6.1 Summary of findings - Bankers Perception

In this section, the perception of bankers with respect to the Education loan has been dealt with. The following points such as Banks General information, Criteria adopted, Information sources, Reasons for rejecting of loan application, Reasons for poor repayment of loan and Overall perception on educational loan have been dealt in detail.

6.1.1 Bankers profile

Officials from the public sector banks accounted for about two-third (61%) of the sampled respondents. Majority (58.2%) of sampled banks are giving educational loans for less than 6 years of duration. Great majority (65.5%) of banks are able to meet their loan disbursement targets. With regard to the receiving loan applications, less than half (45.5%) of bank officials receive loan applications only during a specified period every year and moreover it takes about a month for bankers to process loan sanctioning (49.1%) and disbursement (47.3%). Greater majority (85.5%) of the bankers’ report that they hardly demand for collateral security for educational loan sector, however, it is not the same for other priority sectors. The maximum loan sanctioned for educational loans remains at Rs. 10 lakhs. While more than half of the sampled bankers reported to have received adequate applications, less than majority have received less than 200 applications every year. With regard to repayment satisfaction, less than majority are found to be satisfied with loan repayment. The study also found that bankers take up monthly follow-up (50.9%) to ensure higher repayment of educational loans.

6.1.2 Type of Loan Preferred by Banks for Granting to Customers

With regard to the preference of advances made by banks, the study found that bankers are in general prefer to give industrial loans (3.69), followed by vehicle loans (3.40), durable loans (3.15), and personal loans (3.11). As we see, in the case of industry loans, loans are given to entrepreneurs who are highly motivated to use the advances judiciously to run their industry smoothly and hence their repaying capacity always tends to be higher.
the case of vehicle and personal loan, it is normally given to salaried employees where repayment problems also tend to be very minimal.

6.1.3 Preference towards Priority Sector Loans

Among all priority sector loans, bankers prefer to grant housing loans (3.82) followed closely by education loans (3.80), small scale industries (3.67), agriculture loans (3.33), and self-help groups (3.27). Bankers prefer housing loans because the asset created may well be attached in case of default or failure to repayment such loans. It is therefore concluded that bankers tend to prefer to lend those priority sector advances that has good repayment potential or quality of collateral attached to the lending amount.

6.1.4 Problem Faced in Priority Sector Lending

Bankers report a great deal of problems in dealing with educational loans (3.51) compared to agriculture loans (3.13), small scale industrial loans (3.04), self–help group loans (2.98), and housing loans (2.80). The reason for such perceptions may be because of inefficiency in the scheme at present and the poor repayment levels of the scheme.

6.1.5 Problems Faced in Education loan

Recovery or achieving prompt repayment of loans (3.44) and interference of politicians (3.39) are the two most important problems banks faced in the educational loan segment. Based on cluster segmentation, bankers can be segmented into three cluster groups such as efficient bankers, impeded bankers and troubled bankers. Furthermore, inadequate number of applications (3.31), ineligible applicants (3.05), complex sanctioning procedure (2.98), unrealistic government targets (2.95), and complex disbursement procedure (2.91) are some of the other problems faced by bankers.

Chi-square analysis suggests the existence of significant association between problems faced by bankers and their receiving of application periods, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time, collateral security, any other specific course, perception of repayment and loan collection periods.

Correspondence analysis reveals that the effective bankers face problems related to receiving applications only during specific periods. However, both impeded as well as the troubled bankers face problems of receiving applications throughout the year. The effective bankers take less than a month of duration to sanction educational loans. On the other hand, both impeded and troubled bankers take more than a month to sanction educational loans.
ANOVA results suggest that the bank profile variables such as bank branches, loan sanction time, loan disbursement time are found to be significantly related to process-related problem perceptions, application receiving periods, loan sanction time, loan disbursement time, and loan collection period. However, none of bank profile variables are found to be related to target-related problem perceptions. Independent sample t-test confirm significant relationship between specific course variable and interference-related problems, all the other variables are not related.

Results of canonical correlation between bankers’ problem perceptions and bank profile variables suggest that bankers face significant problems during disbursement time and loan collection period. Among the three problem factors, process-related problem is found with a higher coefficient value of 0.6512. Test of significance for all the canonical correlation values indicate that all coefficients are highly significant.

6.1.6 Information Channels to Spread Information to Targeted People

Information about educational loans is passed to potential beneficiaries during mela/fair/exhibitions as well as to the existing customers who visit the bank for transactions. However, it is important to note that the bank uses all the ten information sources for informing potential beneficiaries about educational loans. Factor analysis resulted in extraction of three information source factors - bank source, customer source and outreach. Using cluster analysis, bankers were segmented into three cluster groups - moderately effective, less effective and effective. Discriminate analysis has been used to derive at two discriminate functions of \( Z_2 = 0.861 \times \text{Outreach} + 0.590 \times \text{Customer sources} + 0.450 \times \text{Bank sources} \).

Chi-square analysis reveals significant association between banker groups and sources of information. More specifically, bankers report of receiving enough applications and overall repayment perceptions are found to be significantly associated with various information sources. Correspondence analysis confirmed the existence of this relationship. Moreover, the study found that both effective and moderately effective bankers use various information channels to spread awareness about educational loans throughout the year.

ANOVA results show significant relationship between repayment perceptions and customer source of information. Variables such as duration of loan and getting adequate number of loan applications is also found to be significantly related to outreach information.
source. Duncan Post-hoc analysis show that bankers use outreach activities such as meal/fair/exhibition and door-to-door campaigning about educational loans given to courses, which is usually for a period of 4-6 years. Moreover, bankers who use customer source for communicating information about educational loans also report to receive sufficient no of applications only sometimes and not quite often. Those bankers who use outreach methods to communicate about educational loans also tend to report good perception about loan repayments.

Independent sample t-tests confirm that those bankers who give educational loans to students of uneducated parents and collateral securities are significantly related to bank source of information. This shows that those customers who come to bank for account operations tends to gain more information about educational loans and by their continued interactions with bankers helps them to gain in more knowledge about the process.

Results of canonical correlation analysis confirm that bankers use multiple sources to convey information about educational loans to target population. These sources include bank source, customer source and outreach. As evident, both bank source and customer sources are significantly influenced by uneducated parent variable. At the second set, collateral variable significantly influence all the three information sources. However, in the third set, no variable is having any effect on the three information sources.

6.1.7 Criteria Adopted by Banks

Course, consistent academic performance and institutional reputation are the three most important criteria adopted by banks for sanctioning educational loans. This indicates many of the key aspects that are critical for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational loan segment. Using cluster analysis, the bankers are grouped into three segments; collateral cluster, course cluster and general cluster. Furthermore, discriminate analysis has generated two functions, Z1= 0.850* Collateral criteria and Z2=0.972*Course criteria.

Chi-square analysis show significant association between bankers segment and variables such as criteria adopted by bankers, duration of loan period, sanctioning loan time and perception of repayment

Correspondence analysis indicates that bankers who report collateral security as important criteria is closely associated to loans of 4-6 years of duration. Furthermore, bankers belonging to both general cluster and course cluster are associated with loans
duration of more than 6 years, however, the degree of association is not so high. Bankers belonging to collateral cluster group are associated with to less than a month time taken for sanctioning educational loans. On the other hand, bankers belonging to course and general cluster groups take more than a month to sanction educational loans; overall perception of educational loan repayment and criteria adopted. As observed, bankers belonging to course cluster groups are associated with very good perceptions of loan repayments compared to bankers belonging to collateral cluster and general cluster groups. This indicates that when bankers consider course criteria as an important predictor of success of loan application and repayment.

ANOVA results suggest significant difference regarding criteria adopted by banks to the educational loan differing based on their demographic variables of duration of banks, number of application received in current year, bankers overall perception of loan repayment and loan collection periods are significantly related to criteria adopted by bankers. Duncan post-hoc results suggest that bankers belonging to course cluster is related to loan sanctioning of durations 4 to 6 years and bankers in collateral cluster is related to receiving about 251 to 300 applications year-on-year; bankers repayment perception of educational loans.

Independent sample t-test confirm existence of significant mean difference among the bankers about criteria adopted by educational loan by banks and their collateral variable are significantly related to bankers belonging to course cluster groups. All the other variables are not related.

Canonical correlation between criteria adopted by bankers and bank profile variables suggest that bankers belonging to two clusters based on criteria adopted by banks are significantly related to variables such as duration of loan period and number of applications. Canonical correlation score is also found as 0.5503 and 0.2748, which is high and significant. Test of significance for all the canonical correlation values indicate that all coefficients are statistically significant.

6.1.8 Level of Preference While Sanctioning

Educational loans are sanctioned predominantly to students studying professional courses (3.76) followed by institutional reputation (3.45) and parents occupation in government sector (3.02). Professional course, institutional reputation and parent’s
occupation continues to be the key differentiators for securing educational loans successfully.

6.1.9 Sources of Awareness Creation

RBI initiatives, government publicity and counseling centers of banks are the three most important sources that bankers use to create awareness about educational loans. Other sources such as educational institutions, banks located inside the premises of institutions, local politicians, banks head office, NGOs, and SEBI also play significant role in the creation of awareness about educational loans and priority sector advances. Using factor analysis, awareness creation sources are categorized into two factors such as implementing agencies and supporting agencies. Subsequently the bankers are segmented into three cluster groups such as effective, moderately effective and less effective bankers. Two discriminant functions of \( Z1 = 0.922 \cdot \text{Supporting agencies} \) and \( Z2 = 0.997 \cdot \text{Implementing agencies} \) are generated on sources of creating awareness of bankers about educational loan.

Chi-square analysis showed significant association between bankers grouped on the awareness and their profile variables only three variables such as uneducated parents, maximum loan and any specific course. Subsequently, correspondence analysis results indicated that those bankers who reported both implementing agencies as well as supporting agencies as responsible for awareness creation also reported to sanctioning of maximum loan amount of 4 Lakhs and 6 Lakhs.

ANOVA results suggest significant relationship between bank profile variables and awareness creation sources. Among the 11 demographic variables, sanctioning time, maximum loan and bankers overall perception of educational loan are significantly related to sources of awareness creation. Duncan post-hoc analysis, as observed, implementing agencies are creating awareness about educational loans, more specifically, during loan mela, exhibitions, and fairs. Supporting agencies, on the other hand, create awareness that educational loans are given to the tune of Rs. 4 Lakhs.

Independent sample t-test results confirmed the relationship between awareness creation agencies and certain bank profile variables. As observed, supporting agencies create awareness about the type of course supported through educational loans. On the other hand, implementing agencies create awareness about the sanctioning of educational loans to all including the children of uneducated parents. Canonical Correlation analysis observed banker’s perception about awareness creation sources largely influences the level of awareness.
6.1.10 Channels Of Communication

Advertisement in Newspapers (4.00) continues to be the most dominant means of communication used by banks followed by TV (3.76), Radio (3.55) and notice distributions (3.35), which may be because of the higher number of subscriptions of Newspaper among potential customers.

6.1.11 Reasons for Rejecting Educational Loan Application

Quality of surety and collateral security is very important for successful educational loan application, otherwise the chances for the rejection of loan application are high. Cluster analysis has been employed to segment the bankers into three categories, namely, defective, moderately defective and less defective. Two discriminant functions are extracted such as

\[ Z1= 0.794 \times \text{Collateral-related} \]

\[ Z2= 0.776 \times \text{Course-related} \]

Chi-square analysis results show significant association between the segments of bankers grouped on the basis of their reasons for rejecting educational loan application and banks demographic variables it is clear that the majority of the variables are not associated with reasons for rejecting loan application cluster. It means that the only one variable such as receiving of application periods is associated with the reasons for rejecting the loan applications clusters. Among the 11 profile variables, only four variables are found to be significantly related to reasons for rejections. Application receiving periods, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time and loan collection period are related to reasons for rejection of educational loan applications.

Correspondence analysis suggests that bankers who are receiving application throughout the year report most applications to be incomplete, however, bankers who receive educational loan applications during specific period or during loan mela usually receive complete applications. When borrowers apply for educational loans during specific window period as communicated by the banks, they tend to gain more information on the requirements and therefore comply with all the conditions laid down by the bank. Canonical correlation results also confirm that those applications which are received during specific period to be less defective.

6.1.12 Reasons for Poor Repayment

Parents’ inadequate income, continuation of studies, and unemployment status of students are the three most important reasons for failure of repayment of educational loans.
Using cluster analysis, bankers are segmented into high risk, moderate risk and low risk banker groups. Two discriminant functions are extracted such as 

\[ Z_1 = 0.722 \times \text{Bankers attitude} + 0.526 \times \text{No Income} \]

\[ Z_2 = 0.574 \times \text{Inadequate income} \]

Chi-square analysis show significant association between bankers group and poor repayment and their profile of the receiving of application periods, sanctioning loan time, disbarment time, collateral security, maximum amount, bankers overall perception of repayment and loan collection periods are associated with the failure of repayment of educational loans.

ANOVA tests show that among 12 variables, only 7 variables such as bank branches, loan application periods, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time, maximum loan limit, banker’s repayment satisfaction and loan collection periods are significantly related with the failure of repayment of educational loans at 5 percent level of the significance.

Independent sample t-tests show that two variables such as uneducated borrowers parents and collateral security are significantly associated with the reasons for making failure of repayment of educational loan.

Correspondence analysis suggests association between maximum loan amount and failure of loan repayment. Bankers who give loan to the amount of 4 lakhs to 10 lakhs are closely associated with moderate risk. Respondents from 2 lakhs to 8 lakhs are associated with high risk cluster.

Bankers belonging to high cluster group receive loan applications throughout the year and bankers belonging to low risk receive application only during specific period. Loan disbursement time and bankers perception are the reasons for failure of repayment of educational loan. As evident, bankers who report attitude problem and occupation-related problem for the failure of repayment are those who disburse loan less than a month.

Results of canonical correlation reveals that attitude, occupation and income related problems as the reasons for the repayment failure of educational loans. This difference in perception is found to be significantly related to collateral securities, maximum loan required and loan disbursement time.

6.1.13 Problems Encountered by Bankers While Trying to Recover the Educational Loan

Bankers encounter problems such as providing false information, not responding properly, make bankers unnecessarily to wait, few people are dodging the bankers to repay
the loans. Bankers also report that borrowers are asking bankers not to visit them at home or at times use unnecessary words.

6.1.14 Bankers Overall Perception about Educational Loan

Majority of the sampled bankers are of the opinion that it is not bad to borrow money for funding studies irrespective of the income levels. Majority of the borrowers think that it’s better to avail whatever is available and the education loan induces the quick employment. Bankers report that recovering educational loans continue to be a big challenge and separate institutional framework are therefore require to take care of the educational loan segment. Bankers report that the interest rate of educational loans should be reduced, increase loan amount, flexibility in certain eligibility conditions and no subsidy should be offered to borrowers. Using cluster analysis, bankers are segmented to three cluster groups – moderately positive, negative and positive bankers. Two discriminant functions are also extracted such as $Z_1=0.718*\text{Burden}$ $Z_2=0.714*\text{Pressure}$, $0.462*\text{Process}$.

Chi-square tests show that receiving adequate application is found to be significantly associated with bankers overall perception of educational loan.

ANOVA results show that bank profile variables such as maximum loan amount, enough application and perception repayment are significantly related to process and burden problem perception. Duncan post-hoc analysis show that those bankers who provide education loan to a maximum of Rs. 8 to 10 lakhs report it as a huge burden to the bank compared to those banks giving lesser loan amounts.

Independent sample t-tests confirm that those bankers who give educational loans to students of collateral securities and specific course are significantly related to bankers overall perception.

Canonical correlation analysis found that sources include pressure, process and burden. As evident, Burden is significantly influenced by enough application receiving banks. In second set, loan collection period variable significantly influence to process factor. However, in the third set, no variable is having any effect on the three banker’s perception.

6.2 Summary of findings-Borrowers Perception

In this section, borrower’s perception towards educational loan has been dealt with. The following points such as borrowers personal profile, loan variables, reasons for opting educational loan, criteria adopted, reasons for rejecting loan application, reasons for default,
borrowers level of satisfaction, awareness and overall perception etc., has been dealt in detail.

6.2.1 Personal Profile

Two-third of the borrowers included in this study is male. Majority of the borrowers are in the age group of 20 to 25 years. This result is quite in line with the general trends that prevail in educational loan sector where young graduates are desirous of pursuing higher studies for better and faster career growth. On the other side, it also evidence that bankers also consider sanctioning loans to younger graduates compared to other graduates in the age group of above 25 years.

More than one-third of the borrowers belong to Other Backward Community-OBC followed by Scheduled Caste-SC and General Category. This explains that educational loans are offered by banks to all social classes, though not in equal proportions. Educational qualifications, just majority of the borrowers has completed their graduation and the rest has completed their school education (HSC). This result reveals that the educational loans are sanctioned by banks to pursue both the graduate and post graduate studies, almost equally.

More than one-fourth are pursuing their studies in Government Colleges followed by Private Colleges, Government-Aided Colleges and Deemed Universities. The rest of the borrowers are from State and Central Universities. Majority of the borrowers are pursuing their education in Urban Centers followed by Semi-Urban Centers. This result suggests that banks are more inclined to sanction educational loans for students studying in institutions in the urban and semi-urban compared to that of rural-based institutions.

The banks prefer to sanction educational loans to students who are pursuing technical and professional degrees that provide good career opportunities to the students and in turn, repayment of educational loans. Respondents based on occupation at present. While majority of the borrowers continue to pursue their studies, a little less than one-third of them are searching for their jobs after completing their studies. However, a little less than one-fifth are gainfully employed.

More than three-fourth of the borrowers’ parents have no formal education or have completed their school education. A significant proportion of the parents has completed their graduation and professional degrees. The real income of borrowers is essentially important to study their liquidity position. Limited income people have no ability to save money at a time for meeting the increasing the costs and hence they have to seek credit sources for
meeting up subsistence and growth needs. Educational loans are sanctioned to students belonging to all economic statuses, say the children of the salaried, farmers, business professionals and daily wagers, however the proportion varies.

6.2.2 Loan Profile

Great majority of the educational loans are disbursed by the public sectors banks. This shows not only the intention of the public sector to promote educational attainment; it also explains the commitment of this sector in shouldering the huge burden of providing for public expenditure. Though the proportion of the participation of the private sector banks is comparatively lower, the researcher is of the view that this is gradually increases because of the new economic reforms and policies. More than one-third of the borrowers requested educational loans in the range of 60,000 to 150,000 and less than one-third has requested about 150,001 to 300,000. A significant proportion of the borrowers is seeking loans to the tune of 300,001 to 400,000.

This study confirm that educational loans are given to students in varying amounts based on the requirements and the evaluation norms as set by the banks, in most cases, students receive loan amount as requested by them. Great majority of the borrowers has not paid the margin money to the banks, which may be due to the low income level of the borrower’s family. Respondents based on the collateral security. Less than two-third (60.3%) of the borrowers has not given any collateral security, which shows that collateral security is not a key determinant for availing educational loans compared to other loans offered by banks. More than one-third of the borrowers have sought surety from neighbors, relatives, friends and parent.

Less than one-third of the borrowers have availed loans in the year 2008-2009, followed by the year 2009-2010 and 2007-2008. Duration of course reveals that student who pursues engineering degrees (4 years) and those who pursue post-graduate education (2 years) like management are able to get educational loans from the banks compared to students who pursue other degrees. A great majority of the borrowers have not used any external influence while availing educational loans from the bank. However, about one-sixth of them have used some influence or the other during the process of availing educational loans.
Majority of the borrowers are of the opinion that they have received adequate amount as educational loans from the banks. However, less than one-fifth of the borrowers have sought financial aid from other sources as well to meet their educational expenses.

Majority of the borrowers are of the opinion that loan sanctioning and disbursement takes about 1-2 months. This result suggests that borrowers of educational loans are not eligible for other scholarships or fellowships. Greater majority of the borrowers of educational loans are not receiving any support from the government or scholarships given by their educational institutions.

Great majority of the borrowers have started repaying their education loan in installments, which is a positive indicator of the efficient functioning of the educational loan sector in the study area.

Majority of the borrowers report that they have to start repaying the loan amount immediately after the completion of the course. About one-third have reported that they have to start repaying from one year after the completion of the course. Two prominent modalities worked out by banks are: repayment should either start immediately after the completion of the course or one year after the completion of the course.

Respondents based on the repayment status. Less than one-fourth of the borrowers (22.7%) have not started their repayment as they are still doing their studies. Significant proportions (17% & 14%) of them have repaid either totally or about 50 to 70%. Rest of the borrowers has been repaid in the range of 10 to 50 per cent. The overall satisfaction on the education loan provided by banks was presented in the following.

Just majority of the borrowers (52%) are either satisfied or dissatisfied with regard to educational loan as offered to them. However, less-than one-fourth (23%) of the borrowers are highly satisfied about the educational loan services offered to them.

### 6.2.3 Reason for Opting Educational Loan

Borrowers have reported that low rate of interest is the major reason (mean-score = 4.17). Good repayment schedule, simple procedure, easy repayment options, ease of availability and unwillingness of people to provide low interest loans are the other major reasons for opting educational loans. It is therefore concluded that borrowers low rate of interest, comfortable repayment schedules and simple procedure are the major reasons for borrowers opting for educational loans. Furthermore, educational loan borrowers are grouped into three clusters namely, easy availability and repayment, many reasons, low
interest rate and two discriminate functions of \( Z_1 = 0.629 \times \text{Repayment schedule is good} + 0.441 \times \text{Easy repayment}, \quad Z_2 = -0.659 \times \text{Easy availability} + 0.564 \times \text{Simple procedure} + 0.344 \times \text{People are not willing} + 0.160 \times \text{Low rate of interest}. \)

Chi-square analysis show significant association between reasons for opting educational loan and their nature of institute, type of institute, course studied and sources of family income, interest rate, margin money, educational expenditure, disbursement time and overall perception of awareness are found to be significantly associated with the reasons for opting educational loans and are statistically significant. Correspondence analysis confirms that borrowers from Government Colleges, Government-Aided Colleges and Deemed University are found to be closely associated with all six reasons for opting educational loans. However, borrowers from State University and Central University are associated with reasons such as easy availability and repayment reasons.

Borrowers belonging to engineering and medicine courses opt for educational loans because of all six reasons. Borrowers belonging to science courses are associated with easy availability and repayment for opting banks educational loans. Borrowers from a salaried family and business family are found to be significantly associated with all six reasons for opting educational loans. Borrowers who have repaid up loan at different ranges 1-3%, 3-6% and 6-95 are found to opt for educational loans for all six reasons. Similarly, those borrowers who have repaid about 12-15% interest rate borrowers are reported to opt for educational loans because of low interest rate and 9-12% of borrowers opt for reasons such as easy availability and repayment schedules of educational loans.

ANOVA results show significant relationship between reasons for opting educational loan by the customers and their demographic characteristics, such as, percentage of marks, type of institute, course studied parent’s education, family income and sources of family income total loan applied, amount of sanctioned, interest rate, portion of completed, and overall awareness of borrowers perception are significantly related with the reasons for opting banks of educational loan at 5 percent level of the significance. Duncan Post-hoc analysis as shown that borrowers belonging to SC and MBCs communities are opting for educational loans because of its availability, 50-60 percentages of marks borrowers opt banks loans for all the six major reasons explained in this study.

Borrowers in the above 70 percentage of marks borrowers are found reasonably opting the banks educational loans. Furthermore Government-aided colleges and whose family income is in the range of 20,001-30,000 and above 40,000 are more likely to opt for
educational loans for all six reasons. Borrowers belonging to professional and salaried families are more likely to opt for educational loans for all six reasons used in this study. Post-hoc Duncan analysis suggest that borrowers who have applied and sanctioned for educational loans from 1.5 to 4 Lakhs opt for educational loans because of low interest terms, rate of interest and reasons for the opting banks educational loans. From the results it is observed that borrowers in the 3-6%, 1-3%, 6-9% and 12-15% of interest rate opt for educational loans because of reasons such as such as people not willing, easy repayment, simple procedure and repayment schedule is good. Furthermore, borrowers in the 9-12% opt for educational loans for all six reasons.

Independent sample t-test results confirm significant relationship between reasons for opting educational loan by customers and the age, nature of institute, collateral security, recommendation, and total getting loan amount and education expenditure.

Canonical correlation results reveals that borrowers opt for educational loans because of three major reasons in that order; easy repayment, low rate of interest and repayment schedule. Differences in sources of family income, total amount sanctioned, rate of interest, educational expenditure and overall awareness of educational about educational loan influence borrowers for educational loans.

Among the six main reasons for opting educational loans, repayment schedule is the canonical correlations explain that among the six main reasons for opting educational loan, repayment schedule is the most significant reason for opting educational loans as it is found with a higher coefficient value of 0.4154. The probability values for the test of significance for all canonical correlation also indicate that all co-efficient are highly significant.

**6.2.4 Criteria Adopted by Banks While Sanctioning Educational Loan**

Professionals’ course, loan amount and surety occupation have been reported as the top three criteria adopted by banks while sanctioning educational loans. Other criteria include; parents’ occupation and parent’s education. It is therefore concluded that banks adopt several criteria while processing educational loans and most educational loans are provided to those pursuing professional courses.

Using cluster analysis, borrowers are segmented into three cluster groups, such as, all criteria, professional course and quantum of loan. Two discriminant functions are extracted such as Z1=0.667*Parents occupation+0.609*Parents education+0.563*Surety occupation+0.307*Depanding on the quantum of loan Z2=0.872*Professional course.
Chi-square analysis reveals significant relationship between borrowers cluster groups on the basis of criteria and their profile of duration of course, total amount sanctioned, disbursement time and overall awareness of educational loan are associated with the criteria adopted by bankers while sanctioning educational loan. Correspondence analysis confirm that loan borrowers with duration of course 2 years are associated of with all criteria adopted. Furthermore borrowers with 4 years duration course are associated with the professional course and quantum of loan. People pursuing 4 years course will be doing only professional course and they may require higher amount of loan.

Above 4, 00,000 loan sanctioned borrowers closely associated with all criteria cluster and 1, 50,001-3, 00,000 loan availed borrowers are associated with the quantum of loan. Up to certain limit the banks consider only nature of course mainly they prefer professional course and after that they look into many factors before deciding to give loan. Loan borrowers with disbursement time less than 1 month are associated with the quantum of loan cluster. Furthermore borrowers with disbursement time 1-2 month are associated with professional course and borrowers with disbursement time more than two month are associated with all criteria. If the loan amount is less then disbursement will take place immediately and if they consider many criteria then disbursement will take longer duration.

ANOVA results show significant relationship between criteria adopted by bankers while sanctioning educational loans and demographic variables such as; social class, family income, course studied, duration of course, present status, total amount sanctioned, interest rate, loan sanctioned time, disbursement time, repayment period and overall perception of awareness are significantly related with the criteria adopted by banks at 5 percent level of the significance.

Duncan post hoc analysis show that educational loans are given to students from SC community to encourage them to use it for professional course. For students from general community, maximum importance is given to parent’s educational qualification. To give educational loan to students who are studying in private colleges the banks give more importance to professional courses. Furthermore, if the amount sanctioned is above 4,00,000 then banks give more importance to parent’s occupation. Furthermore banks are taking more time for disbursement because they consider parents occupation, surety occupation and nature of course.
Independent sample t-test results confirm existence of relationship between criteria adopted by banks and variables such as age, nature of institute, collateral security and getting the total amount by borrowers are significantly associated with the criteria adopted by banks at 5 percent significance.

Canonical correlation results reveals that professional course, social class, total amount sanctioned, and collateral security are the key determinants or criteria that explains borrower’s ability to successfully land up educational loans. Furthermore, canonical correlations results also explain that among the five main criteria of educational loan, professional course continues to be the most significant criterion with a higher coefficient value of 0.3898. The probability values for test of significance for all canonical correlation value indicate that all co-efficient are highly significant.

6.2.5 Reasons for Rejecting Educational Loan Applications

Borrowers report “inability to arrange proper collateral securities” as the most important reason for rejection of bank loan. Other reasons include, insufficient parent income, inconsistent academic performance, less marks in the qualifying examination and improper surety are also important reasons for rejecting loan application. Least important reason is “bank is not near to my residence”. While the place of study is an important factor, however, this study found that the domicile of the borrower is a least important reason.

Using Cluster Analysis, the educational loan borrowers have been grouped into three segments namely, banks reasons, no reasons and borrower’s reasons. Discriminant analysis has generated two functions, Z1 = 0.966*Bank reasons Z2 = 0.996*Borrowers reasons.

Chi-square analysis results show significant association between borrowers groups and profile variables such as the nature of institute, type of institutions, course studied, recommendation, getting the total amount, education expenditure, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time, and repayment started period, portion of completed repayment and overall perception of educational at 5 percent level of significance. Correspondence analysis confirmed the association between the reasons for rejecting loan application and type of institution. While, private college and deemed university borrowers are associated with borrowers reasons cluster and state university, government college and government aided college are found to be associated with no reasons cluster. Loan borrowers who are from engineering colleges are associated with bank reasons. Respondents from management courses are closely associated with borrower’s reasons and medical and science course
respondents are associated with no reasons cluster. Furthermore, borrowers with good and very good level awareness about educational loan are closely associated with the borrower’s reasons; similarly, borrowers with poor and very poor reasons are associated with bank reasons. If the people have more and more awareness then they may know what to do and what not to do.

ANOVA results suggest that demographic variables namely, social status, education, type of institutions, bank branches, name of the banks, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time, portion of loan repayment completed and borrowers perception of educational loan awareness are significantly related with the reason banks rejected educational loan applications. Post hoc Duncan analysis results reveal that MBC category students feel that the rejection of loan application due to bank reasons. The PG qualified respondents feel that rejection of loan application is mainly due to bank reasons because their mean score, whereas others mean score is less than 3. Borrowers studying from private colleges and deemed universities feel that borrower’s reason is the main reason for rejection of loan application. In the bank reasons central university people have high mean value which means they feel that bank reason is the important reason for rejection of loan application.

Canonical correlation analysis reveals that borrowers’ perceptions regarding the reasons for the failure of educational loans differs according to demographic and profile variables of the borrowers. This difference exists because of borrower’s education, level of awareness and loan sanctioning time.

6.2.6 Level of Satisfaction In Education Loan by Borrowers

Based on the mean value, it is found that amount of loan obtained, terms of loan and collateral security are the top three satisfiers. Borrower’s level of satisfaction is comparatively less in relation to issues such as margin money, documentation procedure and repayment schedule and the rate of interest charged. These satisfactions if educational loan borrowers have been factorized into terms and conditions, period and Amount and repayment. Cluster Analysis has been employed to segment the borrowers into three categories namely, low satisfied to borrowers, satisfied on amount and repayment and satisfied on terms and condition period. Discriminant analysis resulted in two discriminant functions such as $Z_1=0.912*\text{Period} + 0.488*\text{Terms and condition}$; $Z_2=0.940*\text{Amount and repayment}$. 
Chi-square analysis show significant association between borrowers groups on the basis of their level of satisfaction and variables such as age, marks percentage, nature of institute, parent’s education, family income, year of availing loan, total loan getting, education expenditure and overall perception and borrower’s level of satisfaction at 5 percent level of significance. Correspondence analysis subsequently show that students who have secured about 60-70 and 70-80 marks percentage are found to be closely associated with the satisfaction on terms and condition of educational loans. Students who have scored about 80-90 mark percentages are associated with the satisfaction on amount and repayments. Borrowers with a family income between and below 10,000, 20,001-30,000 and above 40,000 are associated with the satisfaction on terms and condition period of educational loan. Furthermore borrowers with an income ranging from 10,000-20,000 are associated with satisfaction on amount repayment and 30,000 to 40,000 are associated with low satisfaction levels.

Borrowers who have availed educational loans during 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 periods are closely associated with the satisfaction on amount and repayment. Similarly, students who have availed loans during 2007-2008 and 2010-2011 respondents are associated with the satisfaction on terms and condition. Borrowers who have repaid up loan at different ranges (30-50%, 100% and 50-70%) are closely associated with the satisfaction on terms and condition. Similarly, those borrowers who have repaid about 10-20%, 20-30% and 70-90% portion of loans payable are associated with the satisfaction on amount and repayment.

ANOVA results show that demographic variables of social class, percentage of marks, course studied, family income, sources of family income, sanctioning time, repayment portion of completed and overall perception are significantly related with the level of satisfaction. Post hoc (Duncan) results reveal that educational loan borrowers of social class and family income are highly satisfied with ‘terms and condition’ of educational loan to borrowers. In comparison to other communities, general category borrowers and borrowers from family with an income between 30,001-40,000 and 20,001-30,000 are more satisfaction with educational loans. Marks percentage, two homogenous groups are highly satisfied with ‘amount repayment period’ offered in educational loans.

Borrowers for whom the educational loan sanction time was less than one month and 1-2 month are highly satisfied with the amount and repayment. Borrows who have repaid about 30-50% and 50-70% of the loans are more satisfied with the normal time schedule as
earmarked in the loan documents. Borrowers with a good level of awareness are highly satisfied with both the terms and conditions as well as the normal time schedule as mentioned in the loan agreement with regard to the repayment of educational loans.

Independent sample t-tests confirm the existence of significant mean difference regarding borrowers’ level of satisfaction of educational loan grouped on the basis of their age and nature of institute and education expenditure is significantly associated with the level of satisfaction.

Canonical correlation results confirm that level of satisfaction of borrowers is determined by factors such as nature of institution, year of availing loan, education expenditure, loan sanctioning time and the overall awareness about the educational loan system. Further, the study finds that the satisfaction levels of the borrowers is also influenced by borrower related factors such as the age, social class, family income, etc.

6.2.7 Reasons for Failure of Repayment of Educational Loans

Borrower’s insufficient income, continuation of higher studies and inability to get employment have been reported as the top three reasons behind borrowers’ failure to repay educational loans. Reasons for failure of repayment of educational loan have been grouped into five factors: banker’s attitude, government attitude, employability-related, family commitment and lack of proper surety. Further, the educational loan borrowers have been grouped into three clusters namely, many reasons, personal reason and no-specific reasons and discriminate functions of \( Z_1 = 0.859^* \text{Government Attitude} + 0.435^* \text{Bankers Attitude} \)
\( Z_2 = 0.839^* \text{Lack of proper surety} + 0.315^* \text{Employability-related} + 0.260^* \text{Family commitment} \).

Chi-square analysis suggests the existence of significant association between reasons for failure of repayment of educational loan and their age, social class, educational level, total loan applied, surety are associated. Subsequently, correspondence analysis reveals that borrowers belonging to General social community report failure of repayment of loans due to multiple reasons. Borrowers belong to SC and OBC social communities report no specific reasons for the failure of repayment of educational loans.

Borrowers who are in graduate studies report failure of repayment of educational loans to personal reasons. Graduate borrowers report no specific reasons for repayment failure. Loan borrowers with a family income in the range of Rs. 10,000 to 20,000 report personal reasons for failure of repayment of educational loans. While borrowers with a family income below 10,000 report no specific reasons, borrowers with a family income of
more than Rs. 20,000 report multiple reasons for the failure of repayment of educational loans. In addition total amount applied and reasons for failure of repayment of educational loan. Loan borrowers who have applied educational loan to the amount of Rs. 60,000 report failure of repayment to multiple reasons. While, borrowers who have applied loan for about Rs. 60,000 to 3,00,000 report personal reasons for repayment failure, borrowers who have applied for more than Rs. 3,00,000 report no specific reasons for repayment failures.

ANOVA results show that demographic characteristics such as social class, family income, duration of course, total loan applied, loan sanctioning time, disbursement time and loan repayment person to be significantly related with the non-repayment of educational loans. Duncan Post hoc results reveal the relationship between community category and reasons for the non-repayment of educational loans.

With regard to the community and non-repayment, it is observed that OBC category people are not repaying the educational loans for all the three major reasons explained in this study. However, borrowers in the MBC category are found to default moderately in the repayment of educational loans. Borrowers with a family income below Rs.10,000, Rs.30,000-40,000 and above Rs.40,000 monthly incomes are not repaying the educational loans due to bankers’ attitude, government’s attitude and employability related issues.

Independent sample t-test results confirm significant relationship between reasons for failure of repayment loan by borrowers and gender, recommendation, total loan applied, and support from any other side are significantly associated.

Canonical correlation results reveals that educational loan borrowers regarding reason for making failure of repayment of educational loans. Factors such as social category, education level, family income, total loan applied and collateral security. It means that social class, total loan applied and collateral security is the deciding factor for the failure of repayment educational loans. Among the five main reasons for failure of repayment of educational loan, employability is having higher coefficient value of 0.4460. The probability values for test of significance for all canonical correlation value indicate that all co-efficient are highly significant.

6.2.8 Sources for Creating Awareness about Educational Loan

RBI continues and should continue to sensitize stakeholders on the importance of priority sector advances, especially, the popularity of education loan. The banks located in college or university premises should also play active role in spreading information about
education loan, the government should effectively advertise about education loan are the top three sources preferred by the borrowers to popularize educational loan. The sources of creating awareness about educational loan have been factorized into Services organization, Government and Educational institutions. Using Cluster analysis, the educational loan borrowers have been grouped into three segments based on their report on sources for creating awareness - service organization, no opinion and educational institutions. Emerging two discriminants functions are as follows; 

\[ Z_1 = 0.994 \times \text{Services organization} \]
\[ Z_2 = 0.797 \times \text{Government} + 0.681 \times \text{Educational institutions} \]

Chi-square analysis explain significant association between the segments of educational loan borrowers grouped on the basis of awareness and their profile variables such as social class, nature of institute and type of institute, recommendation, education expenditure, disbursement time, eligible for scholarship, repayment started period, portion of repayment completed and overall perception on awareness of educational loan and sources of creating awareness at 5 percent level of significance. Correspondence analysis results confirm relationship between educational status and the awareness about educational loan.

Borrowers from general social class do not have any specific opinion about sources by which awareness can be created. OBC and MBC people derived information about educational loans from service organizations. SC category people prefer Educational institution to spread information about educational loan. People who have studied from Government College, Government-aided college and private college prefer educational institution to spread information about educational institution. People who study in central university prefer services organizations.

People who got loan sanctioned within 1 month is associated with services organization for creating awareness. Furthermore borrowers who got loan sanctioned within 1-2 month sanctioning time are associated with educational institutions and more than two month respondents are associated with no opinion cluster. Borrowers who have completed 20-30% and 70-90% of loans are associated with no specific opinion cluster and people who have completed less than 10% and 10-20% of loans are associated with services organization.

ANOVA results prove the existence of significant difference in sources of creating awareness of educational loan and their demographic of social class, education, percentage of marks and type of institution, sanctioning time, disbursement time, portion of repayment completed are significantly related with the sources of creating awareness. Duncan Post hoc
results suggest significant relationship between types of institutions and sources of creating awareness. From the results it is observed that Central University students prefer service organization to create awareness about educational loan. However, borrowers in the Central University and Deemed Universities also prefer Govt. to create awareness about educational loan. In comparison to other social status MBC class borrowers and borrowers with PG education qualification prefer services organization to create awareness about educational loan. Borrowers who got loan sanctioned within one month prefer services organization. However, borrowers who got sanctioned after 2 month preferred educational institutions.

Independent sample t-test results confirm relationship between sources of creating awareness and hostel students and education expenditure.

Canonical correlation analysis reveals that borrowers are informed about educational loan service through multiple channels and mediums and are influenced by several factors such as previous education, portion of repayment completed perception about awareness level of educational loan. People preference for educational institutions and Govt. to create awareness is influenced by their level of awareness. This study found that present level of awareness among borrowers as the most influencing variable for the preference of sources for creating awareness about educational loan.

6.2.9 Communication with Borrowers: Present and Prospective

Communication through TV advertisements, print media and radio are the preferred channels of communication adopted by educational loans providers to inform borrowers – present and prospective about educational loans.

6.2.10 Loan Collection Procedures

Borrowers report that bankers are adopting to remind borrowers of educational loans about repayment through postal reminders (3.70), SMS (3.07), telephonic conversation (3.06) and initiation of legal actions (3.03) for collecting repayment from the borrowers.

6.2.11 Borrowers Opinion on Bank Staffs Attitude towards Educational Loans

Borrowers have reported that bank staffs consider not receiving adequate loans as a big burden and problem. Borrowers’ perceive that attitude of bank staff towards educational loans has been indifferent and far from satisfaction.
6.2.12 Borrowers Overall Perception of Educational Loan

Mean analysis concluded that borrowers consider educational loans as a significant opportunity to finance their educational loans. Borrowers expect loan application procedure to be simple, interest to be low or no and government should consider waiver of educational loans, especially to the poor and the needy.

Overall perception has been factored into Issues, Loan Process and Outcome. Borrowers are knowledgeable, moderately knowledgeable and less knowledgeable. Using discriminant analysis, two discriminant functions are extracted, such as Z1=0.642* Loan Process Z2=0.733*Issues, + 0.703*Loan Outcome value added services.

Chi-square analysis suggests association between educational loan borrowers segmented on the basis of their overall perception and age, social class, education and hostler name of the banks, collateral securities, eligible for scholarship and loan repayment person are found to be significantly associated with borrowers overall perception of educational loan.

Correspondent analysis confirms that the borrowers belonging to SC and OBC social communities are closely associated with more knowledgeable perception. Borrowers belonging to General communities are associated with moderately knowledgeable perception for educational loan. Borrowers who secured about to 70-80 and 80-90 percentages of marks borrowers are closely associated with knowledgeable perception of educational loans. Borrowers with a mark percentage in the range of 50-60 and 60-70 per cent are found to be associated with percentages of marks borrowers are associated with moderately knowledgeable perception.

Borrowers who have availed loans from Indian Bank, State Bank of India, Central Bank of India and HDFC bank are moderately knowledgeable about educational loans. While borrowers from Canara Bank and City Union Bank are associated with less knowledgeable, borrowers from other banks such as IOB and Karur Vysya Bank are found be highly knowledgeable about educational loans.

ANOVA results show relationship between demographic variables such as, social class, education, percentage of marks, place of institute, course studied, duration of course, sources of family income, name of the banks, portion of completed loan repayment, loan repayment person and borrowers level of satisfaction with borrowers overall perception of educational loan. Duncan post hoc analysis confirms the significant relationship between borrower’s earlier education qualification and overall perception of educational loans. While
post graduate and graduate borrowers are highly knowledgeable about the loan process and outcomes, borrowers who have completed HSC are more knowledgeable about loan outcomes compared to the loan process. Borrowers with less percentage of marks, for instance, 50 to 70, are more knowledgeable about the issues and loan process pertaining to educational loan segment.

Independent sample t-test results confirm relationship between borrowers overall perception about educational loan and age, hostel student, collateral securities, total amount getting and scholarship.

Canonical correlation analysis shows that all the three factors is significantly influenced by education, place of institute, course studied, hostel and loan repayment person. In second set, education and loan repayment person variable significantly influence to all three factors and the third set, collateral securities and borrowers overall satisfaction influenced by issues and loan outcome factors having the borrowers perception.
6.3 Recommendations

Priority sector advances has increased manifold over the years, however, the cost as well impact of these advances to commercial banks in India has been high and the results are unequivocal. This study confirms that the situation of educational loan sector with regard to bankers and borrowers perceptions is not as positive as it should be. Both the bankers as well as the borrowers face huge challenges that limit the beneficial outcomes of these novel schemes. Based on the findings of this study and secondary data, the following recommendations are enlisted.

As its stands today, the norms for the priority sectors before globalization and with the opening of markets to the global players more structural changes have happened, which profoundly affect the performance of banks. Even more significantly, priority sectors lending has affected all types of banks in variant level. Hence, it is timely to review the definition of priority sector advances. Revised PSL norms are needed to revise and devise stipulations on recipient’s types, funds usage and sub-targets within each sector and different mandates of different banks.

1. This study finds that private sector banks perform better compared to their private counterparts on several measures. There is an urgent need to rethink on the PSL strategy, consolidation and effective use of technology for lending besides greater financial inclusion. Furthermore, commercial banks, for instance, public, private and foreign banks must have different PSL target assignments in line with their business models. This may support these banks to be efficient in operations and also provide safe grounds for the banking sector as a whole.

2. With regard to the perception of bankers; bankers report that they are pressurized on all cylinders with wide range of responsibilities which make them stressed out and sad lot. Bankers continue to see priority sector advances as an added burden. This situation must change. Bankers’ attitude about lending for education also must change. The use of technology to reduce cost of credit delivery is a must.

3. Non-repayment of educational loans continues to be key problem that results in an increase in NPAs for banks, which influence their attitude towards educational loan lending. In the light of this situation, it is important that bankers institute a competency or academic performance based selection criteria for identifying beneficiaries for educational loans.
4. Employability nature of the course pursued, reputation of educational institutions and parent’s ability to repay educational loans, in terms of their occupation, social status and previous loan repayment history are some of the key factors that help bankers in selecting beneficiaries. These criteria are by nature indicates the repayment potential of the beneficiary to a larger extent and hence should be continued to be followed.

5. This study observes that politician tend to give a negative notion among the general public that PSL lending like educational loans need not be repaid. This is a dangerous sign. RBI must recommend the Union Government to take up this issue with the governments in all the States and Union Territories about the importance of the efficiency of PSL and the role of state legislators. Bankers must also be pay due attention and not bow down to the influence of the politicians during the identification of educational loan beneficiaries.

6. Bankers also must sensitize those educational institutions about their role in the PSL scheme. As unemployment among borrowers continues to be a key deterrent for repayment, educational institutions can help improve the efficiency of the PSL scheme in this context. Institutions must motivate students to stay committed to their academic pursuits, develop their employability skills and ensure employment placements at the end of their course to help them repay the loan without any problem.

7. For parents, low interest rate of educational loans continues to be a major reason for availing educational loans. With regard to criteria adopted by banks, it is important that parents ensure their repayment potential or credit rating is good in terms of their occupation, good collateral security and social status.

8. For students aspiring for educational loans, it is important that they are consistently good in their academic performance, which is regarded as a key criterion for successfully landing educational loans.
6.4 Implications of the Study

Today, more than ever, the need for ensuring competitiveness of Indian financial sector is well recognized. Hence this study examined the perceptions of bankers and borrowers, more specifically, about the educational loan sector in Puducherry UT. This study contributes to the growing body of literature by identifying some of key challenges and problems faced by the bankers and borrowers with regard to educational loans. While it is desirable to increase the level of credit disbursed to the priority sectors, several other structural changes are needed to allow the benefits of this scheme to have an impact on these sectors.

This study warns that compromising bank’s profitability and increasing non-performance assets by mandating the provisions of PSL without considering the differences in business models is very costly for the banking industry and the economy as a whole. This study is highly useful for both bankers and borrowers as it brings out the problems associated with the delivery of educational loans. More so, this study brings out clearly information about the criteria adopted by banks, problems encountered by bankers, reasons for poor repayment of educational loans and the overall perceptions of both the bankers and borrowers. This understanding would be of tremendous help to the bankers and borrowers to improve their understanding and motivate them to commit themselves to the success of PSL scheme. Finally, some of the recommendations made in this study would help the bankers that would help them to navigate the challenges posed by competitive landscape in India’s banking industry in the face of the ongoing global financial instability.
6.5 Scope for Future Research

Despite the contribution of this study towards understanding educational loans sector, this study has some limitations, which would serve motivation for future research.

First, this study has used primary data from a sample drawn using cross-sectional study design from a relatively smaller geographical region of Puducherry UT. Future studies can be undertaken in larger States of India.

Studies on the impact of priority sector advances on the academic performance and employability profile among beneficiaries are needed to assess the real benefits of educational loan segment to the broader economy.

This study also did not look into the role of bankers and borrowers into the effective administration and delivery of educational loans. This presents a significant opportunity for future researchers to investigate.

Finally, this study contend that efficiency of any service scheme can only be assessed when it is examined using a stakeholder approach. Therefore, this study recommend that future research be undertaken to measure the efficiency of the educational loan segment in larger State of India using a stakeholder approach.
6.6 Conclusion

Priority sector advances continues to play a major role in providing credit opportunities to unreached and key strategic sectors at preferential interest rate. Although the credit disbursed through the PSL channel has increased multifold, however, extant literature and this study show that the efficiency of the scheme as well as benefits they generate is well below the expected level. Several problems and structural constraints continue to harm the commercial banks, more specifically the public sector banks to competitively perform and remain profitable.

This study asserts the contribution of PSL in increasing the credit supply to priority sectors in India is clear, however, imposing uniform restrictions on all types of commercial banks is not good and it is also costly. Mandated by RBI norms and guidelines, commercial banks continue to extend credit to priority sectors by opening more branches. However, it is timely to strengthen specialized financial institutions like RRBs, cooperatives and MFIs to support priority sectors. Secondary data confirm that PSL lower the profitability of commercial banks by increasing its NPAs. Looking at both the costs and declining profits incurred by commercial banks, it is timely to review PSL.

With the growth of higher education system in India and the recognition of its significance to Indian economy, it is timely that due care to taken to ensure PSL to this sector. Efforts are needed to improve the repayment level of PSL, which has been a significant deterrent in this direction. Politicians, bureaucrats’, bankers as well as the general public must challenge their assumptions about priority sector advance, renew their perceptions to ensure that they have positive attitude towards educational loans and other priority sector advances, commit and participate to aid the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of the scheme. Such an actionable endeavour would support India in its quest to sustain economic development through education and efficiency in economic activity of the banking sector.