Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2025, 10(31s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/ **Research Article**

Analysis of Banker's Perception towards Education Loans: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Banks

Manik Jindal[1], Dr. Parveen Kumar Garg[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Faculty of Management and Commerce, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, manik.jindal02@gmail.com*
[2]*Associate Professor, Faculty of Management and Commerce, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, dr.parveenkumargarg@gmail.com*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 30 Dec 2024

Revised: 05 Feb 2025

Accepted: 25 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT

This study explores the perceptions of bankers towards education loans in India, comparing public and private sector banks. The research collects data from 204 bankers (102 each from public and private sectors) across six districts. It examines key factors such as loan sanctioning processes, repayment patterns, economic policies, and outcomes. Using statistical tools such as ANOVA, correlation and regression analysis, the study reveals significant differences between public and private sector approaches to education loans ($p < 0.05$). Key findings highlight that bankers strongly support prioritizing impoverished students (mean score: 4.04) and perceive education loans as essential for higher education access (mean score: 4.33). Geographic location and loan volume were found to significantly influence bankers' perceptions and loan sanctioning practices.

Keywords: Education Loans, Banker's Perception, Public Sector Banks, Private Sector Banks, Loan Sanctioning Process

Introduction

Background

Education loans have evolved into a vital financial mechanism, helping students pursue higher education despite the rising costs associated with quality education. As the demand for education continues to grow, especially in the face of skyrocketing tuition fees and living expenses, these loans serve as an essential tool for overcoming financial barriers. By providing the necessary financial support, education loans enable students to access institutions and courses that they may otherwise not afford. According to Kumar and Patel (2021), education loans have become a strategic enabler, allowing individuals to pursue academic aspirations without the hindrance of financial limitations. This financial assistance is particularly significant in countries like India, where educational institutions are often financially out of reach for many students from lower-income backgrounds (Chandra, 2020). The availability of education loans not only facilitates individual academic growth but also contributes to the broader goal of improving educational standards and workforce development in emerging economies.

Role of Banking Sectors

Public and private sector banks play crucial and complementary roles in the education financing system, addressing the diverse needs of students across different socioeconomic backgrounds. Public Sector Banks (PSBs) are primarily driven by the social welfare mandate of the government, which influences their approach to education loans. These banks offer loans with more favorable terms, such as lower interest rates, extended repayment periods, and minimal collateral requirements. Their goal is to make education more accessible to a broader segment of the population, particularly students from lower- and middle-income families. Public sector banks often work in alignment with government schemes, providing financial aid that supports social inclusion and encourages higher education enrollment. For instance, PSBs typically offer interest subsidies and support schemes for economically disadvantaged students, ensuring that even students from rural or underprivileged areas can pursue higher education (Jha, 2022).

In contrast, Private Sector Banks (PSBs) adopt a more market-driven approach, offering quicker processing times and more flexible, customized loan products tailored to the needs of different student categories. These banks are more likely to focus on students from urban areas or higher-income brackets, offering loans for specialized programs such as professional courses, foreign education, and high-demand fields like technology and medicine. Private banks often provide additional services, such as faster approval processes, higher loan limits, and competitive interest rates for creditworthy students, making them attractive to those pursuing higher education in more expensive or exclusive institutions. While their primary focus is profitability, private sector banks also contribute significantly to education financing by offering efficient and innovative financial products (Reddy, 2021).

Together, these two sectors—public and private—create a well-rounded and inclusive education loan ecosystem. Public sector banks ensure that education loans are available to students from a wide range of economic backgrounds, promoting social welfare and access to education. Meanwhile, private sector banks meet the demands of students seeking more specialized and quicker financial solutions, catering to those with higher financial stability or specific educational goals. The combined efforts of both sectors help bridge the gap in higher education financing, ensuring that all students, regardless of their economic standing, have access to the resources needed to pursue higher education and career advancement.

The education loan segment in India faces several significant challenges that hinder its full potential. One of the primary concerns is the rising incidence of non-performing assets (NPAs), which occurs when borrowers default on their loans, leading to financial instability for banks and reduced availability of funds for new loans (Kumar, 2020). Additionally, disbursement delays often frustrate students, as the time-consuming process of loan approval and processing can hinder timely access to funds, potentially affecting their ability to meet academic deadlines or secure admissions. Another challenge is the limited coverage for certain academic programs, where many banks have restrictive policies on the types of courses eligible for financing, excluding programs in emerging fields or vocational training. Moreover, stringent collateral requirements make it difficult for students from low-income families to secure loans, as they often lack the assets required to pledge for loan approval. Finally, disparities in interest rates between public and private sector banks further complicate the decision-making process for borrowers, with private sector banks generally charging higher rates than public sector counterparts, making loans more expensive and less accessible for many students (Chaudhary, 2021). These challenges, if not addressed, could impede the growth of the education loan sector and limit its role in promoting higher education access.

Literature Review

A literature review provides a comprehensive synthesis of existing research on a particular topic. It helps to establish the theoretical framework and highlights gaps in knowledge, making it crucial for understanding the current state of research in a field. Below is a detailed literature review on education loans, focusing on their role, challenges, impact, and sector differences.

1. Role and Importance of Education Loans

Education loans are financial products designed to assist students in funding their higher education. As the cost of education has risen globally, particularly in countries like India, education loans have become an essential tool for enabling access to higher education (Chowdhury & Raghunandan, 2020). Several studies argue that education loans provide opportunities for students from low-income families to pursue academic programs that would otherwise be unaffordable. According to Jain (2019), the availability of education loans has been linked to increased college attendance rates, especially among students from marginalized groups.

Public and private sector banks play a significant role in disbursing education loans. Public sector banks, in particular, are motivated by social welfare objectives, offering loans at relatively lower interest rates (Sahoo, 2018). On the other hand, private sector banks, driven by profitability, tend to offer more flexible loan products but at higher interest rates (Kumar & Ranjan, 2020).

2. Challenges in Education Loan Systems

Despite their potential, the education loan system is riddled with several challenges. One of the primary issues is the rising Non-Performing Assets (NPAs). Studies by Mehta & Singh (2021) suggest that the education loan segment has seen a steady rise in NPAs, often due to delayed repayments or defaults. This issue is more prominent among low-income students who face financial difficulties after completing their studies. Furthermore, bankers and financial institutions are often hesitant to provide loans to students from rural areas or lesser-known institutions, perceiving them as high-risk borrowers (Sharma, 2019).

Disbursement delays are another significant challenge faced by students, which may hinder their ability to enroll in courses on time. Research by Kapoor et al. (2022) indicates that loan approval processes in India, particularly for public sector banks, can take several weeks, which leads to missed academic deadlines.

Additionally, the availability of education loans is often limited for certain academic programs or foreign studies. According to Gupta & Sharma (2020), courses in non-technical or vocational fields often do not receive the same attention as technical and professional courses when it comes to loan disbursement, leading to a disparity in loan access across disciplines.

Lastly, stringent collateral requirements are another barrier for students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Many banks require students or their families to provide collateral in the form of property or savings, which is not accessible to all (Kumar & Sharma, 2021). This often excludes students from lower-income families from accessing education loans.

3. Impact of Education Loans on Borrowers

The impact of education loans on borrowers' academic and career outcomes has been widely studied. According to Das & Banerjee (2021), education loans have a positive impact on a student's educational outcomes, as they enable students to pursue higher studies and improve their career prospects. However, the burden of repaying loans after graduation can also be a source of stress for many borrowers, especially in a challenging job market. Some studies have highlighted that while education loans increase access to education, they may also lead to debt stress, which can negatively impact borrowers' mental health and career choices (Reddy, 2020).

Moreover, the repayment structure of education loans has been a topic of concern. Research by Sethi (2018) suggests that many students struggle with the repayment process, particularly when they are unable to find jobs immediately after graduation. The lack of a robust job market for fresh graduates in certain sectors, especially in non-technical fields, exacerbates this problem.

4. Sector-wise Differences in Education Loan Processing

There is considerable research on the differences between public and private sector banks in terms of education loan processing. Public sector banks tend to offer loans at lower interest rates with more favorable repayment terms, reflecting their social welfare orientation (Sethi & Kumar, 2019). These banks also provide subsidies and government-backed schemes, which make education loans more affordable for students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds (Bhatia & Mehta, 2021).

In contrast, private sector banks often offer more customized loan products, focusing on niche markets such as students pursuing specialized courses abroad or in high-demand fields like engineering, medicine, and business (Raghunandan & Rai, 2020). However, these loans tend to come with higher interest rates, and the approval process is more stringent, focusing on credit scores and financial profiles. This can create a divide between students from affluent families and those from lower-income backgrounds in accessing education loans (Sahoo & Sharma, 2022).

5. Government's Role in Education Loan Financing

The Indian government has introduced several schemes to improve access to education loans, particularly for students from economically weaker sections. The Indian government's Education Loan Scheme, which is implemented through public sector banks, provides students with financial support at lower interest rates (Rajan & Muthukumar, 2018). Several studies, such as by Singh (2020), have shown that government-backed education loans have contributed significantly to reducing the financial barriers to higher education.

However, while these schemes have made education loans more accessible, they have also led to challenges in terms of financial sustainability. The government's role in subsidizing loans has resulted in high levels of NPAs, as borrowers, especially from rural areas, are often unable to repay their loans due to low-income prospects post-graduation (Bansal & Rani, 2021). This has raised concerns about the long-term viability of government-subsidized education loans and their ability to meet the growing demand for financial assistance.

6. Future Directions in Education Loan Research

Several areas in education loan research are yet to be explored in depth. One such area is the impact of digitalization on education loan processing. With the rise of fintech companies and digital banking, there is increasing interest in how technology can streamline the loan approval and disbursement process, reduce delays, and lower operational costs for banks (Kaur & Kapoor, 2021). Digital platforms have the potential to make education loans more accessible, especially for students in remote areas.

Another area of research is the long-term impact of education loans on borrowers' success. While many studies focus on the initial stages of loan repayment, there is limited research on how education loans affect borrowers' long-term financial well-being, career trajectory, and social mobility (Jha & Das, 2022). Future research could explore these aspects to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the role education loans play in shaping a borrower's future.

The literature on education loans reveals their critical role in providing access to higher education. However, challenges such as rising NPAs, disbursement delays, and disparities in access between different sectors and geographic locations persist. While public sector banks focus on social welfare, private sector banks cater to more specialized needs, and government initiatives have made education loans more accessible, more research is needed to address these challenges and improve the loan system. Future studies should explore the role of digitalization and the long-term outcomes of education loans for borrowers to enhance the effectiveness and inclusivity of the education financing system.

Research Methodology:

Research Design

This study employs a **quantitative research approach** to gather objective, numerical data that can be analyzed statistically. By utilizing **structured questionnaires**, the research aims to capture precise insights from bankers involved in the education loan processing, ensuring a high degree of reliability and consistency in the data collection process. The questionnaires are designed with clear, closed-ended questions, which are structured on a five-point Likert scale, allowing for easy quantification of responses and making the data suitable for statistical analysis. This method is particularly useful for investigating bankers' perceptions, as it allows for the comparison of responses across different categories such as banking sector (public or private), geographic location, and professional role. To ensure a comprehensive understanding of the issue, the study employs a **cross-sectional study design**, which involves collecting data at a single point in time from a sample representative of the population. This design is effective in examining the existing state of bankers' perceptions toward education loans without the need for long-term data collection. By focusing on measurable variables, such as the loan sanctioning process, repayment patterns, and the impact of economic policies, the study aims to provide objective insights into the factors influencing education loan processing across public and private sector banks. The quantitative nature of this study allows for clear statistical comparisons and facilitates generalization of the findings to a larger population of bankers in India.

Research Objectives:

1. To examine differences in loan sanctioning processes between public and private sector banks.
2. To evaluate banker's perspectives on loan repayment challenges.
3. To analyze the impact of economic policies on education loan implementation.

Hypothesis for Objective 1: To examine differences in loan sanctioning processes between public and private sector banks

- **Null Hypothesis (H_0):** There is no significant difference in the loan sanctioning processes between public and private sector banks.
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H_1):** There is a significant difference in the loan sanctioning processes between public and private sector banks.

2. Hypothesis for Objective 2: To evaluate bankers' perspectives on loan repayment challenges

- **Null Hypothesis (H_0):** There is no significant difference in bankers' perspectives on loan repayment challenges across various demographic and sector-based groups.
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H_1):** There is a significant difference in bankers' perspectives on loan repayment challenges across various demographic and sector-based groups.

3. Hypothesis for Objective 3: To analyze the impact of economic policies on education loan implementation

- **Null Hypothesis (H_0):** Economic policies do not have a significant impact on the implementation of education loans.
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H_1):** Economic policies have a significant impact on the implementation of education loans.

2.2 **Sample Design** based on the provided information:

Stratum	**Subgroups**	**Sample Size**	**Description**
Population	Bankers involved in education loan processing	204 bankers	Bankers who handle education loan disbursement and processing in both public and private banks
Banking Sector	Public Sector	102	Bankers working in public sector banks, involved in education loan processing
	Private Sector	102	Bankers working in private sector banks, involved in education loan processing
Geographic Location	Urban	102	Bankers located in urban areas, involved in education loan processing
	Rural	102	Bankers located in rural areas, involved in education loan processing
Professional Role	Loan Officers	68	Bankers directly involved in processing and managing education loans
	Branch Managers	68	Bankers with managerial roles, overseeing loan processing and administration
	Relationship Managers	68	Bankers responsible for maintaining client relationships and guiding them through the loan process

The sample design follows **stratified random sampling**, ensuring a well-rounded and representative sample across key factors: **banking sector**, **geographic location**, and **professional role**. Each factor influences the perceptions and practices of bankers in education loan processing, making it essential to include all subgroups in the sample. The equal distribution between **public and private sector** banks ensures that the study captures differences in practices and perceptions between these two types of institutions. The inclusion of both **urban and rural** bankers allows for an understanding of regional differences, while the stratification based on **professional role** ensures diverse perspectives from those directly involved in loan processing, management and client interactions. This approach enhances the reliability and generalizability of the findings.

Data Collection Methods

Data for this study were collected using **structured questionnaires**, designed to capture the perceptions of bankers involved in education loan processing. The questionnaires employed a **five-point Likert scale**, which provided a standardized method for measuring responses across various dimensions. These scales ranged from strongly disagree to **strongly agree**, allowing for a nuanced understanding of the attitudes and opinions of bankers regarding education loans. The questionnaire was divided into five core dimensions that are central to the study's objectives.

The first dimension, **General Perception**, sought to gauge bankers' overall views on education loans, focusing on their importance and accessibility. The second dimension, **Loan Sanctioning Process**, explored bankers' attitudes towards the procedures involved in approving and disbursing education loans, including any challenges or improvements they perceived. The third dimension, **Repayment Aspects**, addressed bankers' perspectives on the repayment process, such as the factors influencing repayment behavior, loan recovery challenges, and borrower responsibility. The fourth dimension, **Economic Policies**, investigated how government policies, financial regulations, and economic trends impacted the implementation and success of education loans. Finally, the **Outcomes** dimension focused on the perceived effectiveness of education loans in achieving their intended goals, such as enabling students to pursue higher education and reducing financial barriers. By structuring the questionnaire around these five dimensions, the study was able to systematically collect data on various facets of education loan processing, providing a comprehensive overview of the factors that influence bankers perceptions and practices in both public and private sector banks.

Statistical Analysis

1. Descriptive Statistics Table

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=204)

Category	Sub-category	Frequency	Percentage
Sector	Public	102	50%
	Private	102	50%
Geographic Location	Urban	102	50%
	Rural	102	50%
Professional Role	Loan Officers	68	33.33%
	Branch Managers	68	33.33%
	Relationship Managers	68	33.33%

2. Perception Analysis Table

Table 2: Bankers Perceptions towards Education Loans (N=204)

Perception Factor	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Rank
Need to provide to impoverished students	4.04	0.82	1
Education loans essential for higher education access	4.33	0.76	2
Encourages candidate accountability	3.88	0.91	3
Low interest rates possibility	3.87	0.88	4
Government pressure for more loans	3.81	0.95	5

*Note: Measured on 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree)

3. ANOVA Results

Table 3: ANOVA Results for Perception Differences

Source of Variation	df	F-value	p-value	Effect Size (η^2)
District-wise perceptions	5	8.42	0.003*	0.21
Sector-wise variations	1	12.76	0.001*	0.28
Loan range impact	3	9.34	0.002*	0.24

*Significant at $p < 0.01$ df = degrees of freedom η^2 = eta squared (effect size)

4. Correlation Analysis

Table 4: Correlation Matrix of Key Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Repayment perception	1.00			
2. Economic policies	0.606**	1.00		
3. Loan sanctioning process	0.542**	0.487**	1.00	
4. Outcome perception	0.583**	0.521**	0.498**	1.00

**Correlation is significant at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

5. Regression Analysis

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis Results

Predictor Variables	β	SE	t-value	p-value
Outcome perception	0.38	0.06	6.33	0.001*
Economic policies	0.299	0.05	5.98	0.001*
Loan sanctioning process	0.279	0.04	6.97	0.001*

$R^2 = 0.658$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.642$ $F(3,200) = 128.45$, $p < 0.001$ *Significant at $p < 0.01$

Overall Interpretation

The demographic profile of respondents shows a balanced distribution between public and private sector banks, with each sector representing 50% of the sample. Geographic location is also evenly split between urban and rural respondents, ensuring broad representation across regions. Professional roles are equally distributed among Loan Officers, Branch Managers, and Relationship Managers, with each group comprising 33.33% of the total sample, which ensures comprehensive insights from different banking professionals.

In terms of perceptions towards education loans, the highest level of agreement is found in the belief that loans should be provided to impoverished students, with a mean score of 4.04. This indicates strong support for targeting economically disadvantaged groups. The perception that education loans are essential for access to higher education also holds significant importance, with a mean score of 4.33, suggesting that bankers see these loans as crucial for enabling educational opportunities. Other factors such as candidate accountability, low interest rates, and government pressure are also important but show slightly more variation in opinions, with mean scores below 4.

The ANOVA results reveal significant differences in perceptions based on district, with an F-value of 8.42 and a p-value of 0.003, indicating moderate regional variation. There are also significant differences in perceptions between public and private sectors ($F = 12.76$, $p = 0.001$), with a larger effect size of 0.28, suggesting stronger contrasts between the two sectors. Additionally, the loan range has a significant impact on perceptions, as indicated by an F-value of 9.34 and a p-value of 0.002, with a moderate effect size of 0.24.

Hypothesis testing confirms that perceptions significantly differ based on district, sector, and loan range, all of which are supported by the respective p-values (0.003, 0.001, and 0.002). This indicates that these factors play a substantial role in shaping how bankers perceive education loans.

The correlation analysis shows strong positive relationships between repayment perception and other key factors like economic policies (0.606), the loan sanctioning process (0.542), and outcome perception (0.583). This suggests that as one of these factors changes, the others tend to shift in a similar direction, highlighting the interconnectedness of these variables in shaping bankers' views on education loans.

Regression analysis further supports these findings by showing that outcome perception, economic policies, and the loan sanctioning process significantly predict bankers' perceptions, with all p-values being less than 0.01. The outcome perception has the highest influence, with a β coefficient of 0.38. The model explains 64.2% of the variation in bankers' perceptions, indicating a strong fit and suggesting that these predictors are crucial in understanding the perceptions of education loans. Finally, hypothesis testing for the regression model confirms that the three predictors—outcome perception, economic policies, and loan sanctioning process—significantly contribute to explaining bankers' perceptions, all of which are supported by p-values less than 0.01. This reinforces the importance of these factors in shaping the understanding and attitudes towards education loans

Conclusion:

Based on the descriptive statistics, ANOVA, correlation, and regression analyses, the study finds that sector, district, loan range, economic policies, and outcome perceptions significantly influence bankers' perceptions of education loans. Additionally, significant correlations between key variables highlight their interdependencies. The regression model explains a substantial portion of the variance in bankers' perceptions, indicating that the predictors are important drivers of these perceptions.

References:

[1] Bansal, P., & Rani, A. (2021). *Financial sustainability and the challenges of government-subsidized education loans in India*. Journal of Education Finance, 45(3), 204-220.

[2] Bhatia, S., & Mehta, R. (2021). *Public sector banks and education loans: A review of the impact of government-backed schemes on access to higher education*. Indian Journal of Financial Studies, 39(2), 105-118.

[3] Chowdhury, P., & Raghunandan, K. (2020). *Education loans as a tool for promoting access to higher education in India*. Journal of Education Economics, 42(4), 356-374.

[4] Das, S., & Banerjee, M. (2021). *The effect of education loans on academic and career outcomes: Evidence from India*. International Journal of Educational Development, 50(5), 422-439.

[5] Gupta, S., & Sharma, R. (2020). *Disparities in education loan access: An analysis of sector and discipline differences in India*. Asian Journal of Education, 61(3), 87-101.

[6] Jain, S. (2019). *Education loans and their role in increasing college attendance among marginalized groups in India*. Indian Journal of Education Policy, 31(2), 132-147.

[7] Jha, P., & Das, N. (2022). *Long-term impacts of education loans on borrowers' financial and social mobility: A longitudinal study*. Journal of Higher Education Finance, 43(4), 197-212.

[8] Kapoor, A., Mehta, R., & Sharma, A. (2022). *Challenges in education loan disbursement and their impact on students' academic careers in India*. Journal of Education Administration, 60(1), 15-29.

[9] Kaur, P., & Kapoor, S. (2021). *The role of digitalization in streamlining education loan processes: Implications for access and efficiency*. Journal of Fintech Innovation, 14(2), 84-98.

[10] Kumar, S., & Ranjan, R. (2020). *Private sector education loans in India: A comparative study with public sector banks*. Journal of Banking & Finance, 38(5), 213-228.

[11] Kumar, A., & Sharma, P. (2021). *Collateral requirements for education loans: Impediments for students from lower-income backgrounds in India*. Journal of Financial Inclusion, 27(1), 78-94.

[12] Mehta, N., & Singh, P. (2021). *Non-performing assets in education loan portfolios: Causes and solutions*. Indian Journal of Banking, 59(6), 114-130.

[13] Rajan, M., & Muthukumar, V. (2018). *Government schemes and education loans: A policy review of India's higher education financing*. Asian Education Review, 17(3), 301-315.

[14] Raghunandan, K., & Rai, P. (2020). *Private sector banks and the customization of education loan products: A study of niche markets in India*. Journal of Consumer Finance, 22(4), 265-278.

[15] Reddy, M. (2020). *The psychological impact of education loan repayment on borrowers: A study of Indian graduates*. Journal of Mental Health & Education, 44(1), 52-68.

[16] Sahoo, S. (2018). *Public sector banks and their role in providing education loans: A case study of India*. International Journal of Banking & Finance, 33(2), 189-204.

[17] Sahoo, P., & Sharma, R. (2022). *Education loan accessibility: A comparative analysis of private and public sector banks in India*. Journal of Educational Finance, 40(5), 118-132.

[18] Sethi, P. (2018). *Challenges in education loan repayment: Evidence from India*. International Journal of Economic Development, 35(6), 315-328.

[19] Sethi, P., & Kumar, A. (2019). *Public sector education loans: An overview of processes and challenges in India*. Journal of Educational Finance, 27(4), 190-205.

[20] Sharma, S. (2019). *Rural students and education loans: Challenges and opportunities in India*. Journal of Rural Development, 28(3), 85-102.

[21] Singh, R. (2020). *Government's role in education loan financing: The case of India's Education Loan Scheme*. Indian Journal of Public Policy, 22(5), 146-159.