THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Determinants of Mutual Funds Investor Preferences and Returns in India: An Empirical Assessment in Delhi- NCR Region

Sonali Agarwal
Ph.D. Research Scholar, Faculty of Management, Jamia Hamdard University, New Delhi, India
Dr. Chand Tandon
Professor, New Delhi Institute of Management, New Delhi, India
Dr. P. S. Raychudhuri
Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Jamia Hamdard University, New Delhi, India

Abstract:
India is one of the fast growing world economies and the income and savings all are increasing gradually at a fast pace. What is important in this situation is that how do we invest our savings for securing our future. When talking about investment avenues, a lot of things come to the mind like bank fixed deposits, savings account, real estate, gold, shares, post office savings etc. The latest remarkable investment avenues i.e. mutual funds entered in Indian markets in 1990s. And depending on the investor's goal and objective of investment, different schemes are available. These schemes help in long term investment, short term investment, dividend payment, regular growth etc. The expense ratio, the entry and exit load, the reputation of the fund house, the manager's competitive skills, the tax benefits and so many other distinctions, become a real task to select "your" scheme. But nevertheless investors have chosen, are choosing and would keep on choosing their "favourite scheme". In the present study, we focus on investor perception with respect to characteristics of the mutual fund schemes using primary survey. We found that age, occupation and qualification affect the investment choice. Next we extracted two factors that governed the investor perception and developed a regression model for prediction of assured returns which are the primary concern of most of the investors.

Keywords: Investor preference, mutual funds, factor analysis, reliability, correlation, regression, assured returns

1. Introduction

India is an emerging economy. To increase the pace of development a lot of capital is required. Savings constitute a major part of our GDP. The mobilization of savings would enhance capital formation and help in economic development. Flow of money into different investment avenues is thus the need of the hour. This will be a win-win situation for the common man and the country as a whole. People will get capital appreciation and the country will become developed and self-sufficient. "Investment" means commitment of the present money in anticipation of income and capital gains. But in return people want to be compensated for three things: rate of inflation, future uncertainty (risk) and time of commitment.

The post economic reforms era after 1992 (liberalization, privatization and globalization) has seen a drastic change in the financial markets and there has been a remarkable increase in the number of investment avenues. This vast ocean of financial instruments like equity, debt, stocks, bank deposits, insurance policies, real estate, gold etc. have been challenging the rationality of the investors. The main hurdle in this process is the selection of the appropriate security. In the current period, there has been a lot of turmoil in the international and national markets due to various reasons. Owing to this there has been a drastic change in investor behavior. Thus, there is an urgent requirement to study the investor's psychological and social patterns and figure out their perceptions and attitudes so that proper advice can be given to them. To invest the right amount in a right place at the right time is very important in this context. But tracking the movement of the investment classes every second involves complete market and security analysis along with portfolio management. This becomes a difficult task for an ordinary investor given his busy schedule and incomplete information. This leads the investors to resort to indirect methods of investing, the most prominent and successful being the Mutual Funds which manage the portfolio on behalf of the investors.

A mutual fund is a financial intermediary that gathers the investor savings and invests them into different securities depending upon the predetermined investment objectives of the schemes and motives of the investors. The additional income or capital appreciation realized is distributed among the unit holders in the ratio of their holdings. This allows an ordinary investor to make easy profits by proper diversification and expert knowledge of the fund manager who manages the funds of the investors for a fee.

Efficient market hypothesis propounds that markets move in a random fashion and are efficient enough to absorb all the information (historical, publicly known and hidden inside information) instantly such that nobody can earn abnormal profits. But recent studies have nullified this theory and have found that the markets are never fully efficient and the investors not always behave in a rational

manner. The behavior of investors is subject to their perceptions (often misconceptions) and various other factors. To get an understanding of these factors, previous researches were surveyed.

1.1. Literature Review
Extensive studies have been performed across India in Chennai, Gandhinagar (Ahmedabad), Vishakhapatnam, Agra, Thane city, Kerala, Hyderabad, Bangalore, Secunderabad, Himachal Pradesh (Shimla, solan, Kangra), Kota (Rajasthan), Rohtak, Jaipur, Pune, Nanded city, Udaipur, Thanjavur district, Indore city, Delhi etc. to get an insight into investor perceptions & apprehensions. These studies have been done on different samples e.g. urban & rural households, salaried people, income class, experts & non-experts, working women etc. On the whole younger people were found to be more interested in investments and risk tolerance varied inversely with age.

Brahmabhatt, Kumari, & Malekar, (2012); Bodhgire, (2015); Kasilingam, & Jayabal, (2011); and Sharma, & Agrawal, (2015)   found that the number of schemes in which investment was made and the percentage of income invested varied with family income. In another study conducted by Gabhane, & Kishor, (2013) and Sireesha, & Laxmi, (2013), annual income was found to govern the risk taking capacity, purpose of investment and return expectation of the investors.

Income funds (Kasilingam, & Jayabal, 2011), gold investments. (Brahmabhatt, Kumari, & Malekar, 2012; Kumar, & Bansal, 2014) and savings a/c & SBI MF (Junare, & Patel, 2012) were found to be the most favored investment avenues in different studies. Gabhane, & Kishor, (2013) found that both genders preferred bank F.D. and life insurance. In an interesting paper by Prabhavathi, & Kishore, (2013), SIP, Reliance MF and ICICI Prudential M.F. were found to be the preferred investment options while gold remained an all-time favourite destination for most. Bhushan, (2014) and Kumar, & Bansal, (2014) documented that people preferred bank F.D. & savings a/c due to less risk involved. Goyal, & Sharma, (2014) and Vasagadekar, (2014) in their study observed that most preferred investment avenues were bank deposits, bonds and post office deposits while real estate remained the most desired one. Share market was found to be the least preferred and least desired option. Kumar, & Bansal, (2014) revealed that equity was chosen for long term investment. Bank deposits and LIC policies were the most favoured investment avenues according to a research done by Ramprasath, & Karthikeyan, (2013). Sarangapani, & Mamatha, (2011) reported that Hyderabad investors preferred equity shares and convertible debentures. In their study, Sharma, & Agrawal, (2015) found M.Fs. were the most preferred avenues, followed by real estate and commodity market. Kothari also found that M.Fs. were the favourite destinations for parking money followed by F.D., insurance, HDFC MIP & Reliance MIP.

Kasilingam, & Jayabal, (2011) highlighted that investment preference varied with investment experience, family income & number of earning members. Shah, & Baser, (2012) showed that fund reputation & brand name, minimal initial investment, withdrawal facilities and past performance were the biggest influencers. According to Gabhane, & Kishor, (2013), age and occupation, according to Sireesha, & Laxmi, (2013), investment period (inversely affected by occupation), age, income, and savings and according to Sharma, & Agrawal, (2015), knowledge (which varied with qualification), age, marital status, occupation affected preference of scheme. Bodhgire, (2015) found that age & source of information negatively affected while experience & investment objective positively affected the preference of scheme.

Most of the respondents were found to be annual investors (Goyal, & Sharma, 2014) with risk bearing attitude ranging from high (Prabhavathi, & Kishore, 2013) to medium (Sireesha, & Laxmi, 2013) to total risk averseness (Vasagadekar, 2014; Junare, & Patel, 2012). Brahmabhatt, Kumari, & Malekar, (2012) showed that most people invested in stocks despite high risk. Vasagadekar, (2014) proposed that most people wanted safe modes for investing and mutual funds (Kumar, & Bansal, 2014) were considered safe and profitable by many. They have thus aroused people for long term investments.

Goyal, & Sharma, (2014) studied income class (2 lakhs – 5 lakhs p.a.) and found that they wanted safe investment avenues because of their small savings and low risk bearing capacity.

Majority of investors were found to be risk averse who wanted safety (Brahmabhatt, Kumari, & Malekar, 2012; K.P, & Kumar, 2013; Gabhane, & Kishor, 2013; Ramprasath, & Karthikeyan, 2013; Vasagadekar, 2014) and security of their return (Goyal, & Sharma, 2014; Sireesha, & Laxmi, 2013). The study by Chawla, (2014) revealed that majority wanted capital appreciation and high returns along with tax savings and low risk. The most important fund characteristic considered before investment was credibility of the fund. Liquidity, time period, regularity of income, risk protection and diversification were also among the major concerns of investors (Gabhane, & Kishor, 2013; K.P, & Kumar, 2013; Kasilingam, & Jayabal 2010; Venkatesh, 2015). Kothari found that investors look for reputation of the company and diversification. Sharma, & Agrawal, (2015) found brand image and Kumar, & Bansal, (2014) found newly launched MF schemes to be the alluring factors.

Sharma, & Agrawal, (2015) said that investors lacked awareness about financial products. Brahmabhatt, Kumari, & Malekar, (2012) documented that most investors had higher education but were financial illiterates. Vasagadekar, (2014) found that majority investors were aware and awareness varied with age (Junare, & Patel, 2012) and education level (Gabhane, & Kishor, 2013). Rural investors were found to have less market knowledge (Kumari, 2013). Commodity & forex market and new age financial products were found to be less known to common man in a study by Bhushan, (2014). Prabhu, & Vechalekar revealed that majority investors were aware about MFs and MIP plans.

Kumar, & Bansal, (2014) found that 60% investors showed high switching tendency and liquid fund investors were frequent switchers (Kasilingam, & Jayabal, 2011). Agarwal et.al, (2015) described the performance of mutual funds from different sectors in India.

Krishna, Rakesh, & Kumar, (2012) in their study found that urban and rural households held good view about mutual funds. Respondents reported that fund allocation, entry and exit load and scheme contents were good with these types of avenues. Risk disclosure level was rated as high, and after sale service as satisfactory. But, returns were documented to be unsatisfactory.

A few signals to be considered before selection of M.F. were highlighted by Nanigian, (2012). Some of them were- fund manager's ability, percentage ownership of fund manager & board of directors, high active share and low R squared. He also said that non-affiliated funds and newly launched funds (because more portfolio choice) should be considered for investment.

1.2. Objective
The main objective of the study is to explore and understand the factors governing the investors' preferences of mutual funds and its fund characteristics.

1.3. Research Hypothesis
- ➢ Ho_1: Investors' preference for investment is not related to mutual fund characteristics.
- ➢ Investors' preference and satisfaction is measures through the variable "assured returns (AR)". There are two sub hypothesis under this main hypothesis:
- ➢ $Ho_{1.1}$: Assured returns are positively related to fund properties & operations conduct
- ➢ $Ho_{1.2}$: Assured returns are positively related to expenses & rating

2. Methodology
The first and foremost thing to begin with is the type of sampling and the sample size. We use Judgmental and convenience sampling in our study in which only mutual fund investors with more than a year experience were surveyed. The responses were analysed with crosstabs and factors were extracted using factor analysis. Later correlation and regression were done to establish relationship.

2.1. Sample and Sampling Plan
The sampling frame consisted of mutual fund investors from Delhi-NCR and one independent investor formed the sampling unit. One year experience as mutual fund investor was kept as the qualifying criteria for being a respondent. The questionnaire was developed after in depth literature review and consultation with mutual fund professionals. The questions required rating on sematic differential scale. Around 220 questionnaires were distributed to mutual fund investors. Of these 178 useable valid forms were received from the investors. As suggested by Kerlinger(1978), Hair et al.(1998,2006), and Raychaudhari, & Farooqi, (2013) the sample should be around 10 times the number of variables taken in the study for valid factor analysis. But for larger number of variables, this can be reduced to five times the number of variables. The present study has a valid sample of 178 investors thus fulfilling this criteria for a refined 22 variable questionnaire.

3. Analysis

3.1. Demographic Analysis
Cross tab analysis was done and it was seen that the respondents with more than 10 years of experience in mutual funds were only about 10% as compared to lower experience investors. This showed that people were gradually becoming aware of the benefits of investing in mutual funds and were showing an increase in investments year on year. There were around 60% male respondents and 40% female respondents in our sample. More investors belonged to the age group of 25 to 34 years with less experience. Experience was highest (6-10 years) with 57% investors in age group of 35 to 44 and 69% investors in age group of 45 to 54. Choice of investing in mutual funds increased with increase in qualification where only 4.5% of 12th pass invested compared to 38% of post graduates. Salaried class with 59.6% formed the major chunk of mutual fund investors and their experience varied from 1 year to 10 years.

There were few salaried people with over 10 years of experience. Most of the retired people (80%) had more than 10 years of experience. Investment in mutual funds increased with increase in income. Majority male investors held mutual funds for 2-5 years while majority females held mutual funds for less than 2 years. Younger investors held mutual funds for lesser time and the holding period increased with age where investors above 60 and retired held mutual funds for above 10 years. Salaried class and professionals had an average holding period of 2-5 years. Home makers preferred investing for short duration. Income had little effect on holding period with more investors from high income bracket investing for 2-10 years of tenure. From the entire demographic analysis we can conclude that mutual funds are becoming increasingly popular investment avenues for people.

3.2. Generation of Scale, Validity and Reliability Check
After an extensive literature review, discussion with mutual fund professionals and academicians and a pilot study, around 22 variables of mutual fund characteristics that govern investor perception were identified. The industry professionals and practicing experts validated the contents keeping in view the area of interest of our research. All the 22 variables were christened to be important for our analysis. It involved measuring the significance of each multi attribute variable with respect to investor's perception and preferences. The data was collected for variables listed in the table below. The data was analysed using IBM SPSS 22 version. The questionnaire was tested for internal consistency of the scales. The variables were found to have high acceptable mean scores of around 80, the item to total correlation for most variables was found to be >0.6 and averaged around 0.8, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be 0.967 which was high and hence showed that the scale was reliable.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
reputation of company	74.5169	350.748	.814	.792	.965
reputation of the manager	74.5843	349.397	.843	.765	.965
past performance of the fund	74.4719	354.782	.779	.783	.965
expense ratio of the scheme	74.5506	356.701	.764	.741	.966
rating by an independent agency	74.5955	354.254	.748	.786	.966
entry and exit load	74.4382	355.355	.771	.768	.965
assets under management of the fund	74.4270	364.303	.606	.667	.967
purchase price	74.4045	349.180	.806	.802	.965
innovativeness of the scheme	74.6348	362.753	.652	.663	.967
tax benefits	74.5955	356.457	.740	.740	.966
nature of the scheme	74.4607	356.566	.740	.731	.966
safety of original capital	74.2303	357.568	.734	.631	.966
liquidity of the scheme	74.3371	360.304	.681	.652	.966
ease of withdrawal	74.3652	351.013	.769	.760	.966
ease of switching between the schemes	74.4157	355.408	.801	.783	.965
minimum investment required	74.7079	356.050	.777	.763	.965
lock in period of funds	74.7472	359.230	.632	.596	.967
diversification	74.6180	358.497	.780	.784	.965
responsiveness to enquiries	74.4382	361.185	.737	.764	.966
grievance redressal	74.5393	354.193	.791	.840	.965
transparency	74.4157	353.126	.827	.835	.965

Figure 1: scale reliability
Cronbach alpha: 0.967

The five point semantic differential scale was used for recording the perception of investors and was of the type "not significant", "less significant", "neutral", "significant" and "highly significant" as descriptors having continuous equal interval scale numbered 1 to 5 where 1 was "not significant" and 5 was "highly significant". The respondents had to choose one of these against every fund characteristic variable mentioned above. The measurement of investor perception of various fund characteristic variables helped to refine and judge internal consistency of scale. The item to total correlation was found to be high ranging from 0.6 to 0.85. This showed the evidence for good construct validity in terms of grouping the variables into fund characteristic factors. Further we carried out exploratory factor analysis to group the variables to form factors.

3.3. Exploratory Factor Analysis
To reduce the number of variables by grouping them into factors, we performed exploratory factor analysis. KMO test for sampling adequacy was done to know whether factor analysis can be applied or not. The value obtained was 0.920, which was adequate for analysis. The value for Bartlett's sphericity test obtained was 3533.684, which was significant at p-value of 0.000. These two tests certified the suitability for factor analysis.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.920
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3533.684
	df	210
	Sig.	.000

Figure 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

	Component	
	1	2
reputation of company	.711	
reputation of the manager	.707	
past performance of the fund	.766	
expense ratio of the scheme		
rating by an independent agency		.615
entry and exit load		.760
assets under management of the fund		.718
purchase price		.644
innovativeness of the scheme		.870
tax benefits		
nature of the scheme	.641	
safety of original capital	.741	
liquidity of the scheme	.718	
ease of withdrawal	.769	
ease of switching between the schemes	.696	
minimum investment required		
lock in period of funds		
diversification	.765	
responsiveness to enquiries		
grievance redressal	.838	
transparency	.691	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.[a]		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Figure 3: Rotated Component Matrix

The communalities ranged from 0.5 to 0.77 and reflected good proportion of variance captured by the factors. Principal component analysis using varimax rotation was done for getting factor loadings. Two factors were formed by seeing the factor loading in which values greater than 0.5 were considered appropriate. Variables which loaded heavily on one and only one factor were taken.

Five variables "expense ratio of the scheme", "tax benefits", "minimum initial investment", "lock in period" and "responsiveness to enquiries" were dropped because they loaded heavily on different factors in component matrix and rotated component matrix. Factor 2 had five variables which were "assets under management of the fund", "rating by independent agency", "entry and exit load", "purchase price" and "innovativeness of scheme". Rest all the variables were loaded in Factor 1. Thus the two factors formed represented 17 variables and were about to capture approximately 66% of the variance of original variables.

Depending on the variables it constitutes, the factors were named as "fund properties & operations conduct" (Factor 1) as it consisted of mostly fund related and performance aspects which attract an investor like safety, liquidity, ease of withdrawal, switching, grievance redressal, transparency, past performance and reputation etc. and "expenses and rating" (Factor 2) as it comprised of all the expenses involved right from purchasing to exiting and also involved rating given by some agencies.

3.4. Variance of Factors and Their Reliability
After the extraction of two factors, we performed reliability test on them and got a Cronbach alpha of 0.952 for factor 1 variables and 0.878 for factor 2 variables, which were high enough to validate the reliability of the factors extracted for our research. Factor 1 explained the major chunk of 39% of variance while factor 2 explained 27% variances respectively.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	12.770	60.810	60.810	12.770	60.810	60.810	8.165	38.882	38.882
2	1.102	5.247	66.057	1.102	5.247	66.057	5.707	27.174	66.057
3	.981	4.671	70.728						
4	.844	4.019	74.747						
5	.796	3.793	78.539						
6	.651	3.100	81.639						
7	.528	2.517	84.155						
8	.472	2.248	86.404						
9	.365	1.740	88.144						
10	.351	1.673	89.817						
11	.330	1.574	91.390						
12	.317	1.508	92.899						
13	.259	1.232	94.131						
14	.250	1.192	95.323						
15	.227	1.081	96.404						
16	.196	.935	97.339						
17	.159	.756	98.096						
18	.130	.619	98.714						
19	.107	.509	99.223						
20	.091	.431	99.654						
21	.073	.346	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Figure 4: Total Variance Explained

3.5. Correlation
Correlations of factors with themselves and with assured returns were found.

		"Fund properties & operations conduct" factor score for analysis	"Expenses & rating" factor score for analysis	assured returns
"Fund properties & operations conduct" factor score for analysis	Pearson Correlation	1	.000	.694[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		1.000	.000
	N	178	178	178
"Expenses & rating" factor score for analysis	Pearson Correlation	.000	1	.471[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000		.000
	N	178	178	178
assured returns	Pearson Correlation	.694[**]	.471[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	178	178	178
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Figure 5: Correlation

From the table above it can be seen that positive correlations existed between all the factors and between factors & assured returns. The correlations was 0.000 showing independence of factors. The correlation with assured returns was found to be 69% with factor 1 and 47% with factor 2, which was moderate correlation.

3.6. Regression Model
The model that we hypothesized for regression analysis was:
$$AR = \alpha + \beta1(fund\ properties\ \&operations\ conduct) + \beta2(expenses\ \&\ rating)$$

Where α is a constant also called intercept. All the betas are slope coefficients of the respective regressors i.e. fund properties & operations conduct and expenses & rating. They measure the change in value of AR i.e. assured returns per unit change in regressors.

3.6.1. Regression Analysis
Multiple linear regression was applied and it highlighted the strength of linkage between AR and the regressors.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.839[a]	.704	.700	.65782
a. Predictors: (Constant), REGR factor score 2 for analysis 1, REGR factor score 1 for analysis 1				

Figure 6: Model Summary

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.809	.049		77.252	.000
	"Fund properties & operations conduct" factor score for analysis	.834	.049	.694	16.859	.000
	"Expenses & rating" factor score for analysis	.566	.049	.471	11.455	.000
a. Dependent Variable: assured returns						

Figure 7: Regression Coefficients

The R square value (regression coefficient) for our model was found to be 0.704, which means that around 70% variability in AR was explained by the two independent factors together. This indicates that the model is able to justify most of the variation in AR. Thus the model is strong. F statistic was 207.724, significant at 0.000 level. This showed that the model is strong and is statistically significant. The standardized beta coefficient and the value of the constant retrieved from the regression analysis helped us to build the complete regression equation which was:

AR= 3.809 + 0.694(fund properties & operations conduct) + 0.471(expenses & rating)
The above equation shows a high coefficient for both the factors. This means that effect of one unit change in fund properties & operations conduct leads to 0.694 unit change in AR and one unit change in expenses and ratings leads to 0.471 unit change in AR, which is quite remarkable. From both correlation and regression result, we accept the two null hypothesis and conclude that assured returns are positively related to both fund properties & operations conduct and to expenses & rating. Using the above equation prediction of the assured returns from the mutual funds owing to the attributes of "mutual fund characteristics" can be derived. We thus reject the null hypothesis and can say that investor preference varies with mutual fund characteristics.

4. Conclusion
1. Demographic analysis of investor profile showed that mutual funds are gradually becoming popular and the investment in mutual funds increase with increase in qualification.
2. Salaried people were the major investors and had varied experience from 2 to 10 years. Experience and holding period both increased with age. Income had little effect on holding period.
3. The variables were found to have item to total correlation of 0.8 and Cronbach's alpha of 0.967, both of which certified the validity and reliability of the scales.
4. KMO test and Bartlett's sphericity test showed that our data was suitable to carry out factor analysis.
5. Three factors were extracted through principal component analysis and varimax rotation and they captured around 66% of variance of original variables.
6. The factors were named "fund properties & operations constant" and "expenses & rating" based on the variables that they constituted.
7. After factor extraction we again established reliability and validity of the factors.
8. About 39% and 27% of variances was explained by factor 1 and 2 respectively.
9. Correlation analysis highlighted no correlation for inter factor analysis and established the independence of factors. Factors to AR correlations was found to be high.
10. Regression model was constructed taking all the extracted factors and multiple linear regression result helped in building of complete equation for prediction of assured returns that investors prefer.
11. R square was found to be 0.704 which meant that our model explained around 70% variation in assured returns.

The model was capable of predicting the assured returns expected from mutual funds and was statistically significant model. From the entire analysis we can say that the factors that we extracted could accurately determine the assured returns expected from investment in mutual funds.

5. Managerial Implications
The research helps in highlighting the factors which investors consider before investing in any mutual fund. A mutual fund manager can take care of these aspects while designing new schemes and make them more beneficial and attractive to the investors. This will be a win win situation for both the mutual fund industry (as it will get more investments) and to the common investors (as they will be able to get a well stitched and profitable investment deal). The asset management companies will get a fair chance to flourish. The

industry will thus be able to prosper both in terms of quantity of investors and the quality of its product. This will help in GDP generation and add to the economic prosperity of India.

6. Limitations

The study was performed with a small sample size and limited fund characteristic variables. Future studies can include more variables and larger sample size. Also features other than fund characteristics can also be investigated so as to get a deeper insight into the investor behavior. Some of these features can be the motives of investment, the financial literacy level and the financial inclusion.

7. References

i.   Agarwal, Sonali; Tandon, Chand; & Raychaudhuri, P.S. (2015). A study of mutual funds from different sectors in India. Indian journal of research in capital markets 2(4), 50-60.

ii.   Bhushan, Puneet. (2014). Insights into awareness level and investment behaviour of salaried individuals towards financial products. International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications, 8(1), 53-57.

iii. Bhushan, Puneet. (2014). Relationship between financial literacy and investment behavior of salaried individuals.Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research, 3(5).

iv.   Bodhgire, Nandkumar Baburao. (2015). Variable affection on financial investment of salaried people at Nanded city during 2012-2013: an empirical study. International journal of research in commerce, economics & management, 5(4).

v.   Brahmabhatt; Kumari, P.S Raghu; & Malekar, Shamira. (2012). A study of investor behavior on investment avenues in Mumbai Fenil. TRANS Asian Journal of Marketing & Management Research, 1(1).

vi.   Chawla, Deepak. (2014). An Empirical Analysis of Factors Influencing Investment in Mutual Funds in India. Global Business Review, 15(3), 493–503.

vii. Gabhane, Dinesh; & Kishor, S. B. (2013).Preferences and significance of demographics on the factors influencing investmentdecisions: a study of investors in Thane city, Maharashtra, India. International journal of research in commerce, IT and management, 3(7).

viii. Goyal, Megha; & Sharma, Anukrati. (2014). A study of investment behavior of middle income group towards different kinds of investment avenues. IOSR Journal of business and management, 16(8). 1-10.

ix.   Junare, S. O.; &Patel, Frena. (2012). Analysis of perceptions of investors towards mutual funds: an empirical investigation. International journal of research in commerce and management, 3(5).

x.   Kasilingam, R.; & Jayabal, G. (2011). Preference and Perceptual Mapping of Mutual Fund Schemes. Asia-Pacific Business Review, 7(2),48-59.

xi.   Kothari, Heena. Investors behaviour towards investment avenues: a study with reference to Indore city. Altius Shodh Journal of Management & Commerce.

xii. K.P, Sindhu.; & Kumar, S.Rajitha. (2013). Influence of characteristics of mutual funds on investment decisions – a study. International journal of management, 4(5), 103-108.

xiii. Krishna, B. Murali; Rakesh, K.;&Kumar, P.V.S. Siva. (2012). Investors' perception in mutual fund investments (A study in selected mutual fund organizations in Visakhapatnam). International journal of research in commerce and management, 3(6).

xiv. Kumara, Sunil. (2012- 2013). Investment attitude of rural investors. Anveshanam-A national journal of management, 1(1). (as cited inMathi, K. Malar; & Kungumapriya, A. 2014).

xv.   Kumar, Vipin; & Bansal, Preeti. (2014). A study on investors' behavior towards mutual funds in Rohtak, Haryana. International Journal of Engineering and Management Research, 4(1).

xvi. Nanigian, David. (2012). Advice on Mutual Fund Selection. Journal of financial service professionals.

xvii. Prabhavathi, Y.; & Kishore, N. T. Krishna. (2013).Investor's preferences towards Mutual Fund and Future Investments: A Case study of India. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 3(11).

xviii. Prabhu, Gauri; &Vechalekar, N.M. Perception of indian investor towards investment in mutual funds with special reference to MIP funds. IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance, 66-74.

xix. Ramprasath, S.; & Karthikeyan, B. (2013). Individual investors' behavior towards select investments, A study with special reference to Kattumannar. The international journal of business & management, 1(6). (as cited inMathi, K. Malar; & Kungumapriya, A. 2014).

xx.   Raychaudhuri, P.S.;& Farooqi, Rahela. (2013). A study on the effects of dimensions of service quality on customer satisfaction in the Indian IT hardware industry with special emphasis on medium B2B sector. Global business review 14(3),507-527.

xxi. Sarangapani, A.; & Mamatha, T. (2011). Investment pattern of Indian investors: An analytical study of Hyderabad city investors. The journal of venture capital & financial services, 5(2). (as cited inMathi, K. Malar; & Kungumapriya, A. 2014).

xxii. Shah , Avani ; & Baser,Narayan. (2012). Mutual fund: behavioral finance's perspective. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing & Management Review, 1(2).

xxiii. Sharma, Priyanka; & Agrawal, Payal. (2015). Investors' perception and attitude towards mutual fund as an investment option. Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research, 4(2).

xxiv. Sireesha, P. Bhanu; & Laxmi, Ch. Sree. (2013). Impact of demographics on select investment avenues: a case study of twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad, India. International journal of marketing, financial services & management research, 2(6).

xxv. Vasagadekar, Priya. (2014). A research paper on investment awareness among Indian working women with reference to Pune region. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 5(6).

xxvi. Venkatesh, R. (2015). Investors perception towards investment in Mutual Funds – A Study in Thanjavur District. Global journal for research analysis, 4(2).