A Research Study on Investment Decision Influences of Academic Millennials Investors: Baroda City

Harishchandra Singh Rathod[1], Rahul Chauhan[2], Andino Maseleno[3*], Nabila Kharimah Vedy[4]

[1]Director (I/C), MBA Programme, Shri Jairambhai Patel institute of Business Management and Computer Application (NICM Campus), India.
[2]Research Scholar, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad, India.
[3]Institut Bakti Nusantara, Lampung, Indonesia.*
[4]Institut Bakti Nusantara, Lampung, Indonesia.

Email: [1]drhsrathod@gmail.com, [2]rj88chauhan@gmail.com, [4]nabilakv@gmail.com
Corresponding Email: [3]maselenoandino@gmail.com*

Abstract: Individual investors" keeping in mind the objective of maximizing return and minimizing risk, do adopt different strategies in this portfolio investment building. Some decisions are individual centric and some are in keeping parity with the socio-economic and other national and international parameters. Main aim is to know the impact of investment decision influencer on occupation, Income level and gender of investors. Secondly, to know the impact of Income level of investors on Choice of Various investment decision influencer. Also to know the impact of Occupation in investment tenure. For this research, researcher used SPSS for data analysis. Framed hypothesis solved by using ANOVA. From the research researcher found that there is strong relationship between investment decision influencer with gender, occupation of investors and income level.

Keywords: Investors Decision Influencer, Academician, Investors' Perceptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the Indian monetary marketplace, there are some of funding options. The Economic Survey Report (2012-2013) well-known shows that family financial savings accounted for 3/4th of the gross financial savings with a primary share of financial savings being made in bodily property over monetary property. Further, the record states that among the monetary property, the maximum desired funding alternative is a financial institution deposit at the same time as the least desired is stocks and debentures. This shows that traders in India favor to spend money on much less volatile and secure funding alternatives for making an investment their funds. In addition to this, the SEBI-NCAER (Securities Exchange Board of

India-National Council of Applied Economic Research) survey record on "How Households Save and Invest: Evidence from NCAER Household Survey (2011)", well-known shows that the funding in specific alternatives throughout asset lessons isn't always uniform and funding in securities with inside the North-Japanese place may be very negligible in comparison to the opposite elements of the country.

Investment selections also are motivated via way of means of monetary consciousness and universal infrastructure. Investors" living in specific geographical places percent composition of funding in specific funding options is specific (Economic Survey, 2012-2013) and that they have a look at the marketplace pulse of their personal same way.

It is on this backdrop, it will become very pertinent to investigate the numerous behavioral trends that impact the character traders" funding and disinvestment selections and the way it differs with appreciate to a specific geographical place particularly as regards to capital marketplace investments. In different words, it's miles ideal to look at the idea of co-courting among the geographical place and funding techniques with appreciate to the capital marketplace.

Literature Review

Maditinos, Sevic & Theriou (2007) said that "Investors of Athens inventory trade make their funding choice based totally on essential and technical evaluation and their funding choice are primarily based totally much less on portfolio evaluation".

Investors" funding choices are inspired with the aid of using funding biases of the buyers like – reluctance to comprehend losses, overall performance chasing, and domestic biases. Investors are born with those biases and as a result have full-size affect at the funding choice-making of the buyers Cornqvist and Siegel, (2012).
Cash is the idlest manner of preserving money. As such, for the financial boom of a nation, it's miles vital to keep the financial savings with inside the shape of economic property. Based at the evaluation of family sectors economic property portfolio, it's been determined that Indian households" held a massive element in their financial savings with inside the shape of deposits (each banking and non-banking), accompanied with the aid of using contractual financial savings (provident fund schemes, pension, and lifestyles coverage finances), that's accompanied with the aid of using funding in stocks and debentures (Pathak, 2003).

Mobilization of finances from the savers to the buyers may be very crucial for the improvement and boom of an economy. The capital marketplace performs a critical function with inside the Indian economic gadget with inside the mobilization of finances. The capital marketplace presents a platform for the agencies to elevate finances with inside the new difficulty marketplace and additionally guarantees liquidity to the shareholders to transact the outstanding/present securities (Gurusamy, 2008).

In order to examine investor behavior, it turns into vital to recognize the specific classes of buyers. Bhatt (2008) has labeled the investor with inside the inventory marketplace into three

classes – contrarian, fashion follower, and hedger & holders. The contrarian actions in opposition to the marketplace i.e., they buy whilst others sell. Trend fans commonly circulate with the marketplace fashion, they may be conservative in nature and put money into secure funding options like financial institution stocks. The small buyers of India contain the hedgers and holders who need excessive returns with low risks, ideally assured with the aid of using the government. Researchers on this discipline have additionally determined that buyers`" character can also additionally range throughout classes, with greater hazard being taken with the aid of using a greater acquainted category.

The buyers" who actively take part within side the capital marketplace search for funding techniques via which they could generate returns more than the marketplace return. For the reason of constructing funding techniques, they use each essential in addition to technical evaluation whilst making investments within side the Indian capital marketplace. With growing volatility within side the Indian capital marketplace, the funding horizon of the buyers has reduced (Tripathi, 2009).

Financial occasions and buyers profile dictate the funding avenues for an investor. Individual buyers may want to advantage or lose relying at the agencies they put money into. An investor must have a few fundamental expertise of the economic and marketplace gadget which will control fairness investments. The developments within side the fairness marketplace are pondered with inside the motion of the fairness indices and the extent of the buying and selling activity. In order to sell and shield the hobby of the buyers, Investors Education and Protection Fund has been hooked up below segment 250C of the Companies Act, 1956 with the aid of using manner of Companies (Amendment) Act 1999 (A Guide to Investors, 2008).

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

No.	Particular	Information
1	Research Design	Descriptive
2	Sample Size	50 respondents from Baroda City, Gujarat State
3	Sampling Technique	Non-Random Sampling Technique
4	Sample Profile	Academician from Baroda for Pilot Study
5	Data Collection Instrument	Questionnaire
6	Mode of Data Collection	Respondent Administered Questionnaire
7	Research Objectives	• To know the impact of Investment decision influence on investment decision. • To know the impact of Investment decision influence on investment period and occupation of investors.

[Table 1: Research Methodology]

Data Analysis Tools

ANOVA was used to test whether the means of three or more set populations were equal based on the sample means. The estimate of the population variance ($\sigma2$) is based on the sample-to-sample variation known as the sample-to-sample mean square. Estimating the population variance based on intra-sample variability is called intra-sample mean square. The variance ratio is expressed by F and is given by the following equation.

F = mean squared between samples or groups

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference between Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period

H1: There is statistically significant difference between Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Stock Market	Between Groups	.177	2	.088	.126	.882
	Within Groups	32.943	47	.701		
	Total	33.120	49			
Public Provident Fund	Between Groups	.178	2	.089	.140	.870
	Within Groups	29.822	47	.635		
	Total	30.000	49			
Gold and Silver	Between Groups	1.191	2	.596	1.190	.313
	Within Groups	23.529	47	.501		
	Total	24.720	49			
Investment in Real Assets	Between Groups	2.548	2	1.274	1.521	.229
	Within Groups	39.372	47	.838		
	Total	41.920	49			
Pension Fund	Between Groups	.756	2	.378	.477	.624
	Within Groups	37.264	47	.793		
	Total	38.020	49			
Post Office Saving Scheme	Between Groups	1.156	2	.578	.926	.403
	Within Groups	29.344	47	.624		
	Total	30.500	49			
Insurance	Between Groups	.141	2	.071	.126	.882
	Within Groups	26.359	47	.561		
	Total	26.500	49			
Bit Coin	Between Groups	4.190	2	2.095	2.429	.099
	Within Groups	40.530	47	.862		
	Total	44.720	49			
Mutual Fund	Between Groups	2.784	2	1.392	2.592	.086
	Within Groups	25.236	47	.537		

	Total	28.020	49			
MCX	Between Groups	.392	2	.196	.196	.822
	Within Groups	46.888	47	.998		
	Total	47.280	49			
Future and Options	Between Groups	1.328	2	.664	.757	.475
	Within Groups	41.252	47	.878		
	Total	42.580	49			
Others	Between Groups	.509	2	.255	.403	.670
	Within Groups	29.671	47	.631		
	Total	30.180	49			

[Table 2: Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period]

In above table 2 all *p* values are more than 0.05 so null hypothesis is fail rejected and hence researcher can say that there is no statistically significant difference between Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period. *p* value of Stock Market and Insurance is 0.882 that is highest so it shows strong relationship between Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period where as in case of Mutual Fund (*p*=0.086) Bit Coin (*p*=0.099) shows that less relationship between Choice of Various Investment Alternatives and Investment period

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investors.

H1: There is statistically significant difference Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investors.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reassess your overal investment Decesion	Between Groups	5.909	3	1.970	1.446	.242
	Within Groups	62.671	46	1.362		
	Total	68.580	49			
Assess Your Risk Bearing Level	Between Groups	3.490	3	1.163	.791	.505
	Within Groups	67.630	46	1.470		
	Total	71.120	49			
Determine your return objective for the investment	Between Groups	5.131	3	1.710	.997	.403
	Within Groups	78.889	46	1.715		
	Total	84.020	49			
Consider a Variety of Investment Options	Between Groups	1.072	3	.357	.214	.886
	Within Groups	76.708	46	1.668		
	Total	77.780	49			
Liquidity	Between Groups	9.109	3	3.036	2.302	.090
	Within Groups	60.671	46	1.319		
	Total	69.780	49			
Tax Benefits	Between Groups	.758	3	.253	.161	.922
	Within Groups	72.222	46	1.570		
	Total	72.980	49			
Long Term Reliability	Between Groups	10.704	3	3.568	1.913	.141
	Within Groups	85.796	46	1.865		
	Total	96.500	49			
Market Factor	Between Groups	4.546	3	1.515	1.266	.297
	Within Groups	55.074	46	1.197		
	Total	59.620	49			
Wealth Creation	Between Groups	4.944	3	1.648	1.131	.347
	Within Groups	67.056	46	1.458		
	Total	72.000	49			
Protection against inflation	Between Groups	3.715	3	1.238	.682	.567
	Within Groups	83.505	46	1.815		
	Total	87.220	49			

[Table 3: Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investors]

In above table 3 all p values are more than 0.05 so null hypothesis is fail rejected and hence researcher can say that there is no statistically significant difference Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investor. p value of Tax Benefits is 0.922 that is highest so it shows strong relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investor where as in case of Liquidity (p=0.090) and Long Term Reliability (p=0.141)

shows that less relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Income Level of Investor.

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference Between Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period.

H1: There is statistically significant difference Between Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reassess your overall investment Decision	Between Groups	4.271	2	2.135	1.561	.221
	Within Groups	64.309	47	1.368		
	Total	68.580	49			
Assess Your Risk Bearing Level	Between Groups	7.338	2	3.669	2.704	.077
	Within Groups	63.782	47	1.357		
	Total	71.120	49			
Determine your return objective for the investment	Between Groups	.946	2	.473	.268	.766
	Within Groups	83.074	47	1.768		
	Total	84.020	49			
Consider a Variety of Investment Options	Between Groups	3.728	2	1.864	1.183	.315
	Within Groups	74.052	47	1.576		
	Total	77.780	49			
Liquidity	Between Groups	.145	2	.072	.049	.952
	Within Groups	69.635	47	1.482		
	Total	69.780	49			
Tax Benefits	Between Groups	.735	2	.367	.239	.788
	Within Groups	72.245	47	1.537		
	Total	72.980	49			
Long Term Reliability	Between Groups	6.076	2	3.038	1.579	.217
	Within Groups	90.424	47	1.924		
	Total	96.500	49			
Market Factor	Between Groups	3.267	2	1.634	1.363	.266
	Within Groups	56.353	47	1.199		
	Total	59.620	49			
Wealth Creation	Between Groups	.954	2	.477	.315	.731
	Within Groups	71.046	47	1.512		
	Total	72.000	49			
Protection against	Between Groups	2.679	2	1.340	.745	.480
	Within Groups	84.541	47	1.799		

inflation	Total	87.220	49			

[Table 4: Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period]

In above table 4 all *p* values are more than 0.05 so null hypothesis is fail rejected and hence researcher can say that there is no statistically significant difference Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period. *p* value of Liquidity is 0.952 that is highest so it shows strong relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period where as in case of Risk Bearing Level (*p*=0.077) shows that less relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Investment Period.

Ho: There is no statistically significant difference Between Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors

Ho: There is statistically significant difference Between Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reassess your overall investment Decision	Between Groups	.101	1	.101	.071	.791
	Within Groups	68.479	48	1.427		
	Total	68.580	49			
Assess Your Risk Bearing Level	Between Groups	1.203	1	1.203	.826	.368
	Within Groups	69.917	48	1.457		
	Total	71.120	49			
Determine your return objective for the investment	Between Groups	.041	1	.041	.023	.879
	Within Groups	83.979	48	1.750		
	Total	84.020	49			
Consider a Variety of Investment Options	Between Groups	1.613	1	1.613	1.017	.318
	Within Groups	76.167	48	1.587		
	Total	77.780	49			
Liquidity	Between Groups	1.613	1	1.613	1.136	.292
	Within Groups	68.167	48	1.420		
	Total	69.780	49			
Tax Benefits	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.001	.981
	Within Groups	72.979	48	1.520		
	Total	72.980	49			
Long Term Reliability	Between Groups	.750	1	.750	.376	.543
	Within Groups	95.750	48	1.995		
	Total	96.500	49			
Market Factor	Between Groups	3.308	1	3.308	2.819	.100

	Within Groups	56.313	48	1.173		
	Total	59.620	49			
Wealth Creation	Between Groups	2.083	1	2.083	1.430	.238
	Within Groups	69.917	48	1.457		
	Total	72.000	49			
Protection against inflation	Between Groups	1.470	1	1.470	.823	.369
	Within Groups	85.750	48	1.786		
	Total	87.220	49			

[Table 5: Between Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors]

In above table 5 all *p* values are more than 0.05 so null hypothesis is fail rejected and hence researcher can say that there is no statistically significant difference Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors. *p* value of Liquidity is 0.981 that is highest so it shows strong relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors where as in case of Market Factor (*p*=0.100) shows that less relationship between Investment Decision Influencer and Occupation of Investors.

3. CONCLUSION

From this study, researchers found that there was no statistically significant difference between the choice of different investment options and the duration of the investment, but a statistically significant difference between the influential players of investment decisions and the income levels of investors. You can say that there isn't. In the case of decision-making influencers and investment periods, researchers can say that there is no statistically significant difference between investment decision-making influencers and investment periods. In the case of decision-making influencers and investor professions, researchers can say that there is no statistically significant difference between investment decision-making influencers and investor professions.

4. REFERENCES

1. Bhatt S. (2008), Securities Analysis and Portfolio Management, First Edition, Excel Books, New Delhi, pp 233-501, 623-643.
2. Cornqvist H. & Siegel S. (2012), "Why Do Individuals Exhibit Investment Biases?"; Social Science Research Network.
3. Gurusamy, (Dr.) S. (2008), Indian Financial System, McGraw Hill Education (India) Pvt. Ltd., Noida, U.P, pp 1-14.
4. Maditinos D.I., Sevic Z, & Theriou N.G. (2007), "Investors" Behaviour in The Athens Stock Exchange", Studies in Economics and Finance; Vol. 24, No.1; pp 32-50.
5. Pathak B. V. (2003), Indian Financial System, First Indian Print, Pearson Education, Delhi, pp-1-12.
6. Tripathi (Dr.) V. (2009); Investment Strategies in the Indian Stock Market: A Survey, Indian Journal of Finance; Volume III No.11, pp 3-10.