

Deposit Mobilization by the MFIs: Clients' Perspectives

Khaleda Khatun*
Salahuddin Ahmed Khan**
Dr. Nazrul Islam***

Abstract: *This paper aims at identifying Microfinance Institutions' deposit mobilization issues from the perspectives of the clients - the members of the MFIs. It looks into the different aspects of field level experience and practice of the NGO-MFIs working in Bangladesh. To identify the clients' perspective on deposit mobilization by MFIs, this paper presents findings from a study, which was conducted for Microcredit Regulatory Authority and represents sample survey of 450 members of different NGO-MFIs working in the 4 divisions namely Dhaka, Chittagong, Rajshahi, and Khulna. A structured questionnaire was used to conduct the survey which was developed through literature review and finalized through pilot survey. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics such as tables, simple percentage, correlations etc. were used to describe the situation. Results show that MFIs are filling the gaps of the financial services required by vast majority of relatively poor people having no access to the banking system, and thus working as a complementary segment of overall financial system of the country with demands for more services to render. One of the major demands registered is the access to more flexible system of deposit by the rural people besides their demand for greater volume of credit flow, that still remain only partially fulfilled.*

1. Background

Studies on microfinance mostly covers the issues of impact of microcredit upon the borrowers or the sustainability of the NGO-MFIs to continue microfinance operations. This study has attempted to focus on the deposit services offered by the MFIs in Bangladesh. Deposit has appeared to be one of the critical resources being mobilized by the MFIs in Bangladesh. Not only that it can add additional resources for the MFIs, it is regarded as a strong tool for reaching the hard-core poor. It is also observed that, without such deposit provisions, hard-core poor would have a tendency to 'self select themselves out' of microfinance operations (Sharif, 2002). Besides such abstinence from embarking financial obligations, the hard-core poor families also find the deposit mobilization as the mechanism for forced savings otherwise would not have taken place. Thus, deposit mobilization has been regarded as one of the major contribution of the NGO-MFIs from a group to whom traditional banks will not find economically viable to reach and operationally difficult to approach. But the MFIs with their unique approach of 'bank going to people instead people coming to bank' made such unreachable unviable depositors to deposit billions of taka in the form of deposit. Therefore, the ability to mobilize the resources of micro finance institutes (MFIs) is very much important for their survival and growth in future. This is also important for the economic growth and development of the country. Ability refers to the access of MFIs to the funds and the use

* Associate Professor, Department of Finance, University of Dhaka

** Professor, Department of Finance, University of Dhaka

*** Professor, Business Administration Department, East West University, Dhaka

of funds for their purposes. And when MFIs survive and grow, the multiplier effect will be on the financial performance of the institutions and the economy as well.

Deposit mobilizing ability of the institutes is influenced by a number of factors related to the internal strengths and weaknesses of the institutions and the opportunities and external threats from environment. The internal factors that have influence on the ability of MFIs to mobilize deposit include overall business strategy of the MFIs, governance and management efficiency, operational skill of the people etc. Business strategy and efficiency of the MFIs depends on the leaders of the institutions and thus influence their resource mobilization ability. The internal governance and efficiency is concerned with the input output relationships which are reflected in good track record of accountable ownership and consistently good management of funds, financially sound health with a high rate of loan recovery and consistently good returns ensured by full-time high level committed management team (Robinson, M., 2000). That means the effort given by these institutions and the outcome they receive from the reality will determine how efficient the resource mobilizing ability they have. This demands efficient and competent manpower of the MFIs to materialize the goals on time. Further, operational skill of the people working for the MFIs is also important factor contributing to the efficiency of the resource mobilization of the MFIs. Operational skill may be termed as the technical skills of the employees. Here, technical skills indicate that the people of the MFIs must be able to understand the mechanism and the modality of the operations. They must have higher level of technical training from home and abroad to understand the responsibility related to the nature of the job. Education related to the financial operation and the strategic planning of MFIs may be helpful in this regard.

In addition to above factors, there are also other factors, which may also influence the ability of the MFIs. These include competitive environment in the financial market, policy support from the government, social acceptability issues. (These factors may also be called PEST Political, Economic, Social and Technological factors). The ability of the MFIs significantly depends on the government policy with appropriate regulatory environment and public supervision mechanism. Political stability of the country is yet another factor that has substantial impact on the ability of the MFIs. Political chaos and confusion has direct negative impact on the operational efficiency of the MFIs. Further, market drivers such as, market mechanisms, demand and supply, desire of the customers to access to the funds of the MFIs, insurance protection and the like. Market demand for the fund is independently determined by the interactions of demand and supply. The demand is again dependent on the desire of the customers, which is again determined by the behavior of the MFIs towards them and also by their need for funds. In addition, insurance systems of the country is also concerned with the market drivers that can reduce the risk of the investments.

In addition, a closer look at the deposit mobilization experience of microfinance institutions, understanding how savings can work for microfinance clients, understanding how MFIs can benefit from deposit mobilization services, how to develop and roll out such deposit products – short term and long term savings instruments with considerations for MFIs' clients to improve their operational ability. Acquisition of alternative financial resources for future development in this regard may also be useful (Srnc, K., and AIWA.

E., 2006). In order to optimally use their capacity, appropriate legal requirements, policies and strategies have to be worked out to support MFIs at different stages of their development (Latifee, H. I., 2003).

Self sufficiency approach in overall resource mobilization may be adopted to bring sustainability in the operations of MFIs. Sharma (2003) suggested that MFIs should be operated as a business unit in self-sufficiency approach so that subsidized funds based operations can be minimized. Loan receivers must also be supported by the loan providers to make them sustainable (CGAP, 2003). The strategy should focus on establishing a policy environment conducive to microfinance, developing regulatory and supervision framework, institutional capacity building with a variety of supports should be provided to the loan providers (Nazirwan, Mohamad., 2010). Therefore, two mechanisms such as help clients make regular deposits and help clients restrict the use of their funds except for well-planned uses or emergencies should be ensured in this regard (Ashraf, et al., 2003).

There are few challenges that pro-poor MFI must face in their operations. Successful savings mobilization requires a conducive macroeconomic environment. Where political turmoil, high inflation and uncertainty about the future prevail, savers will try to accumulate real assets rather than deposit their money in savings accounts. Under these circumstances, policy makers must ensure an effective regulatory framework that entails adequate protection to savings and provides incentives for sound management (Elser, et al., 1999).

To overcome the hurdle, MFIs should identify the alternatives to traditional equity, must adjust their balance sheets to present a truer and fairer picture of their financial health. Marking below-market borrowing, or soft loans, to market to capture the implicit subsidy inherent in its lower interest rates, and capitalizing that subsidy as a 'grant' on the balance sheet as equity, is an important part of this solution. Increasing the availability of funds to meet operating deficits through quasi-equity, minimize the amount of equity and equity-like financing MFIs must raise and maximize their ability to leverage on lending funds from banks and other commercial and semi-commercial sources. The bottom line – the equity can be overcome, allowing for more rapid scaling-up of outreach to the poor (Gibbons & Meehan, 2002).

Hence, the critical challenge to make microfinance institutes a sustainable is two-fold. In one side, it is the internal operational skills and on the other side, the favorable environmental impact on the operations of the MFIs. In this regard, the good news is the consensus among the MFIs. That means, achieving an order of magnitude change in the scale of microfinance. This will require higher level of deposit mobilization (Hubka, et al., 2005). A number of government actions may help in increasing the ability of MFIs. The actions are: (i) focus on macroeconomic factors for microfinance, (ii) strengthen the banking system, (iii) develop support infrastructure especially in rural areas, (iv) encourage the development, and (v) streamlining of registration and titling systems for assets owned by rural and poor urban households. Such policies will help the MFIs to remain sustainable and capable of meeting the demands of the members in terms of their

credit needs as well as to safe keep their savings kept in the form of deposit with these institutions.

As such, the deposit mobilization operations of the NGO MFIs need to be visited from different perspectives. How well the deposit mobilization operations are performed by the NGO-MFIs in the country is examined in this paper using the survey data.

2. Research Method and Sampling Design

Studies in different countries show increasing evidence in favor of deposit mobilization by the MFIs while traditional banking and bank regulators are skeptical about the possible risk in deposit mobilization by ‘quasi formal institutions’ like the NGO MFIs. Accordingly, this study was conducted to examine the characteristics, status, and experiences of NGO-MFIs clients. It is an exploratory study and analytical approach is flatly descriptive. Little attempt for statistical inference is made, rather focus was given to describe the objective variables to the interested readers.

The present study discusses deposit mobilization behavior information from 454 clients – the members of 10 different MFIs from 9 districts of 4 administrative divisions of the country. Except 6, all the respondents were female members of different MFIs. The survey was conducted using the divisions as primary strata. Accordingly, 4 divisions namely Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna and Rajshahi were selected. From these divisions, 9 districts were selected randomly. From the selected districts data were collected from 14 Upazilas considering convenience as a major factor.

The data collection approach was root based. The field investigators were assigned to visit target area under supervision of the research team to collect data from different villages in those Upazilas. Each of the field investigators was required to interview 50 NGO-MFI members having linkage with targeted MFIs in selected strata (Table 1 and 2 in the Appendix). Accordingly, data were collected from 468 members of different target MFIs. However, after scrutiny, 14 responses were cancelled and finally 454 sample data were used for the analysis. A structured questionnaire was used (in Bangla) to collect the necessary information for the study.

3. Analysis and Interpretations

This study focuses on three very important aspects of the clients’ perspective of resource mobilization. The aspects are (i) general economic characteristics of the respondents, (ii) deposit behavior of the MFI members or depositors, and (iii) deposit experience of the MFI members. These issues are discussed from the clients’ perspective in the following sections.

3.1 General Economic Characteristics of the Respondents

There are three sections in this part of the study. The sections are (i) house ownership pattern of the sample households, (ii) land ownership pattern of the sample household, and (iii) main profession of the respondents’ family head and income, expenditure and savings pattern of the surveyed households.

3.1.1 House Ownership Pattern of the Sample Households

The Table 1 shows that, out of 454 samples from the 9 districts, majority (89%) are found living in their own houses. Only 50 of them (11%) have reported of living in rented houses. It is observed that 55% of the sample households (251) are living in their ancestral houses while next major group consisting 134 households (29.5%) have their houses built on purchased land. 10 of the sample households were found living on government owned ('Khas') land.

3.1.2 Land Ownership Pattern of the Sample Household

In this study, it is found that only 9% (41) of the sample households are holding more than 50 decimals of land. Among them the biggest land ownership is found to be 150 decimals of land by one household. On the other hand, 45 households (or 9.9% of total) were found to be absolutely landless. Most of sample households have claimed to have land barely enough for having their living home. It is also observed that 85% of the sample households got no land or had a maximum of 25 decimals of land that include their homestead. Thus, the sample households covered in study are mostly in the lower segments in terms of their asset ownership.

Their economic status in terms of wealth (land and house ownership) is further examined with the data presented in Table 2. It is observed that, 45 out of 50 respondents living in rented house are absolutely landless. While 145 out of 251 respondents living in the ancestral homestead are having land barely sufficient for the house only. Thus, the housing and land ownership character of respondents depicts mostly very poor rural households living in different parts of the country.

3.1.3 Main Profession of the Respondents' Family Head and Income, Expenditure and Savings Pattern of the Surveyed Household

Just like their wealth position (in terms of land and house ownership), the surveyed households' income expenditure and savings patterns also reflect their poverty level. Such factors are contingent on the profession in which the income earning persons of the family (mostly husbands and fathers of the respondents as most of them were found to be women. The Tables 3 and 4 show another important demographic characteristic – respondents' professions by their average monthly family income and expense data in order to understand their deposit generating abilities.

The MFIs covered wide varieties of families in terms of the profession of the heads of the family. In this regard, it is worth mentioning here that, 99% of the respondents were women but the professions referred to this study are the professions of their family profession of main income earners as the respondents are in most cases not the main income earners. In this survey, mainly households from 8 different professions were reported. Farming for obvious reason is the main profession as 102 of the 454 respondents (22.5% of the respondents) are primarily coming from farmer family. Daily laborer (54 respondents or 11.9%), shop keepers or vendors (76 respondents or 16.7%) and different types of service holders (42 respondents or 9.3%) were also reported by the surveyed households as their main professions. Animal husbandry (cattle, goat or poultry farming), fishing, remittances of family members were not found as main source of

income by significant number of households. It is also found in the survey that 98 respondents (21.6%) have multiple jobs or professional involvement, that is no, specific profession for these respondents can be considered their main profession. This group of respondents either simultaneously works for more than one type of activities or does whatever opportunity they have.

It is observed that out of 454 respondents, 43% of them have family level monthly income of Tk. 5000 or lesser amount and that 91.6 have monthly family income of Tk. 7000 or less (Table 3). The first row of Table 3 shows that, out of 102 farmer families, income level below Tk. 5000 is reported by 73 out of 102 respondents (71% of farming based families) only 5 of this group's reported family income above Tk. 7000. Among the day labor based families, (76 in number) 69 (almost 84%) have less than Tk. 5000 as monthly income. Among the respondents, the service holder based families have reported higher level of income while those having multiple professions have reported higher levels of income 99% having more than Tk. 4000 as monthly income.

About family expenses it is observed that, 67% has monthly expenditure of Tk. 5000 or less while Tk. 7000 or less were family expenditure is reported by 90% of the respondents (Table 4). About the expense level and professions of the respondent families, it is observed that, the farming based families are more or less similar in terms of their expense level in comparison to their income level having tendency to spend less than their income. Thus, some form of savings is evident in these families. The shop keepers have higher level of income and relatively lower in reporting expenses. Among the service holders, 33 (out of 42) reported income level above Tk. 6000 while in the matter of spending for family purpose, it was found that only 24 had more than Tk. 6000. Among the multiple job holders, 25 reported less than Tk. 5000 monthly income, while reporting monthly expenses, 70 out of 98 has less than Tk. 5000 monthly expenses. Thus, across the profession, it is observed that, relatively families from all types of professions have tendency to save or generate surplus. Given the above general economic characteristics, we now present MFI activities related survey results as under.

The savings generation ability by the families of the respondents is shown in Table 5. It is reported by one fifth of the respondents (93 in number) that, they have some form of negative savings. Such negative savings (or dis-savings in some cases) ranges from more than Tk. 500 to very marginal amount. Another one fifth informed monthly savings ranging from Tk. 0 to Tk. 840 per month. Highest levels of savings ranging Tk. 2700 or more are reported by about 19% of the respondents. Thus, the savings pattern was fairly distributed among the surveyed household families.

3.2.1 Deposit Behavior of Surveyed Households

The deposit behavior of the respondent families is linked to their savings generation capacity in the Table 6. It shows that, all the respondents have some degree of deposit balances ranging from less than Tk. 1000 to a level of more than Tk. 10,000 level despite their ability to generate surplus income as per their reported income expense pattern. It is observed that 103 (22.68%) respondents out of total 454 have more than Tk. 10,000 as their total deposit with the currently affiliated MFIs. The average of all deposits balances of the 454 sample units was estimated Tk. 5460, indicating downward skewness in

deposit position. Besides their deposit with the main MFI (MFI with which respondents maintain active relationship), about 151 of the respondents have also reported to have deposits with other MFIs also.

3.2.2 Different Types of Deposit Accounts

While the respondents have the tendency to save even when they have negative savings, households with positive savings tend to make deposit for long term savings products. It is identified that, all the respondents due to systematic requirement for mandatory savings have at least one depository accounts with the main MFI. The table summarized the deposit behavior of the respondents in terms of different types of accounts with their balances. As understood, all of them have one mandatory deposit account.

As shown in Table 7, it can be understood that, other than mandatory deposit, 73 respondents (15.8% of 453 respondents) maintain monthly voluntary deposit scheme while 152 (33.48%) do also have some form of term deposits. The average size of mandatory deposit was found to be Tk. 2234.73 with maximum amount of Tk. 26000 and minimum of as low as Tk. 40 only. The higher deposit balance is maintained by members having long association with the current NGO, while the Tk. 40 deposit balance was reported by a respondent who became the member only recently. Similarly, it is observed that the average deposit balance for savings account is Tk. 1772.58 with maximum and minimum amounts were Tk. 6020 and Tk. 900 respectively. For the term deposit account, the average is found to be Tk. 702.8 with a minimum balance of Tk. 10 and maximum balance of Tk. 4,200 only. These products are reported to be new and so, volume of deposit balance is not significant.

As mentioned the respondents are maintaining monthly savings, savings and Term Deposit accounts. The monthly savings accounts are flexible products where MFI members can deposit or withdraw any amount. These accounts are not tied to their loan account. The term deposits are almost banking types products having in some cases maturity of more than 8 years of time. The depositors are required to deposit a fixed amount every month (weekly or fortnightly versions are also observed) just like the Deposit Pension Scheme of the commercial banks. The interest rates are also reported to be higher, 7 to 10 percent varying on maturity and NGOs. Thus, the members of MFIs are getting opportunities to mobilize their savings through the NGO-MFIs. The respondents reported that, they are allowed to withdraw their deposits from these accounts.

3.2.3 Level of Satisfaction by the MFI Clienteles

Given the different forms of deposit accounts made available to their clients, the respondents were asked to express their level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction about the services offered by the MFIs. These questions were overall level of assessment on the part of the surveyed MFI clients. The Table 25 to 28 show such opinions expressed by the respondents from different angles.

3.2.4 Level of Satisfaction and House Ownership Pattern

The house ownership is an important indicator for poverty level. Accordingly, the levels of satisfaction expressed in the 5 point scale with 0 as the lowest score and 4 as the

highest score for five different level of satisfaction were placed before the respondents. It can be seen in the Table 8 that, with a maximum score of 4, the respondents' overall satisfaction level is found to be 2.65 reflecting their state of satisfaction is almost in between the continuum of the scale. So, it can be concluded that the respondents are not unhappy with the NGO services nor are they grossly happy with the services.

Given the overall score when we compare such performance in terms of respondents' house ownership pattern, we see that least satisfaction is expressed by the people living in rented house with an overall group score of 2.52. In this category, the highest score is observed from those living in Government 'Khas' land having some special land allocations like 'Asroy' (shelter) projects. Similar pattern is also observed with regard to satisfaction level of households by their land ownership characteristics. It is observed that absolutely landless people showing least level of satisfaction (scoring 2.49 out of highest possible score of 4). One special feature is reflected by the level of satisfaction from the large land owners, who also scored low in satisfaction scale. The higher score was recorded by the middle group who seemed to be the major beneficiary group of the MFIs.

3.2.5 Levels of Satisfaction and Profession

The levels of satisfaction score of the respondents were compared with those of their profession. It is observed that those who are involved in animal husbandry (cattle or goat rearing, poultry farming etc), are the most satisfied group, followed by people going abroad and now getting income from remittances and those who are involved in multiple job. These groups have some degree of support from the MFIs in sending their family members abroad or supporting their multi job (side business or micro-enterprise) development. Least satisfaction was reported by the people involved in Micro-Industry activities. It is observed that, they want more loan and bank like services from their MFIs. Thus, the respondents having different professional background expressed their level of satisfaction with the MFI services. The Table 8 shows the levels of satisfaction of the households in terms of size of deposits. The above findings reveal no clear pattern about the levels of satisfaction score, as the score are distributed across the group, across the household ownership pattern is more or less similar pattern.

3.2.6 Different Deposit and Other Services Demanded from MFIs

In the matter of services desired by the respondents, different types of demands were raised by them. The Table 9 reflects the summary of their expectations about the different services. It is observed that, 42 out of 454 refrained from any desire or expectation while 7 came with unspecific demand for enhancement of services into wider range of activities. About 12% of the respondents demanded better withdrawal facilities with another 6.4% demanding specifically banking service like chequing accounts from MFIs. About 27% demanded higher interest on deposit. About 14% of them required loan in larger amount so that they can make better utilization while another 21.8% demanded more loan with lower interest or longer maturity of loan. 38 respondents (8.4%) expressed concern about the safety of funds or reliability of the activities of the NGO people. However, such concern is expressed about smaller MFIs more than larger MFIs. Thus, the survey examined the expectations of the respondents about their level of satisfaction and desired nature of services from the MFIs.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

This study basically looked into the different aspects of field level experience and practice of the NGO-MFIs in terms of deposit mobilization. The results show that MFIs are to some extent successful in meeting the gaps of their demand for different financial services required by vast majority of relatively poor people having no access to the banking system, and thus, working as a complementary segment of overall financial system of the country. The study also revealed that, there is still room for dealing with demands for more services to render. One of the major demands registered is the access to more flexible system of deposit by the rural people besides their demand for greater volume of credit flow that still remains only partially fulfilled. However, there are other aspects relevant to deposit mobilization than can also be explored by using larger sample size in future.

Table 1:
Distribution of Sample Households by their House Ownership Structure

House Ownership Pattern	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rented house	50	11.0	11.0
Government Khas land	10	2.2	13.2
Made in farming land	9	2.0	15.2
Purchased Land	134	29.5	44.7
Ancestral Homestead	251	55.3	100.0
Total	454	100.0	

Table 2:
Distribution of Sample Households by their Land Ownership and Housing Pattern

Nature of Home Ownership	Ownership Pattern of Land by Size						Total
	Absolutely Landless	Land for Home only	10 Decimals	10-25 Decimals	25-50 Decimals	More than 50 Decimals	
Rented house	45 9.9%	1 .2%	0 .0%	4 .9%	0 .0%	0 .0%	50 11.0%
Home at Government Khas land	0 .0%	7 1.5%	1 .2%	2 .4%	0 .0%	0 .0%	10 2.2%
Home made in farming land	0 .0%	3 .7%	4 .9%	1 .2%	0 .0%	1 .2%	9 2.0%
Home made on purchased land	0 .0%	89 19.6%	4 .9%	16 3.5%	13 2.9%	12 2.6%	134 29.5%
Ancestral Homestead	0 .0%	148 32.6%	33 7.3%	25 5.5%	17 3.7%	28 6.2%	251 55.3%
Total	45 9.9%	248 54.6%	42 9.3%	48 10.6%	30 6.6%	41 9.0%	454 100.0%

Table 3:
Distribution of Sample Households by Profession and Average Monthly Income

Profession	Monthly Average Family Income						Total
	Less than 3000	3000-4000	4000-5000	5000-6000	6000-7000	More than 7000	
Farming	1 1.0%	10 9.8%	43 42.2%	43 42.2%	2 2.0%	3 2.9%	102 100.0%
Shopkeepers	0 .0%	1 1.9%	12 22.2%	23 42.6%	6 11.1%	12 22.2%	54 100.0%
Day Laborer	1 1.3%	22 28.9%	41 53.9%	11 14.5%	1 1.3%	0 .0%	76 100.0%
Service Holders	0 .0%	0 .0%	9 21.4%	17 40.5%	10 23.8%	6 14.3%	42 100.0%
Micro Industry	0 .0%	0 .0%	2 40.0%	3 60.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	5 100.0%
Animal Husbandry	1 12.5%	2 25.0%	2 25.0%	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	8 100.0%
Foreign Remittance Base	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	4 44.4%	4 44.4%	1 11.1%	9 100.0%
Businessman	0 .0%	0 .0%	7 100.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	7 100.0%
Others	1 1.9%	2 3.8%	12 22.6%	26 49.1%	6 11.3%	6 11.3%	53 100.0%
Multiple Job	0 .0%	1 1.0%	24 24.5%	46 46.9%	18 18.4%	9 9.2%	98 100.0%
Total	4 .9%	4 .9%	38 8.4%	152 33.5%	174 38.3%	48 10.6%	38 8.4%

Table 4:
Distribution of Sample Households by Profession and Average Monthly Households Expenses

Profession	Monthly Average Family Expenses						Total
	Less than 3000	3000-4000	4000-5000	5000-6000	6000-7000	More than 7000	
Farming	17 16.7%	25 24.5%	31 30.4%	21 20.6%	3 2.9%	5 4.9%	102 100.0%
Shopkeepers	8 14.8%	9 16.7%	13 24.1%	6 11.1%	5 9.3%	13 24.1%	54 100.0%
Day Laborer	34 44.7%	14 18.4%	21 27.6%	4 5.3%	3 3.9%	0 .0%	76 100.0%
Service Holders	4 9.5%	3 7.1%	11 26.2%	6 14.3%	10 23.8%	8 19.0%	42 100.0%
Micro Industry	1 20.0%	0 .0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	5 100.0%
Animal Husbandry	3 37.5%	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	0 .0%	2 25.0%	8 100.0%
Foreign Remittance Base	0 .0%	1 11.1%	2 22.2%	0 .0%	4 44.4%	2 22.2%	9 100.0%
Businessman	1 14.3%	3 42.9%	3 42.9%	0 .0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	7 100.0%
Others	5 9.4%	12 22.6%	13 24.5%	11 20.8%	6 11.3%	6 11.3%	53 100.0%
Multiple Job	8 8.2%	32 32.7%	30 30.6%	13 13.3%	9 9.2%	6 6.1%	98 100.0%
Total	81 17.8%	81 17.8%	100 22.0%	126 27.8%	63 13.9%	41 9.0%	454 100.0%

Table 5:
Distribution of Sample Households by Average Monthly Family Savings (Surplus /Deficit Income)

Income Level	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than Tk.(479)	45	9.9	9.9
Within Tk. (479) - 0	48	10.6	20.5
From Tk. 1 - 840	89	19.6	40.1
From Tk. 841 - 1640	91	20.0	60.1
From Tk.1641 - 2700	92	20.3	80.4
More than Tk. 2700	89	19.6	100.0
Total	454	100.0	

Table 6:

Monthly Average Family Saving Reported	Total Amount of Deposit of the Respondents with Main Active MFIs					Total
	Up to Tk. 1000	From Tk. 1001-2500	From Tk. 2501-5000	From Tk. 5001-10000	Above Tk. 10000	
Negative Savings reported	24 25.81%	16 17.20%	20 21.51%	22 23.61%	11 11.87%	93 100.0%
From Tk. 1 up to Tk 840	16 18.0%	19 21.3%	17 19.1%	17 19.1%	20 22.5%	89 100.0%
Tk. 841 up to Tk. 1640	14 15.4%	21 23.1%	16 17.6%	21 23.1%	19 20.9%	91 100.0%
Tk. 1641 up to Tk. 2700	17 18.5%	16 17.4%	16 17.4%	16 17.4%	27 29.3%	92 100.0%
More than Tk. 2700	12 13.5%	13 14.6%	15 16.9%	23 25.8%	26 29.2%	89 100.0%
Total	83 18.28%	85 18.70%	84 18.50%	99 21.81%	103 22.68%	454 100.0%

Pattern of Deposit Balances with Main MFI in Comparison with Levels of Monthly Savings Reported by Respondents

**Table7:
Summary of Statistics on Different Types of Deposit Accounts Being Maintained by the Respondents**

	Mandatory Deposit Account	Monthly Deposit Account	Savings Account	Term Deposit Account
No. of Observations	454	73	8	152
Mean of Deposit Balance	2234.73	1772.58	1795.00	702.80
Median of Deposit Balance	1500.00	1200.00	1200.00	502.00
Std. Deviation	2497.385	2222.715	1723.709	777.220
Range	25960	15510	5120	4190
Minimum	40	340	900	10
Maximum	26000	15550	6020	4200
Percentiles				
25	882.25	582.50	985.00	112.50
50	1500.00	1200.00	1200.00	502.00
75	2541.25	2161.00	1545.00	1017.50

Table 8:
Distribution of Sample Households by their Level of Satisfaction and House Ownership Pattern

House Ownership Pattern	Level of Satisfaction					Total Respondents	Group Score
	Very Much Unsatisfied	Not satisfied	Neither Unsatisfied Nor Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied		
Rented House	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	23 46.0%	21 42.0%	4 8.0%	50 100.0%	2.52
Government Khas land	0 .0%	1 10.0%	0 .0%	8 80.0%	1 10.0%	10 100.0%	2.90
Made in Farming Land	0 .0%	1 11.1%	1 11.1%	6 66.7%	1 11.1%	9 100.0%	2.78
Purchased Land	2 1.5%	4 3.0%	40 30.1%	68 51.1%	19 14.3%	133 100.0%	2.74
Ancestral Homestead	4 1.6%	17 6.8%	78 31.1%	126 50.2%	26 10.4%	251 100.0%	2.61
Total	7 1.5%	24 5.3%	142 31.3%	229 50.6%	51 11.3%	453 100.0%	2.65

Table 9:
Additional Services Demanded by the Respondents from the NGO-MFIs

Nature of Benefits/ Services Demanded by Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No Responses	42	9.3	9.3
Better Withdrawal Facilities	54	11.9	21.1
Facilities of Bank Savings Account	29	6.4	27.5
Higher Interest Rate on Deposit	122	26.9	54.4
Greater volume of loan and Longer Maturity	63	13.9	68.3
Lower loan interest and Greater Volume of Loan	99	21.8	90.1
Safety and Reliability	38	8.4	98.5
Wider Ranges of Services	7	1.5	100.0
Total	454	100.0	

References

1. Ananth, B. (2005). Financing Microfinance – the ICICI Bank Partnership Model, *Small Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16, No. 1.
2. Ashraf, N., Gons, N., Karlan, S. D., and Yin, W. (2003). A Review of Commitment Savings Products in Developing Countries, 337 Wallace Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08550.
3. CGAP. (2003). Anatomy of Micro- Finance Deal: A New Approach to Investing in micro-Finance Institutions Focus note, World Bank, Washington D.C.
4. Elser, L., Hannig, A., and Wisniwski, E. (1999). Comparative Analysis of Savings Mobilization Strategies, Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest (VGAP) *Working Group on Savings Mobilization*, Eschborn.
5. Gibbons, S. D., & Meehan, J.W. (2002). Financing Microfinance for Poverty Reduction, 24 June 2004.
6. Hubka, A., and Zaidi, R. (2005). Impact of Government Regulation on microfinance, prepared for the *World Development Report 2005: Improving the Investment Climate for Growth and Poverty Reduction*.
7. Latifee, H. I. (2003). Financing Micro-finance Programs, presented at the *International Workshop on Microfinance in Poverty Reduction and the Challenges for MFIs in Vietnam*, held in Ho Chi Minh City and organized by CEP Fund, HCMC, Vietnam during May 21-24.
8. Miles, A. (2009). Financing the Micro financiers – How MFIs are Sourcing Capital, UNITUS, Blue Orchard.
9. Nazirwan, Mohamad. (2010). The Way Forward: Future Direction and Strategies for Building a Sustainable Microfinance, paper was presented at the *Annual International Workshop on “Issues and Challenges of Microfinance”* on July 14-17 in Hikkaduwa Sri Lanka.
10. Robinson, M. (2000). Savings Mobilization as a Financial Instrument and Its Relevance for the Poor, *HIID Institute Fellow Emeritus*, Washington D.C.
11. Sharma, P. R. (2008). Financial Sustainability of Selected MFIs of Nepal, *The Journal of Nepalese Studies*, Vol. V, No. 1.
12. Srnec, K., and AIWA. E. (2006). Microfinancial Institutions and Financial Resources, *Agricultura Tropica Et Subtropica*, Vol. 39(2).