

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-10

HOUSEHOLD FINANCIAL STRESS IN INDIA: DEBT EXPANSION, NET FINANCIAL SAVING, AND MACROPRUDENTIAL RESILIENCE

***Dr Jainish Bhagat**

P P Savani University, Surat, India.

Article Received: 01 September 2026

*Corresponding Author: Dr Jainish Bhagat

Article Revised: 21 September 2026

P P Savani University, Surat, India.

Published on: 12 October 2026

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.6018>

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the household financial stress paradox in India: household leverage has increased while net financial saving has remained materially below its pandemic peak, even though the banking system remains resilient. Using Reserve Bank of India (RBI), National Statistical Office, and related macro-financial evidence, the paper traces changes in household liabilities, financial saving, credit composition, and regulatory intervention. The analysis distinguishes balance-sheet vulnerability from conventional measures of banking-sector asset quality and argues that the relevant policy problem is not household borrowing per se but the interaction between debt composition, income capacity, liquidity buffers, and macroeconomic shocks. The paper documents the shift toward non-housing retail credit and evaluates the RBI's use of higher risk weights as a targeted macroprudential response. It concludes with a household and regulatory resilience framework based on debt-service capacity, liquidity adequacy, credit underwriting, and stress testing.

JEL Classification: D14; E44; E51; G21; G28; O16

KEYWORDS: Household Debt; Net Financial Saving; Consumer Credit; Macroprudential Policy; Financial Stability; India; Digital Lending.

1. INTRODUCTION

Household balance sheets have become an increasingly important channel through which macroeconomic and financial conditions interact. In emerging economies, the expansion of formal credit can support durable consumption, housing investment, entrepreneurship, and financial inclusion. At the same time, rapid growth in household liabilities can increase

sensitivity to income interruptions, interest-rate changes, asset-price corrections, and inflation in essential goods and services. The policy challenge is therefore not to minimize household debt mechanically, but to distinguish credit that improves lifetime balance sheets from credit that weakens future repayment capacity.

India offers a particularly useful setting for examining this tension. The post-pandemic period combined a release of accumulated precautionary savings, strong retail-credit growth, rapid digitalization of financial services, and a normalization of consumption. RBI evidence shows that household net financial saving fell sharply after the pandemic-era peak. Net financial saving was 11.6% of gross national disposable income (GNDI) in 2020–21 and 5.2% in 2022–23, as households drew down accumulated savings while financial liabilities increased (RBI 2024). Later estimates placed net household financial saving at around 5.1% of GNDI in 2023–24, while financial liabilities rose to around 6.1% of GNDI (RBI 2025).

The liability side has also changed in composition. The latest RBI-based reporting indicates that household debt reached 45.5% of GDP by March 2026 and that non-housing retail loans accounted for 58.4% of household borrowings. These developments matter because a larger role for unsecured or consumption-oriented credit can transmit shocks to household cash flow more rapidly than collateralized borrowing. The increase does not, by itself, establish a systemic crisis: borrower quality and bank capitalization can remain strong while household-level vulnerability increases. The central analytical issue is consequently the coexistence of aggregate financial-sector resilience and heterogeneous household balance-sheet stress.

This paper develops that issue as a household financial stress paradox. The paradox refers to a situation in which headline macroeconomic and banking indicators remain comparatively robust while households experience greater pressure from debt-service commitments and reduced liquid financial buffers. The paper asks three questions. First, how has the structure of household borrowing changed? Second, what does the decline in net financial saving imply for household resilience? Third, how can macroprudential regulation and household-level financial management respond without unnecessarily suppressing productive credit?

The contribution is analytical rather than causal. The paper synthesizes official macro-financial indicators into a coherent balance-sheet framework, separates flow measures of saving from stock measures of debt, and interprets the RBI's consumer-credit measures through a macroprudential lens. This approach also corrects a common analytical error in public commentary: treating all borrowing as equally harmful or all liquid saving as equally desirable. Household resilience depends on the interaction among leverage, liquidity, income stability, interest costs, asset quality, and the purpose of borrowing.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1 Household financial stress as a balance-sheet problem

A household can experience financial stress even when aggregate economic growth is positive. The relevant mechanism is the household balance sheet. Let household net financial wealth be defined as financial assets minus financial liabilities. A decline in net financial saving can occur because households acquire fewer financial assets, increase liabilities, or both. The interpretation therefore depends on the underlying flow of funds. A fall in net financial saving is not equivalent to a fall in income or wealth, but it reduces the pace at which financial buffers are accumulated.

Debt composition is equally important. Housing loans generally create an associated asset, although repayment burdens and house-price risk remain relevant. By contrast, unsecured personal loans, revolving credit-card balances, and short-duration consumer credit can finance consumption without generating a corresponding durable asset. When such liabilities grow faster than income, the household's future discretionary cash flow becomes more constrained. This distinction is consistent with the broader literature on collateral constraints and financial accelerator mechanisms, in which balance-sheet positions influence the transmission of shocks to consumption and investment (Kiyotaki and Moore 1997; Bernanke, Gertler, and Gilchrist 1999).

2.2 The financial stress paradox

The paper conceptualizes financial stress as the interaction of four dimensions: leverage, liquidity, debt composition, and shock exposure. A household with high debt but stable income, long maturities, and substantial collateral may be less vulnerable than a household with lower aggregate debt but unstable income and expensive unsecured credit. Likewise, a large cash reserve can improve short-term resilience but may involve an opportunity cost if maintained substantially above the household's plausible liquidity need.

The analytical framework can therefore be expressed as:

$$\text{Financial Stress} = f(\text{Leverage, Debt-Service Burden, Liquidity Gap, Income Volatility, Interest-Rate Exposure, Asset Buffer})$$

This is a conceptual relationship rather than an estimated structural equation. It is used to organize the evidence and to distinguish measurable balance-sheet indicators from normative recommendations.

3. Data and Analytical Approach

The analysis relies primarily on secondary macro-financial evidence from the Reserve Bank of India and the National Statistical Office, supplemented by the household-debt series reported from the RBI's Financial Stability Report and publicly available macro-financial evidence. The principal indicators are household net financial saving, household financial liabilities, household debt relative to GDP, and the composition of retail credit. The study is descriptive and policy analytical; it does not claim to identify a causal effect of unsecured credit on household distress.

Three principles guide the data treatment. First, flow variables and stock variables are kept separate. Net financial saving is a flow measure, whereas household debt-to-GDP is a stock measure. Second, denominators are identified explicitly. RBI's household saving statistics are commonly expressed relative to GNDI, whereas debt ratios are often expressed relative to GDP. Direct numerical comparison between the two should therefore be interpreted cautiously. Third, revisions are acknowledged. Household saving estimates are subject to revisions as national accounts are updated.

The empirical narrative is organized into four periods: the pre-pandemic baseline; the pandemic accumulation of precautionary financial saving; the post-pandemic normalization and credit expansion; and the subsequent macroprudential recalibration. This chronology allows the paper to distinguish a temporary pandemic saving shock from a longer-term change in household credit composition.

Table 1. Selected household balance-sheet indicators

Notes: The indicators are not directly comparable across denominators or measurement dates. Net financial saving is a flow measure expressed relative to GNDI; household debt-to-GDP is a stock ratio. The 2023–24 net-saving estimate is treated as an estimate/revised national-accounts measure rather than combined with the 2022–23 series. Sources: RBI (2024, 2025); RBI Financial Stability Report (2026), as reported in current RBI-based reporting.

4. Household Balance-Sheet Transition

4.1 Pandemic saving and subsequent normalization

The pandemic produced an unusual accumulation of household financial saving. RBI data show net financial saving at 11.6% of GNDI in 2020–21, compared with 7.6% in 2019–20. Restrictions on mobility and contact-intensive consumption reduced spending opportunities, while uncertainty encouraged precautionary accumulation. As mobility normalized, the

accumulated buffer was progressively used for consumption and investment. Net financial saving fell to 7.2% in 2021–22 and 5.2% in 2022–23 (RBI 2024).

The subsequent movement should not be interpreted simply as financial deterioration. A household may reduce financial saving because it is purchasing a home, acquiring a durable asset, investing in education, or increasing consumption after a period of exceptional restraint. The risk emerges when the reduction in financial buffers is accompanied by rapidly growing liabilities that do not create offsetting assets or income-generating capacity. This is why the composition of credit is central to the analysis.

4.2 Rising household liabilities

Household financial liabilities increased substantially after the pandemic. RBI estimates place financial liabilities at 5.7% of GNDI in 2022–23, compared with 3.8% in 2019–20 and 3.7% in 2020–21. More recent estimates place liabilities at approximately 6.1% of GNDI in 2023–24. The increase indicates a stronger role for borrowing in household financial decisions, although it does not reveal the purpose, maturity, interest rate, or distribution of those liabilities.

The distinction between household debt as a macro stock and household debt-service capacity at the micro level is therefore important. A national debt ratio can rise because of a broad increase in formal financial inclusion, housing finance, consumer credit, or changes in the valuation and reporting of liabilities. A financial-stability assessment must examine whether income growth, repayment capacity, underwriting quality, and bank capital are evolving consistently with the expansion.

4.3 Shift toward non-housing retail credit

Recent RBI-based reporting indicates that non-housing retail loans constituted 58.4% of household borrowings by March 2026. This composition matters because non-housing retail credit contains a larger component of personal and consumption-oriented borrowing than traditional mortgage finance. The rapid growth of digital lending and automated credit offers can reduce transaction costs and widen access, but it can also shorten the time between credit availability and consumption decisions.

The appropriate policy response is consequently neither a generalized credit freeze nor unrestricted credit expansion. The regulatory objective should be to improve the risk sensitivity of underwriting, ensure that lenders internalize the capital cost of higher-risk consumer credit, and monitor concentrations in borrower segments where repayment capacity is most sensitive to employment or income shocks.

5. The Stress Paradox: Strong Banks, Vulnerable Households

A central implication of the evidence is that banking-sector soundness and household financial resilience are related but distinct concepts. The RBI's macroprudential intervention in November 2023 was motivated by strong growth in unsecured consumer credit. Risk weights on specified consumer-credit exposures of commercial banks and NBFCs were raised to 125%, while risk weights on credit-card receivables were also increased. The measures increased the capital requirement associated with these exposures and were designed to moderate excessive risk-taking rather than prohibit consumer borrowing (RBI 2023).

This illustrates a key macroprudential principle: the policy instrument can target the source of systemic risk without applying a uniform restriction to every sector of the economy. A broad monetary tightening would affect housing, investment, working-capital, and productive enterprise credit simultaneously. A targeted risk-weight measure instead changes the capital economics of particular credit categories.

At the household level, however, the policy effect is indirect. Higher capital requirements can influence lending rates, credit availability, underwriting standards, and lender portfolio allocation. The resulting adjustment can be beneficial if it slows the growth of low-quality credit, but it may impose costs if viable households or small businesses are denied productive financing. The effectiveness of the policy therefore depends on the accuracy of risk differentiation.

6. Evaluating Extreme Household-Finance Narratives

6.1 The three-year cash-reserve proposition

The original case material framed a common public recommendation: households should maintain as much as 36 months of living expenses in cash or near-cash assets. From a risk-management perspective, the underlying objective—maintaining liquidity for adverse shocks—is reasonable. The difficulty is the universalization of the rule. A fixed 36-month target ignores income stability, insurance coverage, household composition, debt maturity, access to credit, and the opportunity cost of holding low-return assets.

A more defensible framework is to calibrate liquidity to essential expenditure and shock probability. Households with highly volatile income, limited insurance, or large near-term liabilities may rationally maintain a larger buffer than households with stable salaries and diversified income. The appropriate reserve should therefore be determined by stress scenarios rather than a universal number of months.

6.2 The blanket debt-free proposition

A second oversimplification is the recommendation to eliminate borrowing altogether. Debt can finance productive assets, education, housing, entrepreneurship, and consumption smoothing. The relevant distinction is between borrowing that strengthens future repayment capacity and borrowing that merely brings future consumption forward at a high cost.

For policy and household management, debt should therefore be assessed along four dimensions: purpose, interest rate, maturity, and repayment capacity. High-cost revolving unsecured debt deserves priority for repayment because it can compound rapidly and has no associated collateral or productive asset. Long-maturity borrowing secured against a durable asset may be appropriate if the debt-service burden remains compatible with stable income.

7. Macprudential and Household Resilience Framework

7.1 Regulatory layer

The regulatory framework should operate through risk-sensitive underwriting, capital requirements, borrower-level monitoring, and data-driven stress testing. The RBI's 125% risk weight on specified consumer credit provides a direct example of the capital channel. Additional safeguards can include periodic review of underwriting standards, monitoring of borrower concentration, and greater scrutiny of automated credit models.

- Risk-sensitive capital: maintain higher capital intensity for consumer-credit segments exhibiting rapid growth or deterioration in repayment indicators.
- Underwriting discipline: require lenders to test repayment capacity using verified income and reasonable stress assumptions rather than relying only on automated approval scores.
- Portfolio surveillance: monitor credit growth by borrower type, product, maturity, and lender category rather than relying solely on aggregate retail-credit growth.
- Model governance: subject algorithmic credit-scoring systems to validation, bias testing, and periodic performance review.
- Early-warning indicators: combine delinquency, restructuring, credit utilization, income proxies, and regional employment indicators to detect stress before it becomes visible in aggregate non-performing assets.

7.2 Household layer

At the household level, resilience should be framed as an asset-liability management problem. A practical stress test begins with essential monthly expenditure, minimum debt-service commitments, and the number of months for which income could plausibly be interrupted. The household can then test its balance sheet under scenarios such as a temporary

income loss, an increase in floating-rate borrowing costs, or a major essential expenditure shock.

Debt-Service Ratio (DSR) = Required Monthly Debt Payments / Monthly Net Income

No universal DSR threshold is proposed because appropriate limits vary by income stability, household size, interest-rate exposure, and access to insurance. The more useful principle is that essential debt service should leave sufficient residual income for food, housing, health, education, and precautionary saving.

7.3 Integrated stress-testing matrix

8. Policy Implications for India and Other Emerging Economies

The Indian case has broader relevance for emerging Asia because digital financial infrastructure can accelerate both financial inclusion and credit expansion. The central policy challenge is to ensure that digital access does not outpace risk management. Three implications follow.

First, household credit should be evaluated by composition rather than volume alone. Aggregate credit growth can be consistent with development when it finances housing, education, enterprise formation, and other assets that improve lifetime income or household welfare. The same growth rate can be destabilizing when concentrated in expensive short-duration consumption credit.

Second, macroprudential policy should complement rather than substitute for monetary policy. Risk weights, sectoral exposure limits, underwriting standards, and borrower-based measures can address specific concentrations while preserving monetary policy space for economy-wide objectives. The 2023 RBI intervention demonstrates the value of this targeted approach (RBI 2023).

Third, financial-literacy policy should move from generic advice toward balance-sheet diagnostics. Telling households to 'save more' or 'avoid all debt' is less useful than teaching households how to calculate liquidity needs, compare effective borrowing costs, assess fixed versus floating rates, and stress-test repayment capacity. Such tools are particularly important as credit decisions become increasingly automated and embedded in digital platforms.

9. Limitations and Research Agenda

This study has several limitations. It is based primarily on aggregate secondary data and therefore cannot identify distributional differences across income groups, age cohorts, regions, or borrower types. Household debt-to-GDP is also an aggregate stock indicator and

does not directly measure household distress. In addition, the paper does not estimate a causal model linking non-housing credit growth to consumption or repayment outcomes. Finally, some recent indicators are subject to revisions and differences in measurement concepts across data sources.

Future research should combine household-level survey data with credit-bureau information, administrative income records, and regional price indicators. A panel design could test whether unsecured credit expansion predicts subsequent reductions in consumption or increases in delinquency after controlling for income and employment shocks. Another promising area is the evaluation of algorithmic credit underwriting: whether digital models broaden responsible access to credit or amplify over-indebtedness among financially vulnerable households.

10. CONCLUSION

India's household financial stress should not be characterized as either a crisis or a non-event. The evidence points to a more nuanced transition. Net financial saving declined sharply after the pandemic-era peak, household financial liabilities increased, and the composition of household borrowing shifted toward non-housing retail credit. At the same time, the banking system has remained sufficiently resilient for regulators to address the risk through targeted macroprudential tools rather than generalized credit suppression.

The financial stress paradox arises because aggregate stability can coexist with household-level vulnerability. The relevant policy question is therefore whether households can absorb income, interest-rate, and essential-cost shocks while maintaining repayment capacity and adequate liquidity. The most appropriate response is a combination of risk-sensitive regulation, stronger underwriting and model governance, targeted monitoring of unsecured credit, and household-level balance-sheet stress testing.

The central policy lesson is straightforward: neither unrestricted credit expansion nor blanket debt avoidance is optimal. Resilience requires credit to be matched with repayment capacity, liquidity to be matched with plausible shocks, and regulation to be matched with the risk characteristics of different lending segments. For India and other emerging economies undergoing rapid financialization, this balance will be increasingly important for sustaining inclusive growth without allowing household leverage to become a source of systemic fragility.

REFERENCES

1. Bernanke, B. S., Gertler, M., and Gilchrist, S. (1999), 'The financial accelerator in a quantitative business cycle framework,' in J. B. Taylor and M. Woodford (eds.), *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, Vol. 1C, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 1341–1393.
2. Kiyotaki, N., and Moore, J. (1997), 'Credit cycles,' *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(2), pp. 211–248.
3. Reserve Bank of India (2023), *Regulatory Measures towards Consumer Credit and Bank Credit to NBFCs*, Notification dated 16 November 2023, Mumbai.
4. Reserve Bank of India (2024), *Annual Report 2023–24*, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
5. Reserve Bank of India (2024), *Financial Stability Report*, June 2024, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
6. Reserve Bank of India (2025), *Annual Report 2024–25*, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
7. Reserve Bank of India (2025), *Financial Stability Report*, June 2025, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
8. Reserve Bank of India (2026), *Financial Stability Report*, June 2026, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
9. Reserve Bank of India (2025), *Handbook of Statistics on Indian Economy 2024–25*, Mumbai: Reserve Bank of India.
10. National Statistical Office (2024), *National Accounts Statistics and household saving estimates*, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.