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Abstract

Financial inclusion means providing banking and financial services to all people, in a fair, transparent and equitable manner, at affordable cost. Households, with low income, often lack access to bank account and have to spend time and money for multiple visits to avail the banking services. This study was conducted among the unorganized labourers and small scale traders so as to find out the level of financial inclusion of these respondents. The responses were collected from both unorganized labourers and small scale traders. 160 were account holders and 140 were non-account holders and the sample size was 300. The convenient sampling method was used to collect the respondents’ opinion about financial inclusion. Percentage analysis, Level of financial inclusion, Mean and standard deviation, Cross tabulation, Garrett Ranking, z-test, One-way analysis of variance and Correlation were used to analyse the data. The statistical analysis was done by using SPSS (statistical package for social science) software package version 20.0. This study found that the unorganized sector has large scope for savings, banking and borrowings. Hence it is suggested to the monetary authorities and banks, to work towards financial inclusion and help this particular sector of employees and traders.
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1. Introduction

Financial inclusion is a process of including the people who lack formal financial services, to enjoy the formal financial services. It is observed that there was wide inter-state variation in the level of financial inclusion in India. Among the different States of India, Chandigarh is at the top and Manipur is at the bottom in terms of the level of financial inclusion (Chithra and Selvam, 2013).

Financial inclusion is a great step to alleviate poverty in India. But to achieve this, the Government should provide an enabling environment in which banks are free to pursue the innovations necessary to reach low income consumers and still make a profit (Lakshmi and Visalakshmi, 2013). Success in financial inclusion depends upon appropriate technology and efficient delivery model. It is absolutely beyond any doubt that the financial access would significantly improve in the next three and a half decades (Mamatha, 2015). United States has identified three areas for the purpose of financial inclusion- Access to banking, Access to affordable cost and credit and Access to face to face advice, in the Indian banking system. The illiteracy and low income of people and lack of rural bank branches, are barriers to financial inclusion in many States. (Santosh Ranganath and Tualsi Rao, 2011).

1.1 Financial Inclusion In India

The vision 2020 of the Reserve Bank of India is to open nearly 600 million new accounts and service them through a variety of channels. However, illiteracy and the low income and lack of bank branches in rural areas, continue to be a road block to financial inclusion in many States. Apart from this, there is inadequate legal and financial structure. India, being an agrarian economy, there is hardly any scheme to lend for agriculture. Government should focus on micro insurance too (Hardeep, 2017).

1.2 Why Financial Inclusion?

India needs to work on poverty alleviation, especially among vulnerable groups. Economic growth must be equitable through improvements in livelihoods, decent employment opportunities and food security (Gangopadhyay, et al., 2008) Financial Inclusion (FI) mobilizes savings that promote economic growth, through productive investment. FI promotes financial literacy of the rural population and thus guides them to avoid the expensive and unreliable financial services (Kanaka Raju, K and Chellayya, B., 2014). This helps the weaker sections to channelize their incomes into buying productive resources or assets. In situations of economic crisis, the rural economy can be a support system, to stabilize the financial system. Thus it helps in ensuring a sustainable financial system.

1.3 Unorganised Labourers

Unorganised labourers are like the labourers themselves. Generally, they are wandering labour - shifting from one occupation to another, wage earners, not formally contracted and “unskilled” by usual nomenclature (Saxena, K. B., 2009). The unorganised labour is everywhere - atop our buildings, brushing and painting, standing on a piece of bamboo scaffold and precariously hanging; the rickety housemaids in our households working from dawn to dusk, seven days a week; the prematurely old bus drivers and conductors in the private buses, the rickshawallahs, etc., Though government statistics, about unorganised labour, is not stratified, one can pick the threads from the dismal figure of employment in general (Human Development Report, 2002). The unorganized labour is overwhelming in terms of
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its number and they are universal throughout India. The workplace is scattered and fragmented. There is no formal employer–employee relationship (Muna Kalyani, 2015). Workers in the unorganized sector are usually subject to indebtedness and bondage as their meagre income is not adequate for their livelihood (Muna Kalyani, 2016).

1.4 Small Scale Traders

Small Scale Enterprises cut across all sectors of the country’s economy and provide the most prolific source of employment, not to mention the breeding ground for medium and large industries, which are critical for industrialization (Stella Kemunto Osinde et al., 2013). The Micro and Small Enterprises are businesses, in both formal and informal sectors, are classified into farm and non-farm categories, employing 1-50 workers. Given the importance of this sector in areas of employment creation, growth and poverty alleviation, it is important that it is efficiently managed for effective results (Joseph Ndua Ngugi and Henry Bwisa, 2013). In addition, there are ongoing changes in the business environment, with regard to globalization of markets. Even in advanced countries, large retail chains have not wiped out the small shopkeepers or what are called ‘Mom and Pop’ stores. The personal touch, which they retain, is absent in large retail outlets. Also, their proximity to people is a great advantage (Rangarajan, 2015).

2. Review of Literature

Mandira Sarma and Jesim Paise (2008) found that the issue of financial inclusion is a development policy priority in many countries. Human development and financial inclusion, in a country, move closely with each other, although a few exceptions exist. Among socio-economic factors, as expected, income is positively associated with the level of financial inclusion. \( \text{Subbarao (2009)} \) argues that the financial inclusion is important for sustaining growth. Such access, to powerful as well as the poor people, provides opportunity to build saving, make investment and avail credit. It also makes payment such as social security transfer and national rural employment guarantee programme wages into bank accounts of beneficiaries. \( \text{Shashidharan, K P (2011)} \) found that financial inclusion means ensuring access to cost-effective, appropriate financial services and products, in a fair and transparent manner, to all sections of society, including the vulnerable, poor, unbanked remotest villages. \( \text{Anurag B Singh and Priyanka Tandon (2011)} \) found that in India, half of the poor are financially excluded from the country’s main stream, the banking sector. Still in India 22 percent of the people are living below poverty line. \( \text{Anuradha Gupta (2012)} \) explained that the Government of India and RBI have come out with a major initiative, towards ensuring the inclusive growth, through financial inclusion so that the access of financial service will reach the masses. The main theme is to highlight the requirement of financial inclusion and to estimate the social benefit from these initiatives.

Several studies have been undertaken to identify the usage level of financial inclusion and bank account holders. But there are not many studies relating to the variables considered in the present study. No research had been conducted on the financial inclusiveness of both the persons who have bank account and those who do not have the bank accounts. The present study is an attempt to study the many factors of financial inclusion, especially among unorganized labourers and small scale traders.

3. Statement of the Problem

Financial exclusion is excluding people without affordable credit, savings, insurance assets, money etc. This excluded section largely
comprises of marginal landless labourers, self-employed, unorganized sector enterprises and socially excluded group. Unorganised and small scale traders are the excluded section from financial inclusion. To achieve greater financial inclusion, financial services should reach the poor and socially excluded group, particularly unorganized people. Micro finance, self-help group and other financial institutions have played a vital role in filling up this gap.

4. Need of the Study

The present study involves the analysis of financial inclusion, among unorganised labourers and small scale traders. This study concentrates on inclusion for bank account holders and non account holders in Erode District. The major reasons, for excluding the low income group from access to formal institution, are high cost in accessing formal financial services and non-price barriers, such as identity of person, collateral security, distance between bank and residence, poor infrastructure and behavioural aspects such as non-comfort with financial procedures, lack of understanding etc. This study would help us to know the awareness level towards no-frills account and saving and credit behaviour of the unorganised labour and small scale sector.

5. Objectives of the Study

➢ To measure the level of financial inclusion of unorganized employees and small scale traders.
➢ To find out the respondents’ attitude towards banking, borrowing, savings, opinion about banking experiences of bank account holders.
➢ To determine significant difference in banking operation across different categories of respondents.
➢ To offer workable suggestion for improving financial inclusion of unorganized employees and small traders.

6. Hypotheses of the Study

To find significant difference in banking operation, among different categories of respondents, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested in this study.

NH\textsubscript{01}: There is no significant difference between Gender of the respondents and Opinion about Bank Services.

NH\textsubscript{02}: There is no significant difference between Gender and the respondents’ opinion about borrowing activities.

NH\textsubscript{03}: There is significant difference between Gender of the respondents and usage of Banking.

NH\textsubscript{04}: There is no significant difference between Gender of the respondents and Nature of saving.

NH\textsubscript{05}: There is no significant difference between demographic variables and respondents’ opinion about bank service experiences.

NH\textsubscript{06}: There is no significant difference between demographic variables and respondents’ opinion about borrowing

NH\textsubscript{07}: There is no significant difference between demographic variables and respondents’ opinion about banking.

NH\textsubscript{08}: There is no significant difference between demographic variables and respondents’ opinion about saving.

7. Research Methodology

7.1. Sample Selection

The survey was conducted among 350 respondents. Out of the questionnaires distributed, 300 duly filled in questionnaires were considered for the analysis. From the sample, 160 respondents were bank account holders.
7.2. Sources of Data

In this study, both primary and secondary data were used. The survey was preceded by a pilot study administered to 60 respondents, selected from Erode District. After making necessary changes in the questionnaire, the main survey was conducted. Secondary data for the analysis were collected through books, journals and internet.

7.3. Period of the Study

The survey was conducted from April 2016 to December 2016.

7.4. Tools used in the Study

The analysis was done through descriptive and inferential statistical methods. The four point scale was coded into numeric value, from one to four. Simple percentage analysis, Measure of central tendency, Cross-tabulation, Analysis of variance ANOVA, Henry Garret Ranking, Z-test and Correlation were used to analyse the data. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was used to analyse the data.

8. Analysis of Data and Interpretation

The first objective was to find the level of financial inclusion. Second objective was to find the central tendency of the mean value, Third objective was to find out expectation for non-bank account holders and the fourth objective was to find out the significant difference among banking operations, across different categories of respondents. ANOVA and Z-test were used. Out of 300 respondents, 160 respondents had opened bank accounts and they did banking transactions. The level of financial inclusion is calculated in Table-1 and frequency table for demographic variables of bank account holders is given in Table-2.

The Table-3 shows the mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ opinion about banking experience. The highest mean score was 2.88, which was given to timeliness of credit. Majority of the respondents accepted that banks provided credit for their emergencies. At the same time, the factor, procedural hassles for sanction of loan, recorded the next highest mean score of 2.73 and the next highest mean score was 2.69, obtained for adequacy of loan. The least rated factor was quick response to any problems, for which the mean score obtained was 2.24. The mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ opinion about non-bank account holders is given in Table-4. The highest mean score was 2.90, which indicated that respondents agreed that bank facilities were very important for every individual. Next to that, the statement, ‘banks have introduced a lot of new products in the past five years’, was given the highest mean value of 2.65. Many respondents preferred traditional and face to face banking, along with ATM facility. The least rated factor was that the bank employees give proper respect to the customers, with a mean value of 2.43. The Table - 5 shows the mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ rating, related to borrowing. Mean and standard deviation were calculated in order to measure the central tendency of the data. The highest mean score was 2.65, given to the statement, “Borrowing money from mortgage fund for emergency purpose”. Next to that, the statement, “Borrowing helped to fulfil the expected needs’, obtained a mean value of 2.63 and 2.62 was the mean value obtained for the statement, ‘expenses exceeded income, so I borrow money’. The least rated factor was for the statement, ‘For education purpose, we used to borrow money’ and the mean value was 2.37. The mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ opinion about savings is shown in Table-6. The highest mean score was 2.74, which indicated that, respondents agreed that
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they were very particular about regular savings. The next highest mean score was 2.73, obtained for the statement, ‘saving improved the standard of living of people’ and ‘insufficient income was the reason for no savings’. Following these, the statements, ‘saving is a must for every individual’ and ‘savings help us not to borrow money’, obtained mean scores of 2.61 and 2.60 respectively. Lowest mean score of 2.39 was obtained for the statement, ‘I save money for buying home appliances’.

9. Findings of the Study

Table-7 shows the results of Z test, between the gender of the respondents and experience of bank services. It was used to determine whether the respondents’ opinion on experience of bank services differed among the gender of the respondents. Since the significant value was more than 0.05, the null hypothesis NH-1, is accepted. In other words, there was no significant difference on respondents’ opinion about experience of bank services and gender. The result of Z test, between the gender of the respondents and borrowing, is shown in Table-8. It was used to determine whether the respondents’ opinion on borrowing differed among the gender of the respondents. Since the significant value was more than 0.05, the null hypothesis NH-2, is accepted. In other words, there was no significant difference on respondents’ opinion about borrowing and gender. Table-9 shows the Z test result between the gender of the respondents and banking. It was used to determine whether the respondents’ opinion about banking differed between male and female respondents. Since the significant value was less than 0.05, NH-3, is rejected. Conclusion can be made from the Table that there was significant difference on respondents’ opinion about banking between male and female respondents. The Z test results between the gender of the respondents and nature of saving is presented in Table-10. It was used to determine whether the respondents’ opinion on nature of saving differed among the gender of the respondents. Since the significant value was more than 0.05, the null hypothesis NH-4, is accepted. In other words, there was no significant difference on respondent’s opinion about nature of saving and gender. Table-11 shows the one way ANOVA results between the demographic variable of the respondents and experience about bank service experiences. One way ANOVA was used to determine whether respondents’ opinion about bank service experiences differed among the demographic variables of the respondents. It is inferred from the Table that none of the factors was significant, except income and thus it implies that there was significant difference on respondents’ opinion about bank service experiences and income of the respondents. Hence the null hypothesis NH-5, is accepted. The one way ANOVA results between the demographic variables of the respondents and opinion about borrowing is given in Table-12. One way ANOVA was used to determine whether respondents’ opinion about borrowing differed among the demographic variables of the respondents. It could be inferred from the Table that there was significant difference on respondents’ opinion about borrowing between the marital status, educational qualification and occupation of the respondents. Hence the null hypothesis NH-6, is rejected. Table-13 shows the one way ANOVA results between the demographic variables of the respondents and opinion about banking activities. One way ANOVA was used to determine whether respondents’ opinion about banking activities differed among the demographic variables of the respondents. It is inferred from the Table that none of the demographic variables was significant, except educational qualification of the respondents.
Hence the null hypothesis NH-7, is accepted. The one way ANOVA results between the demographic variables of the respondents and opinion about saving are presented in Table-14. One way ANOVA was used to determine whether respondents’ opinion about saving differed among the demographic variables of the respondents. It is inferred from the Table that there was significant difference on respondents’ opinion about saving between the educational qualification, occupation and income of the respondents. Hence the null hypothesis NH-8, is rejected.

10. Conclusion

Access to financial services such as banking, saving, insurance and remittances is very important for unorganized labourers and small scale traders. The poor households face many constraints in trying to save, invest and protect their livelihoods. They are not aware of banking facilities even about zero minimum bank account. The study was intended to find out the level of financial inclusion of unorganised employees and small scale traders. The major finding of the study is that the level of financial inclusion of unorganised employees and small scale traders stood at 53%. Hence the Government, RBI and other financial institution may have to take efforts so as to increase the level of financial inclusion among general public. The banking services are moderately rated by the respondents. Unorganised sector is one of the important sectors which plays a pivotal role in the socio-economic development of a nation. The study found that the unorganised sector has large scope for savings, banking and borrowings. Hence it is suggested to the monetary authorities and banks to put in their efforts towards financial inclusion for this particular sector of employees and traders. It is important for our country to provide more opportunities to the unorganized employees and small scale traders, so as to make them financially included section.

11. Suggestions

The financial inclusion is very poor for female group. Hence Government and banks should motivate the female group and increase the awareness of opening bank account through special programmes like financial campaign in the localities. The highest education qualification was secondary level and it is easy to include them in banking. They have the affordability for saving, banking and borrowing. Hence the banks can focus their efforts of financial inclusion on the unorganized employees. It is suggested that banks should take steps to increase the banking knowledge of the people and increase the rate of interest for savings.

12. Limitations of the Study

The study was based on the opinion of the respondents and they are likely to vary over time. Data collected were analysed as such and no adjustment in the data was made since the study was related to Erode District only. The project was done in Erode Districts and it did not cover any other area.

13. Scope for Future Research

The study can be extended to other districts and other category of traders.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having bank account</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having banking account</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Financial Inclusion**

\[
\text{Level of Financial Inclusion} = \frac{\text{Number of Account holders}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \\
= \frac{160}{300} \times 100 \\
= 53.33\%.
\]

Source: Primary data
Table – 2
Frequency Table for Demographic Variable of Bank Account Holders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Below-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>widow/widower</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>Primary Level</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Level</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher secondary Level</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Below-5000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10001-15000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15001-20000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masson</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
### Table-3
Respondents Experience about the Bank Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of credit</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of loan</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of Consumption loan</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer relationship</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural hassles for sanction of loan</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of education loan</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Response to any problems</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick. Services</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing accurate information</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over all Mean Score and SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS

### Table-4
Respondent’s Opinion about Banking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank facilities is very important to every individuals</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks have introduced lot of new products for past five years</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this technological era, banks save the customer time</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of customer prefer face to face banking</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM is easy to provide services to clients</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks are trustable financial institution</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks make the financial transactions very easy and quick</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks’ employees give proper respect to the customers</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even uneducated people can open and operate bank accounts easily</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional banking still remains the best option for client</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over all Mean Score and SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS
### Table-5: Respondents Rating for Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks can liberalize the terms and conditions for availing credit facilities</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can borrow money from relatives/friends easier than banks</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaying the borrowing is every difficult to low income people</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education purpose we use to borrow money</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing is inevitable to any person</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make repayment of cash in small amount weekly or fortnightly</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings help me to fulfil my expected needs</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing from private institution involves no or very less formalities</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing leads the individuals to spend on unwanted expenses</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings makes us to face many problem</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For emergencies we use mortgage fund for get borrowings</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My monthly expenses exceed my monthly income. So I borrow money</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use consumer credit for purchasing products and availing services</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks are most reliable person to borrow money</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple borrowing usually leads to non-payment of loans</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over all Mean Score and SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS

### Table-6 : Respondent’s Opinion for Saving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will save money for buying home appliances</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving through public chit fund is easier to get money at accurate time</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very particular about regular saving</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving is a must for every individual</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving is good for meeting any financial crisis and emergency</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings improve the standard of living of people</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving money is difficult for me as my income equals my expenses</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings are possible only for high income group of people</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving money is helping for my investment in my business</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post office deposits is best way for savings</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Insurance policies help the public to save money</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought I didn’t save now ,I would like to save money in future</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there is no sufficient income, savings is not at all possible</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving helps us not to borrow amount from any institution/person</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over all Mean Score and SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.886</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS

---
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### Table-7: Z Test between respondent’s Gender and Opinion about Bank Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>-0.889</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS  
**Note:** *Significant at 5% percent level.

### Table-8: Z Test between respondent's Gender and Opinion about Borrowing Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.094</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS  
**Note:** *Significant at 5% percent level.

### Table-9: Z Test between Respondent’s Gender and Opinion about Banking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.740</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS  
**Note:** *Significant at 5% percent level.

### Table-10: Z Test between Respondent’s Gender and Opinion about Saving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Computed using SPSS  
**Note:** *Significant at 5% percent level.
Table-11 : One-way ANOVA between Respondents’ Demographic Variables with Experience about Bank Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>70.838</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.709</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1768.262</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>76.810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.603</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1762.290</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>36.174</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.058</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1802.926</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>41.473</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.295</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1797.627</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>11.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>92.940</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.980</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1746.160</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.100</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed using SPSS
Note: *Significant at 5% percent level.

Table-12 : One-way ANOVA between Respondents’ Demographic Variables with Opinion about Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>116.973</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.243</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5497.271</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>35.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5614.244</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>371.020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123.673</td>
<td>3.680</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5243.224</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>33.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5614.244</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>696.067</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>232.022</td>
<td>7.360</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4918.177</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>31.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5614.244</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>376.514</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75.303</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>.056*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5237.730</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>34.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5614.244</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>208.248</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.416</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5405.996</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>34.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5614.244</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed using SPSS
Note: *Significant at 5% percent level.
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Table-13 : One-way ANOVA between Respondents’ Demographic Variables and Respondent’s Opinion about Banking Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>31.669</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2197.275</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2228.944</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>54.499</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.166</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2174.444</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2228.944</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>147.738</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49.246</td>
<td>3.691</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2081.206</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2228.944</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>108.898</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.780</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2120.045</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2228.944</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>80.344</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.781</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2148.600</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2228.944</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed using SPSS
Note: *Significant at 5% percent level.

Table-14 : One-way ANOVA between Respondent’s Demographic Variables with Respondent’s Opinion about Saving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>206.274</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.569</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3589.719</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>23.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3795.994</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>130.167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43.389</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3665.826</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>23.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3795.994</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>509.958</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>169.986</td>
<td>8.070</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3286.035</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>21.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3795.994</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>272.562</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54.512</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3523.432</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>22.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3795.994</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>234.638</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78.213</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3561.355</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3795.994</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed using SPSS
Note: *Significant at 5% percent level.