SAFWAN ALMODHAYAN



OPINION AND ANALYSIS

Editorial date: August 20, 2026

The Paycheque That No Longer Waited for Month-End

When Time Entered the Wage Equation

In March 2016, Uber moved one day on the calendar and an entire economic behaviour moved with it. Before the experiment, drivers could work almost whenever they wished but waited for a weekly payment cycle. A trip taken near the start of the week might remain unpaid for nine days; one near the end, for only three. Uber let one group withdraw earned income almost immediately and kept another on the old system. It did not raise the fare or create new demand for rides. It changed only the day on which wages became usable. Researchers estimated that access to immediate withdrawal raised daily working time by 1.4 per cent and revenue by 1.5 per cent for the group offered the feature, with larger effects when the usual weekly payday was further away.1

The numbers look small, but they disturb a comforting assumption: that the wage determines the value of work and its payment date sits harmlessly at the edge of the calendar. The experiment suggests that payday can affect the quantity of work even when the price of an hour does not change. It does not establish that drivers became wealthier in the long run or saved more. It measures labour supply on a platform with flexible hours, not every effect on welfare, and its result cannot simply be transferred to a fixed-shift employee. It reveals something more exact. The economy does not lie only between those who have money and those who need it. A distance in time lies between them as well, and that distance alone may change a person’s decision.1

For two centuries the question of work was: how much will you pay me for what I do? Today it has acquired a less magnificent companion, one much closer to the electricity bill: when can I use what I have earned? A person may work on Monday and have the wage recorded in the employer's books, then fail to pay a small bill on Wednesday before a penalty applies because payroll will not release the money until Friday or month-end. Annual income is not necessarily inadequate. The household may be solvent in theory and unable to pay today, indifferent to how healthy the budget will look on the thirtieth. This is the market for earned wage access (EWA): a service that places part of the money already due for completed work into the worker's hands before the ordinary payday.

Advertising often merges two needs that should remain separate. The first concerns the amount of income: are resources sufficient to cover expenses over a full period? The second concerns the architecture of access: are those resources available when an expense falls due? The first can succeed while the second fails. In a hypothetical calculation, an employee receives net periodic income of $1,200 against obligations of $1,100, leaving a $100 surplus. But a $200 medical bill is due on the seventh, while the wage arrives on the fifteenth. On paper the household does not look destitute. On the seventh it cannot pay. This is a liquidity-timing gap that an income statement alone cannot diagnose. A budgeting app's polite assurance that the month will end in surplus does not help.

Why This Market Appeared

The market did not emerge from nothing. In US Bureau of Labor Statistics data for private-sector establishments, biweekly pay was the most common cycle in February 2023, used by 43 per cent of establishments alongside weekly, semimonthly and monthly cycles. This is a share of establishments, not of workers, and must not be presented as the number of employees waiting two weeks. It is enough to show that spaced payroll is not a rare technical exception. A company gathers hours, verifies schedules and deductions, compiles the payroll file and waits for the next pay event. What the organisation sees as accounting regularity may look to a worker like an empty space between a right that has arisen and a need that has fallen due.9

The problem is larger when pay is less stable than an annual-income figure suggests. Research published by the JPMorganChase Institute in September 2025 analysed hourly workers and found typical month-to-month earnings changes of about 9 per cent, with one quarter of months showing movement of at least 21 per cent in either direction. It associated much of this volatility with employer decisions about hours and schedules rather than changes in the nominal hourly rate. The difficulty doubles: a worker does not know the next paycheque with certainty and may not receive what has already been earned until the due date. Telling that worker to "wait for payday" assumes that waiting is free and that expenses receive the human-resources timetable and agree to follow it.3

We should not, however, turn every household into a stock image of permanent insolvency. Another JPMorganChase Institute study, using anonymised banking data from 5.9 million US households, reported in July 2024 that 92 per cent of households in its sample could manage a $400 emergency by combining cash, reallocatable income and short-term credit; 8 per cent could not do so under that definition. It also found that some households, especially those with lower incomes, could not manage in cash alone and needed to postpone another expense or use credit. This is not a certificate of universal financial safety. It is a reminder that “liquidity” contains layers, that an immediate cash shortage does not always mean the absence of every option, and that some options are costly, conditional or uncertain.4

How Early Access Works

In the simplest version, an EWA platform connects to an employer’s time and payroll records. It confirms that the worker has completed hours entitling them to a particular amount, then permits withdrawal of part of it. When payroll runs, the amount already paid is deducted from earnings for the same period and the remainder reaches the usual account. In another model, a provider deals directly with the consumer, estimates what they may have earned from income and account data, and collects the amount from the account after payday. That is not a detail of the interface. It is the difference between verifying wages through employment records and an outsider predicting them from account activity. As products have developed, the boundaries between the models have begun to overlap.2568

For illustration only, suppose a worker is entitled to $1,200 net for a pay period and takes $300 in earned wages on day ten. With no fee, $900 arrives on payday; the other $300 arrived earlier. The total is unchanged. If instant delivery costs $3, net proceeds become $1,197. The feature did not raise income or mechanically reduce productivity. It moved $300 from the near future into the present for $3. That basic equation should remain visible on the screen. Confusion begins when an app describes the $300 as “extra money available” without making equally clear what will remain on payday.

Paying $3 can be entirely rational. If a bill due today will incur a $15 penalty tomorrow, and no cheaper or simpler route exists, buying the timing for $3 may prevent the larger loss. If the need is urgent medicine or transport to work the next morning, the economic comparison is not between the fee and zero in an ideal world. It is between real alternatives with different times, costs and risks. The researcher’s task is not to scold someone for paying a smaller fee to avoid a larger one. It is to ask whether a free transfer would have arrived in time, whether the bill could have moved without penalty, whether the problem recurs, and whether early access resolves one bad day or advances the shortage of the following week.

When a Small Fee Repeats

Here the less polished face of the market appears. Not all earned-wage access is free, and not every free option is immediate. In a July 2024 study of eight employer-partnered providers, the US Consumer Financial Protection Bureau found that free routes might use a bank transfer taking one to three days or require a particular card or payment channel, while instant delivery to a worker's chosen account often incurred a fee. This can be a legitimate optional service. We can still ask why the true price rises at the exact moment a person loses the ability to wait. Urgency is not evenly distributed among customers. The person most expensive for a liquidity service may be the one least able to buy time.2

In that sample, an average transaction was about $106 and a worker accessed wages about 27 times a year when 2021 and 2022 were combined. Roughly 90 per cent of users paid at least one fee during the study period. The average fee when charged was $3.18, and the average worker paid $68.88 a year. The report says about 82 per cent of transactions in its transaction sample carried a fee and expedited-transfer fees accounted for the overwhelming majority of fee revenue. These are not percentages for every product in the world or every worker in the United States. They describe data from a defined set of providers in a defined period. They are enough to disprove the notion that "free access" describes actual use by definition.2

The data reveal more than the average charge. Across the eight companies, transactions rose from 43.2 million in 2021 to 83.4 million in 2022, while users increased from about 1.9 million to 2.8 million. From the sample and other data, the CFPB estimated that the employer-partnered market reached $22.8 billion through 214 million transactions in 2022, with about 7.2 million workers using it at least once. It added an estimate of roughly $9.1 billion for direct-to-consumer products. We are looking at a genuine market for redistributing the timing of pay, not a minor welcome feature in a human-resources app. A market estimate does not, however, prove that these products caused every need they observed.2

The most controversial number, 109.5 per cent, is easily misused. The CFPB calculated that a typical $106 transaction with a $3.18 fee and ten days to payday was arithmetically equivalent to an approximate annual percentage rate of 109.5 per cent. The worker does not pay 109.5 per cent of the amount in ten days; the worker pays $3.18. Annualising a short fee helps compare products with different time horizons, but does not necessarily describe what will actually be removed from pay over a year. Whether a transaction is legally "credit" also depends on changing definitions, product design and jurisdiction. Both measures should be shown. We should neither bury the actual dollars under a frightening percentage nor bury a large relative price under "only three dollars."28

In the same hypothetical example, a worker paying $3.18 on each of 27 transactions would pay $85.86 over a year. That is a constructed calculation for someone who pays every time, not the study average of $68.88. The difference matters: some transactions may be free and users' fees and frequency vary. We cannot obtain the correct annual cash cost by multiplying one fee by all transactions without the actual distribution. What matters to the household is the number

missing from the withdrawal-success screen: total cost over three, six and twelve months, and what would have happened to its obligations if the payment date had remained unchanged. Small amounts do not become large by magic, but by repetition forgotten one event at a time.

The Bridge and the Loop

A harder test than adding fees is what happens when payday arrives after some of the pay has already arrived. If early access meets a one-off emergency, the following month may breathe normally. If fixed expenses already exceed income, the withdrawal may merely move the date of the shortage. The worker begins the next period with a smaller pay balance, asks for another withdrawal, then begins a third after a further deduction. This path needs no compound interest to become exhausting, but two consecutive withdrawals do not prove "addiction" or mismanagement. A worker may use the service regularly because more frequent pay better matches irregular work and expenses and remains cheaper than the alternatives. We must test the cause and result of repetition, not treat its count as a conviction.

The best distinction in this market is therefore between a bridge and a loop. A bridge crosses a known timing gap to a paycheque that can meet its obligations when it arrives. A loop returns the worker to an equal or larger gap every cycle. The shape of the app does not tell us which one a user occupies. Their cash-flow calendar, needs, access fees, alternatives and payday balance do. A useful bridge may be crossed twenty times a year when hours and expenses are irregular; a harmful loop may begin after only a few uses when household income is already below commitments. An arbitrary threshold such as "three withdrawals mean a problem" tells us little without evidence of harm.

The British regulator's observation was therefore more than a theoretical warning. In a statement published in July 2020, still available after a link update in August 2026, the Financial Conduct Authority said employer salary-advance schemes could help with short-term cash pressure but could not solve broader financial problems by themselves. Repeated reliance, accumulated fees and limited protection in models outside credit regulation merited the attention of workers and employers. The FCA did not say that every early-pay product was unlawful or harmful. It pointed to practical measures: explain the cost, flag repeated use, make suitable financial support available, and encourage models in which employers bear the charge.10

What Is the Employer Buying?

When the market moves from an individual story to an employer's budget, the arithmetic changes. An organisation may offer EWA as a wellbeing benefit intended to relieve pressure, perhaps hoping for better retention or less absence. Some effects are possible; a study of Uber drivers does not make them assured returns. Uber drivers could change their working time in response to faster pay. A receptionist on a fixed shift cannot necessarily work 1.4 per cent

longer because wages became withdrawable. If the company passes operating cost to the worker, it cannot place the service in an “employee care” brochure and then treat the fees as private consumer business outside evaluation of the benefit.

Management should ask a more exact question: why do we need an intermediary to buy the worker’s wage from the near future? The answer may be accounting: payroll was built around fixed cycles, while continuous payments increase reconciliation, audit and correction of hours and entitlements. It may be treasury: the company does not want daily cash outflow before its approved date. Or it may be operational: net pay after deductions and legal obligations is not certain until the period closes. Each answer suggests different solutions. A platform linking the time clock to payment must handle schedule changes, leave, overtime, deductions and legally withheld sums. Withdrawability does not arise from a finger moving across a screen, but from an accounting system able to say responsibly: this amount has truly been earned.

A faster payment rail does not erase those complications. The Federal Reserve launched FedNow for instant payments between participating financial institutions around the clock. A technical route that works at night does not mean an employer can determine every employee’s entitlement at every instant, that all parties are connected, or that funding and operating costs disappeared. Three times must remain separate: when the right to wages arises through work; when the organisation approves the amount in its system; and when the money moves across a payment rail. Marketing collapses the three into a “withdraw now” button even when the obstacle lies in accounting and authority before it lies in banking.11

This opens an engineering opportunity deeper than an app drawing from an available balance. One can imagine payroll infrastructure that verifies accepted hours each day, conservatively calculates earned amounts after expected deductions and limits, then offers a low-cost payment on a date the worker chooses. At period-end, one clear reconciliation shows what was paid and what remains. This does not describe a system deployed by every organisation. It is a possible design requiring testing, legislation and accounting review. The strategic difference is that an early-withdrawal platform solves a problem inside the payroll cycle, while continuous-pay architecture may reconsider the cycle itself. A small company may sensibly pay the fees of an outside service; a large one may invest in making payment cadence resemble earning cadence.

The Same Product, a Changing Law

In December 2025, the CFPB issued an advisory opinion changing its earlier interpretation. For purposes of federal Regulation Z, it concluded that a category it called “Covered EWA” is not credit when it meets exact conditions: withdrawal cannot exceed earned value verified from payroll data; settlement occurs through payroll rather than a later debit from the worker’s ordinary account; the provider has no recourse against the worker for a shortfall, undertakes no debt collection and makes no credit-bureau report about the transaction; and it does not

assess the worker's credit risk. Under that analysis, a service fee alone does not turn the transaction into credit. The Bureau expressly withdrew a proposed 2024 interpretation—never adopted—that would have treated more products as credit.8

The moment is instructive beyond law. In 2024 the Bureau calculated a high illustrative annual rate for withdrawal fees; in 2025 it explained why a product meeting certain conditions was not credit under the text it was interpreting. There need be no contradiction once we separate two questions. What economic price does the worker pay to bring an amount forward? And does a debt relationship arise that makes a particular credit-disclosure rule applicable? A product can carry a real fee and invite consumer criticism without being a "loan" in that legal system. Another product outside the conditions requires its own analysis. The opinion also creates no universal result overriding state law, wage rules, data protection or other law.8

The British comparison shows that the tension is not exclusively American. The FCA described an economic effect resembling some short-term finance while noting that many salary-advance schemes, by design, fall outside British credit regulation. The International Labour Organization similarly examined EWA's benefits and risks for workers and businesses in a 2025 global report, alongside labour and financial rules, without reducing it to one classification. We cannot lift a legal conclusion from Washington and place it on an employment contract in Riyadh or London. Serious analysis must at least ask what local law recognises as earned wages, how deductions occur, who bears losses and fees, and what protection exists when the worker disputes the amount.710

The Remaining-Pay Test

I therefore propose a practical measure called the remaining-pay test. It is neither a published regulatory standard nor a scientific result established by a study, but an initial way to evaluate a service from the worker's perspective. Begin on payday, not at withdrawal: how much will actually arrive after all advances and fees? Which obligations fall due before new income becomes available? How likely is another withdrawal during the next period, and how does that probability differ from the case in which the worker does not use the service? A screen saying "you can withdraw $300" provides half the truth. A screen saying "$900 will remain on the fifteenth, with $720 of obligations due by the twentieth" supports a more mature decision—if the data are accurate and authorised.

The test needs more than total fees. Service cost must be separated from the cost of the displaced alternative: a late fee avoided, an overdraft that did not happen, a higher-cost debt not taken, or a bill date that could have moved for free. A provider cannot claim every withdrawal prevented a penalty; that asserts a counterfactual we did not observe. Effects require research comparing suitable groups over time and treating self-selection carefully.

Heavy users may already face greater financial pressure, so the association between frequent withdrawal and hardship does not prove that withdrawals caused it. Some may still miss bills with EWA but would have missed more without it.

With due respect for privacy, consent and labour-law limits, employers and providers can measure outcomes more meaningful than clicks: average annual fees borne by workers; the employer's share; transfers reaching a critical moment at no charge; distribution of remaining pay after withdrawal; repeated chains accompanied by documented shortfall; disputes over earned wages and the time to correct them; and users' understanding of the payday deduction. Hardest of all: did fees and penalties elsewhere fall, or did money previously paid to a bank move to an EWA company? Improvement in one figure is not victory if the problem moved to another column.

There is also a product test that numbers cannot fully capture: show the free alternative as clearly as instant withdrawal, stop visually rewarding repeated behaviour if it harms the user, and do not celebrate every withdrawal as a financial achievement deserving fireworks. If a user's history shows rising fees without an improved payday balance, the system can suggest suitable routes—rescheduling obligations, finding a fee-free transfer, or seeking independent financial guidance—without humiliating paternalism or arbitrary denial of access to earned wages. Between "let people decide" and "protect them against their will" lies an engineering space called showing consequences before the choice.

I do not want every cash-flow mismatch turned into a button-design defect. Its cause may be low wages, unstable hours, rent rising faster than pay, or a medical emergency. Early access can be a useful painkiller for some days and a bridge that saves a household from greater cost. It is not a cure for the level of wages. The more consequential measure may sit outside the app: steadier scheduling, guaranteed minimum hours, lower late penalties, aligning bills with income, or an employer-funded emergency advance. Product elegance must not distract from the variable its screen cannot change.

The Market Beyond "Send Now"

An investor may ask about the market rather than ethics. The answer is that value in this category will not settle permanently around a share of "send now" fees. It competes with payroll providers, banks, instant-payment rails, human-resources platforms, and every employer that changes payday. As earned-wage information becomes more precise, instant payments easier and transfer fees lower, the fee margin will not remain equally defensible. Value will move towards managing entitlements, errors and deductions; accounting integration; and demonstrated reduction of cash-pressure costs for worker and employer. Some companies will remain money-transfer intermediaries. Others may enter the infrastructure deciding how wages are measured, delivered and reviewed. That is a difference in technical depth, not campaign design.

Return to the Uber experiment. The company did not change workers' pay; it tested a change in timing, and behaviour moved a little. The result deserves its proper size. It is neither a declaration that earlier money always wins nor an indictment of every service fee. It is limited, robust evidence that time entered the wage equation through economic choice. Once a worker has earned the wage, "how long until payday?" is no longer the only question. Who holds the keys to the days between work and payment? Who pays to unlock them? And when today's door opens, does enough remain for the worker to cross the rest of the month?

Sources and references

[1] M. Keith Chen, Katherine Feinerman and Kareem Haggag, "Flexible Pay and Labor Supply: Evidence from Uber's Instant Pay," NBER Working Paper 33177 — November 2024; records indicate later publication in *Management Science*.

[2] US CFPB, "Data Spotlight: Developments in the Paycheck Advance Market" — 18 July 2024; company data for 2021–2022 and 2022 market estimates.

[3] JPMorganChase Institute, "Earnings instability: The hidden volatility of American workers' paychecks" — 30 September 2025; based on original university research and banking data.

[4] JPMorgan Chase Institute, "How vulnerable are Americans to unexpected expenses?" — 30 July 2024; 2021–2023 data.

[5] US Government Accountability Office, *Financial Technology: Products Have Benefits and Risks to Underserved Consumers, and Regulatory Clarity Is Needed*, GAO-23-105536 — 8 March 2023.

[6] Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Terri Bradford, "As Earned Wage Access Grows, Oversight Tries to Catch Up" — 15 May 2024.

[7] International Labour Organization, *Earned wage access: a global study on benefits and risks* — 2025, 51 pages, DOI 10.54394/RKLC1681.

[8] US CFPB, *Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Non-application to Earned Wage Access Products*, advisory opinion — December 2025; published in the Federal Register 23 December 2025, 90 FR 60069.

[9] US Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Length of pay periods in the Current Employment Statistics survey" — 4 August 2023; reference values February 2023.

[10] UK Financial Conduct Authority, "FCA sets out views on Employer Salary Advance Schemes" — Published 30 July 2020; link/technical modification 13 August 2026.

[11] Federal Reserve Financial Services, "About the FedNow Service" and launch notice — Operational since July 2023; current reference page at editorial date.