Colloquy
Vol. 8, Fall 2012, pp. 117-134

How Employment Affects the Academic Achievements of Cal State LA Graduate Students

Angie Vargas & May Maalouly

This quantitative study investigates how California State University, Los Angeles graduate students' academic achievements are affected by their employment. Hardcopy surveys were distributed to 40 students in three different graduate classes in the psychology, history, and communication studies departments. The two variables tested, work motives and success markers, were analyzed using SPSS. The first hypothesis suggests that higher levels of work motives negatively impact graduation goals; the second hypothesis argues that the more employment hours a graduate student takes on, the less academic achievements will be reported. Both hypotheses are utilized with the intention of answering the research question which seeks to investigate how employment affects CSULA graduate students' academic achievements. Results showed that both hypotheses were not supported; there was no relationship found between work motives and enrollment status, nor was there a significant relationship between employment and academic achievements. Both findings suggest that overall academic achievement is not influenced positively or negatively by employment.

Introduction

The financial and academic demands placed on today's graduate students are growing vastly more taxing. With families suffering financially because of the nationwide economic recession, students are forced to act more independently rather than rely on their parents to pay for school related expenses and other everyday necessities. This is a very difficult but very real situation that graduate students are dealing with today. Consequently, Riggert et. al. (2006) reported in their study that approximately 80 percent of college students are employed. And according to Stern and Nakata, "The fraction of U. S. college students who work for pay during the academic year has grown steadily from the early 1960s through the mid-1980s" (1991, p. 30). Graduate students may find juggling a

part-time or full-time job a challenging and overwhelming task to accomplish while trying to maintain high grade point averages (GPAs). However, it seems it may be essential to have one in order to have the other; an obligatory component of a graduate student's life is to have a job in order to pay for the cost of tuition and other school related finances, and it is paramount to understand if juggling both successfully is possible and worth the rewards of doing both simultaneously.

With a growing amount of working students, extensive research has been conducted on the relationship between students who work and attend school at the same time. Some previous studies show that working jobs while going to school can actually harm a student's academic performance because students simply do not have the time to devote to their studies (Tinto, 1993). However, other researchers will argue the opposite; a second large set of studies show that students gain more motivation from working, which helps them achieve higher academically (Yap, 1991). A third set of studies examine how there might be discrepancies in students' GPAs depending on how many hours students are working at their respective jobs; these studies also look at how time management is an imperative marker in determining how well a working student can succeed at school. A fourth set of studies compare how students are at advantages or disadvantages depending on whether or not they work on or off campus; these studies also consider how working certain jobs may help a student in their short term goals, but sometimes working affects the long term goal, such as graduation (Perna, 2010). A fifth study not only takes a look at how grades are affected, but also identifies a student's health as another factor negatively affecting academics and work in a continuous cycle of working hard hours and going to school and vice versa.

If the current research is true and the strain of meeting financial needs sometimes surpasses the commitment to focus on school, then we propose the following hypotheses:

H1: The more a student's work motive increases, the more impacted their academic graduation goals will be affected.

H2: More employment hours leads to less academic achievements.

All the studies that are available on this subject matter focus directly on the academic successes of undergraduate students and not on graduate students. Whether or not graduate students are presented with any additional struggles has yet to be investigated, and whether the type of job has an effect on academic success continues to be an open ended question. Also, because the

studies on this subject are limited to undergraduate students, the current literature does not look at how students might use their on-campus jobs to get ahead in their long term goals (i.e., applying to doctorate programs), and studies also do not look at academic achievement from other standpoints (i.e., having a journal article published).

Some graduate students are facing challenges when trying to manage a full- or part-time job while still attempting to maintain good academic standing. More information on this area of study would give the working graduate student a better understanding of what these challenges and/or difficulties are, which would aid a student in making a more informed decision as to what jobs might help enhance their academic performance.

The purpose of this quantitative survey study is to investigate the link between academic achievements and work motives. Graduate students from different colleges at California State University, Los Angeles were examined to gain a better understanding of how much academic success these students have had, and how they are able to accomplish these achievements even with their employment. In this study, the employment variable is commonly referred to as Work Motive and the academic achievement variable is referred to as Success Markers. We will begin by presenting a review of literature on various similar studies related to whether a student's academic achievement is affected if he or she is employed while enrolled in college as well as whether the number of hours worked affect academic achievement. With a better understanding of the current literature and our own survey research, the following research question is proposed:

RQ1: How does employment affect the academic achievements of Cal State LA graduate students?

Review of Literature

Employment Hours and Academics Commitment

The number of working students has steadily grown throughout the past four decades, and now a large amount of students work in paid jobs while still attending college. There have been an extensive number of studies on whether employment positively or negatively affects academic achievement. Tinto (1993) believes that student employment has an impact on educational experience. He states that "employment not only limits the time one has for academic studies, it also severely limits one's opportunities for interaction with other students and faculty. As a consequence, one's social integration as well as one's academic performance suffers" (Tinto, 1993, p. 269). Similarly, Lammers

et. al. (2001) state that "Little doubt exists that working while enrolled in college is a threat to students' level of academic achievement" (p. 72).

While there is research suggesting that working has a negative impact on students' academics, there is also opposing research that claims that working can actually have positive effects on students' GPAs. Research conducted by Canabal (1998) resulted in findings that show student workers are unaffected by their employment. However, employment among college students did affect the completion of academic degrees; because more students are working both part-time and full-time jobs, students are making the choice to take fewer classes over a longer amount of time, which allows them to still maintain their high GPAs (Canabal, 1998). This means that students can work their jobs without jeopardizing their academic performance. Similarly, Pereles (2007) and Yap (1991) presented results of the positive effects of employment as well. A benefit to working part-time is that students tend to feel more eager and motivated about continuing their studies than their peers who do not work (Yap, 1991). In this respect, a working student learns more about the work force and what opportunities are out in the world. With this knowledge, a student has the ability to make goals and have a better understanding of what route to take in their academic studies. Pereles (2007) explains that working students are unaffected by their jobs because many of them determine that their current jobs are temporary; this means that students focus on their education and rather than put all their energy and efforts into their job, they put in an adequate level of effort. Most working students plan to seek out other opportunities and other jobs after their graduation (Pereles, 2007).

Although different studies on this topic have produced different results, it may prove more useful to investigate in more depth the reasons for these results. To say that holding employment while in college will negatively or positively affect academic achievement would be a generalization because many other factors come into play. According to Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner (2003), it is difficult to agree on the real effect that employment has on academic achievement because sometimes the number of hours worked is the determining factor of whether a student will succeed academically or not; some studies will disagree with that. For example, a student who works part-time may have a higher chance of doing better in school than a student who works full-time simply due to the fact that the part-time student has more time to dedicate to catching up with school work. Previous studies have sometimes found that academic performance is highest among individuals who are working a moderate number of hours (Stinebrickner and Stinebrickner, 2003). Hood et.

al. (1992) found that "grade point averages are highest among students with moderate amounts of work" (p. 450). Hammes and Haller (1983) found that students who worked had overall better grades than students who didn't. In a study of whether there was a relationship between student employment and GPA, Astin (1993) reported that students who worked both full-time and part-time were associated with lower GPAs. The NCES (1994) however, found that students who worked approximately 1-15 hours per week had a much higher GPA than students who worked more than 16 hours per week. They also found that students who worked 1-15 hours per week still had higher GPAs than students who did not work at all. Another self-report study conducted by Hammes and Haller (1983) found that in general students who were employed reported better grades than their unemployed classmates. The studies discussed above are only a fraction of the multitude of studies currently available on the subject matter.

Time Management

There are other factors affecting academic achievement and work such as a student's ability to manage their time well. One can look at whether a student works more hours than another and come to the conclusion that one student's grades suffers more than the next because the former works more hours than the latter. However, that leads one to question whether that is an accurate conclusion to come to; there is literature on how good a student's time management abilities are. In research conducted by Necati Cemaloglu and Sevil Filiz (2010), they suggest that there is a significant and positive relationship between time management and students' academic success. Time consumers do not present a serious problem if students learn to manage time effectively; furthermore, college students who see time management in a positive light end up achieving higher academically (Cemaloglu & Filiz, 2010). The better time management abilities a student has, the more likely they are to not view work as a hindrance to their academic life. This point is further emphasized in research by Maher et. al. (2009): students are able to "see paid work as a necessary integrated aspect of continuing their studies rather than in opposition to study or as a distraction from it" (p. 25). These studies demonstrate that merely noting student's work hours and number of units is not an accurate depiction of how academically successful they are. Time management is a factor considered in research when measuring the academic and employment success of a college student. There are also other studies that indicate that there may be

a relationship between academic achievement and whether the student is employed on or off campus.

Other Employment Factors

One can note the definite advantages to working an on-campus job. For one, students have easier access to school resources such as the library and the computer lab, and communication with teachers is made easier. A pilot study conducted by Pascarella et al. (1994) suggested that students who worked off campus were not negatively affected academically. However, according to B.N. O'Connor (2010), students express a certain amount of regret with not being able to work on campus. Students in this study who worked off campus "reported that they simply had no time to attend extracurricular events, take advantage of campus facilities, or establish friendships" (O'Connor, 2010, p. 364). In other words, students have a desire to engage with the opportunities that a college campus presents, and working an on-campus job can provide this. Other studies found that working in on-campus jobs provides positive effects, in contrast to working in off-campus jobs (Ehrenberg, 1987; Perna, 2010; Vardi, 2009). Ehrenberg and Sherman (1987) also found an asymmetry between on-campus and off-campus employment. They stated that "hours of employment in off- campus jobs were negatively associated with persistence, but students who spent more hours working on campus were more likely to persist through graduation and also to enter graduate school" (1987, p. 17). Whether or not the number of hours a student works positively or negatively affects their academic performance is only one of many factors related to student employment and academic achievement.

Other factors that may affect a student's performance, say Stern and Nakata (1991), involve whether or not paid employment affects a college student's career prospects. They state that "If working during college does not affect school performance but does lead to higher salaries subsequently, then this is an unambiguous benefit. On the other hand, if paid employment causes lower grades or diminishes students' chances of completing their programs, then this could hurt them in the long run" (1991, p. 31). Stern and Nakata state that there is an increase in the number of college students who have been taking paid jobs while attending college as opposed to volunteer work or internships (1991). The number of college students who work for pay has steadily risen the last four decades (1991). More and more students would prefer to make money while attending college. According to Riggert et al. (2006), 79 percent of undergraduate students are employed, while 50 percent described themselves

as working in order to pay for their education, and 29 percent are enrolled in school as a means to establish successful careers. Pernal (2010) also discusses the kinds of problems that working students face: "students are working more and juggling a multitude of roles, creating anxiety and lowering graduation rates" (p. 30). Faculty and administrators in this study were quoted recommending that college students should only be working on campus ten to fifteen hours per week (Pernal, 2010). This presents a clear problem since most studies show that students are working far more hours than what is recommended because of the reality of their financial situations. In fact, Pernal (2010) reveals that eight percent of traditional-age undergraduate students are working approximately thirty-five hours per week. Again, while students are getting experience and making contacts, if working does affect students' academic achievements, then it defeats the purpose of students working to put themselves through school.

Student Health and Work/Academic Performance

Another factor to consider is how working and going to school can affect a student's health and well-being, which, in turn, might have negative impacts on how well a student can perform in either the work force or in the classroom. Vinha, Cavalcante, Juliana, and Andrade (2002) conducted a study which looks at the sleep patterns of student workers and non-workers; their insight shows us how this outside factor can also have its effects on academics. This study found that there are "differences related to the schedule, length and regularity of sleep between working and non-working students who attended classes in the evening" (Vinha, et al., 2002, p. 419). The authors also found that those students who had "higher incidence of spontaneous awaking in the morning" had more satisfying sleep length (p. 421). This is yet another factor that could either boost or harm a student's productivity and overall happiness. One could conclude that work and school affect sleep and in return, sleep affects work and school. It may be worth noting how working part-time or full-time takes away from a student's sleep, which then later hurts or helps a student focus when dealing with academic assignments.

As we've discussed, there are various determining factors that may arise when college students are employed and how it may affect their academic performance. Sometimes the number of hours a student works affects their performance. The difference between part-time and full-time students may affect their GPA. Other factors such as working on-campus or off-campus may affect academic performance as well. Working on-campus may provide a greater advantage for students because it may provide them easier access to

facilities. Sometimes paid employment also plays a role in student achievement because monetary compensation may cause a student to be motivated and thus perform better academically.

Methodology

Background

There has been much research conducted on how college students are able to juggle the demands of both school and work. A bulk of this research has been on undergraduate students and how working affects their chances of academic success, but few studies have concentrated on graduate-level students.

Participants

The site of this study was the California State University, Los Angeles campus wherein approximately 20,000 students are enrolled. Graduate students make up an average of 4,500 of the total school population. There seems to be a significant number of graduate students who are working on pursuing a Master's Degree and who are also employed while attending school. Our attempt was to find out whether employment while pursuing a Master's Degree affects one's academic achievement. Our goal was to reach a significant number of graduate students by distributing a survey during classes. We initially aimed at trying to survey one class from every college in the University. The colleges consisted of the College of Arts and Letters; the College of Business and Economics; the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology; the College of Health and Human Services; and the College of Natural and Social Sciences.

Materials and Procedure

On March 2nd, 2011, 40 students returned the surveys. The hardcopy surveys were distributed during evening classes in three different classrooms on the Cal State LA campus in the music building and in Martin Luther King Hall; graduate students who participated were from the Psychology, History, and Communication Studies departments. All three participating classes were 500-level graduate seminars.

A nonrandom, heterogeneous sample of 40 graduate students consisting of males and females between the ages of 21 years old to over 50 years old, some married, others single, full-time and part-time students, U.S citizens as well as foreign students participated in this analysis to determine how employment affects the academic achievements of Cal State LA graduate students.

Data was collected by means of a survey containing 25 questions. The majority of the questions were Likert-like items based on a scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." These questions mostly measured the students' work motives and how much importance they placed on their current job. For instance, the first group of survey questions asks the student to identify to what degree he or she is working out of financial necessity. Other questions ask the participant to classify how strongly he or she may agree or disagree with the notion that students who have on campus jobs are at an academic advantage over those who work off campus jobs. The third type of questions investigates to what extent students place financial responsibilities as a higher priority over their academic achievements.

About 40 percent of the questions were "yes" and "no," and the remaining questions asked for factual information, such as enrollment status, year in program, GPA, hours worked per week, worked on or off campus, position, age, gender, and field of study. Several of these "yes" and "no" questions measured success markers. Students were asked whether they had submitted papers to conferences, had a journal submission, or been nominated for or received an award or scholarship. All information used in this analysis was derived from survey data.

Analysis Procedure

Once data was collected, a computer analysis program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), was used to determine the significance of the results. T-tests, ONEWAY ANOVA, and Correlation tests were used to analyze the data. Validity of these measures was established though the analysis and was found to be at an adequate level. The constructs were represented by 14 measures; of these measures, "Success Markers" and "Work Motives" were variables that were tested against 12 other single-item indicators.

In the next section, the results for our tests will be discussed in greater depth. We will be determining whether Success Makers and Work Motives, when tested against other variables such as GPA, will yield significant or insignificant results, and whether correlations will be present when using the T-test, ONEWAY ANOVA, and Correlation tests to analyze our data.

Results

There were several T-Tests run in order to gain a better understanding of the relationship between work motive and other variables from the survey, and success markers and other variables from the survey. Many ONEWAY ANOVA

tests were also run; these tests looked at work motive and success markers and their relationships to several variables that participants were asked about. Finally, a Correlation test was run to examine the correlation between work motive and success markers. We will begin by looking at the T-Test results, followed by the ONEWAY ANOVA results, and concluding with a Correlation test.

A total of 40 Cal State LA graduate students participated in this study, and an independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if enrollment status made a difference on a student's work motive. For the group that answered to being a full time student, N = 31, M = 18.0323, s = 5.41285. For the group that answered to being a part time student, N = 9, M = 20.5556, s = 3.74537. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.578, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that the work motive is not significant on the enrollment status, t(-1.305) = 38, p > .001.

The next independent-samples t-test was conducted to examine if a student receiving financial aid made a significant difference on a student's work motive. For the group that answered yes to receiving financial assistance, N = 24, M = 18.3333, s = 4.90489. For the group that claimed to not receive any financial aid, N = 16, M = 19.00, s = 5.64506. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.018, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that work motive is not significant on the student's financial aid assistance, t(-0.396) = 38, p > .001.

The following independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if having a job made a significant difference on a student's work motive. For the group that answered yes to having a job, N = 34, M = 19.2647, s = 5.10679. For the group that said they did not currently have a job, N = 6, M = 14.8333, s = 3.86868. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.283, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test for equal variances at 10 percent significance level was used for this test. The t-test indicated that the work motive is higher for students who have a job, t(2.017) = 38, p < .01, in comparison to students without jobs.

The next independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if gender made a difference on a student's work motive. For the group that answered female, N = 26, M = 18.8077, s = 5.20015. For the group that answered male, N = 14, M = 18.2143, s = 5.23566. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.366, p > .001), therefore values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that the work motive is not significant in relation to the student's gender, t(0.343) = 38, p > .001.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if enrollment in a different college at Cal State LA made a difference on a student's work motive. For the group that answered to being a student of the College of Arts and Letters, N = 23, M = 19.0435, s = 4.93115. For the group that answered to being a student of the College of Natural and Social Sciences, N = 17, M = 18.0000, s = 5.53399. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.331, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that the work motive is not significant on the college the student attends, t(0.628) = 38, p > .001.

We next conducted an independent-sample t-test to find out if enrollment status made a significant impact on a student's success markers. For the group that answered to being a full-time student, N = 31, M = 1.6774, s = 2.11955. For the group that answered to being a part-time student, N = 9, M = 2.2222, s = 2.53859. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.256, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that success markers are not significant on the student's enrollment status, t(-0.65) = 38, p > .001.

The next independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if receiving financial aid made a significant impact on a student's success markers. For the group that answered yes to receiving financial assistance, N = 24, M = 2.0417, s = 2.47561. For the group that answered no to receiving financial aid, N = 16, M = 1.4375, s = 1.71148. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance is significant (F = 6.188, p < .001), so values for equal variances not assumed were used. The t-test indicated that success markers are not significant on the student's financial aid assistance, t(0.912) = 38, p > .001.

The next independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if having or not having a job made a significant impact on a student's success markers. For the group that answered yes to having a job, N = 34, M = 2.0588, s = 2.26891. For the group that answered no to having a job, N = 6, M = 0.3333, s = 0.81650. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was significant (F = 12.312, p < .05), so values for equal variances not assumed were used. The t-test suggested that student's success markers are significant with student's jobs, t(3.368) = 21.783, p < .05. These results indicated that success markers are higher for students who are currently working a job (M = 2.06, s = 2.26891) in comparison to students who are not currently working a job (M = 0.3333, s = 0.81650).

The following independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if student's gender made a significant impact on a student's success markers. For the group that answered female, N = 26, M = 1.8846, s = 2.16013. For the group

that answered male, N = 14, M = 1.6429, s = 2.34052. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was not significant (F = 0.06, p > .001), so values for equal variances assumed were used. The t-test indicated that success markers are not significant on the student's gender, t(0.328) = 38, p > .001.

The final independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out if the belonging to a particular college at Cal State LA made a significant impact on a student's success markers. For the group that answered to being a student of the College of Arts and Letters, N = 23, M = 0.8261, s = 1.55657. For the group that answered to being a student of the College of Natural and Social Sciences, N = 17, M = 3.1176, s = 2.28808. Levene's Test for the Equality of Variance was significant (F = 5.901, p < .05), so values for equal variances not assumed were used. The t-test indicated that success markers are significant on a student's college at Cal State LA, t(-3.564) = 26.558, p < .05. Student's success markers are higher for those who are a part of the College of Natural and Social Sciences (M = 3.12, s = 2.28808) in comparison to those who are a part of the College of Arts and Letters (M = 0.8261, s = 1.55657).

We also wanted to find out whether work motive differed depending on what year the participant was in their Master's program. Our sample of students (N = 40) were divided into four groups. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing work motive to each one of these academic years, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (90.933, 944.667) = 1.155, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' work motives and their different years in their respective Master's programs.

Next, we sought to find out whether work motive differed depending on students' GPA. Our sample of students (N = 40) were divided into a couple of groups; each group represented a different grouping of GPAs. In another ONEWAY ANOVA comparing work motive to different sets of grade point averages, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (20.743, 1014.857) = 0.378, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' work motives and their GPAs.

Next, we wanted to investigate whether work motive differed depending on the number of hours a student worked at their job per week. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into seven groups. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing work motive to each grouping of hours worked by the participants, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (78.774, 782.369) = 0.470, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' work motives and the number of hours they work weekly.

The following test allowed us to find out whether work motive differed depending on the age of the participant. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into five age groups. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing work motive to each age group ranging from under 21 to over 51, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (157.076, 878.524) = 1.564, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' work motives and their age.

We also wanted to take a look at whether a student's success markers differed depending on what year the participant was in their Master's program. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into four groups; the groups varied from first-year graduate students to fourth-year graduate students. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing students' success markers to each one of these academic years, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (10.400, 178.000) = 0.701, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' success markers and their different years in their respective Master's programs.

Next, we ran a test to find out whether a student's success markers differed depending on what their current grade point average is. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into three groups; GPAs were grouped together with the lowest achieving students at a 2.5 and with many between a 3.5-4.0 GPA. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing students' success markers to each one of these GPA groupings, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (17.186, 171.214) = 1.857, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' success markers and their grade point averages.

We looked at whether a student's success markers differed depending on the number of hours the participants worked weekly. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into seven groups; the groups varied from not working any hours to working more than 30 hours per week. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing students' success markers to the number of hours they work per week, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (37.517, 132.369) = 1.323, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' success markers and the number of hours they work at their job every week.

Finally, we looked at whether a student's success markers differed depending on their age. Our sample of students (N = 40) was divided into five groups; the groups varied in age with the youngest group of students being under 21 years old and the eldest students were over the age of 51. In a ONEWAY ANOVA comparing students' success markers to each one of these age groups, the Omnibus F test was not significant, F (157.076, 878.524) = 1.564, p > .008, which means that there is no significant difference between students' success markers and their age group.

After conducting several t-test and ONEWAY ANOVA tests, we also ran a Correlation test to test some relationships even further. Data was collected from 40 participants to determine the relationship between Cal State LA graduate students' work motives and their success markers. A weak negative correlation was found between these two variables, $r = -0.211$, $p > .05$. This correlation test suggests that this correlation is not significant; therefore, there is no significant correlation between work motive and success markers.

Discussion

Several variables that could play a part in how a student's work motive and success markers are measured were explored through numerous t-test and ONEWAY ANOVA tests. These two markers were the focus of the tests conducted because a majority of our survey focused on how these two makers played a role in the lives of Cal State LA graduate students. In order to have a better understanding of how work motive and success markers work and affect one another, we wanted to first explore how several other variables affected these markers on their own.

Five different t-tests were run on how other variables from the survey affected a student's work motive. Based on the survey that was distributed to the graduate students from different Cal State LA colleges, the term Work Motive included several aspects that were found in seven survey questions. They included questions that asked students to identify why they were working at their respective jobs, reasons for working on- or off-campus jobs, and how important it is for them to be working while going to school. The results showed that there was no significant relationship between a student's work motive and the following variables: enrollment status; financial aid assistance; gender; or the college the student belongs to. This means that students' work motives were not higher simply based on their full-time or part-time enrollment status, how much financial assistance they receive for school, their gender, or whether they belonged to the College of Arts and Letters or the College of Natural and Social Sciences.

Our results seem to conflict with previous studies on undergraduate students conducted by Perna (2010) and Riggert et al. (2006). Our t-test showed that graduate students' work motives are not significant in relation to students' enrollment status. These results contradict Hypothesis 1, which stated that work motives had a negative impact on graduation goals. This suggests that although there are other factors that affect the enrollment status (i.e., part-time or full-time) of graduate students, work motives do not appear to be one of such

factors. As a result, long-term graduation goals remain unchanged for employed and unemployed Cal State LA graduate students. Perna (2010) suggested that because students face a tremendous amount of responsibility, they are having to take on many roles (such as that of a worker and a student) which is consequently lowering graduation rates. And at least 50 percent of students say that they work in order to have the means to pay for their education (Riggert et al., 2006). With these past studies conducted, we would have expected to see some kind of significant relationship between work motive and enrollment. Instead, our study contradicts this notion of high work motive being more present in part-time students since the need for work sometimes causes students to take on fewer classes in order to maintain higher GPAs.

The only work motive t-test to show a result of significance was the test that compared work motive and whether or not the student had a job. The mean was higher for students with a job (M = 19.26) than it was for students who claimed to not have a job (M = 14.83). This test reflected what we had anticipated; students who have financial needs or have desires to work an on-campus job in order to be near school facilities have a job. This was in agreement with O'Connor's (2010) study which reflected how students who did not work on campus felt a certain amount of regret, especially since they did not have as much access to campus facilities.

Following the t-tests on work motives, we conducted five additional t-tests comparing student's success markers with five other variables to test for any significant relationships. In this series of tests, three tests showed no significant relationships. The following variables had no significance in relationship to success markers: student's enrollment status; financial aid assistance; and gender. These findings suggest that students did not report higher levels of academic success, such as scholarship awards or journal submission acceptances, in spite of their enrollment status, financial aid, or gender. Our results indicating no significant relationship between success markers and enrollment status are in agreement with research conducted by Canabal (1998) that suggests that students are still able to have academic success (in spite of work) because they simply lessen their school load/enrollment status in order to maintain high GPAs/academic success.

The remaining two t-tests revealed that there are significant relationships between success markers and the student's college, and between success markers and employment status. Students who were from the College of Natural and Social Sciences, more specifically, the 17 students that were from both the Psychology and History departments, reported to have had more

academic achievements than the 23 students from the Communication Studies department. This means that more students from the College of Natural and Social Sciences claim they have submitted more and had more papers accepted to conferences, had more journal submissions accepted, and been nominated for and won more awards and scholarships than that of Communication Studies students. This was new information to uncover since previous studies have mostly been conducted on undergraduates and not graduate students, and previous research also does not compare students from different departments.

We ran seven different ONEWAY ANOVA tests to see if there were any significant relationships between work motives and success markers and several other variables for which participants were asked to answer question. All of the tests showed that there were no significant relationships between any of the variables we tested for. Work motive was not any higher in spite of the participant's year in school. Also, work motive was not higher for students with different grade point averages. Student's desire to work was not higher for students who worked more or less hours. Age also did not make a difference in students' work motives.

As for academic achievement, the ONEWAY ANOVA tests showed that students did not report having more success markers based on their year in school, their current GPA, or their job hours. The final test that looked at possible relationships between success markers and job hours was insightful and especially hit at the core of our research question. This finding allows us to understand that whether students claim to have few academic accomplishments (not regarding GPA) or whether they claim to have several academic accomplishments (in regards to journal acceptances, etc.), the number of job hours has no direct effect on these success markers. Contrary to Hypothesis 2, employment hours do not lead to lesser academic achievements. Based on these results, Cal State LA graduate students demonstrate the ability to multi-task by working their jobs and still pursuing other academic goals such as getting their papers published in academic journals or accepted to conferences. These findings are consistent between graduate students who work part-time or full-time jobs.

Similarly, our Correlations test reflected similar results from the ANOVA test. While there was a negative correlation between work motive and success markers, $r = -0.211$, the number was very close to zero, which makes it a very weak correlation. However, the Correlations test also suggests that this correlation is not significant. This contradicts past studies by Hood, Craig, and Ferguson that propose that academic achievement is higher in students who

have a heavier work schedule (1992). This study was conducted on undergraduate students, and thus, our study might begin to shed light on the differences between undergraduate and graduate students when faced with academics and work hours.

Based on all of the tests that we ran, there are some conclusions that we can make. First, work motive is only significant for students who are currently employed. Success markers are significant for students with a job and also significant in the college students are in; students in the College of Natural and Social Sciences reportedly have more academic achievements than those from the College of Arts and Letters. And finally, there is no significant correlation for students' work motive and their success markers; work motive cannot be used to predict students' success markers. Therefore, to address our research question, based on our study of 40 Cal State LA graduate students, there is no indicator that work has any positive or negative effect on academic success. Cal State LA graduate students' academic achievements are unaffected either way when we look at their employment. For the sake of reliability, in the future we would take a bigger sample of students and also try to find participants from the other three colleges on campus.

References

Astin, A . W. (1993). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Canabal, M. E. (1998). College student degree of participation in the labor force: Determinants and relationship to school performance. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 597-606.

Cemaloglu, N., & Filiz, S. (2010). The relation between time management skills and academic achievement of potential teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 33(4), 3-23.

Ehrenberg, R., & Sherman, D. (1987). Employment while in college, academic achievement, and postcollege outcomes: A summary of results. *Journal of Human Resources*, 22, 1-23.

Hammes, J., & Haller, E. (1983). Making ends meet: Some of the consequences of part-time work for college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 16, 529-535.

Hood, A. B., Craig, A., & Ferguson, B. (1992). The impact of athletics, part-time employment, and other academic activities on academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 447-453.

Lammers, W. J., Onwuegbizie, A. J., & Slate, J. R. (2001). Academic success as a function of the gender, class, age, study habits, and employment of college students. *Research in the Schools*, 8(2), 71-81.

Maher, J. M., Mitchell, J., & Brown, K. (2009). Student/worker/career: The intersecting priorities of arts students. *Australian University Review*, 51 (2), 19-45.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). Undergraduates who work while enrolled in postsecondary education, 1989-1990. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement Publication No. NCES 94-311. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

O'Connor, B. N. (2010). Learning: The experiences of adults who work full-time while attending graduate school part-time. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(6), 359-370.

Pascarella, E. T., Bohr, L., Amaury, N., Desler, M., & Zusman, B. (1994). Impacts of on-campus and off-campus work on first year cognitive outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 364-370.

Pereles, K. L. (2007). Are students who work and workers who go to school different? Comparing organizational commitment. *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, 12(4), 337-352.

Pernal, L. W. (2010). Understanding the working college student. *Academe*, 96(4), 30-33.

Riggert, S. C., Boyle, M., Petrosko, J. M., Ash, D., & Rude-Parkins, C. (2006). Student employment and higher education: Empiricism and contradiction. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 63-92.

Stern, D., & Nakata, Y. (1991). Paid employment among U.S. college students: Trends, effects, and possible causes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62(1), 25-43.

Stinebrickner, T. R., & Stinebrickner, R. (2003). Working during school and academic performance. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 21.2, 449-472.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vardi, I. (2009). The impacts of different types of workload allocation models on academic satisfaction and working life. *Higher Education*, 57(4), 499-508.

Vinha, D, Cavalcante, J. A., & Andrade, M. M. Sleep-wake patterns of student workers and non-workers. *Biological Rhythm*, 33(4), 417-426.

Yap, K. (1991). The student worker. *Youth Studies*, 10(3), 34-39.