

## **SATISFACTION LEVEL OF COMMUTERS TOWARDS BUS SERVICES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COLLEGE STUDENTS IN KUMBAKONAM**

**Dr. M. Ganesan**

Faculty, Department of Commerce and Management Studies, SRC, SASTRA Deemed University,  
Kumbakonam

### **Introduction**

The 'Gurukula' was India's original educational system that dates back to 5000 BC. In this educational system, a pupil (shishya) seeking admission would approach an instructor (Guru). Important disciplines like Physics and Maths are taught by the Guru. However, they also give equal importance to topics like metaphysics and philosophy. The language of exchange was Sanskrit. Instead of only reading books and memorization, the education was practical and connected to nature and real-life circumstances. The pupils' human values development was truly the main focus. So that the students could practically apply their knowledge to find solutions to real-world problems. Principles like empathy, self-reliance, creativity, appropriate behavior, and ethical behaviors were fostered.

### **National Education Policy (NEP)**

The Government of India developed the NEP for 2020 in order to enhance the country's current educational system. It has brought in a number of noteworthy improvements in school and college levels. Its effects on education in India are as follows.

- By 2030, it seeks to achieve a gross enrolment ratio of 100% in educational institutions.
- The Higher Education Commission of India, a new governing body for higher education, will be constituted. It will seek to enhance and modernise India's educational system.
- The new education policy also intends to make all institutions of higher learning interdisciplinary by 2040. Students can therefore enrol in any subject that suits their interests and abilities.
- There are several ways for undergraduate students to leave the programme. After one year of study, students will receive a degree from a college. This, however, only applies to diploma programmes; degree programmes are not included.
- Rather than 6, the minimum age to enter school is now 3. This will help students finish their education earlier.

With universities like Nalanda, which has the world's oldest university system of education, India is one of the historically wealthy nations in terms of the dissemination of information and education. Since then, India's educational system has seen significant changes. The Indian educational system has undergone a significant development in the transition from Gurukuls to contemporary schools to online institutions.

Under the terms of the India's Right to Education Act (2009), amended in 2010, every child between 3 to 18 years must be provided free and compulsory education, which was previously 6-14 prior to the modification of 2009.

### **The following data pertain to India's educational system as of 2020**

- The primary education sector serves the 0–14 age range, which includes 26% of India's population, or around 1.39 billion people.
- Of the 500 million people that make up India's population, 18% are between the ages of 15 and 24 and attend secondary and higher education.
- In India, the adult literacy rate (15+ years) is 69.3%, with adult males having a literacy rate of 78.8% and adult females having a literacy rate of 59.3%.
- Kerala is the state with the highest literacy rate in India, and University of Delhi and IIT Bombay are the most preferred higher education institutions there.
- India is placed 34th out of 100 countries in the 2019 English Proficiency Index.

### **Schools and Colleges in India**

- There will be more than 1.5 million schools and colleges in India by the year 2022.
- India is home to around 45,000 degree-granting institutions, over 1000 universities, and roughly 1500 prestigious institutions.

### **Public transportation in Tamil Nadu**

About one-fourth of the state's workforce uses the state's public transportation system for transportation. Almost the entire length and breadth of the state is serviced by the reliable public transport.

### **Government Bus**

Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Ltd. (TNSTC) is an Indian state that is home to a Government-owned bus company. It provides intercity bus services from Tamil Nadu to its adjacent states as well as to places within Tamil Nadu. In addition, it runs town buses from major Tamil Nadu cities and towns to its neighborhoods, with the exception of Chennai, where MTC, a TNSTC subsidiary,

runs the public bus service. It is both the biggest corporation in the world and the largest government bus transportation company in India.

The Tamil Nadu Government wholly owns and runs TNSTC. TNSTC has begun offering online booking options for bus tickets between the major TNSTC-served cities. It provides services to all of Tamil Nadu's districts as well as the union territory of Pondicherry and the neighboring states of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, and Kerala. The transport corporation had 21 divisions up to 1997, which were afterwards consolidated to create eight divisions. TNSTC owns 321 depots, 5 workshops, and a total of 21,678 buses in its fleet. Additionally, TNSTC provides contract and tourist services. Thiruvalluvar's image and a two-line phrase from Thirukkural are both displayed inside each of the company's buses.

The Union Territory of Pondicherry and the neighboring states of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, and SEC operate long-distance express services that connect all significant cities, tourist hotspots, religious sites, and commercial centers. The SETC provides buses in a variety of service classifications, including semi-deluxe, ultra-deluxe, and air-conditioned, and it accepts reservations in advance. Along with the SETC, private operators also operate a number of buses around the state.

### **Private Bus**

The transportation industry is divided into several distinct sorts of sectors, one of which is the private bus industry. Private bus companies operate buses daily along predetermined routes for corporate passengers as well as throughout cities, states, and across international borders.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Education is a major element in people moving from rural to urban areas because parents believe that a solid education will pave way for greater work prospects and increase the value of their students. When deciding where to live and how much to spend for housing, college students and prospective college students should take transport into account because it's not only a crucial service that will be required, but it may also make a difference when thinking about their college experience.

The effects of student transportation on academic performance might be either favorable or unfavorable. A student's capacity to arrive at college on time, the frequency of their absences, and their availability to take part in before- or after-school activities are all impacted by the logistics of their commutation to and from school. Students' **change**(destinations) for college and their stay are influenced by a variety of factors, including the weather, traffic, unreliable public transportation schedules, out-of-pocket expenses, and changes in where they live.

Students who opt to attend institutions in some cities can take advantage of its economical, dependable, and clean public transportation. However, there may not even be any public transport facilities in many places. As a result, Students find it challenging to travel to colleges.

### **For students, transportation presents obstacles in four different ways**

- Because of the price.
- Because the stops or stations are too far from their place of employment or residence.
- Because college timetables in terms of routes or hours.
- Because it's unreliable.

So that there are fewer buses available for college students.

### **Objectives**

1. To understand the reasons for preferences towards bus transport by the college students.
2. To measure the satisfaction level of the respondents regarding the bus services.
3. To study the problems of the college students while using public transport.
4. To justify suitable suggestions based on the research studies.

### **Research Methodology**

The following is the methodology acquired by the researcher for this study.

### **Population of the study**

The total number of college students (Those who are using the public transport to reach the College) in Kumbakonam.

### **Sample design**

Stratified Random Sampling is a method of sampling that involves the division of a population into smaller subgroups known as strata. In stratified random sampling, or stratification, the strata are formed based on members' shared attributes or characteristics, such as income or educational attainment.

### **Sample size**

Sample size means the numbers of samples are selected from the total population for the investigation. Here 150 students were taken as samples.

### **Statistical techniques**

- ❖ Simple percentages
- ❖ Tables
- ❖ Five Point Likert Scale
- ❖ Chi-Square Test.

## ❖ ANOVA

**Sources of data**

The main sources of data both primary and secondary for this study is collected by the researcher.

**Primary data**

The primary data is directly collected from the respondents through questionnaire.

**Secondary data**

The secondary data is collected from the various books, journals, and websites.

**Hypothesis**

- There is no relationship between satisfaction level and number of kilo meters.
- There is no relationship between satisfaction level and ownership of buses.

**Limitations**

Every study has certain limitations; some of these are inherent in the research design, while some others become part of the study during various stages of research process. The present study is subject to the following limitation. The outcome of the study based for the college students using public transport (only bus) to reach their respective institution from the residence.

**Review of Literature**

According to two research (**Abou-Zeid&Fujii, 2016; Mugionetal., 2018**), the degree of passenger satisfaction with PT is indirectly related to how well they perceive the quality of the transit service. In addition, the majority of these research concluded that the distribution and quality of bus stops, cost, and on-board crowding and seats were the most important determinants of satisfaction from LOS, followed by the quality of route time and ease of travel.

**YudaBalti (2020)**, conducted a research to assess how passengers perceived the value of the PT service. Combining personal norm, customer satisfaction, and planner behaviour theories, they looked at passengers' readiness to suggest PT as a gauge of their opinion of the service. According to their findings, passenger biases and behavioural traits had an impact on how passengers perceived PT.

**The 2020 film Mr. A. David & Mr. Elvis**, This study looks on customer satisfaction with SETC in relation to Coimbatore city in order to pinpoint any issues users may have when using SETC there.

**Dr. R. Chinnaraj (2021)**, this is the Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation's performance study of customer satisfaction.

Mohammad Nizamuddin Abdul Rahim and Zuraini Abdul Aziz Vol. 12 No 3 (2021), the factors influencing traveler preference for public transport between Kelantan and the northern area are evaluated in this study.

### Analysis and Interpretation

Table No.1

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Profile	S. No.	Attributes	Responders	Percent
Gender	1	Male	40	33.3
	2	Female	80	66.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Age	1	17 – 19 Years	8	6.7
	2	20 – 21 years	39	32.5
	3	22 – 25 years	71	59.2
	4	Above 25 years	2	1.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Educational Qualification				
	1	Engineering	29	24.2
	2	Arts and science	70	58.3
	3	Diploma	9	7.5
	4	ITI	5	4.2
	5	Others	7	5.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Residential Place	1	Rural	69	57.5
	2	Semi-urban	21	17.5
	3	Urban	25	20.8
	4	Metro city	5	4.2
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Alternative Sources of Transportation				
	1	Yes	88	73.3
	2	No	32	26.7

		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Users of Alternative Sources</b>	1	NA	26	21.7
	2	Two wheeler	50	41.7
	3	Bi-cycle	11	9.2
	4	Walk	6	5.0
	5	College bus	13	10.8
	6	Other mode	14	11.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
	<b>Reasons for Prefer Bus by Informants</b>	1	Cost	37
2		Comfort / Safety	13	10.0
3		Timing	25	20.8
4		Friends	32	26.7
5		Others	13	10.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Distance</b>		1	Less than 5 km	23
	2	10 km	20	16.7
	3	15 km	21	17.5
	4	More than 20 km	56	46.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total Travel Time</b>	1	Less than half-an-hour	29	24.2
	2	Half-an-hour to one hour	58	48.3
	3	One to two hours	30	25.0
	4	More than two hours	3	02.5
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Daily Bus Fare</b>	1	Less than Rs.20	47	39.2
	2	Rs.20 - 40	47	39.2

	3	Rs.40 - 60	18	15.0
	4	More than Rs.60	8	6.7
		<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Source : Primary Data**

Above table shows that the gender of the informants. 33.3% of the informants are male.59.2% of the informants are 22 – 25 years of age, and 1.7% of the informants are above 25 years of age. 24.2% of the informants are engineering, 58.3% of the informants are arts and science, 7.5% of the informants are diploma, 4.2% of the informants are ITI. 58.3% of informants are in the place of rural. 73.3% of the informants have alternative sources of transportation to reach the institution.41.7% of informants have an option of two wheeler. 33.3% of informants prefer bus because of cost. 17.5% of the informants come from the distance of 15 km.48.3% of the informants selected that it takes half-an-hour to one hour to reach the institution.Majority of the informants selected less than Rs.20 and Rs.20 - 40.

**Table No.2**

**Overall Satisfaction of Bus Transport**

S.NO	Satisfaction	Responders	Percent
1	Highly satisfied	6	5.0
2	Satisfied	26	21.7
3	Neutral	46	38.3
4	Dissatisfied	35	29.2
5	Highly dissatisfied	7	5.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Source: Primary data**

Above table shows that an overall satisfaction of bus services by the informants. 3.3% of the informants chose highly satisfied with the bus services, 30.0% of the informants chose satisfied with the bus services, 40.0% of the informants chose neutral, 22.5% of the informants chose dissatisfied with the bus services, 4.2% of the informants chose highly dissatisfied bus services. Majority of the informants chose neutral.

**Table No. 3**

**Relationship with Distance and Overall Satisfaction**

**H0:** There is no significant association between distance and overall satisfaction level of bus transport of the informants.



How far you are from	Overall Satisfaction of Bus Transport					Total
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Less than 5 km	1	2	9	9	2	23
10 km	2	5	6	6	1	20
15 km	2	6	6	6	1	21
More than 20 km	1	13	25	14	3	56
<b>Total</b>	6	26	46	35	7	120

Source: Primary data

**CHI-SQUARE TESTS**

	Value	Df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	8.452	12	.749
<b>Likelihood ratio</b>	8.861	12	.715
<b>Linear-by-linear association</b>	.781	1	.377
<b>N of valid cases</b>	120		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

Above table shows that the p value (.749) is greater than the 0.05. There is no significance association between distance and overall satisfaction level of bus transport. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 4**

**Relationship between Gender and Preference of Bus**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between gender and preference of bus.

GENDER	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	t-VALUE	SIGNIFICANT
--------	---	------	--------------------	---------	-------------

<b>Male</b>	40	2.8500	1.38767	.501	.618
<b>Female</b>	80	2.7125	1.43371		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The t-test value indicated that it is not significant difference between Gender and preference of bus ( $p > 0.05$ ). The mean score reveal that the female commuters (2.7125) had low level of preference of bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 5**

**Relationship between Educational Qualification and Preference of Bus**

**H0:** There is no significant association between educational qualifications of the informants and preference of bus.

Educational qualifications	Have alternative why prefer bus					Total
	Cost	Comfort / Safety	Timing	Friends	Others	
<b>Engineering</b>	3	3	10	12	1	29
<b>Arts and science</b>	28	7	11	15	9	70
<b>Diploma</b>	3	1	2	2	1	9
<b>ITI</b>	1	1	1	1	1	5
<b>Others</b>	2	1	1	2	1	7
<b>Total</b>	37	13	25	32	13	120

Source: Primary data

**CHI – SQUARE TESTS**

	Value	Df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
<b>Pearson chi-square</b>	15.645	16	.478
<b>Likelihood ratio</b>	16.628	16	.410
<b>Linear-by-linear association</b>	.290	1	.590

<b>N of valid cases</b>	120
-------------------------	-----

Source: Primary data

**Result**

Above table 5 shows that the p value (.478) is greater than the 0.05. There is no significant association between educational qualifications of the informants and preference of bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 6**

**Relationship between Residential Area and Preference of Bus**

**H0:** There is no significant association between residential area of the informants and overall satisfaction level of bus transport.

Residential area	Overall satisfaction level of bus transport					Total
	Highly dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	
Rural	2	19	27	17	4	69
Semi-urban	1	3	9	7	1	21
Urban	2	3	9	10	1	25
Metro city	1	1	1	1	1	5
<b>Total</b>	6	26	46	35	7	120

Source: Primary data

**CHI – SQUARE TESTS**

	Value	Df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
<b>Pearson chi – square</b>	10.285	12	.591
<b>Likelihood ratio</b>	8.915	12	.710
<b>Linear-by-linear association</b>	.381	1	.537
<b>N of valid cases</b>	120		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

Above table shows that the p value (.591) is greater than the 0.05. There is no significance association between educational qualifications of the informants and overall satisfaction level of bus transport. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No.7**

**Relationship between Age and Opinion about the Bus**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between age of the informants and opinion about the bus.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significance
17 – 19 years	8	47.0000	7.07107	1.425	.239
20 – 21 years	39	46.4359	9.92019		
22 – 25 years	71	48.7746	8.75083		
Above 25 years	2	37.5000	14.84924		

**Source:** Primary data

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is more than 0.05 (F=1.425, p>0.05). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the age group of 22 – 25 years (48.7746) had high level of opinion about the bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 8**

**Relationship between Age and Opinion about the Bus Stand**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between age of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significance
17 – 19 years	8	43.2500	9.60283	.459	.711
20 – 21 years	39	40.5385	13.61858		
22 – 25 years	71	42.6620	12.50936		

<b>Above 25 years</b>	2	49.0000	12.72792		
-----------------------	---	---------	----------	--	--

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is more than 0.05 (F=.459, P>0.05). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the age group of above 25 years (49.0000) had high level of opinion about the bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Table No. 9**

**Relationship between Age and Opinion about the Impact of Bus Travel over Student Learning.**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between age of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significance
17 – 19 years	8	47.7500	5.52268	3.658	.015
20 – 21 years	39	42.1026	11.44275		
22 – 25 years	71	48.0704	8.38762		
Above 25 years	2	50.5000	4.94975		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is less than 0.05 (F=3.658, p<0.05). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the age group of above 25 years (50.5000) had high level of opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No. 10**

**Relationship between Gender and Opinion about the Bus**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between gender and opinion about the bus.

GENDER	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t-VALUE	SIGNIFICANT
Male	40	49.9250	7.56980	1.891	.061
Female	80	46.6000	9.74173		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The t-test value indicated that it is not significant difference between gender and opinion about the bus ( $p>0.05$ ). The mean score reveal that the female commuters (46.6000) had low level of opinion about the bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 11**

**Relationship between Gender and Opinion about the Bus Stand**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between gender and opinion about the bus stand.

GENDER	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t-VALUE	SIGNIFICANT
Male	40	38.3500	14.02845	-2.351	.020
Female	80	44.0000	11.53201		

**Source: Primary data**

**Result**

The t-test value indicated that it is significant difference between gender and opinion about the bus stand ( $p<0.05$ ). The mean score reveal that the male commuters (38.3500) had low level of opinion about the bus stand. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No. 12**

**Relationship between Gender and Opinion about the Impact of Bus Travel over Student Learning.**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between gender and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.

GENDER	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t-VALUE	SIGNIFICANT
Male	40	51.2750	6.72152	4.419	.000
Female	80	43.5875	9.91061		

**Source: Primary data**

**Result**

The t-test value indicated that it is significant difference between gender and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning ( $p<0.05$ ). The mean score reveal that the female commuters (43.5875) had low level of opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No. 13**

**Relationship between Educational Qualification and Opinion about the Bus**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about the bus.

Age	Number of respondents	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significance
Engineering	29	50.6897	8.17707	3.762	.007
Arts and science	70	45.3286	9.44967		
Diploma	9	54.8889	5.25463		
ITI	5	50.6000	6.58027		
Others	7	47.8571	8.55236		

Source: Primary data

**RESULT:**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is less than 0.05 (F=3.762, p<0.05). However, the mean score shows that the commuters having diploma (54.8889) had high level of opinion about the bus. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No. 14**

**Relationship between Educational Qualification and Opinion about the Bus Stand**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significance
Engineering	29	41.8276	14.59224	.423	.792
Arts and science	70	42.5571	11.65524		
Diploma	9	41.3333	15.10794		
ITI	5	35.6000	17.51571		
Others	7	44.5714	7.82852		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is more than 0.05 (F=.423, p>0.05). However, the mean score shows that the commuters having other educational qualifications (44.5714) had high level of opinion about the bus stand. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 15**
**Relationship between Educational Qualification and Opinion about the Impact of Bus Travel over Student Learning.**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significant
Engineering	29	50.4828	7.40473	3.543	.009
Arts and science	70	43.6714	10.31352		
Diploma	9	48.1111	6.93622		
ITI	5	52.6000	9.07193		
Others	7	45.8571	6.96248		

Source: Primary data

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is less than 0.05 ( $F=3.543$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). However, the mean score shows that the commuters having ITI (52.6000) had high level of opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No. 16**
**Relationship between Residential Area and Opinion about the Bus**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between residential area of the informants and opinion about the bus.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significant
Rural	69	48.4203	9.54464	2.225	.089
Semi-urban	21	50.3333	8.71971		
Urban	25	44.0800	8.42081		
Metro city	5	45.0000	4.00000		

Source: Primary data

**Result**



The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is more than 0.05 ( $F=2.225$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the area of semi-urban (50.3333) having high level of opinion about the bus. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 17**

**Relationship between Residential Area and Opinion about the Bus Stand**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between residential area of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significant
Rural	69	42.5507	13.67214	.328	.805
Semi-urban	21	42.5238	12.66341		
Urban	25	40.0400	10.94105		
Metro city	5	44.8000	4.49444		

**Source: Primary data**

**Result**

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is more than 0.05 ( $F=.328$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the area of metro city (44.8000) having high level of opinion about the bus stand. Hence null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table No. 18**

**Relationship between Residential Area and Opinion about the Impact of Bus Travel over Student Learning.**

**H0:** There is no significance difference between residential area of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.

Age	Number of responders	Mean	Standard deviation	ANOVA F Value	Significant
Rural	69	47.7246	10.03506	3.417	.020
Semi-urban	21	47.5238	9.26617		
Urban	25	42.2000	8.15986		
Metro city	5	38.4000	2.88097		

**Source: Primary data**

## Result

The ANOVA results indicated that significant value is less than 0.05 ( $F=3.417$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). However, the mean score shows that the commuters in the area of rural (47.7246) having high level of opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning. Hence null hypothesis is rejected.

## Findings, Suggestions and Conclusion

### Findings

- 66.7% of are female.
- 59.2% of are 22 – 25 years of age.
- The majority of students are Arts and Science students.
- The majority of the informants are from rural areas.
- The majority(73.3%) of the informants have alternative sources of transportation.
- The majority (41.7%) of the informants are two wheeler as an option in the sense of alternative sources.
- The majority (30.8%) of the informants prefer bus as a mode of their transport for cost reasons.
- The majority (46.7%) of the informants come from the distance of more than 20 km to their institution.
- The majority (48.3%) of the informants travel half-an-hour to one hour to reach the institution.
- The majority (39.2%) of the informants pay less than Rs.20 and Rs.20 – 40 for daily bus fare to reach the institution.
- The majority (88.3%) of the informants don't possess a bus pass.
- The majority (88.3%) of the informants is not applicable, but minority (4.2%) of the informants possesses a bus pass with the mode of free and with concession.
- The majority (64.2%) of the informants chose no for all government bus allow bus pass.
- The majority (60.0%) of the informants travelling by both the government bus and the private bus.
- The majority (38.3%) of the informants chose neutral for overall satisfaction of bus transport.
- The p value (7.49) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between distance and overall satisfaction level of bus transport.
- The p value (.618) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between gender of the informants and preference of bus.



- The p value (.478) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between educational qualifications of the informants and preference of bus.
- The p value (.591) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between residential area of the informants and overall satisfaction of bus transport.
- The p value (.239) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between age of the informants and opinion about the bus.
- The p value (.711) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between age of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.
- The p value (.015) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between age of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.
- The p value (.061) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between gender of the informants and opinion about the bus.
- The p value (.020) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between gender of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.
- The p value (.000) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between gender of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.
- The p value (.007) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about the bus.
- The p value (.792) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.
- The p value (.009) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between educational qualifications of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.
- The p value (.089) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between residential area of the informants and opinion about the bus.
- The p value (.805) is greater than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is no significant relation between residential area of the informants and opinion about the bus stand.
- The p value (.020) is lesser than the 0.05 limit that shows that there is significant relation between residential area of the informants and opinion about impact of bus travel over student learning.

### Suggestions

It can be difficult to deal with fluctuations in demand, especially when we take into account that the main reasons people travel are for work and study. It is well known that trips tend to be concentrated during peak hours, i.e. the typical two-hour morning peak period runs from 7:30am until 9:30am. The typical duration of the evening peak hour window is two hours, from 5:30 to 7:30, which are often early in the morning and late in the afternoon, with variations depending on local factors and resident characteristics. During peak travel times, there is a large concentration of demand for transport, which causes congestion and overstretched infrastructure. Additionally, even though a big percentage of passengers only travel during a limited window of time, public transport systems ought to be able to function continuously, giving everyone access to travel options.

When creating a schedule for high-frequency bus routes, it's important to strike a balance between the costs incurred by the transit agency and the students in terms of waiting and in-vehicle time. A significant portion of their total transit time is spent waiting for the bus, sometimes in the rain. Bus passengers want to know that their bus will be there shortly, ideally in less than 15 minutes. Short travel distances and quick, dependable wait times are appealing to students. Transit planners must adhere to a precise scheduling procedure, or a set of actions the scheduler takes to construct a schedule, in order to analyze the trade-off between travel speed and reliability.

Students have always been concerned about their comfort and safety. Comfort levels vary greatly during peak hours, mostly due to crowd congestion. Transit organizations should also concentrate on enhancing the quality of the ride itself because a quieter, smoother bus ride can attract passengers and lessen stress.

### **Conclusion**

In today's society, where public transport draws people because of its advantages and benefits, road transport plays a crucial role. The accessibility of buses to different locations and the timely scheduling of buses improved commuter satisfaction. The ability to travel comfortably while taking the bus, arrive at the destination on time, and use the bus as a cost-effective mode of transportation have a significant impact on passengers. Students travelling to and from schools and colleges make up the majority of those using public transportation. The majority of students do not own alternative modes of transportation, making bus service one of the most important modes of mobility they require. People are increasingly choosing to travel by public transport in both urban and rural areas of the world due to rising fuel expenses and air pollution. Public transport could benefit from making services more accessible. In order to increase consumer happiness, the functional aspect needs to be given more

consideration. Frequency, cost, punctuality, and trip time are the primary characteristics that influence a higher level of satisfaction.

According to a survey, public transport is still crucial to the community that depends on it since it is thought to be always safe, secure, and full of information, as well as being reasonably priced for users with average incomes. The study came to the further conclusion that maintaining customer satisfaction sometimes poses a difficulty and that it is necessary to address issues with appropriate pricing setting, safety and security, good and pleasant modes of transportation, and information availability.

### References:

1. Bai, X., & Liu, Y. (2014). An empirical study on commuter satisfaction with public bus services. *Journal of Public Transportation*, 17(2), 123-141. <https://doi.org/10.5038/2375-0901.17.2.7>
2. Jia, R. (2015). Analyzing factors influencing college students' satisfaction with public transport: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Urban Mobility*, 12(3), 45-59. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01019/full>
3. Kamaruddin, R. (2017). Students' satisfaction towards bus service performance at Universiti Utara Malaysia. *International Journal of Transportation Management*, 10(4), 78-87. <https://www.academia.edu/82018947>
4. Dharmaraj, R. (2017). Passenger satisfaction towards government and private sector bus services with special reference to Thiruvannamalai District. *Shanlax International Journal of Commerce*, 5(2), 56-68. Retrieved from <https://www.shanlaxjournals.in/journals/index.php/commerce/article/view/76>
5. Shan, W., & He, Z. (2011). A study on the satisfaction level of TNSTC bus passengers with special reference to Kumbakonam. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 9(3), 89-101. Retrieved from <https://iaraindia.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/13-SATISFACTION-LEVEL-OF-TNSTC-BUS-PASSENGERS.pdf>