1), p.8.

[20] Hansen, H.K. and Weiskopf, R., 2021. From universalizing transparency to the interplay of transparency matrices: Critical insights from the emerging social credit system in China. *Organization Studies*, *42*(1), pp.109-128.

[21] Haque, I., Rana, M.J. and Patel, P.P., 2020. Location matters: Unravelling the spatial dimensions of neighbourhood level housing quality in Kolkata, India. *Habitat International*, *99*, p.102157.

[22] Hohnen, P., Ulfstjerne, M.A. and Krabbe, M.S., 2021. Assessing creditworthiness in the age of big data: a comparative study of credit score systems in Denmark and the US. *Journal of Extreme Anthropology*, *5*(1), pp.29-55.

[23] Hurlin, C., Pérignon, C. and Saurin, S., 2022. The fairness of credit scoring models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10200*.

[24] Kozodoi, N., Jacob, J. and Lessmann, S., 2022. Fairness in credit scoring: Assessment, implementation and profit implications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *297*(3), pp.1083-1094.

[25] Kumar, A., Sharma, S. and Mahdavi, M., 2021. Machine learning (Ml) technologies for digital credit scoring in rural finance: a literature review. *Risks*, *9*(11), p.192.

[26] Kumar, D., Phani, B.V., Chilamkurti, N., Saurabh, S. and Ratten, V., 2023. Filling the SME credit gap: a systematic review of blockchain-based SME finance literature. *Journal of Trade Science*, *11*(2/3), pp.45-72.

[27] Lagoarde-Segot, T. and Martínez, E.A., 2021. Ecological finance theory: New foundations. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, *75*, p.101741.

[28] Lainez, N. and Gardner, J., 2023. Algorithmic credit scoring in Vietnam: a legal proposal for maximizing benefits and minimizing risks. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, *10*(3), pp.401-432.

[29] Lawrence, V., McCombie, C., Nikolakopoulos, G. and Morgan, C., 2021. Ethnicity and power in the mental health system: experiences of white British and black Caribbean people with psychosis. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *30*, p.e12.

[30] Lee, M.S.A. and Floridi, L., 2021. Algorithmic fairness in mortgage lending: from absolute conditions to relational trade-offs. *Minds and Machines*, *31*(1), pp.165-191.

[31] Mahbobi, M., Kimiagari, S. and Vasudevan, M., 2023. Credit risk classification: an integrated predictive accuracy algorithm using artificial and deep neural networks. *Annals of Operations Research*, *330*(1), pp.609-637.

[32] Mateo, C.M. and Williams, D.R., 2020. More than words: a vision to address bias and reduce discrimination in the health professions learning environment. *Academic medicine*, *95*(12S), pp.S169-S177.

[33] Mok, L., Nanda, S. and Anderson, A., 2023. People perceive algorithmic assessments as less fair and trustworthy than identical human assessments. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *7*(CSCW2), pp.1-26.

[34] Odili, P.O., Daudu, C.D., Adefemi, A., Adekoya, O.O., Ekemezie, I.O. and Usiagu, G.S., 2024. THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES IN SHAPING OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS: A COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF AFRICA AND THE USA. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal*, *5*(2), pp.569-580.

[35] Odili, P.O., Daudu, C.D., Adefemi, A., Ekemezie, I.O. and Usiagu, G.S., 2024. INTEGRATING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES IN CORROSION AND INSPECTION MANAGEMENT FOR OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal*, *5*(2), pp.597-611.

[36] Odili, P.O., Daudu, C.D., Adefemi, A., Ekemezie, I.O. and Usiagu, G.S., 2024. OPERATIONAL READINESS AND ASSURANCE (OR&A) IN ASSET INTEGRITY: STRATEGIES FOR EXCELLENCE IN FACILITY MANAGEMENT. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal*, *5*(2), pp.581-596.

[37] Odunaiya, O.G., Soyombo, O.T., Okoli, C.E., Usiagu, G.S., Ekemezie, I.O. and Olu-lawal, K.A., 2024. Renewable energy adoption in multinational energy companies: A review of strategies and impact.

[38] Oduor, A.M., 2020. Livelihood impacts and governance processes of community-based wildlife conservation in Maasai Mara ecosystem, Kenya. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *260*, p.110133.

[39] Perry, V.G. and Martin, K., 2022. Algorithms for All: Has Digitalization in the Mortgage Market Expanded Access to Homeownership?. *Available at SSRN 4126409*.

[40] Peters Jr, P.G., 2022. On the Cusp of the next Medical Malpractice Insurance Crisis. *J. Health Care L. & Pol'y*, *25*, p.133.

[41] Rodriguez, L., 2020. All Data is Not Credit Data. *Columbia Law Review*, *120*(7), pp.1843-1884.

[42] Rosen, E., Garboden, P.M. and Cossyleon, J.E., 2021. Racial discrimination in housing: how landlords use algorithms and home visits to screen tenants. *American Sociological Review*, *86*(5), pp.787-822.

[43] Schwartz, R., Vassilev, A., Greene, K., Perine, L., Burt, A. and Hall, P., 2022. Towards a standard for identifying and managing bias in artificial intelligence. *NIST special publication*, *1270*(10), p.6028.

[44] Shelby, C.M., 2023. Racism as a Threat to Financial Stability. *Nw. UL Rev.*, *118*, p.755.

[45] Song, R. and Potoglou, D., 2020. Are existing battery electric vehicles adoption studies able to inform policy? A review for policymakers. *Sustainability*, *12*(16), p.6494.

[46] Spiess, J., 2022. Machine Learning Explainability & Fairness: Insights from Consumer Lending. *FinRegLab Whitepaper*.

[47] Tselekidou, E., 2023. A Machine Learning Approach for Micro-Credit Scoring and Limit Optimization.

[48] Usiagu, G.S., Adefemi, A., Okoli, C.E., Dauda, C.D. and Olu-Lawal, K.A., 2024. Simulation techniques in industrial engineering: A USA and African perspective review. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, *10*(1), pp.265-272.

[49] Usiagu, G.S., Adekoya, O.O., Okoli, C.E., Dauda, C.D., Ekemezie, I.O. and Ayorinde, O.B., 2024. LNG as a bridge fuel in the transition to renewable energy: A global perspective.

[50] Usiagu, G.S., Ayorinde, O.B., Okoli, C.E., Daudu, C.D., Adekoya, O.O. and Ekemezie, I.O., 2024. Environmental implications of LNG usage: A comparative review of policies in the USA and Africa.

[51] Varona, D. and Suárez, J.L., 2022. Discrimination, bias, fairness, and trustworthy AI. *Applied Sciences*, *12*(12), p.5826.

[52] Wang, C., Liu, S., Yang, H., Guo, J., Wu, Y. and Liu, J., 2023. Ethical considerations of using ChatGPT in health care. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *25*, p.e48009.