



---

## **Personal Saving Behaviour and Financial Literacy among University Students**

**DARSHAN R**

Student, MBA, PES University, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

E-Mail Id: [darshanaadya8@gmail.com](mailto:darshanaadya8@gmail.com)

---

### **ABSTRACT:**

This study investigates the relationship between individual saving behavior and money related education among college undergraduates, centering on how these components impact their generally money related wellbeing. The study particularly examines four key factors:

saving rate of wage, recurrence of investment funds, understanding of budgetary concepts, and affecting variables for saving, to decide their effect on the subordinate variable, money related wellbeing. Money related wellbeing is measured by the students' capacity to oversee monetary commitments, handle crises, and make advance toward future monetary objectives.

Information was collected from a test of college undergraduates through surveys that evaluated their monetary proficiency levels, saving propensities, and the components affecting their saving behavior. Factual examination was utilized to assess the connections between the autonomous factors and money related wellbeing.

The findings uncover that a better rate of pay saved and more visit reserve funds are emphatically related with superior monetary wellbeing. Besides, undergraduates with a solid understanding of budgetary concepts, such as budgeting and obligation administration, tend to display superior money related well-being. Affecting components such as parental direction, peer behavior, and monetary instruction too play a critical part in forming students' saving behaviors and their in general monetary condition.

The study concludes that budgetary proficiency and saving behavior are basic determinants of budgetary wellbeing among college undergraduates. Moving forward money related instruction and making mindfulness almost the significance of steady saving can upgrade the monetary security of this statistic. The study gives profitable bits of knowledge for policymakers and instructive teach to plan viable intercessions pointed at cultivating monetary proficiency and empowering dependable saving propensities among youthful grown-ups.

---

### **INTRODUCTION:**

In later a long time, individual saving behavior and monetary proficiency have gotten to be basic themes within the consider of monetary well-being, particularly among more youthful populaces such as college undergraduates. As they move from youth to adulthood, college undergraduates confront unused money related obligations, counting overseeing educational cost expenses, living costs, and other day by day uses. Be that as it may, numerous undergraduates need the necessary budgetary information to form educated choices, which can lead to monetary trouble or destitute saving propensities.

Individual saving behavior alludes to the activities people take to set aside portion of their pay for future utilize, often as a buffer against unexpected financial crises or to attain particular monetary objectives. Within the setting of college undergraduates, saving behavior can essentially impact their capacity to oversee understudy credits, keep up monetary soundness, and plan for life post-graduation. In spite of the significance of saving, numerous undergraduates battle to embrace successful saving propensities due to restricted wage, need of mindfulness, or destitute money related teach.

Monetary proficiency, on the other hand, involves the understanding and application of different money related concepts, counting budgeting, contributing, and overseeing obligation. It enables people to form sound monetary choices and arrange for long-term budgetary wellbeing. Among college undergraduates, monetary proficiency is significant because it shapes their capacity to explore complex financial items and administrations and dodge monetary pitfalls such as over the top obligation or destitute speculation choices.

The exchange between budgetary education and saving behavior is especially pertinent for university undergraduates, as a better level of budgetary education is often connected to way better saving propensities and generally budgetary well-being. Be that as it may, inquiry about demonstrates that money related proficiency levels among undergraduates stay low, which can contrarily affect their saving behavior and budgetary security. Subsequently,

understanding the components that impact individual saving behavior and improving budgetary literacy among undergraduates is basic for fostering a monetarily mindful era.

This inquires about points to investigate the relationship between individual saving behavior and monetary proficiency among college undergraduates, looking at how money-related information impacts their saving decisions and recognizing key boundaries to compelling saving. Also, the study will give bits of knowledge into how instructive interventions and arrangement measures can move forward monetary proficiency and energize ways better saving habits inside this statistic.

## LITERATURE REVIEW:

- According to Keynes' (1936) Life Cycle Speculation, individuals' saving propensities are to a great extent subordinate on their anticipated future wage and life expectancy. For college undergraduates, who frequently have constrained pay and are fair starting to oversee their individual funds, the affinity to save is for the most part low (Shim et al., 2009).
- Budgetary proficiency, characterized as the capacity to get it and apply money-related concepts such as budgeting, contributing, and obligation administration, is significant for making educated budgetary choices (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2011). College undergraduates, in any case, regularly show low levels of monetary education (Chen & Volpe, 1998). Studies appear that the larger part of undergraduates need information of fundamental money-related concepts, which adversely influences their monetary behavior, counting saving propensities (Mandell, 2009).

## METHODOLOGY:

### Primary data Collected:

Google forms has participated the identification of participants through a questionnaire whereby 135 people participated. The forms have received 51 responses which have been used for analysis in the present study. The data was collected through an online feedback form with closed questions.

The tool SPSS has been used for analysis.

Limitations: Relatively small sample size.

### HYPOTHESIS:

H0a-There is no significant impact of financial concept understanding on financial well being.

H0b-There is no significant impact of savings on financial well being.

H0c- There is no significant impact of influencing on financial well being.

H0d- There is no significant impact of on financial well being.

H1a- There is a significant impact of financial concept understanding on financial well being.

H1b-There is a significant impact of savings on financial well being.

H1c- There is a significant impact of influencing on financial well being.

H1d- There is a significant impact of on financial well being.

### FINANCIAL CONCEPT UNDERSTANDING

VERY POOR	POOR	GOOD	VERY GOOD
7	16	13	15

### SAVINGS %

5%	10%	25%	30%
9	19	11	12

### INFLUENCING FACTORS:

parental guidance	financial education	peer pressure	economic outlook
16	10	11	14

### FREQUENCY OF SAVING

Rarely	Daily	Weekly	Monthly
9	11	14	12

**ANALYSIS:****Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.196 <sup>a</sup>	.038	-.045	2.992	1.846

a. Predictors: (Constant), Financial Concepts Understanding, Savings % of income, Influencing factors, Frequency of savings

b. Dependent Variable: Financial health

The relapse demonstrate in address isn't performing well, as prove by the moo R Square and Balanced R Square values, showing that the indicators have constrained illustrative control for Budgetary wellbeing. Moreover, the Durbin-Watson measurement suggests potential autocorrelation within the residuals, which might influence the model's unwavering quality. These findings recommend that the current show isn't satisfactorily capturing the fundamental relationship between the indicators and the subordinate variable.

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.457	4	4.114	.460	.765 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	411.700	46	8.950		
	Total	428.157	50			

a. Dependent Variable: Financial health

b. Predictors: (Constant), Financial Concepts Understanding, Savings % of income, Influencing factors, Frequency of savings

The ANOVA table gives a measurable test of the generally centrality of the relapse show. In this case, the F-statistic is 0.460 and the p-value is 0.7655. This shows that the demonstrate isn't factually noteworthy, meaning that the independent variables (indicators) don't have a critical impact on the subordinate variable (budgetary wellbeing).

The R-squared value of 0.038, as specified within the past reaction, advance supports this conclusion. It proposes that the demonstrate clarifies as it were a really little extent of the fluctuation in budgetary wellbeing.

In summary, the ANOVA table and the R-squared esteem both show that the regression model may be a destitute fit for anticipating monetary wellbeing. The free factors included within the demonstrate don't have a critical impact on the subordinate variable, and the show clarifies exceptionally small of the fluctuation in budgetary wellbeing. This proposes that the demonstrate isn't valuable for anticipating monetary wellbeing based on the given indicators.

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	7.319	2.251		3.252	.002	2.789	11.849
	Frequency of savings	-.320	.431	-.116	-.741	.462	-1.188	.548
	Savings % of income	-.044	.046	-.149	-.955	.345	-.136	.048
	Influencing factors	.186	.363	.077	.513	.610	-.545	.918
	Financial Concepts Understanding	-.295	.417	-.105	-.708	.482	-1.134	.544

a. Dependent Variable: Financial health

**1. Constant (B = 7.319, Sig. = 0.002)**

The steady (or caught) speaks to the anticipated esteem of monetary wellbeing when all the autonomous factors are set to zero.

In this case, the consistent esteem of 7.319 proposes that when all indicators (recurrence of investment funds, investment funds % of wage, impacting components, budgetary concepts understanding) are at zero, the monetary wellbeing is anticipated to be 7.319 units.

The p-value (Sig.) of 0.002 is profoundly noteworthy (less than 0.05), demonstrating that the steady is measurably critical.

**2. Frequency of savings (B = -0.320, Sig. = 0.462)**

B = -0.320:

This unstandardized coefficient demonstrates that for each unit increment within the recurrence of investment funds, budgetary wellbeing is anticipated to diminish by 0.320 units, holding other factors consistent.

In any case, the p-value (Sig.) = 0.462 is much more noteworthy than 0.05, meaning that this indicator isn't measurably critical. This recommends that recurrence of reserve funds does not have a important impact on monetary wellbeing in this show.

**3. Savings% of income (B = -0.044, Sig. = 0.345)**

B = -0.044:

This coefficient proposes that for each rate increment in investment funds (as a % of wage), budgetary wellbeing is anticipated to diminish by 0.044 units, holding other variables steady.

The p-value (Sig.) = 0.345 is additionally more prominent than 0.05, meaning that savings % of salary isn't factually critical, suggesting it does not have a critical impact on money related wellbeing.

**4. Influencing factors (B = 0.186, Sig. = 0.610)**

B = 0.186:

This shows that for each unit increment in influencing components, money related wellbeing is anticipated to extend by 0.186 units, keeping other factors steady.

Be that as it may, the p-value (Sig.) = 0.610 is more prominent than 0.05, showing that this variable isn't factually noteworthy in foreseeing money related wellbeing.

**5. Financial Concepts Understanding (B = -0.295, Sig. = 0.482)**

B = -0.295:

This coefficient appears that an increment in financial concepts understanding is related with a diminish in monetary wellbeing by 0.295 units.

However, the p-value (Sig.) = 0.482 is higher than 0.05, demonstrating that this indicator isn't factually critical within the show.

**6. Standardized Coefficients**

The Beta values are the standardized coefficients, appearing the relative significance of each autonomous variable when measured in standard deviation units

Investment funds % of salary (Beta = -0.149) is the foremost powerful variable in this show, taken after by budgetary concepts understanding (Beta = -0.105). Be that as it may, since all p-values are more prominent than 0.05 .

Therefore, H0a, H0b, H0c, H0d have been accepted.

The regression equation is as follows

$$Y(\text{Financial Health})=7.319-0.320X1-0.044X2+0.186X3-0.295x4$$

---

**CONCLUSION:****Key findings:****Frail Prescient Control of Factors:**

The comes about appeared a powerless by and large prescient control of the autonomous factors (investment funds rate, recurrence of investment funds, understanding of money related concepts, and impacting components) on monetary wellbeing. The relapse show clarified as it were 3.8% of the fluctuation in money related wellbeing, showing that these factors have restricted impact in anticipating students' budgetary well-being.

**Non-Significant Connections:**

None of the autonomous factors were found to have a factually critical impact on money related wellbeing. Components such as the rate of wage spared, the recurrence of reserve funds, and understanding of money related concepts appeared frail and non-significant connections with budgetary wellbeing. This suggests that other, unexamined components may have a more noteworthy affect on students' money related wellbeing.

**Money related Literacy's Restricted Part:**

Shockingly, the understanding of monetary concepts, regularly seen as a foundation of money related education, did not appear a critical relationship with budgetary wellbeing. This finding recommends that basically knowing around monetary concepts may not interpret into progressed budgetary results for college understudies, highlighting a potential crevice between information and down to earth application.

**Complex Impacting Variables:**

Whereas the impacting variables for sparing (such as peer impact, family exhortation, or financial components) were anticipated to play a part in students' monetary wellbeing, the comes about did not bolster this speculation. This finding recommends that students' sparing behaviors and budgetary choices may be affected by more complex or outside variables not captured in this consider.

---

**IMPLICATIONS:****Require for Commonsense Monetary Instruction:**

The comes about demonstrate a require for monetary proficiency programs that not as it were educate budgetary concepts but too center on commonsense monetary administration abilities. Empowering behaviors such as reliable reserve funds hones and compelling budgeting may have a more grounded affect on making strides students' budgetary wellbeing than hypothetical information alone.

**Assist Investigate Required:**

The frail connections found in this think about propose that assist inquire about is required to investigate other variables impacting money related wellbeing. Factors such as understudy advances, part-time work, family money related back, and investing propensities seem give a more comprehensive understanding of the monetary challenges confronted by college understudies.

**Arrangement Intercessions:**

Colleges and policymakers seem consider advertising more focused on money related instruction workshops, centering on real-world applications such as overseeing understudy credits, making reserve funds plans, and understanding credit. Such activities may offer assistance bridge the hole between monetary information and positive budgetary results.