RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BMCC STUDENTS' CLASS GRADES AND THEIR INTENTION

Narendra C. Bhandari, Pace University, New York, USA
Varsha Deshpande, BMC College, Pune, India

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to study if there is a relationship between BMC College students' class/grades and their intention: (1) To become an entrepreneur, (b) To become a social entrepreneur, or (c) to work for someone else, after they have completed their education. Using certain tests, this study rejected the null hypothesis that there is no relationship, when all students are considered, between their overall class/grades and their intention for A, B, or C. However, when classified by gender and sub-class levels, the study provided different conclusions.

Keywords: BMCC Students, social entrepreneurship, class, grades, intention

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this article is to examine the relationship between only one independent variable, namely, the 'class attained' by the students (such as, distinction, first class, second class, or pass class), and the dependent variable, their 'intention'. The Indian term 'class' is equivalent to the American term 'grades.' These words would be used interchangeably in this article. The overall purpose of this research is therefore to study what the students of Brihan Maharashtra College of Commerce (BMCC), Pune, India, intend to do upon completion of their college education, which may be identified as follows.

1. Option (a): Start a business (without any particular emphasis on it being a socially oriented business). Alternatively, to become an entrepreneur.
2. Option (b): Start a business with (with a particular emphasis on it being a socially oriented business). Alternatively, to become a social entrepreneur.
3. Option (c): Work for someone else.

This is a novel study due to the following reasons:

A. It analyzes the relationship between college students' class/grades and their intentions for entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, or for working for someone else.
B. It analyzes three dependent relationships, rather than the conventional one or two.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several factors influence what students' may intend to do after they have completed their education. Some of these factors include (a) Gender, culture, and country. (b) Family and friends. (C) Age and experience. (D) Personality. (E) Education.

Dozens of research articles have been written on each one of these reasons and their relationship with the students' intention.

Since the focal point of this article is to study the relationship between students' class (grades), an educational variable, and their intention, the survey of literature for this article is limited to those studies that are related to the various educational variables that influence what students intend to do after they have completed their education. These studies, categorized by some broad similarities, are presented below.

Schumpeter (1934) defined entrepreneurship as the process of doing something that ordinarily would not have been done during business routine. Rumelt (1987) defined entrepreneurship as the creation of new businesses (Otache, 2019).

Thompson (2009) stated entrepreneurial intentions as "self-acknowledged conviction by a person that they intend to set up a new business venture and consciously plan to do so at some point in the future" (Israr & Saleem, 2018).

Entrepreneurial intention is defined as the "intention of setting up one's business in the future" and it involves a process of prior planning and thinking (Van Gelderen et al., 2008; Schlaegel & Koenig 2014; Al Saiqal, Ryan, & Parcero, 2019).

Entrepreneurship education consists of "any pedagogical [program] or process of education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills" (Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006b, p. 702; Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014).

Entrepreneurship education refers to the scope of curricular lectures or courses that primarily aim at sensitizing and qualifying students for an entrepreneurial career. (Walter, et al., 2011). EE means teaching people entrepreneurship (Otache, 2019).

Education and Entrepreneurial Intention

Several studies document how educational activity increases students' entrepreneurial intentions (Hmieleski & Corbett, 2006; Raposo et al., 2008; Ferri, et al. 2019)

Many studies show that skills and knowledge obtained from past educational experiences support individuals to develop a positive attitude towards venture creation (Miller et al., 20091; Morris et al., 2013; do Paço et al., 2011; Ferri, et al., 2019).

Moreover, based on the survey conducted on 50 entrepreneurs from diverse backgrounds in selected universities across the UAE, Kargwell, and Inguva (2012) found many entrepreneurs believe that education is a critical success factor in their business. (Saiqal, Ryan, & Parcero, 2019).

Several scholars have pointed out the significance of EE in EI. Some of these studies are presented below in a chronological order.

Dyer (1994), and Klapper and Jarniou (2006) assess how entrepreneurship education can provide access to role models who can make entrepreneurship seem more attractive. In this light, entrepreneurship education can be seen as a kind of 'socialization' effort, in that it attempts to make entrepreneurship attractive as a career path.

The primary objective of entrepreneurship education is to develop all essential entrepreneurial skills to meet entrepreneurial success (Lazear, 2004; Audretsch et al., 2016).

Klapper and Janiou (2006) conclude that, while enforced learning through entrepreneurial courses and seminars may initially be off-putting, such initiatives may have longer-term beneficial impacts on entrepreneurial intention.

It has been argued that students who take entrepreneurship courses are likely to think and behave entrepreneurially than those who do not (Fayolle et al., 2006; Otache, 2019).

According to Wilson and Marlino (2007), in terms of policy, their research findings suggest that providing access to entrepreneurship education is especially important in fueling the pipeline of aspiring women entrepreneurs, because of the strong role education plays in raising their levels of self-efficacy, and ultimately their interest in starting their own venture.

Entrepreneurship education can produce a range of desired out-comes, from increased entrepreneurial intentions to students becoming self-employed to students starting growth-oriented businesses (Dickson et al., 2008; Hamidi et al., 2008; Wilson et al., 2007; Ferri et al., 2019).

EE helps in shaping undergraduate students' entrepreneurial intentions and preparing them to establish their own business (Gerba, 2012b; Nabi & Holden, 2008; Petridou et al., 2009).

Several authors claim the importance of skills acquired during entrepreneurial educational courses or university programmes to shape the intention to become an entrepreneur (Miller et al., 2009).

Lorz (2011; Chengalvala & Rentala, 2017) believes that entrepreneurship education is of crucial importance for facilitating entrepreneurship.

Of all the factors that affect entrepreneurial intentions, EE ranks among the first. EE is the process of teaching the students entrepreneurial competencies and skills that are required to recognise viable business opportunities and translate them into successful business ventures (Iacobucci & Micozzi, 2012; Otache, 2019).

Entrepreneurial education has been the centre of attention and interest among researchers worldwide (Buli & Yesuf, 2015; Nader & Hamdy, 2019.)

The entrepreneurial education has showed higher perceived entrepreneurial motivation among students taking such education, than the students without enterprise courses (Solesvik, 2013; Israr & Saleem, 2018).

Nader and Hamdy (2019) reported that entrepreneurship education should enhance students' intuitive and analytical styles emphasizing the importance of thinking style versatility in order to increase their entrepreneurial intentions.

Research conducted on youth attitudes show that many students (male and female alike) believe that careers in both areas, entrepreneurship and engineering, can benefit from college education that offers diverse courses covering business expertise and technical skills (Dzombak, Rachel, et al., 2016).

Traditional entrepreneurial knowledge learning can no longer meet the dynamic environment's demand for entrepreneurial ability. Entrepreneurship education builds a multi-level social network and comprehensive learning management for the professional ability of entrepreneurs (Wei, Liu, & Sha, 2019).

Entrepreneurial Education and Entrepreneurial Intention: Correlation

Similarly, several researchers have concluded that there is a relationship between EE in EI. Some of such findings are presented below in a chronological order.

A study of college students in China revealed that entrepreneurial education has a significant and positive effect on their entrepreneurial intention but does not have a significant effect on entrepreneurial attitude.

According to a study by Klapper and Jarniou (2006), the entrepreneurship graduates were more entrepreneurial and had stronger entrepreneurial intentions, than the business graduates of other disciplines, in terms of both actual behavior and behavioral intention.

Studies by Basu and Virick (2008) and Davey et al., (2011) show a strong relationship between entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial intentions.

A number of meta-analytical studies concluded that entrepreneurship education has a positive impact on students (Bae et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2013; Nader & Hamdy, 2019).

Likewise, Solesvik (2013) found that the students who participated in entrepreneurial education had higher perceived entrepreneurial motivation than the students who did not study entrepreneurial courses.

In their meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes, Martin, McNally, and Kay (2013) confirmed that entrepreneurship education is associated with higher levels of intention to become an entrepreneur.

Bae et al. (2014) found a significant but a small correlation between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions. This correlation is also greater than that of business education and entrepreneurial intentions.

However, after controlling for pre-education entrepreneurial intentions, the authors noted that the relationship between entrepreneurship education and post-education entrepreneurial intentions was not significant (Bae et al., 2014).

In a study of engineering and non-engineering students, Law and Breznick (2017) concluded that the former has significantly higher levels of 'attitude', 'learning motivation', 'self-efficacy' and 'entrepreneurship intention', when compared to the latter. They further concluded that senior students have significantly higher innovativeness and entrepreneurship intention, when compared to the other students.

Entrepreneurial Education and Entrepreneurial Intention: Lack of Correlation

As presented below, a small number of studies did not support the widely recognized observation that EE helps EI.

Albeit, Oosterbeek et al., (2010) and Ferri, et al., (2019) found that the impact of entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial skills is insignificant or negative.

Walter et al. (2011) found no significant relationship between entrepreneurship support programs and self-employment intentions. Their research suggests that such offers have no direct, motivational effect on students.

Similarly, when measuring the effect of education, the results of this research did not support the hypothesis that education influences entrepreneurial intention, attitude, and perceived behavioral control (Al Saiqal, Ryan, & Parcero, 2019).

Role of Educational Institutions

According to Souitaris, Zer-binati, and Al-Laham (2007), universities are increasingly seen as critical institutions providing society with important learning and inspirational resources that can foster entrepreneurship. A sample of studies related to the significance of educational institutions in this area is presented below.

Mueller and Neck (2010) suggest that traditional entrepreneurship courses offer the foundational skill set for all entrepreneurial ventures regardless of type (Chengalvala & Rentala, 2017).

Nian et al. (2010), cited in Chengalvala and Rentala, (2017) argue that an entrepreneurship education should not only provide theoretical knowledge but also be able to assist the students on establishing an entrepreneurship mind set through developing entrepreneurial skills, behaviours and attitudes.

Salamzadeh et al., (2013) and Chengalvala and Rentala (2017) found that many university students are aware of the concept of entrepreneurship. However, the understanding about entrepreneurship was found to be higher among students who have taken entrepreneurship as a course (Chengalvala & Rentala, 2017).

The universities should provide at an early stage, entrepreneurship education to students in order to increase their awareness about entrepreneurship (Chengalvala & Rentala, 2017).

Israr and Saleem (2018) recommend that universities should expand the number of entrepreneurship courses/ trainings by all its faculties/departments.

This study suggest that universities and other relevant educational institutions should pay more attention to the combination of self-learning and external training in entrepreneurship, as well as the perception of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, to enrich the connotation of entrepreneurship education and improve its effectiveness (Liu, Lin, Zhao, & Zhao, 2019)

With so widely recognized role of universities in promoting entrepreneurship, it is not surprising to see that there are federally funded initiatives such as the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program and laws such as the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 that encouraging universities to invest in infrastructure supportive of entrepreneurship (Walter, et al., 2011).

Role of Class/Grades

An extensive survey of literature that spawned over several years and numerous publications did not find any research that primarily studied relationship between students' grades and their intention for entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, or working for someone else, except one somewhat similar study.

Israr and Saleem (2018) did this unique research. They made a study of what variables can motivate or hinder entrepreneurial intention among university students in Italy. Two of the 18 independent variables selected for their research were (1) students' high school education and (2) their high school grades.

Using multiple regression model, Israr and Saleem (2018) found that students with high school diploma grade ranging from 60 to 70 showed a stronger intention towards entrepreneurship, than those receiving grades from 91 to 100. Thus, a negative relationship was found between the university students' high school diploma grade and their entrepreneurial intention (Israr & Saleem, 2018).

Let us now present our one-of-a-kind research and its findings—that deals with the relationship between some college level students' college level grades and their intention.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Profile Of BMCC Students: Gender, Grade, and Intention

Table 1 presents a profile of the BMCC students based on their gender, grade, and intention.

Of the 242 male students, (242 = 100):

1. 32 (or 13.2%) had obtained distinction marks last semester;
2. 74 (or 30.6%) had obtained first class marks in their last semester;
3. 91 (37.6%) had obtained second class marks in their last semester;
4. 34 (or 14%) had received pass class marks in their last semester; and
5. 11 (or 14.5%) had no response to this question.
6. Of the 82 female students, (82 = 100), 26 (or 31.7%) had obtained distinction last semester;
7. 27 (or 32.9%) had obtained first class marks in their last semester;
8. 17 (20.7%) had obtained second class marks in their last semester;
9. 9 (or 11%) had received pass class marks in their last semester; and,
10. 3 (or 3.7%) had no response.

Questionnaire Design

1. A questionnaire containing 72 questions was distributed among the BMCC students during 2014-2015. Three hundred thirty-eight students provided usable responses to the survey. Of these 338 students, 324 students provided usable responses to Q #15

of the questionnaire that asked about their intention, the dependent variable.
2. In Section 1, the questionnaire contained 14 independent variables (gender, age, father's employment, mother's employment, class attained, etc.), and 1 dependent variable (intention: a, b, or c, as above).
3. In Section 2, there were 19 variables dealing with the respondents' reason for their intention for 'entrepreneurship'.
4. In Section 3, there were 19 variables dealing with the respondents' reason for their intention for 'social entrepreneurship'.
5. In Section 4, the remaining 19 variables dealt with the respondents' reason for their intention for 'working for someone else'.

HYPOTHESES

1. Null hypothesis One: There is no relationship between the students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.
2. Alternate hypothesis One: There is a relationship between the students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.
3. Null hypothesis Two: There is no relationship between the male students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.
4. Alternate hypothesis Two: There is a relationship between the male students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.
5. Null hypothesis Three: There is no relationship between the female students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.
6. Alternate hypothesis Thee: There is a relationship between the male students' class (distinction, first class, second class, or pass class) and their intention to become an entrepreneur, a social entrepreneur, or to work for someone else.

STATISTICAL TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Chi-Square to Test Relationship between Educational Variables and Intention

Since this research is studying the relationship between an educational variable (class/grades) and the students' intention, we first selected all the three education-related independent variables (namely, the year of education, the degree program, and the class/grades) included in the questionnaire, for performing our first set of statistical tests on these data. The test is the Chi Square test.

The Chi-Square Test of Independence (also known as Chi-Square Test of Association) determines whether there is an association between categorical variables (i.e., whether the variables are independent or related). It is a nonparametric test. (Kent State University, 2021.)

Results of these tests as presented in Table 2 show that the null hypothesis is rejected in each of the three cases at the 95% confidence level. In other words, each test rejected the null hypothesis that:

A. There is no relationship between the students' year of education and their intention: (a) for all students, (b) for male students, (c) for female students.
B. There is no relationship between the students' degree program and their intention: (a) for all students, (b) for male students, (c) for female students.
C. There is no relationship between the students' class/grades and their intention: (a) for all students, (b) for male students.

However, in the case of the female students, the null hypothesis that "there is no relationship between the students' class/grades and their intention" is accepted.

MLR Test to Test Relationship between Class and Intention

This research then focused on its central purpose, namely, the relationship between the BMCC students' class/grades (the independent variable) and their intention, namely, for A, B, or C (the dependent variable). The Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) test was chosen for testing this relationship.

Multinomial Logistic Regression analysis is used when the dependent variable is nominal with more than two levels--as in the case of the current study that has three nominal dependent variables. Similar to multiple linear regression, the multinomial regression is a predictive analysis. (The Analysis Factor, 2021)

The intercept, often labeled the constant, is the expected mean value of Y when all X=0. (The Analysis Factor, 2021).

MLR Test Analysis

Table 3 presents the Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) Test of the Relationship between BMCC's Students' Overall grades (the Independent Variables) and Students' Intention (A, B, or C, the Dependent Variables).

The MLR test results show that at the 95% confidence level, or the 5% significance level, the p-value of 0.001 is less than 0.05.

Therefore, as per the MLR testing guidelines, this study rejects the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between students' overall grades and their intention (A, B, or C).

This study then tried to find out, using the MLR testing, if there is a relationship between the different sub-levels of class/grades obtained by students (distinction, first class, second class, and pass class) and their intention (A, B, or C). No such relationship could be established due to their uncertain p-values.

MLR Parameter Estimates Analysis

This study then went an important step further. It analyzed the parameter estimates of the relationship between the students' sub-classes/grades (the independent variables), and their intention (A, B, or C--the dependent variables). Doing it so allowed us to examine this relationship by sub-categorizing the overall grades into their different levels (distinction, first class, second class, and pass class).

An analysis of various parameter estimates presented in Table 4 (related to Table 3) helped us reach the following inferences:

1. The p value of the students achieving the First Class is 0.009, which is less than 0.05 (the 5% significance value). It also has a positive co-efficient of 1.12.
    a. Therefore, as per the MLR testing guidelines, we conclude that the students who scored first class are more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs as compared to becoming social entrepreneurs or working for someone else.
2. Similarly, for the Second Class students, with a p value of 0.027 and a positive co-efficient of 1.12, we conclude that they are more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs as compared to becoming social entrepreneurs or working for someone else.
3. Likewise, for the Distinction Class students, with a p value of 0.684, which is greater than 5%, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.
4. Similarly, for the Pass Class students, with an uncertain p-value, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.

MLR Test Analysis of Male Students

This study then dived a little deeper to examine the relationships between the independent and the dependent variables by dividing the total responses by gender. Tables 5-8 present our findings.

Tables 5 presents the Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) Test of the Relationship between BMCC's 'male' students' grades (the Independent Variables) and their intention (A, B, or C, the Dependent Variable).

The MLR test results show that at the 95% confidence level, or the 5% significance level, the p-value of 0.00 is less than 0.05.

Therefore, as per the MLR testing guidelines, this study rejects the null hypothesis that "there is no relationship between the male students' grades and their intention (for A, B, or C)".

This study then tried to find, using the MLR testing, if there is a relationship between the various sub-levels of class/grades (distinction, first class, second class, and pass class) obtained by the 'male' students, and their intention (A, B, or C). No such relationship could be established due to their uncertain p-values.

MLR Parameter Estimates Analysis of Male Students

An analysis of various parameter estimates presented in Table 6 (related to Table 5) helped us reach the following inferences:

1. The p value of the students achieving the First Class is 0.005, which is less than 0.05 (the 5% significance value). It also has a positive co-efficient of 1.37.
    a. Therefore, as per the MLR testing guidelines, we conclude that the male students who scored first class are more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs as compared to becoming social entrepreneurs or working for someone else.
2. Similarly, for the Second Class male students, with a p value of 0.024 and a positive co-efficient of 1.06, we conclude that they are more likely to intend to become entrepreneurs as compared to becoming social entrepreneurs or working for someone else.
3. Likewise, for the Distinction Class students, with a p value of 0.321, which is greater than 5%, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.
4. Similarly, for the Pass Class male students, with an uncertain p-value, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.

MLR Test Analysis of Female Students

Tables **7** presents the Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) Test of the Relationship between BMCC's 'Female Sudents' grades (the Independent Variables) and their intention (A, B, or C, the Dependent Variable).

The MLR test results show that at the 95% confidence level, or the 5% significance level, the p-value of 0.208, which is more than 0.05.

Therefore, as per the MLR testing guidelines, this study accepts the null hypothesis that "there is no relationship between the female students' overall grades and their intention (for A, B, or C)."

This study then tried to find, using the MLR testing, if there is a relationship between the various sub-levels of class/grades (distinction, first class, second class, and pass class) obtained by the female students, and their intention (A, B, or C). No such relationship could be established due to their uncertain p-values.

MLR Parameter Estimates Analysis of Female Students

An analysis of various parameter estimates presented in Table 8 (related to Table 7) helped us reach the following inferences:

1. The p value of the female students achieving the First Class is 0.757, which is more than 0.05 (the 5% significance value). Hence, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.
2. Similarly, for the Second Class female students, with a p value of 0.708, which is greater than 0.05 (the 5% significance level), we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.

3. Likewise, for the Distinction Class female students, with a p value of 0.757, which is greater than 5%, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.

4. Similarly, for the Pass Class female students, with an uncertain p-value, we cannot infer their intention to become entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, or to work for someone else.

Intention of Women vs Men: Some Variables

Both statistical tests, chi-square and MLR, rejected the null hypothesis for intention of male students. However, all these tests accepted the null hypothesis for intention in the case of the female students. There are several factors responsible for Indian women's seeming lack of interest, relative to their men counterpart, in entrepreneurship or social entrepreneurship.

In her widely acknowledged article, Kabeer (1999) noted that "ability to make choices" is a key element of women empowerment. This in turn, Kabeer argues, depends upon three variables: (1) Access to resources, (2) Agency, and (3) Achievements.

However, often women's access to resources is restricted due to social dogma that treats women's role as secondary to that of men. Culturally, men are considered superior to women. (Carr, Chen, & Jhabvala 1996; Brahme, 1984; cited in Datta & Gailey, 2012.)

Similarly, male-oriented controls can create employment barricades for women. It is difficult for women to start their own business, or even learn entrepreneurial skills, against the wishes of their father or husband. (Also see Sen, 1999; and Pollard, 2006; both cited in Datta & Gailey, 2012.)

Only women give birth. Naturally, they need to spend more time with children. They face challenges in joining social networks, raising funds, and receiving timely information. (Gaiha et al., 2001; Khandker, 1998; and Torri and Martinez, 2013.)

SUMMARY RESULTS BY GENDER AND INTENTION

The statistical analysis of data as presented above can be summarized as below:

Results for All Students, Male and Female Combined

1. Chi-square test rejects the null hypothesis for all students.
2. MLR test rejects the null hypothesis for all students.
3. MLR test could not reflect on the null hypothesis for all students, broken down by their different sub-levels of class/grades, due to their uncertain p-values.

Results for Male Students

1. Chi-square test rejects the null hypothesis for male students.
2. MLR test rejects the null hypothesis for male students.
3. MLR test could not reflect on the null hypothesis for male students, broken down by their different sub-levels of class/grades, due to their uncertain p-values.

Results for Female Students

1. Chi-square test accepts the null hypothesis for female students.
2. MLR test accept the null hypothesis for male students.
3. MLR test could not reflect on the null hypothesis for female students, broken down by their different sub-levels of class/grades, due to their uncertain p-values.

LIMITATION OF THE RESEARCH

This study in an academic environment has the following limitations:

1. It is limited to study of intention of a particular college in India.
2. Its conclusions are based on a relatively small sample of 324 responses.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

We make the following suggestions for further research in this area:

1. We recommend this research to be expanded by using the different educational levels of students (independent variable), such as higher secondary school students, undergraduate students, and graduate students.
2. We recommend research into such relationships by using the different types of education (independent variable), such as students of arts, business management, economics, engineering, and health-sciences.
3. We also recommend the separation of dependent variables, such as intention for entrepreneurship, for social entrepreneurship, or for working for someone else.
4. We recommend research into why women in India continue to lag behind men in terms of their intention for entrepreneurship, for social entrepreneurship, or working for someone else.

CONCLUSIONS

This research explored if there is a relationship between BMC College students' class/grades and their intention: (A) To become an entrepreneur, (B) To become a social entrepreneur, or (C) to work for someone else, after they have completed their education.

This study rejected the null hypothesis that there is no relationship, when 'all students' are considered, between their overall class/grades and their intention for A, B, or C. However, when classified by their gender and sub-class levels, the study provided different conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Pace University, New York, USA, and the BMC College, Pune, India for their support in doing this research. The authors also thank Ms. Sushmitha Mudda for her very valuable assistance in preparing the survey of literature and statistical testing of data.

REFERENCES

Alhosani, A. A., Singh, S. K., & Al Nahyan, M. T. (2017). Role of school leadership and climate in student achievement: The mediating role of parental involvement. *International Journal of Educational Management 31*(6), 843-51.

Almobaireek, W. N., & Manolova, T. S. (2012). Who wants to be an entrepreneur? Entrepreneurial intentions among Saudi university students. *African Journal of Business Management 6*(11):4029-4040.

Alvarez, C., & Urbano, D. (2011) Una década de investigación basada en el GEM: Logros y Retos. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, 46,* 16-37.

Bae, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta–analytic review. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 38*(2), 217-254.

Basu, A., & Virick, M. (2008). Assessing entrepreneurial intentions amongst students: A comparative study. National Collegiate Inventors and Innovators Alliance Conference, Dallas, TX. pp. 79-86.

Bates, T. (2002). Restricted access to markets characterizes women-owned businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing, 17*(4), 313-324.

Brockhaus, R. H., & Horowitz, P. S. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton, & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 25-48). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Brush, C. G. (1992). Research on women business owners: Past trends, a new perspective and future directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 16*(4), 5-30.

Buli, B. M., & Yesuf, W. M. (2015). Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions: Technical-vocational education and training students in Ethiopia. *Education+Training, 57*(8/9), 891-907.

Burch, G. J., & Anderson, N. (2008). Personality as a predictor of work-related behaviour and performance: Recent advances and directions for future research. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 261-305). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Castrogiovanni, GJ., Urbano, D., & Loras, J. (2011). Linking corporate entrepreneurship and human resource management in SMEs. *International Journal of Manpower, 32*(1), 34-47.

Ciavarella, M. A., Bucholtz, A. K., Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Stokes, G. S. (2004). The big five and venture success: Is there a linkage? *Journal of Business Venturing, 19*, 465-483.

Coduras, A., Urbano, D., Rojas, A., & Martínez, S. (2008). The relationship between university support to entrepreneurship with entrepreneurial activity in Spain: A GEM data-based analysis. *International Advances in Economic Research, 14*(4), 395-406.

Davey, T., Plewa, C., & Struwig, M. (2011). Entrepreneurship perceptions and career intentions of international student. *Journal of Education+Training, 53*, 335-352.

Dickson, P. H., Solomon, G. T., & Weaver, K. M. (2008). Entrepreneurial selection and success: Does education matter? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15*, 239-258.

Dorado, S., & Ventresca, M. J. (2013). Crescive entrepreneurship in complex social problems: Institutional conditions for entrepreneurial engagement. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(1), 69-82.

Dyer, W. G. (1994). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial careers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 19(*2), 7-21.

Ettl, K., & Welter, F. (2010). Gender, context and entrepreneurial learning. *Journal of Gender Entrepreneurship, 2*(2), 108-129.

Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: a new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 30*(9), 701-720.

Fiet, J. O. (2001). The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ventures, 16,* 1-24.

Gerba, D. T. (2012b). The context of entrepreneurship education in Ethiopian universities. *Management Research Review, 35*(3), 225-244.

Grace-Martin, K. (2021). Logistic Regression Models for Multinomial and Ordinal Variables. The Analysis Factor.

Gupta, V. K., Turban, D. B., & Bhawe, N. M. (2008). The effect of gender stereotype activation on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1053-1070.

Hamidi, D. Y., Weinberg, K., & Berglund, H. (2008). Creativity in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15*, 304-20.

Harding, R., & Marc, C. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor United Kingdom 2006.* London, UK: London Business School.

Hartog, C., & Hoogendoorn, B. (2011). Prevalence and Determinants of Social Entrepreneurship at the Macro-Level. H201022, EIM Business and Policy Research.

Hmieleski, K. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2006). Proclivity for improvisation as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management, 44(*1), 45-63.

Iacobucci, D., & Micozzi, A. (2012). Entrepreneurship education in Italian universities: Trend, situation and opportunities. *Education + Training, 54*(8), 673-696.

Kargwell, S., & Inguva, I. (2012). Factors influencing the first-generation entrepreneurs: An analytical study on the graduates of UAE universities. *International Journal of Business and Social Science 3*(7):143-149.

Katz, J. (1992). A psychological cognitive model of employment status choice. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 17*(1), 29-37.

Kent State University (2021, April 12). Chi-Square Test of Independence. Kent State University, Retrieved from http://www.libguides.library.kent.edu/spss/chisquare

Knörr, H., Álvarez, C., & Urbano, D. (2013). Entrepreneurs or employees: A cross-cultural cognitive analysis. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 9*(2), 273-294.

Kolvereid, L. (2016). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 21*(1), 47-58.

Law, K. M. Y., & Breznik, K. (2017). Impacts of innovativeness and attitude on entrepreneurial intention: among engineering and non-engineering students. *International Journal of Technological Design Education, 27,* 683-700.

Lee, L., Wong, P. K., Der Foo, M., & Leung, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions: The influence of organizational and individual factors. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(1), 124-136.

Leroy, H., Maes, J., Meuleman, M., Sels, L., & Debrulle, J. (2009, August 11). Gender effect on entrepreneurial intentions: A TPB multi-group analysis at factor and indicator level. Academy of Management Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL.

Liñán, F., Urbano, D., & Guerrero, M. (2011). Regional variations in entrepreneurial cognitions: start-up intentions of university students in Spain. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 23*(3-4), 187-215.

Lundström, A., & Stevenson, L. A. (2005). *Entrepreneurship policy: Theory and Practice.* New York, NY: Springer.

Lüthje, C., & Franke, D. (2003). The 'making' of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT. *R&D Management, 33,* 135-147.

Mahmood, H. G., & Abdullateef, O. A. (2017). Entrepreneurial intentions of business students in Malaysia: the role of self-confidence, educational and relation support. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 24*(1), 54-67.

Martin, B. C., McNally, J.J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(2), 211-224.

Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28(*2), 211-224.

Matlay, H., D. Rae, M. Z., Solesvik, P., Westhead, L., Kolvereid, P., & Matlay, H. (2012). Student intentions to become self-employed: The Ukrainian context. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 19*(3), 441-460.

McEwen, T., & McEwen, B. (2010). Teen Interest in Entrepreneurship: Implications for College-Level Entrepreneurship Education. ASBE 36th Annual Conference.

Miller, B. K., Bell, J. D., Palmer, M., & Gonzalez, A. (2009). Predictors of entrepreneurial intentions: a quasi-experiment comparing students enrolled in introductory management and entrepreneurship classes, *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship, 21*(2), 391.

Morris, M. H., Webb, J. W., Fu, J., & Singhal, S. (2013). A competency-based perspective on entrepreneurship education: conceptual and empirical insights. *Journal of Small Business Management, 51*(3), 352-391.

Nabi, G., & Holden, R. (2008). Graduate entrepreneurship: intentions, education, and training. *Education + Training, 50*(7), 545-551.

National Academy of Engineering (2008). Changing the Conversation: Message for Improving Public Understanding of Engineering.

Nga, J. K. H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(2), 259-282.

Noguera, M., Álvarez, C., & Urbano, D. (2013). Socio-cultural factors and female entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship Management Journal, 9*(2), 183-198.

O'Cinneide, B., & Garavan, T. N. (1994). Entrepreneurship education and training programmes: a review and evaluation - Part 2. *Journal of European Industry Training, 18,* 3-12.

Oosterbeek, H., van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review, 54*(3), 442-454.

Paço, A., Ferreira, J. M., Raposo, M., Rodrigues, R. G., & Dinis, A. (2011). Behaviors and entrepreneurial intention: Empirical findings about secondary students. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship, 9*(1), 20-38.

Pejvak, O., Marie-louise, J., Kaveh, P. and Phillip, T. (2009). What makes people want to become self-employed? Applying the theory of planned behavior. *Advances in Management, 2*(11), 9-19.

Petridou, E., Sarri, A., & Kyrgidou, L. P. (2009). Entrepreneurship education in higher educational institutions: The gender dimension. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 24*(4), 286-309.

Raposo, M., & Paço, A. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: relationship between education. *Psicothema, 23*(3), 453-457.

Raposo, M., do Paço, A., & Ferreira, J. (2008). Entrepreneur's profile: a taxonomy of attributes and motivations of university students. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15*(2), 405-418.

Rumelt, R. P. (1987). Theory, strategy and entrepreneurship. In Teece, D. J. (Ed.), *The competitive challenge* (pp.137-158). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Schlaegel, C., & Koenig, M. (2014). Determinants of entrepreneurial intent: A meta-analytic test and integration of competing models. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice 38*(2), 291-332.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, M, & Twomey, D. (1988). The long-term supply of entrepreneurs: Student's career aspirations in relation to entrepreneurship., *Journal of Small Business Management 26*(4), 5-13.

Sesen, H. (2012). Personality or environment? A comprehensive study on the entrepreneurial intentions of university students. *Education + Training, 55*(7), 624-640.

Shapero A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In Kent, C., et al. (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 72-90). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shapero, A. (1984). The entrepreneurial event. In C. A. Kent (Ed.), *The environment for entrepreneurship.* Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.

Solesvik, M. Z. (2013). Entrepreneurial motivations and intentions: Investigating the role of education major. *Education and Training, 55*(3), 253-271.

The Analysis Factor (2021). People also ask, **'**What does the intercept mean in logistic regression?'

Thompson, E. R. (2009). Individual entrepreneurial intent: Construct clarification and development of an internationally reliable metric. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 33*(3), 669–694.

Thornton, P., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Urbano, D. (2011). Socio-cultural factors and entrepreneurial activity: An overview. *International Small Business Journal, 29*(2), 105-118.

Turker, D., & Selcuk, S. S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European Industrial Training, 33*(2), 142-159.

Urbano, D., Toledano, N., & Soriano, D. (2010). Analyzing social entrepreneurship from an institutional perspective: Evidence from Spain. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1*(1), 54-69.

Van Gelderen, M., Brand, M., van Praag, M., Bodewes, W., Poutsma, E. and Van Gils, A. (2008). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behavior. *Career Development International, 13*(6), 538-591.

Van Gelderen, M., Brand, M., van Praag, M., Bodewes, M., Poutsma, E., & Van Gils, A. (2008). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behavior. *Career Development International 13*(6), 538-59.

Verheul, I., Uhlaner, L., & Thurik, R., (2005). Business accomplishments, gender and entrepreneurial self-image. *Journal of Business Venturing 20*(4), 483-518.

Verheul, I., Van Stel, A., & Thurik, R. (2006). Explaining female and male entrepreneurship at the country level. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 18*(2), 151-183.

Wilson, F., & Kickul, J. (2006). For what, for whom? Examining the diverse motives of future female and male entrepreneurs. Paper presented at the US Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship 2006 Conference, Tucson, AZ. January 12-16.

Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self–efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 31*(3), 387-406.

Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6). 1265- 1772.

TABLE 1
PROFILE OF BMCC STUDENTS BY
GENDER, CLASS OBTAINED, AND INTENTION

Table 09: Profile of students by Class obtained last semester, Gender, and Intention

			Male				Female				Total Male & Female			
			tart Own Business, Not Socially Oriented	tart Own Business (Socially Oriented)	ork for Others	otal	tart Own Business (Not Socially Oriented)	tart Own Business (Socially Oriented)	ork for Others	otal	tart Own Business (Not Socially Oriented)	tart Own Business (Socially Oriented)	ork for Others	otal
1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)	9)	10)	11)	12)	13)	14)	15)
(Q12) Class obtained last semester	Distinction	ount			5	2	2			6	1.0	3.0	4.0	8.0
		xpected Count	6.7	.4	1.0	2.0	2.0	.8	.2	6.0	8.7	.1	0.2	8.0
		% (Q12) obtained within Class	8.1%	5.0%	6.9%	00.0%	6.2%	9.2%	4.6%	00.0 %				
		within Intentio n	.1%	4.2%	8.1%	3.2%	1.6%	3.3%	1.0%	1.7%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0 %
		of Total	.7%	.3%	.2%	3.2%	4.6%	.1%	1.0%	1.7%	9%	6%	5%	00%
	F irst Class	ount	0		9	4	2			7	2.0	1.0	8.0	01.0
		xpected Count	8.5	0.1	5.4	4.0	2.5	.9	.5	7.0	1.0	5.0	4.9	01.0

		within (Q12) Class obtained last semester	7.6%	.8%	5.7%	00.0%	4.4%	2.2%	3.3%	00.0%				
		within Intention	9.7%	5.2%	2.9%	0.6%	1.6%	0.0%	1.0%	2.9%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%
		of Total	0.7%	.1%	.9%	0.6%	4.6%	.3%	1.0%	2.9%	1%	5%	5%	00%
	econd Class	ount	4		8	1	0			7	4.0	.0	5.0	08.0
		xpected count	7.4	2.4	1.2	1.0	.9	.1	.0	7.0	5.3	5.5	7.2	08.0
		within (Q12) Class obtained last semester	9.3%	.9%	0.8%	00.0%	8.8%	.0%	1.2%	00.0%				
		within Intention	2.9%	7.3%	3.7%	7.6%	6.3%	.0%	4.1%	0.7%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%
		of Total	2.3%	.7%	1.6%	7.6%	2.2%	.0%	.5%	0.7%	1%	4%	4%	00%
	Pass Class	ount	0		5	4					3.0	2.0	8.0	3.0
		xpected Count	7.7	.6	1.7	4.0	.2	.6	.2	.0	1.9	.3	4.8	3.0
		within (Q12) Class obtained last semester	9.4%	6.5%	4.1%	00.0%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	00.0%				
		within Intention	.9%	7.3%	8.1%	4.0%	.9%	0.0%	0.3%	1.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%
		of Total	.1%	.7%	.2%	4.0%	.7%	.7%	.7%	1.0%	1%	5%	5%	00%
	No response	ount				1					.0	.0	.0	4.0
		xpected Count	.7	.5	.8	1.0	.4	5	.1	.0	.1	.0	.8	4.0

		within (Q12) Class obtained last semester	7.3%	8.2%	4.5%	00.0%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	00.0%			
		within Intention	.4%	.1%	.2%	.5%	.6%	.7%	.4%	.7%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%	00.0%
		of Total	.2%	8%	.5%	.5%	.2%	.2%	.2%	.7%	1%	5%	5%	00%

Null Hypothesis	**# of responses**	**Type of Test**	**Value**	**df**	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**	**Exact Sig. (2-sided)**	**Decision**
There is no relationship between a student's year of education and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	324	Pearson Chi-Square	14.07	4	0.007	0.007	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a male student's year of education and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	242	Pearson Chi-Square	11.52	4	0.021	0.021	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a female student's year of education and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	81	Pearson Chi-Square	19.13	4	0.001	0.001	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a student's degree program and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	324	Pearson Chi-Square	16.87	6	0.01	0.01	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a male student's degree program and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	242	Pearson Chi-Square	14.82	6	0.022	0.021	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a female student's degree program and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	82	Pearson Chi-Square	18.72	6	0.005	0.004	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	324	Pearson Chi-Square	24.1	6	0.001	0	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a male student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	231	Pearson Chi-Square	26.14	6	0	0	Reject Null Hypothesis
There is no relationship between a female student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any work (15 A, B or C) after studies	79	Pearson Chi-Square	5.708	6	0.457	0.474	Accept Null Hypothesis

TABLE 3
MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION (MLR) TEST OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BMCC ALL STUDENTS' GRADES (THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES) AND STUDENTS' INTENTION (A, B, or C, THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE).

Likelihood Ratio Tests								
Null Hypothesis (All Students)	**Intercept/Class Categories**	**Number of Valid Cases (n)**	**Effect**	**Model Fitting Criteria**	**Likelihood Ratio Tests**			**Decision**
There is no relationship between a student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any (A, B, or C).			-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi Square		df	Sig.	Reject the null hypothesis
	Distinction	58	8.428	0		0	.	
	First Class	101	8.94	0		0	.	
	Second Class	108	8.929	0		0	.	
	Pass Class	43		7.887	0	0	.	
	Total	310	Intercept	34.184	0	0	.	
			Grade	58.171	23.99	6	0.001	

TABLE 4
REPRESENTS THE PARAMETER ESTIMATES
RELATED TO TABLE 3 VARIABLES AND TESTING

Parameter Estimates									
Intention	Intercept/Class Categories	Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Own Business	Intercept	-0.325	0.364	0.799	1	0.371			
	Distinction	0.192	0.471	0.166	1	0.684	1.212	0.481	3.049
	First Class	1.12	0.429	6.81	1	0.009	3.066	1.322	7.112
	Second Class	0.929	0.42	4.884	1	0.027	2.532	1.111	5.771
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
Own Social Business	Intercept	-0.405	0.373	1.184	1	0.277			
	Distinction	-0.208	0.507	0.167	1	0.682	0.813	0.301	2.197
	First Class	-0.529	0.515	1.053	1	0.305	0.589	0.215	1.618
	Second Class	-0.953	0.528	3.258	1	0.071	0.386	0.137	1.085
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
a. The reference category is: WFS.									
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.									

TABLE 5
MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION (MLR) TEST OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BMCC MALE STUDENTS' GRADES (THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES) AND STUDENTS' INTENTION (A, B, or C, THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE).

Likelihood Ratio Tests								
Null Hypothesis (All Students)	Intercept/Class Categories	Number of Valid Cases (n)	Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests			Decision
There is no relationship between a male student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any (A, B, or C).				-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi Square	df	Sig.	Reject the null hypothesis
	Distinction	32		7.24	0	0	.	
	First Class	74		7.881	0	0	.	
	Second Class	91		8.709	0	0	.	
	Pass Class	34		7.339	0	0	.	
	Total	231	Intercept	31.228	0	0	.	
			Grade	57.452	26.22	6	0	

TABLE 6
REPRESENTS THE PARAMETER
ESTIMATES RELATED TO TABLE 5 VARIABLES AND TESTING

Intention	Intercept/Class Categories	Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Intercept	-0.405	0.408	0.986	1	0.321			
Own Business	Distinction	-0.105	0.587	0.032	1	0.858	0.9	0.285	2.843
	First Class	1.373	0.489	7.878	1	0.005	3.947	1.513	10.297
	Second Class	1.062	0.47	5.108	1	0.024	2.893	1.151	7.268
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
	Intercept	-0.511	0.422	1.468	1	0.226			
Own Social Business	Distinction	-0.118	0.608	0.038	1	0.846	0.889	0.27	2.926
	First Class	-0.824	0.656	1.578	1	0.209	0.439	0.121	1.587
	Second Class	-0.624	0.57	1.2	1	0.273	0.536	0.175	1.636
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
a. The reference category is: WFS.									
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.									

TABLE 7
MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION (MLR) TEST OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BMCC FEMALE STUDENTS' GRADES (THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES) AND STUDENTS' INTENTION (A, B, or C, THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE)

Likelihood Ratio Tests								
Null Hypothesis (Female Students)	Intercept/Class Categories	Number of Valid Cases (n)	Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests			Decision
There is no relationship between a female student's marks in last semester and his/her intention towards any (A, B, or C).				-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi Square	df	Sig.	Accept the null hypothesis
	Distinction	26		6.769	0	0	.	
	First Class	27		6.908	0	0	.	
	Second Class	17		3.284	0	0	.	
	Pass Class	9		4.922	0	0	.	
	Total	79	intercept	21.882	0	0	.	
			grade	30.315	8.433	6	0.208	

TABLE 8
REPRESENTS THE PARAMETER ESTIMATES RELATED TO TABLE 7 VARIABLES AND TESTING

Intention	Intercept/Class Categories	Coefficient (B)	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp (B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Intercept	0	0.816	0	1	1			
Own Business	Distinction	0.288	0.928	0.096	1	0.757	1.333	0.216	8.219
	First Class	0.288	0.928	0.096	1	0.757	3.947	0.216	8.219
	Second Class	0.357	0.954	0.14	1	0.708	2.893	0.22	9.262
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
	Intercept	0	0.816	0	1	1			
Own Social Business	Distinction	-0.588	0.989	0.353	1	0.552	0.889	0.8	3.858
	First Class	-0.405	0.972	0.174	1	0.677	0.439	0.099	4.478
	Second Class	-20.963	0	.	1	.	7.87E-10	7.87E-10	7.87E-10
	Pass Class	0b	.	.	0	.	.	.	.
a. The reference category is: WFS.									
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.									