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ABSTRACT

Financial literacy means the use of financial knowledge to make every day decisions such as budgeting, investing and saving in a responsible manner. The objective of this paper was to assess the level of financial literacy of target adult population and analyze the impact of demographic and socio-economic factors on financial literacy of adults. Three research questions were formulated to facilitate the understanding of this. These were: (1) what is the level of financial literacy of the adults working in Tricity (Chandigarh, Mohali, Panchkula), (2) what is the relationship between demographic factors and the level of financial literacy among adults, and (3) what is the relationship between socio-economic factors and the level of financial literacy among adults? The demographic factors investigated in the study were gender, age and education level. The socio-economic variables considered included income level, employment status and sources of information at the workplace. Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The questions assessed the respondent's understanding of the basic financial concepts of simple interest, compound interest, time value of money, inflation and risk diversifications. The questionnaire also requested for demographic and socioeconomic data from the respondents. One way analysis of variance test and t-test have been used to test hypothesis of the study. The respondents, who were male, have higher education levels and young in age were observed to have higher financial literacy levels. Socio-economic factors like occupation and sources of information were also found to have an influence on financial literacy.
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Introduction

The global financial crisis of 2008, led to mounting losses for individuals. Since the financial crisis of 2008, it was strongly felt that individuals must understand the importance of making sound financial decisions. It was felt that in order to make sound personal finance decisions, it is imperative to promote saving and investment behavior, as it will add to more efficient allocation of financial resources and greater financial stability at both micro and macro level. Over the recent years, financial literacy has become a major area of concern in India. The people at large lack basic knowledge about financial matters concerned with day-to-day money management and saving for long term. The aim of financial literacy is to help individuals to improve their level of understanding of financial matters, which will lead to sound and informed decisions, to meet their financial needs and goals. Financial literacy is now considered as an accepted mission of the governments and central banks all over the world. The objective of promoting financial literacy efforts in most of the developed countries is to encourage capital market participation and consumer protection. In developing countries, in order to achieve inclusive growth, financial literacy is more relevant as improved financial knowledge will lead to positive financial behavior which is the essence of financial inclusion. Financial literacy is directly related to the well being of individuals. The importance of financial literacy has increased tremendously, as the financial landscape has become complex with the
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introduction of many new financial products. It is difficult for a common man to understand the risk and return associated with these financial products. Financially literate individuals can make effective use of these financial products and services by evaluating associated risks and returns and finally choosing those products which are best suited to them. Thus, financially literate individuals can make effective use of financial products and services; will not get cheated by sales people selling financial products not suited for them. Financial literacy aids in improving the quality of financial services and contribute to economic growth and development of a country. The importance of financial literacy cannot be underestimated, because a financially illiterate person may be unable to budget appropriately to meet expenditures, be unable to identify financial products or services that meet his/her needs, be unsure how to get and assess independent financial advice, and finally are more likely to fall victims to abusive and exploitative practices and scams (ASIC, 2003).

OECD definition of financial literacy was adopted for the research paper, it defines it as, “A combination of awareness, knowledge, skill, attitude and behavior necessary to make sound financial decisions and ultimately achieve individual financial wellbeing.” (OECD INFE, 2011). Financial inclusion and financial literacy are twin pillars. While financial inclusion acts from supply side providing the financial products and services that people demand, financial literacy stimulates the demand side – making people aware of what they can demand (Subbarao, D., 2010). Emerging economies like India face the problem of low level of literacy, poor accessibility and low demand. The health of the nation’s financial system depends upon the ability of its people to effectively manage their own finances. Financial literacy and financial inclusion will lead to financial stability of the economy.

Research reveals that there is widespread deficiency in financial literacy around the world. It is particularly low among females, lowly educated and poor. The evidence has led to the launch of financial literacy programs in many countries. Reserve Bank of India has undertaken many initiatives like creating awareness about financial products and services, good financial practices, going digital and consumer protection. They have also launched “Project Financial literacy.” to disseminate information regarding the central bank and general banking concepts to various target groups, including school and college students, women, rural and urban poor, defense personnel and senior citizens.

The booklet FAME (Financial Awareness Messages) provides basic financial literacy messages for the information of general public. It contains eleven institution/product neutral financial awareness messages, such as, documents to be submitted while opening a bank account (KYC), importance of budgeting, saving and responsible borrowing, maintaining a good credit score by repaying loans on time, banking at doorstep or at vicinity, knowing how to lodge complaints at the bank and the Banking Ombudsman, usage of electronic remittances, investing money only in registered entities, etc. Securities Exchange Board of India has also launched financial education programmes for various segments of the society viz. school students, college students, working executives, middle income group, home makers, retired personnel, self help groups etc., on various aspects viz. savings, investment, financial planning, banking, insurance, retirement planning etc.

From the above analysis, it is clear that there is still inadequate data on financial literacy particularly in developing countries as most of studies had been undertaken in developed countries and have focused on pensioners and pension schemes, high school and university students and households (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2007, Van Rooij et al., 2011, Lanerretche & Martinez, 2013 and Gaudecker, 2015). Emerging economies like India face the problem of low level of literacy, poor accessibility and low demand. The health of the nation’s financial system depends upon the ability of its people to effectively manage their own finances. Financial literacy and financial inclusion will lead to financial stability of the economy.

Review of Literature

The study presents literature based on the research questions on the topic of financial literacy. A study by the OECD (2005) and work by Lusardi and Mitchell (2007b) reviewed the evidence on financial literacy across countries and found that many other developed countries, including European countries, Australia and Japan there is widespread financial illiteracy. Similar results were echoed in the work of Christelis, Jappelli and Padula (2007), which used data very similar to the US HRS, and found that most respondents in Europe score low on numeracy scales.

Huston (2010) examined the previous literatures to identify obstacles, and proposed an approach, how can a standardized model of financial literacy can be developed. The S2 research data
set was used for the study. The prior studies were analyzed on basis of construct validation. The study found that the majority of studies (72%) did not include a definition of financial literacy. The main obstacle was majority of the studies (88%) reviewed did not include a guide for measurement interpretation. The study also concluded that the more standardized approach to measure financial literacy was needed to identify barriers to financial well-being and assist in solutions that enable effective financial choice.

Rajamohan (2013) examined the effectiveness of the Financial Education workshop to college faculty members to improve the financial knowledge. The sample size was 50. The tools used were Paired sample statistics, paired sample test, correlation test. The study also collects the pre and post Test financial score to know the effectiveness of financial literacy among the faculty members. The study concluded that the financial education workshop actually improve the financial knowledge which enables the participants to take the financial decisions.

Agarwalla et al. (2013) Studied the influence of various socio-demographic and economic factors on different dimensions of financial literacy like financial knowledge, attitude and behavior among the working young in urban India. The target sample size was 1,000. The study concluded that about 24% of the respondents exhibited high financial knowledge. Based on the financial behavior score, about 68% of the employed were classified as possessing positive financial behavior. Overall, the score of financial literacy among the working young in urban India is similar to the levels that prevail among comparable groups in other countries.

Scheresberg (2013) the study examined the financial literacy and financial behavior among the Young Adults. The study used the data from the 2009 National Financial Capability of approximately 4500 young adults. The study assessed the influence of the socio demographic characteristics and risk preferences on financial literacy. They used multiple multivariate regressions. It was found that those who scored higher literacy scores are more likely to have better financial outcomes: they are less likely to use high-cost borrowing methods, and they are more likely to plan for retirement or have set aside savings for emergencies.

Shankari, Navarathinam & Suganya (2014) studied to understand the level of financial literacy in Tamil Nadu District. The main objective of the research was to analyse the relationship between the age, income and education of the respondent towards the financial literacy, and to find out the literacy level towards the Banking Product and Services. The stratified random sampling method was used to collect the data using structured questionnaire. The research model used three aspects namely Behaviour towards Financial Planning, Awareness of Banking Products & Banking Services. The weight age assigned to the variable was 32%, 36% and 32%. The study concluded that the financial literacy level is low among the respondent.

Rohini et al. (2015) examined the level of financial literacy in the villages of Kanyakumari district. The study selected the 200 respondents. The study used the Multifunction logit tool to see the degree and direction of influence of each factor in awareness. The study showed that 95% of the respondents know about the financial services offered by the bank from their friends and 37% from the extension workers. It also showed that the bank should train their staff and there is need to appoint the more number of BCs in every village.

Akhter (2016) assessed the financial literacy awareness of youth and also found out whether there was any significant difference in financial literacy level of youth with the demographic and socio-economic profiles. The study concluded that the youth, women, low income group, less educated and the younger were least aware about the financial literacy.

Gomez and Villagomez (2017) measured the financial literacy among teenagers in Mexico and also presented the results of a financial literacy survey conducted among high school students in Mexico City. The study found that there was low level of financial literacy; only 60% understood the concept of inflation, 34% about risk diversification, and 31% about the Compound Interest. Further concluded that only 1% understands the financial concepts, 57% for financial behaviour and the 70% had positive financial attitude.

Gupta (2017) studied the financial literacy and the investment behaviour of salaried class individual of Delhi and he also studied awareness level about different financial products. The sample size was 180 and the data was collected from the structured questionnaire. The statistical tools used were T test and chi square Test. The study concluded that the salaried individuals level of financial literacy have more effect on their financial products awareness as well as their investment preference.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This study attempts to answer the following questions:
RQ1 - What is the level of financial literacy?

RQ2 - What is the relationship between demographic factors and the level of financial literacy among adults?

RQ3 - What is the relationship between socio-economic factors and the level of financial literacy among adults.

The demographic factors investigated in the study were gender, age and education level. The socio-economic variables considered included income level, employment status and sources of information at the workplace, age, gender, education level, income level, marital status, occupation and financial literacy. It is assumed that answering the first question will help to explore the level of financial literacy among the respondents. It is also assumed that answering the second and third question will examine the relationship of financial literacy between various socio-demographic factors. Based on the stated purpose of the study and on the research questions, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H1 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and gender.
H2 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and age.
H3 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and education.
H4 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and marital status.
H5 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and occupation.
H6 : There is no significant difference between financial literacy and Family Income.

Research Methodology

Questionnaire Design: The questionnaire in this study was divided into four sections consisting of questions on general information, financial literacy test, demographic factors and socioeconomic factors. The questions measuring financial literacy were designed to assess the respondent’s understanding of simple interest, compound interest, inflation, time value of money and risk diversification, similar to the questions used in the financial literacy study by Lusardi & Mitchell (2011). Advance questions were related.

The information about these questions is summarized to financial literacy index and the index is decided on the basis of mean and standard deviation of total questions. Individuals who have scored mean minus S.D are put in low category (13-2) and Mean plus SD are put in high (13+2) Financial literacy category (F.L.C) and rest are put in average category. Those who score below 11 marks are put in low financial literacy category and Family Income.

The study used the SPSS software to calculate one way Annova value in order to determine whether the financial literacy has any significant impact on the demographic factors (age, gender, family income, education level, occupation) among different group of respondents.

Sampling and Data Collection: The population from which a Stratified random sample was selected consists of the Chandigarh, Panchkula and Mohali (i.e. Tricity). From the 300 questionnaires distributed to respondents we received 250 responses, of which 20 were excluded because of incomplete data or response bias of extreme values. The remaining 230 usable questionnaires represent an effective response rate of around 76.6 percent of the total sample. Data analysis carried out using SPSS to obtain both descriptive and inferential statistics. The results of the study were then presented using tables, charts and graphs.

Data Analysis and Discussion

In order to test the financial Literacy among the respondents, the study choose the basic and advance knowledge question of division, compound interest, simple interest, inflation and Inheritance. The aim of the questions is to check the financial knowledge among the respondents or to check the level of literacy among the respondents.

Measurement of Financial Literacy

Our first set of findings on financial literacy among this representative sample of Tricity (Chandigarh, mohali, Panchkula) population is reported in Graph 1 in Appendix. All the respondents answered mostly questions relating to monthly rent, discount, and simple interest correctly. Questions relating to simple interest, the correct response was (72%), Compound interest (67%), Inflation (41%), Inheritance (52%), Time value of money (40%) and Money illusion (60%). Numeracy has been found to play an important role in influencing saving and even budgeting (Maarten van Rooij, Annamaria Lusardi and Rob Alessie, ‘Financial Literacy and Stock Market Participation’ (Working Paper No 13565, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2007). To be able to classify respondents according to different levels of financial sophistication, several other questions were asked from the respondents. In order to make
sound investment decisions, they need knowledge beyond fundamental financial concepts discussed above, including understanding the relationship between risk and return; how bonds, stocks, and mutual funds work; and basic asset pricing. Clearly, these questions are complex questions than the previous set. The purpose of these questions is to measure more advanced financial knowledge related to investment and portfolio choice. (Graph 2 in Appendix) depicts the correct response for advanced questions was in case of functions of stock market (Q1) is 48%, knowledge about stock ownership (Q2) is 52%, meaning of Mutual fund 33.5%, knowledge about debt funds (Q4) 38.5%, which asset displays highest fluctuations (Q5) 53.5%, Risk of losing money (Q6) 38%, 10 year bond Q7 68%, stocks are riskier than bond 49%, safety of investment (Q9) 38%. Bond price changes Q10 - 28.5%. Therefore, it can be concluded that advance knowledge among respondents in majority of questions is found to be less than 50%. The knowledge of basic financial literacy promotes savings whereas knowledge of advanced financial literacy facilitates investment. These findings also confirm the results found in US surveys, such as HRS and the survey of Consumers (Lusardi and Mitchell (2006) and Hilgert, Hogarth and Beverly (2003) Lusardi and Mitchell (2009).

Indices of Financial literacy

The information about these questions is summarized into financial literacy index and the index is decided on the basis of mean and standard deviation of total questions. Table A highlights minimum and maximum scores and table B financial literacy scores in three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A: Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B: Financial Literacy Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Literacy Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (1-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. (12-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (16-20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of Demographic and socio economic Variables on Financial Literacy: In order to test the H1 to H6 of the research, that is there any significant difference in financial literacy among different groups of respondents according to their age, gender, family income, education level, marital status, and occupation, one-way ANOVA, t-test was done. Demographic and Socioeconomic factors. Demographic factors such as age, gender, education level, family income, marital status have been found to influence consumer behavior in the marketing of financial services (Perry, 2008; Phau and Woo, 2008; Worthington, 2006; Dellande and Saporoschenko, 2004, Chen and Volpe, 2002).

- Financial Literacy and Gender: In order to test the 1st hypothesis that there is no significant difference in financial literacy and gender, the t-test of association is used. The total sample of the study is 230 respondents of which 145 are males and 85 are females. Table 1(appendix) shows that the males respondents has mean financial literacy of (M=13.96), S.D= 2.39 and the Females has mean financial literacy of M=13.29, S.D= 2.47, t (228)=172 with degrees of freedom p ≤ .05 indicates that difference is significant. As the mean literacy of the males respondents is more than the females respondents it may be concluded that the males is more likely to have higher financial literacy than the female respondents. Therefore, the results showed the statistically significant difference in the financial literacy of the Males and Females.

Financial knowledge and interests compared to males (Chen and Volpe, 2002, Worthington, 2006 Chen and Volpe, 1998) females are intrinsically right brain thinker which serves them better in nurturing role as wives, mothers and homemakers rather than financial matters (Worthington, 2008). Despite being responsive to financial education, females were found to possess a lower retirement age and income goals (Clark et al, 2006). Females also tend to be risk adverse in financial choices (Dellande and Saporoschenko, 2004). Traditionally, the role of handling finances is left to men and most women will not pursue education on financial matters unless circumstances such as divorce or the death of their spouse force them to be in charge of financial matters in the family (Bach, 2002).
Gender and Financial Literacy Category

Females were more likely to be in the lowest financial category as depicted by the results. 54.3% of females are in low F.L. category while 45.7% are males. While 64.7% of those in high F.L category are males and another 66.7% of avg. F.L. are also males. The reason for low F.L in women is mainly due to the fact that they have more household responsibilities, looking after children and family members than males. Women may find difficult to catch up with economic and financial development than men do. The association between gender and financial literacy category was found to be not significant. $X^2=5.383, p=.068$.

- **Financial Literacy and Age**: In order to test the 2nd hypothesis- An analysis of variance was used to compare financial literacy with the age parameter. Generally, older individuals are more conservative and risk adverse (Dellande and Saporochenko, 2004). The deeper life experiences may encourage the acquisition of skills to secure their financial aspirations (Worthington, 2008). The Table 3 in Appendix provides some very useful descriptive statistics, the mean, standard deviation and 95% confidence interval for the dependent variable (Financial literacy for each separate group (<25, 26-35, 36-45, 45-55 and >55) as well as when all the groups are combined (Total). The result indicates that the significant level $p = .033$ which is below 0.05 and therefore, statistically significant difference in financial literacy and different age groups. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

- **Financial Literacy and Education**: In order to test the 3rd hypothesis; a one way between subjects ANOVA is conducted to know that significant difference exist between the financial literacy of investors based on their Education. Table 4 in Appendix show that there was a significant effect of education on financial literacy at the $p= (.016)$ for the three condition $F (3,226)=3.523 P=.016$. This means that there is difference in the financial literacy and the education of the respondents. The respondents having post graduate degree and professional degree are more financially literate than others. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected.

- **Financial Literacy and Marital Status**: In order to test the 4th hypothesis; a t test of association is used to know the significant difference exist between the financial literacy and the marital status. Table 4(appendix) reveals that Married participants has mean financial literacy of $(M=14.45, \text{SD}=2.39)$ and unmarried participants has mean financial literacy of $(M=13.47, \text{SD}=2.45)$, $t (228) = -.2.47, p<.05(.007)$. It indicates that married people are more financially literate than unmarried as married people have more responsibilities than unmarried. Therefore, it concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between financial literacy and marital status. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected.

- **Financial Literacy and Occupation**: In order to test the 4th hypothesis; A one way analysis of variance is calculated to know that if significant difference exist between the financial literacy of investors respondents based on their occupation. Table 5 in appendix reveals that the result of analysis was significant at $F (2.24) P=. 0.051.$). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected .Banking people deal more with numbers and money and their understanding of finance is high and people in business deal daily with financial matters themselves and their own money is at stake, so they are likely to be more aware of financial product and services.

- **Financial Literacy and Family Income**: In order to test the 5th hypothesis; A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is calculated to know the significant difference exist between financial literacy of investors based on their annual family income. Table 6 shows that the financial literacy and the family income is not statistically significant at $(F = .783 P=.504.)$ Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and income does not play any role in financial literacy.

- **Sources of Advice/Information**: Respondents were analyzed based on the sources of information at the work place. Overall, consumers who make use of financial information use a wide range of sources. However, use of informal channels--like friends and family was more likely to be in lowest financial literacy levels. Graph 4 & 5 in appendix depicts that; 45.2% of respondents consulted friend and family for advice out of these respondent (104) 62.70% of respondents in high financial literacy category do not consult friends and family. 27.8% of total respondents consulted accountant and 21.7% consulted financial advisor. 78.3% of total respondents had not utilized the services of financial advisor because of lack of awareness regarding availability of such facility. 82.9% of those not utilized the services of financial advisor were in low in financial literacy category. Only 21.7% of total respondents consulted financial advisor and 45.2% of total respondents consulted friends and family to make their financial decision more effective both in terms of risk and returns. The findings support the
results of van Rooij et al., (2007), who found that households with high financial literacy levels are most likely to use financial experts as opposed to financial magazines or internet to assist with their decision making.

Research Limitations/Implications
Further research is needed to verify in specific and practical terms, the level and impact of financial literacy on financial behavior.

Practical Implications
Policy makers should collaborate with financial institutions and educational institutions to impart financial literacy skills like importance of budgeting, investing, financial planning and awareness about financial products so that individuals can meet their financial needs and can make responsible decisions.

Conclusion
It was found that the majority of respondents display basic financial knowledge which is around 60% according to our sample of study and have some grasp of concepts such as interest compounding, inflation, and the time value of money. However, very few go beyond these basic concepts; many respondents do not know the difference between bonds and stocks, the relationship between bond prices and interest rates, but advance financial literacy relating to knowledge of stocks, bonds and diversification needs to be improved. As the sample of study is urban educated people, that is why basic knowledge is there in most of the respondents, but for investment purposes advance knowledge is required, which is at nascent stage. As Personal finance plays an important role in enhancing the quality of life, therefore, the policy makers must take effective measures to improve people knowledge. An educated investor is a protected investor. Our findings also illustrate that demographic variables like gender, age, education, marital status have significant effect on financial literacy. Male were observed to exhibit more financial literacy than females. This was consistent with the findings of earlier studies.

Past studies have demonstrated that there is a significant association between age and financial literacy. The findings of this study contradicted with prior researchers. It was observed that financial literacy was highest among the young, and declined among the older respondents. This implies that financial literacy does not have a linear relationship with age. Previous studies have also demonstrated that individuals with higher levels of education were more financially literate as compared to those with lower levels of education. It was observed that there was a significant relationship between educational attainment and financial literacy. This study also analyzed the influence of socio-economic variables on financial literacy. The variable analyzed were income, occupation and sources of financial information at the work place. Further a high proportion of the respondents who were financially literate consulted financial experts or relied on membership to professional bodies and associations in obtaining financial information than friends and family. Analyses of the findings also revealed. There was significant association observed in this study between occupation status and levels of financial literacy among the respondents who took part in the survey. There is a need for increasing the awareness among masses about financial literacy as it is an important element to make sound financial decisions and to avoid excessive debt. Financial education can also play a critical role by equipping consumers with the knowledge required to choose from a myriad of financial products and providers. Reserve Bank of India, SEBI and other financial institutions have started imparting investor education to increase financial inclusion and to promote sound decision making and financial responsibility.
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Appendix

Graph 1: Basic Financial Literacy (% Age of Respondent)
Graph 2: Advance Financial Literacy (% Age of Respondent)

Graph 3: Gender and Financial Literacy Category

Table 1: T-test Results Comparing Males and Females on Knowledge of Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>13.9655</td>
<td>2.39911</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.2941</td>
<td>2.47282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA of Age and Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.3235</td>
<td>2.54770</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.8810</td>
<td>2.40124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.6000</td>
<td>2.50559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.8800</td>
<td>2.13465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.8000</td>
<td>2.09762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE p<.05, 5% Significance

Table 3: One Way ANOVA Comparing Education on Knowledge of Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14.3214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.5758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Graduate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.9600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13.7174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE p<.05

Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and higher education does have its effect on financial literacy of the persons.
### Table 4: T-test Results Comparing Marital Status on Knowledge of Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-2.740</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un Married</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-2.703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: ANOVA Results Comparing Effect of Occupation on Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: ANNOVA Results Comparing Income on Knowledge of Financial Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2L</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.5667</td>
<td>2.49994</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.504(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5L</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.0833</td>
<td>2.45953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10L</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.5455</td>
<td>2.42520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 L</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.5370</td>
<td>2.38480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13.7174</td>
<td>2.44291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4**

- Consulting friends & Family
  - Low: 42.99%
  - Avg: 54.96%
  - High: 62.70%
  - No: 57.10%
  - Yes: 45.10%
  - NA: 37.30%

**Graph 5**

- Consulting financial advisor
  - Low: 17.69%
  - Avg: 27.60%
  - High: 26.56%
  - No: 17.00%
  - Yes: 22.20%
  - NA: 29.55%