

An Empirical Study on Association Between Demographic Factors and Savings Behavior of Degree College Lecturers in Mysore District

MOHANRAJU H¹, DR. AMULYA M²

¹ Research Scholar, DOS in Business Administration, BIMS, University of Mysore

² Associate Professor, DOS in Business Administration, BIMS, University of Mysore

Abstract - The developing countries like India are facing difficulty in finding investment to fund infrastructure. Most of the domestic savers are unaware of the share market and look at it suspiciously as it is not fully known to them. They find it easy to invest in physical assets like land, flat, gold ect. The number of savings and investment avenues are increasing day by day to attract domestic customers. This article aimed to study the savings habit of degree college lecturers in Mysore district. This study found that there is significant association between age, marital status, spouse working status, residence status, teaching stream of the lecturers and savings habits.

Index Terms- Investment pattern, Investment awareness, Investment avenues, Salaried employees, Saving pattern.

I. INTRODUCTION

Savings and investments are important determinant of wellbeing of any individual and any economy. In this time of uncertainty of employment security, increasing inflation rate, increasing in the rate of prone to health issues, increasing in needs and desires and need to plan for retirement, the aspect of savings and investment gaining very crucial importance. In case of any economy savings and investment is important for growth of the economy as savings and investment leads to capital formation, then to investment in businesses and then to increasing in employment rate and then to increasing in standard of living and again leads to increasing in savings and investment. An individual can work efficiently if he is financial secured. Financial security is the result of proper planning and making provision for savings and investment. So savings and investment ensures financial security and efficient discharge of duties in the work place.

Objective:

To find the association between demographic factors and savings behavior of college lecturers in Mysore district.

Hypotheses:

Ho : There is no significant association between Demographic variables and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1: There is significant association between Demographic variables and savings behavior of college lecturers.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology depicts the flow of research process and serves as guidance for the researcher to carry out the research smoothly. It includes data source, sample size, sampling technique and tools of analysis. This study used primary data collection method with standardized questionnaire AND data was collected from 122 degree college lecturers of Mysore district by using convenience sampling method. Chi-sqaure test of independence tool is used to analyze and interpret the data.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

S. Ayeshath Umaira(2022) Conducted study titled "A study on savings and investment pattern of teachers" by collecting primary data with standardized questionnaire using sample size of 50. It was stated that respondents preferred safer investment avenues and they expect regular income from those investments, bank deposit was the most preferred investment avenue as it carried lesser risk and guaranteed returns.(Umaira)

Mitesh Kadakia(2023) made a study titled "A study on savings and investments pattern of degree lecturers with special reference to Hyderabad". The study was based on primary data collection with standardized questionnaire with sample size of 100. . The safety was first preferred quality to make investment in any avenue. Shares and debentures got very less attention of the respondents.(Kadakia)

Dr. Abhinandan N (2020) stated in his study titled " An empirical study on saving and investment pattern of college teachers in Bangalore district" that there is significant relationship between annual income and expected rate of return on investments. It was stated that respondents saved less of their income and also expected less return from their investments.(Dr. Abhinandan N)

Selva Kumar P And Dr. Gayathri Harikumar(2023) conducted a study titled "An empirical study on the saving and investment behavioral patterns f assistant professors in private colleges in Chennai". The primary data was collected from 120 assistant professors using structured closed ended questionnaire. Compared to quarterly or monthly investments, a sizable percentage of respondents prefer monthly investing. The majority of respondents prefer bank deposits over post office plans as investments. Since risk reduction is the main goal of their investments, the majority of respondents are risk averse. Most survey participants consistently save money (monthly).(Kumar)

Sudarshini and N. Mallika(2021) in the article "Saving and investment pattern of teaching

professionals: with reference to Mangalore university" stated that majority of respondents have the habit of monthly saving, second largest percentage of respondents preferred to invest annually and least percentage of respondents preferred to invest daily. Here respondents chose low risk and low return investment avenues as they are not interested to undertake high risk.(Sudarshini and Mallika)

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Results of chi-square test of independence test

Demographic factors	Chi square value	df	p value	
Age	28.661	12	0.004	Significant
Gender	5.528	4	0.237	Not significant
Qualification	6.129	4	0.190	Not significant
Department	24.201	8	0.002	Significant
Marital Status	11.522	4	0.021	Significant
Spouse Working	26.307	8	0.001	Significant
Family Structure	8.835	4	0.065	Not significant
Place of Residence	38.805	8	0.000	Significant
Nature of Residence	15.359	4	0.004	Significant

Source: Primary data

Table 2: Significant demographic factors and savings behaviour

Demographic Factors	Dont Save	No regular saving plan	Save regularly, put money aside from regular income	Spend income of one family member, save the income of other family member	Spend regular income and save other income

		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Age	Below 30 Years	0	0.0 %	6	17.1 %	23	65.7%	2	5.7%	4	11.4 %
	31 to 40 Years	2	3.8 %	11	20.8 %	18	34.0%	16	30.2 %	6	11.3 %
	41 to 50 Years	0	0.0 %	0	0.0%	16	66.7%	6	25.0 %	2	8.3%
	Above 50 Years	0	0.0 %	0	0.0%	10	100.0 %	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
Department	Science	0	0.0 %	4	10.5 %	24	63.2%	8	21.1 %	2	5.3%
	Commerce/Management	0	0.0 %	2	4.1%	31	63.3%	8	16.3 %	8	16.3 %
	Arts	2	5.7 %	11	31.4 %	12	34.3%	8	22.9 %	2	5.7%
	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
Marital Status	Married	0	0.0 %	11	12.4 %	46	51.7%	22	24.7 %	10	11.2 %
	Unmarried	2	6.1 %	6	18.2 %	21	63.6%	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
Spouse Working	Yes	0	0.0 %	9	13.4 %	28	41.8%	20	29.9 %	10	14.9 %
	No	2	7.1 %	6	21.4 %	18	64.3%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%
	Not applicable	0	0.0 %	2	7.4%	21	77.8%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%
	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
Place of Residence	Rural	0	0.0 %	6	75.0 %	0	0.0%	2	25.0 %	0	0.0%
	Semi urban	2	7.7 %	4	15.4 %	12	46.2%	4	15.4 %	4	15.4 %
	Urban	0	0.0 %	7	8.0%	55	62.5%	18	20.5 %	8	9.1%
	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
Nature of Residence	Own House	0	0.0 %	4	5.5%	43	58.9%	18	24.7 %	8	11.0 %
	Rental/Leased House	2	4.1 %	13	26.5 %	24	49.0%	6	12.2 %	4	8.2%

	Total	2	1.6 %	17	13.9 %	67	54.9%	24	19.7 %	12	9.8%
--	-------	---	-------	----	--------	----	-------	----	--------	----	------

Source: Primary data

V. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

Hao: There is no significant association between age and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Ha1: There is significant association between age and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is high significant association between age and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage among all age groups respondents i.e “bellow 30 years”, “31 to 40 years” “41 to 50 years” and “above 50years” major portion of each group respondents save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of , 65.7%, 34%, 66.7% and 100% respectively. Whereas in all the age group least number of respondents don’t save with percentage of 0%, 3.8%, 0% and 0%. Here in the age group of “31 to 40 years” 3.8% of respondents don’t save.

Hbo: There is no significant association between gender and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Hb1: There is significant association between gender and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is no significant association between gender and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Hco: There is no significant association between Qualification and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Hc1: There is significant association between Qualification and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is no significant association between Qualification and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Hod: There is no significant association between teaching stream(department) and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1d: There is significant association between teaching stream(department) and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is high significant association between teaching stream and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage among all teachings stream respondents i.e “Science”, “commerce/management” and “Arts” major percentage of each groups’ respondents save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of , 63.2%, 63.3% and 34.3% respectively. While all teachings stream respondents least percentage of respondents don’t save with percentage of 0%, 0% and 5.7% respectively. Here in the teaching stream of “arts” 5.7% of respondents don’t save and 31.4% respondents have no regular savings plan.

Hoe: There is no significant association between marital status and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1e: There is significant association between marital status and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is association between marital status and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage among both married and unmarried respondents major portion of respondents save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of 51.7% and 63.6% respectively. While both married and unmarried respondents least number of respondents don’t save with percentage of 0% and 6.1%. Here among unmarried respondents 6.1% of respondents don’t save and 31.4% respondents have no regular savings plan.

Hof: There is no significant association between spouse working and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1f: There is significant association between spouse working and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is high significant association between spouse working and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage in all groups i.e “spouse working”, “spouse not working” and “not applicable” respondents, major portion of respondents save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of 41.8%, 64.3% and 77.8% respectively. While both “spouse working”, “not applicable” respondents, least number of respondents don’t save with percentage of 0% and 0% respectively. Among “spouse not working” least number of respondents spend regular income and save other income with percentage 0% and 7.1% of this group respondents don’t save.

Hog: There is no significant association between family structure and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1g: There is significant association between family structure and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is no significant association between family structure and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Hoh: There is no significant association between place of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1h: There is significant association between place of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is high significant association between place of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage among respondents who live in “semi urban” and “urban” largest portion of each group save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of 46.2% and 62.5% respectively, the largest portion of respondents who live in “rural” have no regular savings plan. While

least number of respondents who live in “rural”, “semi urban” and “urban” don’t save with percentage of 0%, 7.7% and 15.4% respectively. Also it is noted 75% of respondents who live in “rural” have no regular savings plan.

Hoi: There is no significant association between nature of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

H1i: There is significant association between nature of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is high significant association between nature of residence and savings behavior of college lecturers.

Based on row percentage among respondents who live in “own house” and “rental/leased” largest portion save regularly by putting money aside from regular income with the percentage of 58.9% and 49% respectively. While least number of respondents who live in “own house” and “rental/leased” don’t save with percentage of 0% and 4.1% respectively. It is also noted that respondents who live in “rental/leased house” 4.1% don’t save at all and 26.5% have no regular savings plan.

CONCLUSION

- Higher age groups’ of respondents save regularly than lower age categories. Middle age categories save more percentage of their income compared to lower and higher age categories.
- Science and commerce/Management subject teaching save money more regularly than Arts subject teaching lecturers.
- Married respondents save more regularly than unmarried respondents.
- Respondents having “Spouse with working” and “Not married respondents” save more regularly than respondents having “Spouse with not working” respondents.
- Respondents residing in semi urban and urban save money more regularly than respondents residing in rural respondents.
- Respondents living in “Own house” save money more regularly than respondents living in “rental/leased house”.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dr. Abhinanadan N. *AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON SAVING AND INVESTMENT PATTERN OF COLLEGE TEACHERS IN BANGALORE DISTRICT*. 2020.
- [2] Kadakia, Mitesh. *A Study on Savings and Investments Pattern of Degree Lecturers with Special Reference to Hyderabad*. Google Scholar, https://www.journal-dogorangsang.in/no_1_Online_23/83_feb.pdf. Accessed 9 Feb. 2024.
- [3] Kumar, Selva. *AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON THE SAVING AND INVESTMENT BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS IN PRIVATE COLLEGES IN CHENNAI*. www.tojdel.net.
- [4] Sudarshini and Mallika. "Saving and Investment Pattern of Teaching Professionals: With Reference to Mangalore University." *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 2021.
- [5] Umaira, S. Ayesath. "Issue 3 IJSDR2203007 Wwww.Ijsdr.Org." *International Journal of Scientific Development and Research*, vol. 7, 2022, pp. 50–50.