

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES FOR COMMUTER STUDENTS

Research-Based Strategies

**EDITED BY
MARIANA REGALADO
and
MAURA A. SMALE**

ALA 
Editions
CHICAGO | 2018

alastore.ala.org

© 2018 by the American Library Association

Extensive effort has gone into ensuring the reliability of the information in this book; however, the publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

ISBNs

978-0-8389-1701-5 (paper)

978-0-8389-1736-7 (PDF)

978-0-8389-1735-0 (ePub)

978-0-8389-1737-4 (Kindle)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Regalado, Mariana, editor. | Smale, Maura A., editor.

Title: Academic libraries for commuter students : research-based strategies / edited by Mariana Regalado and Maura A. Smale.

Description: Chicago : ALA Editions, an imprint of the American Library Association, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018003537 | ISBN 9780838917015 (print : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780838917350 (epub) | ISBN 9780838917367 (pdf) | ISBN 9780838917374 (kindle)

Subjects: LCSH: Academic libraries—Services to commuting college students—United States. | Commuting college students—United States—Case studies. | Libraries and colleges—United States—Case studies.

Classification: LCC Z675.U5 A335 2018 | DDC 027.7—dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018003537>

Cover design by Karen Sheets de Gracia. © Alexey Protasov/Adobe Stock. Text design in the Chaparral, Gotham, and Bell Gothic typefaces.

© This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Printed in the United States of America

22 21 20 19 18 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

- | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Situating Commuter Undergraduates | 1 |
| | MAURA A. SMALE AND MARIANA REGALADO | |
| 2 | Commuter Campus in Transition | 17 |
| | MEETING THE CHANGING NEEDS OF STUDENTS THROUGH
MIXED-METHODS ASSESSMENT | |
| | M. SARA LOWE, WILLIE MILLER, AND PAUL MOFFETT | |
| 3 | Making Space in the Library for Student-Parents | 33 |
| | DONNA M. LANCLOS AND RACHAEL WINTERLING | |
| 4 | Beyond the Bubble | 53 |
| | Undergraduates, Commuting, and the Academic Library
at a Flagship Public University | |
| | JULIANN COUTURE | |

5 	A Decade of Research at Urban Commuter Colleges	69
	JEAN AMARAL, MARIANA REGALADO, AND MAURA A. SMALE	
6 	“I Study in My Car”	85
	Exploring the Study Habits of California Community College Commuter Students	
	BRIAN GREENE AND ELIZABETH HORAN	
7 	Making the Library Work for Community College Commuters	103
	The Case of Montgomery College	
	TANNER WRAY AND NANCY FRIED FOSTER	
8 	Library Instruction and Academic Success	117
	The Impact of Student Engagement at a Community College	
	TED CHODOCK	
9 	Lessons Learned from Our Commuter Students	139
	MARIANA REGALADO AND MAURA A. SMALE	

Contributors 145

Index 149

1

Situating Commuter Undergraduates

It's a crisp fall morning as a New York City College of Technology student leaves her apartment in the Bronx to head to class in Brooklyn. Her commute takes nearly two hours and includes a short leg on the bus and a longer leg on the subway; while the morning rush hour can be crowded, she gets on the subway early enough in its route that she can usually get a seat. Some days she spends the commute just listening to music or reading for fun, though other days she'll review schoolwork on her smartphone, reading a screenshot she took of online course materials so she has access to them while the subway is underground.

Meanwhile, in North Carolina, a UNC Charlotte student gets ready to drive to campus for the day. Her commute takes about forty-five minutes door to door, and she parks on campus because she has paid the parking permit fee for the semester. Even with a permit the parking options on campus vary, and parking in part shapes the structure of her days. If she gets a parking place on the outskirts of campus, she'll sometimes use her long break between classes to run errands, but if she ends up with a good parking spot she tends to stay on campus for the day, studying in the library between classes.

Later that day, across the country in northern California, a Modesto Junior College student heads to work. He drives to commute between his work, school, home, and other responsibilities. While his commute isn't long, he makes the most of his time in the car by listening to audio recordings of his course readings while he drives, though he admits that this multitasking can be somewhat distracting. He fits in studying and homework when and where he can: at work during slow times, at the college library during class breaks (which he prefers for its distraction-free environment), and at home in the evenings after the library is closed.



Like these three undergraduates, the majority of American college students are commuters. While undergraduates who commute to campus are as diverse in their demographics as all college students, there are a number of important considerations specific to living off campus and commuting to school. Most notably, commuter students are much more likely than residential students to have responsibilities apart from their roles on campus. These responsibilities may be as basic as cooking their own meals, but they are also likely to include working full- or part-time, child care, family or community obligations, and more. Students who live off campus often must negotiate living spaces with family, roommates, or others outside of the learning institution. Moreover, the mode of each student's commute may deeply impact her days, and possibly involve a considerable time commitment. Yet, despite the large numbers of commuter students in the United States, and the complexities of their lives, there is a need for research and publications on the "overlooked majority" of commuter college students (Biddix 2015; Dugan et al. 2008), and, specifically, on how academic libraries serve this population.

In this volume we bring together studies undertaken by librarians and researchers at community and baccalaureate colleges and universities from locations across the United States, covering commuter institutions and those with both commuter and residential populations. Each chapter is a case study of research on serving commuter students at a particular institution, encompassing a detailed description of the research methods used, analysis of what was learned during the research, and specific interventions or changes made in library services, resources, or facilities as a result. Taking into account the lived experiences of commuter students at our institutions can enable librarians to design and develop services, resources, and facilities to best meet the needs of these students.

DEFINING UNDERGRADUATE COMMUTER STUDENTS

Contrary to the popular view of "traditional" college students—those who are between 18 and 24 years old and who live in dormitories or residence halls on

their college or university campus—the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that close to 87 percent of students at U.S. colleges and universities are commuters (NCES 2012). Yet, while most students commute, they have not been the focus of research studies to the same degree as have “traditional” students. There is no single definition of commuter college students; rather, the broad category of “commuter” incorporates a wide range of attributes and many nuances, as the case studies in this volume explore.

The NCES subdivides the commuter student population into those who live off campus with their parents, just under 37 percent, and those who live off campus but not with their parents—about 50 percent of all undergraduates (NCES 2012). However, these categories do not encompass all of the potential variation in commuter students’ living arrangements. Students may live in campus housing for their first year before moving to housing that is not owned by the university, though remaining close to campus. Others may live in residence halls that are owned by the institution but are far enough away from the main areas of campus to require a commute by car or bus. Students who live off campus may live with roommates or with extended family. For the purposes of this discussion, commuters are students who do not live in college-provided housing on campus, for them, “home” is a place independent from the institution, no matter what their physical distance from the institution is.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) further differentiates between commuters who walk to campus and those who drive (Jacoby 2015a, 290). Yet this distinction does not take into account differences in commuting to colleges in urban, suburban, and rural areas, including transit times. In urban areas, where more American undergraduates attend college than in all suburban and rural areas combined (Florida 2016), reliance on public transportation may supersede the distinction between walking or driving to campus (Clark 2006, 3). Suburban students or those on physically large campuses may also rely on intra-campus or public buses, especially if they cannot afford to drive; other transportation options include carpooling, car-sharing, or bicycling. Intriguingly, recent research suggests that many students do not consider those who live close enough to campus to walk there to fit into the category of “commuters” (Badger 2014). The cost and reliability of transportation can seriously affect students’ opportunities to participate in their academic commitments (Jacoby 2015a, 292). Indeed, understanding students’ commutes is highly relevant to their experiences in our institutions (Clark 2006; Delcore, Mullooly, and Scroggins 2009).

Adding further to this complexity, commuter students are typically found to share at least some of the characteristics of nontraditional college students (Jacoby 2015a, 290; Newbold, Mehta, and Forbus 2011), who are defined as

being independent for financial aid purposes, having one or more dependents, being a single caregiver, not having a traditional high school diploma, delaying postsecondary enrollment, attending school part time, and being employed full time. (NCES 2015, 1)

While there is overlap between the categories of commuter and nontraditional students, considering them as coterminous elides their distinctions. For example, most students work for pay at some point in college, though not all students work full-time (Alfano and Eduljee 2013). Furthermore, students at predominantly or solely commuter institutions may share a majority of characteristics with their “traditional” peers at residential campuses, such as age (18–24), work status (part-time or not at all), and enrollment status (full-time).

However, many commuter students have responsibilities outside of their academic work, sometimes quite significant and time-consuming ones (Burlison 2015; Perna 2010). They may work part-time or full-time, and it is likely that their jobs are off campus. They may care for children, siblings, parents, or other family members. Commuters who remain in their homes and communities are more likely to retain involvement in nonacademic activities in these locations, such as participating in religious communities, volunteer work, or other community commitments. These activities are often valued by students, but may constrain their time available for on-campus commitments beyond their coursework.

Institutions with a majority of residential students may not be as welcoming to their commuter students, since “facilities, class schedules, and campus life are still frequently designed to suit traditional-age, full-time, often residential students” (Jacoby 2015b, 9). Even those colleges and universities in which most or all students commute may lack accommodations that could benefit commuter students specifically; for example, clustering required courses to reduce the number of days on which students must come to campus, or offering facilities and services specifically for students who cannot return to their homes during the school day or who are primarily on campus on evenings and weekends. Considering support networks for commuter students—both on campus and in students’ lives outside of the institution—as well as advisement and orientation for commuter students can help ameliorate their marginality (Jacoby and Garland 2004). While the chapters in this volume explore the ways in which academic libraries can support commuter students, it is useful to consider previous case studies on the commuter student experience.

RESEARCH ON THE COMMUTER STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Since commuters are such a large percentage of college students overall, examining research on them can add context to inform our understanding of the spaces, resources, instruction, and other services that academic libraries provide. Much published research has focused on commuters who are in the minority of students enrolled at predominantly residential institutions. Overall, literature on the experiences of commuter undergraduates is primarily concerned with discussion of student engagement and academic success.

Student Engagement and Academic Success

Student engagement has been shown to positively impact the standard measures of student success, including grade point average (GPA), year-to-year retention rate (also referred to as academic persistence), and graduation rate. As defined by the NSSE, student engagement includes both “the amount of time and effort” students spend on academics as well as “how the institution deploys its resources” to provide students with opportunities “to participate in activities that decades of research studies show are linked to student learning” (NSSE 2017).

Nearly two decades ago, Jacoby (2000b, 4) expressed concern about commuter students’ involvement in their education, since “uninvolved students tend to not study enough, spend little time on campus, not be involved in student life, and have few contacts with faculty and fellow students.” She further suggested that, despite educational goals that “are just as high as those of residential students,” commuters “simply cannot always make education their primary focus” (5). Kuh, Gonyea, and Palmer (2001, 1) reiterated that commuters are less involved in college life than residential students “who go away to college,” and that commuters are “distracted by too many competing demands on their time because of work or family commitments.” Using NSSE data, these authors concluded that “residential students were more engaged in effective educational practices and—in all likelihood—were benefiting more from their college experience” than were commuter students (6).

While Kuh, Gonyea, and Palmer (2001, 9) acknowledged that “the effect sizes are relatively small” in their research, the sense of commuter students as a population of concern within undergraduate institutions persists. While commuter students clearly have different attributes and needs than their residential peers, the continued framing of commuter students as a problem in need of fixing has permeated much research in the past two decades, despite many changes in higher education during that time. More recent research has begun to complicate and extend the picture of commuter students’ experiences.

A survey of students at a private college with a mixed commuter and residential population found that participation in extracurricular activities was lower for commuters than for residential students, and more commuters than residential students wished they were more connected with campus life, though some residential students wished for more connection as well (Alfano and Eduljee 2013). Institutional research at a large, predominantly commuter university revealed that in-state and Hispanic students were more likely to be commuters, while black students and those of higher socioeconomic status were more likely to be residential. However, no significant difference was found for GPA and other academic success measures between commuter and residential students (Gianoutsos and Rosser 2014). Researchers who examined NCES data have also found that commuting had no significant effect on student persistence from the first to second year (Ishitani and Reid 2015, 22).

Finally, a survey at a large university examined commuters and distance traveled and found no evidence that living farther away from campus impacted students' GPA (Nelson et al. 2016).

A 2016 study using NSSE data to specifically examine living environments and student engagement significantly updates our understanding of the commuter student experience (Gonyea, Hurtado, and Graham 2017). This research found “subdued” effects of students' living environment on a range of measures. While there was a positive effect for residential students on retention and graduation, there were negative effects on residential students' psychological well-being in the first year especially, and inconclusive effects on cognitive outcomes, diversity attitudes, and academic self-concept. The researchers posit that commuter students in general are more engaged than in the past, and note that previous research did not account for the nuances between residential and commuter student experiences. They concluded by asserting that if “institutions have made headway in integrating off campus students into the academic and social community, then the benefits of living on campus have not declined, rather the ill-effects of living off campus have been attenuated” (21).

Student Identity and Multiple Life Roles

Several studies have examined identity in commuter undergraduates. A qualitative study by Clark (2005) at an urban commuter college highlighted students' inexperience with their roles as college students. This unfamiliarity prevented students from strategizing effectively; she suggested that “common experiences” and a focus on finding time and space to study can be effective ways to help students be successful. A survey of commuter students at a university with a mixed commuter and residential population disclosed that commuters were more likely to be nontraditional students, worked more hours than residential students, and were less likely to participate in campus activities than residential students, confirming prior research (Newbold, Mehta, and Forbus 2011, 149). Results from a focus group and survey at a university with both residential and commuter students focused on “the sources of [commuter students'] stress with college life and the coping strategies they employ” (Forbus, Newbold, and Mehta 2010). They found that while commuter students did report more stress, they had developed more effective strategies to deal with stress than had residential students.

A focus on commuter students' identities and multiple life roles includes several studies that specifically examined aspects of student engagement. Research using NSSE results found higher engagement levels for black students at an urban commuter university who were involved in Greek organizations, interacted often with faculty, and participated in cocurricular activities (Yearwood and Jones 2012). Studies at a private college and urban public

university with mixed residential and commuter enrollment explored living situations and family commitments that commuter students may have in addition to their required coursework. Findings revealed that students perceive the support and understanding of their families to be important to their success, though a lack of family adaptation to a student's academic role could be a challenge (Burlison 2015, 30; see also Badger 2014). A survey of freshman student adjustment at an urban commuter college also had mixed results: student athletes found it easier to adjust to the social component of college, while women had an easier time adjusting to the academics of college than men (Melendez 2016).

Research on faculty perceptions of the experience of commuter students is also relevant to the study of commuter students' experiences. Focus group research conducted with faculty at two commuter universities and a community college suggested that faculty understood that working commuter students have multiple life roles (Ziskin, Zerquera, and Torres 2010, 11), realized the many challenges of working students, and knew about student strategies and their lives (Zerquera, Ziskin, and Torres 2016). Interviews conducted with faculty at several urban commuter colleges revealed similar insights (Smale and Regalado 2014). Interestingly, while faculty acknowledge that students "compartmentalize these roles, . . . findings also suggest that these faculty and practitioners believe students *should* compartmentalize their multiple roles to promote their academic success" (Ziskin, Zerquera, and Torres 2010, 11, emphasis added). Further, most of the faculty interviewed had a traditional college experience themselves, which required them to adapt their understanding of their students' lives (12).

Students and the Commute

The student experience while commuting has also been the focus of a few studies. In interviews with urban students who use public transportation, researchers found that many students were eager to take advantage of commute time for schoolwork, though the realities of crowded buses and subway cars could make this difficult (Regalado and Smale 2015a). These students were more likely to engage in reading or writing than the average urban public transit commuter (Lopatovska et al. 2011). Latino commuter students interviewed at a large university shared their concerns about "the high level of traffic, taking the bus to school, and the amount of time and energy involved in commuting to campus" (Hernandez 2002, 75). A study of the scholarly activities of undergraduates in suburban California found that they often used their cars as private study spaces while on campus (Delcore, Mullooly, and Scroggins 2009). Other studies of students who drive to campus have found high levels of stress among students who drive, stress that is related to traffic and the need to find parking in particular (Forbus, Newbold, and Mehta 2010).

Technology and Commuter Students

Though technology is especially relevant to academic libraries, research on commuter student experiences has not explored the impact of technology on higher education, especially the development of the Internet, instructional technology, and personal mobile devices like smartphones. Some scholars have suggested that technology might be used to increase the amount of contact between faculty and commuter students, both to “create academic community” and to increase “student learning outside the curriculum” (Kruger 2000, 66) and between the institution and commuter students, especially by using social media to promote programs and events and to provide useful information (Yearwood and Jones 2012, 122). Recent surveys of U.S. college students’ technology use reveal that undergraduates own more computing devices than does the population as a whole, and that they “use their devices extensively and view them as important to their academic success” (Brooks 2016, 5). Other studies found that students “prefer courses that use technology” (Buckenmeyer et al. 2016), and that commuters in particular rely on their smartphones to complete schoolwork while in transit (Smale and Regalado 2017). Ultimately, many hope that technology may be used to increase commuter students’ engagement with the institution (Kretovics 2015; Yearwood and Jones 2012). However, it is important to note the persistence of the digital divide in the United States: smartphone ownership and home broadband access decrease along with household income, and in 2016 only 64 percent of those with household incomes of less than \$30,000 a year owned a smartphone (Rainie 2017). This unequal access may hinder commuter students especially.

COMMUTER STUDENTS IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Understanding the practices of commuter students in college and university libraries is critical to planning and deploying resources and services to meet their needs. Previous research on commuter students in the academic library literature has centered on three themes: the library as place, studies of information literacy and library instruction for commuter students, and technology that commuter students use for their academic work.

A number of studies have acknowledged the important role that academic libraries play as a place for student work on campus, and have sought to understand how commuters use their academic libraries in order to better serve those students. Some have focused on or revealed insight into subgroups of the commuter student population. Qualitative research with Hispanic students at an urban university revealed that they “are trying to balance work and school, spend significant time commuting, and have limited access to quiet space for studying”; they highly valued the library as a study location

(Green 2012, 97). A recent study using ethnographic methods at a small, urban, primarily commuter college at which a majority of students are black and female found that commuter students appreciated the library as a place to build community, though they acknowledged the tension between collaborative work and the need for quiet work space (Manley 2015). Research at an urban commuter college examined student use of the 24-hour study space, a new service offered during finals week, and learned that the heaviest users of the study space tended to be younger and full-time students early in their college careers who lived with their parents (Richards 2016, 11).

Other research has examined multiple institutions and libraries revealing both specific, local needs as well as common themes. Using surveys and seating sweeps, researchers in five Canadian academic libraries with a mix of commuter and residential populations suggested that “students perceive the combination of setting, resources, and community that the library provides as an incubator for learning and that, by virtue of being among these things, they believe they will learn” (May and Swabey 2015, 790); this is congruent with findings from other studies (Khoo et al. 2016; Regalado and Smale 2015b). Research at an urban library that serves three predominantly commuter colleges also highlighted the centrality of library resources and services to their academic work; students requested more computers and more quiet space for studying (Brown-Sica 2012). A study of five regional, solely commuter campuses of a state university system created a survey to learn more about the specific needs of each regional campus (Dryden and Roseman 2010). Importantly, some of these researchers were able to leverage their data to create renovation plans or add services to better meet the needs of their commuter students (Dryden and Roseman 2010; Brown-Sica 2012; Richards 2016).

While information literacy and library instruction is a heavily researched topic in academic libraries, there are few studies of information literacy specifically for commuter college and university students. Studies on library instruction at community colleges partially fill this gap, since the overwhelming majority of community college students are commuters rather than residential students. A review of the literature on the information needs of mature—that is, over age twenty-four—community college students reveals that they bring a range of prior experiences with libraries and information literacy (Zeit 2014). These authors suggest that a focus on the unique needs of these students, especially for those who don’t plan to go on to seek a baccalaureate degree, can contribute to their success in college and in their careers.

In recent years there has been an increasing focus on technology for information literacy and library instruction, and the use of technology more generally to support all students in academic libraries. Librarians at an urban commuter college note that commuter students rely heavily on mobile devices for their academic work, both on and off campus and on the commute. In order to accommodate and support these students, they began to offer library instruction specifically focused on using mobile devices to access the library

and do research (Havelka and Verbovetskaya 2012). Much has been written about library support for online learning, and commuter students share some attributes of distance-learning students as well: they may have limited time on campus or fit their homework into times in their schedule when the library is closed, and thus may benefit from increased online access to library resources and services. Research on strategies to engage distance-learning students with the library—such as online reference available twenty-four hours a day, online tutorials and research guides, and embedding librarians into course websites or learning management systems—may also be relevant to commuter students in college and university libraries (Hedreen 2012).

ABOUT THIS BOOK

This book aims to make a significant contribution to the academic library literature by focusing specifically on research with commuter students, in order to help academic librarians understand the unique needs of commuters and contribute to their success in college. We have sought here to include a wide range of U.S. colleges and universities that serve commuter students. Institutions large and small from urban and suburban locations all over the country are represented. Some are solely (or almost solely) commuter campuses, while others serve a mix of commuter and residential students in varying proportions; flagship, regional, and single-campus institutions are included. The transportation that students use to attend these colleges and universities also varies, from driving with its attendant need for parking, to public transportation like buses, subways, or regional rail, to bicycling or walking. Housing situations—determined in large part by the cost of living in a particular area—differ for students between and within these institutions, as does the availability of other spaces for students to engage in academic work, such as public libraries, their jobs, cafes, and parks, among others. These variations in space availability have an impact on commuter students that may not be felt among their residential counterparts. The studies in this book further seek to complement and complicate existing research on commuter students. Many of the researchers use qualitative methods of data collection and analysis, or a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, which provide different insight into the lived experiences of commuter students than the primarily quantitative research published in the higher education literature (Badger 2014).

The chapters in this volume present case studies of research on commuter students at college and university libraries. The chapters are organized by institution type, beginning with large universities with some residential students, and moving on to institutions that almost exclusively enroll commuter students, most of which are community colleges. All chapter authors explain the research question or aim of the research project and describe the institutional context, with special consideration of the needs of commuter and

residential students for institutions that serve both. In addition to sharing the results of their research, chapter authors discuss what was learned during their studies with a focus on specific interventions or initiatives that have been undertaken (or are planned) in their libraries to better serve commuter students. Authors describe the research methods used in detail so that readers may replicate the research at their own institutions if desired.

In chapter 2, M. Sara Lowe, Willie Miller, and Paul Moffett share their work on two space assessment projects at the main library at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Traditionally a commuter campus, IUPUI has substantially increased the number of residential students in the last decade, which has introduced new patterns of library use. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods, their research revealed important ways that the library could move ahead to best meet the changing needs of both populations of students.

Donna Lanclos and Rachael Winterling discuss the implementation of the Family Friendly Library Room at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, in chapter 3. This innovative library space is intended to address the unique needs of commuter students and their children. This chapter demonstrates how the project was grounded in prior space-use studies and an initial assessment of student needs. Subsequent interviews with students about how they actually used the room provided critical information for assessing the project's successes and suggesting areas for improvement.

Chapter 4, by Juliann Couture, brings us to the University of Colorado Boulder, where mapping and interviews were used to learn more about the lived experiences of students who often begin their college careers in campus housing and then move off campus. This research has helped interrogate the place of the library within the “campus bubble” that defines much of the student experience on this large public university’s flagship campus, and has informed space planning decisions.

In chapter 5, Jean Amaral, Mariana Regalado, and Maura Smale discuss their qualitative research with students at seven colleges of the City University of New York (CUNY), the largest urban public university in the United States and a predominantly commuter institution. Incorporating both community colleges and four-year schools and spanning nearly a decade, their research projects have explored the experiences and frustrations of this diverse student body. In particular, this research illuminates strategies for completing academic work among urban students who primarily commute via public transportation.

Chapters 6 through 8 present research from community colleges in the United States, a population that is not well studied even though 45 percent of U.S. undergraduates attend a community college (American Association of Community Colleges 2016). Most, though not all, community colleges do not offer campus housing, thus community college students make up a large proportion of commuter undergraduates in the United States.

In chapter 6, Brian Greene and Elizabeth Horan examine the lived experiences of students at Modesto Junior College in northern California and Coastline Community College in southern California. Both are community colleges, yet they differ in location and the prevalence of online learning at each institution. Research into the nonacademic commitments of students, their living situations, and transportation requirements revealed much about student study habits, and suggests strategies that both libraries—despite their differences—can implement to better serve their students.

In chapter 7, Tanner Wray and Nancy Fried Foster share research into the place of the library in the student experience at the three campuses of Montgomery College in Maryland. This large study involved participation from multiple stakeholders across all three campuses to learn about student academic work practices and faculty and staff experiences in the libraries and beyond, and has illuminated the differing needs of each campus while leading to a more solid embedding of the libraries into the life of this community college.

Chapter 8, by Ted Chodock, discusses the assessment of instruction and information literacy at the College of Southern Nevada, a highly diverse community college in the Las Vegas metropolitan area. Drawing on research performed as a participant in the Association of College & Research Libraries' Assessment in Action program, this chapter explores the effect of student engagement in different types of library instruction on student success outcomes.

We conclude the volume in chapter 9 by bringing together insights gained from the research studies included here and suggestions for future research. We have learned about the centrality of the commute to students' lives, the importance of place on campus for commuter students, the value of collaborating within and beyond the library, and the benefits of listening to students' experiences and ideas. We hope that readers not only find the information shared in this volume to be useful in their own practice as academic librarians, but are also inspired to learn more about their own commuter students.

REFERENCES

- Alfano, Halley J., and Nina B. Eduljee. 2013. "Differences in Work, Levels of Involvement, and Academic Performance between Residential and Commuter Students." *College Student Journal* 47 (2): 334–42.
- American Association of Community Colleges. 2016. "Fast Facts from Our Fact Sheet." www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfactsfactsheet.aspx.
- Badger, Caitlin W. 2014. "A Student Perspective: Commuter Student Experiences, Definitions and Self-Identification." *Humphrey Public Affairs Review*. <http://humphreyreview.umn.edu/student-perspective-commuter-student-experiences-definitions-and-self-identification>.
- Biddix, J. Patrick. 2015. "Editor's Notes." *New Directions for Student Services* 2015 (150): 1–2. doi:10.1002/ss.20121.

- Brooks, D. Christopher. 2016. *ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2016*. Louisville, CO: ECAR. <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2016/6/2016-students-and-technology-research-study>.
- Brown-Sica, Margaret S. 2012. "Library Spaces for Urban, Diverse Commuter Students: A Participatory Action Research Project." *College & Research Libraries* 73 (3): 217–31. doi:10.5860/crl-221.
- Buckenmeyer, Janet A., Casimir Barczyk, Emily Hixon, Heather Zamojski, and Annette Tomory. 2016. "Technology's Role in Learning at a Commuter Campus: The Student Perspective." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 40 (3): 412–31. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2014.984596.
- Burlison, Mary Beth. 2015. "Nonacademic Commitments Affecting Commuter Student Involvement and Engagement." *New Directions for Student Services* 2015 (150): 27–34. doi:10.1002/ss.20124.
- Clark, Marcia Roe. 2005. "Negotiating the Freshman Year: Challenges and Strategies among First-Year College Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 46 (3): 296–316. doi:10.1353/csd.2005.0022.
- . 2006. "Succeeding in the City: Challenges and Best Practices on Urban Commuter Campuses." *About Campus* 11 (3): 2–8. doi:10.1002/abc.166.
- Delcore, Henry D., James Mullooly, and Michael Scroggins. 2009. *The Library Study at Fresno State*. Fresno, CA: Institute of Public Anthropology, California State University. www.csufresno.edu/anthropology/ipa/thelibrarystudy.html.
- Dryden, Nancy H., and Shelley G. Roseman. 2010. "Learning Commons: Addressing the Needs of Commuter Regional Campuses." *Journal of Library Administration* 50 (5–6): 581–601. doi:10.1080/01930826.2010.488917.
- Dugan, John P., John L. Garland, Barbara Jacoby, and Anna Gasiorski. 2008. "Understanding Commuter Student Self-Efficacy for Leadership: A Within-Group Analysis." *NASPA Journal* 45 (2): 282–310. doi:10.2202/1949–6605.1951.
- Florida, Richard. 2016. "America's Biggest College Towns." CityLab. September 8. www.citylab.com/housing/2016/09/americas-biggest-college-towns/498755/.
- Forbus, Patricia, John Newbold, and Sanjay Mehta. 2010. "University Commuter Students: Time Management, Stress Factors and Coping Strategies." *Advances in Business Research* 1 (1): 142–51.
- Gianoutsos, D., and Vicki Rosser. 2014. "Is There 'Still' a Considerable Difference? Comparing Residential and Commuter Student Profile Characteristics at a Public, Research, Commuter University." *College Student Journal* 48 (4): 613–28.
- Gonyea, Robert M., Sarah S. Hurtado, and Polly A. Graham. 2017. "Living Environments and Student Engagement: Research Findings and Implications." Presentation at the American College Personnel Association Annual Convention, March 26–29, Columbus, OH. http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/presentations/2017/ACPA_2017_Gonyea_Hurtado_Graham_slides.pdf.
- Green, David. 2012. "Supporting the Academic Success of Hispanic Students." In *College Libraries and Student Culture: What We Now Know*, edited by Lynda M. Duke and Andrew D. Asher, 87–108. Chicago: American Library Association.

- Havelka, Stefanie, and Alevtina Verbovetskaya. 2012. "Mobile Information Literacy: Let's Use an App for That!" *College & Research Libraries News* 73 (1): 22–23. <http://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/8689>.
- Hedreen, Rebecca. 2012. "Time Zones, Screencasts, and Becoming Real: Lessons Learned as a Distance Librarian." *Urban Library Journal* 18 (1). <http://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj/v0118/iss1/3>.
- Hernandez, John C. 2002. "A Qualitative Exploration of the First-Year Experience of Latino College Students." *NASPA Journal* 40 (1): 69–84. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1189.
- Ishitani, Terry T., and Aileen M. Reid. 2015. "First-to-Second-Year Persistence Profile of Commuter Students." *New Directions for Student Services* 2015 (150): 13–26. doi:10.1002/ss.20123.
- Jacoby, Barbara. 2000a. *Involving Commuter Students in Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 2000b. "Why Involve Commuter Students in Learning?" In *Involving Commuter Students in Learning*, edited by Barbara Jacoby, 3–12. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 2015a. "Engaging Commuter and Part-Time Students." In *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*, edited by Stephen John Quaye and Shaun R. Harper, 2nd ed., 289–305. New York: Routledge.
- . 2015b. "Enhancing Commuter Student Success: What's Theory Got to Do with It?" *New Directions for Student Services* 2015 (150): 3–12. doi:10.1002/ss.20122.
- Jacoby, Barbara, and John Garland. 2004. "Strategies for Enhancing Commuter Student Success." *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* 6 (1): 61–79. doi:10.2190/567C-5TME-Q8F4-8FRG.
- Khoo, Michael J., Lily Rozaklis, Catherine Hall, and Diana Kusunoki. 2016. "A Really Nice Spot': Evaluating Place, Space, and Technology in Academic Libraries." *College & Research Libraries* 77 (1): 51–70. doi:10.5860/cr1.77.1.51.
- Kretovics, Mark. 2015. "Commuter Students, Online Services, and Online Communities." *New Directions for Student Services* 2015 (150): 69–78. doi:10.1002/ss.20128.
- Kruger, Kevin. 2000. "Using Information Technology to Create Communities of Learners." In *Involving Commuter Students in Learning*, edited by Barbara Jacoby, 59–70. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, George D., Robert M. Gonyea, and Megan Palmer. 2001. "The Disengaged Commuter Student: Fact or Fiction?" *Commuter Perspectives* 27 (1): 2–5.
- Lopatovska, Irene, Alexandra S. Basen, Anshuman D. Duneja, Helen Kwong, Denise L. Pasquinelli, Sarah Sopab, Brian M. Stokes, and Christopher Weller. 2011. "Information Behaviour of New York City Subway Commuters." *Information Research* 16 (4). <http://informationr.net/ir/16-4/paper501.html>.

- Manley, Laura. 2015. *Building Community in the Academic Library: Exploring the Commuter Student Experience*. River Forest, IL: Dominican University. <http://dom.constellation.libras.org/handle/10969/898>.
- May, Francine, and Alice Swabey. 2015. "Using and Experiencing the Academic Library: A Multisite Observational Study of Space and Place." *College & Research Libraries* 76 (6): 771–95. doi:10.5860/cr1.76.6.771.
- Melendez, Mickey C. 2016. "Adjustment to College in an Urban Commuter Setting: The Impact of Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Athletic Participation." *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* 18 (1): 31–48. doi:10.1177/1521025115579671.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2012. "College & Career Tables Library." <https://nces.ed.gov/datalab/tableslibrary/viewtable.aspx?tableid=9562>.
- . 2015. "Demographic and Enrollment Characteristics of Nontraditional Undergraduates: 2011–12." Washington, DC. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2015025>.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. 2017. "About NSSE." <http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/about.cfm>.
- Nelson, Danielle, Kaustav Misra, Gail E. Sype, and Wayne Mackie. 2016. "An Analysis of the Relationship between Distance from Campus and GPA of Commuter Students." *Journal of International Education Research* 12 (1): 37–46. doi:10.19030/jier.v12i1.9565.
- Newbold, John J., Sanjay S. Mehta, and Patricia Forbus. 2011. "Commuter Students: Involvement and Identification with an Institution of Higher Education." *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 15 (2): 141–53.
- Perna, Laura W., ed. 2010. *Understanding the Working College Student: New Research and Its Implications for Policy and Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Rainie, Lee. 2017. "Digital Divides—Feeding America." Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech. February 9. www.pewinternet.org/2017/02/09/digital-divides-feeding-america/.
- Regalado, Mariana, and Maura A. Smale. 2015a. "Serving the Commuter College Student in Urban Academic Libraries." *Urban Library Journal* 21 (1). <http://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj/v0121/iss1/3>.
- . 2015b. "‘I Am More Productive in the Library Because It’s Quiet’: Commuter Students in the College Library." *College & Research Libraries* 76 (7): 899–913. doi:10.5860/cr1.76.7.899.
- Richards, Maureen. 2016. "24/7 Library Hours at an Urban Commuter College." *Urban Library Journal* 22 (1). <http://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj/v0122/iss1/2>.
- Smale, Maura A., and Mariana Regalado. 2014. "Commuter Students Using Technology." *EDUCAUSE Review Online*, September. <http://er.educause.edu/articles/2014/9/commuter-students-using-technology>.
- . 2017. *Digital Technology as Affordance and Barrier in Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Yearwood, Trina Lynn, and Elizabeth A. Jones. 2012. "Understanding What Influences Successful Black Commuter Students' Engagement in College." *The Journal of General Education* 61 (2): 97–125. doi:10.1353/jge.2012.0015.
- Zeit, Krystina. 2014. "The Information Needs and Behavior of Mature Community College Students: A Review of Literature." *Community & Junior College Libraries* 20 (3–4): 57–62. doi:10.1080/02763915.2014.1015341.
- Zerquera, Desiree D., Mary Ziskin, and Vasti Torres. 2016. "Faculty Views of 'Nontraditional' Students: Aligning Perspectives for Student Success." *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*. doi:10.1177/1521025116645109.
- Ziskin, Mary, Desiree Zerquera, and Vasti Torres. 2010. "Faculty & Practitioners' Views of Working, Commuting Students: Aligning Perspectives for Academic Success." Project on Academic Success, Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University. http://pas.indiana.edu/pdf/ASHE2010_MWSC_PrFac.pdf.

Index

A

- “A Day in the Life” (ADITL) project
 - CU Boulder students, survey responses of, 57–63
 - CUNY students and, 74
 - description of, 56
 - IUPUI participation in, 20
- Academic Libraries for Commuter Students* (Regalado & Smale), 10–12
- academic library
 - commuter students in, research on, 8–10
 - library instruction/student success, 119–121
- academic practices, 76–77
- academic success
 - academic library’s contribution to, 143
 - CSN’s AIA project, 121–123
 - library services and, 130
 - student engagement and, 5–6
 - See also* success
- academic work
 - “A Day in the Life” project, 74
 - future library study, 73
 - impact of commutes on, 61–63
 - information needs/information-seeking study, 72–73
 - student academic practices findings, 76–77
 - student reading practices study, 74
 - student technology use study, 73–74
 - time as facilitator/constraint for students, 77–79
 - Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- access
 - to Family Friendly Library Room, 42, 45
 - to library, student study time and, 98
- ACRL
 - See* Association of College & Research Libraries
- active learning techniques, 120
- adult students
 - See* student-parents
- age, 38

- AIA program
 See Assessment in Action
 (AIA) program
- Alfano, Halley J., 4, 5
- Amaral, Jean
 CUNY research, 11, 69–82
 studies by, 72–73
- American Association of Community
 Colleges, 11
- Anderson, Helen, 107
- ANSWER Family Friendly Library Room,
 35–40
- anthropology students
 collaboration with faculty, 142
 ethnographic studies by,
 106, 108–109, 111
 research question of, 104–105
- ARCH 201 (Introduction to Architectural
 Design) course, 110
- architecture students, 109–110
- Asher, Andrew
 on commuting by UNC
 Charlotte students, 34
 on commuting concerns of UNC
 Charlotte students, 41
 on comparative research, 143
 CU Boulder students, survey
 responses of, 57
 on “A Day in the Life” project, 56
 ERIAL Project, 72
 study of academic library/students, 53
- assessment, 29
- Assessment in Action (AIA) program
 College of Southern Nevada,
 institutional context, 118–119
 commuter community college
 library instruction/student
 success, 119–121
 CSN proposals for, 117
 CSN’s AIA, posttest version, 134–138
 CSN’s AIA project, 121–122
 CSN’s AIA project, changes to
 instruction program, 129
 CSN’s AIA project, conclusion
 about, 130–131
 CSN’s AIA project, limitations
 of, 128–129
 CSN’s AIA project, results/
 interpretation of, 122–128
 research on libraries/
 academic success, 143
 assignment-integrated library instruction
 attendance at, outcomes from, 124
 effectiveness of, 121, 122
 importance of, 130
 information literacy outcome
 of, 126–127
 student engagement and, 128
 Association of College & Research
 Libraries (ACRL)
 *Information Literacy Competency
 Standards for Higher Education*, 121
 Value of Academic Libraries/
 Assessment in Action projects,
 143
 See also Assessment in Action
 (AIA) program
- Atkins Ethnography Project, 34–35
- B**
- Badger, Caitlin W.
 on commuter students, 3, 85
 on research methods, 10
 on student engagement, 7
- balance, 91
- Bantz, Charles, 17–18
- Barnett, Elisabeth A., 118
- BC
 See Brooklyn College
- BCC
 See Bronx Community College
- bicycle, 60
- Biddix, J. Patrick, 2, 22
- Borough of Manhattan Community
 College (BMCC)
 in CUNY system, 70–71
 “A Day in the Life” project, 74
 relaxation stations/music
 events at, 80–81
 “Research for Life” workshops, 81
 student technology use study, 73–74
 technology at library, 80
 time as facilitator/constraint
 for students, 78

- Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- Braxton, John M., 120
- Bronx Community College (BCC), 70–71, 72, 120
- Brooklyn College (BC)
- “A Day in the Life” project, 74
 - “draw your research steps” exercise, 81
 - institutional context, 70–71
 - printers at, 80
 - student technology use study, 73–74
 - Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- Brooks, D. Christopher, 8
- Brown-Sica, Margaret S., 9, 53
- Buckenmeyer, Janet A., 8
- Burgess, Matthew, 81
- Burgoyne, Mary Beth, 120
- Burlison, Mary Beth, 4, 7
- bus, 60
- C**
- California Community College Chancellor’s Datamart, 87
- California community college students
- as commuter students, 85
 - institutional context, 86–87
 - study habits survey, conclusion about, 100
 - study habits survey, introduction of, 85–86
 - study habits survey, methods for, 87–88
 - study habits survey results, 88–97
 - survey responses, discussions/lessons learned, 97–99
- car, as student study location, 94
- carrel desks, 78, 80
- CCNY (City College of New York), 70–71, 72
- challenges, 75
- Charleston campus, College of Southern Nevada, 118
- Chodock, Ted
- on collaboration, 141
 - on library instruction/academic success, 12, 117–131
 - research on library’s contribution to academic success, 143
- Chuppa-Cornell, Kim, 120
- City College of New York (CCNY), 70–71, 72
- City Tech
- See New York City College of Technology (City Tech)
- City University of New York (CUNY)
- impacts/outcomes of research, 79–82
 - institutional context, 70–71
 - lessons learned from commuter students, 140, 141
 - online courses at, 142
 - research on students at, 11, 69–70
 - research studies/methods, 71–75
 - results/findings of research, 75–79
 - time as facilitator/constraint for students, 78
- Clark, Marcia Roe
- on commuter students, 3
 - on commuting, 140
 - student identity study by, 6
- classmates, 76
- Coastline Community College
- experiences of students at, 12
 - institutional context, 86–87
 - lessons learned from commuter students, 140, 141
 - online courses at, 142
 - study habits survey, methods for, 87–88
 - study habits survey, results of, 88–97
- cognitive maps, 37
- collaboration
- benefits of, 141
 - library renovation and, 28–29
 - student outcomes and, 120
 - student/faculty, 142–143
- collaborative study space
- at UL, student feedback about, 26–28
 - UL renovation plans and, 28–29
- College of Southern Nevada (CSN)
- AIA, posttest version, 134–138
 - AIA project, description of, 121–122
 - AIA project, limitations of, 128–129

- College of Southern Nevada (cont.)
 - AIA project, results/interpretation of, 122–128
 - AIA proposal, 117
 - assessment of instruction/information literacy at, 12
 - future directions at, 130–131
 - institutional context, 118–119
 - instruction program, changes to, 129
 - library instruction/student success, 119–121
- colleges/universities
 - included in *Academic Libraries for Commuter Students* (Regalado & Smale), 10
 - modeling university with FFLR, 43–44
- community, 4
- community colleges
 - academic library use by students, 9
 - College of Southern Nevada, 117–131
 - of CUNY system, 70–71
 - library needs of commuter students, 103–104
 - Montgomery College,
 - conclusion about, 115
 - Montgomery College, institutional context, 105–106
 - Montgomery College, methods of ethnographic studies, 106–110
 - Montgomery College, outcomes of project, 112–115
 - Montgomery College, research question, 104–105
 - Montgomery College, results of study, 110–111
 - overview of chapters on, 11–12
 - See also* California community college students
- commute
 - academic work, impact on, 61–63
 - of commuter students, types of, 3
 - of CU Boulder students, 54, 57–61
 - of CUNY students, 69–70
 - Family Friendly Library Room and, 44–45
 - FFLR pre-occupation interviews, findings from, 41
 - future research on, 142
 - IUPUI mapping study, results of, 23–26
 - lessons learned from commuter students, 139, 140
 - research on commuter students, 7
 - student time management and, 78
 - technology use by students during, 8
 - UNC Charlotte students and, 34
- commuter students
 - in academic libraries, 8–10
 - California community college students as, 85, 86
 - commute, impact on academic work, 61–63
 - at CU Boulder, 53–54
 - CU Boulder students, survey responses of, 57–63
 - at CUNY, research on, 69–70
 - CUNY research, impacts/outcomes of, 79–82
 - CUNY research, results/findings of, 75–79
 - CUNY research studies/methods, 71–75
 - definition of, 2–4
 - examples of, 1–2
 - at IUPUI, decrease in number of, 17–18, 19
 - lessons learned from, 139–143
 - library needs of, 103
 - overview of chapters on, 10–12
 - research on experience of, 4–8
 - responsibilities of, 2
 - student study habits survey results, 88–97
- comprehensive college, CUNY system, 70–71
- Cone University Center, 33–34
- confidence
 - library instruction and, 124, 130
 - student engagement and, 128
- connectedness, 124, 130
- course reserves
 - benefits for students, 76–77
 - for commuter students, 98–99
 - marketing of, 64
- Couture, Juliann, 11, 53–66

- Covit, Raissa, 88
 Cowan, Susanna M., 20
 CSN
 See College of Southern Nevada
 CSN Institutional Research, 118
 CSN Libraries, 118
 CU Boulder
 See University of Colorado
 Boulder (CU Boulder)
 CUNY
 See City University of New York
 CUNY OIRA, 69, 71, 78
- D**
- Dace, Karen, 19
 Daniels, Erin, 98
 data analysis, 88, 108, 109
 De Araujo, Pedro, 17
 debrief, 20, 21, 25
 Deil-Amen, Regina
 on library instruction, 130
 on relationships for information
 networks, 131
 on student/librarian connections, 120
 work on academic libraries/
 student success, 119
 Delcore, H. D.
 on commute, 7
 on commuter students, 3, 53
 mapping study for library research, 20
 Dembo, Myron H., 118
 design
 by architecture students, 109–110
 for future changes at Montgomery
 College Libraries, 114
 participatory design activities by
 library teams, 106–109
 participatory design activities,
 findings from, 110–111
 desktop computer, 96
 digital divide, 8
 distance learning students, 10
 distraction, 40, 93
 Dominguez, Gricel, 22
 “draw your research steps” exercise, 81
 drawings
 from CUNY research projects, 75
 for ethnographic project, 107, 108
 by students about research project, 72
 driving
 See commute
 Dryden, Nancy H., 9
 Dugan, John P., 2
 Duke, Lynda M., 53, 72
- E**
- Eduljee, Nina B., 4, 5
 electrical outlets, 63, 64, 113
 embedded librarian
 course grade and, 124
 CSN’s AIA project to study, 122
 CSN’s movement towards, 121
 information literacy/
 confidence and, 127
 results from program, 129
 student engagement and, 128
 employment
 See work
 engagement
 See student engagement
 e-resources, 113
 ethnographic project
 outcomes of, 112–115
 research methods for, 106–110
 research question, 104–105
 results of, 110–111
 Ethnographic Research in Illinois
 Academic Libraries (ERIAL)
 Project, 72
 Evans, Tim, 19
- F**
- faculty
 commuter students, perceptions
 of, 7
 feedback for students, 76
 library instruction and, 120
 technology for contact with
 students, 8
 family
 balance between life/school/work, 91
 Family Friendly Library Room, 35–40
 FFLR pre-occupation interviews,
 findings from, 40–42

- family (cont.)
 support of, student engagement
 and, 7
See also student-parents
- Family Friendly Library Room (FFLR)
 Atkins Ethnography Project, 34–35
 conclusion about, 46–47
 creation of, 35–40
 institutional context, 33–34
 non-users, learning from, 45
 partnership for, 141
 post-occupation interviews,
 findings from, 42–45
 pre-occupation interviews,
 findings from, 40–42
 problem-solving/next steps, 45–46
 research methods for, 49–51
- feedback, 76
- Florida, Richard, 3
- focus, 43
- focus groups, 73
- food, 98
- Forbus, Patricia, 3, 6, 7
- ForRentUniversity.com, 19
- Foster, Nancy Fried
 Atkins Library research, 35
 on college commuters at Montgomery
 College, 12, 103–115
 library study at Rochester, 72, 107
 mapping study for library research, 20
 student study habits, 95
 study of academic library/students, 53
- Fransen, Jan, 119
- Freshman-Year-Seminars (FYS), 120
- friends, 76
- furniture, 64–65
- future library study, 73
- G**
- Garland, John, 4
- gender, 38
- Georgas, Helen, 81
- Gianoutsos, D., 5
- Gibbons, Susan
 Atkins Library research, 35
 library study at Rochester, 72, 107
 mapping study for library research, 20
 on student study habits, 95
 study of academic library/students, 53
- Gonyea, Robert M., 5, 6
- Google, 100
- Gourlay, Lesley, 35, 47
- grade point average (GPA)
 information literacy score and, 126
 library instruction attendance and, 124
 of library users/non-users, 119
 of residential/commuter students, 5, 6
- Graham, Polly A., 6
- Green, David, 8–9
- Greene, Brian
 data analysis of study habits survey, 88
 overview of chapter by, 12
 position at Columbia College, 100
 on study habits of California
 community college commuter
 students, 85–100
 survey instrument, 87
- Gross, Melissa, 124
- group work spaces, 113–114
- H**
- Hackathorn, Jana, 119
- Havelka, Stefanie, 9–10
- Hedreen, Rebecca, 10
- help, 97, 114
- Henderson campus, College of Southern
 Nevada, 118
- Herman B. Wells Library, IUPUI
 Bloomington campus, 18
- Hernandez, John C., 7
- Hispanic students, 8–9
- home, 93
- Homestead, Steven, 88
- Horan, Elizabeth, 12, 85–100
- housing
 choice of, 58–59
 for CU Boulder students, 54, 55
See also living arrangements
- Howard, Jennifer, 95
- Hudson, Gail I., 85
- Hughes, Annie M., 22
- Hughes, Katherine L.
 on relationships for information
 networks, 120–121, 130, 131

- work on academic libraries/
student success, 119
 - Human Library event, 131
 - Hunter College (HC), 70–71, 72
 - Hurtado, Sarah S., 6
- I**
- identity, 6–7
 - inclusivity, 44
 - Indiana University-Purdue University
Indianapolis (IUPUI)
 - conclusions/next steps, 29–30
 - institutional context, 19–20
 - interventions, 28–29
 - lessons learned from commuter
students, 141
 - mapping study, 20–21
 - mapping study, results of, 23–26
 - observation study, results of, 26–28
 - space assessment projects at library, 11
 - space study, 21–23
 - information
 - information needs/information-
seeking study, 72–73
 - student academic practices
findings, 76–77
 - information literacy
 - academic library use by
commuter students, 9–10
 - library instruction/retention and,
120
 - library instruction's impact
on, 124–127
 - Information Literacy Competency Standards
for Higher Education* (ACRL), 121
 - information networks, 130, 131
 - instruction
 - See* library instruction
 - Internet
 - Montgomery College Libraries
improvements, 113
 - student information-seeking
practices on, 77
 - technology use by commuter
students, 8
 - interviews
 - by anthropology students, 109
 - for CUNY research projects, 75
 - for Family Friendly Library
Room, 39, 49–50
 - for FFLR, findings from, 40–45
 - for information needs/information-
seeking study, 73
 - for student reading practices study, 74
 - for Undergraduate Scholarly
Habits Study, 72
 - Ireland, Ashley, 119
 - Ishitani, Terry T., 5
 - IUPUI
 - See* Indiana University-Purdue
University Indianapolis
 - IUPUI Housing and Residence Life, 19
 - IUPUI Institutional Research and Decision
Support, 19
- J**
- J. Murrey Atkins Library
 - Atkins Ethnography Project, 34–35
 - Family Friendly Library Room, 35–40
 - FFLR, conclusion about, 46–47
 - FFLR, problem-solving/
next steps, 45–46
 - findings from post-occupation
interviews, 42–45
 - findings from pre-occupation
interviews, 40–42
 - institutional context, 33–34
 - research methods for FFLR, 49–51
 - Jacoby, Barbara, 3, 4, 5
 - Jepsen, Christopher, 85
 - job
 - See* work
 - Jones, Elizabeth A., 6, 8
- K**
- Karp, Melinda Mechur
 - on relationships for information
networks, 120–121, 130, 131
 - work on academic libraries/
student success, 119
 - Khoo, Michael, 9, 20
 - Kim Wu, Somaly, 34
 - Kretovics, Mark
 - on commuter students, 86

Kretovics, Mark (cont.)
 on online college services, 98
 on technology use by
 commuter students, 8

Kruger, Kevin, 8

Kuh, George D., 5, 120

L

Lanclos, Donna

Atkins Ethnography Project,
 34–35
 on comparative research, 143
 on making space in library for
 student-parents, 33–47
 overview of chapter by, 11
 on student study spaces, 47

laptop, 96

Latham, Don, 124

Le Cornu, Alison, 35

Lee, Scott W., 131

lessons learned, 139–143

librarian

CSN's AIA project, 121–122
 library instruction/student
 success, 119–121
 relationships for information
 networks, 130, 131
 student study survey responses
 on use of, 96

library

of College of Southern Nevada,
 student use of, 118–119
 commuter students in academic
 libraries, research on, 8–10
 CUNY research, impacts/
 outcomes of, 79–82
 CUNY students' use of library
 for coursework, 78–79
 future library study, 73
 information needs of students
 and, 73
 lessons learned from commuter
 students, 139–142
 Montgomery College, library use
 research question, 104–105
 Montgomery College project
 outcomes, 112–115

Montgomery College, research
 methods for ethnographic
 project, 106–110

Montgomery College's ethnographic
 project, results from, 110–111

Montgomery College's
 libraries, 105–106

research, student attitudes
 on, 127–128

student study habits, support of, 100
 student study location

preferences, 94, 95–96

student study survey
 responses on, 97–99

Library & Learning Centers, Modesto
 Junior College, 87, 88

library hours

extended open hours, 112

mismatch with student study hours, 98

library instruction

commuter community college
 library instruction/student
 success, 119–121

CSN's AIA project, 121–122

CSN's AIA project, changes to
 instruction program, 129

CSN's AIA project, conclusion
 about, 130–131

CSN's AIA project, results of, 122–128

CSN's Assessment in Action:
 posttest version, 134–138

library space

Atkins Ethnography Project, 34–35

CU Boulder students' use of, 61–62

CU Boulder University Libraries,
 interventions/initiatives, 64–65

CUNY research, impacts/
 outcomes of, 79–80

design work by architecture
 students, 109–110

Family Friendly Library Room,
 creation of, 35–40

FFLR, conclusion about, 46–47

FFLR, findings from interviews
 about, 42–45

FFLR, problem-solving/
 next steps, 45–46

FFLR research methods, 49–51
 IUPUI, conclusions/next steps for, 29–30
 IUPUI interventions, 28–29
 IUPUI mapping study, 20–21
 IUPUI space study, 21–23
 IUPUI studies about student use of, 17–18
 IUPUI studies, results of, 23–28
 J. Murrey Atkins Library, study spaces of, 34
 student information-seeking practices and, 76–77
 library teams, 106–111
 life, 88–91
 life roles, 7, 77–78
 Linn, Mott, 22
 listening, 141–142
 living arrangements
 of commuter students, 2, 3, 10
 student engagement and, 6
 See also housing
 location, study
 See study space
 locker, 41, 61–62, 64
 Lopatovska, Irene, 7
 Lowe, M. Sara, 11, 17–30

M

Macan, Therese H., 90, 91
 Manley, Laura, 9
 mapping study
 “A Day in the Life” project at CUNY, 74
 demographics of participants in, 21
 description of, 20–21
 for IUPUI, 18
 for IUPUI, methodology for, 20–21
 results of, 23–26
 with space study, 29–30
 Marshall, Ann, 107
 May, Francine, 9
 Mehta, Sanjay S., 3, 6, 7
 Melendez, Mickey C., 7
 Melssen, Maria, 22
 Milem, Jeffrey F., 20
 Miller, Susan, 35
 Miller, Willie, 11, 17–30

mobile devices
 academic library access using, 9–10
 for CUNY students commute time, 78
 student information-seeking practices with, 77
 technology use by commuter students, 8

Modesto Junior College
 commuter student at, 2
 experiences of students at, 12
 institutional context, 86–87
 lessons learned from commuter students, 140, 141
 study habits survey, methods for, 87–88
 study habits survey, results of, 88–97

Moffett, Paul, 11, 17–30

Montgomery College
 ethnographic studies, conclusion about, 115
 institutional context, 105–106
 library needs of commuter students, 103–104
 methods of ethnographic studies, 106–110
 outcomes of project, 112–115
 research into place of library at, 12
 research question, 104–105
 results of ethnographic studies, 110–111
 student/faculty collaboration at, 142–143

Mossler, Ron, 118

Mullooly, J.
 on commute, 7
 on commuter students, 3, 53
 mapping study for library research, 20

multitasking, 78, 90

Murray, Adam, 119

Murray, James, 17

music events, 80–81

N

Nackerud, Shane, 119

Nakajima, Mikiko A., 118

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 3, 118

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
 on commuter students, 3
 on residential students, 17
 on student engagement, 5, 6
- Nelson, Danielle, 6
- Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), 117
- New York City College of Technology (City Tech)
 chat reference service, 81
 commuter student at, 1
 in CUNY system, 70–71
 “A Day in the Life” project, 74
 printers at, 80
 student technology use study, 73–74
 Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- Newbold, John J.
 on commute, 7
 on commuter students, 3, 91
 on stress of commuter students, 6
- Nonis, Sarath A., 85
- nontraditional students, 3–4
- Nordstokke, David W., 90
- Norlin Library, CU Boulder, 55, 62
- North Carolina State University Libraries, 23
- North Las Vegas, College of Southern Nevada, 118
- NSHE (Nevada System of Higher Education), 117
- NSSE
See National Survey of Student Engagement
- O**
- Oakleaf, Megan, 119
- observation
 by anthropology students, 109
 by Atkins Ethnography Project, 35
 of CUNY students, 81
- observation study
 of IUPUI, 21–23
 melding with mapping study, 29–30
 results of, 26–28
- Office of Adult Students and Evening Services (OASES), 33, 35–37, 39
- Office of Undergraduate Admissions, 34
- O’Gara, Lauren
 on academic libraries/
 student success, 119
 on relationships for information networks, 120–121, 130, 131
- Oliver, Martin, 35, 47
- One Button Studios, 112
- online learning community course, 120, 128
- online learning initiatives, 142
- open concept study rooms, 29
- P**
- Palmer, Megan, 5
- parents, 91
See also family; student-parents
- parking
 at CU Boulder, 60, 63, 65
 Family Friendly Library Room and, 44–45
 IUPUI mapping study, 24, 25
 UNC Charlotte students and, 34
- participatory design activities
 findings from, 110–111
 by library teams, 106–109
- Perna, Laura W., 4, 89
- persistence, 5
- Phipps, Lawrie, 35
- photographs, 37, 75
- Plant, E., 92
- post-occupation interviews
 about FFLR, 39
 findings from, 42–45
 questions for, 50
- pre-occupation interviews
 for FFLR, 39–40
 findings from, 40–42
 questions for, 49–50
- printer, 80
- procrastination, 76
- Promote Undergraduate Student Learning and Success initiative, 17
- Public Policy Institute of California, 85
- public transportation, 7

Q

qualitative data, 82
 qualitative study design, 39–40
 Queensborough Community College
 (QCC), 70–71

questions

for student study habits
 survey, 87–88, 99
 of survey for CSN's AIA
 project, 121–122

quiet

of FFLR, 43, 45
 library as study space for, 25–26
 need for quiet work space, 9
 quiet library floor, value of, 28
 quiet work spaces at Montgomery
 College Libraries, 113–114
 student study location
 preferences, 94–95
 study space, 62, 63, 80
 zone at library, 65

R

Rainie, Lee, 8

reading, 74, 111

recruitment

of CU Boulder students, 56
 for FFLR research, 49
 recruiting script for FFLR, 50–51

Regalado, Mariana

on commuter students, 1–12, 53
 CUNY research, 69–82
 “draw your research steps” exercise, 81
 on lessons learned from commuter
 students, 139–143
 on library space, 118
 on life roles of commuter students, 7
 research with students at
 CUNY colleges, 11
 on technology use by
 commuter students, 8
 Undergraduate Scholarly
 Habits Study, 72

Reid, Aileen M., 5

rental costs, 58

research

on commuter student experience, 4–8

CUNY, impacts/outcomes of, 79–82

CUNY, institutional context, 70–71

CUNY, research studies/
 methods, 71–75

CUNY, results/findings of, 75–79

at CUNY campuses, 69–82

“draw your research steps” exercise, 81

FFLR research methods, 49–51

future, suggestions for, 142–143

included in *Academic Libraries*

for Commuter Students

(Regalado & Smale), 10–12

methods of Montgomery College
 libraries, 106–109

student attitudes on library

research, 127–128

student study survey

responses on, 96–97

research databases, 96

residence halls, 65

residential students

at CU Boulder, 55, 58–60

engagement of, 5–6

institutions with majority of, 4

at IUPUI, increase in number

of, 17–18, 19

responsibilities, 2, 4, 90

retention, student, 119–120

Richards, Maureen, 9

Roberson, Caprice, 121

roles

of commuter students, 6–7

of students, structure in

academic work and, 76

time as facilitator/constraint

for students and, 77–78

room reservation data, 38–39, 46

Roseman, Shelley G., 9

Rosser, Vicki, 5

S

Saklofske, Donald H., 90

Sanabria, Jesus E., 120

scanner, 80

schedule

Family Friendly Library

Room use and, 42

- schedule (cont.)
 - student study habits survey
 - responses about, 90–91
 - time as facilitator/constraint
 - for students, 77–79
 - See also* time
- scholarly habits, 72
- Schuck, Beth, 117
- Scroggins, Michael
 - on commute, 7
 - on commuter students, 3
 - mapping study for library research, 20
 - study on commutes of students, 53
- “seat sweep,” 22
- seating, 56, 64–65
- Sengupta, Ria, 85
- senior colleges, 70–71
- Sharman, Alison, 20
- signage, 65
- SLOs (student learning outcomes), 129
- Smale, Maura A.
 - on commuter students, 1–12
 - CUNY research, 69–82
 - on lessons learned from commuter students, 139–143
 - on library space, 118
 - on life roles of commuter students, 7
 - research with students at
 - CUNY colleges, 11
 - student reading practices study by, 74
 - study on commutes of students, 53
 - on technology use by
 - commuter students, 8
 - Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- smartphone
 - commuter students’ use of, 8
 - student information-seeking practices with, 77
 - student use of for study,
 - 96, 98, 99, 100
- social media, 8
- Soria, Krista M., 119
- space, 18
 - See also* library space; study space
- space study
 - description of, 21–23
 - for IUPUI, 18
 - melding with mapping study, 29–30
 - results of, 26–28
- Stelnicki, Andrea M., 90
- stress, 6, 7
- structure, 76
- student engagement
 - academic success and, 5–6
 - at College of Southern Nevada, 118–119
 - CSN’s AIA project, results of, 122–128
 - library focus on, 130
 - library instruction/student success, 119–121
- student identity, 6–7
- student learning outcomes (SLOs), 129
- student outcomes, 117
- student retention, 119–120
- student-parents
 - Family Friendly Library Room, 35–40
 - FFLR, conclusion about, 46–47
 - FFLR, post-occupation interview findings, 42–45
 - FFLR, pre-occupation interview findings, 40–42
 - FFLR, problem-solving/next steps, 45–46
 - FFLR research methods, 49–51
 - at UNC Charlotte, 33–34
- students
 - at College of Southern Nevada, 118
 - commuting by CUNY students,
 - research on, 69–70
 - at CU Boulder, 53–54, 57–63
 - CUNY research, impacts/outcomes of, 79–82
 - CUNY research, results/findings of, 75–79
 - CUNY research studies/methods, 71–75
 - “A Day in the Life” project, 56
 - design work by architecture students, 109–110
 - lessons learned from commuter students, 139–142
 - library instruction, academic success and, 130

- library instruction/student success, 119–121
 - library research, attitudes on, 127–128
 - listening to, 141–142
 - of Montgomery College, 105–106
 - Montgomery College project outcomes, 112–115
 - Montgomery College students' use of library, 110–111
 - observations by anthropology students, 108–109
 - at UNC Charlotte, 33–34
 - See also* California community college students; commuter students
 - study
 - academic library use by commuter students, 8–10
 - student use of commute time for, 7
 - study habits survey
 - conclusion about, 100
 - discussions/lessons learned, 97–99
 - institutional context, 86–87
 - introduction to, 85–86
 - methods for, 87–88
 - results of, 88–97
 - study space
 - for commuter students, lessons learned about, 140
 - CU Boulder students, barriers/frustrations of, 63
 - CU Boulder University Libraries, interventions/initiatives, 64–65
 - CUNY research, impacts/outcomes of, 80
 - for CUNY students, time and, 77–79
 - Family Friendly Library Room, 35–40
 - IUPUI mapping study, results of, 23–26
 - IUPUI observation study, results of, 26–28
 - at J. Murrey Atkins Library, 34
 - Montgomery College project outcomes, 112–115
 - Montgomery College students' use of library for, 110–111
 - study habits survey results on, 92–96, 97–98
 - University Library renovation for, 18
 - stuff, 41
 - subway, 78
 - success
 - CSN's AIA project, 121–122
 - library instruction and, 119–121
 - life roles of commuter students and, 7
 - student engagement and, 5–6
 - See also* academic success
 - Sullivan, Anna Shaw, 120
 - Suma, 23
 - support, 4, 76
 - survey
 - for CSN's AIA project, 121–122
 - CU Boulder students, survey responses of, 57–63
 - for "A Day in the Life" project, 56, 74
 - IUPUI mapping study, 20–21
 - IUPUI mapping study, results of, 23–26
 - for Montgomery College's ethnographic project, 108
 - See also* study habits survey
 - SurveyMonkey, 88, 99
 - Swabey, Alice, 9
 - swipe card, 42, 45
- T**
- technology
 - academic library access with mobile devices, 9–10
 - commuter students and, 8
 - at CU Boulder University Libraries, 63, 64
 - in Family Friendly Library Room, 43, 45–46
 - student barriers/frustrations at CU Boulder, 63
 - student information-seeking practices and, 77
 - student study survey responses on, 96–97
 - student technology use study, 73–74
 - student use of for study, 100
 - time and, 79

- technology (cont.)
 upgrades at Montgomery College Libraries, 112–113
- text message survey
 “A Day in the Life” project, 56, 74
 for IUPUI mapping study, 20–21
- textbooks
 at Montgomery College Libraries, 114
 students use of for study, 98–99
- time
 commuting, time spent on, 140
 as facilitator/constraint for students, 77–79
 lessons learned from commuter students, 140
 for student study, 92, 95
 student study habits survey responses about, 90–91
- Tinto, Vincent, 119, 120
- Torres, Vasti, 7
- transportation
 commute, research on student experience of, 7
 commuter students’ college experience and, 140
 commuter students, mode of transportation, 3
 for CU Boulder students commute to/around campus, 59–61
 for CUNY students commute, 78
 use of by students, 10
- Twiss-Brooks, Andrea B., 20
- U**
- Undergraduate Scholarly Habits Study, 72
- University Library (UL) of IUPUI
 conclusions/next steps, 29–30
 institutional context, 19–20
 interventions, 28–29
 mapping study, 20–21
 mapping study, results of, 23–26
 observation study, results of, 26–28
 renovation of, 17
 space needs of, 18
 space study, 21–23
- University of Colorado Boulder (CU Boulder)
 barriers/frustrations of students, 63
 commute, impact on academic work, 61–63
 commute to/around campus, 59–61
 conclusions/next steps for, 65–66
 “A Day in the Life” project, 56
 distances traveled/time spent on activities by students, 57–58
 housing, student choice in, 58–59
 institutional context, 54–56
 interventions/initiatives, 64–65
 lessons learned from commuter students, 140, 141
 life of students at, 53–54
 mapping/interviews at, 11
- University of Colorado Boulder University Libraries
 conclusion/next steps, 65–66
 description of, 55–56
 interventions/initiatives, 64–65
 student barriers/frustrations and, 63
 student use of for academic work, 61–62
- University of Maryland, 104
- University of North Carolina, Charlotte
 Atkins Ethnography Project, 34–35
 commuter student at, 1
 conclusion about FFLR, 46–47
 Family Friendly Library Room, 35–40
 Family Friendly Library Room, implementation of, 11
 Family Friendly Library Room, partnership for, 141
 institutional context, 33–34
 lessons learned from commuter students, 140
 non-users, learning from, 45
 post-occupation interviews, findings from, 42–45
 pre-occupation interviews, findings from, 40–42
 problem-solving/next steps, 45–46
 research methods for FFLR, 49–51
- University of Rochester, 72, 107

urban commuter colleges
 CUNY, institutional context, 70–71
 impacts/outcomes of research, 79–82
 research at, 69–82
 research on students at CUNY
 campuses, 69–70
 research studies/methods, 71–75
 results/findings of research, 75–79
 U.S. Census Bureau, 86
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
 Development, 55
 Usina, Phyllis, 98

V

Value of Academic Libraries initiative,
 119, 143
 Verbovetskaya, Alevtina, 9–10

W

walking, 3
 website, library, 98, 127
 White, David, 35
 Wi-Fi access, 77

Winterling, Rachael, 11, 33–47
 work
 of commuter students, 2, 4
 student study habits survey and,
 88–91
 study time and, 93
 Wray, Tanner
 on collaboration with
 students, 142–143
 on college commuters at Montgomery
 College, 12, 103–115
 on lessons learned from commuter
 students, 141
 Wrigley, Julia, 71

Y

Yearwood, Trina Lynn, 6, 8

Z

Zentner, Aeron, 88
 Zerquera, Desiree D., 7
 Ziskin, Mary, 7