RELATIVE RISK LEVEL AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS OF THE EMPLOYEES OF A BUSINESS PROCESS OUTSOURCING COMPANY IN MAKATI CITY

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty of the
Graduate Studies in Business
College of Business Administration
De La Salle University-Dasmariñas
City of Dasmariñas

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Business Administration

ROWENA D. DAGUM

January 2011

ABSTRACT

DAGUM ROWENA D, Relative Risk Level and Investment Decisions of the Employees of a Business Process Outsourcing Company in Makati City. Master in Business Administration, De La Salle University-Dasmarinas, Cavite, September 2010. Adviser: Mr. Don S. Malabanan

This study aimed to analyze the relative risk level and investment decisions of the employees of business process outsourcing company in Makati City. This study would like to prove two main statements: first, to know the effect of various socioeconomic factors, investment objectives, investment knowledge and behavioral factors on relative risk level; and second, to determine the relationship between relative risk level and investment decisions.

Descriptive statistics such as arithmetic mean, frequency distribution, and percentage were used to describe the socioeconomic profile of the respondents. Crosstabulations for investors and non-investors were employed to determine whether socioeconomic characteristics influence individual investment decisions of employees. Pearson's Chi was used to determine the association between risk level and various socioeconomic and nonmetric variables. Logistic regression was also used to determine the effect of socioeconomic and other nonmetric variables on relative risk level.

Most of the respondents were female, single, and able to reach college. The mean age of the respondents was 28.78 years and they have been working with the company for an average of 2.66 years. Around 36 percent earned a total compensation

income between PhP300,000 to PhP450,000 and about 43 percent had a total annual income from allowances below PhP150,000. Majority of the respondents have savings deposit while only eight of the respondents own debt instruments. Eighty six percent of the respondents said that they intend to invest in asset purchases in the future and majority of the respondents are loss averse. It was found that the level of investment knowledge and behavioral factors were insignificant. For investment objective, majority of the respondents are concerned with growth of their assets and financial investments. The investment objective - growth and income was found to have an influence on relative risk level. There is no association between relative risk level and intent to do asset purchase in the future. It is also inferred that there is no relationship between relative risk level and investment decisions.

Majority of the employees prefer to be safe in dealing with investment decisions. For future studies, it is highly encouraged to pursue the same topic but in a different industry where investment engagement is saturated (e.g. Philippine Stock Traders). Risk preferences are one of the most crucial parameters in economics and everyday life. Future researches on this topic will also help in order to increase the awareness of individuals on the benefits of investment decisions as an opportunity for growth and income.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
DEED OF DECLARATION	ii
APPROVAL SHEET	iii
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES.	xvi
INTRODUCTION	1
INTRODUCTION	3
Statement of the Problem	7
Objectives of the Study	8
Hypotheses of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	10
Scope and Limitations of the Study	11
Definition of Terms	11

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
CONCEPTUAL AND FRAMEWORK	36
METHODOLOGY	47
Research Design	47
Time and Place of the Study	47
Sources of Data	49
Sampling Procedures	49
Collection of Data	50
Methods of Analysis	52
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	61
Profile of the Respondents	61
Asset and Financial Investments	78
Intent to Invest and Do Asset Purchase in the Future	95
Relative Risk Level	97
Investment knowledge	100
Investment objectives	102
Behavioral Factors	104
Effects of Socioeconomic Characteristics, Investment Knowledge, Objective and Behavioral Factors on Relative Risk Level	115
O11 1X01UU YO 1X10IX LACYO1	11.

Relationship Between Relative Risk Level and Investment Decision	
and investment Decision	117
Relationship Between Relative Risk level	
and Intend to Invest in Various Assets	125
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	126
Summary	126
Conclusions	130
Recommendation.	131
REFERENCES	133
APPENDIXES	152

Table		Page
1	Likert Scale Rating for the Level of Investment Knowledge, Investment Objective and Behavioral Factors	57
	Objective and Benavioral Factors	31
2	Matrix for Mean Score Rating Interpretation	60
3	Summary of Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondent, Makati City, 2010	62
4	Assets and Financial Investments of the Respondent, Makati City, 2010	80
5	Distribution of Respondents on Reasons Why They Do Not Invest in Various Asset Types, Makati City, 2010	83
6	Distribution by the Number of Cars Invested by the Respondents, Makati City, 2010	91
7	Distribution by the Type of Insurance Invested by the Respondents, Makati City, 2010	93
8	Mean Score of Respondents - Reason for Not Investing, Makati City, 2010	96
9	Distribution of Respondents – Intent To Do Asset Purchase in the Future, Makati City, 2010	96
10	Priority Listings of Assets Investment, Makati City, 2010	98
11	Distribution of Respondents by the Type of Risk Level, Makati City, 2010	100
12	Mean Score of Respondents by the Level of Investment Knowledge, Makati City, 2010	101

Table		Page
13	Summary of Mean Score Results by the Level of Investment Knowledge, Makati City, 2010	103
14	Summary of Results by Investment Objectives, Makati City, 2010	103
15	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Representativeness, Makati City, 2010	105
16	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Representativeness, Makati City, 2010	105
17	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Overconfidence, Makati City, 2010	107
18	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Overconfidence, Makati City, 2010	107
19	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Anchoring, Makati City, 2010	109
20	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Anchoring, Makati City, 2010	109
21	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Disposition Effect, Makati City, 2010	110
22	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Disposition Effect, Makati City, 2010	111
23	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Regret Theory, Makati City, 2010	112
24	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Disposition Effect, Makati City, 2010	112

Table		Page
25	Mean Score of Respondents Influenced by Herding, Makati City, 2010	113
26	Summary of Mean Score Results Influenced by Herding, Makati City, 2010	114
27	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with the Breakdown of Respondents' Number of Dependents, Non Investor and Investor, Makati City, 2010	114
28	Logistic Regression Estimates of the Effect of Socioeconomic Characteristics, Investment Knowledge, Objective and Behavioral Factors on the Relative Risk Level, Makati City, 2010	116
29	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Savings Deposit, in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	118
30	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Time Deposits, in Pesos, Makati, 2010	118
31	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Real Estate, in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	120
32	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Equity Investment, in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	120
33	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Debt Instrument, in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	122

Table		Page
34	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Mutual Funds,	
	in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	122
35	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with Total Value Invested in Car,	
	in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	124
36	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk	
	with Total Value Invested in Insurance,	
	in Pesos, Makati City, 2010	124
37	Cross-tabulation of Level of Related Risk with	
	Intent to Invest in the Future, Makati City, 2010	125

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	An empirical model indicating the input role of investor risk tolerance, as predicted by eight demographic characteristics, leading to the establishment of objectives and the development of an investment management strategy by Grable and Lytton (1998)	39
2	Theoretical framework of Investors Behavioral Decision	
_	by Nik Maheran and Nurazleena (2007	40
3	Paradigm of how socioeconomic, behavioral factors, investment knowledge and investment objective	
	affects relative risk level and investment decision	43
4	Distribution of respondents by age	63
5	Distribution of respondents by the number of household size	65
6	Distribution of respondents by the number of dependents	66
7	Distribution of respondents by educational attainment	68
8	Distribution of respondents based on title designation	69
9	Distribution of respondents by total number of years working	71
10	Distribution of respondents by total number of years working in the company	72
11	Distribution of respondents by total number of years working in the BPO industry	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
12	Distribution of respondents by annual compensation income	75
13	Distribution of respondents by annual income from allowances	76
14	Distribution of respondents by annual income from own business	77
15	Distribution of respondents by annual income from other sources	79
16	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment savings deposits	81
17	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in time deposits	84
18	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in real estate	85
19	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in equity shares	87
20	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in debt instrument	88
21	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in mutual funds	90
22	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in car	92
23	Distribution of respondents by the amount of investment in insurance	94