



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF STUDENT-COMMUTERS AND NON-COMMUTERS

IRENE PAJARILLO-AQUINO, LPT, MST Faculty-College of Teacher Education Cagayan State University Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines 3500

ABSTRACT: *Recognizing group differences on the academic achievements between student-commuters and non-commuters is critical, as the commuter population nationwide continues to increase and universities are forced to compete for the patronage of these commuter students” (Newbold, Mehta and Forbus, 2011, p. 142). This study aimed to compare and analyse the academic performance of student-commuter and non-commuter of the College of Teacher Education. The researcher utilized a descriptive correlational design to analyse the academic performance of the student-commuter and non-commuter of the College of Teacher Education. The questionnaire which was patterned from Glenda Lee Cacdan et.al was used to gather data that are relevant to the study. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I is the profile of the respondents and Part II includes the perception of the respondents on commuting and staying in the campus. Based on the findings of this study, it is therefore concluded that the perception of the respondents on the effects of commuting and staying in the campus has no significant relationship with the academic performance of student-commuters and non-commuters. There is no significant difference between the academic performance of the student-commuter and non-commuter of the College of Teacher Education. In the light of the foregoing results of this study, it is strongly recommended that students should focus on their study and allow themselves the opportunity to participate on academic and non-academic activities to improve and promote their highest potential as students, whether they are commuting or staying in the campus.*

KEYWORDS: *commuters, non-commuters, academic performance, descriptive-correlational design, perception*

INTRODUCTION

If we need farms to sustain our foods, we also need schools for our innermost needs to fulfil true essence of life. As (Proverbs 19:2) says, “also the soul without knowledge is not good,” so we therefore say that education must be pursued by a person. In connection to this saying, distance from school is not what matters, it is the learning that one gets that is significant. Students are sacrificing to go to school just to pursue their aims for higher



education. Some stay with their parents while studying, and some chose to live in or near the campus for them to be educated. No matter what way of getting to school, a realization of having the degree is still the primary concern of the students to attain.

“A satisfactory academic report is a requirement for all students to maintain and to be retained in the programs in which they are enrolled with. Failure in maintaining such a standard will be dealt with by the institution and the faculty concerned. Students often consider grades when evaluating academic performance. This performance is based on the students’ general weighted average and serves as the basis for their retention in the University.

The grant of scholarships and assistance to students are normally based on their academic grades in the same way that some employers, especially when hiring recent graduates would look at the academic performance the applicant have in the University. Grades carry more weight in some industries especially technical profession such as law, medicine and finance. Other industries place less importance on it, particularly creative profession such as writing or art and occupations such as sales where people skills are more crucial than knowledge.

Understanding group differences between commuters and non-commuters is critical, as the commuter population nationwide continues to increase and universities are forced to compete for the patronage of these commuter students” (Newbold, Mehta and Forbus, 2011, p. 142). This study investigates differences in working while in college, levels of involvement, and academic performance between students who live on campus and students who commute to campus. Many studies have been conducted by Literature Review Working IN College and Academic Performance examining the relationship between working in college and academic performance. Research indicates that “70 % to 80% of students work while they are enrolled”. (ACE Center for Policy Analysis, 2006; p.1).



While residential and commuter students claimed that they did not feel like a part of the college community, they also reported a desire to participate more in school-activities. Implications of the results are discussed. There are numerous studies that examined differences between students who live on campus and those that commute to college, with some studies suggesting that students who live on campus tend to have advantages over those who commute to campus (Peterson 1975). Some of these differences include involvement in student activities on campus and greater levels of stress as a result of working and commuting. Peterson (1975) suggests that “residence halls dwellers are better off financially, educationally, and in other ways to begin with.” Newbold, Mehta, and Forbus (2011) examined demographic differences between 108 commuter students and 345 residential at a mid-sized Southwestern state university in order to determine student attitudes, opinions, and reasons for being in a university, their level of involvement and participation in various studies, attitudes toward work, social life, and relationships, time management strategies, attitudes toward stress and how they cope with it.

Based on an exploratory survey that investigated the college experiences among commuting students, attending three types of institutions to compare college experiences between commuting and resident students. Students for study were (1) 100 commuters from a large, primarily resident university, (2) 100 commuters from a community college with no resident students, (3) 87 commuters from a municipal university enrolling a large percentage of commuters, and (4) 100 resident students enrolled in the same university as the first group. The study was limited to first-time freshmen who were under age 21, single, carrying a study program of 12 units or more, and, is commuting, living with parents. Across-group matching were made, as far as possible, on established ability levels, distances of residence from college, major curriculum groupings, and sex.

A special questionnaire as used to gather on such matters as attendance at cultural events, educational goals, membership and participation in student groups and activities, friendship and dating patterns, hours of work, income, and expenditures. Data on grades and credits were gathered from college records. The findings showed some evidence that the



commuting freshmen, particularly if he attended a large resident institution, may be slow in his social contact with other students. A large majority of the commuters expressed no disappointment in college, making no comments or suggestions when invited to do so. Commuting appeared to have no effect on performance or persistence patterns.

According to Kamrun Nesa on February 20, 2013, there is a sense of displacement among student commuters. They are college students but do not reside at college. They are on campus for a large portion of the day, but cannot wholeheartedly, call Fordham their home. Instead of rolling out of bed five minutes before class, they roll out of bed two or more hours beforehand. However, this does not imply that residents are better off. Nor does it imply that commuters are performing poorly in classes. In spite of these disadvantages, there is no denying that commuters have the best of both worlds. We may not reside on campus but we be as involved on campus as residents while simultaneously going home at the end of the everyday.

While it is understandable why some may assume that commuters are more likely to struggle academically, there are more motivation for us to do well. According to a study performed by the University of Carolina, Irvine in 2007, roughly 63% of commuters are able to understand their class material more and think critically as opposed to the 58% of residents.

It is also assumed that commuters are the likely to skip classes because they live farther away, but it is quite the opposite. Attendance is more valuable to commuters because it is harder for them to get notes or talk to professors since they are not on campus at all times. When residents are absent, they can ask a roommate or another resident to collect notes and can even study for tests together in the dorms.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aimed to compare and analyse the academic performance of commuter and non-commuter students of the College of Teacher Education. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:



1. What is the profile of the pupil-respondents in term of:
 1. Age
 2. Sex
 3. Place of residence
 4. Economic status
 - 1.4.1 occupation of parents
 - 1.4.2 monthly income of parents
 - 1.4.3 weekly allowance
2. How do respondents perceive the effects of commuting and staying inside the campus?
3. What is the academic performance level of the respondents?
4. Is there a significant difference between the respondents' academic performance?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant difference between the academic performance of the commuter and non-commuter students of the College of Teacher Education.

METHODOLOGY

The researchers utilized a descriptive correlational design because they analysed the academic performance of the commuter and non-commuter students of the College of Teacher Education.

Data Gathering Tool

The questionnaire was used to gather data that are relevant to the study. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I is the profile of the respondents which includes age, sex, place of residence, economic status, occupation of parents, monthly income of parents, weekly allowance and valuated general average during the first semester S.Y. 2016-2017 of the respondents. Part II includes the perception of the respondents on commuting and staying in the campus.



Statistical Treatment

To give meaning to the data gathered, the data was subjected to some statistical treatment such as frequent counts, and weighted mean, t-test.

Frequency and percentage distribution was used to determine respondents; profile in terms of age, sex, economic status, and place of residence.

Weighted mean distribution was used to determine the respondents' perception frequency on the situations given that are involved in their studies using the scale below.

Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
1.00 –1.66	Never
1.67 – 2.33	Sometimes
2.34 – 3.00	Always

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Age

Profile	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency (n=100)	Percentage	Frequency (n=100)	Percentage
21-22	2	2.00	6	6.00
19-20	48	48.00	60	60.00
17-18	50	50.00	34	34.00
Mean Age	19.5			

Table 1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the two-group of respondents as to age. The table reveals that most of the non-commuter respondents' age ranges from 19-20 composing 60 percent of the total number of respondents, 34 percent has an age ranging from 17-18, and 6percent has an age ranging from 21-22. It was also revealed on the table that most of the commuter respondents' age ranges from 17 -18 composing 50 percent of the total number, 48percent has an age ranging from 19-20, only



2percent has an age ranging from 21-22. It was revealed that the mean age of the respondents is 19.5.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Sex

Profile	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency (n=100)	Percentage	Frequency (n=100)	Percentage
Male	30	30.00	20	20.00
Female	70	70.00	80	80.00

Table 2 shows that frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' sex. Of all the 200 respondents, from the commuters, 70 are female while only 30 are male. From the non-commuter respondents, 80 are female while only 20 are male. The data revealed that the female respondents have out-numbered the male respondents.

Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Economic Status in term of Occupation of Parents

Economic Status	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A. OCCUPATION				
Construction Worker	8	08.00	0	0.00
Housekeeper	12	12.00	16	16.00
Farmer	64	64.00	72	72.00
LGU Employee	2	2.00	0	0.00
OFW	4	4.00	6	6.00
Teacher	2	2.00	2	2.00
Tricycle Driver	2	2.00	4	4.00
Utility Worker	2	2.00	0	0.00

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' economic status in terms of occupation of their parents. The table shows that 64 percent of their parents occupation of the commuters group is engaged farming. For the non-commuter respondents, 72 percent of their parents' occupation is farming. This implies that majority of the respondents' parents' occupation is engaged farming.



Table 4

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Economic Status in term of Monthly Income of Parents

Economic Status	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
B. PARENTS' MONTHLY INCOME				
1,000- 3,999	46	46.00	40	40.00
4,000-7,999	34	34.00	42	42.00
8,000-11,999	8	8.00	12	12.00
12,000-15,999	6	6.00	2	2.00
16,000 – 20,000	3	6.00	4	4.00

Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' economic status in terms of monthly income of the parents. The data revealed that 46 or 46 percent of the parents of the commuters' group of respondents have a monthly income in pesos of 1,000- 3,999 while the highest frequency of the parents' income of the non-commuters group is 42 or 42 percent. This implies that most of the respondents' parents' monthly income ranges from 1,000- 7,999 pesos which correspond with their occupation.

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Economic Status in terms of their Weekly Allowance

Economic Status	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
B. WEEKLY ALLOWANCE				
100-199	2	2.00	2	2.00
200-299	10	10.00	8	8.00
300-399	10	10.00	26	26.00
400-499	8	8.00	0	0.00
500-599	64	64.00	62	62.00
600-699	2	2.00	0	0.00
700-799	2	2.00	2	2.00
800-899	0	0.00	0	0.00
900-1,000	2	2.00	0	0.00



Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' economic status in terms of their weekly allowance (in pesos). For the commuters, 64 (64%) ranges from 500-599. For the weekly allowance of the non-commuters, 62 (62%) ranges from 500-599. The data imply that the allowance allocated weekly is just enough amount for their needs.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Respondents' Profile in terms of Place of Residence

Place of Residence/Boarding House	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency (n=84)	Percentage	Frequency (n=58)	Percentage
Piat, Cagayan	18	21.43		
Sto. Nino, Cagayan	34	40.48		
Tuao, Cagayan	32	38.09		
Allayban's Residence			2	3.45
Anotnio's Boarding House			2	3.45
Babaran's Boarding House			10	17.25
Barakib			6	10.34
Dante's Boarding House			2	3.45
Happy Valley			2	3.45
Ladies Dormitory			28	48.27
Mayor's Boarding House			2	3.45
Pallatao's Boarding House			4	6.90

The frequency and percentage distribution of the place of residence of the commuters and non-commuters is shown in the table.. Out of 100 respondents, only 42 indicated their place of residence with respondents from Sto Nino got the highest frequency of 34 or 40.48 percent. On the part of the non-commuters, out of 100, only 29 indicated their place of residence with Ladies dormitory got the highest frequency of 28 or 48.27 percent.



Table 7

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Academic Performance

Average Grade	Commuters		Non-commuters	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
90-100	20	20.00	12	12.00
85-89	62	62.00	24	24.00
80-84	18	18.00	64	62.00
75-79	0	0.00	1	2.00
Below 75	0	0.00	0	0.00

Table 7 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' academic performance. Average grade of commuters is from 85-89 and has frequency of 62 and a percentage of 62.00 For non-commuters, the average grade is from 80-84 with a frequency of 62 and a percentage of 62.00.

90-100	-	Outstanding
85-89	-	Very Satisfactory
80-84	-	Satisfactory
75-79	-	Fairly Satisfactory
Below 75	-	did not meet expectation



Table 8.1

Weighted Mean of Commuter Respondents on the Effects of Commuting and Staying in the Campus

Commuters		
Statements	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I come to school late.	1.82	Sometimes
I feel very tired of going to school.	1.86	Sometimes
I feel Stressed at school and at home.	1.88	Sometimes
I have a competing responsibilities (family, work, interests, etc) outside the academic classroom	1.90	Sometimes
I have opportunities to make friends.	2.40	Always
I become socially integrated into the campus community	2.20	Sometimes
I have time to personally talk with my teacher at night who lives in the campus	1.22	Never
I usually visit my classmate and discuss our lesson at night.	1.42	Never
I can freely watch programs in school at night.	1.48	Never
I observe faculty and staff members on campus involved in non-classroom activities such as playing sports in the recreation center	1.54	Never
I participate on academic and extracurricular activities	1.70	Sometimes
I have a relaxation time after my class in the afternoon.	2.32	Sometimes
I can attend early my class in the morning.	2.54	Always
I can take part in student for a, and discussing current campus events in small groups.	2.12	Sometimes
I have occasions to establish personal relationships with faculty and staff who serve as my resources and mentors.	1.90	Sometimes
I can save half of my allowance very week.	1.64	Never
I get enough sleep at night	1.94	Sometimes
I have enough time in doing my school works at home.	2.58	Always
I enjoy easy access to campus resources (library, athletic facilities, labs, ect)	2.00	Sometimes
I participate actively in our class.	2.20	Sometimes
Overall Weighted Mean	1.89	Sometimes

Table 8.1 shows the weighted mean of the perception of the commuter respondents on commuting and staying in the campus. Statement **“I have enough time in doing my school works at home”** has the highest weighted mean of 2.58 from the commuters with a



descriptive value of Always. This implies that commuters are somehow giving more time in doing their school works even when they were just commuting.

Table 8.2

Weighted Mean of Non-Commuter Respondents on the Effects of Commuting and Staying in the Campus

Statements	Commuters	
	Weighted Mean	Descriptive Value
I come to school late.	1.66	Never
I feel very tired of going to school.	1.68	Sometimes
I feel Stressed at school and at home.	1.94	Sometimes
I have a competing responsibilities (family, work, interests, etc) outside the academic classroom	2.22	Sometimes
I have opportunities to make friends.	2.36	Always
I become socially integrated into the campus community	2.44	Always
I have time to personally talk with my teacher at night who lives in the campus	1.84	Sometimes
I usually visit my classmate and discuss our lesson at night.	1.76	Sometimes
I can freely watch programs in school at night.	2.06	Sometimes
I observe faculty and staff members on campus involved in non-classroom activities such as playing sports in the recreation center	2.30	Sometimes
I participate on academic and extracurricular activities	1.92	Sometimes
I have a relaxation time after my class in the afternoon.	2.22	Sometimes
I can attend early my class in the morning.	2.42	Always
I can take part in student for a, and discussing current campus events in small groups.	2.04	Sometimes
I have occasions to establish personal relationships with faculty and staff who serve as my resources and mentors.	1.68	Sometimes
I can save half of my allowance very week.	2.20	Sometimes
I get enough sleep at night	2.48	Always
I have enough time in doing my school works at home.	2.20	Sometimes
I enjoy easy access to campus resources (library, athletic facilities, labs, ect)	2.18	Sometimes
I participate actively in our class.	2.29	Sometimes
Overall Weighted Mean	2.09	Sometimes



Table 8.2 presents the weighted mean of Non-commuter Respondents' perception on the effects of commuting and staying in the campus. The highest weighted mean of non-commuters is 2.48 with a descriptive value of Always for statement **"I get enough sleep at night"**, which implies that since the respondents are not commuting, they have enough time doing their school works in the afternoon before going to bed early in the evening. The lowest weighted mean of non-commuters is 1.66 with a descriptive value of Never for statement **"I come to school late"**, this implies that most of the non-commuters arrived in school early.'

Table 9

Analysis on the Academic Performance of Commuters and Non-commuters of the College of Teacher Education

Computed t- value	Degree of Freedom	Critical Value at .05	Decision
0.48	98	1.98	Not Significant

Table 9 presents the analysis on the academic performance of commuters and non-commuters of the College of Teacher Education. As reflected on the table, it reveals that there is no significant relationship between the academic performance of commuters and non-commuters of College of Teacher Education.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the data gathered as regards to the academic performance level of the respondents, majority of the respondents have an average grade ranging from 80-90 and above which has a level of satisfactory to outstanding.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, it is therefore concluded that the perception of the respondents on the effects of commuting and staying in the campus has no significant relationship with the academic performance of commuters and non-commuters. There is no significant difference between the academic performance of the commuter and non-commuter students of the College of Teacher Education.



RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the foregoing results of this study, it is strongly recommended that students should focus on their study and allow themselves the opportunity to participate on academic and non-academic activities to improve and promote their highest potential as students, whether they are commuting or staying in the campus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<http://answers.com/Q/What is meant by Academic performance?>

http://www.static.fas.harvard.edu/registrar/ugrad_handbook/.../academic_performance.html

<http://scholar.google.com.ph/based on an exploratory survey of college experiences>

<http://education State University.com/pages 1875/Commuter Students.html>

<http://www.questia.com.library/journal/differences in work levels of involvement and academic>

Harvard University School Journal