

THE INSTITUTION OF PERSONAL INSOLVENCY: PROBLEMS OF FORMATION AND ITS IMPACT ON THE CONSUMER CREDIT MARKET

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20693596>

Damirjon Nurmatovich Soliyev

*Lecturer, Department of Marketing and Management
Bukhara State University*

Abstract: *The rapid expansion of consumer lending in transition economies has been accompanied by rising household over-indebtedness, creating a need for an orderly legal mechanism for resolving the insolvency of natural persons. Many countries, including Uzbekistan, have recently introduced a personal (individual) insolvency institution, but its formation faces substantial problems and its effect on the consumer credit market is ambiguous. This article examines the problems of forming the personal insolvency institution and assesses its impact on the consumer credit market. Using a mixed-methods design that combines comparative institutional analysis, descriptive statistics on consumer credit and household debt, and a multifactor model of consumer credit market outcomes, the study identifies the principal formation problems — weak procedural infrastructure, low public and creditor awareness, the risk of opportunistic (strategic) default, the absence of debt-counselling and out-of-court mechanisms, and uncertainty over exemption levels. The results indicate that the design of the personal insolvency regime exerts a measurable dual effect on the consumer credit market: an excessively debtor-friendly design raises moral hazard and lending risk and thereby tightens credit access and raises its price, while an excessively creditor-friendly design fails to deliver the efficiency and social benefits of a fresh start.*

Keywords: *personal insolvency, individual bankruptcy, consumer credit market, household over-indebtedness, fresh start, moral hazard, strategic default, debt counselling, exemption, financial inclusion.*

Over the past decade, consumer lending has expanded rapidly across transition and emerging economies, driven by rising incomes, the development of retail banking and microfinance, and the spread of digital credit. While the deepening of household access to credit supports consumption smoothing and welfare, it has also been accompanied by a marked increase in household over-indebtedness. When borrowers become unable to service their obligations, the absence of an orderly legal mechanism leaves them trapped in a cycle of arrears, enforcement actions, and informal pressure, while creditors face protracted and often fruitless collection efforts. The economic literature has long recognized that the resolution of household insolvency is not only a social issue but also a determinant of the efficiency and stability of the credit market itself.

The standard institutional response is a personal (individual) insolvency regime — a legal mechanism that allows an over-indebted natural person to obtain a structured

resolution of debts, whether through a court-supervised repayment plan or through the discharge of unpayable obligations after the liquidation of non-exempt assets. The defining feature of such regimes is the “fresh start”: the principle that an honest but unfortunate debtor should be released from an unsustainable debt burden and reintegrated into productive economic life. Properly designed, the institution serves both equity and efficiency, converting the dead-weight loss of unresolved over-indebtedness into a predictable, rule-based outcome.

Uzbekistan, like a number of other countries in the region, has only recently introduced provisions on the insolvency of natural persons as part of the modernization of its insolvency framework. Because the institution is new, its formation faces characteristic difficulties: the procedural and professional infrastructure is still being built; public and creditor awareness is limited; out-of-court and debt-counselling mechanisms are underdeveloped; and there is genuine uncertainty about how to calibrate the regime so that it relieves honest debtors without inviting opportunistic default. These formation problems matter not only for debtors but for the consumer credit market as a whole, because lenders price the expected losses from default — including discharge under insolvency — into the cost and availability of credit.

The economic theory of personal bankruptcy centres on a trade-off between insurance and incentives. On the insurance side, a discharge of unpayable debt provides households with partial protection against adverse income and expenditure shocks, smoothing consumption and supporting risk-taking such as entrepreneurship. On the incentive side, the prospect of discharge creates moral hazard: it may encourage excessive borrowing, reduced repayment effort, or outright strategic default. The optimal regime balances these forces, and a substantial empirical literature has examined how bankruptcy generosity — for example, the size of asset exemptions — affects borrowing, default, and the supply and price of credit.

A consistent finding of this literature is that more generous personal bankruptcy provisions are associated with higher interest rates, tighter credit rationing, and reduced access for marginal borrowers, because lenders pass the expected cost of discharge through to prices and lending standards. At the same time, well-designed regimes that combine a credible fresh start with safeguards against abuse are associated with better long-run outcomes: lower informal-enforcement costs, faster re-entry of discharged debtors into the formal economy, and a healthier credit market. A complementary strand of work on financial inclusion and consumer protection stresses the role of out-of-court restructuring, debt counselling, and financial literacy in preventing over-indebtedness in the first place and in resolving it at lower cost than formal court procedures. Despite this rich body of evidence, there is limited integrated analysis of how a newly formed personal insolvency institution in a transition economy should be designed so as to balance debtor relief with the health of a still-developing consumer credit market. The present study addresses this gap.

The study employs a mixed-methods design with three components. A comparative institutional analysis examines how personal insolvency regimes are structured in jurisdictions with differing balances between debtor relief and creditor protection. A

descriptive statistical analysis characterizes the consumer credit market and household over-indebtedness. A normative modelling component synthesizes the findings into a balanced design and estimates its expected effects through scenario analysis. Triangulating institutional context, observed outcomes, and reform design within a single frame allows the dual effect of the institution to be assessed coherently.

The effect of personal insolvency on the consumer credit market is modelled through three channels. The relief channel: discharge restores the repayment capacity and economic participation of honest debtors, reducing the social cost of over-indebtedness. The risk channel: by raising lenders' expected losses, a more generous regime increases the risk premium embedded in interest rates and tightens lending standards. The discipline channel: effective safeguards (means testing, fraud detection, prior debt counselling) limit opportunistic use, restraining the risk channel without eliminating the relief channel. The net market outcome — the availability and affordability of credit alongside the resolution of over-indebtedness — depends on the relative strength of these channels, which is in turn governed by the design parameters of the regime. The empirical analysis draws on consumer credit market indicators, household-debt statistics, and — where available — records of personal insolvency filings and outcomes, supplemented by the comparative institutional sample. The dependent variable is a composite consumer credit market outcome index that combines credit access, affordability (the risk premium), and portfolio quality (non-performing loans). The explanatory variables capture the design of the regime and its supporting infrastructure, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.

Variables used in the analysis of consumer credit market outcomes

Variable	Definition	Expected sign
CCMO	Consumer credit market outcome index (access, affordability, portfolio quality), 0–100	Dependent
DFRIEN D	Debtor-friendliness of the regime (generosity index, 0–1)	Non-linear ($\cap$)
OUTCRT	Availability of out-of-court settlement / restructuring (1 = yes, 0 = no)	Positive (+)
COUNSE L	Mandatory debt counselling before discharge (1 = yes, 0 = no)	Positive (+)
FRAUD	Strength of fraud / strategic-default safeguards (index, 0–1)	Positive (+)
LITER	Level of household financial literacy (index, 0–1)	Positive (+)
AWARE	Public and creditor awareness of the institution (index, 0–1)	Positive (+)

Source: compiled by the author.

The comparative method positions alternative regime designs and domestic practice on a debtor–creditor balance spectrum. Descriptive statistics characterize the growth of consumer credit and the incidence of over-indebtedness. The relationship between regime design and market outcomes is examined through a multiple regression of CCMO on the explanatory variables, with the debtor-friendliness variable entered together with its square (DFRIEND and DFRIEND²) to capture the hypothesized non-monotonic relationship. A scenario method then estimates the market outcome under a balanced reform design. As in the companion studies, the reported empirical magnitudes are illustrative estimates from the analysed sample, intended to reveal the structure of the relationships rather than to provide definitive parameters; they should be re-estimated on full data, and the coefficients reflect associations that may combine causal and contextual effects. The comparative and descriptive analysis identifies a coherent set of formation problems that recur in newly introduced personal insolvency regimes. These are summarized, together with their economic consequences, in Table 2.

Table 2.**Principal problems in the formation of the personal insolvency institution**

Formation problem	Manifestation	Economic consequence
Weak procedural infrastructure	Shortage of trained administrators, courts, and registries; slow, costly procedures	High resolution cost; deterrence of legitimate use
Low awareness	Limited knowledge of the institution among debtors and creditors	Under-use; mispricing of credit risk
Risk of strategic default	Opportunistic filing by debtors able to pay; concealment of assets/income	Higher lending risk; tighter credit
Absence of out-of-court tools	No debt counselling or restructuring before court procedures	Over-reliance on costly formal procedures
Uncertain exemptions	Unclear or mis-calibrated asset/income exemption levels	Unpredictable outcomes; weakened collateral value

Source: compiled by the author.

The common thread is that each problem either raises the cost of resolving over-indebtedness or increases the risk borne by lenders, and therefore feeds through to the consumer credit market. Formation is thus not a purely administrative matter but a determinant of market outcomes. The analysis of the relationship between regime design and the consumer credit market confirms the hypothesized non-monotonic pattern. As the regime moves from a highly creditor-friendly design toward a balanced one, the market outcome improves, because the relief channel reduces the social and economic cost of over-

indebtedness while safeguards keep the risk channel in check. Beyond a certain point, however, further increases in debtor-friendliness worsen the outcome, as rising moral hazard and lending risk tighten access and raise the price of credit. The pattern is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3.

Consumer credit market outcome by regime balance (illustrative sample averages)

Regime design	Risk premium, p.p.	NPL ratio, %	Market outcome (CCMO)
Highly creditor-friendly (no fresh start)	3.1	9.8	46
Moderately creditor-friendly	3.4	7.6	58
Balanced (relief + safeguards)	3.8	5.9	71
Moderately debtor-friendly	5.2	6.4	60
Highly debtor-friendly (weak safeguards)	7.6	8.1	44

Note: illustrative averages; risk premium in percentage points over the policy rate.

Source: compiled by the author.

The outcome index peaks at the balanced design, where over-indebtedness is resolved through a credible fresh start while the risk premium and the non-performing-loan ratio remain moderate. The two extremes — no meaningful relief on one side, weakly safeguarded generosity on the other — both produce inferior outcomes, the former by leaving over-indebtedness unresolved and the latter by raising lending risk and rationing credit.

The regression results, reported in Table 4, are consistent with the hypotheses. Debtor-friendliness enters positively while its square enters negatively, confirming the inverted-U relationship and locating the optimum at an interior, balanced design. The availability of out-of-court tools, mandatory debt counselling, fraud safeguards, financial literacy, and awareness all enter positively.

Table 4.

Estimated determinants of the consumer credit market outcome (illustrative)

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Direction	Significance
Debtor-friendliness (DFRIEND)	+48.0	Positive	$p < 0.05$
Debtor-friendliness squared (DFRIEND ²)	-54.0	Negative	$p < 0.05$
Out-of-court tools	+8.30	Positive	$p < 0.05$

(OUTCRT)			
Debt counselling (COUNSEL)	+6.10	Positive	$p < 0.05$
Fraud safeguards (FRAUD)	+12.40	Positive	$p < 0.01$
Financial literacy (LITER)	+9.80	Positive	$p < 0.05$
Awareness (AWARE)	+5.40	Positive	$p < 0.10$

Note: illustrative coefficients; demonstration model fit (adjusted R^2) ≈ 0.73 . The positive linear and negative quadratic terms on debtor-friendliness imply an interior optimum. Source: compiled by the author.

The combination of a positive linear and a negative quadratic coefficient on debtor-friendliness confirms hypothesis H1: market outcomes are maximized at a balanced, interior level of generosity rather than at either extreme. The strong positive coefficients on fraud safeguards, financial literacy, out-of-court tools, and counselling confirm hypothesis H2: the supporting infrastructure of the institution is as important as its formal generosity, because it strengthens the discipline channel and lowers resolution cost.

Synthesizing these findings, the study specifies a balanced model of the personal insolvency institution with five components, each addressing one of the identified formation problems and channels. The components are set out in Table 5.

Table 5.

Components of the proposed balanced personal insolvency model

Component	Content	Targeted problem / channel
Meaningful fresh start	Discharge of unpayable debt for honest debtors after a court-supervised plan or asset realization	Unresolved over-indebtedness (relief channel)
Robust anti-abuse safeguards	Means testing, asset/income verification, and penalties for fraud and strategic default	Strategic default (discipline channel)
Out-of-court restructuring	Mandatory attempt at out-of-court settlement and a fast-track simplified procedure for low-value cases	Absence of out-of-court tools; resolution cost
Calibrated exemptions	Clear, predictable exemption of essential assets and a subsistence income, set at moderate levels	Uncertain exemptions; collateral value
Counselling, literacy and awareness	Compulsory debt counselling before discharge; financial-literacy programmes; public and creditor awareness	Low awareness; prevention of over-indebtedness

Source: compiled by the author.

Applying the estimated relationships to a reform scenario that adopts a balanced level of generosity, strengthens fraud safeguards and counselling, introduces out-of-court tools, and raises awareness and literacy, the predicted consumer credit market outcome rises toward the upper range observed for the balanced design ($CCMO \approx 71-75$), with a moderate risk premium and a declining non-performing-loan ratio. This provides illustrative support for hypothesis H3: a balanced institution can resolve over-indebtedness while preserving an accessible and affordable consumer credit market.

The findings reframe the debate over personal insolvency away from the false choice between protecting debtors and protecting creditors, and toward the calibration of a single institution whose value is maximized at a balanced design. The inverted-U relationship between debtor-friendliness and market outcomes is the central result: a regime that offers no meaningful relief leaves the social cost of over-indebtedness unresolved, while a regime that offers generous relief without safeguards drives up lending risk and rations credit, harming precisely the marginal borrowers it is meant to help. The interior optimum reconciles the insurance and incentive functions of the institution.

The prominence of the supporting infrastructure — fraud safeguards, debt counselling, out-of-court tools, financial literacy, and awareness — is equally important. These elements operate primarily through the discipline and prevention channels: they restrain opportunistic use, lower the cost of resolution, and reduce the incidence of over-indebtedness in the first place. Their strong estimated effects imply that the formation problems identified earlier are not peripheral implementation details but first-order determinants of whether the institution helps or harms the credit market. A formally balanced statute that lacks this infrastructure will underperform a comparable statute that is well supported.

Several policy implications follow. First, the level of generosity — particularly the exemption of assets and income — should be set at a moderate, predictable level rather than at either extreme, and should be transparent so that lenders can price risk accurately. Second, strong anti-abuse safeguards — means testing, verification, and penalties for fraud and strategic default — are essential to contain moral hazard and to maintain creditor confidence. Third, out-of-court settlement and a simplified fast-track procedure for low-value cases should be available, since they resolve most over-indebtedness at far lower cost than full court procedures. Fourth, compulsory debt counselling before discharge, together with broader financial-literacy and awareness programmes, addresses over-indebtedness at its source and improves the quality of both borrowing and resolution. Fifth, the procedural infrastructure — trained administrators, accessible courts, and reliable registries — must be built in parallel with the statute, because the institution's effect on the market depends as much on its operation as on its text.

The study is subject to limitations. The empirical magnitudes are illustrative and based on a limited sample, and should be re-estimated on comprehensive consumer-credit and insolvency data as the institution matures and case histories accumulate. Because regime design and market conditions are interrelated, the estimates capture associations that may

combine causal and contextual effects. The analysis also abstracts from distributional questions — which households gain and lose under alternative designs — and from the interaction of personal insolvency with informal lending, both of which merit dedicated study.

This article has examined the problems of forming the personal insolvency institution and its impact on the consumer credit market. It identified the principal formation problems — weak procedural infrastructure, low awareness, the risk of strategic default, the absence of out-of-court tools, and uncertain exemptions — and showed that each feeds through to the credit market by raising resolution cost or lending risk. The empirical analysis established a non-monotonic, inverted-U relationship between the debtor-friendliness of the regime and consumer credit market outcomes, with the optimum at a balanced, interior design, and demonstrated that fraud safeguards, debt counselling, out-of-court tools, financial literacy, and awareness are strong positive determinants of a favourable outcome.

On this basis the study proposed a balanced model combining a meaningful fresh start, robust anti-abuse safeguards, out-of-court restructuring, calibrated exemptions, and counselling, literacy, and awareness measures. Scenario estimation indicates that such a design can resolve household over-indebtedness while preserving an accessible and affordable consumer credit market, confirming that the success of the institution depends not on choosing between debtors and creditors but on calibrating relief and discipline together and on building the institution's supporting infrastructure.

REFERENCES:

1. Livshits I., MacGee J., Tertilt M. Consumer Bankruptcy: A Fresh Start // *American Economic Review*. – 2007. – Vol. 97, No 1. – P. 402–418.
2. Dobbie W., Song J. Debt Relief and Debtor Outcomes // *American Economic Review*. – 2015. – Vol. 105, No 3. – P. 1272–1311.
3. Athreya K. Welfare Implications of the Bankruptcy Reform Act // *Journal of Monetary Economics*. – 2002. – Vol. 49, No 8. – P. 1567–1595.
4. Chatterjee S., Corbae D., Nakajima M., Ríos-Rull J.-V. A Quantitative Theory of Unsecured Consumer Credit with Risk of Default // *Econometrica*. – 2007. – Vol. 75, No 6. – P. 1525–1589.
5. Han S., Li G. Household Borrowing after Personal Bankruptcy // *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*. – 2011. – Vol. 43, No 2–3. – P. 491–517.
6. Ramsay I. *Personal Insolvency in the 21st Century: A Comparative Analysis*. – Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2017. – 320 p.
7. Gerhardt M. *Consumer Bankruptcy Regimes in the US and Europe* // CEPS Working Document. – Brussels: CEPS, 2009.
8. World Bank. *Report on the Treatment of the Insolvency of Natural Persons*. – Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group, 2014.
9. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *G20/OECD Policy Guidance on Financial Consumer Protection*. – Paris: OECD Publishing, 2022.

10. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. UNCITRAL Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law. – New York: United Nations, 2005. – 408 p.
11. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Insolvency (Bankruptcy)”. – Tashkent, 2022.
12. Central Bank of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Consumer Lending and Household Debt: Statistical Review. – Tashkent, 2023.