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The purpose of this study was to determine the sense of mattering among students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration at Rowan University. A secondary purpose was to use this population to compare feelings of mattering between residential and commuting students. The subjects of this study were 240 Rowan University students who were enrolled in an undergraduate program as well as the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration during the spring semester of 2017. Data were collected using a variation of the College Mattering Inventory (Tovar et al., 2009), which contains 29 Likert scale statements consisting of six subscales that sought to determine students’ attitudes toward mattering. Results indicate that students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration had a higher overall sense of mattering when compared to the normative sample by Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009) as well as a previous study on mattering conducted at Rowan University (McGuire, 2012) with undergraduate students. This study also found that when comparing residential and commuting students in the same concentration, commuter students had all-around lower feelings of mattering and higher feelings of marginality than their residential peers.
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Chapter I

Introduction

For many colleges and universities retention rates and graduation rates are critical for growth. It is important to consider the factors that influence those areas such as student involvement, engagement, and feelings of mattering (Moore, Lovell, McGann, & Wyrick, 1998). One of the major influences is residence. Students who attend colleges and universities often have different experiences based on residency. Students who live on campus, for example, are more likely to be involved in various organizations (Jacoby, 2000). Commuting students often spend less time on campus and are less engaged in on campus activities (Jacoby, 2000). These varying experiences can lead to differences in feelings of belonging on campus.

Statement of the Problem

When looking at many universities there is a reoccurring issue. Many of the student involvement and engagement efforts of colleges and universities favor the residential student population. The average meeting time of clubs, programs, and events are created around residential students’ schedules (Jacoby, 2000). A neglected population is commuter students who generally are less involved and engaged than their residential counterparts (Jacoby, 2000). Even the types of programming are geared towards the interests of residential students, which are different than the interests of commuter students (Jacoby, 2000). This contributes to a higher percentage of commuter students leaving school prematurely.

Given the large percentage of commuting students at many colleges and universities, understanding this population is crucial to increased retention and growth.
One way to increase the likelihood of retaining students is to have an environment that promotes a sense of belonging and mattering among all students (Rosenberg & McCullough 1981). The problem is that given the varying experiences of residential and commuter students there may be very different feelings about the level of mattering on campus. Universities need to successfully provide an environment of mattering to all students enrolled regardless of residential status. Ironically, commuter students face challenges that are unique to their circumstance.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to discover any relevant connections between residency and a student’s sense of mattering. Using the *College Mattering Inventory* (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009), the study sought to determine if residential or commuter students felt a sense of mattering or marginality and then looked to compare those results to determine any differences in the responses. The research focused on Rowan University, a public, comprehensive residential institution. According to data collected through College Board, Rowan University has a commuting population of approximately 7700 students (64% of the undergraduate student population). This research highlights the sense of mattering that commuter students may feel on a residential campus and how that differs from the sense of mattering that residential students feel on the same campus. This study aimed to bring to light some possible reasons for disparities among feelings of mattering to different groups of students. This study specifically looks at a subgroup of Rowan University, the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, to study the influence of residency on mattering versus marginality.
Significance of the Study

As college debt continues to rise, students and parents consider options that may save money while still receiving a desired education. One way to obtain the same academic excellence for a reduced cost is for students to commute to college. The commuter population of traditional residential colleges has been steadily increasing and the need to retain those students has become critical to many institutions. As the research demonstrates, students who have a strong sense of mattering at a college have a greater chance of being retained and reaching graduation. With this in mind, determining the sense of mattering of a growing subset of students is crucial to the success of higher education.

Thus, this study aimed to provide insight into the sense of mattering that commuter students had in comparison to residential students at a traditional, residential comprehensive institution, to determine if there was a disparity between the two groups and how to better serve both sets of students. By using the subgroup of Rowan University, the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, this study aimed to minimize other factors that influence mattering. All students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration at Rowan University have between a 3.0 and 4.0 GPA and were highly involved in the concentration and community due to their required participation hours. This allowed the study to look at residency while minimizing other influences.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study is governed by several assumptions. The first assumption is that all subjects answered all parts of the surveys truthfully. It is also assumed that the sample was representative of the entire commuter and residential population proportionally. This
may not be the case given that the students who chose to participate may be, by nature, have a higher sense of mattering than students who chose not to respond to the survey.

By creating and distributing the survey instrument, it is possible that I analyzed the information with a bias given my background as a commuting student. I evaluated the data based on preconceived ideas about what those answers should be.

Another significant limitation is the Honors program is a very unique program within Rowan University. The data collected from this subgroup can only be applied within the subgroup and cannot be applied to Rowan University as a whole. During the fall 2016-spring 2017 academic year, I interned at the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. This, in combination with my undergraduate membership in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, may lead to potential bias in data analysis. There may be personal experiences in my background as an alumnus of the program that may cause me to find unsupported correlations in the data. To counter this bias, a third party reviewed my data and findings to confirm that all the findings had merit.

**Operational Definitions**

1. Commuter Student: For the purpose of this study, commuter students were defined as non-residential students enrolled at Rowan University during the fall 2016-spring 2017 academic year. For the purpose of this study, all students lived within 40 miles of Rowan’s Glassboro campus. Commuter students either lived with their parent or legal guardians, were under the age of 21 and held a freshman or sophomore status; or lived with a parent or legal guardian or independently, were 21 and/or have junior or senior status.
Commuter students, for this study, were full-time students of traditional or non-traditional age who were pursing an undergraduate degree.

2. Honors Student: For the purpose of this study, an honors student is defined as a student who applied to and was accepted into the Bantivolgio Honors Concentration at Rowan University prior to the spring of 2017.

3. Residence Halls: Residence halls, for this study, refer to dormitory and suite style housing that is exclusively for students enrolled in Rowan University for the spring 2017 semester and reside on Rowan University’s Glassboro Campus.

4. Residential Student: For the purpose of this study, residential students are defined students enrolled at Rowan University during the fall 2016-spring 2017 academic year who have on-campus housing. Residential students, for this study, were full-time students of traditional or non-traditional age who were pursing an undergraduate degree.

5. Sense of Belonging: Students’ sense of belonging will be defined as “mattering” in the context of Nancy Schlossberg’s definition: “Mattering is a motive: the feeling that others depend on us, are interested in us, are concerned with our fate, or experience us as an ego-extension exercises a powerful influence on our actions” (Schlossberg, 1989, p. 3).

6. Traditional Students: Traditional students are students between the ages of 18-24 who attended Rowan University during the spring 2017 semester.
**Research Questions**

This study explored the following three questions:

1. Do students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration feel as though they matter in the following areas: general college mattering, mattering v marginality, mattering to advisors, mattering to instructors, mattering to students, and perceived value.

2. How does the sense of mattering in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration compare to the general Rowan population and the normative study?

3. Does residency play a significant role in students’ feelings of mattering on a college campus?

**Overview of the Study**

Chapter II reviews the available research available on commuter students and students’ sense of belonging. It analyzes relevant studies centering on commuting college students and literature provided about honors students’ sense of belonging on college campuses with an emphasis on residence.

Chapter III describes the procedures and methodologies of this study in detail. This includes the context of the study, population and sampling, data collection instrument, data gathering procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. This section summarizes the collected data and contextualizes it in regards to the research questions provided in Chapter I.

Chapter V discusses the relevant findings of the study, offers suggestions, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations for practice and further study.
Chapter II

Review of the Literature

This section evaluates relevant research available on commuting students, student satisfaction, and sense of belonging in higher education. The chapter begins by examining the theory of mattering and marginality. It then discusses the attributes of commuter students including characteristics, challenges, levels of involvement, and differences between residential and commuting students. Then, it highlights some characteristics of honors students. Finally, the discussion focuses on the current literature available concerning commuting students and their sense of belonging as well as the instrument of this study, the *College Mattering Inventory*.

Mattering and Marginality

Rosenberg and McCullough (1981) introduced the idea of mattering as the feelings created by knowing that people are interested in one’s life, wellbeing, and that those people depend on them. In fact, a feeling of being depended on by others is what all humans possess at their core (Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981). Nancy Schlossberg’s (1989) theory of mattering puts those feelings into perspective. Mattering is the belief that a person feels wanted and acknowledged by someone else (Schlossberg, 1989). Mattering is experienced in ones personal life, work life, and voluntary/ community activities (Schlossberg, 1989).

Mattering takes the form of attention, appreciation, importance, dependence, and ego-extension (Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981). Attention is when a person feels noticed by others (Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981). Dependence is the feeling of needing and being needed by others (Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981). Importance is the
feeling that someone cares about a person’s interests, life, and thoughts. Ego-extension includes feelings of pride (Schlossberg, 1989). Appreciation, introduced by Schlossberg in addition to Rosenberg and McCullough’s original four forms of mattering, is the act of or the receiving of gratitude (Schlossberg, 1989). People need to feel a connection to their environment. They need to feel as though they are making an impact and are considered and cared for in that environment.

Marginality occurs when individuals face a transition between roles (Schlossberg, 1989). This is normal and can happen multiple times in someone’s life. It can take time for someone to become central to a group and elicit the desired feeling of mattering (Schlossberg, 1989). In a college setting, many students have the potential to feel marginalized in the transition from being a member of their hometown community to being a member of their college community (Jacoby, 2000). It is when an individual feels displaced and unaccepted in a new situation. The greater the difference is between those roles, the higher chance of marginalization. This is common when students who do not share the same experience such as those who are of different ages, socio-economic statuses, genders and ethnicities (Schlossberg, 1989).

Rosenberg and McCullough (1981) found that people of higher socio-economic statuses ranked higher on the mattering scales than those of lower statuses. Commuting students are more likely to come from lower socio-economic classes and struggle financially (Burilson, 2015). Commuter students are at a higher risk for feeling marginalized and isolated (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011). Feelings of mattering are motivational (Schlossberg, 1989). Mattering and a sense of belonging on campus is a strong predictor of student persistence through college and is, therefore, a crucial area to
address in new and continuing students (Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow, & Salomone, 2002)

**Commuting Students**

Presently, commuting students are the majority of the American collegiate population. In 1998, they consisted of roughly 86% of U.S. college students with numbers increasing since (Jacoby, 2000). Even with commuting students as the majority on most college campuses, residential students are still seen as the ‘traditional’ college student and policies and practices are not created with commuting students in mind, but rather, they cater to the residential population (Jacoby, 2000). This stems from the residential model promoted by the most prestigious American universities, the Ivy Leagues (Jacoby, 1989). Commuting students are any student who does not reside in housing provided by a college (Alfano & Eduljee, 2013; Jacoby, 1989). It is important to note, however, that when discussing the definition of “commuting students” with actual commuting students, researchers do not include students who lived close enough to campus to walk between their home and college. They see “commuting students” as a group who specifically could not access their home while at school (Weiss, 2014). While that encompasses a large amount of students, commuters generally fall into several categories. Students may be dependent students (often of traditional age) who are living at home with their parents, non-traditional aged students living in apartments or homes that they pay for, full-time traditionally aged students renting off-campus housings, or other specific circumstances (Jacoby & Garland, 2004).
Characteristics of Commuting Students

The characteristics of commuting students are important to understand. Those characteristics are distinctly different from the characteristics of residential students (Jacoby, 1989). Commuting students are more likely to be non-traditional students. Commuting students are more likely to be first generation students (Jacoby, 2000). They are more likely to work full-time off campus (Alfano & Eduljee, 2013). In particular, the percentage of minority students who commute is much higher than the percentage of residential students. It is also much more likely for part-time students to make up a large percentage of the commuter population (Jacoby, 2000). On average, they are also more likely to come from a family with less education and lower household incomes than residential students (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011). Commuting students are more likely to have transferred into their institution (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011).

Given the vast diversity of the commuting students’ subgroup, they are a complex group to study (Dugan, Garland, Jacoby, & Gasiorski, 2008). There are even noticeable differences between dependent and independent commuting students (Dugan et al., 2008). Among those differences is a varying level of applied leadership abilities (Dugan et al., 2008).

Commuter Student Involvement

Living on campus has been shown to provide many benefits to students. One of which is by providing students who live on campus with a plethora of opportunities for growth and learning due to abundance of programming and co-curricular activities (Jacoby, 1989). Since commuting students have a limited amount of time spent in this activity-rich environment, they are at a distinct disadvantage from their residential peers.
(Chickering, 1974). Several studies have supported the statement that commuter students are less involved on campus than their residential peers (Alfano & Eduljee, 2013; Layman, 2005). Jacoby (1989) showed that there was a glaring misconception that commuter students had no desire to be involved and that was the only reason why they lacked involvement. They did, in fact, desire to be involved (Jacoby, 1989). This is one of several common excuses provided by faculty and staff to explain the lack of involvement by commuting students. This also included commuting students being seen as less academically able or and less committed to their educational success (Dugan et al., 2008).

There have been copious amounts of research confirming the idea that involvement does have a positive impact on student development. It effects leadership development, potential placement and success in post-collegiate careers, retention and degree completion (Moore, Lovell, McGann, & Wyrick, 1998). Positive correlations between student involvement and intrapersonal and interpersonal skills have been made along with student involvement and student self-confidence. Students who participate in extracurricular activities have been shown to have a higher degree of self-awareness when it came to applicable job-skills including strengths and limitations (Moore et al., 1998).

Individuals who feel marginalized are less likely to reach out to organizations, administrators, or individuals about getting involved or utilizing resources. This stems from a lack of knowledge provided and attention being paid to them (Schlossberg, 1989). Additionally, traditional college programming caters to residential, traditional-aged students and does not necessarily appeal to the needs of commuter students who are more practically and academically driven (Burilson, 2015). Briggs (2011) conducted research
that concluded that commuting students were interested and willing to participate in programming, but were unable due to the late times of these programs and time commitment conflicts of their employment and home responsibilities.

**Challenges for Commuting Students**

Commuting students face many additional challenges as compared to residential students. They are consistently overlooked or ignored on residential campuses (Baum, 2005). Commuting students often feel unable to make lasting peer connections, manage their time effectively, and adequately park on campus (Bloomquist, 2014).

**Transportation**

Transportation has consistently been brought up through research as a key element that affects commuting students and their feelings and perceptions of college (Briggs, 2011; Jacoby 1989). Costs associated with transportation such as gas, bus fair, parking passes, and insurance put additional financial pressure on commuting students who cannot subsidize those costs through loan programs (Jacoby & Garland, 2004). Commuting students need to consider weather, parking space availability, and traffic into their schedule when heading to and from college. As a result of these additional considerations, convenience timing for classes and services is necessary to truly accommodate commuting students (Jacoby, 2000).

**Multiple Roles**

Commuting students need assistance and patience to balance multiple roles (Briggs, 2011). They often have to coordinate their school life, home life, personal life, and professional life in addition to their extracurricular activities and involvement at the institution (Jacoby, 2000). Since commuters are more likely to work full-time they may
have a very small amount of flexibility in their schedules, which may conflict with office hours, club meetings, or university events (Alfano & Eduljee, 2013). Additionally, commuting students must rely on support structures outside of campus and those who may not understand the demands and pressures of higher education (Jacoby, 2000). Those structures may come in the form of family, spouses, friends or even children.

**Finding a “Second Home”**

Commuting students are often not given the space on campus to feel comfortable such as lockers or lounges (Jacoby, 2000). When looking at desirable spaces for commuting students, they seek privacy, a place to store personal belongings safely, and a place to socialize with their peers (Weiss, 2014). Due to the lack of facilities specifically for commuting students, many utilize other spaces around their campus. These include academic buildings, library facilities, computer laboratories, and student health services (Dunham, 2000). These facilities are not ideal, however, since libraries and academic buildings have no way for students to store or personalize their space. This leads to some students spending free time in the comfort of their cars (Weiss, 2014). A positive correlation was found between the utilization of university resources and the sense of belonging found in commuting students (Cattell, 2016). That being the case, commuting students severely underutilize university resources (Dunham, 2000). They are also less likely to participate in co-curricular activities and utilize education resources, which results in a widening gap of achievement between residential and commuting students (Chickering, 1974).
Relationship Development on Campus

Commuting students struggle to find time and spaces to make friends on campus (Baum, 2005; Bloomquist, 2014; Weiss, 2014;). Due to their lower levels of involvement, commuting students are less able to adequately socialize with peers to create lasting relationships (Briggs, 2011). Commuting students often have the ability to socialize with peers during classes and many professors do not facilitate that socialization in their courses (Baum, 2005). This leads to commuting students needing to start over each semester when it comes to building relationships on campus. With a lack of substantial relationships, commuting students do not have the necessary support structure to succeed at the same rate as residential students who have more consistent relationships (Jacoby, 2000).

Residential Vs. Commuting Students

Commuting students’ face unique challenges that residential students do not. These students obviously require different programming to make the most of the collegiate experience, however, many colleges continue to program for residential students and assume that commuting students will benefit and learn equally as well from those programs as their residential peers (Dugan et al., 2008). Some characteristics of residential students that Chickering (1974) discovered were greater high school credentials, they were more active in leadership roles in their high school clubs, they were engaged in more intellectual activities, they more often applied to two or more colleges, and they had higher overall educational goals than compared to commuter students.
While the research is clear that commuting students have different characteristics than residential students, one major difference is their representation among student groups and associations such as student government (Jacoby, 1989). While the majority of club representatives are residential students, all commuting students are grouped into a single organization in many institutions (Commuter Student Association) that limits their influence on a collegiate scale (Briggs, 2011). There may be a correlation between commuting students’ lack of representation on campus and their lack of feelings of identity with their institution (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011).

Commuting students are more likely to limit or schedule their time spent on campus in order to address the other demands on their schedule (Jacoby, 2000). This includes, but is not limited to, family life, martial obligations, jobs, and other personal obligations. The lack of a physical presence on campus leads to lower levels of involvement when extra-curricular activities are not scheduled around or during class hours (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011). Commuter students in general are less involved than residential students in areas including athletics, Greek organizations, campus clubs, and community service (Pustorino, 2014). This may be due to the lack of connection students feel to campus when clubs and organizations are scheduled during inaccessible times (Briggs, 2011). Weiss’s (2014) findings support a marginalized feeling due to the timing of activities and programs and goes on to address that some students feel additionally disadvantaged due to the favor that scholarship committees and school leadership positions put on certain extra-curricular events which may not feasibly fit into a commuting students’ schedule.
A study of the demographic and psychographic differences between commuting students and residential students concluded there are several distinct differences including age, wages, desire to join the alumni association and belief that the university had a good reputation (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011).

Satisfaction with a collegiate experience has yielded many difference results. While Liu and Jung (1980) found no significant difference between residential and commuter students’ satisfaction with their university, two other studies offer contradictory findings. Newbold, Mehta, and Forbus (2011) found that commuting students were less likely to believe their university was distinct and less likely to identify with the institution. Dunham (2000) found that surveyed commuter students who identified as “traditional” (aged 18-24) were dissatisfied with their collegiate experience. Layman (2005) found the opposite result. He found that commuting students felt closer to their career goals and overall more satisfied with their institution when compared to their residential counterparts. Some reasons for the disparity in results can be explained by realizing that satisfaction levels were found to correlate to distance from campus and socio-economic status (Dunham, 2000), two pieces of information that were not gathered during Layman’s research. Wicker (2004) found mattering to be the largest predictor of student satisfaction at an institution.

**Research on Commuter Student Sense of Belonging**

Commuter students often lack a sense of belonging on their college campus. This stems from a lack of accommodations that would allow them to obtain a feeling of being valued by an institution (Jacoby, 1989). While Jacoby (1989) conducted research on commuting students that yielded findings about marginalization in commuting students,
there have been several studies that found conflicting results. Briggs (2011) conducted a study on commuter students’ sense of belonging and found a moderate feeling of belonging as well as feelings of isolation. The institutional established organization for commuting students (Commuting Student Association) was not effectively helping students acclimate or providing a sense of community. There was also a drop in a sense of belonging for upperclassmen students for every year after the first. Separate programs developed for freshmen students provided more involvement during the first year and as those programs finish and upperclassmen become less involved, their feelings of belonging dropped (Briggs, 2011). Another important note was the significant difference between students who transferred into the institution, who possessed much weaker senses of belonging (Briggs, 2011).

Bloomquist (2014) conducted a mixed methods study on commuter student sense of belonging and while, like Briggs, he did find that many students felt a sense of mattering, he noted several statistically significant correlations for those individuals who felt marginalized. Those correlations included a positive correlation between mattering and first semester GPA meaning that the stronger the feelings of marginalization, the lower the student’s GPA (Bloomquist, 2014).

Dunham (2000) researched commuting student satisfaction with university resources. Although the survey response rate was low and the sample size was small for the study, which limits the generalizations that can be made from the findings, several correlations can be presented for consideration. Dunham found that dependent commuting students who lived at home with their parents over two miles from campus
utilized campus resources less. This is consistent with findings of other studies (Cattell, 2016; Weiss, 2014).

Weiss (2014) conducted 10 phenomenological interviews with commuting students who brought photos representing their experiences. When evaluating how commuting students made meaning of their collegiate experiences, Weiss (2014) found four themes: “the social construction of which students are considered commuters; isolation and level of consciousness; the relationship between living arrangement and independence; and accessibility and relevance of campus involvement” (Weiss, 2014, p. 155). Commuting students were found to simultaneously feel as if they were missing out on essential college experiences while at the same time being satisfied with their independence and self-direction (Weiss, 2014). The largest implication from this study was the vast differences in experiences between commuting students. Weiss encourages the continued collection of commuting student stories and the facilitating of programming “to examine the scope of campus involvement, integration of family, work, community, and school life, support for wellness, providing ‘second homes,’ and reinventing residential life” (Weiss, 2014, p. 172).

In contrast to the above studies, Wicker (2004) conducted a study using a student satisfaction inventory; it was administered to commuting students at the University of Maryland. Wicker (2004) found that commuting distance or type of commuting status were not predictors of mattering or satisfactory levels. Wicker (2004) found significant correlations between feelings of mattering and demographic aspects of students, suggesting that addressing programming for commuting students may not be as effective at aiding those students as programming for specific demographics and minorities. As the
knowledge base indicates, commuter students are more likely to be minority students, transfer students, and non-traditional students and this study suggests that feelings of marginalization may not stem from commuting challenges, but more complex characteristics (Jacoby, 2000).

**Specific Characteristics of Honors Students**

While this study uses honors students as a subgroup for us to control academic achievement and involvement, there are several characteristics of this group that should be considered when studying them. Astin’s (1993) research on honors students found that students who participate in honors programs have higher bachelors degree attainment, self-reported readiness for graduate school, and overall collegiate satisfaction. Honors students, according are also more likely to think critically and successfully problem-solve (Astin, 1993). Hébert and McBee (2007) looked at the impact of honors programs on the subjects. What they found was the students who participate in honors programs are more likely to feel a sense of community due to the exposure to likeminded individuals. The study also revealed an increased desire for knowledge and academic growth.

Shushok (2002) studied a population of honors students both quantitatively and qualitatively. The results of that study found many similarities in involvement and engagement between honors and non-honors students. When compared to non-honors students with similar academic backgrounds, there was little difference. This included similar motivations to attend college, one of which was financial for both groups (Shushok, 2002). One thing to note about honors students is that they may actually feel marginalized from the other groups on a college campus due to their academic interests (Shushok, 2002).
Zieniuk (2011) specifically looked at Rowan University’s Honors Concentration. This mixed study looked at the Honors Concentration and its impact on the students enrolled. This study found high levels of student satisfaction with the program, with one theme suggesting more involvement opportunities for students. Students interviewed by Zieniuk expressed growth both academically and socially (Zieniuk, 2011).

The College Mattering Inventory at Rowan University

The *College Mattering Inventory* is a survey instrument whose validity was established by Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009). Since the creation of this mattering inventory, many studies have utilized this resource to determine mattering on their own campus.

McGuire (2012) used the *College Mattering Inventory* to determine the overall feelings of mattering of undergraduate students at Rowan University. While that study determined that the majority of students felt that they mattered, it made no distinction about the effects that any subgroup, such as a concentration in Honors, may have had on the student’s sense of mattering. Based off of McGuire’s (2012) work at Rowan University, Olsen (2015) sought to use the *College Mattering Inventory* to determine the effect of involvement programs on sense of belonging. Specifically, Olsen conducted a study on 400 Rowan students who attended Rowan After hours. The results of this study showed that participation in Rowan After Hours had a positive effect on students’ sense of belonging. Johnston (2014) conducted research on Rowan University’s Rohrer College of Business. Specifically, Johnston (2014) used the *College Mattering Inventory* to determine transfer students’ sense of mattering to the Rohrer College of Business. Johnston surveyed junior and senior transfer students at Rowan University who identified
as Business Majors. Similar to Olsen, Johnston’s data were compared to McGuire’s study as well as the normative sample.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

Commuting students, despite being the majority at many institutions, are often not considered separately from residential students in regards to programming and policymaking. They have very different needs from residential students and are often non-traditional and/or transfer students (Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011). They are more likely to struggle financially and work part or full time while simultaneously being less likely to attend full time and more likely to stop out (Burilson, 2015). The current research surrounding comparisons between commuting and residential students shows commuting students are lacking or receiving less than their residential counterparts (Chickering, 1974). They are also considered a-typical students in regards to their demographics.

Current research stresses the important of mattering in regards to student success and persistence (Hoffman et al., 2002). With commuting students more at risk for departure, researching their persistence is important for the success in colleges with growing numbers of commuting students (Jacoby, 1989). Additionally, despite the research that exists to describe the differences between residential students and commuting students, faculty and staff continue to program for residential students with the false belief that it will equally benefit their commuting counterparts (Dugan et al., 2008). Through a study of the literature provided on commuter students, several gaps in research emerge. There is little research surrounding specific comparisons between commuter and residential students’ sense of belonging. Without a frame of reference,
researchers are only able to see conflicting results. By providing a study to compare students based on residence, researchers could compare levels of mattering to determine smaller differences. Despite the current research, there is a gap in the knowledge base when it comes to evaluating the commuter subset of students with regards to a student’s sense of mattering on a college campus as compared to residential students on the same campus. There is also a lack of research on sense of belonging in honors students.
Chapter III

Methodology

Context of the Study

This study was conducted at Rowan University, a four-year public, residential institution with over 14,000 undergraduate students, which classifies it as a medium-sized institution. Rowan University is located in Glassboro, NJ. Ninety-five percent of Rowan students consist of “in-state” students who claim residency in New Jersey (Common Data set, 2016). According to the Common Data set (2016) Rowan has a commuting percentage of 63% representing roughly 8,300 students. The residential student population is nearly 4,900 students, 37%. That being said, when looking exclusively at first-year freshman, 79% live on campus and 21% commute (Common Data set, 2016). This means that 29% of Rowan’s residential population consists of first-year freshman students. Roughly 10% of students are enrolled part-time. The ethnic composition of the school is 66% Caucasian, 12% Hispanic/Latino, 10% African American, 5% Asian American and 7% other (Common Data set, 2016). Rowan University is 49% male and 51% female with 90% of its students being of traditional age. Rowan University has a student to faculty ratio of 18:1 and offers 74 bachelors degree programs as well as various graduate programs (Common Data set, 2016). The Middle States Commission of Higher Education accredits Rowan University.

There is limited information available about the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. Students are able to apply to the program any time between being admitted to Rowan University and the student’s junior year at the University.

Membership in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration requires that students complete
eight specific “Honors” courses with rigorous GPAs to graduate with a concentration in Honors Studies. Additionally, students must complete 14 hours of Honors recommended activities and 14 hours of community service per semester (“Concentration Requirements,” 2017). Bantivoglio Honors students also receive several benefits. These include priority registration, study abroad and conference funding, honors-only lounges, and honors priority housing (“Honors Benefits,” 2017). Honor’s commuting students are given the option to utilize lockers in the Honors Lounge (“Honors Benefits,” 2017). Honors upperclassmen students are housed in the Whitney Center, apartment-style lodging for 278 students that also houses the Honors Lounge, classroom spaces, and Honors Administrative Office and Honors underclassmen are housed in Holly Pointe Commons in a living learning community (“Apartment Style Residence Halls,” 2017).

**Population and Sampling**

This study used a subgroup of Rowan University. It looked at Bantivoglio Honors Concentration’s sense of belonging and whether there is a comparable difference based on residency of students. The target population for this research was students who attended Rowan University during the fall 2016- spring 2017 academic year and were part of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration for spring 2017. The students should be classified as Honors as well as either “commuter students” or “residential students,” which means that they attended at least one class on Rowan University’s Glassboro Campus. This excludes purely distance learners and students at satellite campuses due to simplicity for comparison. There were no age, gender or race requirements for participation in this research. Students were required to be registered as full-time students. The sample size of this study was 501 subjects. The surveys were distributed to
all of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. Participation was voluntary and students were recruited through the Honors Announcer. Students were offered 1 hour of service for participation in the survey. The Bantivoglio Honors Concentration consists of roughly 500 students. A total of 138 of those students identify as commuting students.

**Data Collection Instrument**

The *College Mattering Inventory* (Appendix B) was taken with permission from Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009) (Appendix D) and distributed in an online capacity to all students in the study with anonymity. This mattering inventory addressed “importance, attention, support, dependence, ego-extension, and marginality and other areas of mattering” (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009, p. 173). Specifically, the *College Mattering Inventory* measures a student’s sense of importance, attention, and support in relationships with faculty members, advisors and counselors, peers, and learning environments (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009). This instrument consists of 29 Likert scale statements ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). There were 17 items that needed to be reverse-scored before data analysis due to the negative manner in which they were posed to subjects. This was purposefully done to limit the presence of acquiescence in the responses (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009).

The *College Mattering Inventory* used the *Sense of Belonging Scale* from Hoffman et al., (2002) to find convergent evidence of validity through external measures (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009). The *Sense of Belonging Scale* measured areas such as “perceived peer support, perceived faculty support/comfort, perceived isolation, and perceived empathetic faculty understanding” (Tovar, Simon, & Lee, 2009, p. 173) using a
29 Likert-scale questionnaire. The pattern of correlations supported the convergent evidence for the validity of the *College Mattering Inventory*.

The *College Mattering Inventory* was recreated digitally for this study with the addition of 7 demographic questions requesting the students age, race, gender, year, residency, time as a member of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, and distance from the University.

The reliability and validity of the *College Mattering Inventory* was determined by Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009) during their analysis of the *College Mattering Inventory* as a survey instrument. Cronbach Alpha’s coefficient for internal consistency determined reliability using the Likert scale items. For total mattering scale $\alpha=.91$. The six subscales had strong reliability scores as well; general college mattering $\alpha=.89$, mattering versus marginality $\alpha=.83$, mattering to counselors or advisors $\alpha=.84$, mattering to instructors $\alpha=.76$, mattering to students $\alpha=.77$, and perception of mattering $\alpha=.72$. Cronbach Alpha was used to calculate reliability for the Likert scale items in this study using SPSS computer software. These calculations resulted in total mattering scale $\alpha=.88$, general college mattering $\alpha=.81$, mattering versus marginality $\alpha=.84$, mattering to counselors or advisors $\alpha=.84$, mattering to instructors $\alpha=.71$, mattering to students $\alpha=.79$, and perception of mattering $\alpha=.80$. Coefficient scores of .70 or greater are an indication of a stable and internally consistent instrument. Thus, the survey was judged to be reliable.

**Data Gathering Procedures**

Prior to the collection of any data, an Institutional Review Board application (Appendix A) was completed and approved. All subjects gave informed consent to participate in this study. No personal identification questions were asked in order to
maintain anonymity of all subjects. Subjects were only asked to confirm their status as ‘residential’ or ‘commuting’ and that they were enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration during the spring of 2017.

Surveys were distributed in April 2017. These students were recruited through email and reminded weekly to complete the survey. Surveys were conducted electronically through the program Qualtrics. There were approximately 500 students enrolled in the Honors Concentration at Rowan University for the spring 2017 semester. Data were collected using a stratified random sample. Based on a sample size calculator 122 of the 138 commuting students in Honors and 271 of the 363 residential students were needed to participate in the College Mattering Inventory. For a desired 70% participation rate, 85 commuting students and 190 residential students were needed. Minimally, 61 commuting students and 136 residential students were needed for a 50% response rate.

Data Analysis

The demographic characteristics of this study were collected through the first seven questions of the survey and included year, gender, distance from campus, age range and race/ethnic background. Dependent variables were collected through 29 Likert scale statements on the survey. The dependent variables were the unaltered College Mattering Inventory. Significant variations between residential and commuter student sense of mattering were analyzed. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software to create frequency tables. To analyze the research questions descriptive statistics, including percentages, frequency distributions, and measures of central tendency, were used.
Chapter IV

Findings

Profile of the Sample

The subjects of this study were undergraduate students at Rowan University who were members of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration during the spring 2017 semester. The survey was distributed electronically through email to the members of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. Data were collected using a stratified random sample.

Of the 122 commuting students selected, 65 students responded for a response rate of 53%. Of the 271 residential students selected, 175 students responded for a response rate of 65%. Combining both groups yielded a response rate of 60%.

The background information for the surveyed sample are shown in Table 4.1. The majority of the sample were native students to Rowan University. Only 4% of students transferred to Rowan from another university. The class years of the subjects were pretty evenly split with underclassman (35%) having a slightly higher response rate than upperclassman (35%). Subject responses for how long they were members of the Honors Concentration did not align completely with their class year. This may be due to students taking on higher course loads or entering college with advanced placement credits.

Nearly half of the subjects were members of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration for less than a year (41%). Roughly 32% were members of the Concentration between 1-2 years and the rest of the responses came from students who had been in the concentration over 3 years (27%).

The gender of the subjects consisted of 52% female, 46% male, and 2% other gender identities. This is similar to Rowan University as a whole, which is 51% female
and 49% male (Common Data set, 2016). The racial breakdown of the subjects consists of a population that is slightly different than Rowan University’s overall sample. The Honors Concentration has a higher percentage of Caucasian and Asian/Pacific Islander students with 87% Caucasian (compared to Rowan University’s overall rate of 66%), and 8% Asian/ Pacific Islander (compared to Rowan University’s 5%) (Common Data Set, 2016). The percentages of Hispanic/ Latina and African American students are minimal and combined with other races only total 5% of subjects.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Background Demographics (N=240)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as part of Honors</strong> (Missing= 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>87.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>96.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>72.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific questions about residency were asked based on the response to the question “Do you live in Rowan University Housing?” Table 4.2 displays the results of the residency specific questions. Of the 175 subjects who responded that they do live in Rowan University Housing, 73% identified as residing in Honors specific housing (in the Whitney Center and Holly Pointe Commons). Rowan Boulevard, non-honors housing of a similar style to the Whitney Center, housed 12% of the respondents. Of the 65 students who did not live in Rowan University housing, the majority of respondents (52%) lived in the surrounding community of Glassboro. Nearly 17% of respondents identified as living 5.1-10 miles from campus. An equal number of subjects responded as living 10.1-15 miles from Rowan University (nearly 17% of respondents). Only about 5% of respondents lived 15.1-20 miles away. There were six respondents (10%) who identified as living further than 20 miles from Rowan University.
Table 4.2

Residency Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=240)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>72.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residences on Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Residential Students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=170)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Pointe Commons</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney Center</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Boulevard</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other underclassman housing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other upperclassman Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance from Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 miles from Rowan University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-10 miles from Rowan University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-15 miles from Rowan University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1-20 miles from Rowan University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 miles from Rowan University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Data

**Research question 1.** Do students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration feel as though they matter in the following areas: general college mattering, mattering v marginality, mattering to advisors, mattering to instructors, mattering to students, and perceived value.

Table 4.3 displays the data for subjects’ attitudes of general college mattering.

General college mattering is the feeling that at Rowan University, there are others who
value the respondent. Items are arranged by mean scores from most to least positive. Overall, subjects had high feelings of general college mattering. Six of the eight statements had over 50% of subjects responding with either “Moderately” or “Very Much.” “There are people at the University who are genuinely interested in me as a person,” 53.7% selected moderately and 28.3% selected very much; “There are people at the University who are concerned about my future,” 80.5% selected either “moderately” or “very much.” The statement, “Other students are happy for me when I do well in exams or projects,” had 70% of subjects responding with “moderately” or “very much.” “People on campus are generally supportive of my individual needs,” had 75.2% of subjects selecting “moderately” or “very much.” “People on campus seem happy about my accomplishments,” had 70% of subjects responding positively as well, as did “There are people on campus who are sad for me when I fail in something I set out to do,” with 66% of subjects responding with “moderately” or “very much.”
Table 4.3

*General College Mattering (N=240)*

*(1=Not at All, 2=Slightly, 3=Somewhat, 4=Moderately, 5=Very Much)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people at the University who are genuinely interested in me as a person.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=4.06, SD=.7714, Missing=7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are people at the University who are concerned about my future.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=4.06, SD=.8231, Missing=7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students are happy for me when I do well in exams or projects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.84, SD=.7854, Missing=7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on campus are generally supportive of my individual needs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.81, SD=.7122, Missing=7</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on campus seem happy about my accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.8, SD=.7178, Missing=7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people on campus who are sad for me when I fail in something I set out to do.</td>
<td>4 1.7</td>
<td>19 8.2</td>
<td>55 23.6</td>
<td>129 55.4</td>
<td>26 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.66, SD=.8464, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel pressured to do better because people at the college would be disappointed if I did not.</td>
<td>13 5.6</td>
<td>40 17.2</td>
<td>63 27.0</td>
<td>92 39.5</td>
<td>25 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.33, SD=1.057, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people on campus are disappointed in me when I do not accomplish all I should.</td>
<td>9 3.9</td>
<td>50 21.5</td>
<td>85 36.5</td>
<td>82 35.2</td>
<td>7 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.12, SD=.9112, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second subscale is mattering versus marginality. Table 4.4 displays the data gathered on this subscale. This subscale measures whether students felt a stronger sense of mattering on campus or a stronger feeling of being marginalized, or lack of belonging. This section was inversely scored due to the fact that each statement was presented negatively. Therefore, a response of “very much” actually means “not at all” and a response of “moderately actually means “slightly.” “Somewhat” stays the same despite reverse scoring. The statement with the highest mean value, and therefore greatest
attitudes of marginality, was, “Sometimes I get so wrapped up in my personal problems that I isolate myself from others at the University,” with 31.8% of subjects responding with “moderately” and 8.6% responding with “very much.” The statement with the lowest mean value, and therefore highest level of mattering was, “Sometimes I feel that no one at the University notices me,” with 25.8% of subjects selecting “not at all” and 41.6% of subjects responding with “slightly.” All of the other statements trended towards feelings of mattering over marginality with over 50% of subjects selecting “slightly” or “not at all.”

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mattering Vs. Marginality (N=240)</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel that no one at the University notices me.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.21, SD=1.011, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel that I am not interesting to anyone at the University.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.4, SD=.9959, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often feel isolated when involved in student activities (e.g., clubs, events).</td>
<td>45 19.3%</td>
<td>98 42.1%</td>
<td>47 20.2%</td>
<td>38 16.3%</td>
<td>5 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.4, SD=1.042, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel alone at the University.</td>
<td>59 25.3%</td>
<td>66 28.3%</td>
<td>60 25.8%</td>
<td>39 16.8%</td>
<td>9 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.45, SD=1.152, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel socially inadequate at school.</td>
<td>37 15.9%</td>
<td>100 42.9%</td>
<td>47 20.2%</td>
<td>40 17.2%</td>
<td>9 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.5, SD=1.071, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I get so wrapped up in my personal problems that I isolate myself from others at the University.</td>
<td>25 10.7%</td>
<td>72 30.9%</td>
<td>42 18.0%</td>
<td>74 31.8%</td>
<td>20 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.97, SD=1.185, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*items reverse scored

The third subscale is mattering to advisors. Subjects were given explicit instructions to consider their Honors advisors as opposed to their academic college advisor to determine personal feelings of mattering to advisors as it relates specifically to the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. Table 4.5 displays the data collected for the subscale on mattering to advisors using mean scores from most to least positive.
Table 4.5

*Mattering to Advisors (N=240)*

*(1=Not at All, 2=Slightly, 3=Somewhat, 4=Moderately, 5=Very Much)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My advisor is generally receptive to what I have to say. n=233, M=3.91, SD=.085, Missing=7</td>
<td>2 0.9</td>
<td>10 4.3</td>
<td>53 22.8</td>
<td>111 47.6</td>
<td>57 24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors at the University generally show their concern for students' well-being. n=233, M=3.83, SD=.088, Missing=7</td>
<td>3 1.3</td>
<td>14 6.0</td>
<td>53 22.8</td>
<td>113 48.5</td>
<td>50 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had a personal problem, I believe that advisors would be willing to discuss it with me. n=233, M=3.72, SD=.935, Missing=7</td>
<td>4 1.7</td>
<td>22 9.4</td>
<td>53 22.8</td>
<td>110 47.2</td>
<td>44 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I stopped attending Rowan University, my advisor(s) would be disappointed. n=233, M=3.4, SD=1.05, Missing=7</td>
<td>12 5.2</td>
<td>31 13.3</td>
<td>74 31.8</td>
<td>83 35.6</td>
<td>33 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my advisor(s) would miss me if I suddenly stopped attending Rowan University. n=233, M=3.03, SD=1.12, Missing=7</td>
<td>22 9.4</td>
<td>54 23.2</td>
<td>73 31.3</td>
<td>62 26.6</td>
<td>22 9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the data on mattering to advisors most responses were very positive. Three statements had over 50% of subjects responding positively with either “moderately” or “very much” selected. “My advisor is generally receptive to what I have to say,” had 47.6% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 24.5% selecting “very much.” “Advisors at the University generally show their concern for students’ well-being,” had 48.5% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 21.5% “very much.” “If I had a personal problem, I believe that advisors would be willing to discuss it with me.” had 47.2% of subjects responding “moderately” and 18.9% “very much.”

The fourth subscale is mattering to instructors. This subscale is used to determine the extent at which the subjects felt as though they value to their instructors. Subjects were instructed to consider their Honors instructors rather than all of their professors at Rowan University. This may range from experiences with 1-10 professors depending on the number of honors courses the participant has taken. This section was inversely scored due to the fact that each statement was presented negatively. Therefore, a response of “very much” actually means “not at all” and a response of “moderately actually means “slightly.” “Somewhat” stays the same despite reverse scoring. All of the statements in this section had over 50% of subjects selecting “not at all” or “slightly” meaning that there is a very high feeling of mattering to instructors in the Honors Concentration at Rowan University. The statement, “My instructors sometimes ignore my comments or questions” had over 70% of students selecting “slightly” or “not at all” and had the lowest mean score of all of the statements.
Table 4.6

Mattering to Instructors (N=240)
(1=Not at All, 2=Slightly, 3=Somewhat, 4=Moderately, 5=Very Much)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My instructors sometimes ignore my comments or questions.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=1.95, SD=.085, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes my instructors simply do not listen to what I have to say.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.11, SD=.094, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel my instructor(s) want me to hurry up and finish speaking.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.14, SD=.084, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel my instructor(s) care more about other things than me as a student.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=2.46, SD=1.04, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*items reverse scored

The fifth subscale is mattering to students. This subscale measures the extent to which subjects felt as though they matter to their peers on campus. This subscale had very positive responses to the statements as is displayed in Table 4.7, “Other students rely
on me for support,” which had 49.8% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 13.8% of subjects selecting “very much.” “When in groups, other students tend to rely on my contributions,” had 49.8% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 21.5% of subjects selecting “very much.” “Some students are dependent on my guidance or assistance to help them succeed,” had 36.1% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 12.5% of subjects selecting “very much.”

Table 4.7

Mattering to Students (N=240)
(1=Not at All, 2=Slightly, 3=Somewhat, 4=Moderately, 5=Very Much)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When in groups, other students tend to rely on my contributions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.87, SD=.082, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students rely on me for support.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.68, SD=.084, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some students are dependent on my guidance or assistance to help them succeed.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=233, M=3.35, SD=1.03, Missing=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final subscale is perceived value. This section addresses to what extent the subjects’ felt that their contributions and involvement matter. Table 4.8 displays the data collected for this subscale.

Perceived value is the most positive of the six subscales for the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration. “It is comforting to know that my contributions are valued by my instructors,” had 50.6% of respondents selecting “moderately” and 36% of respondents selecting “very much.” “There are people at the University that sincerely appreciate my involvement as a student,” had 51.1% of respondents selecting “moderately” and “34.8% of subjects responding “very much.” “Knowing that other people at the University care for me motivates me to do better,” had 48.5% of respondents selecting “moderately” and “29.2% of respondents choosing “very much.”

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is comforting to know that my contributions are valued by my instructors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=233, M=4.21, SD=.0726, Missing=7
Table 4.8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people at the University that sincerely appreciate my involvement as a student.</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td>4 1.7</td>
<td>28 12.0</td>
<td>119 51.1</td>
<td>81 34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that other people at the University care for me motivates me to do better.</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td>7 3.0</td>
<td>44 18.9</td>
<td>113 48.5</td>
<td>68 29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 2. How does the sense of mattering in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration compare to the general Rowan population and the normative study?

Table 4.9 displays the mean scores for the six subscales of mattering of this study with a comparison to the study of Rowan University undergraduates (McGuire, 2012) and the normative sample from Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009).

In four of the six subscales, this study yielded higher positive mean scores compared to both the Rowan University undergraduate study and the normative sample. In two of the six subscales, this study yielded higher negative mean scores. In the two subscales that were reverse scored, “Mattering to Instructors” and “Matter v. Marginality,” this study had higher negative results, meaning that there is a lower sense
of mattering in these two categories. For “Mattering to Instructors,” this study had a mean score of 2.17, which is higher than Rowan University undergraduates (2.03) and the normative sample (1.87). For “Mattering v. Marginality,” this study had a mean score of 2.49, which is higher than Rowan University undergraduates (2.15) and the normative sample (2.30).

In the other four areas this study yielded higher feelings of mattering through more positive results than the other comparative studies. “Perception of Value,” in this study had a mean score of 4.14, which is .35 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.79) and .44 higher than the normative sample (3.70). “General College Mattering,” in this study had a mean score of 3.71, which is .39 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.32) and .73 higher than the normative sample (2.98). “Mattering to Students,” in this study had a mean score of 3.63, which is .30 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.33) and .66 higher than the normative sample (2.97). “Mattering to Advisors,” in this study had a mean score of 3.58, which is .68 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (2.90) and .62 higher than the normative sample (2.96).
Table 4.9

Descriptive Statistics for Six Subscales for Research and Normative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Honors Concentration (N=240)</th>
<th>Rowan University Undergraduate Study (N=386)</th>
<th>Normative Sample Statement (N=1,755)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General College Mattering</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.8281</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Students</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.6715</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Advisors</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.9385</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Instructors</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.9882</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering v. Marginality</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Value</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.9301</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research question 3.** Does residency play a significant role in students’ feelings of mattering on a college campus?

Table 4.10 displays the mean scores for the six subscales of mattering of this study divided by residency along with a comparison to the study of Rowan University undergraduates (McGuire, 2012) and the normative sample (Tovar, Simon, Lee, 2009).

In four of the six subscales, this study yielded higher positive mean scores for residential students as compared to commuting students. It should be noted that although the commuting students had lower mean mattering scores, they are still higher than the Rowan University undergraduate study mean scores and the normative sample mean scores. In two of the six subscales, this study yielded higher negative mean scores for commuting students as compared to residential students, Rowan University
undergraduates, and the normative sample. In the two subscales that were reverse scored, “Mattering to Instructors” and “Matter v. Marginality,” this study had higher negative results for commuting students, meaning there is a lower sense of mattering in these two categories. For “Mattering to Instructors,” commuting students had only a marginally lower result (2.21 compared to residential students mean score of 2.15). For “Matter v. Marginality,” commuting Honors students had significantly higher feelings of marginality. Commuting students (2.73) were .33 higher than residential students (2.40).

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Honors Concentration Commuting Students (n=65)</th>
<th>Honors Concentration Residential Students (n=175)</th>
<th>Rowan University Undergraduate Study (N=386)</th>
<th>Normative Sample Statement (N= 1,755)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General College Matter</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Students</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Advisors</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering to Instructors</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattering v. Marginality</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the other four areas, this study yielded lower feelings of mattering for commuting students as compared to residential students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration at Rowan University. The feelings of mattering of commuting students in
the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration are, however, higher than the Rowan University undergraduate study and the normative sample statement. “Perception of Value,” for commuting students had a mean score of 4.07, which is .09 lower than residential students (4.16). “General College Mattering,” for commuting students had a mean score of 3.55, which is .22 lower than residential students (3.77). “Mattering to Students,” for commuting students had a mean score of 4.59, which is .22 lower than residential students (4.81). “Mattering to Advisors,” for commuting students had a mean score of 3.44, which is .19 lower than residential students (3.63).
Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

Commuting students, despite being the majority at many institutions, are often not considered separately from residential students in regards to programming and policy-making. Many of the student involvement and engagement efforts of colleges and universities favor the residential student population. The average meeting time of clubs, programs, and events are created around residential students’ schedules (Jacoby, 2000). A neglected population is commuter students who generally are less involved and engaged than their residential counterparts (Jacoby, 2000).

Given the large percentage of commuting students at many colleges and universities, understanding this population is crucial to increased retention and growth. The current research surrounding comparisons between commuting and residential students shows commuting students are lacking or receiving less than their residential counterparts (Chickering, 1974). They are also considered a-typical students in regards to their demographics. One way to increase the likelihood of retaining students is to have an environment that promotes a sense of belonging and mattering among all students (Rosenberg & McCullough 1981). Current research stresses the important of mattering in regards to student success and persistence (Hoffman et al., 2002). Despite the research that exists to describe the differences between residential students and commuting students lower feelings of mattering have still been discovered (Jacoby, 1989).

The purpose of this study was to discover any relevant connections between residency and a student’s sense of mattering. Using the College Mattering Inventory, the
study sought to determine if residential or commuter students felt a sense of mattering or marginality and then compared those results to determine any differences in the responses. The *College Mattering Inventory* is a survey instrument whose validity was established by Tovar, Simon, and Lee (2009). Since the creation of the mattering inventory, many studies have utilized this resource to determine mattering on their own campus. McGuire (2012), Olsen (2015), and Johnston (2014) collected survey data using the *College Mattering Inventory* at Rowan University. This study builds off of their research and expands the knowledge base to include students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentrations. This study also provides a comparison between residential and commuter students who had similar academic achievements and social involvement.

This study was conducted during April 2017. It was distributed electronically through email and included 240 student survey responses; 65 commuter responses and 175 residential responses.

**Discussion of the Findings**

**Research question 1.** Do students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration feel as though they matter in the following areas: general college mattering, mattering v marginality, mattering to advisors, mattering to instructors, mattering to students, and perceived value.

An analysis was conducted of the six subscales of mattering using the mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage of response for each of the statements from each the subscales. Each subscale was analyzed overall and for specific statement responses. Generally, the responses to all six subscales were very positive.
While most of the subscales had positive responses, perceived value was by far the highest subscale with a mean score of 4.14 out of 5. Students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration have an extremely high feeling of being valued at Rowan University. “It is comforting to know that my contributions are valued by my instructors,” had 50.6% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 36% of subjects selecting “very much.” “There are people at the University that sincerely appreciate my involvement as a student,” had 51.1% of subjects selecting “moderately” and “very much.” “Knowing that other people at the University care for me motivates me to do better,” had 48.5% of subjects selecting “moderately” and “very much.” These findings are consistent with the high levels of satisfaction that students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration reported in Zieniuk’s (2011) study.

General college mattering (mean score of 3.71), mattering to students (mean score of 3.63) and mattering to advisors (mean score of 3.58) were all positive and suggest that students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration felt as though they matter at Rowan University as well as to their peers and Honors advisors. This is supported by the research of Hébert and McBee (2007), who found that students who participate in Honors programs are more likely to feel a sense of community due to the exposure to likeminded individuals.

Several statements elicited extremely positive responses. Two from general college mattering are: “There are people at the University who are concerned about my future,” had a mean score of 4.06 out of 5 and 80.5% either “moderately” or “very much” being selected. This may come from the staff in the Honors Concentration, or the staff
whom work with the students in their other on-campus activities encouraged by the Honors Concentration. The statement, “Other students are happy for me when I do well in exams or projects,” had a mean score of 4.06 out of 5 and 70% of subjects selecting “moderately” or “very much.” This is due to the sense of community that the honors programs foster in their students (Hébert & McBee, 2007).

When looking at advisors, students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration felt listened to and heard. “My advisor is generally receptive to what I have to say,” had a mean score of 3.97 and 47.6% of subjects responded “moderately” and 24.5% “very much.”

Mattering to students had one particularly high statement. “When in groups, other students tend to rely on my contributions,” had a mean score of 3.81 and 49.8% of subjects selecting “moderately” and 21.5% of subjects selecting “very much.” This may come from the academic excellence that all Honors students have in common. When working in groups, their high academic capacity makes the other students in their groups rely on each other for larger and higher quality contributions.

Mattering to instructors had a mean score of 2.17 and was reverse scored. This means that the closer a score of 5, the less the subjects felt that they mattered. Students may have felt as though they were not a priority to their instructors. The Honors Concentration attracts highly qualified faculty, yet it is possible that they may be more research or publication focused. “I often feel my instructor(s) care more about other things than me as a student,” had a mean score of 2.46 with nearly 30% of students selecting “moderately” or “very much.”
Mattering vs. marginality was also reverse scored and had a mean score of 2.49. This means that the closer to 5, the less the respondents felt they mattered. The statement with the highest mean value, and therefore highest level of marginality, was, “Sometimes I get so wrapped up in my personal problems that I isolate myself from others at the University,” with 31.8% of subjects responding with “moderately” and 8.6% responding with “very much.” These responses suggest a lack of willingness to seek out, or have knowledge of, campus resources for students who are often more involved and overworked (Astin, 1993).

**Research question 2.** How does the sense of mattering in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration compare to the general Rowan population and the normative study?

Students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration had a higher sense of mattering in almost every subscale when compared to Rowan University as a whole and when compared to the normative sample. “Perception of Value,” in this study had a mean score of 4.14, which is .35 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.79) and .44 higher than the normative sample (3.70). “General College Mattering,” in this study had a mean score of 3.71, which is .39 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.32) and .73 higher than the normative sample (2.98). “Mattering to Students,” in this study had a mean score of 3.63, which is .30 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (3.33) and .66 higher than the normative sample (2.97). “Mattering to Advisors,” in this study had a mean score of 3.58, which is .68 higher than Rowan University undergraduates (2.90) and .62 higher than the normative sample (2.96).

These high mean values can be attributed to the high levels of involvement that the Honors Concentration requires from its students to remain in the program. Astin
(1999) stressed the importance of involvement in student development and in increasing students’ perceived value at a university. It might not be that the concentration offers more enriching experiences, but simply requires more involvement experiences from its students. Bantivoglio Honors Concentration requires 14 service hours each semester that are essentially hours devoted to involvement on campus and in the concentration (Concentration Requirements, 2017). In one study of a population of honors students, many similarities in involvement and engagement between honors and non-honors students were found (Shushok, 2002). This may mean that all students look to get involved, but the Honors Concentration’s requirement for involvement has created higher feelings of mattering in students due to that increased involvement. The increased levels of involvement promote increased leadership development, potential placement and success in post-collegiate careers, and higher retention and degree completion levels (Moore, Lovell, McGann, & Wyrick, 1998). Positive correlations have been found between student involvement and intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. Students who participate in extracurricular activities have been shown to have a higher degree of institutional satisfaction (Moore et al., 1998).

Additionally, Rowan honors students have higher feelings of marginality than the general undergraduate population and the normative sample. Marginality occurs when individuals face a transition between roles (Schlossberg, 1989). It can take time for someone to become central to a group and elicit that desired feeling of mattering (Schlossberg, 1989). Given that 73% of respondents to this survey had spent 2 years or less in the Honors Concentration, the higher than average feelings of marginality can be attributed to a current transition from being a high school student or college student to an
honors student. The greater the difference is between those roles, the higher chance of marginalization (Schlossberg, 1989).

**Research question 3.** Does residency play a significant role in students’ feelings of mattering on a college campus?

Commuting students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration had lower feelings of mattering than their residential counterparts in every area. In four of the six subscales, this study yielded higher positive mean scores for residential students as compared to commuting students. “Perception of Value,” for commuting students had a mean score of 4.07, which is .09 lower than residential students (4.16). “General College Mattering,” for commuting students had a mean score of 3.55, which is .22 lower than residential students (3.77). “Mattering to Students,” for commuting students had a mean score of 4.59, which is .22 lower than residential students (4.81). “Mattering to Advisors,” for commuting students had a mean score of 3.44, which is .19 lower than residential students (3.63). In the two subscales that were reverse scored, “Mattering to Instructors” and “Matter v. Marginality,” this study had higher negative results for commuting students, meaning there is a lower sense of mattering in these two categories. For “Mattering to Instructors,” commuting students had only a marginally lower result (2.21 compared to residential students’ mean score of 2.15. For “Mattering v. Marginality,” commuting Honors students had significantly higher feelings of marginality. Commuting students (2.73) were .33 higher than residential students (2.40).

The largest discrepancy in mattering was when evaluating mattering v. marginality. This means commuting students felt marginalized much more than their residential counterparts. This is consistent with results of other studies (Dunham, 2000;
Jacoby, 1989). Traditional college programming, even in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, caters to residential, traditional-aged students and does not necessarily appeal to the needs of commuter students who are more practically and academically driven (Burilson, 2015). The timing of the programs including late times and increased time commitment conflicts with employment and home responsibilities thus making it more difficult for commuting students to get involved in programs and organizations on campus (Briggs, 2011). Weiss’s (2014) findings also support a marginalized feeling due to the timing of activities and adds that some students feel additionally disadvantaged due to the favor that scholarship committees and school leadership positions put on certain extra-curricular events which may not feasibly fit into a commuting students’ schedule.

While commuting Rowan honors students yielded lower feelings of mattering than residential Honors students, they had higher feelings of mattering than the Rowan University undergraduate sample (McGuire, 2012). Since commuting students have transportation time to factor into their schedules, they are at a distinct disadvantage from residential peers when considering on-campus involvement (Chickering, 1974). Several studies have suggested that commuter students are less involved on campus than their residential peers (Alfano & Eduljee, 2013; Layman, 2005). This may be true for Honors commuting students as well. Given that increased involvement is related to higher levels of mattering (Astin, 1999), it is likely that commuting honors students are more involved than the average Rowan undergraduate, yet less involved than their residential Honors student counterpart. This would explain why their overall feelings of mattering are lower than their residential Honors student counterparts, yet higher than the general Rowan University undergraduate population.
Conclusions

Data collected in this study using the *College Mattering Inventory* found that students who are part of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration had positive feelings of mattering in four of the six mattering subscales.

This study revealed a very high perception of value for students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, even compared to Rowan University undergraduates and the normative sample. The mean score of perceived value was 4.14 out of 5. These data suggest that the Bantivoglio Honors Concentrations perks and personalized attention to its students fosters a sense of mattering to those individuals. The overall high feelings of matter compared to the Rowan University undergraduate population and the normative sample suggest that the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration has a positive impact on the feelings of mattering of its students.

Consistent with McGuire (2012) and Olsen (2015), Rowan University’s lowest subscale is mattering v. marginality. This is something that Rowan University, as well as the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration, should look to address in future programming. Commuting students in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration had a higher feeling of marginalization compared to their residential Honors student counterparts (2.73 compared to 2.4), Rowan University undergraduates (2.15) and the normative sample (2.3).

Students enrolled in the Bantivoglio Honors Concentrations all must meet similar GPA and involvement requirements (Concentration Requirements, 2017). Commuting students, when compared to residential students of similar involvement and academic excellence, were found to have lower feelings of mattering in every subscale. Commuting
students have significantly lower feelings of general mattering (.22 difference), mattering to students (.22 difference), mattering to advisors (.19 difference) and higher feelings of marginality (.33 difference).

**Recommendations for Practice**

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are provided:

1. The Bantivoglio Honors Concentration should make a conscious effort to create programming specifically targeted at commuting students. These programs should focus on aiding in the transition into the Rowan University community and fostering more meaningful relationships in the Honors Concentration.

2. The Bantivoglio Honors Concentration should conduct further research into its student population to determine which groups feel marginalized and discover reasons behind that marginalization.

3. The Bantivoglio Honors Concentration should create additional programming, or enhance existing programming, to help its students transition into their role as college students.

4. Honors instructors should make stronger connections with their students and become more accessible to commuting students. One recommendation would be to offer a variety of office hours for students with limited time on campus.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are provided for future research on the topic of commuting students:
1. Qualitative research should be conducted as a follow up to determine possible reasons for the feelings of marginalization found in the survey subjects.

2. A version of the College Mattering Inventory should be created to specifically ask honors students how their experiences with Honors professors and advisors directly compares to their experience with non-honors professors and advisors to get a clearer sense of the impact the concentration has on its students.

3. A large-scale study using the College Mattering Inventory should be conducted to determine if the trend of decreased feelings of mattering found in commuting students in the Honors Concentration could be extended to all of Rowan University.
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Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Commuter Student and Residential Student Mattering in an Honors Concentration

You are invited to participate in this online research survey entitled Commuter Student and Residential Student Mattering in an Honors Concentration. You are included in this survey because you are a member of the Bantovoglio Honors Concentration during the spring 2017 semester. The number of subjects to be enrolled in the study will be 500.

The survey may take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in this survey, do not respond to this online survey. Completing this survey indicates that you are voluntarily giving consent to participate in the survey. We expect the study to last two weeks.

The purpose of this research study is to survey the members of the Bantovoglio Honors Concentration to determine their sense of mattering to Rowan University.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with this survey. This survey will count as 1 service hour towards your required 14 service hours this semester. By participating in this study you may help us understand what my affect student’s sense of mattering at Rowan University and particularly in the Bantovoglio Honors Concentration.

Your response will be kept confidential. We will store the data in a secure computer file and the file will destroyed once the data has been published. Any part of the research that is published as part of this study will not include your individual information. If you have any questions about the survey, you can contact me/or the researcher at the address provided below, but you do not have to give your personal identification.

Please complete the checkbox below.

To participate in this survey, you must be 18 years or older and a current member of the Bantovoglio honors Concentration. I certify that I meet those criteria.

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q12 Are you enrolled as a full-time undergraduate student at Rowan University for the Spring 2017 semester who is a current member of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration?

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)
Q2 What year are you currently in

- Freshman (1)
- Sophomore (2)
- Junior (3)
- Senior (4)

Q3 What Gender do you identify with?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non Binary (3)
- Transgender Women (4)
- Transgender man (5)
- Other (6)

Q4 What is your race/ethnicity?

- White/ Caucasian (1)
- Black / African American (2)
- Latino / Latina (3)
- Asian / Pacific Islander (4)
- American Indian (5)
- Other (6) ____________________

Q6 Did you transfer to Rowan University?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q7 Do you live in Rowan University Housing?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q8 Where do you live at Rowan University?

- Holly Pointe Commons (1)
- Whitney Center (2)
- Rowan Boulevard (3)
- Other underclassmen housing (4)
- Other Uppclassmen Housing (5)

Q9 How far away from Rowan University do you live during the school year?

- 0-5 miles from Rowan University (1)
- 5.1-10 miles from Rowan University (2)
- 10.1-15 miles from Rowan University (3)
- 15.1-20 miles from Rowan University (4)
- Over 20 miles from Rowan University (5)

Q10 How many years have you been a part of the Bantivoglio Honors Concentration

- Less than 1 year (1)
- 1-2 years (2)
- 2-3 years (3)
- 3-4 years (4)

Q11 Please select the response that best expresses your agreement with each statement below.

When considering interactions with "instructors" and "advisors" please reflect on your Honors interactions.

College Mattering Inventory (Tovar, Simon & Lee, 2009)

The CMI Survey instrument was removed at the request of Dr. Tovar and Dr. Simon, please contact the author (merril.simon@csun.edu) for more information or to reference or receive a copy of the instrument.
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CMI Survey Instrument

College Mattering Inventory (Tovar, Simon & Lee, 2009)

The CMI Survey instrument was removed at the request of Dr. Tovar and Dr. Simon, please contact the author (merril.simon@csun.edu) for more information or to reference or receive a copy of the instrument.
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Permission to use the College Mattering Inventory

Request to use the College Mattering Inventory in Master’s Thesis Research

TOVAR_ESAU <TOVAR_ESAU@smc.edu>
To: "Cattell, Jamie" <cattel17@students.rowan.edu>

Jamie, My sincere apology for not replying sooner. You have permission to use the CMI in your study, subject to the conditions noted in the Agreement.

Esau

Esau Tovar, Ph.D.
Dean, Enrollment Services
Santa Monica College
1900 Fice Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA 90405
Office: 310-458-6012 Fax: 310-458-8019
tovar_esau@smc.edu

From: Cattell, Jamie [mailto:cattel17@students.rowan.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 9:03 AM
To: TOVAR_ESAU <TOVAR_ESAU@smc.edu>
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