

1 Suman Biswas¹, Mst. Shonamoty Khatun², Md. Yasin Ali Parh³ and Dr. Md. Sazzad
2 Hossain⁴

3 ¹ Islamic University, Kushtia

4 Received: 13 December 2015 Accepted: 4 January 2016 Published: 15 January 2016

5

6 **Abstract**

7 The main objective of this study is to examine the existing situation of results of the graduate
8 students at Islamic University in Kushtia, Bangladesh as well as to identify the factors
9 associated behind this issue. An analysis has been performed by using the primary data which
10 collected form the graduate students of Islamic University under simple random sampling
11 technique. Chi-square test for dependency checking has been performed as Bivariate analysis.
12 After performing Bivariate analysis Multinomial logistic regression analysis has been
13 performed. The result of the study has revealed that the factors like SSC and HSC results of
14 the student, Parental academic qualification, Higher family income, residential in hall,
15 student's class attendance, study time without class period have a positive impact and the
16 factors like students' internet use for non-academic purpose, political status, mobile phone
17 using for non academic purpose in the University have a negative impact of students academic
18 results.

19

20 **Index terms**— academic results in cgpa, simple random sampling (without replacement) techniques, bivariate
21 analysis, multinomial logistic regression model.

22 **1 Introduction**

23 Education is considered as a first step for every human activity in the present era. It plays a vital role in the
24 development of human capital and is linked with an individual's well being and opportunities for better living
25 [1]. To be developed a country well-educated individuals are needed whose academic results and performances
26 are good. Huge number of students in Bangladesh does not get chance for higher study. However most of the
27 students who get scope for higher study cannot make good results.

28 In recent years, all the universities in Bangladesh use the CGPA system to evaluate the academic results of
29 students. The CGPA shows the average of overall grades of the semesters or years of the period a student spends
30 in the university. Most of the universities in the world are using the CGPA system for evaluating the academic
31 result of the students. For instances, teachers evaluate the academic result of the students by using the CGPA
32 system in Malaysia [2]. Also, in USA student's academic results is evaluated by making CGPA.

33 As academic result is considered as the measurement of qualification of the students, different studies have
34 been performed to find the behind reason of the academic results. Many studies have shown that different factors
35 have significant affect on academic results.

36 For example, Graetz [3] showed that one's educational success depends very strongly on socioeconomic status
37 of the parents. Alnabhan [4] observed that the lack of family support for a student is the main factor behind a low
38 level of student achievement cumulative GPA. Also, Woessmann [5] concludes that family background has strong
39 and similar effects on both Europe and the USA. He also estimates the model using a QR (Quantify Rational)
40 approach where he concludes that there is weak evidence of variation in the family background influence.

41 Not only the socio-economic status but also the educational level of the parents is an important factor for
42 making the good results. In this purposes, Aghus and Makhbul [2] observed in their study that the mothers have
43 more influence on their children academic achievements and performance. Students' performance in intermediate
44 examination is positively associated with the mother education. Also there have different variables which have
45 important effect on academic results. Among them, Al-Tamimi and Al-Shayeb [6] found that attendance, gender,
46 and semester load are the most significant variables. They also found that significant gender differences exist, with

4 B) METHODOLOGY

47 males outperforming females. Moreover, Applegate and Daly [7] used data collected from a survey of students at
48 the University of Canberra, Australia and found that there is a positive correlation with the percentage of classes
49 missed and a perception of a more negative effect of employment on grades.

50 Trained teachers are also an important fact in this case. Amitava Raychaudhuri, Manojit Debnath, Saswata
51 Sen, and Braja Gopal Majumder [8] by applying regression analysis in their study found Mother's education &
52 presence of trained teacher have a positive impact of students' academic performance.

53 In Bangladesh, the relationship between family background and student performance is not expected to be
54 different from other countries. Since the country is researches were conducted, we need to estimate the relative
55 importance of the factors. We hardly find any research on this issue in Bangladesh. However, depending on these
56 theoretical and empirical findings, we set up our statistical model and estimate the various factors that affect the
57 academic result of Islamic University students, Kushtia, Bangladesh.

58 As there are several factors that have significant affect on academic results in university level, the main
59 objective of the present study is to determine the factors that affect results (CGPA) in which information is
60 collected from Islamic University, Kushtia, Bangladesh. More specially, the objectives of the present study are ?
61 To find the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

62 ? To examine the factors that affects the academic results in university level.

63 ? To provide better suggestion.

64 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the data variables and methodology,
65 Section 3 represents analysis and results. Finally, Section 4 summarizes the conclusions of the results and gives
66 a short suggestion.

67 2 II.

68 3 Data and Methodology a) Data and Variables

69 There are total 37 numbers of public universities in Bangladesh that are being run under the University Grants
70 Commission (UGC). Islamic University, Kushtia is one of the most renowned among them which includes 22
71 departments under 5 faculties and approximately 3500 graduate students are getting their education in different
72 subjects. The data used in this study are collected primarily by the direct interview from the students. From
73 each department, by drawing simple random sampling (without replacement) techniques a total 500 number of
74 graduate students information have been collected.

75 As factors that influencing the academic performance would be determined, a large number of explanatory
76 variables have been handled in this study. The variables are classified as-

77 4 b) Methodology

78 The main objective of this study is to determine the relationship between dependent variable and independent
79 variables. To check the dependency among the variables bivariate analysis has been performed. Bivariate analysis
80 involves the analysis of two variables for the purpose of determining the empirical relationship between them [9].
81 Cross tabulation was done to find any association between two variables and was tested by chi-square. This step
82 of analysis provides us with the list of independent variables to be used in multinomial logistic regression.

83 The Multinomial Logistic regression Model is applied to determine the impact of different factors on the
84 academic results. It is the linear regression analysis to conduct when the dependent variable is nominal with more
85 than two levels. Thus it is an extension of logistic regression, which analyzes dichotomous (binary) dependents.
86 Like all linear regressions, the multinomial regression is a predictive analysis. Multinomial regression is used
87 to describe data and to explain the relationship between one dependent nominal variable and one or more
88 continuous-level (interval or ratio scale) independent variables.

89 Standard linear regression requires the dependent variable to be of continuous-level (interval or ratio) scale.
90 Logistic regression jumps the gap by assuming that the dependent variable is a stochastic event. And the
91 dependent variable describes the outcome of this stochastic event with a density function (a function of cumulated
92 probabilities ranging from 0 to 1). Statisticians then argue one event happens if the probability is less than 0.5
93 and the opposite event happens when probability is greater than 0.5.

94 In statistics, multinomial logistic regression is a classification method that generalizes logistic regression to
95 multiclass problems, i.e. with more than two possible discrete outcome [10]. That is, it is a model that is used
96 to predict the probabilities of the different possible outcomes of a categorically distributed dependent variable,
97 given a set of independent variables (which may be real-valued, binary-valued, categorical-valued, etc.).

98 Multinomial logistic regression uses a linear predictor function $(,) f k i$ to predict the probability that
99 observation i has outcome k , of the following form: $0, 1, 1, 2, 2, , , (,) ... k k i k i M k M i f k i x x x ? ? ?$
100 $= + + +$ Where $, m k k i f k i x ? =$

101 Where k ? the set of regression coefficients associated with outcome k and $i x$ (a row vector) is the set of
102 explanatory variables associated with observation i .

103 III.

104 5 Analysis and Results

105 Determined the factors that affect the academic result of students are the main theme of this study. Thus the
106 association of dependent and independent variables has been found by bivariate analysis and then the impact of
107 the factors by multinomial logistic regression model.

108 The frequencies and percentages of different explanatory variables and chi-square value and corresponding
109 P-values are given in Table 1. From Table 1 it is concluded that Faculty name of the respondents, Birth place,
110 SSC result of the respondents, HSC result of the respondents, Parents academic qualification, Family income,
111 Residential status, Internet use for non-academic purposes, Political status, Study time (without class period),
112 Type of study, Class attendance, Using mobile phone for nonacademic purpose have significant effect on Academic
113 results at 1 percent and 5 percent level of significance. Also parent's occupations are significant at 10 percent
114 level of significance.

115 6 Volume XVI Issue I Version I

116 Finally to examine the effect of explanatory variables on academic result multivariate multinomial logistic
117 regression models are fitted to the data considering all the explanatory variables found significant at 1 and
118 5 percent level of significance in bivariate analysis. The results are shown in the Table 2. The results of Table
119 2 give the estimates of the logistic regression coefficients corresponding to the explanatory variables and their
120 relative odds ratio for each categories of the variable. In logistic regression the interpretation is done in terms of
121 odds ratio. Odds ratios are used to compare the relative odds of two groups. In this study the categories of each
122 variable compare with the reference category.

123 7 Family income

124 In Table 2 the Odds ratio under faculty indicates that in Science faculty the chance of poor result (less than 3)
125 is 1.079 times more likely than the Business faculty compared to the good result (above 3.5). In Arts faculty
126 the chance of poor result is 0.202 times than the Business faculty and the result is significant at 10 percent level
127 of significance. Similarly, the chances of medium result (3-3.5) in Science and Arts faculties are 0.696 and 0.548
128 times respectively likely than the Business faculty and the results are not significant. Students born in urban
129 have the chance of getting poor result 0.720 times than that of the rural but urban students have 1.196 times
130 chances of getting medium result than the rural students. Thus the rural students make poor result more than
131 the urban students. This may be due to the lack of facilities of education of rural students.

132 The odds ratio under SSC result of the respondent shows that in medium result (less than 4) of SSC the
133 chance of poor result is highly significant and 15.417 times more likely than the very good result (above 4.5)
134 and in good result (4-4.5) the chance of poor result is 0.414 times than the very good result. That is, students
135 who got medium result in SSC have the greater chance to get poor result in university level compared to the
136 good and very good result in SSC. Similarly, in medium result (less than 4) the chance of medium result in
137 university level is significant and 4.241 times more likely than the very good result (above 4.5) and in good result
138 (4-4.5) the chance of getting medium result is 1.306 times than the very good result. The odds ratio under
139 HSC result of the respondent shows that in medium result (less than 4) the chance of poor result in university
140 level is highly significant and 7.090 times more likely than the very good result (above 4.5) and in good result
141 (4-4.5) the chance of poor result is significantly 3.728 times than the very good result. That is, students who got
142 medium result in HSC have the greater chance to get poor result in university level compared to the good and
143 very good result in HSC. Similarly, in medium result (less than 4) the chance of medium result in university level
144 is significant and 3.147 times more likely than the very good result (above 4.5) and in good result (4-4.5) the
145 chance of getting medium result is 3.299 times than the very good result and the results are found significant.
146 The odds ratio under the father's academic qualification reveals that in Primary education the chance of poor
147 result is significant and 0.116 times likely than the higher education compared to the chance of good result. In no
148 education and secondary education the chances of poor result are 0.590 and 0.802 times respectively. Similarly,
149 in Primary education the chance of medium result is highly significant and 0.128 times likely than the higher
150 education compared to the chance of good result. In no education and secondary education the chances of poor
151 result are 2.077 and 2.563 times more likely than the higher education respectively. The odds ratio under the
152 mother's academic qualification shows that in Primary and secondary education the chances of poor result are
153 significant and 0.025 and 0.032 times more likely than the higher education compared to the chance of good
154 result. In no education the chance of poor result is 0.241 times than the higher education. Similarly, in Primary
155 and secondary education of mother the chances of poor result are highly significant and 0.068 and 0.023 times
156 more likely than the higher education compared to the chance of good result.

157 The result under family income shows that in less than 10000 the chance of poor result is 2.248 times more
158 likely than the above 20000 and in 10000-20000 the chance of poor result is significant and 7.982 times more
159 likely than the above 20000. Moreover, in less than 10000 the chance of medium result is 0.541 times more likely
160 than the above 20000 and in 10000-20000 the chance is 1.070 times more likely than the above 20000. The result
161 under residential status shows that in hall the chance of poor result is 0.977 times than in mess. Also the students
162 who stay in family have a highly significant effect on poor result and the chance is 21.100 times more likely than
163 the students stay in mess. Similarly, the chance of medium result of students who stay in family is found highly

8 CONCLUSION

164 significant and 7.7040 times and the chance of medium result who stay in hall is 1.128 times more likely than that
165 of the students stay in mess.

166 The odds ratio under Internet use for nonacademy purposes indicates that the chance of poor result who use
167 internet for non-academic purposes less than 10 (hrs/week) is found significant and 3.501 times more likely than
168 more than 10 (hrs/week). But the chance of medium result is not significant at all. The odds ratio under political
169 status shows that it has a negative and highly significant effect on results. The result shows that the chance of
170 poor result in no politics is 0.016 times and in less than 10 (hrs/week) is 0.034 times likely the more than 10
171 (hrs/week). Also the Factors that Affect the Academic Results: A Case Study of Islamic University, Kushtia,
172 Bangladesh chance of medium result in no politics is 0.048 and in less than 10 (hrs/week) is 0.101 times likely
173 the more than 10 (hrs/week). The odds ratio under study time without class period reveals that the chances of
174 poor results in less than 10 and 10-20(hrs/week) are found highly significant and 164.96 and 98.297 times more
175 likely than more than 30 (hrs/week). That is, the students who study less time have the more chance to get the
176 poor result. Similarly, the chance of medium result is significant in less than 10, 10-20 and 20-30 (hrs/week) and
177 the results are 11.923, 43.318 and 8.047 times respectively more likely than the more than 30 (hrs/week). The
178 students who read hand note only have more chance to get poor result than who read book and both hand note
179 and book and the result is significant and it is 573.93 times more likely than who read both hand note and book.
180 Similarly, the chance of getting medium result is significant and it is 5.977 times more likely than who read both
181 hand note and book. Also the students who have less than 80 percent class attendance have more probability
182 to get the poor result and it is 14.970 times more likely than the above 90 percent class attendance. Students
183 who use mobile phone less than 5 (hrs/week) have a negative impact on poor and medium result than who use
184 mobile phone more than 5 (hrs/week).

185 IV.

186 8 Conclusion

187 The study examines the factors of results of the graduate students by using the primary data which is collected
188 from the graduate students of Islamic University, Kushtia, Bangladesh under simple random sampling technique.
189 Both bivariate and Multinomial Logistic regression analyses have been performed to identify the important factors
190 that affect the academic results. The results show that there are many factors that affect the academic result.

191 In Multinomial logistic regression analysis it is found that the factors such as Arts faculty, Medium result in
192 SSC, Medium and Good result in HSC, Father education of Primary level, Mother education of Primary and
193 Secondary level, Family income of between 10000 to 20000, Residential status at Family, Political status of No
194 politics and Less than 10 (hrs/wk), Type of study of Handnote, Class attendance of Less than 80 percent, Mobile
195 phone using status of Less than 5 (hrs/wk) have significant effect on getting Poor result. Also Medium result
196 in SSC, Medium and Good result in HSC, Father education of Primary level, Mother education of Primary and
197 Secondary level, Residential status at Family, Political status of No politics and Less than 10 (hrs/wk), Type of
198 study of Handnote, Mobile phone using status of Less than 5 (hrs/wk) have significant effect on getting medium
199 result.

200 It is revealed that the students who do not involve in politics they can show good performance on the academic
201 results than who spend more time for political purpose. Furthermore, the students who do not spend more time
202 in mobile phone and internet for non academic purpose they can also show good performance than who spend
203 more time for these non academic purposes and the students who have above 90 percent class attendance and
204 study above 30 hours per week their academic result performance is better than the other categories of these
205 factors. Also the factors such as father's occupation, staying in hall, and SSC & HSC results of the students,
206 education level of their parents, higher family income have positive impact on the academic results of the students
207 in Islamic University, Kushtia.

208 Finally it can be declared that if we maximize the quality and facilities of the factors that have positive impact
209 on academic results and minimize the negative factors that are main constraints then the academic performance
210 of the students in Islamic University should be good. ¹



Figure 1: ?

8 CONCLUSION

1

Factors	CGPA						P-value
Independent variables	Poor (< 3)	Medium (3-3.5)	Good (> 3.5)	?	2		
Faculty Name of the respondent							
Science	29(41.4%)	114(38.1%)	69(52.7%)				
Arts	23(32.9%)	124(41.5%)	45(34.4%)	10.831	0.029		
Business	18(25.7%)	61(20.4%)	17(13.0%)				
Gender							
Male	36(51.4%)	169(56.5%)	71(54.2%)	0.667	0.716		
Female	34(48.6%)	130(43.5%)	60(45.8%)				
Religion							
Muslim	49(70.0%)	235(78.6%)	109(83.2%)				
Hindu	21(30.0%)	63(21.1%)	22(16.8%)	5.444	0.245		
Others	0(0.0%)	1(0.3%)	0(0.0%)				
Birth place							
Urban	17(24.3%)	110(36.8%)	29(22.1%)	10.923	0.004		
Rural	53(75.7%)	189(63.2%)	102(77.9%)				
SSC result of the respondents							
Medium(Less than 4)	26(37.1%)	57(19.1%)	12(9.2%)				
Good (4-4.5)	11(15.7%)	66(22.1%)	46(35.1%)	29.109	0.000		
Very Good (above 4.5)	33(47.1%)	176(58.9%)	73(55.7%)				
HSC result of the respondents							
Medium(Less than 4)	23(32.9%)	57(19.1%)	29(22.1%)				
Good (4-4.5)	20(28.6%)	88(29.4%)	20(15.3%)	17.555	0.002		
Very Good (above 4.5)	27(38.6%)	154(51.5%)	82(62.6%)				
Father's academic qualification							
No education	5(7.1%)	29(9.7%)	4(3.1%)				
Primary	31(44.3%)	76(25.4%)	50(38.2%)	17.478	0.008		
Secondary	14(20.0%)	67(22.4%)	26(19.8%)				
Higher	20(28.6%)	127(42.5%)	51(38.9%)				
Father's occupation							
Job	22(31.4%)	104(34.8%)	53(40.5%)				
Business	22(31.4%)	78(26.1%)	19(14.5%)	9.380	0.052		
Farmer	26(37.1%)	117(39.1%)	59(45.0%)				
Mother's academic qualification							
No education	32(45.7%)	108(36.1%)	36(27.5%)				
Primary	16(22.9%)	73(24.4%)	54(41.2%)	29.881	0.000		
Secondary	20(28.6%)	82(27.4%)	39(29.8%)				
Higher	2(2.9%)	36(12.0)	2(1.5%)				
Mother's occupation							
House wife	64(91.4%)	268(89.6%)	126(96.2%)	5.084	0.079		
Job	6(8.6%)	31(10.4%)	5(3.8%)				

[Note: s- Year 2016]

Figure 2: Table 1 :

Factors	Poor result (Less than 3)		Medium result (3-3.5)	
	Coefficient	Odds Ratio	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Faculty Name of the respondent				
Science	0.076	1.079	-0.362	0.696
Arts	-1.600	0.202*	-0.601	0.548
Business				
Birth place				
Urban	-0.329	0.720	0.179	1.196
Rural				
SSC result of the respondents				
Medium (Less than 4)	2.736	15.417***	1.486	4.421**
Good (4-4.5) Very Good (above 4.5)	-0.883	0.414	0.267	1.306
HSC result of the respondents Medium (3.5-3.99) Good (4-4.5)	1.959	7.090***	1.147	3.147**
Very Good (above 4.5)	1.316	3.728**	1.194	3.299***
Father's academic qualification				11
No education	-0.528	0.590	0.731	2.077
Primary Secondary Higher Mother's academic qualification	-2.157	0.116**	-2.053	0.128***
No education	-0.221	0.802	0.941	2.563
Primary Secondary Higher Family income	-1.422	0.241	-1.709	0.181
Less than 10000 10000-20000	-3.703	0.025**	-2.682	0.068***
Above 20000 Residential status Hall	-3.429	0.032***	-3.760	0.023***
	0.810	2.248	-0.614	0.541
	2.077	7.982**	0.068	1.070
	-0.023	0.977	0.121	1.128
Family Mess	3.049	21.100***	2.042	7.7040*** (G)
Internet use for non-academy (hrs/week)	-1.530	0.217	-0.890	0.411
Not use Less than 10	1.253	3.501*	0.561	1.752
Greater than 10 Political status(hrs/week)	-4.128	0.016***	-3.038	0.048***
No politics Less than 10	-3.373	0.034***	-2.292	0.101**
Greater than 10 Study without class period (hrs/week)	5.106	164.96***	2.478	11.923***
Less than 10 Between 10 to 20 Between 20 to 30	4.588	98.297***	3.769	43.318***
Greater than 30 Type of study	0.887	2.428	2.085	8.047***
Hand note Book Book & hand notes	6.353	573.93***	1.788	5.977***
Class attendance (%) Less than 80	1.814	6.134	-0.384	0.681
	2.706	14.970**	0.770	2.159
Between 80 to 90	1.183	3.263	1.228	3.413
Above 90				
Mobile phone using status (hrs/week)				
Less than 5	-2.914	0.054**	-2.378	0.093**
Between(5-14)	-0.815	0.443	-0.607	0.545

[Note: Factors that Affect the Academic Results: A Case Study of Islamic University, Kushtia, Bangladesh above 14 ? ***/**/* indicates significant at 1% / 5% / 10% respectively ? Last category in each variables indicates the reference category ? Among the results good result is the reference category.]

Figure 3: Table 2 :

211 [Agus and Makhbul ()] 'An empirical study on academic achievement of business students' in pursuing higher
212 education: An emphasis on the influence of family backgrounds'. Agus , Z K Makhbul . *Paper presented at*
213 *International Conference on the Challenges of Learning and Teaching in a Brave New World: Issues and*
214 *Opportunities in Borderless Education*, (Hatyai Thailand) 2002.

215 [Greene ()] 'Boston: Pearson Education. 803-806'. William H Greene . *Econometric Analysis*, 2012. (Seventh
216 edition)

217 [Al-Nabhan ()] 'Developing a tool to measure the satisfaction degree in Educational faculty in Muta'a University'.
218 M Al-Nabhan . *Educational Research center Journal* 2001. 10 (20) p. .

219 [Al-Tamimi and Shayeb ()] 'Factors affecting student performance in the introductory finance course'. H Al-
220 Tamimi , A Shayeb . *Journal of Economic & Administrative Sciences* 2002. 18 (2) p. .

221 [Raychaudhuri et al. ()] 'Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance: A case study in Agartala Municipal
222 Council Area'. Amitava Raychaudhuri , Manojit Debnath , Saswata Sen , Braja Gopal , Majumder .
223 *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology* 2010. 7 (2) p. .

224 [Woessmann ()] *How Equal Are Educational Opportunities? Family Background and Student Achievement in*
225 *Europe and the United States. CESifo Working Paper 1162*, Ludger Woessmann . 2004. Munich: CESifo.

226 [Graetz (ed.) ()] *Socioeconomic Status in Education Research and Policy*, B Graetz . Ainley, J, Graetz, B., Long,
227 M. and Batten, M. (ed.) 1995. Canberra: DEET/ACER. (Social economic Status and School Education)

228 [Applegate and Daly ()] 'The impact of paid work on the academic performance of students: A case student
229 from the University of Canberra'. C Applegate , A Daly . *Australian Journal of Education* 2006. 50 p. .

230 [Battle and Lewis ()] 'The increasing significance of class: The relative effects of race and socioeconomic status
231 on academic achievement'. J Battle , M Lewis . *Journal of Poverty* 2002. 6 (2) p. .

232 [Earl and Babbie ()] *The practice of social research*, R Earl , Babbie . 2009. Wadsworth Publishing. (12 th
233 edition)