AN EXPLORATION OF CAMPUS ENGAGEMENT OF STUDENTS RESIDING ON CAMPUS AND STUDENTS THAT COMMUTE

Kimberley G. Morrow

An Exploration of Campus Engagement of Students Residing on Campus and Students that Commute

A Field Study

Presented to

The College of Graduate Studies

Austin Peay State University

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Education Specialist

Kimberley G. Morrow

August 2011

To the College of Graduate Studies:

We are submitting a field study written by Kimberley G. Morrow entitled "An Exploration of Campus Engagement of Students Residing on Campus and Students that Commute." We have examined the final copy of this field study for form and content. We recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Educational Specialist.

Research/Committee Advisor/Chair

Committee Member

Committee Member

Accepted for the council

Dean, College of Graduate Studies

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for an Education Specialist Degree at Austin Peay State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

Permission for extensive quotation or reproduction of this field study may be granted by my major professor, or in her absence, by the Head of the Inter-Library Services. Any copying or the use of the material in this field study for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature: Intuley Morrow

Date: 220//

DEDICATION

"And whatever things you ask in prayer, believing, you will receive." Matthew 21:22

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my mother, Ollie, who has always pushed me to achieve and prayed for my success and to my sister, Candice, and my nephews, Gabriel and Matthew, who helped me laugh when I wanted to throw in the towel. I could not have done this without you.

I would like to thank my advisor and committee chairperson, Dr. Tammy Shutt, for her assistance in this process. I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Stewart and Dr. Luck, for their assistance. A special thanks to Dr. Roger Wiemers and Dr. Lilian Obi for their SPSS assistance.

ABSTRACT

KIMBERLEY G. MORROW. An Exploration of Campus Engagement of Students Residing on Campus and Students that Commute (under the direction of DR. TÄMMY SHUTT).

The purpose of this study was to examine if there were any differences between students residing on campus and commuter students' level of engagement. Overall satisfaction with the university was also investigated to determine if there were differences based on gender, age, ethnicity, and enrollment status. Engagement was measured using five benchmarks: academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, activecollaborative learning, supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience. The participants were freshmen and seniors who participated in the 2006, 2007, and 2009 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement. Descriptive statistics, t-tests, and ANOVA were used to test ten null hypotheses at the .01 level of confidence. Based on the t-tests it was determined that there were significant differences between the two groups of students in the areas of academic challenge, supportive campus environment, and active-collaborative learning. The analyses of variance did not yield any significant difference in the students' overall experience with the university based on gender, age, ethnicity, or enrollment status.

Table of Content

Chapter

I.	Introduction	1
	Statement of the problem	1
	Purpose of the study	2
	Significance of the study	3
	Research questions	3
	Hypotheses	4
	Limitations	5
	Delimitation	5
	Assumptions	6
	Definitions of terms	6
II.	Literature review	8
	Theoretical perspective	8
	Involvement and student success	9
	Five dimensions of student engagement	. 13
	Level of academic challenge	. 13
	Student-faculty interactions	. 14
	Supportive campus environment	. 15
	Active and collaborative learning	. 15
	Enriching educational experiences	. 16
	Students residing on campus.	. 16
	Commuter students	. 18
III.	Methodology	. 21
	Overview	. 21
	Participants	. 22
	Instrument	. 22
	Data analysis plan	. 27
	Validity and reliability	. 29
IV.	Findings	. 31
	Research question one	. 31

	Level of academic challenge	. 32
	Student-faculty interaction	
	Active collaborative learning	
	Supportive campus environment	34
	Enriching educational experience	35
	Research question two	36
	Research question three	37
	Overall satisfaction and gender	37
	Overall satisfaction and enrollment status	38
	Overall satisfaction and ethnicity	39
	Overall satisfaction and age	41
V.	Conclusions	 43
	Research question one	44
	Research question two	45
	Research question three	45
	Recommendations for further study	46
	References	47
	Appendices	55
	Appendix A: Internal Review Board Approval	55
	Appendix R: National Survey of Student Engagement Surveys	64

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

According to a report by the State Higher Education Executive Officers in 2005, the United States no longer leads the developed world in college completion rates.

Institutions of higher education are being held more accountable by the federal government and policy makers to improve graduation rates (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). This trend in higher education has increased focus on student success and retention (Astin, 2006). This focus begins the moment the student applies for admission and continues through his or her transition from high school to college with a focus on graduation.

According to Tinto (2006) there are five conditions that influence/effect retention: advice, support, expectation, learning, and involvement. Successful institutions supply students with clear and consistent information about institution's requirements. These institutions effectively advise students about programs of study and future career goals. Support is also key to retention. Institutions should provide academic, social, and personal support to students. High expectations are an important condition of student success. Students are more likely to persist and graduate in educational settings that expect them to succeed. Learning has always been key to student retention. Students who learn and are actively engaged in the learning process persist. Institutions that are successful in fostering settings that educate their students are successful in retaining their students. Involvement is a condition that supports student retention. Institutions that

support and facilitate opportunities for both academic and social involvement have students who persist and graduate (Tinto, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore any variations between students residing on campus and commuters as they relate to the Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and involvement trends for both student groups. These benchmarks are based on 42 key questions from the NSSE survey that assess many critical aspects of the student experience. These benchmarks are: level of academic challenge; student-faculty interaction; active-collaborative learning; supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2009)

Recent research has focused on the effects of specialized housing on student success and engagement (Price & Lee, 2005; Eck, Edge, & Stephenson, 2007).

According to Horn and Berktold (1998), approximately 86% of college and university students are defined as commuters. In light of this, the question becomes - Are commuters less engaged than students who live on campus? The answer to this question is important in insuring that all students gain the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to live self sufficient, responsible, productive lives after college and gain the most benefit from their college career.

Significance of the Study

This study replicates and extends research conducted by Cobbs (2008) in which student engagement was explored with traditional and nontraditional students. The research described in this study explores engagement based on the participant's type of residence or living environment. This research can be used to create policies to encourage students to reside on campus. It could also influence the development of specialized programs designed to engage and involve students in the campus environment. The findings would identify any unique needs of commuter students and provide the campus community with information which could be used to create programs and initiatives to address those needs.

Research Questions

The following research questions were generated to guide the study.

- 1. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) student-faculty interaction, (c) active-collaborative learning, (d) supportive campus environment, and (e) enriching educational experience?
- 2. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university?
- 3. Does overall satisfaction with the university differ for students residing on campus and commuters based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b)

enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student)?

Hypotheses

- There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the level of academic challenge benchmark.
- 2. There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the student-faculty interaction benchmark.
- 3. There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the active-collaborative learning benchmark.
- 4. There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the supportive campus environment benchmark.
- 5. There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the enriching educational experience benchmark.
- 6. There is no statistically significant difference in students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university.

- 7. There is no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction with the university of students residing on campus and commuters based on gender.
- 8. There is no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction with the university of students residing on campus and commuters based on enrollment status.
- There is no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction with the university of students residing on campus and commuters based on race/ethnicity.
- 10. There is no statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction with the university of students residing on campus and commuters based on age (traditional/nontraditional student).

Limitations

The study was based on these limitations:

- The data are based on a single institution comprised of approximately 10,000 students.
- 2. There is no knowledge of pre college attributes of involvement.

Delimitation

The study was subject to the following;

 The study is delimited to the freshman taking the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2006, 2007, and 2009.

Assumptions

The study was based on these assumptions:

- The students participating in the NSSE in 2006, 2007, and 2009 answered the questions honestly.
- 2. The students who completed the NSSE in 2006, 2007, and 2009 did so voluntarily.

Definitions of Terms

- Benchmark/Dimensions- the areas measured by the NSSE instrument (i.e. academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, active-collaborative learning, supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience).
- Commuter any student not residing in facilities provided through the Department of Housing/Residence Life and Dining Services.
- 3. Engagement (term will be used interchangeably with "involvement": the energy and time students devote to academic and social activities (Astin, 1999).
- 4. Enrollment Status- Full time status is 12 credit hours or more. Part time is 11 credit hours or less.
- 5. National Survey of Student Engagement- the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was designed to examine the degree to which students are actively engaged in programs and activities that institutions provide for learning and personal development. The instrument consists of 80 questions and

participating colleges and universities administer the survey to students classified as freshmen and seniors.

- 6. Nontraditional student- student who is 24 years of age or older.
- 7. Resident a student who resides in facilities provided through the Department of Housing/Residence Life and Dining Services.
- 8. Traditional student- student who is less than 24 years of age.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Theoretical Perspective

A set of theories, commonly referred to as the College Impact Models of Student Change, concentrate on the "environmental and inter-individual origins of student change... [and] emphasize change associated with the characteristics of the institutions students attend (between-college effects) or with the experiences students have while enrolled (within-college effects)" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005, p. 18). These theories include Pascarella's General Model for Assessing Change and Astin's Theory of "Involvement" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Each theorist outlines concepts which can impact retention and overall student satisfaction.

Pascarella's General Model for Assessing Change incorporates five key sets of variables examining direct and indirect effects of student change: student background/precollege traits, structural/organizational characteristics of institution, institutional environment, interactions with agents of socialization, and quality of student effort (Perozzi, 2009). According to Pascarella, these five variables explain changes in students' learning and cognitive development (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). A student's success is a function of the direct and indirect interaction of these variables.

According to Involvement Theory (Astin, 1999) a highly involved student is one who devotes considerable energy to academics, spends much time on campus, participates in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty and other

students. This theory suggests that the student plays an integral role in determining his or her own degree of involvement in college classes, extracurricular activities and social activities. Astin also listed factors which can greatly impact student involvement. He stated that residing on campus is "probably the most important and pervasive environmental influence on the student's persistence in school" (Astin, 1999). Astin maintained that the student who resides on campus spends time within the university community. These students have greater opportunity to interact with faculty, join student groups, become involved in hall government, or join a sorority or fraternity and are generally more engaged in the college experience. Research has supported the principles of Astin's theory (Baker, 2008; Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2008; Schuetz, 2008) showing that the aforementioned activities attributed greatly to the student's chances of graduating and developing more on a personal level.

Involvement and Student Success

Kuh et al. (2008) examined the relationship between specific student behaviors and the practices and conditions the institution utilizes to foster student success and the effects of participating in educationally purposeful activities on students from different racial backgrounds. The researchers discovered that participation in educationally purposeful activities was positively related to academic outcomes. They found that first year students who participated in such activities had higher GPAs. The activities were also positively related to persistence between the first and second year of college. In addition, the research indicated that effects of such educational practices and participation

to be even greater for lower ability students and students of color compared to white students.

Students who are intensely involved in activities during their first year of college reported better friendship qualities and lower rates of loneliness and dissatisfaction.

Those students who become involved in organizations for social reasons were more likely to report having a best friend following their transition to college (Bohnert, Aikins, & Edidin, 2007). These friendships were found to have a positive effect on students' transition into college and overall satisfaction with their college experience.

Although a significant amount of the research regarding the relationship between involvement and student success focused on involvement at the four year institution level, research regarding student involvement at the community college level yielded similar results. Schuetz (2008) found that among adult students at a community college, early involvement trends were similar to those students at four year institutions. The findings also supported the importance of interactions and a supportive campus environment.

Research indicated that not only is involvement a personal benefit for students, it also had a positive effect on the off campus community (Eklund-Leen and Young, 1997). In research investigating the attitudes of student organization members and nonmembers and their involvement in campus and community events, Eklund-Leen and Young (1997) found that involvement in student organizations enhances the educational outcomes for

an institution. They also found that students who were highly involved on campus tended toward high involvement in the community.

Demographic factors have been found to influence student engagement and involvement. Research indicated (Baker, 2008) ethnicity plays a role in student involvement. When investigating the role of involvement in student organizations for minority students, the type of organization plays a key role. Depending on the type of organization, there could be positive or negative results on student success. Fischer (2007) explored racial/ethnic differences in college involvement and successful student outcomes and found that predictors of college grades appeared to vary considerably by race/ethnic group. For minority students, greater involvement in formal social activities, such as clubs and organizations, was positively related to college grades and overall satisfaction. Involvement in extracurricular activities appeared to have a positive relationship with academic success regardless of the achievement level of the student (Wiggan , 2008).

Females outnumber males in higher education (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Research indicated that attitudes and means of engagement differ based on gender (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Utilizing NSSE survey results to determine predictors for personal and cognitive growth, Belcheir (2001) found that women reported feeling they had experienced more personal growth while in college. However, the males reported having experienced more cognitive growth. Research by Halawah (2006) supported these results and suggested that this difference in growth could be due to a female tendency of

establishing close relationships with faculty more so than their male counterparts. These studies also lend support for positive correlation between engagement/involvement and psychosocial development. Foubert and Grainger (2006) found that among freshmen and senior students, the more involved students reported greater development of autonomy and interdependence than uninvolved students. They also found that the more involved students reported greater clarity of purpose as outlined by Chickering and Reisser's (1993) six vectors.

Although a large body of research suggested a positive relationship between involvement in campus activities and student success (Price & Lee, 2005; Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2007; Kuh et al, 2008; Arboleda, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen, 2003; Astin, 1999; Astin, 2006; Baker, 2008), some researchers have found the opposite to be true. Yin and Lei (2007) investigated the impact of involvement in campus activities and organizations on the achievement and satisfaction of students enrolled in a hospitality program. Based on survey analysis regarding their involvement with groups and organizations on campus, Yin and Lei found that hospitality students who participated in campus activities had lower academic achievement than students who did not participate in campus activities. In examining the amount of campus involvement and overall student satisfaction, the researchers did not find a positive relationship between more involvement and increased student satisfaction. However, the research indicated inter-correlations among student satisfaction in campus activities, continuous active

organization participation, and organization suggestions to friends were positively related and statistically significant (Yin & Lei, 2007).

Five Dimensions of Student Engagement

The National Survey of Student Engagement is a survey administered through Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, in cooperation with the Indiana University Center for Survey Research and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). The survey provides data to colleges and universities which can be used to improve undergraduate education, as well as for state accountability and accreditation efforts. NSSE is organized according to five benchmarks of effective practice and which research studies have shown are linked to desired college outcomes (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2009). The dimensions of engagement are as follows: level of academic challenge; student-faculty interactions; active-collaborative learning; supportive campus environment; and enriching educational experience (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007).

Level of academic challenge

Level of academic challenge refers to the importance of academic effort and setting high expectations for student performance (Kezar, 2006). According to the National Survey of Student Engagement (2007) colleges and universities can foster high academic challenge for their students by creating intellectually challenging and creative work for the students to participate. "Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by emphasizing the importance of academic effort and setting high

expectations for student performance" (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007, para 10).

Student-faculty interactions

Student interaction with faculty members is the amount and nature of time spent by students in and out of the classroom with faculty (Kezar, 2006). According to the National Survey of Student Engagement (2007, para 9), "students see first-hand how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, life-long learning." Kuh et al. (2007) stated that not only are interactions with faculty and staff members important in a student's success, but peer interactions and relationships also play a role. These relationships have been found to play a major role particularly in a new student's transition into college (Wilcox, Winn, & Fyvie-Gauld, 2005). Research has found this to be particularly true for African American and Hispanic students with more ties to professors. These students had more positive ratings of their overall college satisfaction (Fischer, 2007).

Positive social support assists a student in developing a sense of belonging with the college environment. Establishing compatible friendships with peers is essential to retention (Wilcox et al., 2007). Swenson, Nordstrom, and Hiester (2008), found that not only do new peer friendships assist students in their adjustment to the campus environment, but also effects feelings of isolation from peers and poor academic and emotional adjustment. Research has demonstrated that these interactions are not just

important to students transitioning from high school to college, but continue to be important beyond the freshman year. Sanchez-Leguilinel (2008) found that a supportive relationship with peers also improves retention for sophomore students.

Supportive campus environment

The supportive campus environment benchmark is based on the idea that students perform better at colleges that demonstrate their commitment to student success and where collaborative relationships exist on campus to ensure student success (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007). Kezar (2006) found that institutional size influences this benchmark. At larger institutions programs are created to "breakdown" the university into smaller, yet interlocking pieces. At smaller institutions, Kezar found that faculty, staff, and students, rather than programs, tended to be the focal point for support.

Active and collaborative learning

Active and collaborative learning is based on the idea that students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and are asked to think, process, and apply what they are learning to different situations and settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily during and after college (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007).

Enriching educational experiences

According to National Survey of Student Engagement (2007), enriching educational experiences is one in which learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom operate in conjunction with the academic program.

Experiencing diversity teaches students valuable things about themselves and other cultures. Used appropriately, technology facilitates learning and promotes collaboration between peers and instructors. Internships, community service, and senior capstone courses provide students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful and, ultimately, more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are (National Survey of Student Engagement. 2007, para. 23).

Students Residing on Campus

Residing on campus has been found to be socially and academically beneficial for college students and a key (Astin, 1999). There are many factors which can influence a student's involvement in residence hall activities and programs. Arboleda, et al. (2003) found that male students expressed a stronger sense of community and belonging through common experiences and regular interactions with peers. Majority students were also more involved than the minority students in their study and seniors were less involved than all other demographics in the study. Arboleda et al. (2003) also found satisfaction in the residence hall and contact with hall personnel to be factors in student involvement. Students who reported being more satisfied with the structure of their hall's community

and having a contact with hall staff were more involved in the activities and programs offered within the hall. The latter lends support to the importance of student-faculty interactions, showing that positive interactions with university personnel in any capacity contribute to a student's satisfaction.

The residence hall community has been compared to a family in that it comprises rules, boundaries and an atmosphere of care and concern for others (Enochs & Roland, 2006). When exploring issues of social adjustment of students residing on campus, specifically in living and learning communities, some researchers have found that both males and female students had a significantly better than of social adjustment (Enochs & Roland). These findings demonstrate that even for those students residing on campus, the more involved the housing environment the more benefit to the student.

Living on campus has been found to have an effect on students' openness to diversity (Pike, 2009). It has been argued that progress in students' openness to diversity is related to opportunities for positive interactions among diverse groups of students. It is argued that in order for students to make substantial progress in the areas of tolerance and openness to diversity, students need the opportunity to interact with students of diverse backgrounds. Residence halls provide the environment to facilitate students' interactions with diverse peers. The gains involved with this type of environment are significantly more substantial depending on the type of residence hall environment. Living and learning communities typically encourage programming designed to enhance students' exposure to diverse populations and ideas (Pike).

Commuter Students

Commuters are defined as students not living in housing provided by the institution. Approximately 86% of college and university students fall into this category (Jacoby & Garland, 2004). Due to the increase in privatized housing, commuters are not as easily distinguished from students living on campus for some institutions. The demand for university operated housing has led some institutions to work with private developers to create off campus housing options for students. Despite the trend toward privatized housing, commuters continue to be the body of students for which home and campus are not synonymous (Jacoby & Garland).

Commuter students include traditionally aged full-time students who live at home with their parents, students living in rental housing near campus, students, adult students with careers, and students who are parents. For students residing on campus, being a student is the primary role. This is not always the case for the commuter student.

Commuters often balance academics with being a spouse, a parent, a career, and caretaking among others (Jacoby & Garland, 2004). This indicates that commuters are a diverse group facing many challenges that students residing on campus do not.

Commuter students often struggle with "fitting in" to the campus community.

This is particularly evident with first year students. Due to the fact that a commuter student's primary point of contact with peers is the classroom, he or she often finds it difficult to meet peers. The residence halls provide students residing on campus the opportunity to live, eat, study, and socialize with their fellow residents. This integration

of daily activities and proximity affords these students the opportunity to make friends and become socially integrated into the campus community (Tenhouse, n.d.).

Consequently, commuting is negatively related to attainment of a bachelor's degree and enrollment in graduate school (Astin, 1999).

Peer group interaction positively affects critical thinking skills, cultural awareness, leadership development, and academic development (Astin, 1999) in college students. According to Astin, as a result of not living in housing provided by the university or spending a considerable amount of time on campus, commuter students miss opportunities to "connect" to the university and other students; consequently, their learning and development are affected.

Often the assumption is made that commuter students are apathetic and are not interested in attending campus events (University Of Akron, n.d.). Jacoby and Garland (2004) explored research regarding the needs of commuter students and developed specific strategies designed to promote commuter student success. Krause (2007) investigated commuter students and their social involvement with peers during the early months of their time in college. As previous research has shown (Bohnert, et al., 2007) connections made early in the first year of a student's college career are very important. Krause (2007) also found that the more formal, in class setting tended not to be a place where substantial interactions took place. Students reported feeling uncomfortable during the first few weeks of the semester not having someone to sit with during lectures. Other

students avoided talking to others in class because they did not feel it was an appropriate setting to talk to peers.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Overview

This chapter discusses the research methods used to analyze the data for this study. The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there are differences between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement at a midsize southeastern state university. The study also explored whether there are differences between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with a midsize southeastern state university. This work also investigated differences between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university in regard to the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student). The following research questions guide this study:

- 1. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement: (1) level of academic challenge, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) active-collaborative learning, (4) supportive campus environment, and (5) enriching educational experience?
- 2. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university?

3. Does the overall satisfaction for students residing on campus and commuters differ based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student)?

Participants

The participants consisted of 2271 college freshmen and seniors who completed the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey in spring semester 2006, 2007, and 2009. This number represents a 10% reduction in the total number of survey participants for the 2006, 2007, and 2009 to exclude those participants who did not respond to questions regarding their current living environment. Permission was obtained from the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to use the archival data. The participants in this study were not identified or approached, and were not directly involved.

Instrument

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was designed to examine the degree to which students are actively engaged in programs and activities that institutions provide for learning and personal development. The survey was administered by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) following the guidelines outlined by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (CPR). CPR serves as host for the National Survey of Student Engagement (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2010). The survey is administered to freshmen and seniors at hundreds of colleges and universities in the United States (Kuh, 2003). The primary objective of the

survey is to provide data that institutions can use to "improve undergraduate education, inform state accountability and accreditation efforts, and facilitate national and sector benchmarking efforts, among others" (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2009). The NSSE consists of 29 questions containing 80 items. These questions are grouped under five dimensions or benchmarks and allow colleges and universities to identify weakness in their practices and procedures and the opportunity to construct policies to improve them (Jaschik, 2009). The five benchmarks are the following: Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interactions, Enriching Educational Experiences, and Supportive Campus Environment. The items within each benchmark are described as follows:

Level of Academic Challenge- 11 items

Due to differences in the survey's rating scale the following survey items were combined to create category 1 of the level of academic challenge benchmark:

- Time spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities).
- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations.
- Campus environment promotes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work.
- Coursework emphasizes: applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

- Coursework emphasizes: making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- Coursework emphasizes: analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth
- Coursework emphasizes: synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

The following survey items in the level of academic challenge shared a common rating scale and were combined to create category 2 of the level of academic challenge benchmark:

- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
- Number of written papers and reports of 20 pages or more.
- Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages.
- Number of written papers and reports of fewer than 5 pages.

Active and Collaborative Learning – 7 items

- Asked questions in class that contributed to class discussions.
- Made a class presentation.
- Worked with other students on projects during class.
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments.
- Tutored or taught other students.
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course.

• Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc).

Student-Faculty Interactions – 6 items

- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor.
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor.
- Discussed idea from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class.
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc).
- Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral).
- Worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements.

Enriching Educational Experiences – 12 items

- Talking with students with different religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values.
- Talking with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own.
- An institutional climate that encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds.
- Used electronic technology to discuss or complete an assignment.
- Participated in a practicum, internship or field experience.

- Participated in community service or volunteer work.
- Participated in foreign language coursework.
- Participated in a study abroad program.
- Participated in an independent study or self-designed major.
- Participated in a culminating senior experience such as a capstone course, thesis,
 project, comprehensive exam, etc.
- Participated in co-curricular activities such as organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.
- Participated in a learning community.

Supportive Campus Environment – 6 items

Due to differences in the rating scale for this benchmark the following survey items were combined to create category 1 of the supportive campus environment benchmark:

- A campus environment providing the support you need to help you succeed academically.
- Campus environments helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.).
- A campus environment providing the support you need to thrive socially.

The following survey items were combined to create category 2 of the supportive campus environment benchmark:

- A campus environment enhancing the quality of your relationships with other students.
- A campus environment enhancing the quality of your relationships with faculty members.
- A campus environment enhancing the quality of your relationship with administrative personnel and offices.

Students were also asked questions to gather background information, such as gender, age, race/ethnicity, enrollment status, living arrangements, transfer status, and international student status. The participants completed the NSSE and the data was collected from the web based administration of the survey. NSSE determines commuter status by asking the following questions: (a) Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity/sorority), (b) Residence (house, apartment, etc) within walking distance of the institution, (c) Residence within driving distance, and (d) Fraternity or sorority house (National Survey of Student Engagement Web-Site, 2010a). For the purpose of this study participants who selected residence within walking distance of the institution, residence within driving distance, and fraternity/sorority housing were classified as commuters.

Data Analysis Plan

The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data.

Based on suggestions offered by Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research

(2008) t-tests and Analysis of Variance were recommended. The study was conducted to

test ten null hypotheses at the .01 level of confidence. Listed below are the data analysis procedures for each of the hypotheses.

- 1. There is no statistically significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) student-faculty interaction, (c) active-collaborative learning, (d) supportive campus environment, and (e) enriching educational experience. Means, Standard Deviations, and *t*-test were be used to compare the engagement profile of students residing on campus and commuters in the dimensions of academic challenge, student/faculty interaction, active-collaborative learning, supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience.
- 2. There is no statistically significant difference in students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university. Means, Standard Deviations, and *t*-tests were used to compare students who reside on campus and commuter students' satisfaction with the university.
- 3. There is no statistically significant difference in students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student). Two-way Analysis of Variances (ANOVA) was used to report the results of these variables. The independent variables used

in conducting the two-way ANOVAs were: gender, ethnicity, and enrollment status. The dependent variable used was living environment.

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (2008) suggests the previously mentioned methods of analysis; however, they do also share the limitations of *t*-tests with NSSE data. This test can show the likelihood that any differences between 2 years of data occurred by chance; however, it does not offer any information on the magnitude of the difference.

Validity and Reliability

Validity is often seen as the most important property of an assessment tool. The team that developed the NSSE invested considerable time making sure the items on the survey were clearly worded, well-defined, and had high face and content validity. Logical relationships exist between the items that are consistent with the results of objective measures and other research (National Survey of Student Engagement Web-Site, 2010b). The survey item responses are approximately normally distributed and the response patterns to different clusters of items discriminate among students both within and across major fields and institutions. The survey is administered in the spring term to freshman and seniors who were enrolled in the preceding fall term (National Survey of Student Engagement web-site, 2010b).

An important indicator of an instrument's psychometric quality is its degree of reliability. Reliability is the degree to which a set of items consistently measures the same thing across respondents and institutional settings. Stability, the degree to which the

students respond in similar ways at two different points in time, is another characteristic of a reliable instrument. Test-retest is one way to determine the reliability of an instrument. In regard to the National Survey of Student Engagement, this involves the same students completing the NSSE two or more times within a reasonably short time span. Due to the expense and effort involved in administering a large scale instrument, very few have test-retest information available. The spring term administering of the NSSE further hinders the ability to retest for reliability (National Survey of Student Engagement web-site, 2010c).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This study was undertaken to determine if there are differences in the engagement of students residing on campus and those students that commute. The student explored student engagement based on five benchmarks of student engagement: level of academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, active-collaborative learning, supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience. Permission to conduct this study was requested and obtained from the Institution Review Board of Austin Peay State University.

This study utilized descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze 10 hypotheses. Independent samples t-tests were used to test hypotheses one – six. Hypotheses seven – ten were tested using a series of Two Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs). This chapter discusses hypothesis and provides detailed statistical information and related tables.

Research Question One

Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement:

(1) level of academic challenge, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) active-collaborative learning, (4) supportive campus environment, and (5) enriching educational experience?

Independent-samples t-tests comparing means ratings of students residing on campus and commuters' level of engagement were done for each of the five benchmarks.

Level of Academic Challenge

Within the area of level of academic challenge, no significant difference was found, as shown in table 2, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students for category 2 of level of academic challenge (t(2250) =-2.82, p = .778). However, a significant difference was found, as shown in table 2, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students for category 1 of level of academic challenge (t(2248)=-2.952, p=003). In category 1 the mean rating for commuters (m=2.755, sd=.56542) was significantly higher than the mean rating for students residing on campus (m=2.6677, sd=.52723). Therefore, null hypothesis one is rejected.

Table 1

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Level of Academic Challenge - Category 1						
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Residents	442	2.6677	.52723	-2.952	2248	.003*
Commuters	1808	2.7551	.56542			

^{*}p < 01

Table 2

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Level of Academic Challenge – Category 2						
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Residents	440	2.3523	.50487	282	2250	.778*
Commuters *n < 0.1	1812	2.3612	.61629			

Student-Faculty Interaction

Within the area of level of student-faculty interaction, there was no significance found, as shown in table 3, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students' for student-faculty interaction (t(2246)=.032, p=974). The mean rating for students residing on campus (m=2.2566, sd=.61256) was not significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=2.2556, sd=.60018). Therefore, null hypothesis two is retained.

Table 3

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Student-Faculty Interaction						
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Residents	441	2.2566	.61256	.032	2246	.974*
Commuters	1807	2.2556	.60018			
n/01*						

p < 01*

Active Collaborative Learning

Within the area of active collaborative learning, a significant difference was found, as shown in table 4, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students' for the active collaborative learning benchmark (t(2237)=-2.643 p=008). The mean rating for commuters (m=2.4110, sd=.5330) was significantly higher than the mean rating for students residing on campus (m=2.3367, sd=.49545). Therefore, null hypothesis three is rejected.

Table 4 Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Active Collaborative Learning						
N	Mean	SD	t	df	р	
437	2.3367	.49545	-2.643	2237	.008*	
1808	2.7551	.56542				
		437 2.3367	437 2.3367 .49545	437 2.3367 .49545 -2.643	437 2.3367 .49545 -2.643 2237	

p<01

Supportive Campus Environment

Within the area of supportive campus environment, no significant difference, as shown in table 5, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students for supportive campus environment category 1 (t(2259) =- 1.285, p = .199). However, a significant difference was found, as shown in table 6, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students' for supportive campus environment category 2 (t(2249) = 6.475, p=000). The mean rating for students residing

on campus (m=2.5805, sd=.73693) was significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=2.3133, sd=.78663). Therefore, null hypothesis four is rejected.

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Supportive Campus Environment – Category 1						
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	р
Residents	441	5.0106	1.13257	-1.285	2259	.199*
Commuters	1820	5.0919	1.20689			
p<01*						

Table 6

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Supportive Campus Environment - Category 2 Group N Mean SD df t Residents 441 2.5805 6.475 2249 *000 .73693 Commuters 1810 2.3133 .78663 p < 01*

Enriching Educational Experience

Table 5

Within the area of enriching educational experience, no significant difference was found, as shown in table 7, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students' for enriching educational experience (t(2216)=.788, p=431). The mean rating for students residing on campus (m=2.2368, sd=.46810) was not

significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=2.2180, sd=.44056). Therefore, null hypothesis five is retained.

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Level of Engagement

Enriching Educational Experience						
N	Mean	SD	t	df	p	
435	2.2368	.46810	.788	2216	.431*	
1783	2.2180	.44056				
	435	N Mean 435 2.2368	N Mean SD 435 2.2368 .46810	N Mean SD <i>t</i> 435 2.2368 .46810 .788	N Mean SD <i>t df</i> 435 2.2368 .46810 .788 2216	

Research Question Two

Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university? An independent samples t-test was used comparing mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction/experience with the university.

Overall Satisfaction

Table 7

Within the area of overall satisfaction with the university, no significant difference was found, as shown in table 8, between the mean ratings of students residing on campus and commuter students for overall satisfaction with the university (t(2267)=1.578, p=115). The mean rating for students residing on campus (m=3.1284, sd=.69937) was not significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=3.0674, sd=.17773). Therefore, null hypothesis six is retained.

Table 8

Comparison of Students Residing on Campus and Commuters' Overall Satisfaction

Overall Satisfaction						
Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Residents	444	3.1284	.69937	1.578	2267	.115*
Commuters p < 01*	1825	3.0674	.17773			

Research Question Three

Does overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters differ based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student)?

Overall Satisfaction and Gender

Table 9

The overall mean scores for overall satisfaction with the university for residents and commuters by gender were compared and are listed in table 9.

Means of Overall Satisfaction by Living Environment and Gender

Living	Gender	N	Mean	SD
Environment				
Residents	Male	132	3.0758	.67289
	Female	312	3.1506	.67075
Commuters	Male	580	3.0414	.79832
	Female	1245	3.0795	.70775

A two-way ANOVA was performed to compare overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters by gender. No significance was found among the students (F(1,2265) = .190, p = .663). Therefore, null hypothesis 7 is retained. ANOVA findings are reported in table 10.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance Overall Experience by Living Environment and Gender

Source	df	F	p
Living Environment (LE)			
	1	1.568	.211
Gender (G)	1	1.799	.180
LE x G	1	.190	.663*
Error	2265		

p<01*

Table 11

Overall Satisfaction and Enrollment Status

The overall mean scores for overall satisfaction with the university for residents and commuters by enrollment status were compared and are listed in table 11.

Means of Overall Satisfaction by Living Environment and Enrollment Status

Living	Enrollment Status	N	Mean	SD
Environment				
Residents	Part-time	7	3.2857	.56695
	Full-time	437	3.1259	.70153
Commuters	Part-time	362	3.0815	.76242
	Full-time	1463	3.0639	.73172

A two-way ANOVA was performed to compare overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters by enrollment status. No significance was found among the students (F(1,2265) = .255, p = .613). Therefore, null hypothesis eight is retained. ANOVA findings are reported in table 12.

Table 12

Analysis of Variance Overall Experience by Living Environment and Enrollment Status

Source	df	F	p
Living Environment (LE)	1	.893	.345
Enrollment Status (ES)	1	.397	.529
LE x ES	1	.255	.613*
Error	2265		

p < 01*

Overall Satisfaction and Ethnicity

The overall mean scores for overall satisfaction with the university for residents and commuters by ethnicity were compared and are listed in table 13.

Table 13

Means of Overall Satisfaction by Living Environment and Ethnicity Living Ethnicity N Mean SD Environment American Indian or other Residents Native American 73 3.0548 .60988 Black or African American 3 3.1667 .28868 White (non-Hispanic) 310 3.1613 .70121 Mexican or Mexican American 8 3.3750 .69437 Other Hispanic or Latino 7 3.1429 .74801 Other 43 2.9651 .82661 American Indian or other Commuters Native American 237 3.0316 .75215 Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander 13 2.4615 1.16300 Black or African American 49 2.9694 .68014 White (non-Hispanic) 1227 3.0856 .72111 Mexican or Mexican American 81 3.1358 .77060 Other Hispanic or Latino 12 2.9583 .49810 Other 206 3.0413 .78523

A two-way ANOVA was performed to compare overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters by ethnicity. No significance was found among the students (F(5,2265) = .432, p = .826). Therefore, null hypothesis nine was retained. ANOVA findings are reported in table 14.

Analysis of Variance Overall Experience by Living Environment and Ethnicity

Source	df	F	p
Living Environment (LE)			
	1	1.015	.314
Ethnicity (E)	6	2.403	.026
LE x E	5	.432	.826*
Error	2265		
p<01*			

r ---

Table 15

Table 14

Overall Satisfaction and Age

The overall mean scores for overall satisfaction with the university for residents and commuters by age were compared and are listed in table 15.

Means of Overall Satisfaction by Living Environment and Age

Living	Age	N	Mean	SD
Environment				
Residents	Traditional	417	3.1283	.70350
	Non Traditional	27	3.1296	.64439
Commuters	Traditional	728	3.1023	.69546
	Non Traditional	1145	3.0494	.76445

A two-way ANOVA was performed to compare overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters by age. No significance was found among the students (F(1,2240) = .132, p=716). Therefore, null hypothesis ten is retained. ANOVA findings are reported in table 16.

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Overall Experience by Living Environment and Age

Source	df	F	p
Living Environment (LE)			
	1	.506	.477
Age (A)	1	.119	.730
LE x A	1	.132	.716*
Error	2240		
p<01			

Chapter V

Conclusions

The primary purpose of this study was examined the engagement of residents and commuters. The secondary purpose was to explore the overall satisfaction of students based on living environment as well as variations according to gender, race, age, and enrollment status. The dimensions used to measure the levels of student engagement are the following: academic challenge, student-faculty interactions, active-collaborative learning, supportive campus environment, and enriching educational experience. The following research questions guide this study.

Research Questions

- 1. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement: (1) level of academic challenge, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) active-collaborative learning, (4) supportive campus environment, and (5) enriching educational experience?
- 2. Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university?
- 3. Does the overall satisfaction for students residing on campus and commuters differ based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student)?

The following is a summary of the major findings of this study.

Research Question One

Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement with regards to the following five dimensions of engagement:

(1) level of academic challenge, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) active-collaborative learning, (4) supportive campus environment, and (5) enriching educational experience?

Independent samples t-tests were used to answer this question. Findings related to the differences between students residing on campus and commuters' engagement as measured by the five benchmarks are the following:

Level of Academic Challenge

The mean rating for commuter students (m=2.7551, sd =.56542) was significantly higher than the mean rating for students residing on campus (m =2.6677, sd=.52723). The results of the student indicate that commuter students report having spent more time preparing for class, processing class information, and studying than those students residing on campus.

Active-Collaborative Learning

There was a statistically significant difference in the level of student engagement as measured y active-collaborative learning between students residing on campus and commuters. The mean rating for commuters (m =2.4110, sd=.49545) was significantly higher than the mean rating for students residing on campus (m =2.3367, sd=.49545). The results of the study indicate that commuter students are participating in class and

working collaboratively with other students at a higher rate than students who reside on campus.

Supportive Campus Environment

The mean rating for students residing on campus (m=2.5805, sd=.73693) was significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=2.3133, sd=.78663). The results indicate that residents feel the campus environment enhances their relationships with peers, university officials, and faculty.

No statistically significant was found between students residing on campus and commuters for the following levels of engagement:

- Student-faculty interaction
- Enriching educational experience

Research Question Two

Is there a significant difference between students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university? An independent samples t-test was used to answer this question. There was no statistically significant difference found in students residing on campus and commuters' overall satisfaction with the university. The mean rating for students residing on campus (m=3.1284, sd=.69937) was not significantly higher than the mean rating for commuters (m=3.0674, sd=.17773). The results indicate that students residing on campus and commuters are equally satisfied with their college experience.

Research Question Three

Does overall satisfaction with the university for students residing on campus and commuters differ based on the following variables: (a) gender, (b) enrollment status, (c) race/ethnicity, and (d) age (traditional/nontraditional student)?

Analysis of variance (two-way ANOVAs) was used to report the results of these variables. The independent variables used in conducting the two-way ANOVAs were: gender, ethnicity, age, and enrollment status. The dependent variable used was living environment. No significant difference was found between residents and commuters on any of the independent variables. The results indicate that students residing on campus and commuters regardless of gender, enrollment status, race/ethnicity, or age are equally satisfied with their college experience.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings from this research have implications for future student engagement research. Based on the results, the following recommendations for future research are proposed:

- Future research should focus on grade point average and living environment.
 Do residents or commuters have higher gpas?
- 2. Future research should focus on differences between first generation college students. Are first generation college students more engaged in their college experience?

3. Future research should investigate any specialized needs to students and determine how a more engaged campus could assist students with those needs.

The literature review in Chapter II supported the premise that residing on campus had a stronger impact on student engagement than commuting (Astin, 1999). Based on the data from this study, this premise was not strongly supported. The current research found significance in the area of academic challenge, showing that commuter students expressed spending more time preparing for class, worked harder to meet instructor expectations, and processed more the information learned in class. This supports previous research which found that commuters often struggle to integrate into the campus community (Tenhouse, n.d.). Significance was also found in the area of active collaborative learning, showing that commuters expressed spending significantly more time than residents working with others outside of class. These findings differ from previous research which found that commuters miss opportunities to connect to peers (Astin, 1999). In the area of supportive campus environment, significance was also found. The research found that students residing on campus perceive that the campus assists them in succeeding academically and socially more so than those students who commute (Astin, 1999). Residents also reported feeling that the campus assisted them in coping more with areas not related to academics and promoted supportive relationships among students and their peers, faculty and administration.

References

- Arboleda, A., Wang, Yongyi, Shelley, M. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2003). Predictors of residence hall involvement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(4), 517-531.
- Astin, A. (2006). Making sense out of degree completion rates. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, and Practice, 7*(1-2), 5-17.
- Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education.

 *Journal of College Student Development, 40, 518-529.
- Baker, C. N. (2008). Under-represented college students and extracurricular involvement: the effects of various student organizations on academic performance. *Social Psychology Education*, 11, 273-298
- Belcheir, M. J. (2001). What predicts perceived gains in learning and in satisfaction

 (BSU-RR-2001-02). Retrieved from Bosie State University Office of Institutional

 Assessment website: Boise State University website:

 http://cpr.iub.edu/uploads/Belcheir,%20M.J.%20(May,%202001).pdf
- Bohnert, A. M., Aikins, J. W., & Edidin, J. (2007). The role of organized activities in facilitating social adaptation across the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 22(2), 189-208.

- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and Identity, 2nd ed. As cited in Foubert & Grainger. Effects of in clubs and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal (Online)*, 43(1), 1-10.
- Cobbs, Tajhma C. (2008). Student engagement on a traditional campus: A comparison of traditional and nontraditional students (Doctoral Dissertation). *Dissertation Abstracts International*: 1554875571.
- Eck, J., Edge, H., & Stephenson, K. (2007). Investigating types of student engagement through living-learning communities: the perspective from Rollins College.

 **Assessment Update, 19(3), 6-8.
- Eklund-Leen, S. J., & Young, R. B. (1997). Attitudes of student organization members and non members about campus and community involvement. *Community College Review*, 24(4), 71-81.
- Enochs, W. K., & Roland, C. B. (2006). Social adjustment of college freshmen: the importance of gender and living environment. *College Student Journal*, 40(1), 11-22.
- Fischer, M. J. (2007). Settling into college life: Differences by race/ethnicity in college involvement and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(2), 125-161.

- Foubert, J. D., & Grainger, L. U. (2006). Effects of involvement and organizations on the psychosocial development of first-year and senior college students. *NASPA Journal (Online)*, 43(1), 1 10. Retrieved from http://www.albany.edu/involvement/involved/effects_of_involvement.pdf
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 698-713.
- Halawah, I. (2006). The impact of student-faculty informal interpersonal relationships on intellectual and personal development. *College Student Journal*, 40(3), 670-678.
- Horn, L. J., & Berktold, J. (1998). *Profile of undergraduates in U.S. postsecondary*education institutions: 1995-96. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education website: U.S. Department of Education website:

 http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006184
- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. (2008). NSSE multi-year data analysis guide. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/pdf/NSSE%20Multi-Year%20Data%20Analysis%20Guide.pdf
- Jacoby, B., & Garland, J. (2004). Strategies for enhancing commuter student success [Abstract]. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 6(1), 61-79.
- Jaschik, S. (2009). *More engaged*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/11/09/nsse

- Kezar, A. J. (2006). The impact of institutional size on student engagement. *NASPA Journal (Online)*, 43(1), 87-114.
- Krause, K. D. (2007). Social involvement and commuter students: the first-year student voice. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 19(1), 27-45.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/nsse_2001/pdf/framework-2001.pdf
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 540-563.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B., & Hayek, J. C. (2007). Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations. ASHE Higher Education Report, 32(5), 1 - 182.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (2007). *Benchmarks of effective educational*practice. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from Indiana University Bloomington

 website: http://www.nsse.iub.edu/pdf/nsse_benchmarks.pdf

- National Survey of Student Engagement (2009). Assessment for improvement: Tracking student engagement over time- annual results 2009. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University for Postsecondary Research. Retrieved from National Survey of Student Engagement website:
 - $http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2009_Results/pdf/NSSE_AR_2009.pdf$
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2010a). *Validity*. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/html/PsychometricPortfolio Validity.cfm
- National Survey of Student Engagement Web-Site. (2010b). *Reliability*. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/html/PsychometricPortfolio Reliability.cfm
- National Survey Of Student Engagement Web-Site. (2010c). *Validity*. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/html/PsychometricPortfolio Validity.cfm
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). How college affects students, vol 2: A third decade of research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Perozzi, B. (Ed.). (2009). Enhancing student learning through college employment.

 Bloomington, IN: Association of College Unions International.
- Pike, G. R. (2009). The differential effects of on- and off-campus living arrangements on students' openness to diversity. *NASPA Journal*, 46(4), 629-645.
- Price, D. V., & Lee, M. (2005, December). Learning communities and student success in postsecondary education. Retrieved from http://www.mdrc.org/publications/418/full.pdf

- Sanchez-Leguilinel, Caridad (2008). Supporting "slumping" sophomores: programmatic peer initiatives designed to enhance retention in the crucial second year of college. *College Student Journal*, 42(2), 637-646.
- Schuetz, P. (2008). A theory driven model of community college student engagement.

 Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 32, 305-324.
- State Higher Education Executive Officers (2005). Accountability for better results: A national imperative for higher education. Retrieved from http://www.sheeo.org/account/accountability.pdf
- Swenson, L. M., Nordstrom, A., & Hiester, M. (2008). The role of peer relationships in adjustment to college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(6), 551-567.
- Tenhouse, A. M. (n.d.). *Commuter students-commuter student challenges*. Retrieved from http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1875/Commuter-Students.html
- Tinto, V. (2006). Taking student retention seriously. Keynote presentation and paper at

 Maricopa Community College District. Retrieved from

 http://www.mcli.dist.maricopa.edu/fsd/c2006/docs/takingretentionseriously.pdf
- University Of Akron. (n.d.). *Myths and realities about commuter students*. Retrieved from http://www.uakron.edu/studentlife/commcent/myths.php
- U.S. Department Of Education. (2006, September). *A test of leadership: Charting the*future of U.S. higher education. Retrieved from

 http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/pre-pub-report.pdf

- Wiggan , G. (2008). From opposition to engagement: Lessons from high achieving African American students. *The Urban Review*, 40(4), 317-349.
- Wilcox, P., Winn, S., & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people: the role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(6), 707-722.
- Yin, D., & Lei, S. A. (2007). Impacts of campus involvement on hospitality student achievement and satisfaction. *Education*, 128(2), 282-293.

Appendices

Appendix A

Austin Peay State University

Institutional Review Board Approval

Aug. 16, 2010

Kimberley Morrow Housing/Residence Life and Dining Services P.O. Box 4596 Austin Peay St. Univ.

RE: Your application regarding study number 10-021: An Exploration of the relationship between residing on campus, student involvement in campus activities and faculty/peer interactions.

Dear Ms. Morrow

Thank you for your recent submission. We appreciate your cooperation with the human research review process. I have reviewed your study on an expedited basis and am pleased to inform you that I have approved your study pending the following modification:

In your responses to #13 and #14 of the application, make it clear that the data will be stripped of all
personally identifiable information including the participants' names.

This approval is subject to APSU Policies and Procedures governing human subject research. The full IRB will still review this protocol and reserves the right to withdraw expedited approval if unresolved issues are raised during their review.

Once you have provided documentation to the IRB that the modifications have been made, you are free to conduct your study. Your study is subject to continuing review on or before Aug 16, 2011, unless closed before that date. Enclosed please find the forms to report when your study has been completed and the form to request an annual review of a continuing study. Please submit the appropriate form prior to Aug 16, 2011.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. If you have any questions or require further information, you can contact me by phone (931-221-7231) or email (grahc@apsu.edu)

Again, thank you for your cooperation with the APSU IRB and the human research review process. Best wishes for a successful study!

Sincerely,

Charles R. Grah, Chair

Austin Peay Institutional Review Board

Cc: Dr. Tammy Shutt, College of Education

Appendix B

National Survey of Student Engagement 2006, 2007, and 2009 Surveys



National Survey of Student Engagement 2006⁵⁸

		incti	LL:											
1	In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? Mark your answers in the boxes. Examples: 🖂 or 🔳													
		Very		Some- times		Very Some- often Often times Nevo	er							
	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions					r. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's								
t	Made a class presentation					standards or expectations								
	prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in					s. Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	1							
	Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources					t. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students,	•							
е	Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders political beliefs, etc.) in class					family members, co-workers, etc.) U. Had serious conversations with]							
	discussions or writing assignments					students of a different cace or ethnicity than your own]							
f	Come to class without completing readings or assignments					v. Had serious conversations with students who are very different								
	. Worked with other students on projects during class				P	from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	1							
h	. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments				/ / /		J							
i	Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or		~	_		2 During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?								
	during class discussions				-07/	Very Quite Ver much a bit Some litt								
j	. Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)			D.		A Momentains facts ideas or								
k	Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) aspart of a regular course		<u>_</u>			a. Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form]							
1	Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	1				b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and	_							
m	Used e-mail to communicate	_	7	-	П	c. Synthesizing and organizing	_							
n	with an instructor Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor					ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships]							
	Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor					d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments,								
	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	5				or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions]							
1	Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your				_	e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new								
	academic performance					situations]							

During the current school yeareading and writing have you	done?	,			7 Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your
 Number of assigned textbooks, books course readings 	s, or boo	ok-leng	gth packs	of	institution? Do not Have
None 1-4 5-10	11-] 20	More tha	n 20	Plan plan not Done to do to do decided
b. Number of books read on your own (renjoyment or academic enrichment	not assi	gned)	for perso	nal	a. Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op
None 1-4 5-10	11-] 20	More tha	n 20	experience, or clinical assignment
c. Number of written papers or reports of	of 20 p a			11 20	b. Community service or volunteer work
None 1-4 5-10	11-		More tha	n 20	c. Participate in a learning community or some other
d. Number of written papers or reports t	_	_	nd 19 pa	ages	formal program where groups of students take
None 1-4 5-10	11-	_	More tha	n 20	two or more classes together
e. Number of written papers or reports of	of fewe	r tha	n 5 page	es	d. Work on a research project with a faculty member
None 1-4 5-10	11-		More tha		outside of course or program requirements
In a typical week, how many sets do you complete?	home	work	proble	m /	e Foreign language
None	1-2	3-4	Me 5-6 tha	ore/ an 6	Study abroad
a. Number of problem sets that	V		V 2		g. Independent study or self-designed major \(\square\) \(\square\)
take you more than an hour to complete			口?		h. Culminating senior experience (capstone
 b. Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour 			(,)		course, senior project or thesis comprehensive
to complete				7\	exam, etc.)
5 Mark the box that best repres which your examinations duri	ents t	he ex	xtent to	loor	Mark the box that best represents the quality of
year have challenged you to d		bes	t work.	1/	your relationships with people at your institution.
Very little	~	X	ery much		a. Relationships with other students
1 2 3	5	6	7	7	Unfriendly, Friendly, Unsupportive, Supportive, Sense of alienation Sense of belongi
6 During the current school year have you done each of the fol			ow orte	П	₩ ₩
, \ <u>'</u>	Very often	Ofter	Some- times		1 2 3 4 5 6 7
a. Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play,	, W.	~	W	-	b. Relationships with faculty members
dance, or other theater performance					Unavailable, Available, Unhelpful, Helpful,
b. Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities	/b~				Unsympathetic Sympathetic
c. Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)					
d. Examined the strengths and					c. Relationships with administrative personnel and offices
weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue					Unhelpful, Helpful,
e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an		_	_		Inconsiderate, Considerate, Rigid Flexible
issue looks from his or her perspectiv f. Learned something that changed	ve 🗌				•
the way you understand an issue or concept					1 2 3 4 5 6 7

About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following? a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and									To what extent has your ex institution contributed to you	our k	nowle	dae s		50
а	hame	WORK OF	lab work	(, analyzi	ng data	writing, , rehears	doing ing, and		areas?	in the	e follo	wing		
	0	1-5	ic activit	11-15	☐ 16-20	 21-25	 26-30	More			Quite a bit	Some	Very little	
		per we	ay on c a	ampus				than 30	education					
b	0	1-5 per we	6-10	11-15	16-20	 21-25	26-30	More than 30	b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills c. Writing clearly and effectively					
C	0	ng for p 1-5 per we	6-10	11-15	☐ 16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	d. Speaking clearly and effectively e. Thinking critically and analytically f. Analyzing quantitative problems	9-1 9-1 9-1				
d	public	ations,	student g	ricular ac governme mural sp	ent, frat	ernity or	tions, ca sorority,	ampus	g. Using computing and information technology h. Working effectively with others					
e	0 Hours	1-5 per we		11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30 , etc.)	More than 30	i. Voting in local, state, or national elections j. Learning effectively on your own					
	0 Hours	1-5 per we	6-10 ek	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	k. Understanding yourself I. Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds					
f			e for dep use, etc.)	endents	living w	ith you (parents,		m. Solving complex real-world problems					
	0	1-5 per we	6-10	11-15	☐ 16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics					
g		-		driving, w	alking,	etc.)			o Contributing to the welfare of your community					
	0 Hours	1-5 per we	6-10 ek	⊔ 11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	p. Developing a deepened sense of spirituality					
10	To w	hat ex		oes you ving?	\ W	ary Qui	to		12 Overall, how would you eva academic advising you hav institution?					
	time s work	tudying	and on	mounts o	· I		` { IJ□		Good Fair Poor					
	to hel	p you si	ncceleq/s	you need cademica	ally	₹) E	<u> </u>		13 How would you evaluate you experience at this institution	our e on?	ntire	educat	ional	
	studer social, backg	nts from , and ra- rounds	cial or et	it econon hnic] [] [☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair					
	acade family	mic resp , etc.)	oonsibilit	your no ies (work	ς,] [Poor 14 If you could start over aga same institution you are no	in, w	ould y	ou go	to the	
	to thr	ive socia	ally	you need	d 				☐ Definitely yes	ow di	cenul	iig:		
	perfor	ies (spe mances	, athletic	ents and akers, cul c events, cademic v	etc.)			_	☐ Probably yes ☐ Probably no ☐ Definitely no					

Write in your year of birth: 1 9	Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored
16 Your sex	by your institution's athletics department?
Male Female	Yes No (Go to question 25.)
17 Are you an international student or foreign national?	On what team(s) are you an athlete (e.g., football, swimming)? Please answer below:
☐ Yes ☐ No	У
What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark only one.)	25 What have most of your grades been up to now
☐ American Indian or other Native American	at this institution?
Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander	□ A □ B+ □ C+ \
☐ Black or African American	□ A-
☐ White (non-Hispanic)	□ B- □ C of lower
Mexican or Mexican American	26 Which of the following best describes where
	you are living now while attending college?
Puerto Rican	Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity/
Other Hispanic or Latino	sorority house)
☐ Multiracial	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within
☐ Other	walking distance of the institution
☐ I prefer not to respond	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within driving distance of the institution
_	Fraternity or sorority house
19 What is your current classification in college?	
☐ Freshman/first-year ☐ Senior / (27 What is the highest level of education that your
☐ Sophomore ☐ Unclassified	parent(s) completed? (Mark one box per column.)
Junior	Father Mother
	Y Y
20 Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere?	Did not finish high school
_	Graduated from high school
☐ Started here ☐ Started elsewhere	Attended college but did not complete degree
Since graduating from high school, which of the following types of schools have you	Completed an associate's degree (A.A., A.S., etc.)
attended other than the one you are attending now? (Mark all that apply.)	Completed a bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
☐ Vocational or technical school☐ Community or junior college	Completed a master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
4-year college other than this one	☐ Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D.,
None	J.D., M.D., etc.)
Other	28 Please print your major(s) or your expected major(s).
2 Thinking about this current academic term,	a. Primary major (Print only one.):
how would you characterize your enrollment?	
☐ Full-time ☐ Less than full-time	
_ Less dian full white	
3 Are you a member of a social fraternity or	b. If applicable, second major (not minor, concentration, etc.):
sorority?	
☐ Yes ☐ No	
THANKS FOR SHARING VOILE	VIEWSI

THANKS FOR SHARING YOUR VI

After completing the survey, please put it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and deposit it in any U.S. Postal Service mailbox. Questions or comments? Contact the National Survey of Student Engagement, Indiana University, 1900 East Tenth Street, Eigenmann Hall Suite 419, Bloomington IN 47406-7512 or nsse@indiana.edu or www.nsse.iub.edu. Copyright © 2005 Indiana University.

National Survey of Student Engagement 200762

The College Student Report

1	In your experience at your	insti	tution	during	the cu	rrent school year, about how often have you done	
	Cueri	Very		Some- times	. the bo	xes. Examples: ⊠ or ■ Very Some-	
		A	V		V	often Often times No	ever
	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions					r. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's	V
b.	Made a class presentation					standards or expectations	
C.	Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in					s. Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	
	Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources					t. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students,	ш
e.	Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders political beliefs, etc.) in class	5,				family members, co-workers, etc.) U. Had-serious conversations with	
	discussions or writing assignments					students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	
	Come to class without completing readings or assignments					v Had serious conversations with students who are very different	
g.	Worked with other students on projects during class				٦ [^]	from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political	
h.	Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments				(f	opinions, or personal values	
j.	Put together ideas or concepts				111	2 During the current school year, how much has	5
	from different courses when			\sim		your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?	
	completing assignments or during class discussions		9	P	7/	Very Quite V	/ery ittle
j.	Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)			7	Q	a. Memorizing facts, ideas, or	W
k.	Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course			P		methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	
	Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment		V _Q			b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	П
m.	Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor	Д				c. Synthesizing and organizing	_
n.	Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	口 `				ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	
	Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor	4				d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments,	
	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class					or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	
٦٠	Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance					e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	

	reading a	ne current a and writing	have you	done	?			7	Which of th	e follow	ing hav	e you d	one or o	lo ⁶³
a.	Number of course read	assigned textl lings	DOOKS, DOOKS,	, or bo	ook-len	igth pa	cks of		institution?)	ic you s	raduat		
	None	1-4	5-10	[11		More	than 20				Done	Plan	Do not plan	not
b.	Number of I	books read or	your own (n						Dracticum int	awa alata	₩ Dolle	to do	to do	decided
	enjoyment (or academic e	enrichment	,	_		_	a.	Practicum, interiend	ce, co-op				
	None	□ 1-4	5-10	11	 -20	More	than 20		experience, or assignment	clinical				
c.	Number of	written papers	s or reports o	of 20 p	pages	or mo	re	b.	Community se volunteer wor		()	\sim		
	None	□ 1-4	□ 5-10	_		More	than 20	c.	Participate in	alearning		> _	П	ш
d.		written paper:	s or reports b						community or formal progra	some other	er			
									groups of stud	dents take	\)			
	None	1-4	5-10		-20		than 20		two or more of together	lasses	. 7		П	П
e.	_	written papers	s or reports o		_	ın 5 pa	ages	d.	Work on a res	earch pro	ject	_		_
	None	□ 1-4	5-10		_ _ -20	More	∐ than 20		with a faculty outside of cou	member)/			
4	In a <i>typic</i>	<i>cal week</i> , h	ow many h	nome	work	prob	lem		program requ					
		ou complet						e.	Foreign langu coursework	àge /	П			
			None :	1-2	3-4	5-6	More than 6 /	f.	Study abroad					П
,	Number of r	problem sets	that	W	A.	1	∇		Independent	study or	_	_	_	_
a.	take you m	ore than an h	nour	_	_	_	_<		self-designed	-				
	to complete		. 🗆	Ш	Ш			10.	Culminating s experience (c					
b.		problem sets t ss than an ho							course, senior	50.00	r			
	to complete						U_{\Box}		thésis, comprexam, etc.)	enensive				
5		box that b							7					
		ur examina e challenge						8	Mark the b your relation					
	Very little	chancinge	u you to u	7		ery m	1		your relativ	onompo	with pe	opic at	your mis	ocicución.
				, `		V	\sim	a.	Relationships	with othe	r studen	ts		
	1	2 3	∐ L 4 !	 5	6	7			Unfriendl	• •			F	riendly,
6	During th	e current s	school vear	r, abo	out he	ow of	ten		Unsupporti Sense of alier					ipportive, of belongin
		done each				$\smile_{/}$	/		W	iddoll			Dense	w Sciongii
				Very	Ofto	Son	ie- es Neve	-] [Ö
	W202	^		Piten	W		* *		1		3 4	. 5	0	
a.	Attended ar music, thea	n art exhibit, p ter, or oth er p	olay, dance, performance	4	\sqrt{h}		1 🗆	b.	Relationships	with facu	Ity mem	bers		
b.		r participated		(-)	/ -	_			Unavailab					vailable,
	physical fitn	ess activities							Unhelpfu Unsympath					Helpful, mpathetic
C.		l in activities t ur spiritu ality							W				,	W
		neditation, pra] [□ 7
d.	Examined th	he strengths a	and						1	2	3 4	. 5		
		of your own topic or issue				Г	1 0	c.	Relationships	with adm	inistrati	ve perso	nnel and	offices
e.	Tried to bet	ter understan	d someone						Unhelpfu					Helpful,
	else's views	by imagining	how an	_		_	1 0		Inconsider Rigid	ate,				nsiderate, Flexible
f.		from his or he mething that o		<u> </u>	Ц	L			Kigiu					₩
	the way you	understand	an issue				. –							
	or concept								1	2	3 4	5	6	7

	7-da	y wee	K dom.	hours o			iig:	/pical	To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the skills.
ĉ	1	MAIOTK ()	Idu Wolf	udying, ro k, analyzir	eading, ng data	writing, , rehears	doing ing, and	i	and personal development in the following areas?
		1-5	ic activit	11-15	☐ 16-20	 21-25	☐ 26-30	More	Very Quite Very much a bit Some little a. Acquiring a broad general
	Hours	per we	ay on c a	ampus				than 30	education
t		1-5 per we	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills c. Writing clearly and effectively
	0 Hours	1-5 per wee		11-15	16-20	21-25	□ 26-30	More than 30	d. Speaking clearly and effectively e. Thinking critically and analytically f. Analyzing quantitative problems
C	nublic	ations, sollegiate	student of or intra	ricular act governme mural spo	nt, frate orts, etc	ernity or :.)	sorority	ampus ,	g. Using computing and information technology h. Working effectively with others
e	-	1-5 per wee	_	11-15 ig (watch	16-20 ing TV,	21-25 partying	26-30 , etc.)	More than 30	national elections
	0 Hours	1-5 per wee	6-10 ek	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	I. Understanding people of other racial and ethric backgrounds
f		_	for dep	endents I	iving wi	th you (p	parents,	/	m. Solving complex real-world problems
	0 Hours	1-5 per wee	☐ 6-10 ek	11-15	∐ 16-20	☐ 21-25	26-30	More than 30	n. Developing a personal code of Valdes and ethics
g	. Comm			Iriving, wa	alking,	etc.)			o. Contributing to the welfare of vour community
	0 Hours	1-5 per wee	6-10 ek	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30	p. Developing a deepened sense of spirituality
10	To w	hat ex	tent do	oes you	r insti	tution (empha	size	12 Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of
	each	of the	follow	ing?		ry Qui		Very	academic advising you have received at your institution?
					mi	ich a b	it Son	e little	Excellent
а	. Spend	ing sign	ificant ar	mounts of	f	\\\	U		☐ Good ☐ Fair
	work	tuaying	and on a	academic		J /E	1 c		Poor
	to help	you su	cceed a	you need cademical		<u> </u>] [13 How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
	studer social, backgr	nts from and rac rounds	cial or eth	t econom nnic	_/[<i>)</i>] [] [] [Excellent Good Fair
	family,	mic resp , etc.)	onsibiliti	your non es (work,	Г) [] [] [Poor 14 If you could start over again, would you go to the
e.	Provid		support	you need			_	_	same institution you are now attending? Definitely yes
	Attend activiti perfori	ling cam les (spec mances,	ipus ever cial spea athletic	kers, cult events, e	ural etc.) [_	☐ Probably yes ☐ Probably no ☐ Definitely no
g.	Using	compute	ers in ac	ademic w	ork [Definitely no

15 Write in yo	our year of bir	th: 1 9		24	Are you	u a stuc	dent-athlete on a team sponsored
16 Your sex: ☐ Male	☐ Female				Yes		ation's athletics department? No (Go to question 25.)
_	internationa	l student or fo	reign		On v	vhat te ball, sw	am(s) are you an athlete (e.g., /imming)? Please answer below:
Yes	□No						y
18 What is yo	ur racial or et one.)	hnic identifica	tion?	25	What h	ave mo	ost of your grades been up to now
☐ American	Indian or other N	Native American			at this □ A	msutut	tion? \/
_	an American, or I	Pacific Islander			□ A-	_] B
_	frican American						B- C or lower
☐ White (no				26	Which	7	
_	r Mexican Americ	can			you are	e living	ollowing best describes where now while attending college?
☐ Puerto Ric					□ Dorm	itory or d	ther campus housing (not fraternity/
	panic or Latino				301011	ry mouse) /
☐ Multiracial ☐ Other				/_	☐ Resid walk	ence (hò ina dist	use, apartment, etc.) within appe of the institution
_	at to recoond			/(∟ √Re ∮ id	ence (ho	use, apartment, etc.) within
☐ I prefer no	ot to respond				DINI	ng dista	nce of the institution orority house
19 What is you	ır current cla	ssification in c	ollege?	22		•	
☐ Freshman,	/first-year	Senior	\mathcal{A}	2/	What is	the hi	ghest level of education that your pleted? (Mark one box per column
☐ Sophomor	e [Unclassified			1/		
☐ Junior			11		Father	Mother	•
20 Did you beg	in college at	vour current		`	/ <u>i</u>	Ď	Did not finish high school
	or elsewhere?		7/)/			Graduated from high school
☐ Started he	re Starte	d elsewhere	_	\			Attended college but did not complete
21 Since gradu	ating from hi	igh school, wh	ich of)	П		degree Completed an associate's degree (A.A.,
		hools have yo	u \/		_	_	A.S., etc.)
attending n	ther than the ow? (Mark al	I that apply.)	\rightarrow				Completed a bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
	or technical scho						Completed a master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
_	or junior college ege other than th	\ \ \ \					Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)
None				_	_		
Other		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \			Please najor(s		our major(s) or your expected
22 Thinking ab	out this curre	ent academic t	erm.	a. F	rimary n	najor (Pri	int only one.):
how would	you characte	rize your enro	Ilment?				
☐ Full-time	Less than fu	time الا					
22 4				b. I	f applica	ble, seco	nd major (not minor, concentration, etc.):
Are you a m sorority?	ember of a so	ocial fraternity	or			167	
Yes							
1 165	□No		ļ				
T	HANKS FO	R SHARIN	NG YOUR	VIE	WS!		
After completing the c	union places put i	it in the anclosed no	ctane-naid envel	ope and	deposit it	in any U.	S.
University, 1900 Fact	C. Questions or com	nments? Contact the nmann Hall Suite 41	a National Survey	or Stuc	ent Engag	yement, II	Idiana
nsse@indiana edu or	. Cilui Street, Liger	Complete Source 41	Indiana Universit	V			

nsse@indiana.edu or www.nsse.iub.edu. Copyright © 2006 Indiana University.



National Survey of Student Engagement 2009⁶⁶

The College Student Report

In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? Mark your answers in the boxes. Examples: 🛛 or 🔳

	Very often	Often	Some- times	Never		Very often	Often	Some- times	Never
 a. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions 					r. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's	•	*	•	-
b. Made a class presentation					standards or expectations				
 c. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in 					s. Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)				
 d. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources 					t. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students,		_	_	_
e. Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments			П	П	family members, co-workers, etc.) u. Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own				
f. Come to class without completing readings or assignments	. []				v. Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their				
 g. Worked with other students on projects during class 					religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values				
h. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments									
i. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when					2 During the current school y your coursework emphasize				S
completing assignments or during class discussions					mental activities?		Quite a bit	Some	Very little
j. Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)					a. Memorizing facts, ideas, or	-	-	-	~
 k. Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course 					methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form b. Analyzing the basic elements of				
I. Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	П	П	П	П	an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and				
n. Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor	П			П	considering its components c. Synthesizing and organizing	ш	Ц	Ц	
n. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor					ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships				
o. Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor					 d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining 				
p. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class					how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	, 			
 Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance 					 Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations 				

During the current school year reading and writing have you a. Number of assigned textbooks, books	done	?			7 Whi	Piuli	LU UU I	llowin	g have	e you	done o	r do	— 67
course readings	, or bc		уш раск	s of	insti	tutio	n?		you g	auu	ate Iroi	n your	
None 1-4 5-10			More th						р	one	Plan to do	Do not plan	Hav not decid
 b. Number of books read on your own (renjoyment or academic enrichment 	not ass	signed)	for pers	onal	a. Pract	icum,	internsh	ip,	_	*	*	10 00	w
None 1-4 5-10	11-] -20	More tha	an 20	field expe	experi rience	ence, co , or clinic	-OD		_			
c. Number of written papers or reports of	of 20 p				b. Comr	nmen munity	service	or					
None 1-4 5-10	11-	_ -20	More that	an 20	volur	iteer v	vork in a lear						
d. Number of written papers or reports b	etwe	en 5 a	nd 19 p	ages	comr	nunity	or some	other					
None 1-4 5-10	11-		More th		group	os of s	students re classes	take					
e. Number of written papers or reports o	of few	er tha	n 5 pag	es	toget	her	research						
None 1-4 5-10	11-	-20	More th	an 20	with	a facu	ilty mem course o	ber	Į.				
In a typical week, how many he sets do you complete?	nome	work	proble	m	progr	ram re	equireme						
None	1-2	3-4		More	e. Forei cours	gn iar seworl							
a. Number of problem sets that	W	3-4	V	w v	f. Study								
take you more than an hour to complete		П	П	П	self-c	design	nt study ed majoi						
b. Number of problem sets that		810	A. Salar		expe	rience	g senior (capsto					*	
take you less than an hour to complete					thesi	s, con	nior proje nprehens			П			
5 Mark the box that best repres					100	, etc.		hat ha	ct ron	L	nts the	L. Gualita	of.
which your examinations duri year have challenged you to d		ır bes	t work								at your		
Very little		Ve	ry much				ips with	other s	tuden	ts			
] 5	6	7		Unsu	riendl pport	ive,					Friend Support	ive,
6 During the current school year	r, abo	out ho	w ofte	e n	Sense o	of allei	nation				Ser	se of be	ionging
have you done each of the foll		g?	_										
		Often	Some- times			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
a. Attended an art exhibit, play, dance,		_		4			ips with	faculty	meml	oers			
music, theater, or other performance b. Exercised or participated in			Ш	Ш	Un	vailab helpfu	ıl,					Availab Helpfu	ıl,
physical fitness activities					Unsyı	mpath	etic					Sympath	etic
c. Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality	_												
(worship, meditation, prayer, etc.) d. Examined the strengths and		Ц	П	Ц		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	П	П						admini	strativ	e per	sonnel a		
e. Tried to better understand someone	_		_	_	Incor	helpfu nsider	1					Helpfu Consider	ate,
else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	e 🔲					Rigid						Flexib	ic
f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue										5]	7	
or concept					I	1	2	3	4	5	0		

 About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following? a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and 	To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?
other academic activities)	Very Quite Ver much a bit Some littl
Hours per week than 30 b. Working for pay on campus	a. Acquiring a broad general education
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30	b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills
c. Working for pay off campus	d. Speaking clearly and effectively
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More Hours per week than 30	e. Thinking critically and analytically \(\square\) \(\
d. Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus	g. Using computing and information
publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	h. Working effectively with others
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More Hours per week than 30	i. Voting in local, state, or national elections
e. Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)	j. Learning effectively on your own
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More Hours per week than 30	I. Understanding people of other
f. Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	racial and ethnic backgrounds
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More	n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics
Hours per week than 30 9. Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)	o. Contributing to the welfare of your community
0 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More	p. Developing a deepened sense of spirituality
10 To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following? Very Quite Very	Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution? Excellent Good
a. Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Fair Poor To How would you evaluate your entire educational
b. Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically	experience at this institution? Excellent
c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	Good Fair Poor
d. Helping you cope with your non- academic responsibilities (work,	If you could start over again, would you go to the
family, etc.) e. Providing the support you need to thrive socially	same institution you are now attending? Definitely yes
f. Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)	Probably yes Probably no Definitely no

Write in your year of birth: 19	Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored 6
_	1 1 V
16 Your sex:	No (Go to question 25.)
☐ Male ☐ Female	On what team(s) are you an athlete (e.g., football, swimming)? Please answer below:
If Are you an international student or foreign national?	diswel below:
☐ Yes ☐ No	y What I
What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark only one.)	25 What have most of your grades been up to now at this institution?
American Indian or other Native American	H ^A , □ C+
Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander	□ A- □ B □ C
7 (A 6 M)	☐ B- ☐ C- or lower
Black or African American	
☐ White (non-Hispanic)	Which of the following best describes where you are living now while attending college?
☐ Mexican or Mexican American ☐ Puerto Rican	Dormitory or other campus based on the college?
	Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity/ sorority house)
Other Hispanic or Latino	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within
Multiracial	distance of the institution
Other	Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within
☐ I prefer not to respond	distance of the institution
	Fraternity or sorority house
19 What is your current classification in college?	None of the above
Freshman/first-year Senior	27 What is the highest level of education that your
☐ Sophomore ☐ Unclassified	parent(s) completed? (Mark one box per column.)
Junior	Father Mother
es.	
20 Did you begin college at your current	Did not finish high school
institution or elsewhere?	Graduated from high school
Started here Started elsewhere	
	Attended college but did not complete degree
Since graduating from high school, which of	Completed an associate's degree (A.A.,
the following types of schools have you	A.S., etc.)
attended other than the one you are	Completed a bachelor's degree (B.A.,
attending now? (Mark all that apply.)	B.S., etc.) Completed a master's degree (M.A.,
Vocational or technical school	M.S., etc.)
Community or junior college	Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D.,
4-year college other than this one	J.D., M.D., etc.)
∐ None	28 Please print your major(s) or your expected
Other	major(s).
7) Thinking at a second	a. Primary major (Print only one.):
Thinking about this current academic term,	(i mil one)
Toward you characterize your enrollment?	
Less than full-time	
Are you a mombon of	b. If applicable, second major (not minor, concentration, etc.):
Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?	
Yes No	
LI NO	
THANKS FOR SHARING YOUR RES	DONCECI
Indiana University 1000 5	or Student Engagement,
nsse@indiana.edu or www.nsse.iub.edu. Copyright © 2008 Indiana University	/ 512 UI