



A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SATISFACTION OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN GOVERNMENT FINANCED AND SELF FINANCED COURSES

Dr. Shalini Tiwari

Department of Education, University of Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

In education sector satisfaction of students is a key factor in determining the quality service offered by the institutions. Thus, it occupies a very important place in educational research. The present study attempts to compare satisfaction of students of government financed and self-financed courses offered by University of Allahabad and its constituent colleges. A sample of 500 second year students was taken in which 250 belonged to self-financed and rest 250 were of government financed courses. The findings of the study clearly indicated that students enrolled in both self-financed and government financed courses have similar satisfaction. In higher education ensuring students' satisfaction becomes more important due to its potential impact on their retention, specially, in self-financed courses which are playing a major role in massive expansion of opportunities being provided to students.

Keywords: *Satisfaction of students, Self-financed courses, Government financed courses*

According to Arambewela and Hall (2013) satisfaction of students reflects the efforts of the universities to cater the needs of the students. Quality of facilities provided by the universities also determine satisfaction of students (Yusoff et al., 2015; Karna and Julin, 2015 and Hanssen and Solvoll, 2015). Qualitative meaningful educational programs ensure students' satisfaction (Ali, Zhou, Hussain, Nair and Ragavan, 2016). Osman, Satpura and Saha (2017) found that satisfaction of students was greatly influenced by program quality and service quality. One of the major findings of the study conducted by Ting, Khoo and Chong (2017) emphasised on the positive impact of technology in ensuring students' satisfaction. Deuren and Lhaden (2017) found no significant difference in overall satisfaction of students of public and private university. Ullah et al., (2018) found that academic system of the university had a positive impact on satisfaction of students. Results of the study conducted by Weerasinghe and Fernando (2018) highlighted influence of university image on satisfaction of students. Research findings of Ofulue and Ogunleye (2019) indicated a high correlation between learners' support and students' satisfaction. Nadishan et al., (2020) assessed various factors influencing satisfaction of students. Venkateswarlu, Malviya and Vinay (2020) found that academic delivery contributed significantly to satisfaction of students. Panchasara and Dangarwala (2021) investigated satisfaction level of students of self-financed colleges and found it to be positively correlated to responsiveness. After an intensive review of literature, it was found that very few studies have been conducted on comparison of satisfaction of students of government and self-financed courses, in fact the researcher could not come across any study that compares satisfaction of students enrolled in self-financed and government financed courses of the same university. Thus, in the present study an attempt has been made to compare satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed courses of University of Allahabad.

Published by:

Pather Dabi Educational Trust, (Regn No: IV-1402-00064/2023), Under Govt. of West Bengal, India.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were as follows-

1. To compare satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed B.Sc. courses of University of Allahabad.
2. To compare satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed B.Com. courses of University of Allahabad.
3. To compare satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed B.Ed. courses of University of Allahabad.
4. To compare satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed courses of University of Allahabad.

Hypotheses

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Sc. government financed and self-financed courses.
2. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Com. government financed and self-financed courses.
3. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Ed. government financed and self-financed courses.
4. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed courses.

Methodology: The sample of the study comprised of 500 second year students of University of Allahabad and its affiliated colleges. Out of which 80 students belonged to B.Ed., 200 students of B.Sc. and 220 were of B.Com. self-financed and government financed courses. Self-constructed Students Satisfaction Scale was used for collection of data regarding satisfaction of students. The dimensions taken for measurement of satisfaction of students were library facilities, human resources, physical resources, educational activities, fees, duration, number of seats, evaluation process and future prospects of the courses. For comparison of data t-ratio was calculated. Level of significance for acceptance and rejection of hypothesis was 0.05.

Results and discussion:

Table-1
Mean, S.D. and t-ratio showing the difference in satisfaction of B.Sc. students of government financed and self-financed courses

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio
Government financed	100	104.16	7.3	6.77*
Self-financed	100	84.57	27.9	

*Significant at .05 level

Table 1 shows that the value of t-ratio is 6.77 which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Sc. government financed and self-financed courses is rejected. It means that B. Sc. students of both government financed and self-financed courses in University of Allahabad and its constituent colleges do not have similar satisfaction. Higher mean scores of governments financed courses implies that students enrolled in these courses are more satisfied than those of self-financed courses. The dimensions on which dissimilar satisfaction were obtained were library facilities, human resources, fees, duration, number of seats, evaluation process and future prospects of the courses.

Table-2

Mean, S.D. and t-ratio showing the difference in satisfaction of B.Com. students of government financed and self-financed courses

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio
Government financed	110	95.4	8.29	4.86*
Self-financed	110	89.9	8.4	

*Significant at .05 level

Table 2 shows that the value of t-ratio is 4.86 which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Com. government financed and self-financed courses, is rejected. This implies that students of B.Com. course studying through self-financed mode in University of Allahabad differ in their satisfaction as compared to those of students of government financed courses. Higher mean scores in case of government financed courses shows that students of these courses are more satisfied than students enrolled in self-financed courses. The dimensions on which students of government financed courses found to be more satisfied than students of self-financed courses were human resources, fees, number of seats and duration of their courses.

Table -3

Mean, S.D. and t-ratio showing the difference in satisfaction of B.Ed. students of government financed and self-financed courses

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio
Government financed	40	95.53	9.26	0.81
Self-financed	40	93.95	7.92	

Table 3 shows that the value of t-ratio is 0.81 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in B.Ed. government financed and self-financed courses is accepted. It means that B. Ed. students of both government financed and self-financed courses in University of Allahabad and its constituent colleges have similar satisfaction level. When dimensional analysis was done, then students of B.Ed. courses differ in their satisfaction with respect to fees, number of seats, duration, evaluation and future prospects of their courses.

The dimensions on which students of all (B.Sc., B.Com. and B.Ed.) the government financed and self-financed courses taken in the study have similar satisfaction were physical resources and educational activities, while students of self-financed courses were not satisfied with fees, duration and number of seats provided for their courses. But when aggregate scores of all dimensions taken together for all three courses was compared, students of both self-financed and government financed courses were found to have similar satisfaction level, as indicated in the following table.

Table -4

Mean, S.D. and t-ratio showing the difference in satisfaction of students of government financed and self-financed courses.

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-ratio
Government financed	250	224.83	61.42	2.97
Self-financed	250	208.67	60.12	

Table 4 shows that the value of t-ratio is 2.97 which is not significant at 0.05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis that, there is no significant difference between the satisfaction of students enrolled in government financed and self-financed courses is accepted. It means that students of both government financed and self-financed courses in University of Allahabad and its constituent colleges have similar satisfaction level

Conclusion

Thus, the above results indicate that there is no significant difference in satisfaction of students studying through self-financed and government financed course (B.Ed., B.Sc., B.Com.) in University of Allahabad. Though on the whole satisfaction of students was found to be similar in both the government financed and self-financed courses, yet on some dimensions students did not have similar satisfaction. Effective assessment practices, providing scholarships for the meritorious students, adequate library facilities, are desirous for improving status of the courses. Thus, findings of the present study has implications for policy makers, administrators and teaching faculty that much has to be done for ensuring satisfaction of students, who are main stakeholders of our education system

References

1. Ali, F., Zhou, Y., Hussain, K., Nair, P. K. & Ragavan, N. A. (2016). Does Higher Education Service Quality Effect Student Satisfaction, Image and Loyalty? A Study of International Students in Malaysian Public Universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 24, 70-94.
2. Arambewela, R. & Hall, J. (2013). The International Effects of the Internal and External University Environment and the Influence of Personal Values, on Satisfaction among International Postgraduate Students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(7), 972-988.
3. Asaduzzaman, H. M. & Rahman, M. (2013). Service Quality and Student Satisfaction: A Case Study on Private Universities in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*, 1(3), 128-135.
4. Deuren, V. R. & Lhaden, K. (2017). Student Satisfaction in Higher Education; A Comparative Study of a Public and a Private College. *Bhutan Journal of Research and Development*, 1(3), 45-52.
5. Eshun, E.F., Badu, A.K. & Korwu, P. (2018). Impact of Service Quality on Students' satisfaction in a Ghanaian Tertiary Institution. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 8(3), 97-112.
6. Hanssen, T. E.S. & Solvoll, G. (2015). The Importance of University Facilities for Student Satisfaction at a Norwegian University. *Facilities*, 744-759.
7. Karna, S. & Julin, P. (2015). A Framework for Measuring Student and Staff Satisfaction with University Campus Facilities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23(1), 47-61.
8. Mazumder, Q. H. (2013). Student Satisfaction in Private and Public Universities in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 2(2), 78-84.
9. Mwiya, B., Bwalya, J., Siachinji, B., Sikombe, S., Chanda, H. & Chawala, M. (2017). Higher Education Quality and Student Satisfaction Nexus: Evidence from Zambia. *Creative Education*, 8, 1044-1068
10. Nadishan, G. S. W. Y., Ameen, Z., Kulatunga, K., Perera, A., Perera, C., Madhavika, W. D. N. & Nagendrakumar, N. (2020). An Empirical Study of Students' Satisfaction With Professional Accounting Education Programs. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342493252>
11. Nagendrakumar, N. & Jayasundara, N. S. (2014). Students' Satisfaction with Post Graduate Degree Programmes Offered by Different Higher Education Institutions in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1(10), 77-85.
12. Naidu, P., & Derani, N.E.S. (2016). A Comparative Study on Quality of Education Received by Students of Private Universities versus Public Universities. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 659-666.

13. Ofulue, C. I. and Ogunleye, B. O. (2020). A Survey of Student Satisfaction of Institutional Processes at the National Open University of Nigeria. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342165651>
14. Osman, A.R., Saputra, R.S. and Saha, J. (2017). Determinants of Student Satisfaction in the Context of Higher Education: A Complete Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 5(6), 1-14.
15. Osman, A.R., & Saputra, R.S. (2019). A Pragmatic Model of Student Satisfaction: A Viewpoint of Private Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(2), 142-166.
16. Panchasara, D.S. and Dangarwala, U.R. (2021). Service Quality and Satisfaction of Students: A Study of Selected Self Finance Colleges in Anand. *Towards Excellence*, 13(2), 26-35.
17. Rajput, S., Sengar, A.S. and Gupta, S. (2020). Establishing the Relationship between Service Quality and Student Satisfaction. *Conference Paper*. 1050-1063. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341548372>
18. Rehman, F. K. U., Farooq, M., Bekmyrza, T., Younas, W. and Raju, V. (2018). Investigating the Factors Impacting the Student Satisfaction with the Universities: A Comparative Study of Malaysia and Pakistan. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2, 117-126.
19. Son, H.T., Ha, N.T. and Khuyen, P.T.M. (2018). Measuring Students' Satisfaction with Higher Education Service-An Experimental Study at Thainguyen University. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management*, 3(4), 21-34.
20. Ting, T.T., Khoo, S.X. and Chong, K.C. (2017). Student's Satisfaction on Education System – A case study on a Malaysia University College. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 9(3), 1-7.
21. Ullah, M.A., Alam, M. M., Mahiuddinn, M. and Rahman, M.M. (2018). Predicting Factors of Student Dissatisfaction for Retention. *Proceedings of IEMIS*, 1, 501-510.,
22. Venkateswarlu, P., Malaviya, S. and Vinay, M. (2020). Determinants of Satisfaction of Students Studying in Private Universities-Application of Kano Model. *Theoretical Economics Lettes*, 10, 1-16.
23. Weerasinghe, IM.S., Lalitha, R., and Fernando, S. (2017). Students' Satisfaction in Higher Education Literature Review. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 533-539.
24. Yusoff, M., McLeay, F. and Woodruffe-Burto, H. (2015). Dimensions Driving Business Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 23(1), 86-104.