



Entrepreneurial Inclination OF Management students- a comparative study of Gender and Residential Background

Vinod Kumar Mishra *

Abstract

The Paper investigates the entrepreneurial inclination of the Students of Management at Indore. It explores, whether or not demographic variables i.e. gender and residential background, interfere or no longer with the observe-variable i.e. `entrepreneurship inclination. For this motive a hundred, and sixty MBA college students were measured for entrepreneurial inclination inclusive of ninety-two males. and sixty-eight females; fifty-three had their history from rural and 107 were from city area. To apprehend the importance of gender and residential background two-sample t- test were applied. The test revealed that each gender and residential background had been insignificant. The study would be beneficial to the authorities in addition to instructional establishments in designing their techniques for selling entrepreneurship to beautify the economy, employment creativity, innovation, and betterment of society.

KEY WORDS: *Entrepreneurial Inclination, Innovation, Creativity. Residential Background*

Entrepreneurship is a core of the economic growth of states. Shane (2012) lamented that entrepreneurial dynamism plays a crucial role in economic growth. In their study, Henderson and Weiler (2010) recognized that Entrepreneurship is a major engine of economic growth of a country (it provides multiple benefits to the society like employment, mobilizing the economy, service to society. and innovation. It is a kind of working wisdom enabling an individual whether a self-employed or a manager to understand the level of risk involved in the work initiative and transform it into a profit-making activity. Entrepreneurship refers to individual opportunistic activity that creates value and bears risk and is strongly associated with innovation (Sexton and Kasarda, 1992) it is to organize and manage business by considerable initiative and risk (Flexner and Hauck, 1983). Entrepreneurs are change agents, innovators, risk takers, decision makers and people with definite position. It is a person who combines various factors of production, processes, raw material, converts raw material into a finished products and creates utility in the product and sales the product into the market in order to earn profit'(Kaulgud, 2003). The driving force for establishing an enterprise lies in venturous nature, autonomy, risk taking spirit and innovative ideas. They are by nature independent, motivated to experimentation and learn new things by self-efforts, believe in contemplation, realistic in observation, adventurist, internal locus of control, and proficient in reading body language, and having envisioning ability Jangalwa and Mishra (2012). Brookhouse (1982) and Caird (1990) had found that both entrepreneurs and senior managers

have internal locus of control as they believe that they are the master of their fate. They believe in taking measured risk (Brookhouse, 1998).

Manimala (2005) defined an entrepreneur as identifying a business opportunity out of the prevailing environmental conditions, demanding a solution to the persisting problem, or sometimes even creating a demand that practically does not exist. The entrepreneurs do not see their profession as a means of livelihood; rather they envision it as a means to bring change in society.

Entrepreneurs are driven by their visions and dreams. They sometimes innovate and foray into ventures and also plan exit strategies. It is a process that includes three important elements, adaption, invention, and innovation. Schumpeter (1965) asserted that entrepreneurs are innovators who use this process of shattering the status quo of the existing products and services to set new products and new services.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to understand the process of entrepreneurship development in higher educational institutions it is imperative to understand the purpose of entrepreneurship.

Most of the growth of the entrepreneurship ecosystem within educational institutions focuses significantly on knowledge and entrepreneurial skills through activities like seminars, business training, industry support, or competitions for business plans (Bergner et al., 2023; Lim et al., 2023). Such programs can enhance their entrepreneurial knowledge and skills as part of the strategy to address graduate unemployment issues. Various efforts to strengthen the field of entrepreneurship among students in higher learning institutions have been put into action (Alakaleek et al. , 2023). For instance, since 1989, the Student Entrepreneur Development Program has been initiated to foster entrepreneurial activities and encourage students' mindsets to pursue careers as entrepreneurs while alleviating unemployment among graduates (Moraes et al., 2023). These initiatives encompass student entrepreneurship training, which was subsequently replaced by an entrepreneurship module for first-year students comprising two credits, organizing short-term entrepreneurship courses for final-year students, group business promotion initiatives on campus, establishing companies, and Student in Free Enterprise (SIFE) community activities aimed at enhancing the local community's economic status. The Ministry of Higher Education has introduced the Entrepreneurship Action Plan for Higher Education Institutions (EAP-HEIS 2021-2025) and the MOHE Guide to Entrepreneurship Integrated Education (EIE) to bolster the longevity of the entrepreneurship agenda in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and to cultivate a larger number of entrepreneurs among students and graduates.

Smith (1776) defined an entrepreneur as an individual, who undertakes the formation of an organisation for commercial purposes by recognizing the potential demand for goods and services and thereby acts as an economic agent and transforms demand into supply. Say (1845) argued that the nature of entrepreneurial work is more of organising rather than capitalist or financier. Drucker (1985) had contended that entrepreneur is a person capable of converting sources into resources. The researchers Gartner (1998) had affirmed that it is the intention of developing career as entrepreneur over a period of time bring into the reality to establish oneself as entrepreneur. Dana (2000) stated that there was a difference in the Indians attitude and intention about entrepreneurship. Indians believe in maintaining status quo than to be venturist, restlessness to achieve something big in life. For example Anglo-Indians have strong drive to achieve more in life. Though, change can be seen in the Indians for e-ship; as the

youngsters are more open for developing their career in entrepreneurship. The major factors contributing for development was identified by Dana (2000); Handy and et al (2002) and Shivani et al (2006) that it is the change in culture, means of education, economic and political environment, positively effecting on Indians mindset about entrepreneurship.

Schumpeter (1934) enumerated that entrepreneurship has long been recognised as important economic sector to enrich at local, regional and national levels. Reynolds et al (2004) had contended that the entrepreneurial activity is majorly influenced by environmental factors such as culture, concern for entrepreneurial training & education. It is a major driving economic sector for developed nations. Therefore, many of the nation facilitate for e-ship education, training and finance as it is the major source of innovation. They also found that British Occupation, religion and cultural values, government regulations had negatively affected as the e-ship in Indian culture. Handy et al (2000) affirmed that it was the government regulation impeded the process of e-ship in India. Mishra (2011, 2012) found that government policies are supportive to the entrepreneurs now as it was not a decade ago. Jangalwa & Mishra (2012) had found that the government initiatives in the first decade of 21st Century have brought positive changes in the society. Although instead of perceiving entrepreneurship as an engine for economic booster, it is more perceived as employment generator in India. Wani et al (2003) had discussed that now a day's entrepreneurship is promoted in education sector also.

Entrepreneurs as Innovator and Economic Booster

Drucker (1985) defined entrepreneurship “as a systematic innovation which consists in the purposeful and organised search for changes and in a systematic analysis of the opportunities such changes might offer for economic and social innovation.” Schumpeter (1961) described “Entrepreneurship is one of the basic requirements for industrial development. An entrepreneur is a dynamic agent of change, or the catalyst who transforms the physical, human resources into corresponding production possibilities. Right entrepreneurship makes it possible to exploit the available opportunities for higher business gains. These business gains besides fuelling existing demands, add further to investment potential, thereby, creating higher employment output and growth. Entrepreneurship, being an individual based characteristic, is mostly determined by factors like socio-economic characteristic, is mostly determined by factors like socioeconomic status, education and knowledge, organizational skills, information base, innovation orientation, progressive values etc.

Carree and Thurik (2002) had found that entrepreneurship and its relevance to economic growth cannot be directly relevant. Bygrave & Minniti (2000) had found that relevance is not possible because of the problem in the finding connections between entrepreneurship and intermediate variables. Some such variables are innovation, competition, exit and entry policies of the firms, supply of energy and efforts by entrepreneurs differ.

Emergence of Entrepreneurship

Although entrepreneurial skill varies from individual to individual, its concentration in some societies compared to others shows specific factors may explain differences in achievements. Studies show that the emergence of entrepreneurs in a society depends closely upon the inter-linked economic, psychological, religious and cultural attributes. With the inability to assimilate such a detailed profile to entrepreneurial factors across the states of India, an outline in terms of broad indicators can be expected to offer some expectations.

Difference between Managers and Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneurs and managers are two different types of people. Entrepreneurs often lack diplomacy, they dislike bureaucracy and they have a lot of energy and are source of dramatic change. Jangalwa & Mishra, (2015) Manager, by contrast, tend to be more introverts, more diplomatic, more conforming and sensitive to status. Entrepreneurs are more found to be in small units, rather than in big organisation and appear to be deviant within big organisations. Almost all the major entrepreneurial activities throughout the world have started from the small-scale sector. Entrepreneurship is a composite skill, including imagination, readiness to take risk, ability to bring together and put to use the factors of production. Entrepreneurship is not an inborn quality of a particular group or family yet it is learned from Social environment.

RATIONALE

Entrepreneurship works as a honey-bee model. It provides multiple benefits such as generating employment, mobilises individual's funds, service to society and boost the economy. Further, it is a major source of bringing innovation in the business. Todtling & Wanzanbock, (2003) had contended that it is a booster in economic growth. Yet, it consistently demands for innovation. Carree and Thurik (2002) had argued by giving evidence to exhibit the relevance of e-ship to economic growth. The turbulence of entry and exit in a particular industry, the size distributions in regions (Lloyd-Ellis and Bernhardt, 2000). Same was also affirmed by two more research, but their argument was not based on region rather it was based on change in the size of distribution ultimately effect on the (Carree, Van Stel, Thurik & Wennekers, 2002).

Women as Entrepreneur

Murugesan and Jayavelu (2020) used the Big Five theory to examine how personality traits affected entrepreneurial intentions. They found that female students tend to steer clear of entrepreneurial activities because they have a less positive view of their efficiency, are less likely to consider themselves entrepreneurs, and are less likely to have entrepreneurial goals. These results are consistent with those of Wilson, Kickul, and Marlino's study [21], which also found that young female students have lower levels of self-efficacy in areas they believe to be male, such as entrepreneurial intentions, whereas male students have higher levels of entrepreneurial intention than female students.

OBJECTIVES

1. To study the entrepreneurial behaviour of male and female MBA Students.
2. To study the entrepreneurial behaviour of Rural and Urban male and female MBA Students.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the research has been discussed in the heads viz. The Study, The Research Design, The Sample Design, The Sample, The Tools for Data Collection and The Tools for Data Analysis.

The Study

The present study is an empirical study in nature. It aims to identify and assess the entrepreneurial behaviour of MBA students particularly in terms of entrepreneurial behaviour of male and female and enterprising score of rural and urban students.

Respondents

The students who were enrolled in the MBA course in various management institutions at Indore city.

Tools for Data Collection

The data collected from the source thus the data was of primary nature.

Variables

The study was focused to discover the entrepreneurial behaviour of young budding managers differ on the basis of gender and origin or not. Thus *Entrepreneurial Behaviour* was the study-variable and gender and origin were independent variable.

The Sample

The sample was constituted of 160 respondents having composition of 92 male and 68 female respondents. Out of the 160, the origin statistics was, 53 were from rural and remaining i.e. 107 were from urban origin.

Questionnaire

Caird, Sally and Cliff Johnson (2003). *The Entrepreneurial Behaviour*. Durham University Business School: USA. The instrument consists of 54 items on five point Likert scale. The Cronbach's Alpha was found higher i.e. 0.758.

HYPOTHESIS

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of male MBA and female MBA students in terms of entrepreneurship scores.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of male and female MBA students hailing from rural and urban area.

RESULTS

H₀₁ and **H₀₂** both were accepted.

DISCUSSION

The study aimed to investigate the significance of two demographic variables i.e. gender and origin, whether affecting entrepreneurship behavior or not. Both were discussed in the light of another research finding, which were as follows:

The gender was found insignificant for entrepreneurship behaviour as the results exhibited that the mean scores of males and females for 3.4275 and 3.4055 respectively, with a standard deviation of 0.335 and 0.238. Thus, it is clear that the male's mean score ranged a little higher than their counterpart. Similar results were reported by Ahl (2002) and Reynolds

(1997). They recommended that gender differences in entrepreneurship behavior should not be emphasized. In a multivariate analysis by Reynolds (2003), it was observed that gender as a tendency disappeared. Although it was research on entrepreneurship, the underlying presumption of this reference is based on the inclination that higher entrepreneurship behavioral people could take the initiative to adopt entrepreneurship as a career. Although, Wagner (2004) had found that gender was significant. He argued that the scores for males and females in terms of entrepreneurship were statistically different. He indicated that it might be the fear of failure may be a responsible factor. Furthermore, he found that women tend to perceive more risk than their counter parts, therefore they are reluctant in taking risk. Normally it is reported by most of the researches that males are aggressive as well as higher aspirant than their counter part. This might be the reason for significant difference (Schoett and Bager, 2004). The ratio of female in MBA programs has dramatically increased and they may be little lacking in participative spirit. Verheul & Thurik (2003) had argued on the same line as they mentioned that gender analysis suggested that the female participation rate in the workforce is one major explanation why they relatively under representation. If, merely mean scores for demographic factors are considered i.e. gender and origin then abysmally low differences were observed among them in terms of entrepreneurship.

Contrary to the current findings, Ramazan and Ali (2012) found that features like gender, age, education, native or nomad were significant. So there were mixed results regarding the gender as an independent variable. The difference might be negligent because of increased level of education and understanding. Similarly Bird and Brush (2002) had found that in feminine leadership organisations the orientation towards relation was found higher in comparison to the growth of business. Whereas their counterparts i.e. the male entrepreneurs were observed more inclined towards profit and growth rather than relationship. They also found that female entrepreneurs were more value oriented in comparison to their counterparts. Manuere (2013) had stated that undergraduates had exhibited concern for society and asserted that entrepreneurship is better for organizations as they generate employment. Thus, it is a service to society. Despite of exhibiting concern only males were found more inclined than female students to start up a business after graduation. So finally this inclination might not be so emphatic that creating difference to observe gender as significant variable.

The origin was found insignificant as the mean scores for entrepreneurship behaviour for rural and urban young budding managers were found 3.473 and 3.391 respectively. Though the difference was more but statistically it was found insignificant. The gender equality is progressive in society but still it is male dominant society. It seems that due to the male dominance, males might perceive that they are more responsible as a family member to be main earner than their counter parts. Ramazan and Ali (2012) had conducted a research study on entrepreneurship behaviour and nomad v/s native and found that there was significant difference. This study was conducted in European countries. When comparing this to the current research the subjects have a basic difference of education can be observed. Thus, it might be the level of education affecting entrepreneurial behaviour.

CONCLUSION

Finally it can be said that there exists a deference between male and female young budding managers in terms of their entrepreneurial behavior; and no such difference was observed concerning the origin. However, study reveals that more in-depth research is required to understand the role of cultural factors in entrepreneurial behavior. Further, the study can

be replicated on a larger perspective and framework. So that policy initiatives can be extracted for entrepreneurship to pave the path for improving levels of employment, boosting the economy and quality of life via enhancing innovations.

Edwards and Muir (2005); Postigo et al. (2006); and Nurmi and Paasio (2007) had affirmed that the demand is increasing for seeking entrepreneurship education from their graduation and post graduation institutions so that students could equip themselves for better career. Further, Mahlberg (1996) had found that for inculcating entrepreneurial skills, the universities are considered to be the ideal place by the society. Therefore, it is affirmed by the researchers of this study that vigorous initiatives are required as it is a long term process. Even the government, society and seminaries combined efforts needs long term efforts to see the effect as it is a process of about 6 to 10 years to bring positive change in the society.

References

1. Ahl, H. J. (2002). *The Making of the Female Entrepreneur*. Doctoral dissertation. Jonkoping: Jonkoping International Business School.
2. Bergner, S., Auburger, J., & Paleczek, D. (2023). The why and the how: A nexus on how opportunity, risk, and personality affect entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(6), 2656-2689.
3. Bird, B. and C. Brush (2002). A Gendered Perspective on Organisational Creation, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* Vo. 26, (3), pp 41-65.
4. Brookhouse, R. H. (1982). The Psychology of Entrepreneurs, in C. A. Kent; D. L. Sexton and K. H. Vesper (eds). *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. London: Prentice Hall.
5. Brookhouse, R. H. (1998). Risk-taking Propensity of Entrepreneurs. *Academia of Management Journal*, 23 (3), 49-52.
6. Bygrave, W. D. and Minniti, M (2000). The social dynamics of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3). pp 25-36.
7. Caird, S. (1990). What Does It Mean To Be Enterprising? *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 1 (3), 27-41.
8. Carree, M. A. and Thurik, A.R. (2002). The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Economic Growth. Website <http://people.few.eur.nl/thurik/Research/Books/Thurikf.pdf>> 22 nd March, 2012.
9. Carree, M., Van Stel, A., Thurik, R., and Wennekers, S. (2002). Economic Development and Business Ownership: An Analysis Using Data of 23 OECD Countries in the Period 1976-1996. *Small Business Economics*, 19, 271-290.
10. Dana, L. P. (2000). Creating Entrepreneurs in India. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38, 86-91.
11. Drucker, Peter F. (1985). *Practice of Management*, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, India.
12. Flexner, Stuart Gerg and Leonore Cry Hauck (1983). *Random House Unabridged Dictionary* (II Edi.). New York: Random House.
13. Gartner, W.B. (1994). Where's Entrepreneurship: Finding the Definitive Definition. In G.E. Hills (ed.), *Marketing and Entrepreneurship* (25-33). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
14. Handy, F., Kassam, M. and Ramade, S. (2002). Factors Influencing Women An Entrepreneur of NGO's in India. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13, 139-54.
15. Henderson, J. and Weiler, S. (2010), Enterprise and job growth, probing the boundaries of time and space, *Economic Development Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp 23-32
16. Jangalwa, Rajesh and Vinod Mishra (2012). *Innovative Strategies for Entrepreneurship Organisations in India, Dynamics of Innovative Practices*, ISBN: 978-93-5062-183-7.
17. Jangalwa, Rajesh and Vinod Mishra (2012) *A Demographic Study of Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Young Budding Managers, 'Quality Management Practices for Global Excellence'* Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.

18. Kaulgud, Aruna (2003). Entrepreneurship Management. Bangalore: Thomson Learning.
19. Lloyd-Ellis, H. and Bernhardt, D (2000). Enterprise, Inequality and Economic Development, *Review of Economic Studies*, 67, 147-168.
20. Manimala, Mathew J. (2005). Entrepreneurship Theory at the Crossroads, Paradigms and Praxis. Biztantra, Wily Dreamtech, India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
21. Manuere, Faitira; Kizito Danha and Tasara Majoni (2013). Entrepreneurship Attitudes and Knowledge: A Survey of Fourth Year University Students. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, January 2013 (4), p-9.
22. Mishra, V.K. (2011) Factors Affecting Entrepreneurism: a Perceptual Study of B-School Students, *Review of Professional Management*, Vol. 9 (2) July-December 2011. NDIM, New Delhi. Pp 8-12.
23. Mishra, Vinod (2012) Why Entrepreneurship? A Study of Students in Professional Education, Dynamics of Innovative Practices In Management, ISBN: 978-93-5062-183-7.
24. Murugesan, R; Jayavelu, R. (2017). The Influence of Big Five Personality Traits and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intention: The Role of Gender, *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Innovation in Emerging Economies*, Vol.3, pp 41-61.
25. Wilson, F., Kickul, J., Marlino, D.,(2007). Gender, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, and Entrepreneurial Career Intentions: Implications for Entrepreneurship Education, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31, pp387-406.
26. Reynolds, P. D. (1997). Who Starts New Firms? Preliminary Explorations of Firms-Ingestion. *Small Business Economics*, 9, 449-462.
27. Reynolds, P.D., Bygrave, W.D. and Eutio, E (2004). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2003) Executive Report. Babson College, London Business School and the Kauffman Foundation.
28. Say, Jean Baptiste (1821). Political Economy (4th ed.), Translated by Prinsep C.R. (1830), John Grigg Publication, Philadelphia, USA.
29. Schoett, T. and Bager, T. (2004). Growth Expectations by Entrepreneurs in Nascent Firms, Baby Businesses and Mature Firms. In T. Bager and M. Hancock (Eds.), *The Growth of Danish Firms. Part 2 of The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, Denmark 2003* (219-230). Copenhagen: Boersens.
30. Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development, trans. B Opie, Harward University Press, Cambridge. 1961.
31. Sexton, D.L. and Kasarda. J.D. (1992), State of the Art of Entrepreneurship, PWS -Kent, Boston, MA.
32. Shane, Scott. (2012). Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research, *Academy of Management of Management Review*, Vol. 37:1, pp 10-20.
33. Shivani, S. Mukherjee, S.K. and Sharan, R. (2006). Socio Cultural Influences on Indian Entrepreneurs: The need for Appropriate Structural Interventions. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 17, 5-13.
34. Smith, Adam (1776). Wealth of Nations, W. Strahan and T.Cadell Publication, London, UK.
35. Todtling, F. and Wanzenbock, H. (2003). Regional Differences in Structural Characteristics of Start-ups. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 15, 351-370.
36. Ugun, Ramazan and Ali AKDEMİR (2012). Entrepreneurial Behaviors of Turkish Entrepreneurs: A Research about Perception and Seize of Opportunities of Turkish Entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 3 No. 15; August 2012*
37. Verheul, I. and Thurik, A. R. (2003). *Explaining the Entrepreneurial Activity Rate of Women: A Macro-level Perspective. SCALES Paper N200304*. Zoetermeer, NL.: EIM.
38. Wagner, J. (2004c). *What a Difference a Y Makes - Female and Male Nascent Entrepreneurs in Germany. IZA DP No. 1134*. Bonn, Germany: Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit.

39. Wani, VP., Garg, T. K. and Sharma, S. K. (2003). The Role of Technical Institutions in Developing a Techno-entrepreneurial Workforce for Sustainable Development of SME's in India. *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, 1, 71-88.

ANNEXURE

Test of Reliability of the Entrepreneurship Behaviour Instrument

Summary Item Statistics							
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.410	2.340	4.308	1.969	1.841	.152	54
Item Variances	1.077	.656	1.591	.935	2.424	.039	54
Inter-Item Covariances	.059	-.279	.534	.813	-1.910	.014	54

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.758	.760	54

Crosstabs

Gender * Origin Cross tabulation				
Count				
		Origin		
		Rural	Urban	Total
Gender	Male	33	59	92
	Female	20	48	68
Total		53	107	160

T-Test

Group Statistics					
	Gend	N	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
Entrepreneurship Score	Male	92	3.427	.33469	.03489
	Femal	68	3.405	.23787	.02885

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
Entrepreneurship Score	Equal variances assumed	4.858	.029	.462	158	.645	.02198	.04758	-.07199	.11595
	Equal variances not assumed			.485	157.789	.628	.02198	.04527	-.06744	.11140

** Significant at 95% confidence level.

T-Test

Group Statistics										
	Origin	N	Mean	Std.	Std.					
Entrepreneurship Score	Rural	53	3.472	.25006	.03435					
	Urban	107	3.391	.31496	.03045					
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
Entrepreneurship Score	Equal variances assumed	1.869	.174	1.647	158	.102	.08166	.04958	-.01627	.17958
	Equal variances not assumed			1.779	127.281	.078	.08166	.04590	-.00917	.17248