

Factor Identification and Usage of Pocket Money among Students: A Case Study

Iqra Mukhtar[#], Anam Javaid^{*}

^{#*}*The Women University Multan, Pakistan*

Abstract—Pocket Money is an important factor in student's life style because it matters a lot on their life style among friends in the institution. The current study is about the daily pocket money amount of the students and identification of different factors effecting on their pocket money. Different factors like age, family income, qualification, expenditure on transportation, shopping, having meal on restaurant, amount spend on their food, basic necessities and luxuries from their pocket money has been used. Average pocket money of students has been analyzed as 149.304 rupee per day by taking 500 observations from different institutions by using questionnaire survey through purposive sampling from district Multan. Frequency distribution is constructed and Chi square is used to find association of different factors of pocket money.

Keywords— Pocket Money, Income, Saving, Expenditure.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pocket money can be defined as a small amount of money given to a child by its parents, typically on a regular basis. Pocket money is an important factor regarding student's living style especially among their friends in the institution. Different students get different pocket money depends on the family income, status, level, age etc. different works have been done regarding this topic as Furnham (1999) investigated the adult's perceptions and the use of allowance or pocket money to educate the children and for this purpose they used data of 400 British adults through questionnaire about their attitudes towards, and behaviour concerning, allowances (pocket money) to children and young people [1]. Lewis and Scott (2000) investigated that Pocket money practices had an effect on economic socialization so the persons who received pocket money regularly in childhood at age 16 to 18 were more competent economically[2]. Barnett-Verzat and Wolff (2002) performed the work on Motives related to allowance of Pocket money allowance and family incentives [3]. Kirkcaldy et al. (2003) worked on parental attitudes related to pocket money, attribute keenness and on professional pressure and found the Demographic variables as less analytical of effectiveness as compared to the factors related to psychology/attitude [4]. Pinto et al. (2005) investigated through a survey regarding student's spending habits in Guangzhou, Hong Kong and Macau and they observed that they spend mostly money on entertainment, clothes and other accessories [5]. Shigekawa (2009) found in research that it is considered a first step for students to be an independent consumers by getting pocket money and also

parents give the pocket money to students for some purpose and it is supposed that pocket money schemes impact children's consumer socialization to some range. [6]. Mahreen, Basit et al. (2010) found that the education lined up to connect students and teachers realizations food ingredients sold in and around schools in school hours or recess in conditions of quality and quantity of food, services provided to students, and prices of food items by collecting data from teachers and students through questionnaire and examined that girl pupil got comparatively less pocket money than boy pupils also found that girls bought food ingredients more than boys [7]. Pillai et al (2010) worked on "Financial Prence among youth" and found that the women were more likely than men to have an outstanding credit card balance and typically had more debt than men [8]. Ahmad shah et.al (2012) analyzed the effect of pocket money in the education production function. Their purpose was to answer the questions as that pocket money is a regressor related to explanation of education production function and the other is can pocket money be served as an alternative to family income in the education production function? They suggested that pocket money had its importance in explaining the education production function so also it could be used as an alternative to family income. However, researcher did not advise using it when family income is on hand [9]. Saravanan and Devakinandini(2015) worked in a study for perception of students at college level about spending of pocket money related to the reference of students that whether they are studying in arts and science colleges in Coimbatore. For this purpose, they took data of 120 students [10].

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the purpose of observing factors related to daily pocket money, a dataset is taken from different universities included The women university Multan, Bahaddin Zakariya University, Emerson College and from Nawaz Sharif University Multan. The effect of different factors related to pocket money has been seen on their living standard. For this purpose 500 observations are taken from the above mentioned institute and different descriptive and influential techniques have been used for analysis purpose.

III. RESULTS

For the factors used in this study, frequency distribution of different factors can be analyzed below. The following table

shows the detail about family income of the students belonging to different institutes.

Table 1 Family Income

Family Income	Frequency	Percent
below 10000	35	7.0
10,000-25000	122	24.4
25000-40,000	139	27.8
40,000-65,000	98	19.6
above 65,000	106	21.2
Total	500	100

From the above table, it is clear that 7% of respondent's family income is below 10,000, while 27.8% family income of respondents is 25,000-40,000 i.e. maximum respondents of family income is between 25 to 40 thousands. Another question was about the amount of daily pocket money which they received and it can be analyzed below.

Table 2 Amount of Daily Pocket Money received

Daily Pocket Money amount	Frequency	Percent
less than 100	185	37.0
100-200	249	49.8
300-500	51	10.2
more than 500	15	3.0
Total	500	100

From the above table, it is shown that, 3% of respondents have daily pocket money more than 500, and 49.8% respondents have pocket money 100-200, we can also observe frequency distribution of the daily pocket money of students among the respondents. So the maximum students are getting pocket money as between 100 to 200 per day.

About the amount of money they usually spend on a day can be analyzed as below.

Table 3 Students Usually Spend amount each Day

Amount Spend each day	Frequency	Percent
less than100	270	54.0
100-200	183	36.6
300-400	29	5.8
more than 400	18	3.6
Total	500	100.0

It is concluded that 54% respondents spends less than 100 rupee each day, 3.6% respondents spends more than 400 each day so maximum students are spending less than 100 each day. Saving money is also a factor related to student's pocket money as the students with more pocket money can save more money as compare to others so the following frequency distribution can be seen from analysis point of view.

Table 4 Good at Saving Money?

Views	Frequency	Percent
always	121	24.2
sometime	266	53.2
never	113	22.6
Total	500	100

It is concluded that 24.2% of respondents always good at saving money, 53.2% respondents sometime saving money while 22.6% respondents do never saving money.

A factor of charity is being analyzed in this study to see that how many students give charity from the amount of pocket money they have. So the following frequency distribution can be seen for this purpose.

Table 5 Give Money to Charity?

Views	Frequency	Percent
Yes	389	77.8
No	111	22.2
Total	500	100.0

From the above table, it is shown that 77.8% respondents give money to charity, 22.2% respondents no give money to charity means majority of students are giving money to charity.

Table 6. Amount Spend on Food Every Day

Amount Spend on food every day	Frequency	Percent
less than 100	309	61.8
100-200	163	32.6
300-500	19	3.8
more than 500	9	1.8
Total	500	100.0

It is concluded that 61.8% respondents spend on food the amount less than 100 every day while 1.8% of the respondents spend on food more than 500 every day . so majority are spending less than 100 rupee on food everyday also a question was asked about the meal on restaurant that whether they go there to spend money on weekly basis or not. So it can be analyzed as below.

Table 7. Spent money to eat Good Meal at a Restaurant Weekly

Restaurant	Frequency	Percent
100-500	271	54.2
500-1000	143	28.6
1000-2000	54	10.8
more than 2000	32	6.4
Total	500	100.0

It is concluded that 52.4% respondents spent to eat good meal at a restaurant the amount 100-500 weekly while 6.4% of the respondents spent at a restaurant more than 2000 weekly. Students also have to use transportation from home to their educational institute so we also try to analyses the factor related to transportation that if they are spending money on transportation from their pocket money or not. The following table can help us to analyses the situation regarding money spend on transportation from their home to educational institute.

Table 8. Spend amount Each Month on Transportation

Spend amount on transportation	Frequency	Percent
less than 500	207	41.4
500-1000	135	27.0
1000-2000	91	18.2
2000-3000	53	10.6
more than 3000	14	2.8
Total	500	100.0

It is concluded that 41.4% respondents spend on transportation the amount less than 500 monthly while 2.8% of the respondents spend on transportation the amount more than 3000 monthly.

Another important question for this study was that the students are spending most of their pocket money on which factor so the following is the result of the above question regarding the money spend factor.

Table 9. Spent Most of Their Money

Items	Frequency	Percent
fast food	84	16.8
dresssing	107	21.4
education	219	43.8
others	90	18
Total	500	100

It is concluded that 43.8% respondents spent most of their amount on education while 18% respondents spent on other things.

IV. CHI SQUARE

Chi square technique is used to see association between different factors related to student's daily pocket money. To see the association between family income and daily pocket money, chi square is being used because mostly students with high family income get more pocket money as compare to students belonging to low income families. The following is the result of this analysis.

Table 10. Family Income and Daily Pocket Money

Family Income	< 100	100-200	300-500	>500	Total
below 10000	30	4	1	0	35
10,000-25000	51	67	3	1	122
25000-40,000	71	53	13	2	139
40,000-65,000	22	66	10	0	98
above 65,000	11	59	24	12	106
Total	185	249	51	15	500

Chi-Square = .000, Cramer's V =.000

From the above chi square result, it is clear that there is association between family income and daily pocket money its mean that on students pocket money, family income factor is also an important factor in this regards.

Association between Daily Pocket Money and Savings

Hypothesis can be made as below.

H₀: There is no association between daily pocket money and savings.

H₁: There is an association between daily pocket money and savings.

To see the association between above two factors, it can be proceed as by analyzing the cross tab for Chi square distribution and by using 5% level of signifance the association of the above factors can be analyzed that the students with daily pocket money also are good on savings or not. The result can be seen as in the table for the above mentioned hypothesis for the students having daily pocket money amount as from less than 100 to those who have amount of more than 500 of daily pocket money.

Table 11. Daily Pocket Money and Good at Saving Money

		always	sometime	never	Total
Daily Pocket money Amount	less than 100	50	99	36	185
	100-200	58	141	50	249
	300-500	8	23	20	51
	more than 500	5	3	7	15
Total		121	266	113	500

Chi-Square = .005, d.f = 6 α = 0.05 Cramer's V =.005

From the above analysis association between two attributes i.e. daily pocket money and good at saving money can be seen its mean that pocket money amount is also effecting on saving amount.

V. DISCUSSION

From the above results, the frequency distribution of different factors can be analyzed. It can be seen that mostly students belong to a family of having income between 25 to 40 thousand rupees also the students were spending most of their pocket money on education and sometimes mostly students are able to save their money after spending.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Furnham, A. (1999). "Economic socialization: A study of adults' perceptions and uses of allowances (pocket money) to educate children." *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 17(4): 585-604.
- [2]. Lewis, A. and A. J. Scott (2000). "The economic awareness, knowledge and pocket money practices of a sample of UK adolescents: A study of economic socialisation and economic psychology." *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education* 4(1): 34-46.
- [3]. Barnet-Verzat, C. and F.-C. Wolff (2002). "Motives for pocket money allowance and family incentives." *Journal of economic psychology* 23(3): 339-366.
- [4]. Kirkcaldy, B., A. Furnham, et al. (2003). "Parental attitudes towards pocket money, trait competitiveness and occupational stress." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 18(4): 305-323.
- [5]. Pinto, M. B., D. H. Parente, et al. (2005). "Information learned from socialization agents: Its relationship to credit card use." *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 33(4): 357-367.
- [6]. Shigekawa, J. (2009) from Saitama University. "Variables determining pocket money for junior-high school students". *The journal of consumer Affairs* 55, 29:219-241.
- [7]. Pillai, R., R. Carlo et al (2010) "Financial preference among youth" *Munich personal RePEc Archive* 22. Retrieved from <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen>.
- [8]. Mahreen, F., A. Basit, et al. (2010). "Food Sold In And Around The School: Is It Worth The Students' Pocket Money?" *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 1(3).
- [9]. A., Z. F. Syeda, et al. (2012). "Pocket Money as a proxy for Family Income." *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education* 2(4).
- [10]. Saravanan, D. and V. Devakinandini (2015). "A study on perception of college students about spending of pocket money with reference to students studying in arts & science colleges in coimbatore." *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services and Management Research* 3(3).