

Financial Independence, Family Pressure and The Knowledge-Confidence Gap: Evidence from Single Working Women in Urban India

Harshal Dilip Bendekar¹ · Siddharth Dongre²

¹ Student, S B Jain Institute of Technology, Management and Research

² Assistant Professor, S B Jain Institute of Technology, Management and Research

Corresponding author:

Siddharth Dongre

Email: siddharthdongre@sbjit.edu.in

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8027-9165>

Co-author email:

Harshal Dilip Bendekar: bendekarharshal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Single working women in India constitute a rapidly growing demographic segment, yet their financial behavior remains under-researched. This study examines financial independence, risk tolerance, investment behavior, and barriers to investing among single working women in urban India.

Methodology: A cross-sectional survey of 100 single working women (aged 22–60) was conducted across Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 Indian cities. Validated scales measured Financial Independence Score (FIS, $\alpha=0.78$), Risk Tolerance Score (RTS, $\alpha=0.71$), Financial Literacy Score (FLS), and asset allocation. Hypotheses were tested using t-tests, ANOVA, correlation, and Mann-Whitney U tests.

Findings: Despite high financial literacy (mean 4.3/5), only 12% of respondents make independent investment decisions. Cryptocurrency allocation (12.1%) exceeds equity allocation (11.2%) – a reversal of prudent investment principles. Only 30.2% of monthly surplus is invested on average. Family pressure is cited as a barrier by 42% of respondents, and 48% report a “lack of knowledge” despite high objective literacy (knowledge-confidence gap). Single women have significantly higher risk tolerance than married women (RTS 8.73 vs. 7.82, $p=0.044$). Single mothers have significantly lower emergency funds than never-married women ($p=0.048$).

Originality/value: This is the first study to quantify crypto > equity allocation among single Indian women and to systematically measure family pressure as a barrier using the Theory of Planned Behavior framework.

Keywords: Single working women, financial independence, asset allocation, family pressure, knowledge-confidence gap, India, behavioral finance, cryptocurrency

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The financial landscape of India has undergone a paradigm shift over the past decade. With increasing urbanization, rising education levels among women, delayed marriages, and a cultural shift toward financial self-reliance, a new demographic segment has emerged: single working women (Agarwal et al., 2015; Ministry of Statistics, 2023). This segment includes never-married professionals, divorced women, widows, and separated women who are solely responsible for their financial well-being without the support of a spouse.

According to recent estimates, India has over 80 million single women, including never-married, divorced, widowed, and separated women (SEBI-NCAER, 2021). A significant proportion of these women are employed and earning, yet their financial needs remain largely underserved by the financial services industry, which continues to design products primarily for nuclear families or male breadwinners (AMFI, 2024).

Historically, financial decision-making in Indian households has been predominantly male-dominated (Johnson & Johnson, 2021). Women, even when earning, often delegated investment decisions to fathers, husbands, or brothers (Mehta & Sharma, 2022). However, the rise of single working women challenges this traditional norm. These women are not only earning their own income but are also solely accountable for their expenses, savings, investments, insurance, and retirement planning (Kumar & Singh, 2018).

Despite their growing economic significance, single working women remain significantly under-researched in academic finance literature (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014). Most existing studies either focus on “working women” as a homogeneous group, lumping together married and unmarried women, or treat women’s financial behavior as an extension of household finance rather than an independent domain of study (Guiso & Jappelli, 2019). This aggregation masks the unique financial challenges, risk profiles, and behavioral patterns of single working women (Barber & Odean, 2013).

The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a financial wake-up call for many single women (RBI, 2023). The pandemic exposed the vulnerabilities of those without adequate emergency savings, insurance coverage, or diversified investment portfolios (Kaur & Singh, 2021). Many single women who lost jobs or faced pay cuts had no second income to fall back on, highlighting the critical importance of financial independence (Chakraborty & Sen, 2020).

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite demonstrating adequate financial literacy scores (mean 4.3/5) and having regular employment income (82% earning above ₹30,000 per month), single working women in urban India exhibit suboptimal investment behavior characterized by low equity allocation, disproportionately high allocation to speculative assets like cryptocurrency, and heavy reliance on family members for investment decisions (Kumar & Singh, 2018; SEBI-NCAER, 2021). The gap between financial knowledge and actual investment action remains poorly understood (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014), and the specific barriers faced by single working women have not been systematically quantified (Mehta & Sharma, 2022).

This study addresses six specific research gaps identified in the literature: (G1) treating women as a homogeneous group; (G2) limited focus on single working women in India; (G3) lack of primary data on financial independence metrics; (G4) unstudied relationship between living arrangement and investment behavior; (G5) rare quantitative measurement of family pressure as a barrier; and (G6) no comparison across marital sub-groups.

1.3 Research Objectives and Hypotheses

The study had five objectives: (O1) measure Financial Independence Score (FIS); (O2) assess risk tolerance and investment behavior; (O3) identify barriers and influencers; (O4) examine relationships between financial literacy, risk tolerance, and asset allocation; and (O5) compare across marital sub-groups.

Based on the literature (Ajzen, 1991; Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014; van Rooij et al., 2011), six hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Single women have higher risk tolerance than married women.

H2: Higher financial literacy leads to higher equity allocation.

H3: Living arrangement significantly affects investment aggressiveness.

H4: Higher Financial Independence Score (FIS) leads to higher percentage of surplus invested.

H5: Family pressure as a barrier leads to lower equity allocation.

H6: Single mothers have lower emergency funds than never-married women.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Four theoretical frameworks guide this study.

Life Cycle Hypothesis (Modigliani & Brumberg, 1954). LCH posits that individuals save during working years to smooth consumption during retirement (Modigliani, 1986). For single working women, LCH is particularly relevant because they cannot rely on a spouse's retirement income (Deaton, 2005). Their retirement savings must be self-sufficient, making disciplined long-term saving critical. However, the theory does not account for gender-specific factors such as longer life expectancy for women, career breaks, or the gender pay gap (Atkinson et al., 2018).

Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Prospect theory demonstrated that individuals exhibit loss aversion, reference dependence, and probability weighting (Kahneman, 2011). For single working women, loss aversion may be particularly pronounced because they lack a spouse's income as a safety net (Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). This heightened loss aversion may lead them to avoid equity markets, preferring "safe" but lower-return assets (Barber & Odean, 2013).

Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). TPB provides a framework for understanding the gap between financial knowledge and actual investment behavior. According to TPB, behavior is determined by intentions, which are influenced by attitudes, subjective norms (social pressure), and perceived behavioral control (self-efficacy). In this context, even if a single working woman has positive attitudes toward investing, she may not invest if her family discourages it (subjective norm) or if she feels she lacks knowledge (perceived behavioral control) (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005). This framework helps explain the "confidence gap" observed in pilot studies (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2007).

Resource-Based Theory of the Household (Becker, 1981). Becker's theory posits that household decisions are made collectively with differential bargaining power based on each member's resources. In traditional Indian households, men have historically controlled financial resources (Lundberg & Pollak, 1996). For single working women who live with parents, this dynamic may persist, with parents continuing to exert influence over investment decisions despite the woman's independent income (Chiappori, 1992).

2.2 Empirical Literature Review

International studies. Barber and Odean (2001) found that women traded less frequently than men and achieved better risk-adjusted returns due to lower overconfidence. Lusardi and Mitchell (2014) found that women consistently have lower financial literacy than men across all countries, but noted that single women tend to have higher financial literacy than married women because they are forced to manage their own finances. Grable and Lytton (1999) developed a 13-item risk tolerance scale widely used in financial planning research. Finke et al. (2017) found that financial literacy declines with age after 60, suggesting the importance of early financial education.

Indian studies. Agarwal et al. (2015) found that financial literacy in India is low by international standards, with women scoring significantly lower than men. Kumar and Singh (2018) found that single working women preferred fixed deposits and gold over equities, with family influence identified as the most significant barrier. Mehta and Sharma (2022) found that single mothers had significantly lower emergency funds, less insurance coverage, and lower retirement savings compared to never-married women. Sahi et al. (2019) found that loss aversion and herding behavior were particularly pronounced among women investors, with family members identified as the primary source of herding influence.

Financial independence studies. Robb and Woodyard (2011) found that both objective and subjective financial literacy influence financial behavior, but subjective literacy often has a stronger effect – critical for understanding the "confidence gap." Van Rooij et al. (2011) found that both basic and advanced financial literacy significantly increase stock market participation.

2.3 Research Gap and Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature review, six research gaps were identified (Table 1). This study addresses all six gaps.

Table 1: Research Gaps Addressed

Gap	Description	Supporting Authors
G1	Women treated as homogeneous group	Lusardi & Mitchell (2014); Barber & Odean (2001)
G2	Few studies on single working women in India	Kumar & Singh (2018); Mehta & Sharma (2022)
G3	Limited primary data on financial independence metrics	SEBI-NCAER (2021); RBI (2023)
G4	Living arrangement and investment behavior unstudied	Bucher-Koenen et al. (2017)
G5	Quantitative measurement of family pressure rare	Sahi et al. (2019)
G6	No comparison across never-married, divorced, widowed	Hanna & Lindamood (2019)

Table 1: Source: Author's compilation from literature review

The conceptual framework positions Financial Independence Score (FIS) and Financial Literacy Score (FLS) as independent variables, Risk Tolerance Score (RTS) as a mediating variable, and Asset Allocation and Investment Rate as dependent variables, with Barriers (including family pressure) and Living Arrangement as moderating variables.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey design (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The design was appropriate because it allowed collection of primary data from a targeted population, measured multiple variables simultaneously, enabled hypothesis testing, and was time- and cost-effective.

3.2 Sampling and Participants

Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were used, as the target population (single working women) is specific and difficult to reach through random sampling. The inclusion criteria were: female gender, age 22–60 years, currently employed (full-time, part-time, or self-employed), single marital status (never married, divorced, widowed, or separated), residing in India, and willing to provide informed consent.

Data were collected between January and February 2026 through multiple channels: LinkedIn women's professional groups, women's Employee Resource Groups (ERGs), Reddit (r/TwoXIndia), WhatsApp groups, and personal networks. A total of 108 responses were received; after data cleaning (removing incomplete responses, respondents outside India, and those not meeting inclusion criteria), the final sample was N=100.

Table 2: Sample Composition (N=100)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Marital Status	Never married	66	66%
	Married (for comparison)	23	23%
	Divorced	6	6%

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
	Widowed	3	3%
	Separated	2	2%
Age Group	22–30 years	55	55%
	31–40 years	30	30%
	41–50 years	10	10%
	51–60 years	5	5%
City Type	Tier 1 (Metro)	44	44%
	Tier 2	44	44%
	Tier 3/Rural	12	12%
Monthly Income	Below ₹30,000	18	18%
	₹30,001–₹60,000	36	36%
	₹60,001–₹1,00,000	31	31%
	Above ₹1,00,000	15	15%
Living Arrangement	With parents/family	67	67%
	Living alone	18	18%
	With roommates	12	12%
	With children (single mother)	3	3%

Table 2: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=100)

3.3 Measures

Financial Independence Score (FIS). Eight items adapted from Robb and Woodyard (2011) measured financial independence, including sole decision-making, emergency fund adequacy, debt status, retirement contributions, insurance ownership, will existence, and survival capacity without external support. Each item used a 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). FIS ranged from 8 to 40. Cronbach's α was 0.78 (acceptable).

Risk Tolerance Score (RTS). Three items adapted from Grable and Lytton (1999) measured risk tolerance: a hypothetical investment choice (4-point scale), reaction to a 15% portfolio loss (4-point scale), and self-reported comfort with financial risk (5-point scale). RTS ranged from 3 to 13. Cronbach's α was 0.71 (acceptable).

Financial Literacy Score (FLS). Five objective knowledge questions (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2014) covered compound interest, historical asset returns, PPF rates, credit score purpose, and SEBI regulation. FLS ranged from 0 to 5.

Investment Behavior. Respondents reported percentage of monthly surplus invested (0–100%, using category midpoints) and asset allocation across nine categories (total 100%).

Barriers and Influencers. Multiple-select and single-select questions captured barriers to investing, primary investment decision influencers, and social pressures.

3.4 Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel (data cleaning, descriptive statistics) and JAMOVI version 2.4 (inferential statistics). Independent t-tests tested H1 and H5. One-way ANOVA tested H3. Pearson correlation tested H2. Spearman correlation (non-parametric) tested H4. Mann-Whitney U test tested H6 (due to small sub-group sizes). Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Anonymity was assured. No personally identifiable information was collected unless participants voluntarily opted into follow-up interviews (Section G). The survey was reviewed for face validity with five pilot respondents.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Key Financial Variables

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Key Financial Variables (N=100)

Variable	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Std Dev	Skewness
Financial Independence Score (FIS)	27.4	28.0	12	38	6.8	-0.42
Risk Tolerance Score (RTS)	8.5	8.0	5	12	1.9	+0.31
Financial Literacy Score (FLS)	4.3	4.0	2	5	0.8	-0.89
% of Surplus Invested	30.2%	26.0%	0%	100%	22.4%	+1.21

Variable	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Std Dev	Skewness
Equity Allocation (%)	11.2%	8.5%	0%	48.6%	10.8%	+1.45
Cryptocurrency Allocation (%)	12.1%	8.5%	0%	58.7%	13.4%	+1.89
Cash/Savings (%)	11.6%	8.2%	0%	42.5%	9.8%	+1.34

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Key Financial Variables

The mean FIS of 27.4/40 (68.5%) indicates moderate financial independence with significant room for improvement. The RTS of 8.5/13 (65%) is moderate but lower than comparative studies of single women in Western countries (Grable & Joo, 2004).

Critical finding: Cryptocurrency allocation (12.1%) exceeds equity allocation (11.2%). This reverses prudent investment principles, suggesting that single working women allocate more to speculative, unregulated assets than to productive, long-term wealth-building assets. Only 30.2% of monthly surplus is invested on average, leaving approximately 70% in cash, savings accounts, or consumption – a “cash drag” that impairs long-term wealth accumulation.

4.2 Financial Independence Components

Table 4: Financial Independence Indicators (B1–B8)

Statement (abbreviated)	Mean (1–5)	% Agree (4 or 5)
Survive 1 year without external support	3.6	62%
Sole decision-maker for monthly expenses	3.5	58%
Own life/health insurance policy	3.5	58%
6-month emergency fund	3.5	56%
No high-interest debt	3.4	54%
No permission for purchases >₹5,000	3.4	52%
Regular retirement contribution	3.4	52%
Have a will or succession plan	3.3	44%

Table 4: Financial Independence Indicators (FIS Components)

Critical gaps exist: only 44% have a will, only 52% contribute regularly to retirement, and only 56% have a 6-month emergency fund. One respondent’s open-ended comment illustrates the will gap: “I know I should make a will, but it feels morbid. Also, my family would be upset if they knew I was planning for ‘after’ – they think I’m being dramatic” (Respondent #34, never married, 32 years).

4.3 Barriers and Influencers

Table 5: Top Barriers to Investing (Multiple selections allowed)

Barrier	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of knowledge / financial literacy	48	48%
No time to research investments	44	44%
Family discouragement / pressure	42	42%
Insufficient disposable income	40	40%
Lack of trust in financial advisors / market	38	38%

Table 5: Barriers to Investing Reported by Respondents

Knowledge-confidence gap: Despite mean FLS of 4.3/5 (70% scoring 4 or 5), 48% cite “lack of knowledge” as a barrier. One respondent explained: “*I know what a mutual fund is theoretically, but when I open the app, there are so many options – large cap, mid cap, small cap, ELSS, sectoral. I freeze. My father says just put it in FD, so I do*” (Respondent #12, never married, 27 years).

Family pressure (42%) is consistent with Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior. Another respondent shared: “*My mother said stocks are gambling. She lost money in 2008. I can’t tell her I have a small crypto investment – she would panic*” (Respondent #78, never married, 29 years).

Table 6: Primary Influencer on Investment Decisions (Single select)

Influencer	Frequency	Percentage
Husband/Partner	18	18%
Social media / Finfluencers	15	15%
Self (self-directed)	12	12%
Financial advisor (professional)	12	12%
Male sibling (brother)	12	12%
Parents (father/mother)	11	11%
Female sibling (sister)	11	11%
Friends / Colleagues	9	9%

Table 6: Primary Influencers on Investment Decisions

Only 12% make independent investment decisions. This is a striking finding that confirms the literature (Kumar & Singh, 2018; SEBI-NCAER, 2021). Social media/finfluencers (15%) are the second most important influencer, reflecting the growing role of platforms like YouTube and Instagram in shaping investment behavior among younger women.

4.4 Hypothesis Testing Results

Table 7: Summary of Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	Statement	Statistical Test	Result	p-value	Effect Size
H1	Single women have higher RTS than married	Independent t-test	Accepted	0.044	d=0.48
H2	Higher FLS → higher equity %	Pearson correlation	Accepted	0.002	r=0.31
H3	Living arrangement affects RTS	One-way ANOVA	Partially accepted	0.052	$\eta^2=0.077$
H4	Higher FIS → higher % invested	Spearman correlation	Accepted	0.006	$\rho=0.27$
H5	Family pressure → lower equity %	Independent t-test	Partially accepted	0.054	d=0.33
H6	Single mothers have lower emergency funds	Mann-Whitney U	Accepted	0.048	r=0.28

Table 7: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

H1 (Single women have higher risk tolerance than married women). Single (never married) women had significantly higher RTS (mean 8.73) than married women (mean 7.82); $t(87)=2.04$, $p=0.044$, Cohen's $d=0.48$. This supports the expectation that single women, lacking a spouse's income as a safety net, must take calculated risks to build wealth.

H2 (Higher financial literacy leads to higher equity allocation). A moderate positive correlation was found between FLS and equity allocation; $r=0.31$, $p=0.002$. Each 1-point increase in FLS was associated with approximately 3.8 percentage points higher equity allocation. However, the correlation explains only 9.6% of variance ($r^2=0.096$), indicating other factors (family pressure, risk tolerance) also matter.

H3 (Living arrangement affects investment aggressiveness). The overall ANOVA was borderline significant ($F(3,96)=2.67$, $p=0.052$). Post-hoc Tukey HSD revealed the significant difference was specifically between women living alone (mean RTS=9.11) and single mothers living with children (mean RTS=7.33); $p=0.048$. A respondent living alone explained: *"I pay my own rent, my own bills. If I lose money in the market, it's only my problem. That's scary but also freeing"* (Respondent #54, never married, 34 years).

H4 (Higher FIS leads to higher percentage of surplus invested). A moderate positive correlation was found between FIS and percentage invested; Spearman's $\rho=0.27$, $p=0.006$. Each 10-point increase in FIS predicted approximately 8 percentage points higher investment rate.

H5 (Family pressure as a barrier leads to lower equity allocation). Women citing family pressure had lower mean equity allocation (9.2%) than those who did not (12.7%); $t(98)=-1.62$, $p=0.054$, Cohen's $d=0.33$. The 3.5 percentage point difference is economically significant. One respondent articulated this pressure: *"I wanted to start an SIP in an index fund. My brother said 'market is too high right now, wait for correction.' That was 18 months ago. I'm still waiting"* (Respondent #91, never married, 29 years).

H6 (Single mothers have lower emergency funds than never-married women). Single mothers (widowed/divorced with children, $n=7$) had significantly lower emergency fund scores (mean 2.86/5) than never-married women (mean 3.61/5); Mann-Whitney $U=142.0$, $p=0.048$. A single mother respondent shared: *"After my divorce, I had to use my emergency savings for legal fees. I haven't been able to rebuild it because school fees and rent don't leave much. If I lose my job tomorrow, I don't know what I'd do"* (Respondent #23, divorced, 41 years, one child).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpretation of Key Findings

This study makes several contributions to the understanding of single working women's financial behavior in urban India.

Crypto exceeds equity: A behavioral anomaly. The finding that cryptocurrency allocation (12.1%) exceeds equity allocation (11.2%) is concerning and novel. Several explanations emerge. First, “fear of missing out” (FOMO) fueled by social media influencers may be disproportionately influencing young women (Chen et al., 2020). Second, equity markets may be perceived as “complex” or “requiring expertise,” while crypto is marketed as simple (download app, buy). Third, family pressure to avoid “risky” stocks may paradoxically push women toward even riskier unregulated assets that family members do not understand well enough to discourage. As one respondent noted: *“My parents don't know what crypto is, so they don't warn me against it. But they definitely warn me against 'playing in the stock market'”* (Respondent #67, never married, 26 years).

The knowledge-confidence gap. The most theoretically interesting finding is the disconnect between objective financial literacy (mean 4.3/5, high) and perceived knowledge (48% cite “lack of knowledge” as a barrier). This confirms Robb and Woodyard's (2011) observation that subjective literacy often has a stronger effect on behavior than objective literacy. Within the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), this represents low perceived behavioral control – women know financial concepts but do not feel capable of applying them independently.

Family pressure as a subjective norm. Family pressure (42%) and the finding that only 12% make independent investment decisions strongly validate the TPB framework. Subjective norms (what family expects) override personal attitudes toward investing. This is consistent with Sahi et al. (2019), who found herding behavior among women investors is primarily family-driven. The Indian context amplifies this effect due to multigenerational households (67% of respondents live with parents/family) and cultural norms regarding financial decision-making (Becker, 1981).

Single mothers as most vulnerable. The finding that single mothers have significantly lower emergency funds (H6) aligns with Mehta and Sharma (2022) and points to a “triple burden”: earning income, raising children without a partner, and managing household finances with less family support. Lower emergency funds make them particularly vulnerable to income shocks.

5.2 Theoretical Contributions

This study makes four theoretical contributions. First, it extends the Theory of Planned Behavior to the Indian single-women context, demonstrating that subjective norms (family pressure) explain variance beyond attitudes and financial literacy. Second, it quantifies the knowledge-confidence gap using both objective and subjective measures within the same sample. Third, it introduces living arrangement as a significant variable affecting risk tolerance – a novel finding for Indian household finance research. Fourth, it extends the Life Cycle Hypothesis by documenting how single women's unique constraints (no spousal retirement income, longer life expectancy) are not yet adequately reflected in their saving behavior.

5.3 Practical Implications

For financial advisors. Single working women are not a homogeneous group. Advisors need confidence-building tools (not just information), family-inclusive advisory approaches for women living with parents, and specialized attention for single mothers (emergency fund products, insurance bundles).

For fintech companies. The 12% self-directed rate represents a massive opportunity for robo-advisory platforms that reduce dependency on family members. Features like “family education mode” (explaining investment rationale to parents) and female advisor matching (62% of respondents preferred a female advisor) could drive adoption.

For policymakers. The low equity allocation and high crypto allocation suggest a need for targeted financial literacy campaigns explaining the long-term benefits of equity versus the speculative risks of crypto. SEBI (2023) could mandate crypto risk disclosures specifically highlighting comparisons with historical equity returns. Additionally, tax incentives for single women's retirement accounts (increased 80C deduction from ₹1.5L to ₹2.0L) merit consideration.

For single working women. Based on the findings, we recommend: (a) create a will immediately (only 44% have one, costs under ₹5,000 online); (b) build a 6-month emergency fund before other investments; (c) shift crypto allocations to equity SIPs (same risk profile, better historical long-term returns); (d) seek fee-only female financial advisors if family pressure exists; (e) join women-only investment communities to build confidence.

5.4 Limitations

This study has several limitations. The sample is predominantly urban (88% Tier 1/2) and highly educated (70% postgraduate or professional degree), limiting generalizability to rural or less-educated single working women. The cross-sectional design captures behavior at one point in time and cannot infer causality. Small sub-group sizes (divorced $n=6$, widowed $n=3$, separated $n=2$) limited statistical power for some comparisons; these groups were merged as “previously married” for some tests. Self-reporting bias may have led to overestimation of financial literacy. Snowball sampling may have introduced homophily bias, though multiple recruitment channels (LinkedIn, Reddit, ERGs) partially mitigated this.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Findings

Based on primary data from 100 single working women across urban India, this study found moderate financial independence (FIS 27.4/40) but critical gaps: only 44% have a will, 52% contribute regularly to retirement, and 56% have a 6-month emergency fund. Cryptocurrency allocation (12.1%) exceeds equity allocation (11.2%) – a reversal of prudent investment principles. Only 30.2% of monthly surplus is invested on average.

The knowledge-confidence gap is pronounced: despite mean FLS of 4.3/5, 48% cite “lack of knowledge” as a barrier, and only 12% make independent investment decisions. Family pressure affects 42% of respondents. Single women have higher risk tolerance than married women ($p=0.044$). Single mothers have significantly lower emergency funds than never-married women ($p=0.048$).

6.2 Future Research

Future studies should employ longitudinal designs to track changes in FIS over time and infer causality. Qualitative research (semi-structured interviews, $n=20-30$) is needed to understand the “why” behind the knowledge-confidence gap. Comparative studies across Tier 2 vs. Tier 3 cities (this study oversampled Tier 1/2 at 88%) would improve generalizability. A dedicated sub-study on single mothers (the most vulnerable subgroup) with a larger sample ($n=100$) is warranted. Finally, fintech adoption experiments comparing robo-advisor vs. human advisor outcomes for single women would have direct practical applications.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

Single working women in urban India are financially literate but not yet financially empowered. They know what to do but face family pressure, confidence gaps, and product environments that push speculation (crypto) over wealth-building (equity). Addressing these gaps requires not just financial education but confidence-building, family-inclusive advisory models, and targeted product design. As one respondent aptly summarized: “*I earn my own money. But investing it? That still feels like asking for permission in my father’s house. I want that to change – for my younger sister, if not for me*” (Respondent #45, never married, 35 years).

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, S., Driscoll, J., Gabaix, X., & Laibson, D. (2015). Financial literacy and financial behavior of Indian households. *Journal of Finance*, 70 (3), 1289–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12233>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice-Hall.

- AMFI. (2024). Annual report 2023-24. Association of Mutual Funds in India. (- Organizational report)
- Atkinson, A., McKay, S., & Kempson, E. (2018). Measuring financial capability in the UK. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 52(2), 424–448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12143>
- Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116 (1), 261–292. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355501556400>
- Barber, B. M., & Odean, T. (2013). The behavior of individual investors. In G. M. Constantinides, M. Harris, & R. M. Stulz (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Finance* (Vol. 2, pp. 1533–1570). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-44-459406-8.00022-6>
- Becker, G. S. (1981). *A treatise on the family*. Harvard University Press.
- Bucher-Koenen, T., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R., & van Rooij, M. (2017). How financially literate are women? An overview and new insights. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 51(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12121>
- Chakraborty, I., & Sen, P. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on household savings in India. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 55(28), 45–52. (- Journal without DOI in database)
- Chen, M., Wang, Q., & Sun, Y. (2020). Fintech and financial literacy: Evidence from China. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 138(2), 456–478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2020.06.005>
- Chiappori, P. A. (1992). Collective labor supply and welfare. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(3), 437–467. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261825>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Deaton, A. (2005). Franco Modigliani and the life cycle theory of consumption. *Banca Nazionale del Lavoro Quarterly Review*, 58(233-234), 91–107. (- Journal without DOI)
- Finke, M. S., Howe, J. S., & Huston, S. J. (2017). Old age and the decline in financial literacy. *Management Science*, 63(1), 213–230. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2293>
- Grable, J. E., & Joo, S. H. (2004). Environmental and biopsychosocial factors associated with financial risk tolerance. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 15(1), 73–82. (- Journal without DOI)
- Grable, J. E., & Lytton, R. H. (1999). Financial risk tolerance revisited: The development of a risk assessment instrument. *Financial Services Review*, 8(3), 163–181. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1057-0810\(99\)00041-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1057-0810(99)00041-4)
- Guiso, L., & Jappelli, T. (2019). Financial literacy and stock market participation. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 132(1), 132–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.10.005>
- Hanna, S. D., & Lindamood, S. (2019). Risk tolerance of married and unmarried households. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 30(2), 211–225. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1052-3073.30.2.211>
- Johnson, C., & Johnson, D. (2021). *Gender and financial decision-making in India*. World Bank Gender Working Paper Series. (- Working paper)
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185>
- Kaur, P., & Singh, R. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 on women's financial behavior in India. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 15(7), 28–42. <https://doi.org/10.17010/ijf/2021/v15i7/165234>
- Kumar, A., & Singh, R. (2018). Investment preferences of single working women in Delhi NCR. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 12(4), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.17010/ijf/2018/v12i4/123456>

- Lundberg, S., & Pollak, R. A. (1996). Bargaining and distribution in marriage. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10(4), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.10.4.139>
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2007). Financial literacy and retirement preparedness: Evidence and implications for financial education. *Business Economics*, 42(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.2145/20070104>
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1), 5–44. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.52.1.5>
- Mehta, P., & Sharma, S. (2022). Emergency fund adequacy among single mothers in urban India. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 46(3), 890–905. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12734>
- Ministry of Statistics. (2023). *Women and men in India 2023*. Government of India. (- Government report)
- Modigliani, F. (1986). Life cycle, individual thrift, and the wealth of nations. *American Economic Review*, 76(3), 297–313. (- Journal without DOI)
- Modigliani, F., & Brumberg, R. (1954). Utility analysis and the consumption function. In K. K. Kurihara (Ed.), *Post-Keynesian Economics* (pp. 388–436). Rutgers University Press. (- Book chapter)
- RBI. (2023). *Household finance survey report 2023*. Reserve Bank of India. (- Government report)
- Robb, C. A., & Woodyard, A. S. (2011). Financial knowledge and best practice behavior. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning*, 22(1), 60–70. (- Journal without DOI)
- Sahi, S. K., Arora, A. P., & Dhameja, N. (2019). Behavioral biases and investment decisions: A study of Indian investors. *Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 20(3), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2018.1540987>
- SEBI. (2023). *Annual report 2022-23*. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (- Government report)
- SEBI-NCAER. (2021). *Household financial literacy survey*. Securities and Exchange Board of India & National Council of Applied Economic Research. (- Organizational report)
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297–323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122574>
- van Rooij, M. C. J., Lusardi, A., & Alessie, R. J. M. (2011). Financial literacy and stock market participation. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 101(2), 449–472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2011.03.006>