Chapter 5

findings
Section I

Demographics of the respondents

- The study revealed that the age of respondents and people between the age of 45-55(40) is more. Then is the between the age of 35-45(24), between the age of 25-35(21), and between the age of 55-65(15).

- As far as education is concerned there is more person that are ssc passed{33}, hssc passed {30}, graduate(27) and there is no illiterate out of these respondents.

- Under the martial status in this out of 100 respondents 95 are married and 5 are unmarried.

- As far as occupation is concerned in which mostly respondents are working in agriculture(50). and then at peoples are doing service(26) and then business (24).

- About total number of family members in which less than 8 respondents are 65 and less than 4 are 34 and less than 10 are 1.

- About the the Earning members in family of respondents in this there are more respondents whose earning member is one(45) and 2 earning members are at(41) and 3 earning member is 14.

- As concerned about the monthly income there are 38 respondents whose monthly income is less than 15000, 30000 and more are 28, between 15000-20000 are 20 and between 20000-30000 are 14.

- About housing status that out of 100 respondents 95 have their own house and five are living at rental house.
Section -2 awareness

- all the 100 respondents are aware about microfinance.
- The study reveals the comparison between education and source of information of microfinance it shows the respondents that are graduate get more information from banks, that are ssc pass that also get information from banks 12 person that are ssc pass get information from friends. ssc pass also get information from banks. 13 person that are ssc pass get information from friends. SHG representative have less response of awareness towards educated respondents.
- About the comparison between age and source of information of microfinance it shows the respondents that are between 45-55 get more information from banks, and friend are also providing more information to the different age groups. SHG representative have less response of awareness.
- The study reveals the comparison between marital status and source of information of microfinance it shows the respondents that are married get more information from banks and afterwards get from friend. SHG representative have less response of awareness.
- About the comparison between income and source of information of microfinance it shows the respondents that are income of less than 15000 get information from friends and banks more. SHG representative have less response of awareness.
- About the comparison of microfinance schemes and source of information of MFIS the study found that bank is playing a major role in awareness of microfinance schemes and friend are at 2nd place to give information to people and shg representative have low role in awareness program as compare to friend and banks. there is also one thing should be consider that micro insurance awareness is very less among the respondents. they know more about the microcredit and afterwards saving schemes.
- About the comparison of types of microfinance schemes and source of information of MFIS we found that bank is playing a high role in awareness of microfinance schemes and friend are at 2nd place to give information to people and shg representative have low role in awareness program as compare to friend and banks.
About “Microfinance is about lending in small amounts”. The mean score is 3.55 which shows that respondents are aware about “Microfinance is about lending in small amounts”. The Standard deviation is 1.28 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents. It shows that sample is not consistent in answering the facts. The low value of p(.000) shows that the 3.55 is significantly different from 3 which implies that customers are aware regarding statement 1. Thus the null hypothesis of no awareness is rejected to prove that respondents know that microfinance is about lending the small amounts.

About “Microfinance is about Financing micro business”. The mean score is 3.40 which shows that respondents are aware. The Standard deviation is 1.20 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents. It shows that sample is not consistent in answering the facts. The low value of p(.001) shows that the 3.40 is significantly different from 3 which implies that customers are aware. Thus the null hypothesis of no awareness is rejected to prove that respondents know that microfinance is about Financing micro business.

About “Microfinance is about saving.”. The mean score is 3.590 which shows that respondents are aware. The Standard deviation is 1.26 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents. It shows that sample is not consistent in answering the facts. The low value of p(.000) shows that the 3.59 is significantly different from 3 which implies that customers are aware regarding statement 3. Thus the null hypothesis of no awareness is rejected to prove that respondents know that microfinance is about savings.

“Microfinance is about providing insurance.”. The mean score is 1.53 which shows that respondents are unaware. The Standard deviation is .626 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents is low. It shows that sample consistent The low value of p(.000) shows that the 1.53 is significantly less from 3 which implies that customers are not aware regarding statement 4. Thus the null hypothesis of no awareness could not be rejected. Since the mean score is
significantly less than 3 it means that respondents are unaware about that insurance is also a part of microfinance.

- “Microfinance is about fund transfer”. The mean score is 1.54 which shows that respondents are unaware. The Standard deviation is .64228 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents is low. It shows that sample is consistent. The low value of p(.000) shows that the 1.540 is significantly different from 3 which implies that customers are not aware. Thus the null hypothesis of no awareness could not be rejected. Since the mean score is significantly less than 3 it means that respondents are unaware about that insurance is also a part of microfinance.

- “Overall awareness of microfinance is reasonable.” The mean score is 3.00 which shows that respondents are neutral respondents are aware about some of schemes and some of not. The Standard deviation is 1.50 which shows the variability among the responses of the respondents. It shows that sample is not consistent. The value of p(1.000) shows that the 3.000 is not significantly different from 3. The study thus fails to reject the null hypothesis of no awareness when it comes to level of awareness. The respondents do know about the microfinance but are not aware of the complete definition of the microfinance. The respondents are not aware of the insurance and fund transfer scheme of the microfinance.

The overall results suggest that the all respondents are aware of the microfinance but the level of awareness is not high specially in case of micro insurance and fund transfer activities of the micro insurance.