

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Investor Behaviour and Stock Market Perception in India: A Focus on Bhubaneswar City

Dr. Bishwajit Rout¹, Mr. Bharata Bhusan Sahoo²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Model Degree College, Boudh, Sarasara, Boudh, Odisha-762026, India, e-mail-<u>mail4bishwa@gmail.com</u> ²Doctoral Research Scholar, P.G Department of Commerce, Fakir Mohan University, Vyasa Vihar, Balasore, Odisha, India, e-mail-<u>bharatabhusan@gmail.com</u>

ABSTRACT

The stock market plays a crucial role in the economic development of a country by facilitating investment and capital formation (World Federation of Exchanges, 2025). However, investors' perception towards stock market investment is influenced by a variety of factors, including economic, psychological, and sociodemographic aspects (Rajagopalan & Gurusamy, 2015). This study aims to analyse the key factors affecting investors' perception towards investment in the stock market, with a specific focus on investors in Bhubaneswar City, India. The primary objective is to identify key determinants affecting investment decisions and analyse their correlation with demographic variables such as gender, age, education, and income. Data were collected from 160 investors of the National Stock Exchange through a structured questionnaire employing a five-point Likert scale across 25 variables. Factor analysis revealed seven core factors influencing investment decisions: fundamental, internal & regulatory, economic & informational, strength & affordability, individual benefit, goodwill, and external factors.

The results of this research provide valuable insights for policymakers, financial advisors, and market regulators to enhance investor education programs and formulate strategies to boost retail investor participation in the stock market. Strengthening investor awareness, ensuring transparent regulatory frameworks, and addressing behavioural biases can contribute to a more vibrant and inclusive investment environment.

Keywords: Investor perception, stock market, investment behaviour, retail investor.

Introduction:

Investment in stocks is characterized by a high rate of return in the long term with high (Martin and Wagner, 2019). The stock market is one of a wellknown and preferable investment platform because of impressive returns, diversification benefits and the fact that it is a safe place to invest for the long term (Abbes and Trichilli, 2015; Arouri et al., 2015; Guidi and Ugur, 2014; Lodhi, 2014; O'Hagan-Luff and Berrill, 2019; Rosenberg, 2022). It has been stated that saving and investing is the only way to attain financial security (U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2011).

Though investment in the stock market seems lucrative, what influences investors' decisions in choosing a particular stock remains debatable. According to (Jabbarova, 2016), predicting investors' decision-making based on classical probability theory is no longer promising nowadays. Several other issues have also been highlighted that make this paper relevant. Thus, behavioural finance researchers have become increasingly interested in investigating the factors influencing stock investment decisions (Aspara, 2013). The literature shows that investors tend to choose a particular stock because of various factors, such as a company's stock price, credit rating, market sentiment, dividend policy and corporate earnings (Ding et al., 2019; Tomola, 2013; Xie et al., 2019).

Over the past two decades, India's stock market has undergone significant transformation, driven by technological advancements, regulatory reforms, and increased participation from domestic and foreign investors. However, despite this growth, investor participation in the stock market remains relatively low in several parts of India, especially in Tier-2 and Tier-3 cities. Understanding investor behaviour and perception in these regions is crucial for designing policies that promote financial inclusion and market participation. This research focuses on Bhubaneswar, the capital city of Odisha, to explore the underlying behavioural patterns and perceptions that influence investment decisions in the stock market.

Investor behaviour is an area within behavioural finance that seeks to understand how psychological influences and cognitive biases affect the investment decisions of individuals (Ricciardi & Simon, 2000). Traditional financial theories, such as the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), assume that investors are rational and markets are efficient. However, empirical evidence suggests that investors often deviate from rational decision-making due to factors such as overconfidence, herd behaviour, loss aversion, and mental accounting (Barberis & Thaler, 2003). These behavioural biases can lead to suboptimal investment choices and market anomalies. In the context of a growing economy like India, where financial literacy levels vary significantly across regions, understanding these behavioural aspects becomes even more pertinent.

Bhubaneswar, with its growing urban population, rising income levels, and increasing access to digital infrastructure, represents a fertile ground for financial growth and investment. Yet, anecdotal evidence suggests that residents of Bhubaneswar may still perceive the stock market as risky, speculative, and largely inaccessible. Cultural attitudes toward savings, risk aversion, limited financial literacy, and trust issues with market intermediaries may contribute to this cautious outlook (Kumar & Goyal, 2015). Furthermore, the role of local financial advisors, peer influence, media exposure, and recent market events could also shape perceptions and behaviours uniquely in this city.

This study aims to investigate the behavioural patterns of investors in Bhubaneswar and assess their perception of the stock market. It seeks to identify key motivators and barriers to investment, understand the role of demographic and socio-economic factors, and evaluate the extent to which behavioural biases influence decision-making. The research will utilize a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews, to provide a holistic understanding of investor psychology in this region. The significance of this research lies in its potential to inform policy-making, financial education initiatives, and investment advisory services tailored to regional needs. By focusing on Bhubaneswar, the study fills a critical gap in literature, as most existing studies tend to concentrate on national-level trends or data from metropolitan areas. It also contributes to the broader discourse on behavioural finance in emerging markets, where contextual factors such as culture, tradition, and socio-economic diversity play a substantial role in shaping financial behaviour (Pompian, 2012).

India moves toward greater financial inclusion and economic development, understanding regional investor behaviour becomes imperative. By examining the perceptions and attitudes of investors in Bhubaneswar, this study hopes to uncover insights that can help bridge the gap between potential and actual participation in the stock market, ultimately contributing to a more robust and inclusive financial ecosystem.

Literature Survey:

Investor behaviour and stock market perception have garnered significant attention in financial research, particularly in emerging economies like India. Individual investor decisions are often influenced by psychological biases, socio-economic factors, and access to market information (Barberis & Thaler, 2003). Studies indicate that Indian investors demonstrate a preference for short-term gains and are highly influenced by market trends, media, and peer recommendations (Bakar & Yi, 2016). Urban centers, such as Bhubaneswar, exhibit unique investor profiles shaped by regional economic growth, financial literacy, and accessibility to investment avenues (Raghunathan & Reddy, 2020). Moreover, behavioural finance theories suggest that cognitive biases like overconfidence, herding, and risk aversion significantly impact investment choices (Kumar & Goyal, 2015). Understanding local investor psychology in cities like Bhubaneswar is crucial for developing inclusive financial policies and promoting informed investment practices.

(Kahneman & Tversky, 1972) found that there is a lack of reconciliation between the normative and the descriptive theory of choices. Normative analysis which is used to predict and explain actual behavior is supported by three statements. Firstly, people are effective in pursuing their goals. Secondly, competition favors rational individuals and organizations. Finally, an intuitive appeal of the axioms of rational choice makes it plausible that the theory derived from these axioms support the acceptable account of choice behavior. (Rajarajan, 2000) revealed that there is an association between the lifestyle clusters investment and related characteristics. (Szyszka, 2011) in his study on efficient market hypothesis to behavioral finance analyzed how investor's psychology changes the vision of financial markets. He found that investors are not always able to correctly value the utility of decision alternatives, cannot update and estimate probability and events and do not diversify properly. Recent research shows a persistent effect of investor psychology on trading and risk-taking behavior (Barber & Odean, 2001).

According to (Shleifer, 2000), market information has a significant impact on the stock market and, hence, on individual investors' investment behavior. (Waweru *et al.*,2008) showed that, to some extent, investors' investment behavior is affected by the changes in the price of stocks. Stocks that have had a significant price movement for two years in row attract investors who choose to purchase rather than sell (Odean, 1999).

Motivated by them, researchers nowadays are trying to explore how investors' biases affect the efficiency of capital markets. Studies conducted by (Hilbert, 2012) and (Chaudhary, 2013) supported the effect of behavioral factors on investing outcomes such as greed, fear, cognitive dissonance, mental accounting, heuristics and anchoring of investors' thinking. (Hilbert, 2012) showed how behavioral bias such as herding, overconfidence and reinforcement bias influence individual investors more as compared to their institutional counterparts, whereas (Chaudhary, 2013) discovered that behavioral finance explains investors' irrational financial decisions and anchoring, overconfidence, herd behavior, over and underreaction, and loss aversions lead to irrational financial decisions. Different financial traits and biases such as loss aversion, hindsight bias, anchoring, endowment effect, disposition effect and mental accounting help individual investors in making sound financial decisions. Furthermore, according to (Caparrelli et al., 2004), the herding effect impacts stockholders, causing them to move in unison with the rest of the herd if there are changes.

Investors, according to (Barber and Odean, 2000), sometimes place too much confidence in their previous gains and investment skills, leading them to overestimate their knowledge while underestimating risks. Overconfidence in predicting stock prices along with unnecessary transactions can ultimately lead to poor investment choices (Barber and Odean, 2000). However, some studies did not find any significant impact of overconfidence bias on the investment decision. This suggests that overconfidence is not common among individual investors around the world.

Research Gap:

1. Most studies focus on metro cities, neglecting Bhubaneswar, a growing tier-2 city with distinct investor traits shaped by its unique socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. 2. Existing research lacks emphasis on localized investor perceptions, overlooking how regional economic conditions and cultural influences affect investment behaviour in cities like Bhubaneswar.

Objectives:

- 1. To identify key psychological, informational, and demographic factors influencing investor behaviour and stock market perception in Bhubaneswar City.
- 2. To examine how demographic characteristics affect individual investment decisions and stock market perception among investors in Bhubaneswar City.

Methodology:

This study employs a quantitative research approach to explore investor behaviour and stock market perception in Bhubaneswar City. Primary data was collected using a structured, close-ended questionnaire, designed on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The questionnaire consisted of two sections: the first capturing demographic information (such as age, gender, education, income, and occupation), and the second focusing on variables related to investment behaviour and stock market perception.

The study adopts a non-probability convenience sampling method to select 150 individual investors residing in Bhubaneswar. Respondents were chosen based on their active involvement in the National Stock Exchange (NSE) through online platforms, financial institutions, or self-managed portfolios.

Collected data was analyzed using statistical tools such as factor analysis, t-tests, and ANOVA to identify significant behavioural patterns and the influence of demographic variables. While convenience sampling may limit broader generalizability, it provides valuable insights for exploratory research within a specific urban context like Bhubaneswar.

Demographic profile of the investors has been provided in table 1.

Table 1: Respondent's Profile

Classes	Frequency	Percentage
Male	126	78.8
Female	34	21.2
Below 25 years	20	12.5
25 to 40 years	42	26.25
41 to 55 years	58	36.25
Above 55 years	40	25.0
10 th	2	1.2
10+2	11	6.9
Graduation	101	63.1
Post Graduation	46	28.8
Student	17	10.6
Service	68	42.5
Business	37	23.1
Others	38	23.8
Below 10000	22	13.75
10000 to 25000	32	20.0
25000 to 50000	62	38.75
Above 50000	44	27.5
	Classes Male Female Below 25 years 25 to 40 years 41 to 55 years Above 55 years 10 th 10+2 Graduation Post Graduation Student Service Business Others Below 10000 10000 to 25000 25000 to 50000	Classes Frequency Male 126 Female 34 Below 25 years 20 25 to 40 years 42 41 to 55 years 58 Above 55 years 40 10 th 2 10+2 11 Graduation 101 Post Graduation 46 Student 17 Service 68 Business 37 Others 38 Below 10000 22 10000 to 25000 32 25000 to 50000 44

Factor analysis has been applied to identify underlying latent factors while ANOVA and Independent Sample t-test have been employed to analyze differences in preferences in terms of demographic factors of investors. SPSS has been used for these analyses.

Hypothesis:

According to the demographic variables, the hypotheses have been developed and tested in this study. In case of "Gender" there are only two groups where an Independent Sample T-test is justified. In case of "Age Group", "Occupation Group", "Education Group" & "Income Group" there are four groups in each and an ANOVA test is justified there. The null hypotheses are,

H1: There is no significant association between the gender of the investor & their investment perception.

H2: There is no significant association between the age of the investor & their investment perception.

H3: There is no significant association between the educational level of the investor & their investment perception.

H4: There is no significant difference between the occupation of the investor & their investment perception.

Data Analysis:

In this study, to reduce primarily identified 25 variables into lower number of manageable variables (principle factors), factors analysis technique has been used.

Results of Factor Analysis:

Table 2 presents the analysis results, showing a chi-square statistic of 1409.282 with 300 degrees of freedom at a 0.000 significance level. The KMO value is 0.721, which is acceptable (p > 0.5). These results indicate the data is suitable for factor analysis and support further investigation using the principal components analysis method.

Table: 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.721
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1409.282
	Df	300
	Sig.	.000

Only factors with eigenvalues above 1.0 are kept, while others are excluded, based on factor analysis results. Eigenvalues reflect the variance each factor explains. It is advised to retain factors that together explain at least 60% of the total variance to ensure a meaningful and reliable representation of the underlying data structure.

Table 3: Factor Analysis

	Factor Loading	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cumulative %
Factor 1 (Fundamental)		5.076	20.306	20.306
Earnings per share	.743			
Price earnings ratio	.747			
Market price movement	.765			
Factor 2 (Internal & Regulatory)		2.882	11.527	31.832
Net assets value	.746			
Net profit after tax	.680			
Dividend pays out ratio	.741			
Security exchange commission regulations	.410			

Factor3 (Economical & Informational)		2.234	8.938	40.770
Friends, family & peers	.577			
Brokers recommendation	.399			
Market statistics	.447			
Inflation	.484			
Decline in bank & government interest rate	.739			
Information technology				
	.452			
Factor 4 (Strength & Affordability)				
Marketability				
.453		1.7757.10147.87		
Liquidity position	.849	1		
Debt asset ratio	.746			
Company turnover	.640			
Factor 5 (Individual Benefit)				
Dividend				
.763		1.5946.37554.24 7		
Dividend payment pattern	.491			
Bonus shares	.811			
Factor 6 (Goodwill)				
Image or reputation of company				
.682		1.3065.22659.47 3		
Current ownership	.617			
Board of directors	.755			
Factor 7 (External)		1.0984.39163.86 3		
Political instability				
.798				
Market rumor	.652			

As shown in Table 3, Factor 1 is labeled as the *Fundamental Factor*, comprising variables V4 (Earnings per Share), V6 (Price-Earnings Ratio), and V8 (Market Price Movement). This factor explains 20.306% of the total variance. Factor 2, termed the *Internal and Regulatory Factor*, includes V5 (Net Asset Value), V7 (Net Profit After Tax), V9 (Dividend Payout Ratio), and V17 (Securities Exchange Commission Regulations), contributing 11.527% to the total variance. Factor 3, identified as the *Economic and Informational Factor*, explains 8.938% of the variance and consists of V1 (Friends, Family & Peers), V2 (Broker Recommendations), V3 (Market Statistics), V18 (Inflation), V19 (Decline in Bank & Government Interest Rates), and V23 (Information Technology). The fourth factor, labeled *Strength and Affordability*, comprises V10 (Marketability), V11 (Liquidity Position), V12 (Debt-Asset Ratio), and V13 (Company Turnover), and accounts for 7.101% of the total variance. Factor 5 is titled *Individual Benefit Factor*, includes V20 (Company Reputation), V21 (Current Ownership), and V22 (Board of Directors), explaining 5.226% of the variance. Finally, Factor 7 is referred to as the *External Factor*, consisting of V24 (Political Instability) and V25 (Market Rumors), and contributes 4.391% to the total variance. Collectively, these seven factors explain a cumulative total of 63.863% of the variance in the dataset.

The Independent Samples t-Test for Gender:

The Independent Samples t-test has been used to see whether there is any significant association between the gender of the investor & their investment perception.

Table 4: Interdependent Sample t-test

	Mean	Value	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances t-test for		Equality of Means		
	Male	Female	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
v1: Friends, family & peers	4.44	4.71	6.600	.011	-2.112	158	.038
v2: Brokers recommendation	4.22	4.21	.891	.347	.092	158	.927
v3: Market statistics	4.10	4.12	.783	.378	093	158	.926
v4: Earnings per share	3.99	4.06	2.038	.155	416	158	.678
v5: Net assets value	3.49	3.44	.005	.941	.270	158	.787
v6: Price earnings ratio	3.93	3.62	.618	.433	1.719	158	.088
v7: Net profit after tax	3.78	3.71	.003	.954	.386	158	.700
v8: Market price movement	4.09	4.21	2.449	.120	717	158	.474
v9: Dividend payout ratio	3.27	3.35	.009	.925	396	158	.693
v10: Marketability	4.28	4.21	.035	.852	.397	158	.692
v11: Liquidity position	3.80	3.62	.269	.605	.970	158	.333
v12: Debt asset ratio	3.59	3.29	.201	.655	1.580	158	.116
v13: Company turnover	3.73	3.82	.727	.395	500	158	.618
v14: Dividend	4.07	4.09	1.658	.200	095	158	.924
v15: Dividend payment pattern	4.20	4.12	.281	.597	.543	158	.588
v16: Bonus shares	4.18	4.00	.783	.378	1.063	158	.292
v17: SEC regulations	4.16	4.06	.563	.454	.513	158	.609
v18: Inflation	3.25	3.62	.796	.374	-1.399	158	.164
v19: Decline in bank interest rate	4.31	4.26	.603	.438	.252	158	.801
v20: Image or reputation	4.02	3.79	1.754	.187	1.212	158	.227
v21: Current ownership	3.17	3.12	.384	.537	.215	158	.830
v22: Board of directors	3.34	3.18	.569	.452	.745	158	.458
v23; Information technology	4.16	4.12	.371	.543	.232	158	.817
v24: Political instability	3.93	3.91	.037	.847	.094	158	.925
v25: Market rumor	3.78	3.85	.372	.543	309	158	.758

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for the two groups based on the grouping variable, along with the inferential statistics output. The analysis assumes that gender does not influence investor preferences when making investment decisions. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, it suggests no statistically significant difference, supporting the assumption. Conversely, a p-value less than 0.05 indicates a significant difference, meaning gender does influence preferences. According to Table 4, for 24 out of the 25 variables, Levene's test for equality of variances shows a p-value greater than 0.05, which confirms the assumption of equal variances. This suggests that gender does not significantly affect preferences for these variables. Additionally, the t-test for equality of means also yields p-values greater than 0.05 for these same variables, supporting the acceptance of the null hypothesis (H1). The only exception is the variable "friends, family & peers," which does show a statistically significant difference, implying gender-based variation in preference. Overall, the data indicates that male and female investors do not differ significantly in their preferences for most variables when making investment decisions, with the exception of influence from personal networks like friends, family, and peers.

ANOVA Analysis:

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been used to determine whether there are any significant differences among various age, educational, occupational and income groups concerning their preferences of variables during investment decision.

Differences among Age Groups.

Table 5: Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Age.

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	7.282	3	156	.000
v2: Brokers recommendation	.144	3	156	.933
v3: Market statistics	4.561	3	156	.004
v4: Earnings per share	3.422	3	156	.019
v5: Net assets value	.792	3	156	.500
v6: Price earnings ratio	1.499	3	156	.217
v7: Net profit after tax	1.144	3	156	.333
v8: Market price movement	.255	3	156	.858
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	2.802	3	156	.042
v10: Marketability	.954	3	156	.416
v11: Liquidity position	.566	3	156	.638
v12: Debt asset ratio	3.614	3	156	.015
v13: Company turnover	1.439	3	156	.233
v14: Dividend	.455	3	156	.714
v15: Dividend payment pattern	1.796	3	156	.150
v16: Bonus shares	.235	3	156	.872
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	.495	3	156	.686
v18: Inflation	1.138	3	156	.335
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	1.619	3	156	.187
v20: Image or reputation of company	2.416	3	156	.069
v21: Current ownership	.222	3	156	.881
v22: Board of directors	.477	3	156	.699
v23; Information technology	1.969	3	156	.121
v24: Political instability	1.614	3	156	.188
v25: Market rumor	.615	3	156	.606

Levene's Table 5 reveals that the p-value for variables V2, V5, V6, V7, V8, V10, V11, V13, V14, V15, V16, V17, V18, V19, V20, V21, V22, V23, V24, and V25 is greater than 0.05. This means equal variances are assumed, and the null hypothesis is accepted for these variables, suggesting no significant difference in investor preferences. Hence, applying ANOVA to these variables is appropriate. However, for variables V1, V3, V4, V9, and V12, the p-value is less than 0.05, indicating unequal variances. In these cases, investor perception varies significantly with age, making ANOVA unsuitable. Therefore, to ensure accurate results, a robust test for equality of means such as the Welch Test should be used instead.

Table 6: ANOVA of Age.

Between Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
v2: Brokers recommendation	3.622	3	1.207	1.452	.230
v5: Net assets value	5.578	3	1.859	2.009	.115
v6: Price earnings ratio	.832	3	.277	.309	.819
v7: Net profit after tax	1.381	3	.460	.493	.687
v8: Market price movement	2.766	3	.922	1.270	.287

v10: Marketability	.915	3	.305	.345	.793
v11: Liquidity position	1.611	3	.537	.554	.646
v13: Company turnover	.953	3	.318	.337	.799
v14: Dividend	.539	3	.180	.215	.886
v15: Dividend payment pattern	1.795	3	.598	1.015	.388
v16: Bonus shares	5.297	3	1.766	2.288	.081
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	3.851	3	1.284	1.274	.285
v18: Inflation	12.271	3	4.090	2.302	.079
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	3.896	3	1.299	1.562	.201
v20: Image or reputation of company	3.069	3	1.023	1.142	.334
v21: Current ownership	3.517	3	1.172	.848	.469
v22: Board of directors	1.568	3	.523	.395	.757
v23; Information technology	.161	3	.054	.063	.979
v24: Political instability	1.126	3	.375	.437	.727
v25: Market rumor	3.821	3	1.274	.806	.492

The ANOVA Table 6 shows that for all the variables, p > 0.05. Thus, H2 is accepted, implying that there are no significant differences in the age groups towards investment.

Table 7: Robust Tests of Equality of Means for Age

		Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	Welch	3.734	3	58.085	.016
v3: Market statistics	Welch	.185	3	60.717	.906
v4: Earnings per share	Welch	.195	3	69.924	.899
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	Welch	.233	3	63.819	.873
v12: Debt asset ratio	Welch	.352	3	62.129	.788
a. Asymptotically F distributed.	I	I	1		

The output of Welch table 7 shows that for variable V1, p<0.05, indicating a significant difference among investors across age groups regarding friends, family, and peers. However, for variables V3, V4, V9, and V12, p>0.05, suggesting no significant age-based differences among investors for those variables.

Differences among Educational Groups.

Table 8: Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Education

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	7.223	3	156	.000
v2: Brokers recommendation	2.167	3	156	.094
v3: Market statistics	3.720	3	156	.013
v4: Earnings per share	1.494	3	156	.218
v5: Net assets value	7.770	3	156	.000
v6: Price earnings ratio	.564	3	156	.640

v7: Net profit after tax	1.693	3	156	.171
v8: Market price movement	.854	3	156	.467
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	2.943	3	156	.035
v10: Marketability	8.823	3	156	.000
v11: Liquidity position	.256	3	156	.857
v12: Debt asset ratio	.449	3	156	.719
v13: Company turnover	1.272	3	156	.286
v14: Dividend	2.059	3	156	.108
v15: Dividend payment pattern	2.070	3	156	.106
v16: Bonus shares	4.681	3	156	.004
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	.606	3	156	.612
v18: Inflation	.446	3	156	.721
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	4.711	3	156	.004
v20: Image or reputation of company	6.498	3	156	.000
v21: Current ownership	3.758	3	156	.012
v22: Board of directors	1.424	3	156	.238
v23; Information technology	3.587	3	156	.015
v24: Political instability	1.894	3	156	.133
v25: Market rumor	4.098	3	156	.008

Levene's Table 8 shows that for variables V2, V4, V6, V7, V8, V11, V12, V13, V14, V15, V17, V18, V22, and V24, p > 0.05. This indicates that equal variances are assumed and the null hypothesis is accepted. However, for variables V1, V3, V5, V9, V10, V16, V19, V20, V21, V23, and V25, p < 0.05, meaning the null hypothesis is rejected and equal variances are not assumed between the investor's education and their investment perception.

Table 9: ANOVA of Education.

Between Groups			Mean Square		
	Sum of Squares	df		F	Sig.
v2: Brokers recommendation	6.738	3	2.246	2.768	.044
v4: Earnings per share	6.530	3	2.177	3.314	.022
v6: Price earnings ratio	4.878	3	1.626	1.864	.138
v7: Net profit after tax	5.043	3	1.681	1.848	.141
v8: Market price movement	3.706	3	1.235	1.716	.166
v11: Liquidity position	4.220	3	1.407	1.475	.223
v12: Debt asset ratio	8.308	3	2.769	3.095	.029
v13: Company turnover	3.781	3	1.260	1.363	.256
v14: Dividend	3.017	3	1.006	1.225	.303
v15: Dividend payment pattern	4.808	3	1.603	2.812	.041
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	5.799	3	1.933	1.943	.125
v18: Inflation	6.062	3	2.021	1.112	.346

v22: Board of directors	4.937	3	1.646	1.264	.289
v24: Political instability	3.013	3	1.004	1.186	.317

ANOVA Table 9 reveals that for variables V6, V7, V8, V11, V13, V14, V17, V18, V22, and V24, p-values are greater than 0.05. Thus, H3 is accepted, indicating no significant differences in education among the groups regarding investment. However, for variables V2, V4, V12, and V15, p-values are less than 0.05, leading to the rejection of H3. This suggests there are significant differences in education among the groups concerning investment.

Table 10: Robust Tests of Equality of Means for Education

		Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	Welch	•			•
v3: Market statistics	Welch	1.483	3	4.625	.333
v5: Net assets value	Welch	1.540	3	4.560	.322
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	Welch	•			
v10: Marketability	Welch	·			
v16: Bonus shares	Welch	•			
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	Welch	.700	3	4.654	.594
v20: Image or reputation of company	Welch	•			
v21: Current ownership	Welch	.329	3	4.801	.805
v23; Information technology	Welch	•			•
v25: Market rumor	Welch	•			•
	•				

The Welch table output shows p > .05 for variables V3, V5, V19, and V21. However, the Welch test could not be performed for V1, V9, V10, V16, V20, V23, and V25 because at least one group in each of these variables has zero variance.

Differences among Educational Groups.

Table 11: Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Occupation.

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	1.748	3	156	.159
v2: Brokers recommendation	.365	3	156	.778
v3: Market statistics	2.241	3	156	.086
v4: Earnings per share	.362	3	156	.781
v5: Net assets value	1.259	3	156	.291
v6: Price earnings ratio	.049	3	156	.985
v7: Net profit after tax	2.974	3	156	.033
v8: Market price movement	3.545	3	156	.016
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	2.553	3	156	.058
v10: Marketability	1.019	3	156	.386
v11: Liquidity position	1.127	3	156	.340
v12: Debt asset ratio	2.459	3	156	.065
v13: Company turnover	2.517	3	156	.060

v14: Dividend	.879	3	156	.454
v15: Dividend payment pattern	.483	3	156	.694
v16: Bonus shares	.039	3	156	.990
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	1.619	3	156	.187
v18: Inflation	.584	3	156	.627
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	.123	3	156	.947
v20: Image or reputation of company	1.262	3	156	.290
v21: Current ownership	.245	3	156	.865
v22: Board of directors	.688	3	156	.561
v23; Information technology	1.270	3	156	.287
v24: Political instability	1.220	3	156	.304
v25: Market rumor	3.823	3	156	.011

Levene's Table 11 indicates that for variables V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, V6, V9, V10, V11, V12, V13, V14, V15, V16, V17, V18, V19, V20, V21, V22, V23, and V24, p-values are greater than 0.05, suggesting equal variances are assumed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, and ANOVA is appropriate for these variables. However, for V7, V8, and V25, p-values are less than 0.05, meaning equal variances are not assumed between investors' occupation and their investment perceptions.

Table 12: ANOVA of Occupation.

Between Groups	Sum of Squares		Mean Square	F	Sig.
v1: Friends, family & peers	2.274 3		.758	1.059	.369
v2: Brokers recommendation	1.947	3	.649	.771	.512
v3: Market statistics	5.287	3	1.762	2.808	.041
v4: Earnings per share	1.282	3	.427	.619	.604
v5: Net assets value	4.600	3	1.533	1.646	.181
v6: Price earnings ratio	.727	3	.242	.270	.847
v9: Dividend pays out ratio	4.989	3	1.663	1.427	.237
v10: Marketability	2.748	3	.916	1.049	.373
v11: Liquidity position	3.034	3	1.011	1.052	.371
v12: Debt asset ratio	3.931	3	1.310	1.420	.239
v13: Company turnover	1.024	3	.341	.362	.780
v14: Dividend	4.751	3	1.584	1.955	.123
v15: Dividend payment pattern	3.567	3	1.189	2.057	.108
v16: Bonus shares	2.652	3	.884	1.121	.343
v17: Security exchange commission regulations	8.092	3	2.697	2.752	.045
v18: Inflation	11.351	3	3.784	2.123	.100
v19: Decline in bank & government interest rate	1.564	3	.521	.616	.606
v20: Image or reputation of company	6.093	3	2.031	2.317	.078
v21: Current ownership	2.377	3	.792	.570	.635

v22: Board of directors	7.053	3	2.351	1.825	.145
v23; Information technology	5.590	3	1.863	2.292	.080
v24: Political instability	1.622	3	.541	.632	.595

The ANOVA Table 12 indicates that for variables V1, V2, V4, V5, V6, V9, V10, V11, V12, V13, V14, V15, V16, V18, V19, V20, V21, V22, V23, and V24, p-values are greater than 0.05, suggesting no significant differences in occupation among the groups regarding investment. Hence, hypothesis H4 is accepted for these twenty-three variables. However, for variables V3 and V17, p-values are less than 0.05, indicating significant differences in education levels among the groups towards investment. Consequently, the Welch test was conducted for further analysis.

Table 13: Robust Tests of Equality of Means for Occupation.

		Statistic ^a	df1	df2	Sig.
v7: Net profit after tax	Welch	.420	3	54.088	.740
v8: Market price movement	Welch	2.108	3	58.069	.109
v25: Market rumor	Welch	1.962	3	61.545	.129
a. Asymptotically F distributed.			•		

The output from the Welch table 13 represents that for variables V7, V8 and V25 p > 0.05.

Discussion:

The analysis of the sample reveals that the majority of respondents are male, highlighting the dominance of males within this industry. According to the data collected, 78.80% of the participants are male, while females make up 21.20% of the sample. In terms of age distribution, most respondents fall within the age group of 41 to 55 years. The next significant group consists of individuals aged between 25 to 40 years, followed by those above 55 years of age. It is likely that individuals aged over 55 are either retired or rely on sources of income other than active business or service employment. Conversely, individuals engaged in services or business activities are comparatively more involved in stock market investments than those in other categories. Furthermore, they tend to possess greater years of investment experience compared to others.

Through the study, twenty-five variables were considered, from which seven core factors were extracted. The primary objective of investors remains profit maximization. To achieve this goal, they continuously monitor several critical factors, including market price movements, net asset value, reductions in bank and government interest rates, liquidity status, issuance of bonus shares, board of directors' performance, and political stability.

When examining demographic variables such as age, educational qualifications, and monthly income, the study found that these factors exhibited independence in terms of investment behavior in the equity market. Gender bias was not clearly evident from the sample, although the proportion of female investors was significantly lower. However, a significant difference was observed between genders concerning their investment perceptions when influenced by friends, family, and peer suggestions.

Similarly, the study identified a significant difference between different age groups regarding investment perception, specifically in the area of advice from friends, family, and peers. On the other hand, no significant differences were found between investors' educational levels and their investment perceptions. Likewise, the occupation of the investor did not result in any notable difference in investment perceptions. Overall, the findings suggest that while some demographic aspects influence certain areas of investment behavior, others remain independent of these factors.

Conclusion:

The capital market operates largely on the expectations of investors, which can be either rational or irrational. As human beings, investors are often influenced by both emotional behavior and rational factors like their tolerance for risk. However, when analyzing investor decisions under key assumptions such as homogeneous expectations and information efficiency, it is found that the true essence of their expectations often does not align with theoretical models. Participants in the stock market, including marketers and related individuals, frequently rely on suggestions from friends, family, and peers. These recommendations, often categorized as advice, involve guidance on buying, selling, or holding securities, as well as assessments of a stock's potential. In this context, the impact of suggestions from friends, family, and peers is observed to vary across different genders and age groups. Therefore, marketers and others involved in the equity market recognize these variations as important and should respond appropriately by paying greater attention to these influences. This study highlights the critical role of such social factors in shaping investment decisions. Furthermore, it emphasizes the importance of understanding the demographic differences among investors to better predict their behavior. By examining these aspects, the study aims to assist

policymakers and regulatory authorities by offering valuable insights into the decision-making patterns of individual investors, ultimately contributing to more informed and inclusive strategies within the capital market framework.

Reference:

Abbes, M. B., & Trichilli, Y. (2015). Islamic stock markets and potential diversification benefits. Borsa Istanbul Review, 15(2), 93-105.

Arouri, M. E. H., Lahiani, A., & Nguyen, D. K. (2015). World gold prices and stock returns in China: Insights for hedging and diversification strategies. *Economic Modelling*, 44, 273–282.

Aspara, J. (2013). The role of product and brand perceptions in stock investing: Effects on investment considerations, optimism and confidence. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, *14*(3), 195–212.

Bakar, S., & Yi, A. N. C. (2016). The impact of psychological factors on investors' decision making in Malaysian stock market: A case of Klang Valley and Pahang. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 319–328. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00040-X

Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2000). Trading is hazardous to your wealth: The common stock investment performance of individual investors. *The Journal of Finance*, 55(2), 773–806. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.0022602271190900

Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1), 261–292.

Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. In G. Constantinides, M. Harris, & R. Stulz (Eds.), Handbook of the Economics of Finance (Vol. 1, pp. 1053–1128). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6

Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. In G. Constantinides, M. Harris, & R. Stulz (Eds.), Handbook of the Economics of Finance (Vol. 1, pp. 1053–1128). Elsevier.

Caparrelli, F., D'Arcangelis, A. M., & Cassuto, A. (2004). Herding in the Italian stock market: A case of behavioral finance. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 5(4), 222–230. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427579jpfm0504_5

Chaudhary, A. K. (2013). Impact of behavioral finance in investment decisions and strategies: A fresh approach. *International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy*, 2(2), 66–83.

Ding, W., Mazouz, K., & Wang, Q. (2019). Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock returns: New theory and evidence. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 53(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11156-018-0756-z

Guidi, F., & Ugur, M. (2014). An analysis of South-Eastern European stock markets: Evidence on cointegration and portfolio diversification benefits. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 30*, 119–136.

Hilbert, M. (2012). Toward a synthesis of cognitive biases: How noisy information procession can bias human decision making. *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*(2), 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025940

Jabbarova, A. I. (2016). Solution for the investment decision making problem through interval probabilities. Procedia Computer Science, 102, 465–468.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1972). Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness. Cognitive Psychology, 3(3), 430-454.

Kumar, S., & Goyal, N. (2015). Behavioural biases in investment decision making – A systematic literature review. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 7(1), 88–108. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRFM-07-2014-0022

Lodhi, S. (2014). Factors influencing individual investor behavior: An empirical study of city Karachi. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *16*(2), 68–76.

Martin, I. W., & Wagner, C. (2019). What is the expected return on a stock? The Journal of Finance, 74(4), 1887–1929.

Odean, T. (1999). Do investors trade too much? American Economic Review, 89(5), 1279–1298. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.89.5.1279

Pompian, M. M. (2012). Behavioral finance and investor types: Managing behavior to make better investment decisions. John Wiley & Sons.

Raghunathan, V., & Reddy, M. S. (2020). Financial literacy and investment behaviour: A study of investors in Bhubaneswar. *Indian Journal of Finance and Banking*, 4(1), 24–35.

Rajarajan, V. (2000). Investors lifestyle & investment characteristics. Finance India, 15(2), 465-478.

Ricciardi, V., & Simon, H. K. (2000). What is behavioral finance? Business, Education and Technology Journal, 2(2), 1-9.

Rosenberg, E. (2022). Why invest in the stock market? Because it can be more dangerous not to. Business Insider.

Shleifer, A. (2000). Inefficient markets: An introduction to behavioral finance. Oxford University Press.

Szyszka, A. (2011). Behavioral anatomy of the financial crisis. The Journal of CENTRUM Cathedra, 3(2), 45-51.

Tomola, M. O. (2013). Factors influencing investment decisions in capital market: A study of individual investors in Nigeria. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, 4(7), 141–161.

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2011). Saving and investing: A roadmap to your financial security through saving and investing. Saving and Investing for Students. <u>https://www.sec.gov/investor/pubs/savings-investing-for-students.pdf</u>

Waweru, N., Munyoki, E., & Uliana, E. (2008). The effects of behavioral factors in investment decision-making: A survey of institutional investors operating at the Nairobi stock exchange. International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets, 1, 24–41. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEM.2008.019243

Xie, Y., Yang, J., & Munir, F. (2019). Overflow effect of credit rating announcements on stock exchange based on event study. *Applied Economics Letters*, 26(17), 1452–1462.