

A Demographic Study on Student Retention in Professional Institutes

Ankita Jain

Assistant Professor

Shri Vaishnav Institute of Management, Indore
ankitajainpimr@gmail.com

Anukool Manish Hyde

Professor and HOD- HR and General Management
Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore
anukool_h@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT

Student retention is a foremost concern for educational institutions around the world. It has a direct link to the social, economic and political growth of a country. This has become an issue of increasing concern for Professional Degree Colleges in India. Student retention is paramount for accomplishing goals of institutions for sustainable growth and success. Low student retention rates negatively affect both the student and the institution. The first year of college for loads of students is definitely one of the most hectic years which consists of getting lost on campus, getting a schedule that is not the best, and trying to fit into a new world that you have been thrown into. This may cause students to feel left out, or helpless in their state, but it could also help them flourish and succeed in college life. Many students take it as a positive a negative outcome, resulting in the commonly known problem; retention. "Retention can be defined in terms of program completion" (Walleri, 1981, p. 5). "For students in special programs and community education, retention can be defined meaningfully only in terms of student objectives" (Walleri, 1981, p. 4).

Retention is Influenced at Individual Level (Academic Performance, College, academic performance, course load and credits earned, academic self-discipline, Attitudes and Satisfaction, Positive attitude about academics, commitment to college, sense of belonging and social connectedness), at Institutional Level (Academic Engagement, Undergraduate research activities, university size, opportunities to join clubs and at Social and External Level (Social and Family Support).

In this research Primary data has been collected from students of professional Institutes of Indore Division through using a Self Designed Questionnaire. t-test and One way ANOVA test have been applied for the purpose of demographical study on student retention in professional institutes". Normality and Reliability have been checked.

This study reveals that Students' perception towards retention is almost same with respect to gender, age, area, family income, family size and course in which they study.

Keywords: Demographics, Student Retention, Attrition, Higher Education, Self-Satisfaction, Attitude.

INTRODUCTION

The Student's particularly of to begin with year of college is expect one of the foremost frenzied years in college life. The primary year comprises of getting lost on campus, getting a plan that isn't the leading, and attempting to fit into a world that you just have been tossed into. Maintenance is fundamentally fair the significance of colleges attempting to progress the graduation rates as well as the first-year dropout rates. Madgett & Belanger (2008) recognize maintenance as an appealing method for countries to guarantee a unfaltering supply of college graduates and reduce abilities awkward nature and deficiencies. Maintenance appears to influence understudies who are impeded in a way, or who don't have the points of interest other understudies have. Parkin and Baldwin (p 65, 2009) characterize perseverance in "the capacity of understudies to proceed their posts econdary ponders from one year to the next and eventually to continue to the completion of the program". Understudy addition hypothesis in Tinto's (1975) effort contends that scholastic addition.

DEFINITIONS

STUDENT: - A understudy may be a learner or somebody who goes to an instructive institution. It moreover named as, "student" alludes to an attendee of a lower instructive established. When speaking about learning exterior an institution, "understudy" is additionally utilized to refer to somebody who is learning a point or who may "be a understudy of" a certain subject or individual. Within the largest sense of the word, an understudy is anybody looking to memorize or to develop by experience.

RETENTION: - 'Retention' alludes to the length of time that understudies proceed to consider at a specific institution. The word is frequently utilized as a metric, measuring the rate of understudies that stay in ponder until they have completed a specific qualification.

STUDENT RETENTION: There are a few edges of understudy maintenance. A DROPOUT, or LEAVER, is an understudy who enters school yet leaves before graduating and stays away for the indefinite future to that or some other school. In the midst of these two extremes are TRANSFERS, understudies who start learns at one foundation and after that exchange to another. From the understudy's viewpoint, exchanging is typical advance. From the point of view of the organization where the understudy initially selected, the understudy has dropped out. While it is anything but difficult to recognize a STAYER, an understudy who has left school could return whenever. Understudies who re-select in the wake of stopping school are called STOP OUTS. Understudies regularly quit school because of a budgetary deficiency or a family emergency and restore a year later.

(Seidman, 2012) Perplexity of what the term 'RETENTION' implies stems from researchers intercity the term with other words with changed essences. 'ATTRITION' is frequently utilized where 'retention' would be more suitable, as steady loss alludes as it were to the Re-enrolment of understudies in successive semesters while 'PERSISTENCE', too regularly utilized as a equivalent word for 'retention' concerns the want and activity of a understudy to remain in higher instruction from introductory passage to capability completion (Seidman, 2012).

Faculty branded numerous of the same reasons for whittling down that Students cited; but workforce too seen that steady loss comes about from issues with youthfulness of Students, need of objectives, and destitute scholastic arrangement. Tinto (1975) famous that among the foremost genuine issues with which at-risk Students must run are those moulded by family background (like status within the society, values, prospect), person traits (like sex, race, capacity), and pre-college tutoring (GPA, scholastic and social fulfillments). Deterrents of individual circumstances or conduct cited by staff included well being, conjugal, money related, transportation, and child care issues; moo inspiration; moo self-esteem; work changes; no, off-base, or unreasonable objectives; and adolescence. Scholastic particular impediments cited included destitute scholarly arrangement, destitute think about propensities, moo grades, destitute prompting, lacking introduction, overwhelming lesson loads, destitute lesson participation, and need of mindfulness of the requests of college. In this think about, Students more regularly cited outside impacts though staff more frequently cited inside impacts as the foremost important determinant of whittling down.

Hypothetical Viewpoint

The overabundance of Student Retention hypotheses can be isolated up into six foci: mental, natural, societal, financial, organizational, and associations (Tinto, 1993). Briefly, mental hypotheses centred on the shortcomings of Students, societal speculations centre on the impact of outside powers, financial depend on monetary things affecting Student Retention, organizational speculations put the burden on the educate of higher instruction and, at long last, associations hypotheses utilize a combination of those recorded over in arrange to endeavor an clarification of Student flight. Table one briefly portrays each of the hypotheses.

Student Retention Theories (Tinto, 1993)

- **Psychological:** These sorts of hypotheses are based on separately particular characteristics such as judgment skills, inspiration, identity, and mien.
- **Environmental:** In coordinate differentiate to mental hypotheses of Retention; naturally based speculations depend on the impacts of social, financial, and organizational environment of the Student. Student Retention is related to social victory whereas Student whittling down may be a result of social stratification.

- **Societal** - These speculations of Student Retention cover to some degree with natural speculations but foremost significance is set on the social setting.
- **Economic** The avocation for Student flight in financial hypotheses of Student Retention is based on a cost-analysis by the Student. Enrollment is seen as a positive return on venture or, non-enrollment is the result of a negative fetched to advantage proportion. These sorts of hypotheses stretch the significance and impacts of funds and budgetary help.
- **Organizational** In spite of the fact that societal speculations center on advanced instruction setting. These hypotheses believe Retention relating to various regulation uniqueness including structure, estimate & consumptions per Student.
- **Interactional** The foremost all encompassing of the hypotheses are considered associations. Basically, these hypotheses come together over said ranges of Retention contemplations in a show that permits for numerous changeable intelligent. Hypothetical system to display think about is measured collaborations hypothesis of Student Retention.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Alicia B. Harvey-Smith over viewed of chosen considers straightforwardly relating retention in higher instruction. It has been talked about on essential Retention models and at that point centers more closely on the Retention of minority Students. It closes with suggestions for a minority Retention show Student, coordinates suggested best hones and a show utilized to decipher the hypothesis into hone on one community college campus. The survey is guided by a want to find and reveal noteworthy impacts and factors that have helped the tirelessness and Retention of minority Students. It investigates a few of the issues influencing African American Students especially, with an endeavor to clarify the complexity in finding solutions. There are moreover constrained thinks about with this as a center, which are grounded and conducted at the community college level.

Parkin and Baldwin (2009) explained persistence as “the ability of students to continue their post secondary studies from one year to the next and ultimately to proceed to the completion of the program”.

Dixon, Rayle, and Chung (2007) concluded “mattering” the environment of the college, determination like “experience of others depending on us, being interested in us, and being concerned with our fate”.

Orsuwan and Cole (2007) studied of Asian/Pacific Islander student satisfaction, establish to more prominent community connectivity or sense of having a place has a critical affiliation with more prominent instructive fulfillment. They talked about that scholarly integration alone isn't adequate to clarify the Retention of racial alternative Students, who encounter distinctive and regularly lower degrees of social integration when compared to racial larger part Students.

Allen et al. (2006) studied factors related to third-year college retention, established to “academic self-discipline, pre-college academic performance, and pre-college educational development have indirect effects on retention and transfer”. They also found that the scholarly accomplishment of freshers was slanted by scholastic self-discipline, proposing a roundabout impact of scholarly teach on scholastic execution, a really solid investigator of college Retention, for both beneath- and upperclassmen in college.

Nicpon et al. (2006) showed a positive relationship between social integration student retention, they found that superior levels of social reinforce relate to more critical tirelessness and less opinions of melancholy, but did not relate it to educational achievement.

Kuh and Love (2004) concluded that Understudies who made social affiliations through social bunches that duplicate their culture of root were more likely to drive forward in instruction at higher level. While such bunches may outline physically and casually, colleges may as well develop and make such openings to relate.

Alexander Astin (1997) in his book, *What Things in College*, takes a interesting approach by centering primarily on the designs of engagement displayed by fruitful Students. He clarified that the keys to victory are included and associated. Inclusion alludes to both formal scholastic or mental interests as well as co-curricular exercises. Among the essential measures of scholarly inclusion is time went through on scholarly ponders and errands, and the improvement of higher cognitive aptitudes (e.g., understanding, application, investigation, blend, and assessment). Co-curricular association incorporates measures of support in campus exercises and enrollment in academic/honors affiliations and social clubs. Association alludes to holding with peers, staff and staff as well as sharing the regulation values.

Carr's (1992) conducted a ponder, at San Jose City Community College; He inspected the fourth-semester determination rates of African American men to explore the impact of the athletic scholastic bolster programs on Retention. They found that African American guys in a seriously back program had a fourth semester determination rate of 56 % higher than any bunch at the institution. This campus back program centered basically on making a sense of community for the men who taken part. It has delayed to grant the same sense of society experienced by the program's members to all African American Students on campus.

Coll and Von Seggern (1991) illustrating on the writing have started to analyze community college Retention information on expressed goals of students' upon passage. Categorizing Students based on their most vital reason for going to college, important summarize and evaluation of objective fulfillment students' can happen. This emphasized on the significance of tolerating Student objectives forthright and require for more exact summarize.

Ellison (1987) conducted a ponder at Cuyahoga Community College, endeavored to supply a diagram of the issues and a few potential arrangements related with tall dropout rates at community colleges. Ponder highlighted taken a toll as being one of the causes of discontinuance in community colleges and encourage prescribed that there will be more prominent consistency in measuring and characterizing Student Retention and withdrawal at community colleges. The require for the execution of dropout avoidance methodologies, such as introduction of unused Students, monetary help programs, programs related to advancing a sense of community, and upgrading scholastic fabulousness. The report prescribed specialized exercises for at-risk Students, previous Students, and returning Students. This report encourages prescribed that community colleges plan and conduct valuable Retention assessments, facilitate their endeavors to encourage tall school-to-college move, make strides Retention and accomplishment, and advance two- and four-year college exchange.

Vincent Tinto's (1987) show of Student flight has had the most noteworthy impact on our understanding of Student Retention. His hypothesis made a difference direct a huge number of papers and observational thinks about of Student Retention. The show sets that Students enter college with family and person qualities as well as pre-college tutoring. They enter with certain commitments, both to wrapping up college and to remaining at their college.

OBJECTIVES

- To study Student Retention with respect to GENDER of students in professional institutes.
- To study Student Retention with respect to AGE of students in professional institutes.
- To study Student Retention with respect to AREA of students in professional institutes.
- To study Student Retention with respect to FAMILY INCOME of students in professional institutes.
- To study Student Retention with respect to FAMILY SIZE of students in professional institutes.
- To study Student Retention with respect to COURSE of students in professional institutes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Type: Descriptive

Universe- Indore Division has been selected for data collection.

Sample Size: 154

Sampling Technique- Convenience Sampling technique has been used for collection of data.

Sampling Unit- Data is collected from Students of various Professional Institutes.

Tools for Data Collection- In this research Primary data has been collected from students of professional Institutes of Indore Division through using a Self Designed Questionnaire and analysis has been done through statistics tools with the help of SPSS. Secondary data will also be used from Journals, Articles and Websites.

Sampling plan: Data has been collected from the students studying in various professional colleges in different programs in last 4 months for this study by self designed questionnaire.

Tools for Data Analysis - t-test and One way ANOVA test have been applied as a tool for analysis of data. Normality and Reliability tested for this study.

Hypotheses

- H_{01} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to GENDER of students in professional institutes.
- H_{02} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to AGE of students in professional institutes.
- H_{03} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to AREA of students in professional institutes.
- H_{04} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to FAMILY INCOME of students in professional institutes.
- H_{05} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to FAMILY SIZE of students in professional institutes.
- H_{06} : There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to COURSE of students in professional institutes.

RESULTS

Normality Test(See annexure 1)

Most statistical tests assume that the data are normally distributed hence there is a necessity to check the distribution. The Kolmogorov- Smirnov Statistic tests the hypothesis that the data normally distributed. A low significance value less than 0.05 indicates that the distribution of the data differs significantly from a normal distribution. After conducting this test, it was found that the assumption holds good for the data. The data is normality distributed (1.773).

Reliability (See annexure 2)

Reliability test has been made for testing the reliability of student retention, with the help of Coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). Reliability of data is (.995) which is tremendous; according to different theory of reliability value above 0.6 is appropriate, low value below the 0.5 implies that reliability may not be appropriate.

DISCUSSION

Since $p = .000$ (see annexure 3) is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H_{01} (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to GENDER of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be concluded that male and female students perceive almost same about retention.

Since $p = .729$ (see annexure 4) is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H_{02} (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to AGE of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be concluded that student perception does not differ in the context of retention.

Since $p = .119$ (see annexure 5) is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H_{03} (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to AREA of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be concluded that Student Retention perception is almost same.

Since $p = .413$ (see annexure 6) which is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H_{04} (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to FAMILY INCOME of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be said that perception on Student Retention is almost same irrespective of family income of the students.

Since $p = .703$ (see annexure 7) is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H_{05} (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to FAMILY SIZE of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be concluded that Student's perception on Retention is almost same irrespective of family size.

Since $p = .560$ (see annexure 8) is greater than .05 which means that null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, H06 (There is no significant difference in Student Retention with respect to COURSE of students in professional institutes.) is accepted. Hence, it may be concluded that Student Retention is almost same irrespective of Course opted by students in Professional Institutes.

CONCLUSION

Student Retention is influenced by various changes within the environment counting conditions of financial environment, social and social issues, technological advancement, and competitive circumstances. Retention in Student is integrating various point of views on education and introducing greater accountability on various institutions to eradicate orderly hurdles and problems for college conclusion. We must make every possible effort to generate a staying situation for our students in appropriate ways to foster student retention.

Study carried out reveals that Students' perception towards retention is almost same with respect to gender, age, area, family income, family size and course in which they study. In all demographical variables it was found that null hypothesis is accepted. The reason could be that now - a- days students are demanding and career conscious which is not affected by any demographical variable. Therefore, all null hypotheses were accepted.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- This study has taken place in short span of time and with few resources,
- The sample size was not big.
- This study was limited to professional institutes.
- The responses collected from respondents might be biased.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, J., Robbins, S.B., Casillas, A., and I. Oh. (2006). Third-Year College Retention and Transfer: Effects of Academic Performance, Motivation, and Social Connectedness. *Review of Higher Education*, 49: 647-664.
2. Astin, A.W. (1997.) *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
3. Bean, John P. (1990). "Why Students Leave: Insights From Research." In *the Strategic Management of College Enrollments*, Ed. Don Hossler and John P. Bean. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
4. Carr, P. (1992). *College Success and the Black Male* (Research Report No# 128). San Jose, Ca: San Jose/Evergreen Community College District..
5. Coll, K. M. & Von Seggern, D. J. (1991). *Community College Student Retention: Some Procedural and Programmatic Suggestions*. Paper Presented at the Wyoming Higher Education-Student Affairs Conference. Powell Wy.
6. Dixon Rayle, A., and K. Chung. (2008). Revisiting First-Year College Students' Mattering: Social Support, Academic Stress, and the Mattering Experience. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 9(1): 21-37.
7. Ellison, N. (1987). *Access Excellence and Student Retention: A Leadership Commitment*. (Opinion Paper No# 20). Cleveland, Oh: Cuyahugo Community College.
8. Kuh, G., and P. Love. (2004). *A Cultural Perspective on Student Departure*. In *Reworking The Student Departure Puzzle* Ed. J. M. Braxton. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
9. Nicpon, M., Huser, L., Blanks, E., Sollenberger, S., Befort, C., and S. Kurpius. (2007). The Relationship of Loneliness and Social Support with College Freshmen's Academic Performance and Persistence. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 8(3): 345-358.
10. Orsuwan, M., and D. Cole. (2007). The Moderating Effects of Race/Ethnicity on the Experience of Asian American and Pacific Islander Community College Students. *Asian American Policy Review*, 16: 61-85.

11. Parkin, A and N. Baldwin. (2009). Persistence in Post-Secondary Education.' In J. Berger, A. Motte and A. Parkins (Eds) The Price of Knowledge: Access and Student Finance in Canada, The Canadian Millenium Scholarship Foundation.
12. Slater, R. B. (1994). The Growing Gender Gap in Black Higher Education. *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 13, 52-59.
13. Tinto, Vincent. (1987). Leaving College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Webliography

- <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/ijced-10-2016-0019?fullsc=1&journalcode=ijced>
- <https://www.ccsse.org/center/resources/docs/research/harvey-smith.pdf>
- <http://cobek.com/pdf/student-retention-white-paper.pdf>
- http://www.ksbe.edu/_assets/spi/pdfs/retention_brief.pdf
- <http://www.ccsse.org/>
- <http://www.ksbe.edu/>
- <http://www.answers.com/>
- <http://www.pbr.co.in/>
- <https://www.scribd.com/>

Annexure

ANNEXURE 1: NORMALITY TEST
ONE-SAMPLE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST

| | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| | | VAR00001 |
| N | | 154 |
| Normal Parameters ^a | Mean | 98.5584 |
| | Std. Deviation | 15.64265 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Absolute | .143 |
| | Positive | .107 |
| | Negative | -.143 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | | 1.773 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | | .004 |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. | | |

ANNEXURE 2: RELIABILITY TEST
RELIABILITY STATISTICS

| | |
|------------------|--------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | No. of Items |
| .955 | 24 |

ANNEXURE 3: Gender
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|----------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| VAR0001 | Equal variances assumed | 13.120 | .000 | -2.469 | 152 | .015 | -6.13516 | 2.48534 | -11.04544 | -1.22489 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.379 | 104.470 | .019 | -6.13516 | 2.57884 | -11.24882 | -1.02150 |

ANNEXURE 4: AGE
ANOVA

| VAR00001 | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 156.420 | 2 | 78.210 | .317 | .729 |
| Within Groups | 37281.554 | 151 | 246.898 | | |
| Total | 37437.974 | 153 | | | |

ANNEXURE 4.1: AGE 1
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS

| VAR00001 Tukey HSD | (J) VAR00002 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| (I) VAR00002 | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| below 20 yrs | between 20 to 22 yrs | 1.52466 | 2.71701 | .841 | -4.9066 | 7.9560 |
| | above 22 yrs | 2.92628 | 4.20103 | .766 | -7.0178 | 12.8704 |
| between 20 to 22 yrs | below 20 yrs | -1.52466 | 2.71701 | .841 | -7.9560 | 4.9066 |
| | above 22 yrs | 1.40162 | 4.33362 | .944 | -8.8563 | 11.6595 |
| above 22 yrs | below 20 yrs | -2.92628 | 4.20103 | .766 | -12.8704 | 7.0178 |
| | between 20 to 22 yrs | -1.40162 | 4.33362 | .944 | -11.6595 | 8.8563 |

ANNEXURE 5: Area

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| VAR00001 | | | | | |
| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 1039.978 | 2 | 519.989 | 2.157 | .119 |
| Within Groups | 36397.996 | 151 | 241.046 | | |
| Total | 37437.974 | 153 | | | |

ANNEXURE 5.1: Area 1

| Multiple Comparisons | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| VAR00001 Tukey HSD | | | | | | |
| (I) VAR00002 | (J) VAR00002 | Mean Difference (I- J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| urban | semi urban | 6.98488 | 3.48952 | .115 | -1.2750 | 15.2448 |
| | rural | 3.43831 | 4.03885 | .672 | -6.1219 | 12.9985 |
| semi urban | urban | -6.98488 | 3.48952 | .115 | -15.2448 | 1.2750 |
| | rural | -3.54657 | 4.92167 | .752 | -15.1964 | 8.1033 |
| rural | urban | -3.43831 | 4.03885 | .672 | -12.9985 | 6.1219 |
| | semi urban | 3.54657 | 4.92167 | .752 | -8.1033 | 15.1964 |

ANNEXURE 6: Family Income

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| VAR00001 | | | | | |
| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 705.609 | 3 | 235.203 | .960 | .413 |
| Within Groups | 36732.365 | 150 | 244.882 | | |
| Total | 37437.974 | 153 | | | |

ANNEXURE 6.1: FAMILY INCOME 1
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS

| VAR00001 Tukey HSD | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------|----------------------------|----------------|
| (I) VAR00002 | (J) VAR00002 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| upto 2 lakh | above 2 lakh-5 lakh | 1.52653 | 3.08147 | .960 | -6.4793 | 9.5324 |
| | above 5 lakh- 10 lakh | 5.39796 | 4.47106 | .623 | -6.2181 | 17.0141 |
| | above 10 lakh | 7.89796 | 6.12225 | .571 | -8.0081 | 23.8040 |
| above 2 lakh- 5 lakh | upto 2 lakh | -1.52653 | 3.08147 | .960 | -9.5324 | 6.4793 |
| | above 5 lakh- 10 lakh | 3.87143 | 4.94856 | .862 | -8.9852 | 16.7281 |
| | above 10 lakh | 6.37143 | 6.47919 | .759 | -10.4619 | 23.2048 |
| above 5 lakh- 10 lakh | upto 2 lakh | -5.39796 | 4.47106 | .623 | -17.0141 | 6.2181 |
| | above 2 lakh-5 lakh | -3.87143 | 4.94856 | .862 | -16.7281 | 8.9852 |
| | above 10 lakh | 2.50000 | 7.24395 | .986 | -16.3202 | 21.3202 |
| above 10 lakh | upto 2 lakh | -7.89796 | 6.12225 | .571 | -23.8040 | 8.0081 |
| | above 2 lakh-5 lakh | -6.37143 | 6.47919 | .759 | -23.2048 | 10.4619 |
| | above 5 lakh- 10 lakh | -2.50000 | 7.24395 | .986 | -21.3202 | 16.3202 |

ANNEXURE 7: FAMILY SIZE
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| VAR00001 | Equal variances assumed | .146 | .703 | .281 | 152 | .779 | .73724 | 2.62830 | -4.45548 | 5.92997 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | .267 | 98.570 | .790 | .73724 | 2.76134 | -4.74215 | 6.21664 |

ANNEXURE 8: COURSE
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| VAR00001 | Equal variances assumed | .342 | .560 | -.349 | 152 | .728 | 1.19566 | 3.42812 | -7.96858 | 5.57726 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.385 | 37.556 | .703 | 1.19566 | 3.10861 | -7.49116 | 5.09984 |