

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-10-2019

A replication study on the impact of Rowan After Hours student employment on student engagement

Eleni Dendrinou
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dendrinou, Eleni, "A replication study on the impact of Rowan After Hours student employment on student engagement" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2658.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2658>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

**A REPLICATION STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF ROWAN AFTER HOURS
STUDENT EMPLOYMENT ON STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

by

Eleni Dendrinou

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Educational Services and Leadership
College of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirement

For the degree of
Master of Arts in Higher Education

at

Rowan University

May 1, 2019

Thesis Chair: Dr. Drew Tinnin

© 2019 Eleni Dendrinou

Acknowledgments

Without the support from my family, friends, and mentors this goal and accomplishment would not have been possible. First, I would like to thank my parents and two brothers, Ari and Yanni, for their endless love and support. You have pushed me to be the best that I can be and for that I am so grateful. Words cannot express how much I appreciate and love each of you.

I want to thank Peter for always supporting me and my goals. Your love, encouragement, and patience throughout this journey means the world to me. Thank you for being my rock and for always believing in me.

Thank you to my peers in the program for always encouraging each other and making this experience unforgettable. I wish you all the best of luck in your endeavors. We did it!

I would like to acknowledge Lauren Kuski for allowing me to replicate her study and for being such an incredible mentor. Thank you for all of your wisdom and guidance. I would also like to thank the Rowan After Hours student employees for taking part in this study and for completing my survey. I couldn't have done this without their willing participation.

And finally, I want to give a huge thank you to Dr. Drew Tinnin, Dr. MaryBeth Walpole, and Dr. Tyrone McCombs for being wonderful professional mentors. Dr. Drew Tinnin thank you for providing me and my peers endless support and guidance throughout this journey. Your understanding and patience means the world. Thank you!

Abstract

Eleni Dendrinou
A REPLICATION STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF ROWAN AFTER HOURS
STUDENT EMPLOYMENT ON STUDENT ENGAGEMENT
2018-2019
Drew Tinnin, Ed.D.
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of student employment at Rowan After Hours (RAH) on student engagement. This is a replication study of Lauren Thompson's thesis from 2013, which investigated the impact of RAH student employment on student engagement at Rowan University. A survey was distributed to the spring 2019 Rowan After Hours undergraduate student staff, collected, and compared to the findings from the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE). This survey consisted of questions regarding the student's engagement on Rowan University's campus, such as their engagement with peers and faculty, taking lessons learned in class and using them in out-of-classroom experiences, and how much their experience at Rowan has contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development. Research indicates that students who work 20 hours or less on campus are significantly and positively related to grades, acting through student engagement (Pike, Kuh, & Massa-McKinley, 2009). The findings of this study suggest that Rowan After Hours is still highly engaged at Rowan University compared to Thompson's (2013) study and NSSE's study in 2016.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
List of Tables	vii
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Statement of the Research Problem	1
Significance of the Research Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Assumptions and Limitations	4
Operational Definitions	4
Research Questions	5
Organization of Remaining Chapters.....	5
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	7
Student Engagement.....	7
Late Night Programming.....	15
Rowan After Hours	16
Previous Research on Rowan After Hours.....	18
Summary of the Literature Review	20
Chapter III: Methodology.....	22
Context of Study	22
Population and Sampling.....	23
Data Collection Instruments	24
Data Gathering Procedures.....	25
Data Analysis.....	25

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter IV: Findings.....	26
Profile of Sample.....	26
Data Analysis.....	28
Research Question 1.....	28
Research Question 2.....	35
Research Question 3.....	41
Research Question 4.....	44
Chapter V: Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	57
Summary of the Study.....	57
Discussion of the Findings.....	59
Research Question 1.....	59
Research Question 2.....	62
Research Question 3.....	66
Research Question 4.....	67
Conclusions.....	68
Recommendations for Further Practice.....	73
Recommendations for Further Research.....	74
References.....	75
Appendix A: The College Student Report Item Usage Agreement.....	79
Appendix B: Approval to Replicate Lauren Thompson’s Study.....	81
Appendix C: Rowan After Hours Student Employee Survey.....	82

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 4.1. Years Employed by RAH (N=22).....	27
Table 4.2. Integrating Coursework to Real-Life Experiences (N=22).....	29
Table 4.3. Emphasis in Coursework (N=22).....	31
Table 4.4. Hours Spent Reading for Class (N=22).....	32
Table 4.5. Length of Written Papers (N=22).....	33
Table 4.6. Institutional Influence on Knowledge and Personal Development (N=22)...	34
Table 4.7. Academic Involvement (N=22).....	36
Table 4.8. Involvement with Faculty (N=22).....	37
Table 4.9. Plans Before Graduating (N=22).....	39
Table 4.10. Quality of On-Campus Interactions (N=22)	40
Table 4.11. Time Spent in a 7-Day Week (N=22).....	42
Table 4.12. Comparison of GPA Between RAH and NSSE.....	45
Table 4.13. Comparison of Emphasis in Coursework Between RAH and NSSE	46
Table 4.14. Comparison of Institutional Influence Between RAH and NSSE.....	48
Table 4.15. Comparison of Academic Involvement Between RAH and NSSE.....	50
Table 4.16. Comparison of Involvement with Faculty Between RAH and NSSE.....	51
Table 4.17. Comparison of Plans Before Graduating Between RAH and NSSE.....	53
Table 4.18. Comparison of On-Campus Interactions Between RAH and NSSE	55
Table 4.19. Comparison of Time Spent in a Week Between RAH and NSSE	56

Chapter I

Introduction

Student engagement is a popular topic discussed among higher education professionals. Research has shown the more involved students are with their college campus, the better their experience (Astin, 1999). There are many benefits to being engaged as a student, both academically and personally. There are also benefits for the institution, including improved retention rates and student achievement (Kuh, 2009). Many scholars, such as Kuh (2009), Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) agree that providing students with interactive, collaborative, and engaging environments will help them in their success. Due to the profound research indicating the importance of student engagement, higher education administrators are seeking ways to improve their programs to increase engagement on campus. Being involved on campus as a student worker can be very engaging for the student (Creager, Kuh, McClellan, & Savoca, 2018). This study examines the relationship between being a student employee on campus and engagement.

Statement of the Research Problem

There is a growing body of research regarding the topic of student engagement. However, there is limited research regarding the impact of student employment on engagement. Previous research has shown that students who are employed on campus tend to be more engaged; therefore, they have greater success in college and beyond (Creager et al., 2018). It is important for higher education institutions to provide their students with employment opportunities to foster their growth. More employment opportunities on campus could improve student engagement and, therefore, student success.

Student employment opportunities can support retention, persistence, and assist students in being successful in college and after (Creager et al., 2018). Student employment can foster intelligence and the skills required for student success. Noel-Levitz (2010) states “on-campus jobs can provide a supportive and non-threatening environment where students learn to interface comfortably with the public, understand the value of teamwork, develop time management and computer skills, and build self-esteem as they are recognized for their accomplishments” (p.3).

Campus jobs can be excellent catalysts for student career development and promotes postgraduate success. According to the National Associations of Colleges and Employers (2015), the top five skills employers most desired in college graduates in 2010 were communication skills, analytical abilities, teamwork, technical skills, and a strong work ethic. Most on campus jobs provide students with opportunities to develop these skills and to be more prepared when applying for jobs after graduation. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) suggest that working during college has a positive impact on career choice, career attainment, and level of professional responsibility attained early in one’s career. They lead to a greater chance of full-time employment upon graduation.

More research needs to be done to assess the effect of student employment on student engagement, specifically for employment opportunities among late night programming initiatives. This study analyzed the engagement patterns among Rowan After Hours (RAH) student employees. This study’s findings support the notion that student employment has a positive impact on student engagement.

Significance of the Research Problem

This study examined the impact of student employment at Rowan After Hours on student engagement. This is a replication study of Lauren Thompson's thesis from 2013, which investigated the impact of RAH student employment on student engagement at Rowan University. Thompson sent out a survey to RAH student employees during the spring 2013 semester. Thompson compared the responses from the surveys to findings from the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE). She found that RAH student employees were more highly engaged at Rowan University than students at similar institutions. The findings of this study may or may not be similar to Thompson's (2013) findings. The results of this study could influence Rowan After Hours and how it impacts their employee's engagement on campus. The findings from this study could not only help other institutions that have similar programs, but higher education institutions that provide student employment on their campuses. Institutions can benefit from understanding the impact student employment has on student engagement.

Purpose of the Study

This study replicated Lauren Thompson's thesis conducted in 2013 regarding the impact of student employment on student engagement. The study was replicated in order to compare results to see if they were consistent with different supervision and different staff demographics today. The purpose of this study was to investigate Rowan After Hours student employees and their engagement levels on campus. This study also compared the RAH student employees to the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) reports from 2016.

Assumptions and Limitations

The scope of the survey was limited to Rowan After Hours undergraduate student employees. This study assumes that all students who took part in the survey would answer survey items truthfully and honestly. However, this may not always be true. Also, there may be researcher bias due to collegial relationships with subjects.

Operational Definitions

1. Engagement: The Glossary of Education Reform (2014) defines engagement as, “the degree of attention, curiosity, and interest students show when they are learning or being taught, which extends to the level of motivation they have to learn and progress in their education” (para.1).
2. Good Academic Standing: As defined in Rowan University’s Policies, “Students who have attempted 15 or more semester hour credits and have a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 are considered to be in good academic standing” (p. 1). Student employees must be in good academic standing in order to participate in work study programs on campus.
3. Late Night Program: For the purposes of this study, refers to a planned program of events or activities for students running from 9PM to 1AM Thursday to Sunday nights that serves to further engage the student population in a safe and welcoming environment that promotes healthy lifestyle choices.
4. Programming: Planned events or activities on Rowan University’s campus for the entertainment and educational benefit of the student.
5. Rowan After Hours and its Mission Statement: As stated on the RAH website, “Rowan After Hours (RAH) provides late-night/weekend opportunities for Rowan

University students to become active in campus life by executing diverse, quality programs in a safe and welcoming environment” (Rowan After Hours, 2018, para. 2).

6. Student Employees: Young adults who attend Rowan University for the academic year for the fall of 2018 and spring of 2019 who are currently employed by Rowan After Hours.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions adapted from Thompson’s (2013) thesis:

1. Does being a student employee in RAH encourage students to become engaged in the Rowan University community and their academics?
2. Are RAH employees making significant gains in personal development and growth through their engagement in RAH?
3. How does student employment in RAH impact student engagement?
4. How do RAH student employees compare to the reported 2016 NSSE results for undergraduate students at Rowan University?

Organization of Remaining Chapters

Chapter II provides a review of relevant literature as it relates to late night programs and student engagement.

Chapter III describes the methodology used to gather data within this study. The methodology includes an explanation of the context of the study, the population and sample, the data collection instrument, the procedure of gathering data, and an analysis of the data.

Chapter IV contains the findings of the study and gives a statistical breakdown of the data collected using SPSS computer software for statistical analysis.

Chapter V summarizes the findings and discusses any conclusions that can be inferred from the results and recommendations for practice and further research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

On-campus student employment is said to have numerous benefits for student development, but is often an underused resource (NASPA, 2019). It can be defined as a paid learning and engagement opportunity that can improve student retention and connection to the institution (Johnson, 2019) and can dramatically enhance students' college experience and better connect them to careers (NASPA, 2019).

Late night programming is an employment opportunity for students on campus that can give them these benefits, while also benefiting the undergraduate student population as a whole. Late night programming on college campuses was created to be an alternative for students to stay on campus and participate in activities in a safe and welcoming environment instead of underage drinking. There is a certain culture surrounding colleges where students feel social pressures to drink. This has been a long-standing problem on college campuses; however, late night programming has helped subdue this problem.

Student Engagement

The development of college students has been a popular topic in higher education for some time. Colleges and universities have spent countless time and money on this research. This large amount of research has been utilized by higher education professionals to gain a better understanding of their students and the way they develop throughout their collegiate years. Having this knowledge is beneficial for higher education professionals in aiding their students' development academically, socially, and mentally.

Among this research is student engagement, which has been referenced for over 20 years. Over time, the meaning and application of student engagement has evolved to represent increasingly complex understandings of the relationship between desired outcomes and the amount of time and effort students invest in their studies and other activities relating to their undergraduate experience (Kuh, 2009).

Pace (1980, 1984) developed the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) to measure the quality of effort exerted by students to identify the activities that contributed to various dimensions of student learning and development. His research shows that the more energy and time students spent on certain tasks, such as studying and interacting with peers and faculty, the more they gained from their studies and other aspects of the college experience.

Astin (1999) highlighted the psychological and behavioral dimensions of time on task and quality of effort with his theory of involvement. Astin is widely known for being a major contributor to involvement and its importance to undergraduate education. Astin (1999) found that involvement is important to student achievement and other valued outcomes for students.

Chickering and Gamson (1987) came up with seven good practices in undergraduate education. These seven practices are: (a) student-faculty contact, (b) active learning, (c) prompt feedback, (d) time on task, (e) high expectations, (f) respect for diverse learning styles, and (g) cooperation among students. Each of their seven practices represents a different dimension of engagement.

One of the conclusions found in *How College Affects Students* (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005) was that the amount of time and energy students put forth into various activities on campus (student engagement) is positively linked with desired outcomes of undergraduate education. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) also found that students from different backgrounds all generally benefit from engagement; however, some students benefit more than others. Astin's involvement theory groups students into two categories, the involved students and the uninvolved students. Astin (1999) describes a highly involved student as "one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students" (p. 297). Whereas, an uninvolved student neglects their studies, spends little time on campus, does not participate in extracurricular activities, and rarely interacts with faculty or peers. The student who is more engaged with the campus and those around them, will most likely benefit more from their engagement than someone who is less engaged.

Astin's student involvement theory (1999) has five basic postulates that correlate to engagement:

1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects. The objects may be highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry examination).
2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum; that is, different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.

3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student's involvement in academic work, for instance, can be measured quantitatively (how many hours the student spends studying) and qualitatively (whether the student reviews and comprehends reading assignments or simply stares at the textbook and daydreams).
4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.
5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement.

(p. 298)

The first postulate states that for a student to be involved in an activity, energy must be exerted. Postulate two means that different students exert energy differently. The third postulate means that students' involvement can be measured both quantitatively and qualitatively. Postulates four and five are both important to institutions especially because they help in designing more effective educational programs for students. Postulate four means the more involved a student is, the more he/she will learn. Postulate five states the best policies are ones that allow students to be more involved. If colleges and universities followed these postulates on their campuses, the students would reap all of the benefits associated with being involved. According to Astin (1999), the more engaged students are on campus, the greater success they will have both academically and socially.

What happens when higher education institutions do not follow Astin's postulates and do not understand the importance of getting students more involved on their campus?

There is a great sum of research which found engagement effects retention rates. Students who do not feel involved may drop out for lack of connection to the campus. Kuh (2009) suggests colleges and universities be more engaged with their students not only inside the classroom but outside, as well, which will in turn increase retention rates.

There are many studies conducted in the past that suggest faculty interactions with students can be very beneficial to students' engagement. Astin's (1993) study found that students who attend campuses where faculty have deep connections with their students are more satisfied with their educational experience. Astin (1993) found that the environment created by faculty for students is critical for quality undergraduate education. DeAngelo, Mason, and Winters (2016) agree that faculty-student interaction is important in student development and retention. Faculty and staff are key components in creating a successful culture on campus (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015). Two of Chickering and Gamson's (1999) seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education are to encourage student-faculty contact and encourage cooperation among students. Kuh, Pace, and Vesper (1997) found that encouraging students to interact with faculty members and peers were the best predictors of student educational gains in college.

Tinto (1988) believes that student engagement plays a critical role in retention. According to Tinto, there are three stages first-year students tend to go through when moving onto a college campus. The first stage first-year students experience is separation, which "entails some sort of parting from past habits and patterns of affiliation" (Tinto, 1988, p. 443). Due to many students leaving comfortable situations into an unknown environment, this can cause the student stress. Already students may feel disoriented and

if students have more severe emotions, they may have thoughts about not continuing. The second stage is transition, which means that students have to transition from past to present. This process may be easy for some students, whereas other students may struggle. Tinto states that without assistance in this stage, students may withdraw from college early in their academic year. This is a great opportunity for higher education institutions to step in and help their students transition. The third stage is integration, which is when students should be getting involved on campus. Tinto (1988) states “because social interactions are the primary vehicle through which such integrative associations arise, individuals have to establish contact with other members of the institution, student and faculty alike. Failure to do so may lead to the absence of integration and to its associated sense of isolation. This, in turn, may lead to departure from the institution” (p. 446). Therefore, having that student-student and student-faculty interactions is critical for retention. Tinto suggests that these relationships are what ground students when transitioning through this life change.

It is important to note that this may not apply to students who commute. First-year students who live at home may be at a disadvantage when it comes to being engaged on campus. This is due to lack of time on campus. Kuh, Gonyea, and Palmer (2001) found that students who lived on campus were more involved, and in turn, benefitted more from their college experience. Commuters tend to have less contact with faculty and tend to not take advantage of all of the programs and organizations schools offer. “It appears that the further away from campus (walking distance, driving distance) the less likely a student is to take advantage of the educational resources the institution provides” (Kuh, Gonyea, & Palmer, 2001, p. 9). Alfano and Eduljee (2013) surveyed 108 undergraduate

students at a private college. They found that there was an overall lack of engagement in organizations and clubs on campus among commuter students when compared to residential students. Tinto (1993) states that students who are more involved as members of the college community will be more likely to invest in greater efforts to learn.

Tinto (1988) points out that there are extracurricular activities and programs (such as Greek Life, intramural sports, student government, etc.) most higher education institutions offer that provide students with opportunities to make peer and faculty relationships and help get students more engaged. However, Tinto (1988) also mentions that new students may not be aware of these programs due to the programs lack of reaching out. If first-year and transfer students are not being given the chance to get to know about these different programs, they are forced to try and figure it out themselves, which can be very difficult and overwhelming. This process may be too much for some students to handle and, in turn, may drop out. It is important for higher education institutions to notice this problem and take action. For example, one way colleges and universities may solve this issue of getting clubs and organizations to be more known is to have an involvement fair. New students are able to walk around while clubs and organizations on campus have tables that contain information students can learn more about.

Scholars have hypothesized undergraduate students who are engaged on their college campus can have greater academic and social outcomes. However, there is research that states over involvement can negatively impact students' development as well. "Some students are so highly involved, they experience challenges with their physical health, emotional well-being, academic performance, and interpersonal

relationship” (Couch, 2018). The studies mentioned previously in this section indicate that the more involved a student is, the better the outcome, but rarely mention that being too engaged can be detrimental. “Students who work on campus for less than 15 hours a week have higher graduation rates than those who work off-campus for more hours” (Perry, 2019). Therefore, it is recommended students work on-campus jobs for a limited number of hours as to not overwork them. Over involvement is important to note when discussing the benefits of student engagement and should be made aware when doing this kind of study. This study analyzes student engagement with the knowledge that there is a gray area between being engaged and being overly engaged to the point of negatively impacting their development and growth.

A common survey used to collect information about undergraduate student engagement is NSSE, National Survey of Student Engagement. This survey annually collects data at hundreds of four-year institutions specifically about first-year and senior students’ participation in programs provided by the college or university for their learning and personal development (About NSSE, 2019). Results from this survey provide the institution insight of how their students spend their time and what they gain from their experiences at college. These survey results can be used to “identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside of the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and practice more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education” (About NSSE, 2019). This study uses questions from NSSE to determine these aspects as it relates to Rowan After Hours and will establish areas that may need to be improved or modified in the program.

Late Night Programming

One of the most challenging issues facing colleges and universities is alcohol abuse and underage drinking among college students. According to Kawachi and Weitzman (2000), binge drinking affects two-fifths of the college student population. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2015), binge drinking is defined as a pattern of drinking that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) levels to 0.08 g/dL. This typically occurs at the consumption of four alcoholic beverages for women and five alcoholic beverages for men in about two hours. Alcohol misuse can lead to numerous issues on college campuses, such as increased incidents of unsafe sex, sexual abuse, and academic problems. This has been a problem that higher education institutions have tried to minimize for many years. There have been efforts to change the culture of drinking on college campuses by creating alcohol education programs. However, these programs have not made a sizeable change to the percentages of college students who binge drink (Shotick & Galsky, 2013). There are success stories from individual campuses who have shown that things like reducing or eliminating kegs on campus, close supervision at social events, and implementing non-alcoholic on-campus events make a difference on their campus.

According to the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Task Force and the Higher Education Center, one key strategy to change the drinking culture at colleges is to provide students with alternative late night activities (Shotick & Galsky, 2013). Students say one primary reason they drink is due to lack of things to do on campus. Kawachi and Weitzman (2000) found that campus-level patterns of participation in voluntary activities play an important role in preventing binge drinking in the college

setting. Providing students with an alternative, engaging, and fun activity is said to reduce binge drinking and underage drinking on campus. Maggs, Patrick, and Osgood (2010) have found that students drank less on days they attended alcohol-free social programs.

The positive effects of late night programming are three-fold: students who don't drink, have a safe environment to socialize; those who 'might' drink have an alternative to drinking; and those who do drink will reduce the time drinking by attending late night events to eat, socialize, and participate in activities. (Shotick & Galsky, 2013, p. 19)

These events can reduce the harm, danger, and legal implications that is associated with underage drinking and alcohol abuse. According to Prange (2005), there are many college campuses who have implemented late night programming and have seen a change with their students, such as University of Kansas, Slippery Rock University, University of Michigan, and many more. Rowan University has also implemented this program and named it Rowan After Hours (RAH).

Rowan After Hours

Rowan After Hours (RAH) is a late night program that occurs every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night on Rowan University's campus from 9 PM – 1 AM. The programs usually take place at the Pit in the Chamberlain Student Center. The mission statement for Rowan After Hours can be found on their website, which states "Rowan After Hours provides late-night/weekend opportunities for Rowan University students to become active in campus life by executing diverse, quality programs in a safe and welcoming environment" (p.1). These events consist of DIY nights, novelty nights,

comedians, open mic nights, and many more fun and entertaining programs. Rowan After Hours started in the 2007-2008 academic year. It was created in hopes of getting more students involved and to be an alternative to drinking. This idea was taken from a late night program structure developed by Binghamton University – State University of New York (Milsted, 2010). RAH began as a once a week program on Thursday nights, but due to the success, it developed into a department in campus activities and takes place three nights a week. It is funded solely by student fees (Olsen, 2015).

Currently, Rowan After Hours has one full-time professional staff member, two graduate coordinators, and 24 undergraduate students. Five of these undergraduates hold leadership positions within RAH. One is a coordinator for co-sponsorships who is responsible for partnerships with other organizations for events on campus. Another undergraduate coordinator is responsible for technical services related to audio or video during events. There is an undergraduate coordinator responsible for DIYs, which means “do it yourself” or creating things without direct help from an expert. Therefore, any events that have DIYs, the coordinator is responsible for. There is also a programming coordinator who coordinates all bingos, casinos, decorations, and original events. Lastly, there is a marketing coordinator for RAH who is responsible for promoting the events. All members of the staff are divided into four of these committees run by each of the coordinators to accomplish certain tasks, excluding co-sponsorships who works directly with the graduate coordinators.

All students are invited and encouraged to attend the late night programs that Rowan University offers. The students are given calendars regarding these programs as soon as they move into their dorms and the calendar can also be easily found online. This

is to ensure the accessibility students have with RAH and all it has to offer. Students can only enter the event through the entrance of the Pit in the Chamberlain Student Center. They are welcomed by RAH staff who swipe their Rowan ID card. In doing so, RAH is able to make sure the student is a Rowan student and compile attendance numbers for each night.

Previous Research on Rowan After Hours

There has been previous research conducted on the Rowan After Hours program. One study was conducted by Brian Milsted (2010). The purpose of Milsted's (2010) study was to investigate student attitudes toward Rowan After Hours, to determine the program's impact on student involvement, and to assess whether Rowan After Hours was fulfilling its mission statement. The survey used in this study was developed by Matthew Malagiere (2008) for determining student satisfaction towards the Chamberlain Student Center at Rowan University and slightly modified by Milsted to make it relevant to the Rowan After Hours program. Survey items used a Likert scale and consisted of 28 statements regarding the attitudes of students towards the advertising and operational efficiency of Rowan After Hours, satisfaction with food services, the activities offered, and an appraisal of the professional staff at Rowan After Hours. Each section has their own set of questions. The items on involvement were taken from Ohio State University's student involvement survey in 2009. Surveyors were asked questions regarding their attitudes concerning student involvement. The final section of the survey asked students for direct feedback on their experiences through short answers. Milsted (2010) distributed the survey throughout a three-week period at Rowan After Hours. Students who were checking into the program were given the opportunity to fill them out. Of the surveys

returned, 365 were completed. Survey data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. The short answer responses in the final section of the survey were analyzed by looking at common themes. Milsted (2010) found that students had a high level of agreement that Rowan After Hours was fulfilling its mission statement and that students had an overall satisfaction with the Rowan After Hours program.

The purpose of Lauren Thompson's (2013) study was to investigate the impact of student employment in Rowan After Hours on student engagement. Her subjects for the study were Rowan After Hours full-time student employees. Thompson's (2013) survey instrument was adopted and modified from the *National Survey of Student Engagement 2013* (NSSE) developed by *The College Student Report* and the Trustees of Indiana University. The survey consisted of 21 questions in multiple choice and Likert scale to determine the relationship between being a RAH employee and being engaged on Rowan University's campus. She distributed 19 surveys to Rowan After Hours student employees and received 19 completed. The survey data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. Thompson (2013) found that RAH student employees were more highly engaged on their campus and community. The results of this study support the fulfillment of the mission statement for RAH. Part of the mission statement is to keep students engaged on campus and this study showed that students connected to RAH do feel they are engaged.

Sarah Olsen's (2015) study was conducted to determine the attitudes of student participants of the Rowan After Hours' program on mattering. Olsen's (2015) focused theory was Scholssberg's (1989) Mattering Versus Marginality theory. This theory

claims that the more students feel they matter, the less they will feel marginalized. Olsen used Tovar, Simon, and Lee's (2009) mattering scale. The scale measures students' feelings of mattering using six subscales, such as general college mattering, mattering versus marginality, mattering to instructors, mattering to counselors and advisors, mattering to students, and perception of value. This study consisted of 400 participants in Rowan After Hours. The survey data was analyzed and compared to previous research on mattering. Olsen (2015) found that students participating in the RAH program had a positive attitude towards mattering overall. Previous research suggests that Rowan After Hours is meeting its mission, has a positive view from the students, and benefits its student employees and their engagement on campus.

Summary of the Literature Review

Astin's (1999) involvement theory and Tinto's (1988) departure theory agree that the more involved or integrated a student is on campus, the better their success. However, it is important to note and remember that a student being overly engaged can be detrimental as well. Realizing the difference is imperative when analyzing the students' development and growth. Higher education institutions should be encouraging their students to join organizations and clubs and make sure that they are giving their students the information they need to be more involved. There are many opportunities for students to be more engaged on campus, whether that is with student government, athletics, Greek life, and many more. There is much research that suggests getting involved in these activities is more beneficial for students. Another activity students can benefit from is late night programming on campus. This program is created to entice students to get more involved and to be a substitute for underage drinking and binge drinking. These problems

with drinking have always been prevalent on college campuses and schools have been trying to minimize this issue for years. Studies have found that late night programming may be a solution. More students are attending these programs and less are making bad decisions. Rowan University's late night program is Rowan After Hours and has been an option for students to attend for years.

It is critical for all Rowan students to be engaged, but also important for Rowan student employees to feel involved with the campus. Research is lacking in student engagement among student employees and more research needs to be conducted. This study will add to the research on the benefits of students being employed on campus by comparing its data to Lauren Thompson's study (2013) and Rowan University's student responses to the NSSE survey in 2016.

Chapter III

Methodology

Context of Study

This study was conducted at Rowan University. Rowan is a public research university located in Glassboro, New Jersey. According to Rowan Fast Facts (2017), Rowan has around 15,400 undergraduate students and approximately 4,018 employees coming from 38 states and 34 countries with a student/faculty ratio of 17:1. The university has around 13,058 full-time students and 3,097 part-time students enrolled (Saadeddine, 2015). Rowan offers various programs and resources for their students, such as leadership programs and services, campus activities, Greek life, and student government opportunities. Many of these opportunities are housed in the Chamberlain Student Center.

During the 2017-2018 academic year, the Chamberlain Student Center and the Office of Student Activities merged together to become one department now called the Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities (SCCA). According to the annual report from 2016-2017, the Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities employs 91 undergraduate student staff and volunteers and 7 graduate coordinators, as well as, 8 professional staff members. These numbers have increased, and now SCCA employs over 100 undergraduate student staff and volunteers and has 8 graduate coordinators. During the 2016-2017 year, the Student Center held 207 events and collaborated with 36 student organizations, 12 university departments, 5 philanthropic groups, and 91 local businesses. The Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities has two program

initiatives, Student University Programmers (SUP) and Rowan After Hours (RAH), who were responsible for these events and collaborations.

The Student University Programmers is a student programming board with over 70 student volunteers. SUP's events this year account for almost 9,000 attendees. Rowan After Hours is the late night and weekend programming initiative, which occurs every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night from 9PM to 1AM. RAH hosted over 70 events during the 2016-2017 academic year and accounted for almost 22,000 attendees. Combined, SUP and RAH reached over 43,000 attendees in 2016-2017. The SCCA was rated with a 95% positive customer service experience in the Fall of 2016. The SCCA has five core values, such as student development, community building, service excellence, quality, and fun. Their mission statement mentions "the SCCA creates opportunities for student engagement and learning..." for everyone who walks through their doors. This information can be found on the About Us Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities (2017) website.

Population and Sampling

The target population for this study was undergraduate students employed within Rowan After Hours. The professional staff member, Lauren Kuski, who is the Assistant Director of RAH was notified of this study and provided access to participants. The criterion sample was RAH student employees during the spring 2019 semester. The surveys were distributed to all 22 of the Rowan After Hours student employees during the spring semester and all 22 surveys were completed.

Data Collection Instruments

The survey instrument that was used in this study was adopted from the online version of the *National Survey of Student Engagement 2018* (NSSE) developed by *The College Student Report* and the Trustees of Indiana University titled *Student-Employee Involvement Study*. Copyright and permission to use the survey instrument can be found in Appendix A. According to the National Survey of Student Engagement website,

NSSE annually collects information at hundreds of four-year colleges and universities about first-year and senior students' participation in programs and activities that institutions offer. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduate students spend their time and what they gain from attending college. (About NSSE, 2019, para. 2)

The survey (Appendix C) consists of 21 questions with 2 open-ended questions. Items 1-21 used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-18 The Trustees of Indiana University.

The instrument was field tested to three Rowan University students who are not employed by RAH to ensure correct format and content validity of the instrument. The students were asked to answer the survey making notes of any confusion or problems then provide feedback. The first test revealed that the survey was ready to be administered to the RAH staff.

Data Gathering Procedures

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Rowan University, the surveys were distributed in January 2019. The survey begins with a brief introduction to the survey and explained that the participation of the survey was voluntary. No identifying information was collected on the survey. I gave the survey to all 22 RAH student employees with the hope of getting responses from all of them. Due to my sample size being so small, I needed 100% of the surveys I distributed to be responded. There is no cost to the subjects. No further compensation was provided. The risk of harm is minimal. Risks associated with this study are very low given the nature of the survey instrument. All questions are optional and students can choose whether they would like to participate or not. I provided my contact information in case any student would like to discuss the survey further. I shared the data I received for my capstone research project with the faculty of my master's program and uploaded my thesis to ProQuest.

Data Analysis

Most of the responses received from the survey instrument were analyzed by entering the data into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 24 software program (McMillan, 2016). Descriptive statistics provided frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for various sections on the survey and were used to examine the data in regard to the research questions. The open-ended questions were analyzed by categorizing the responses and creating themes among them. The data from this survey's responses was compared to Thompson's (2013) study and the NSSE study in 2016, in which Rowan University's first-year and senior students participated.

Chapter IV

Findings

Profile of Sample

The subjects in this study consisted of 22 undergraduate students employed by Rowan After Hours in the spring of 2019. Of the 22 surveys distributed, 22 completed surveys were returned, yielding a return rate of 100%. There were 22 undergraduate students employed by RAH in spring 2019. There were 16 female employees (72.7%) and 6 male employees (27.3%). One (4.5%) of the student staff reported being 18 years old, 5 (22.7%) reported being 19 years old, 4 (18.2%) reported being 20 years old, 9 (40.9%) reported being 21 years old, 2 (9.1%) reported being 22 years old, and 1 (4.5%) reported being 24 years or older. Of the 22 employees, 1 (4.5%) reported being in their freshman year or first-year, 6 (27.3%) reported being in their sophomore year, 7 (31.8%) reported being in their junior year, and 8 (36.4%) reported being in their senior year of college. All 22 student employees were born in the United States.

Table 4.1 shows how long each student has been employed by Rowan After Hours as of February 2019. The majority of students (59.1%) reported being employed by RAH for less than one year.

Table 4.1

Years Employed by RAH (N=22)

Variable	<i>f</i>	%
Less than one year	13	59.1
One year	0	0
Two years	6	27.3
Three years	2	9.1
Four or more years	1	4.5

When asked how many majors each student plans to complete, excluding minors, 15 (68.2%) of students reported completing one major while 7 (31.8%) reported completing more than one major. As of February 2019, 5 (22.7%) of the RAH student employees reported most of their grades being an A, 9 (40.9%) reported receiving mostly A-'s, 3 (13.6%) reported mostly B+'s, 2 (9.1%) reported mostly B's, 2 (9.1%) reported mostly C+'s, and 1 (4.5%) employee reported receiving mostly C's.

Of the 22 student employees, 20 (90.9%) of them reported starting their college careers at Rowan University, while 2 (9.1%) reported starting at another institution. When asked about their highest level of education they expect to complete, 7 (31.8%) are expecting to complete their bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.), 10 (45.5%) expect to complete their master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.), and 5 (22.7%) expect to complete their doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.). None of the student employees reported they expected to complete some college but less than a college degree. When asked how many courses they are taking for credit this academic term, spring of 2019, 1 (4.5%) reported taking 3 courses, 7 (31.8%) reported taking 4 courses, 9 (40.9%) reported

taking 5 courses, 3 (13.6%) reported taking 6 courses, and 2 (9.1%) reported taking 7 or more during this spring semester.

Data Analysis

Research question 1. Does being a student employee in RAH encourage students to become engaged in the Rowan University community and their academics?

Table 4.2 details how often the student employees reported connecting learning experiences within the classroom to experiences in different classes or outside of the classroom. A majority of the students responded that they very often or often utilize what they learned within the classroom to other experiences. Only 3 (13.6%) students reported that they never included diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments, while 1 (4.5%) reported they never combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments and 1 (4.5%) student reported that they never examined the strengths and weaknesses of their own views on a topic or issue.

Table 4.2

Integrating Coursework to Real-Life Experiences (N=22)

Variable	Very Often		Often		Sometimes		Never	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments M= 3.05, SD= .899	8	36.4	8	36.4	5	22.7	1	4.5
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues M= 3.18, SD= .664	7	31.8	12	54.5	3	13.6	0	0
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments M= 2.95, SD= 1.090	9	40.9	6	27.3	4	18.2	3	13.6
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue M= 3.00, SD= .926	8	36.4	7	31.8	6	27.3	1	4.5
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective M= 3.23, SD= .685	8	36.4	11	50.0	3	13.6	0	0
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept M= 3.18, SD= .664	7	31.8	12	54.5	3	13.6	0	0
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge M= 3.32, SD= .716	10	45.5	9	40.9	3	13.6	0	0

Table 4.3 contains data showing how often a student's coursework emphasized particular methods in the classroom. A majority of the students reported they have very often or often applied facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations, analyzed an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts, evaluated a point of view, decision, or information source, and formed a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information. However, a majority of 13 (59.1%) students reported they sometimes memorize course material. Only 2 (9.1%) students reported they never apply facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations, while 1 (4.5%) student said they never analyzed an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts and 1 (4.5%) student reported they never evaluated a point of view, decision, or information source.

Table 4.3

Emphasis in Coursework (N=22)

Variable	Very Often		Often		Sometimes		Never	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Memorizing course material M= 2.50, SD= .673	2	9.1	7	31.8	13	59.1	0	0
Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations M= 3.27, SD= .935	11	50.0	8	36.4	1	4.5	2	9.1
Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts M= 3.14, SD= .774	7	31.8	12	54.5	2	9.1	1	4.5
Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source M= 3.05, SD= .899	8	36.4	8	36.4	5	22.7	1	4.5
Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information M= 3.36, SD= .658	10	45.5	10	45.5	2	9.1	0	0

Table 4.4 shows how many hours students spend in a typical 7-day week reading for their courses. The majority of students (59.1%) read 1-5 hours per week, while 1 (4.5%) student reported reading 0 hours of their coursework.

Table 4.4

Hours Spent Reading for Class (N=22)

Variable	<i>f</i>	%
0 hours	1	4.5
1-5 hours	13	59.1
6-10 hours	6	27.3
11-15 hours	2	9.1
16-20 hours	0	0
More than 20 hours	0	0
M= 2.41, SD= .734		

Table 4.5 contains data that demonstrates how many papers, reports, or other writing tasks the students have been assigned of various lengths. All of the students have been assigned at least one paper that was up to 5 pages; whereas, 12 (54.5%) students have not been assigned a paper that was 11 pages or more and 8 (36.4%) have been assigned at least one paper that was 11 pages or more.

Table 4.5

Length of Written Papers (N=22)

Variable	None		1-2 papers		3-5 papers		6-10 papers		11-15 papers		16-20 papers		More than 20	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Up to 5 pages M=3.36, SD=1.177	0	0	5	22.7	9	40.9	5	22.7	1	4.5	2	9.1	0	0
Between 6-10 pages M=2.09, SD=.921	6	27.3	10	45.5	4	18.2	2	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 pages or more M=1.59, SD=.796	12	54.5	8	36.4	1	4.5	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.6 demonstrates how much the students experiences at Rowan University has contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development. The majority of the students reported very much or quite a bit of institutional influence on their knowledge, skills, and development. However, 6 (27.3%) students reported having very little influence on analyzing numerical and statistical information, 2 (9.1%) reported having very little influence on speaking clearly and effectively, 1 (4.5%) student said there was very little influence on working effectively with others, and 1 (4.5%) student said there was very little influence on developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics.

Table 4.6

Institutional Influence on Knowledge and Personal Development (N=22)

Variable	Very Much		Quite a Bit		Some		Very Little	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Writing clearly and effectively M= 3.14, SD= .834	9	40.9	7	31.8	6	27.3	0	0
Speaking clearly and effectively M= 3.14, SD= .941	9	40.9	9	40.9	2	9.1	2	9.1
Thinking critically and analytically M= 3.45, SD= .596	11	50.0	10	45.5	1	4.5	0	0
Analyzing numerical and statistical information M= 2.45, SD= .1.184	6	27.3	4	18.2	6	27.3	6	27.3
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills M= 3.73, SD= .456	16	72.7	6	27.3	0	0	0	0
Working effectively with others M= 3.68, SD= .716	17	77.3	4	18.2	0	0	1	4.5
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics M= 3.27, SD= .827	10	45.5	9	40.9	2	9.1	1	4.5
Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.) M= 3.32, SD= .716	10	45.5	9	40.9	3	13.6	0	0
Solving complex real-world problems M= 3.18, SD= .853	10	45.5	6	27.3	6	27.3	0	0
Being an informed and active citizen M= 3.14, SD= .774	8	36.4	9	40.9	5	22.7	0	0

Research question 2. Are RAH employees making significant gains in personal development and growth through their engagement in RAH?

Table 4.7 demonstrates how often students are involved in their coursework, with peers, and with assignments in class. A majority of the students reported that they very often or often are involved in their coursework, with peers, and with assignments in class. However, 4 (18.2%) students reported never preparing two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in, 2 (9.1%) students said they never worked with other students on course projects or assignments, 2 (9.1%) students said they never gave a course presentation, 1 (4.5%) student reported they never asked questions or contributed to course discussion in other ways, 1 (4.5%) student reported they never asked another student to help understand course material, 1 (4.5%) student reported they never explained course material to one or more students, and 1 (4.5%) student reported they never prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students.

Table 4.7

Academic Involvement (N=22)

Variable	Very Often		Often		Sometimes		Never	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways M= 3.00, SD= .690	4	18.2	15	68.2	2	9.1	1	4.5
Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in M= 2.68, SD= 1.086	6	27.3	7	31.8	5	22.7	4	18.2
Come to class without completing readings or assignments M= 2.14, SD= .941	2	9.1	5	22.7	9	40.9	6	27.3
Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.) M= 2.59, SD= .796	4	18.2	5	22.7	13	59.1	0	0
Asked another student to help you understand course material M= 2.77, SD= .869	5	22.7	8	36.4	8	36.4	1	4.5
Explained course material to one or more students M= 2.82, SD= .795	4	18.2	11	50.0	6	27.3	1	4.5
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students M= 2.95, SD= .950	8	36.4	6	27.3	7	31.8	1	4.5
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments M= 3.23, SD= .922	10	45.5	9	40.9	1	4.5	2	9.1
Gave a course presentation M= 3.05, SD= .899	10	45.5	5	22.7	5	22.7	2	9.1

Table 4.8 depicts how often students interact with faculty on campus. The majority of students reported interacting with faculty often or sometimes.

Table 4.8

Involvement with Faculty (N=22)

Variable	Very Often		Often		Sometimes		Never	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Talked about career plans with a faculty member M= 2.64, SD= .848	4	18.2	7	31.8	10	45.5	1	4.5
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.) M= 2.68, SD= .945	5	22.7	7	31.8	8	36.4	2	9.1
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class M= 2.32, SD= .945	2	9.1	8	36.4	7	31.8	5	22.7
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member M= 2.18, SD= 1.006	3	13.6	4	18.2	9	40.9	6	27.3

Table 4.9 demonstrates the students plans to participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement, hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group, participate in a learning community where groups of students take two or more classes together, participate in a study abroad program, work

with a faculty member on a research project, and complete a culminating senior experience. The majority of students have done or are in progress of holding a formal leadership role in a student organization or group (45.5%) and participate in a learning community where groups of students take two or more classes together (40.9%). The majority of students plan to participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement (59.1%) and complete a culminating senior experience (45.5%). The majority of students do not plan to participate in a study abroad (63.6%) or work with a faculty member on a research project (54.5%).

Table 4.9

Plans Before Graduating (N=22)

Variable	Done or in progress		Plan to do		Do not plan to do		Have not decided	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement M= 3.18, SD= .733	7	31.8	13	59.1	1	4.5	1	4.5
Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group M= 3.18, SD= .907	10	45.5	7	31.8	4	18.2	1	4.5
Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together M= 2.77, SD= 1.152	9	40.9	2	9.1	8	36.4	3	13.6
Participate in a study abroad program M= 1.82, SD= .588	0	0	2	9.1	14	63.6	6	27.3
Work with a faculty member on a research project M= 1.82, SD= .664	0	0	3	13.6	12	54.5	7	31.8
Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.) M= 2.82, SD= 1.053	6	27.3	10	45.5	2	9.1	4	18.2

Table 4.10 shows the students' quality of interactions between other students, academic advisors, faculty, student services staff, and other administrative staff and offices. A majority of the students (63.6%) reported having excellent interactions with

fellow students. A majority of the students reported having acceptable interactions with academic advisors (50.0%), with student services staff (63.6%), and with other administrative staff and offices (63.6%). Half of the students (50.0%) reported having excellent interactions with faculty while the other half of students (50.0%) reported having acceptable interactions with faculty.

Table 4.10

Quality of On-Campus Interactions (N=22)

Variable	Excellent		Acceptable		Poor		N/A	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Students M= 3.64, SD= .492	14	63.6	8	36.4	0	0	0	0
Academic Advisors M= 2.95, SD= .722	5	22.7	11	50.0	6	27.3	0	0
Faculty M= 3.50, SD= .512	11	50.0	11	50.0	0	0	0	0
Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.) M= 2.95, SD= .722	4	18.2	14	63.6	3	13.6	1	4.5
Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.) M= 2.55, SD= .671	0	0	14	63.6	6	27.3	2	9.1

The first open-ended question of the survey instrument asked the students “how is being a RAH student employee impacting your personal development and growth?” Most of the responses were positive mentioning the improvements of various skills, such as time management, team work, problem-solving, social, and leadership skills. Six of the students commented on how RAH has helped improve their own wellbeing, such as feeling more confident, happier, and less anxious. A few mentioned RAH has made them “step out of their comfort zone”, “break out of their shell”, and “feel more valued as a human being”. Two student employees mentioned that they feel their second year isn’t as beneficial to their development and growth as their first year. One student mentioned their social life has faltered slightly due to the time commitment as a coordinator for RAH. The other student stated that their first year they were able to aim for higher goals and leadership opportunities; however, their second year they felt that they did not grow as much.

Research question 3. How does student employment in RAH impact student engagement?

Table 4.11 depicts how the student employees spend their time in a 7-day week. The majority of the students (36.4%) spend 1-5 hours preparing for class, the majority of students (50.5%) spend 1-5 hours participating in co-curricular activities, the majority of students (54.5%) spend 11-15 hours working for pay on campus, the majority of students (68.2%) spend 0 hours working for pay off campus, the majority of students (59.1%) spend 0 hours doing community service or volunteer work, the majority of students (22.7%) spend 11-15 hours relaxing and socializing, the majority of students (95.5%)

spend 0 hours providing care for dependents, and the majority of students (72.7%) spend 0 hours commuting to campus in a week.

Table 4.11

Time Spent in a 7-Day Week (N=22)

Variable	0		1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		26-30	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities) M= 3.59, SD= 1.532	0	0	8	36.4	2	9.1	7	31.8	2	9.1	2	9.1	1	4.5
Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.) M= 2.86, SD= 1.612	3	13.6	11	50.0	1	4.5	2	9.1	3	13.6	2	9.1	0	0

Table 4.11 (continued)

Variable	0		1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		26-30	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Working for pay on campus M= 3.95, SD= .785	0	0	1	4.5	4	18.2	12	54.5	5	22.7	0	0	0	0
Working for pay off campus M= 1.68, SD= 1.211	15	68.2	3	13.6	1	4.5	2	9.1	1	4.5	0	0	0	0
Doing community service or volunteer work M= 1.45, SD= .596	13	59.1	8	36.4	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relaxing and socializing M= 4.59, SD= 2.039	0	0	4	18.2	3	13.6	5	22.7	4	18.2	2	9.1	0	0
Providing care for dependents (children, parents, etc.) M= 1.05, SD= .213	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commuting to campus (driving, walking, etc.) M= 1.27, SD= .456	16	72.7	6	27.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The second open-ended question asked, “how do you think being a student employee for RAH impacts your engagement on Rowan’s campus?” Many of the responses mentioned their presence on campus. They reported that being a RAH employee, they are able to meet many students of different ages. Meeting as many people as they do, they feel that as they walk through campus they are recognized and some stated that they are acknowledged as a spokesperson for not only Student Center events but campus-wide events. Some responses to this question were “I feel much more connected to Rowan as a whole because of RAH”, “I am now much more engaged”, “being a RAH employee you become one with Rowan’s community”, and “with clubs, I am already engaged on campus; however, RAH allows me to engage with the campus on a wider/broader level that affects more than just my club members”. Overall, the responses were positive and the student employees feel that RAH improves their engagement on Rowan’s campus.

Research question 4. How do RAH student employees compare to the reported 2016 NSSE results for undergraduate students at Rowan University?

Table 4.12 below depicts the comparison between RAH student employees and the NSSE Rowan University student respondents in 2016 for their current course grade. RAH had 63.6% of their employees receive A and A-'s whereas 45% of Rowan students who participated in NSSE in 2016 received A and A-'s.

Table 4.12

Comparison of GPA Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	% of RAH	% of NSSE 2016
A	22.7	26
A-	40.9	19
B+	13.6	20
B	9.1	20
B-	0	5
C+	9.1	7
C	4.5	3
C- or lower	0	1

Table 4.13 compares the emphasis in coursework between RAH and NSSE. The table shows that 20% of Rowan students who participated in NSSE in 2016 reported they very often memorized course material while only 9.1% of RAH employees reported memorizing course material. Half of the RAH staff (50%) reported applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations very often, while 39% of NSSE respondents reported the same. Very often analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts was fairly similar between RAH (31.8%) and NSSE (34%). As for examining a point of view, decision, or information source, 36.4% of RAH reported they do this very often, while 26% of NSSE reported doing this very often. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE 28% reported forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information.

Table 4.13

Comparison of Emphasis in Coursework Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Very Often		Often		Total	
	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %
Memorizing course material	9.1	20.0	31.8	44.0	40.9	64.0
Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	50.0	39.0	36.4	40.0	86.4	79.0
Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	31.8	34.0	54.5	39.0	86.3	73.0
Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	36.4	26.0	36.4	39.0	72.8	65.0
Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	45.5	28.0	45.5	44.0	91.0	72.0

Table 4.14 shows the comparison of institutional influence between RAH and NSSE in 2016. RAH reported 40.9% and NSSE reported 33% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for writing clearly and effectively. RAH reported 40.9% and NSSE reported 33% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for speaking clearly and effectively. RAH reported 50% and NSSE reported 46% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for thinking critically and effectively. RAH reported 27.3% and NSSE reported 35% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for analyzing numerical and statistical information. RAH reported 72.7% and NSSE reported 32% very much felt

that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for acquiring a job- or work-related knowledge and skills. RAH reported 77.3% and NSSE reported 37% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for working effectively with others. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 27% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 25% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for understanding people of other backgrounds. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 30% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for solving complex real-world problems. RAH reported 36.4% and NSSE reported 21% very much felt that their experience at Rowan influenced their skills for being an informed and active citizen.

Table 4.14

Comparison of Institutional Influence Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Very Much		Quite a Bit		Total	
	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %
Writing clearly and effectively	40.9	33.0	31.8	37.0	72.7	70.0
Speaking clearly and effectively	40.9	33.0	40.9	35.0	81.8	68.0
Thinking critically and analytically	50.0	46.0	45.5	35.0	95.5	81.0
Analyzing numerical and statistical information	27.3	35.0	18.2	31.0	45.5	66.0
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	72.7	32.0	27.3	37.0	100.0	69.0
Working effectively with others	77.3	37.0	18.2	37.0	95.5	74.0
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	45.5	27.0	40.9	33.0	86.4	60.0
Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	45.5	25.0	40.9	32.0	86.4	57.0
Solving complex real-world problems	45.5	30.0	27.3	31.0	72.8	61.0
Being an informed and active citizen	36.4	21.0	40.9	31.0	77.3	52.0

Table 4.15 is a comparison of academic involvement between RAH and NSSE. RAH reported 18.2% and NSSE reported 43% have very often asked questions or contributed to course discussion in other ways. RAH reported 27.3% and NSSE reported 15% have very often prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in. RAH reported 9.1% and NSSE reported 5% have very often went to class without completing readings or assignments. RAH reported 18.2% and NSSE reported 7% have very often attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance. RAH reported 22.7% and NSSE reported 14% have very often asked another student to help them understand course material. RAH reported 18.2% and NSSE reported 22% have very often explained course material to one or more students. RAH reported 36.4% and NSSE reported 21% have very often prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 32% have very often worked with other students on course projects or assignments. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 31% have very often given a course presentation.

Table 4.15

Comparison of Academic Involvement Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Very Often		Often		Total	
	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %
Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways	18.2	43.0	68.2	35.0	86.4	78.0
Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	27.3	15.0	31.8	30.0	59.1	45.0
Come to class without completing readings or assignments	9.1	5.0	22.7	12.0	31.8	17.0
Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)	18.2	7.0	22.7	11.0	40.9	18.0
Asked another student to help you understand course material	22.7	14.0	36.4	35.0	59.1	49.0
Explained course material to one or more students	18.2	22.0	50.0	43.0	68.2	65.0
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	36.4	21.0	27.3	29.0	63.7	50.0
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	45.5	32.0	40.9	37.0	86.4	69.0
Gave a course presentation	45.5	31.0	22.7	36.0	68.2	67.0

Table 4.16 demonstrates the comparison of involvement with faculty between RAH and NSSE. RAH reported 18.2% and NSSE reported 21% have very often talked

about career plans with a faculty member. RAH reported 22.7% and NSSE reported 13% have very often worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework. RAH reported 9.1% and NSSE reported 16% have very often discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class. RAH reported 13.6% and NSSE reported 16% have very often discussed their academic performance with a faculty member.

Table 4.16

Comparison of Involvement with Faculty Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Very Often		Often		Total	
	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %	RAH %	NSSE %
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	18.2	21.0	31.8	25.0	50.0	46.0
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	22.7	13.0	31.8	18.0	54.5	31.0
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	9.1	16.0	36.4	23.0	45.5	39.0
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	13.6	16.0	18.2	25.0	31.8	41.0

Table 4.17 is a comparison of the plans before graduating between RAH and NSSE. RAH reported 31.8% and NSSE reported 55% have done or are in progress of participating in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement. RAH reported 45.5% and NSSE reported 36% have done or are in progress of holding a formal leadership role in a student organization or group. RAH reported 40.9% and NSSE reported 29% have done or are in progress of participating in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 6% have done or are in progress of participating in a study abroad program. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 26% have done or are in progress of working with a faculty member on a research project. RAH reported 27.3% and NSSE reported 38% have done or are in progress of completing a culminating senior experience.

Table 4.17

Comparison of Plans Before Graduating Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Done or in progress		Plan to do		Total	
	RAH	NSSE	RAH	NSSE	RAH	NSSE
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement	31.8	55.0	59.1	26.0	90.0	81.0
Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group	45.5	36.0	31.8	9.0	77.3	45.0
Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	40.9	29.0	9.1	10.0	50.0	39.0
Participate in a study abroad program	0	6.0	9.1	8.0	9.1	14.0
Work with a faculty member on a research project	0	26.0	13.6	12.0	13.6	38.0
Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	27.3	38.0	45.5	24.0	72.8	62.0

Table 4.18 compares the quality of on-campus interactions with students, faculty, and staff between RAH student employees and the Rowan student respondents to NSSE in 2016. However, NSSE used a different scale in their study instrument than the one used in this study. NSSE in 2016 used a Likert scale ranging from 1-7 for this question., 1 being “Poor” and 7 being “Excellent”. Therefore, I have only compared the scores for “excellent” from both studies. It is important to note that since the respondents for NSSE

had more options to select, this may have swayed their decision from choosing “Excellent”. RAH reported 63.6% and NSSE reported 30% having excellent quality of interactions with students. RAH reported 22.7% and NSSE reported 26% having excellent quality of interactions with academic advisors. RAH reported 50% and NSSE reported 24% having excellent quality of interactions with faculty. RAH reported 18.2% and NSSE reported 11% having excellent quality of interactions with student services staff. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 14% having excellent quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices.

Table 4.18

Comparison of On-Campus Interactions Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	Excellent	
	RAH %	NSSE %
Students	63.6	30.0
Academic Advisors	22.7	26.0
Faculty	50.0	24.0
Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	18.2	11.0
Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	0	14.0

Table 4.19 demonstrates the comparison of time spent in a 7-day week between RAH and NSSE. Included in the table is the data for 6-10 hours, 11-15 hours, and 16-20 hours. This section will be comparing the 11-15 hours for each event. RAH reported 31.8% and NSSE reported 19% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week preparing for class. RAH reported 9.1% and NSSE reported 6% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week participating in co-curricular activities. RAH reported 54.5% and NSSE reported 5% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week working for pay on campus. RAH reported 9.1% and NSSE reported 9% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week working for pay off campus. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 4% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week doing community service or volunteer work. RAH reported 22.7% and NSSE reported 20% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week relaxing and socializing. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 8% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week providing care for

dependents. RAH reported 0% and NSSE reported 20% spending 11-15 hours in a 7-day week commuting to campus.

Table 4.19

Comparison of Time Spent in a Week Between RAH and NSSE

Variable	11-30 hours	
	RAH %	NSSE %
Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	54.5	50.0
Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	31.8	17.0
Working for pay on campus	77.2	11.0
Working for pay off campus	13.6	36.0
Doing community service or volunteer work	0	7.0
Relaxing and socializing	50.0	41.0
Providing care for dependents (children, parents, etc.)	0	7.0
Commuting to campus (driving, walking, etc.)	0	10.0

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study was conducted at Rowan University's Chamberlain Student Center in Glassboro, New Jersey during the 2018-2019 academic year. The purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of student employment at Rowan After Hours (RAH) on student engagement. This was a replication study of Lauren Thompson's thesis from 2013, which investigated the impact of RAH student employment on student engagement at Rowan University. The subjects of the study were the undergraduate students employed by Rowan After Hours.

The survey instrument used in this study was a replication of what Thompson (2013) used for her study, with an addition of two open-ended questions. The survey instrument was adopted and modified from the online version of the *National Survey of Student Engagement 2018* (NSSE) developed by *The College Student Report* and the Trustees of Indiana University.

The survey (Appendix C) consisted of 21 questions with 2 open-ended questions. Items 1-21 were used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-18 The Trustees of Indiana University. The questions asked were used to determine the relationship between RAH employees and being engaged on Rowan University's campus. The first page of the survey was an alternative consent form notifying the student employee that they would not be penalized

for not participating and that if they did decide to participate, it would be anonymous. If they chose to go on, that was their consent to taking the survey. The first 9 questions of the survey were used to accumulate demographic data to determine age, gender, class level, how long they have worked for RAH, being an international student, number of majors planned to complete, self-reported grades up to the point of completing the survey at Rowan University, if they began college at Rowan or at another institution, and their highest level of education they expect to complete. The next 10 questions asked about how often they integrate coursework to real-life situations, their emphasis in coursework, hours spent reading for class, length of papers they have written for classes, Rowan's influence on their knowledge, skills, and personal development, their academic involvement, their involvement with faculty, plans before graduating, quality of on-campus interactions with students, faculty, and staff, and time spent in a 7-day week. The following two questions of the survey asked how they would evaluate their entire educational experience at Rowan and how many courses they were taking the current semester. Finally, the last two questions were open-ended about the impact on their personal development and growth from being a RAH student employee and how they think being a student employee for RAH impacts their engagement on campus. This study was distributed to all 22 RAH student employees and completed and returned by all 22, which yielded a return of 100%.

The results of the study were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 24 software program. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were provided by this program of the demographics and levels of engagement.

Discussion of the Findings

This section will compare this study's responses to the spring 2013 RAH student employee respondents from Lauren Thompson's (2013) study and it will also compare its responses to the Rowan University freshman/first-year and senior year students' responses to NSSE in 2016.

Research question 1. Does being a student employee in RAH encourage students to become engaged in the Rowan University community and their academics?

Based on the responses from the 2019 RAH student employees and the RAH student employees from 2013, in general, RAH student employees fall below the grade point average compared to RAH student employees from 2013. In total, 100% of RAH employees from 2013 reported having a B- or higher while only 86.3% of the 2019 RAH employees reported having a B- or higher and 13.6% fall between having a C+ and C. Therefore, RAH student employees from 2013 received higher grades than the employees from 2019.

Based on the responses from the 2019 RAH student employees and the NSSE 2016 respondents, in general, RAH student employees fall below the grade point average compared to the NSSE 2016 report. In total, 90% of the NSSE respondents from 2016 reported having B- or higher and 11% reported having a C+ or lower, whereas 86.3% of the 2019 RAH employees reported having a B- or higher and 13.6% fall between having a C+ and C.

Next, I compared the emphasis in coursework between the 2019 RAH student employees and the RAH student employees from 2013. The data demonstrates that 2019

RAH student employees are above the average by 2013 RAH student employees in applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations (RAH `19 86.4% / RAH `13 84.2%); analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts (RAH `19 86.3% / RAH `13 84.2%); forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information (RAH `19 91% / RAH `13 84.2%). RAH 2019 student employees fell below the average on memorizing course material (RAH `19 40.9% / RAH `13 84.2%); and evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source (RAH `19 72.8% / RAH `13 73.6%). This was evaluated on the respondents answering, “very often” or “often” on the survey instrument.

I also compared the emphasis in coursework between the 2019 RAH student employees and the NSSE respondents in 2016. The data demonstrates that 2019 RAH student employees are above the average by the 2016 NSSE respondents in applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations (RAH `19 86.4% / NSSE 79%); analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts (RAH `19 86.3% / NSSE 73%); evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source (RAH `19 72.8% / NSSE 65%); forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information (RAH `19 91% / NSSE 72%) and RAH 2019 student employees fell below the average on memorizing course material (RAH `19 40.9% / NSSE 64%). This was evaluated on the respondents answering, “very often” or “often” on the survey instrument.

Finally, when comparing data on institutional influence between the 2019 RAH student employees and the RAH student employees from 2013, the data demonstrates that 2019 RAH student employees are above the average by 2013 RAH student employees in

thinking critically and analytically (RAH `19 95.5% / RAH `13 94.7%) and acquiring job- or work- related knowledge and skills (RAH `19 100% / RAH `13 94.7%). RAH 2019 student employees fell below the average on writing clearly and effectively (RAH `19 72.7% / RAH `13 78.9%); speaking clearly and effectively (RAH `19 81.8% / RAH `13 89.5%); developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics (RAH `19 86.4% / RAH `13 100%); understanding people of other backgrounds (RAH `19 86.4% / RAH `13 89.5%); and solving complex real-world problems (RAH `19 72.8% / RAH `13 84.2%). This was evaluated on the respondents answering, “very often” or “often” on the survey instrument.

When comparing data on institutional influence between the 2019 RAH student employees and the NSSE respondents in 2016, the data demonstrates that 2019 RAH student employees are above the average by the 2016 NSSE respondents in writing clearly and effectively (RAH `19 72.7% / NSSE 70%); speaking clearly and effectively (RAH `19 81.8% / NSSE 68%); thinking critically and analytically (RAH `19 95.5% / NSSE 81%); acquiring job- or work- related knowledge and skills (RAH `19 100% / NSSE 69%); working effectively with others (RAH `19 95.5% / NSSE 74%); developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics (RAH `19 86.4% / NSSE 60%); understanding people of other backgrounds (RAH `19 86.4% / NSSE 57%); solving complex real-world problems (RAH `19 72.8% / NSSE 61%); and being an informed and active citizen (RAH `19 77.3% / NSSE 52%). RAH 2019 student employees fell below the average on analyzing numerical and statistical information (RAH `19 45.5% / NSSE 66%). This was evaluated on the respondents answering, “very often” or “often” on the survey instrument.

Research question 2. Are RAH employees making significant gains in personal development and growth through their engagement in RAH?

To answer this question, RAH students were asked about their academic involvement. Compared to the 2013 RAH employee student responses, RAH student employees this year are more academically involved. RAH 2019 student employees responded above average when asked if they asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways (RAH `19 86.4% / RAH `13 84.2%); how often they prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in (RAH `19 59.1% / RAH `13 36.9%); attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (RAH `19 40.9% / RAH `13 31.6%); worked with other students on course projects or assignments (RAH `19 86.4% / RAH `13 78.9%); and how often they gave a course presentation (RAH `19 68.2% / RAH `13 57.9%). These above average responses when compared to the responses of RAH employees 6 years ago show that there is improvement regarding academic involvement. This could be due to the fact that RAH employees are constantly engaged with students and professional staff at work creating a comfort when engaging with others inside and outside the classroom.

Compared to the NSSE responses in 2016, the 2019 RAH student employees are more academically involved. RAH student employees responded above average when asked if they asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways (RAH `19 86.4% / NSSE 78%); how often they prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in (RAH `19 59.1% / NSSE 45%); attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (RAH `19 40.9% / NSSE 18%); asked another student to help them understand the course material (RAH `19 59.1% / NSSE 49%); explained

course material to one or more students (RAH `19 68.2% / NSSE 65%); prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students (RAH `19 63.7% / NSSE 50%); worked with other students on course projects or assignments (RAH `19 86.4% / NSSE 69%); and how often they gave a course presentation (RAH `19 68.2% / NSSE 67%).

RAH student employees were asked about their involvement with faculty compared to the 2013 RAH employee student responses. RAH 2019 student employees scored above average and stated they “very often” or “often” discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with faculty members outside of class (RAH `19 45.5% / RAH `13 42.1%). RAH 2019 student employees scored below average on how often they talked about career plans with a faculty member (RAH `19 50% / RAH `13 52.6%); how often they worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (RAH `19 54.5% / RAH `13 78.9%); and how often they discussed their academic performance with a faculty member (RAH `19 31.8% / RAH `13 52.6%).

When compared to NSSE responses in 2016, RAH 2019 student employees stated that they “very often” or “often” talked about career plans with a faculty member (RAH `19 50% / NSSE 46%); how often they worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (RAH `19 54.5% / NSSE 31%); and how often they discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with faculty members outside of class (RAH `19 45.5% / NSSE 39%). RAH 2019 student employees scored below average on how often they discussed their academic performance with a faculty member (RAH `19 31.8% / NSSE 41%).

Next, students were asked a series of questions to learn what type of activities and projects they were planning to complete before graduating college. Compared to RAH student employees from 2013, RAH 2019 students responded above average on completing, in the process of completing, or plan to complete participation in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement (RAH `19 90% / RAH `13 89.5%). RAH 2019 student employees scored below average on completing, in the process of completing, or plan to complete participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together (RAH `19 50% / RAH `13 94.8%); participate in a study abroad program (RAH `19 9.1% / RAH `13 26.4%); work with a faculty member on a research project (RAH `19 13.6% / RAH `13 36.8%); and complete a culminating senior experience (RAH `19 72.8% / RAH `13 79%).

Compared to NSSE respondents from 2016, RAH 2019 students responded above average on completing, in the process of completing, or plan to complete participation in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement (RAH `19 90% / NSSE 81%); hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group (RAH `19 77.3% / NSSE 45%); participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together (RAH `19 50% / NSSE 39%); and complete a culminating senior experience (RAH `19 72.8% / NSSE 62%). RAH 2019 student employees scored below average on completing, in the process of completing, or plan to complete participation in a study abroad program (RAH `19 9.1% / NSSE 14%) and work with a faculty member on a research project (RAH `19 13.6% / NSSE 38%).

Finally, students were asked to rate the quality of their on-campus interactions. RAH 2019 student employees and RAH student employees from 2013 responded that they had “excellent” or “acceptable” interactions with students (RAH `19 100% / RAH `13 100%) and faculty (RAH `19 100% / RAH `13 100%). RAH 2019 students fell below the 2013 RAH employees’ results on “excellent” or “acceptable” interactions with academic advisors (RAH `19 72.7% / RAH `13 94.4%) and other administrative staff and offices (RAH `19 63.6% / RAH `13 68.5%).

Compared to NSSE respondents in 2016, RAH 2019 student employees scored above average and responded having “excellent” interactions with students (RAH `19 63.6% / NSSE 30%), faculty (RAH `19 50% / NSSE 24%), and student services staff (RAH `19 18.2% / NSSE 11%). RAH 2019 students fell below the 2013 RAH employees’ results on “excellent” interactions with academic advisors (RAH `19 22.7% / NSSE 26%) and other administrative staff and offices (RAH `19 0% / NSSE 14%). This section focused on the responses for “excellent” due to the fact that NSSE’s survey in 2016 used a likert scale. Therefore, it was easier to measure and compare the responses to “excellent” rather than both “excellent” and “acceptable” interactions as I did above for RAH 2013 student employees.

In the survey instrument for this study, I added an open-ended question asking, “how is being a RAH student employee impacting your personal development and growth?” This question was not asked in Thompson’s (2013) study nor was it asked in the NSSE survey in 2016. I found that most of the responses were positive. Students mentioned improvements of various transferrable skills (time management, team work, problem solving, social, and leadership skills), some mentioned that RAH helped them

improve their wellbeing (more confident and happier), and some stated RAH has helped them “break out of their shell”. Two student employees mentioned that they feel their second year is not as beneficial as their first year in terms of their own development and growth. One student mentioned the time commitment as a coordinator has caused a slight decline in their social life, while the other student stated that they did not have as much growth opportunities in their second year of RAH compared to their first.

Research question 3. How does student employment in RAH impact student engagement?

Throughout a 7-day week, RAH student employees in 2019 spent between 11-30 hours a week working on campus (77.2%) compared to 73.7% of the 2013 RAH students working between 11-30 hours a week. RAH student employees this year spent 11-30 hours a week preparing for class (54.5) compared to 52.7% of the RAH students in 2013. More student employees worked for pay off campus from 11-30 hours this year than they did in 2013 (RAH `19 13.6% / RAH `13 0%). RAH 2019 students fell below the 2013 RAH employees’ responses by spending 11-30 hours participating in co-curricular activities (RAH `19 31.8% / RAH `13 42.4%); relaxing and socializing (RAH `19 50% / RAH `13 58%); and commuting to campus (RAH `19 0% / RAH `13 5.3%).

Throughout a 7-day week, RAH student employees in 2019 spent between 11-30 hours a week working on campus (77.2%) compared to 73.7% of the NSSE 2016 respondents working between 11-30 hours a week. Compared to NSSE 2016, RAH student employees were above average when it comes to spending 11-30 hours preparing for class (RAH `19 54.5% / NSSE 50%); participating in co-curricular activities (RAH

'19 31.8% / NSSE 17%); and spending 11-30 hours relaxing and socializing (RAH '19 50% / NSSE 41%). Comparatively, 7% of NSSE 2016 students reported spending 11-30 hours per week providing care for dependents and 36% spent that amount of time working for pay off campus where RAH student employees reported 13.6% working for pay off campus and 0% taking care of a dependent.

Another open-ended question was added to this survey that was not asked in Thompson's (2013) study or the NSSE survey in 2016. The open-ended question asked, "how do you think being a student employee for RAH impacts your engagement on Rowan's campus?" Many of the responses mentioned the people they meet and the connections they make. As a RAH employee, they meet students of different ages and sometimes professional staff members from throughout campus. They reported that because they meet so many people, they feel that as they walk around campus they are known as spokespeople for the Student Center and because of this, they feel more connected to the campus. Overall, the responses were positive and the student employees feel that RAH improves their engagement on Rowan's campus.

Research question 4. How do RAH student employees compare to the reported 2016 NSSE results for undergraduate students at Rowan University?

As reported throughout this section, compared to NSSE 2016 results, RAH student employees responded 83% above average and only 17% below the average NSSE 2016 results. This suggests that RAH student employees are more fully engaged in Rowan University and its community than the NSSE student respondents in 2016.

Conclusions

RAH student employee responses were compared to the data collected during Thompson's (2013) study for RAH student employees in 2013 and it also compares this study's responses to the NSSE 2016 survey in which Rowan University first-year and senior year students participated.

Based on the data collected from 2019 RAH student employees and the comparison of data from RAH employees from 2013, it seems students are still engaged in the community and academics today as they were in 2013, although falling short in a few aspects. Based on the results of the survey, Rowan After Hours 2019 student employees responded with a higher rate compared to 2013 RAH students in that they have applied facts, theories, or methods to practical problems; analyzed an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts; formed a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information; think critically and analytically; acquired job- or work- related knowledge and skills; discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with faculty members outside of class; participated in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement; spent more time working on campus, spent more time preparing for class, and more student employees worked for pay off campus. Both RAH employees from 2013 and 2019 reported having "excellent" or "acceptable" interactions with students and faculty.

However, RAH 2019 student employees responded with a lower rate compared to 2013 RAH students in memorizing course material; evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source; writing clearly and effectively; speaking clearly and effectively;

developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics; understanding people of other backgrounds; solving complex real-world problems; talking about career plans with a faculty member; how often they work with a faculty member on activities other than coursework; how often they discuss their academic performance with a faculty member; participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together; participate in a study abroad program; work with a faculty member on a research project; complete a culminating senior experience; having excellent” or “acceptable” interactions with academic advisors and other administrative staff and offices; participating in co-curricular activities; relaxing and socializing and commuting to campus.

Compared to the respondents to Thompson’s (2013) study, 2019 RAH employees are engaged on Rowan’s campus and community, but have faltered some when analyzing the lower rated responses. Student employees for RAH in 2013 rated speaking clearly and effectively, developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics, and understanding people of other backgrounds higher than the student employees working for RAH today. These are skills Rowan After Hours hopes to instill in their employees: ability to communicate effectively, ability to understand one’s code of values/ethics, and work with people from diverse backgrounds. These were still ranked highly, even above the NSSE 2016 average, but they have dipped slightly in the past 6 years and should be questioned why that is.

Based on the data collected from 2019 RAH student employees and the comparison of data from NSSE 2016, RAH student employees responded 83% above average and only 17% below the average NSSE 2016 results. This suggests that RAH

student employees are more engaged in Rowan University and its community than the NSSE student respondents in 2016.

Based on the results of the survey, Rowan After Hours 2019 student employees responded with a higher rate compared to NSSE 2016 respondents in applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations; analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts; evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source; forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information; writing clearly and effectively; speaking clearly and effectively; thinking critically and analytically; acquiring job- or work- related knowledge and skills; working effectively with others; developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics; understanding people of other backgrounds; solving complex real-world problems; being an informed and active citizen; asking questions or contributing to course discussions in other ways; prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in; attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance; asked another student to help them understand the course material; explained course material to one or more students; prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students; worked with other students on course projects or assignments; how often they gave a course presentation; talked about career plans with a faculty member; how often they worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework; how often they discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with faculty members outside of class; participation in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement; held a formal leadership role in a student organization or group; participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two

or more classes together; complete a culminating senior experience; having “excellent” interactions with students, faculty, and student services staff; working on campus; preparing for class; participating in co-curricular activities; and relaxing and socializing.

However, RAH 2019 student employees responded with a lower rate compared to NSSE 2016 in memorizing course material; analyzing numerical and statistical information; discussed their academic performance with a faculty member; participation in a study abroad program; work with a faculty member on a research project; “excellent” interactions with academic advisors and other administrative staff and offices; providing care for dependents and working for pay off campus.

Compared to the respondents for NSSE, the RAH student employees this year are more involved in their community and more invested in their academics than the Rowan University respondents from 2016. This could be due to the policies that are set when working for Rowan After Hours, such as the policy for grade point average in order to be employed, limited number of hours that can be worked each week as Perry (2019) stated to be important, or the various opportunities the SCCA (Student Center and Campus Activities), where Rowan After Hours is housed, offers for student employees to get more involved on the campus and in the community. In turn, as the students become more involved members of the community, they will become more likely to invest in greater efforts to learn (Tinto, 1993).

Acquiring job- or work- related knowledge and skills was scored very high at 100% for the RAH student employees which relates to the importance of student employment on campus. As mentioned before, one of the benefits of working on campus as an undergraduate student is that it prepares you for life after college and for a career,

as evident in this study (NASPA, 2019). As students stated in the first open-ended question, working for Rowan After Hours gives you various transferrable skills that can be used in future careers, such as time management, team work, problem solving, communication, and leadership skills. Being able to take work experiences as a student into the workplace after college is one of the biggest benefits to being a student employee. This gives them an opportunity to learn more about themselves personally and professionally and grow and develop into successful adults. The students ranked being an informed and active citizen as 77.3%, which is higher than the NSSE 2016 average.

The RAH student employees also ranked having “excellent” or “acceptable” interactions with students and faculty very high at 100%. As previously mentioned, faculty-student interaction is imperative in student retention and development (DeAngelo, Mason, & Winters, 2016). Having an environment on campus where students and faculty are comfortable with communicating and making connections can improve the mindset for both the students and faculty members. Kuh, Pace, and Vesper (1997) advise to encourage students to interact with peers and faculty as it leads to student educational gains and that is what RAH provides their student employees. RAH creates a space where students feel safe and comfortable interacting with others.

Rowan After Hours also follows Chickering and Gamson (1987) seven good practices in undergraduate education. The program allows for student-student and student-faculty interactions. Employees are encouraged to communicate with students all night and with faculty that may attend, as well. The student employees are also active learners in that they do not just listen and memorize, but instead actively participate and collaborate with one another. They are often given tasks with deadlines and have high

expectations for their work. Throughout the semester, Lauren holds two-on-ones with the student employee and one of the graduate coordinators. During this meeting, they discuss strengths of the employee and how they can improve for the future. They give feedback to the student and allow the student to give their own feedback as well.

Rowan After Hours is a program that teaches their employees transferable skills, encourages them to make connections to their peers, faculty, and community, and supports their successes both academically and personally. It is evident in this study that the student employees are engaged to Rowan University and its community due to their experience with Rowan After Hours.

Recommendations for Further Practice

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. Further develop diversity training for the RAH student employees to improve their understanding of people with diverse backgrounds.
2. Further incorporate communication training for the student staff to continue to improve their communications skills, such as speaking and writing.
3. Encourage staff to connect with faculty outside of the classroom to discuss their academic work and future goals they may have.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. Expand this research to not only studying RAH student employees, but to other departments that give the students opportunity to work for pay. This will broaden the pool of respondents and give a more holistic view of working as a student on Rowan's campus.
2. A study can be done on the attitudes of students who attend RAH and compare them to the attitudes of students who do not regularly attend RAH, their participation on campus and sense of community/connection to Rowan University.
3. Conduct a study regarding the wellbeing of students who work on campus compared to students who work off campus or do not work at all. There is research cited in this study about the importance of limiting the number of hours students work, research further into what that looks like on Rowan's campus.

References

- About Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities. (2017). Retrieved from <https://sites.rowan.edu/scca/aboutus/index.html>
- About NSSE. (2019). Retrieved from <http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/about.cfm>
- Alfano, H. J., & Eduljee, N. B. (2013). Differences in work, levels of involvement, and academic performance between residential and commuter students. *College Student Journal*, 47(2), 334-342.
- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (1999). Student Involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1999). Development and adaptations of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching And Learning*, 80, 75-81.
- Couch, M. (2018). Too much of a good thing: Understanding the perils of over involvement. Retrieved from <https://www.acui.org/resources/bulletin/bulletin-detail/2018/09/04/too-much-of-a-good-thing-understanding-the-perils-of-overinvolvement>
- Creager, K., Kuh, G., McClellan, G., & Savoca, M. (2018). *A good job: Campus employment as a high-impact practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- DeAngelo, L., Mason, J., & Winters, D. (2016). Faculty engagement in mentoring undergraduate students: How institutional environments regulate and promote extra role behavior. *Innovative Higher Education*, 41(4), 317-332. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9350-7>
- Glossary of Education Reform (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.edglossary.org/student-engagement/>
- Harrill, M., Lawton, J. A., & Fabianke, J. (2015). Faculty and staff engagement: A core component of student success. *Peer Review*, 17(4), 11-14. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.rowan.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1779217064?accountid=13605>
- Johnson, S. (2019). Future of Work: How can colleges build a better future for work-study? Retrieved from <https://www.edsurge.com/news/2019-03-12-how-can-colleges-build-a-better-future-for-work-study>

- Kawachi, I., & Weitzman, E. (2000). Giving means receiving: The protective effect of social capital on binge drinking on college campuses. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(12), 1936-1939.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 683-706.
- Kuh, G. D., Gonyea, R. M., & Palmer, M. (2001). The disengaged commuter student: fact or fiction? *Commuter Perspectives, 27*, 2-5.
- Kuh, G. D., Pace, C., & Vesper, N. (1997). The development of process indicators to estimate student gains associated with good practices in undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(4), 435-454.
- Maggs, J. L., Patrick, M. E., & Osgood D. W. (2010). Latenight penn state alcohol-free programming: students drink less on days they participate. *Prevention Science, 11*(2), 155-162.
- Malagiere, M. T. (2008). *A student satisfaction study of the chamberlain student center* (Master's thesis). Rowan University, Glassboro.
- McMillan, J. H. (2016). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (7th ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Milsted, B. (2010). *A study of the impact of late night programming on student involvement at Rowan University*. (Master's thesis). Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey
- NASPA (2019). Cision PR Newswire: Report highlights five ways colleges can connect on-campus employment to student success. Retrieved from <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/report-highlights-five-ways-colleges-can-connect-on-campus-employment-to-student-success-300810889.html>
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2015). *Job Outlook 2016: The attributes employers want to see on new college graduates' resumes*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacweb.org/career-development/trends-and-predictions/job-outlook-2016-attributes-employers-want-to-see-on-new-college-graduates-resumes/>
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2015). Retrieved from <https://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/CollegeFactSheet/Collegefactsheet.pdf>.
- Noel-Levitz. (2010). *Enhancing Student Success by treating "student jobs" as "real jobs."* Coralville, IA: Author.

- Olsen, S. (2015). *Student affairs programs at Rowan University and their impact on students' sense of mattering*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey
- Pace, C. (1980). *Measuring the quality of student effort*. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 2, 10-16.
- Pace, C. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences. An account of the development and use of the college student experiences questionnaire*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, A. (2019). Learning while you earn in college: A new study finds that students are more successful when they get work-study jobs that are relevant to their career interests. Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/learning-while-you-earn-in-college/>
- Pike, G., Kuh, G., & Massa-McKinley, R. (2009). First-year student's employment, engagement, and academic achievement: untangling the relationship between work and grades. *NASPA Journal*, 45(4), 560-582.
- Prange, R. (2005). Alcohol-free programming – a “cool” way to attract and entertain students. *The Programmers Handbook*. Retrieved from <https://www.lycoming.edu/student-involvement/pdfs/chapter-6.pdf>
- Rowan After Hours. Rowan University Chamberlain Student Center and Campus Activities. Retrieved from <https://sites.rowan.edu/scca/RAH/index.html>
- Rowan Fast Facts (2017). Rowan University. Retrieved from <https://sites.rowan.edu/fastfacts/>
- Saadeddine, R. (2015). Rowan University Enrollment and Demographics. Retrieved from <https://academics.rowan.edu/education/Faculty,%20Staff,%20and%20Student%20Resources/accreditation/documents/ru-enrollment-data-fa15.pdf>
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. In D.C. Roberts (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense of community* (pp.5-15). *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Shotick, J., & Galsky, A. (2013). Impact of late night programming on alcohol use. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 57(1), 16. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=OVIC&u=rowan&id=GALE%7CA342466816&v=2.1&it=r&sid=summon#>
- Thompson, L. (2013). *Rowan After Hours: The impact of student employment on student engagement*. (Master's thesis). Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey
- Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections on the longitudinal character of student leaving. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(4), 438-455.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tovar, E., Simon, M. A., & Lee, H. B. (2009). Development and validation of the College Mattering Inventory with diverse, urban college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 42, 154-178.
- Umbach, P. & Wawrzynski, M. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184.
- Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy. (2018). Retrieved from <https://confluence.rowan.edu/display/POLICY/Undergraduate+Academic+Standing>

Appendix A

The College Student Report Item Usage Agreement



The College Student Report Item Usage Agreement

The National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE) survey instrument, *The College Student Report*, is copyrighted and the copyright is owned by The Trustees of Indiana University. Any use of survey items contained within *The College Student Report* is prohibited without prior written permission from Indiana University. When fully executed, this Agreement constitutes written permission from the University, on behalf of NSSE, for the party named below to use an item or items from *The College Student Report* in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

In consideration of the mutual promises below, the parties hereby agree as follows:

- 1) The University hereby grants **Eleni Dendrinios** ("Licensee") a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable license to use, reproduce, distribute, publicly display and perform, and create derivatives from, in all media now known or hereafter developed, the item(s) listed in the proposal attached as Exhibit A, solely for the purpose of including such item(s) in the survey activity described in Exhibit A, which is incorporated by reference into this Agreement. This license does not include any right to sublicense others. This license only covers the survey instrument, time frame, population, and other terms described in Exhibit A. Any different or repeated use of the item(s) shall require an additional license.
- 2) "National Survey of Student Engagement", "NSSE", and the NSSE logo are registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Except as provided in part 3c below, these elements may not be incorporated without permission in materials developed under this agreement, including but not limited to surveys, Web sites, reports, and promotional materials.
- 3) In exchange for the license granted in section 1, Licensee agrees:
 - a) there will be no licensing fee to use NSSE items for the purposes described in Exhibit A;
 - b) to provide to NSSE frequency distributions and means on the licensed item(s);
 - c) on the survey form itself, and in all publications or presentations of data obtained through the licensed item(s), to include the following citation: "Items xx and xx used with permission from *The College Student Report*, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-18 The Trustees of Indiana University";
 - d) to provide to NSSE a copy of any derivatives of, or alterations to, the item(s) that Licensee makes for the purpose of Licensee's survey ("modified items"), for NSSE's own nonprofit, educational purposes, which shall include the use of the modified items in *The College Student Report* or any other survey instruments, reports, or other educational or professional materials that NSSE may develop or use in the future. Licensee hereby grants the University a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable, royalty-free license to use,

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
1900 East Tenth Street • Eigenmann Hall, Suite 419 • Bloomington, IN 47406
Phone: (812) 856-5824 • Fax: (812) 856-5150 • E-mail: nsse@indiana.edu • Web Address: www.nsse.iub.edu



reproduce, distribute, create derivatives from, and publicly display and perform the modified items, in any media now known or hereafter developed; and

e) to provide to NSSE, for its own nonprofit, educational purposes, a copy of all reports, presentations, analyses, or other materials in which the item(s) licensed under this Agreement, or modified items, and any responses to licensed or modified items, are presented, discussed, or analyzed. NSSE shall not make public any data it obtains under this subsection in a manner that identifies specific institutions or individuals, except with the consent of the Licensee.

4) This Agreement expires on March 1, 2019.

The undersigned hereby consent to the terms of this Agreement and confirm that they have all necessary authority to enter into this Agreement.

For The Trustees of Indiana University:

Alex McCormick

Digitally signed by Alexander McCormick
Date: 2018.11.20 15:35:09 -05'00'

Alexander C. McCormick
Director
National Survey of Student Engagement

_____ Date

For Licensee:

Eleni Dendrinos

Eleni Dendrinos
Graduate Coordinator, Event Management
Rowan University

11/13/18
_____ Date

For Advisor:

Drew Tinnin

Drew Tinnin, Ed.D.
Assistant Vice President for Student Life
Rowan University

11/13/18
_____ Date

Appendix B

Approval to Replicate Lauren Thompson's Study

Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at 4:11:37 PM Eastern Standard Time

Subject: Re: Thesis
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at 2:28:54 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Kuski, Lauren Anne
To: Dendrinis, Eleni Denise
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png, image003.png, image004.png

Eleni,

Thanks for reaching out! Based on our conversation, I'm thrilled to hear that you'll be replicating my thesis!

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks,
Lauren

--

Lauren Kuski

Assistant Director, Rowan After Hours (RAH)

Chamberlain Student Center & Campus Activities

201 Mullica Hill Road | Student Center, Rm 220A | Glassboro, NJ 08028

phone. 856.256.4879 | email. kuski@rowan.edu | rowan.edu/scca

pronouns. she/her/hers



From: "Dendrinis, Eleni Denise" <dendrinoe5@rowan.edu>
Date: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at 9:19 AM
To: "Kuski, Lauren Anne" <kuski@rowan.edu>
Subject: Re: Thesis

Good morning Lauren!

I realized that since I met with you in person to receive approval for replicating your thesis, I do not have written approval from you. Am I able to replicate your research regarding the impact of RAH student employment on student engagement?

Thanks,

--

Eleni Dendrinis

Graduate Coordinator, Event Management

Appendix C

Rowan After Hours Student Employee Survey

CHAMBERLAIN STUDENT CENTER & CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

Rowan After Hours

STUDENT EMPLOYEE PAPER SURVEY (ALTERNATE CONSENT)

My name is Eleni Dendrinis, and I am a graduate student in the Higher Education Administration program at Rowan University. I am inviting you to participate in a research survey entitled "A Replication Study on the Impact of Rowan After Hours Student Employment on Student Engagement." We are inviting you because you are currently a Rowan After Hours student employee at Rowan University. In order to participate in this survey, you must be 18 years or older.

The survey may take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate in this survey, do not respond to this paper survey. The number of subjects to be enrolled in the study will be 24 student employees.

The purpose of this research study is to find, if any, relation between being a student employee of Rowan After Hours and being actively engaged at Rowan University. If you choose to participate in this survey, no identifying information will be provided about your responses and your identities will remain anonymous. By receiving this survey, your standing as an employee will not be affected based on your participation or lack of participation in this survey. You need not respond to any questions that you do not feel comfortable with answering.

Completing this survey indicates that you are voluntarily giving consent to participate in the survey. There are no risks or discomforts associated with this survey. There may be no direct benefit to you, however, by participating in this study, you may help us understand how student employment contributes to collegiate engagement.

Your response will be kept confidential. We will store the data in a secure computer file and the file will be 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 at dendrinoe5@rowan.edu or (856)256-4616 or my advisor, Dr. Drew Tinnin at tinnin@rowan.edu or (856)256-4453, but you do not have to give your personal identification.


Items 1-21 used with permission from The College Student Report, National Survey of Student Engagement, Copyright 2001-18 The Trustees of Indiana University.

1. What is your age?
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24 or older

2. What is your gender?
 - Male

1

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28

 **APPROVED**
Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
IRB #: Pro2018000261
APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
EXPIRATION DATE:

- Female
 - I choose not to identify
3. What is your class level?
- Freshman/First-Year
 - Sophomore
 - Junior
 - Senior
 - Unclassified
4. As of January 2019, I have been working for RAH:
- Less than one year
 - One year
 - Two years
 - Three years
 - Four or more years
5. Are you an international student?
- Yes
 - No

2

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28

 **APPROVED**
Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
IRB #: Pro2018000261
APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
EXPIRATION DATE:

6. How many majors do you plan to complete? (Do not count minors.)
- One
 - More than one
7. What have most of your grades been up to now at this institution?
- A
 - A-
 - B+
 - B
 - B-
 - C+
 - C
 - C- or lower
8. Did you begin college at this institution or elsewhere?
- Started here
 - Started elsewhere
9. What is the highest level of education you ever expect to complete?
- Some college but less than a bachelor's degree
 - Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
 - Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
 - Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)

10. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways	4	3	2	1
b. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	4	3	2	1
c. Come to class without completing readings or assignments	4	3	2	1
d. Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)	4	3	2	1
	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Never
e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	4	3	2	1
f. Explained course material to one or more students	4	3	2	1

3

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28


APPROVED
 Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
 IRB #: Pro2018000261
 APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
 EXPIRATION DATE:

g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	4	3	2	1
h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	4	3	2	1
i. Gave a course presentation	4	3	2	1

11. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	4	3	2	1
b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	4	3	2	1
c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	4	3	2	1
d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	4	3	2	1
e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	4	3	2	1
f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	4	3	2	1
g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	4	3	2	1

12. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	4	3	2	1
b. Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	4	3	2	1
c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	4	3	2	1
d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty	4	3	2	1

4

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28


APPROVED
 Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
 IRB #: Pro2018000261
 APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
 EXPIRATION DATE:

member				
--------	--	--	--	--

13. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Memorizing course material	4	3	2	1
b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	4	3	2	1
c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	4	3	2	1
d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	4	3	2	1
e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	4	3	2	1

14. In a typical 7-day week, about how many hours do you spend reading for your courses?

- 0 hours
- 1-5 hours
- 6-10 hours
- 11-15 hours
- 16-20 hours
- More than 20 hours

15. During the current school year, about how many papers, reports, or other writings tasks of the following length have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed.)

	None	1-2 papers	3-5 papers	6-10 papers	11-15 papers	16-20 papers	More than 20
a. Up to 5 pages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Between 6-10 pages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. 11 pages or more	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?

	Done or in progress	Plan to do	Do not plan to do	Have not decided
a. Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement	4	3	2	1
b. Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group	4	3	2	1

5

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28


APPROVED
 Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
 IRB #: Pro2018000261
 APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
 EXPIRATION DATE:

c. Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	4	3	2	1
d. Participate in a study abroad program	4	3	2	1
e. Work with a faculty member on a research project	4	3	2	1
f. Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	4	3	2	1

17. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?

	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30
a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
b. Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
c. Working for pay on campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
d. Working for pay off campus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
e. Doing community service or volunteer work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
f. Relaxing and socializing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
g. Providing care for dependents (children, parents, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
h. Commuting to campus (driving, walking, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

6

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28


APPROVED
 Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
 IRB #: Pro2018000261
 APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
 EXPIRATION DATE:

18. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

	Very Much	Quite a bit	Some	Very little
a. Writing clearly and effectively	4	3	2	1
b. Speaking clearly and effectively	4	3	2	1
c. Thinking critically and analytically	4	3	2	1
d. Analyzing numerical and statistical information	4	3	2	1
e. Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	4	3	2	1
f. Working effectively with others	4	3	2	1
g. Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	4	3	2	1
h. Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	4	3	2	1
i. Solving complex real-world problems	4	3	2	1
j. Being an informed and active citizen	4	3	2	1

19. Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution.

	Excellent	Acceptable	Poor	N/A
a. Students	4	3	2	1
b. Academic Advisors	4	3	2	1
c. Faculty	4	3	2	1
d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	4	3	2	1
e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	4	3	2	1

20. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

7

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28


APPROVED
 Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
 IRB #: Pro2018000261
 APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
 EXPIRATION DATE:

21. How many courses are you taking for credit this current academic term?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 or more

22. How is being a RAH student employee impacting your personal development and growth?

8

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28

 **APPROVED**
Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
IRB #: Pro2018000261
APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
EXPIRATION DATE:

23. How do you think being a student employee for RAH impacts your engagement on Rowan's campus?

Version #: 0.01
Version Date: 2018-12-28

9

Rowan University  APPROVED
Creation/Revision Date: 02/10/2015
IRB #: Pro2018000261
APPROVAL DATE: 1/10/2019
EXPIRATION DATE: