

Chapman University

Chapman University Digital Commons

Communication Faculty Articles and Research

School of Communication

3-11-2020

Addressing Student Precarities in Higher Education: Our Responsibility as Teachers and Scholars

Sara LaBelle

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/comm_articles



Part of the Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons, Disability and Equity in Education Commons, Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Education Economics Commons, Other Education Commons, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons, and the Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons

Addressing Student Precarities in Higher Education: Our Responsibility as Teachers and Scholars

Comments

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Communication Education*, volume 69, issue 2, in 2020, available online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1724311>. It may differ slightly from the final version of record.

Copyright

National Communication Association

Forum on Student Precarity

Addressing Student Precarities in Higher Education: Our Responsibility as Teachers and
Scholars

Sara LaBelle, Ph.D.
Chapman University
One University Dr.
Orange, CA 92866
714-289-3198
labelle@chapman.edu

Addressing Student Precarities in Higher Education: Our Responsibility as Teachers and Scholars

The transition from high school to college life presents a number of challenges to young adults, including new living arrangements, new social circles, increased independence, and the pressures of academic responsibilities (Johnston, 2010). As a result, college students face a number of health concerns, including but not limited to sleep deprivation, lack of proper nutrition and exercise, psychological distress, acute illness, and the social pressures to engage in substance and alcohol abuse (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). In fact, in the Spring 2019 report of the American College Health Association (ACHA)'s National College Health Assessment, the nearly 68,000 college student respondents reported a variety of health-related issues that have negatively impacted their academic performance in the past 30 days. This includes stress (34%), mental health issues (anxiety, 27.8%; depression, 20.2%), chronic health problems (4.6%) sleep difficulties (22%), and temporary health issues (e.g., pain, 3.7%; common cold, 14.8%). Further, nearly 26% of college students reported that within the past 12 months they had a personal health issue that was "traumatic or difficult to handle" (ACHA, 2019). This is particularly problematic when considering that exposure to traumatic or difficult events is associated with withdrawing from courses, failing grades, and lower grade point averages, particularly among students from low-income backgrounds (Warnecke & Lewine, 2019). More broadly, mental health issues such as depression and anxiety affect students' ability to perform well in college and reduce the likelihood of graduation (Eisenberg, Downs, Golberstein, & Zivin, 2009; Mojtabai et al., 2015).

These problems are exacerbated for subgroups of students, such as those without health insurance, those with significant and mounting debt, and those who are food insecure. According

to the U.S. Census, as of 2017 14.5% of young adults aged 19-25 were uninsured; the rate of uninsured individuals in the general population is 8.8% (Berchick, Hood, & Barnett, 2018). In fact, due to what Freudenberg, Goldrick-Rab, and Poppendieck (2019) term “the new economics of college” (p. 1652), the rates of food insecurity among the college student population range from 20-50%, which is considerably higher than the 12% of the general US population. This rising food insecurity (i.e., limited or uncertain access to adequate food, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture) is related to the increase in students from families below the federal poverty line, the increasing number of students who work full-time earning a minimum wage that is not sufficient to cover rising tuition costs, and decreases in funding for higher education programs that support affordable student housing and meal programs (Freudenberg et al., 2019).

In their essay, Bahrainwala notes that colleges and universities cater to what is often named (perhaps problematically) the *traditional* student, the prevalence of which is undoubtedly changing. Data from the 2016 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, indicate that 71% of college students have at least one of the following *nontraditional student* characteristics: financially independent from parents, one or more dependents, single caregiver, no traditional high school diploma, delayed college enrollment, enrolled part time, and/or employed full time during the school year (United States Government Accountability Office, GAO, 2018). In fact, the average college student age in 2016 was 26 years old, a quarter of whom work full time (GAO, 2018). The *traditional* college student, who graduates high school and immediately enrolls full-time into college, depends on their parents financially, and does not work during the school year is no longer the norm.

In a study of nearly 9,000 students in the California public university system, Martinez, Frongillo, Leung, and Ritchie (2018) found a direct relationship between college students’ food

insecurity and their grade point average; students' grade point average was also indirectly affected by poor mental health resulting from food insecurity. Further adding to the cyclical nature of this problem, research indicates that students' appraisal of their student loan debt is significantly associated with poorer mental health; and this relationship is worse for Black/African-American and Hispanic/Latino students than their Asian and White American peers (Tran, Mintert, & Llamas, 2018). Students who struggle with mental health issues do not perform as well academically (Turner & Berry, 2000), are less likely to participate in class (Carton & Goodboy, 2015), and are at risk for suicidal ideation (Eisenberg, Gollust, Golberstein, & Hefner, 2007). In sum, there is a wealth of evidence that suggests that student precarities such as mental health, lack of insurance, food insecurity, and other typically-considered *non-traditional* student characteristics are impacting students' ability to succeed in college. This, of course, begs the question, "What can we do about it?" As such, this essay will focus on how we, as scholars of communication and instruction, can address, mitigate, and even illuminate these issues of precarity in our pedagogy, our scholarship, and our professional lives. This argument is centered on three key premises: (1) it is the responsibility of instructors to care about student precarities, (2) as instructional scholars and experts in communication, we are well prepared to mitigate these precarities in our course structure and pedagogy, as well as (3) in the scholarship we produce and prioritize on teaching and learning.

The Importance of Instructors in Addressing Student Precarities

As teachers, we are often "the front line" when it comes to the issues that our students face (Rudick & Dannels, 2018, p. 407). As representatives of the universities at which we are employed, we see the students (arguably) on the most regular and consistent basis: at minimum, instructors interact with students three hours per week. This does not include the students that

come to see us during our office hours, who pass us in the halls, who work on research projects with us, who are our internship advisees, or whom we mentor in the endless ways in which we engage in out-of-class communication with our students.

When it comes to addressing precarities such as issues with mental health, however, instructors have varying levels of comfort with having these conversations with students. In a study by White and LaBelle (2019), instructors were found to have four approaches, or communicative roles, with such conversations: (a) the *empathic listener*, who is comfortable with interpersonal discussions of mental health with students and providing emotional support, (b) the *referral source*, who is comfortable with allowing students to come to them with mental health issues, but is quick to redirect them to professional resources on or off campus, (c) the *first responder*, who sees their role as a faculty member as being a ‘first alert’ to administration or other offices on campus that can help students in distress, and (d) the *bystander*, who is not comfortable with any type of role in students’ mental health. Although these four roles were identified in the context of mental health, these findings provide an indication of how faculty may feel about approaching the topic(s) of student precarity in their classrooms.

Importantly, although the instructors felt varying levels of comfort and responsibility to have discussions about mental health with their students, all four of the aforementioned roles shared a common concern about such interactions: being unqualified or underprepared to have these conversations. As White and LaBelle (2019) note, these valid concerns illuminate the need for communication training for university faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and administration in addressing student precarities; as well as for universities to have sufficient and appropriate resources to direct students to. Relatedly, scholars of communication and instruction have an opportunity to share their wealth of knowledge on pedagogical strategies that promote

communities of learning through communication training on their own campuses. We turn to a brief overview of such strategies next.

Pedagogy that Creates Supportive Environments

To structure the discussion of pedagogical strategies suggested in the communication and instruction literature, this essay focuses on (a) structural considerations and related (b) teacher behaviors that will create a connected and supportive environment for traditional and nontraditional students alike. As argued by Weber, Martin, and Myers (2011), together with students' characteristics, structural elements and teacher behaviors work to influence students' beliefs about a course, which in turn affect students' learning outcomes.

Structuring the Course to Create a Supportive Environment

In White and LaBelle's (2019) study, instructors addressed issues of students' mental health through two structural elements of their course: statements and information about on-campus resources in the course syllabus, and regular check-ins and/or reminders with students regarding mental health management. For instance, at my academic institution, the following optional statement is encouraged to be included in course syllabi:

Over the course of the semester, you may experience a range of challenges that interfere with your learning, such as problems with friend, family, and or significant other relationships; substance use; concerns about personal adequacy; feeling overwhelmed; or feeling sad or anxious without knowing why. These mental health concerns or stressful events may diminish your academic performance and/or reduce your ability to participate in daily activities. You can learn more about the resources available through Chapman University's Student Psychological Counseling Services here: <https://www.chapman.edu/students/health-and-safety/psychological-counseling/>.

Intended to be included alongside required statements on accommodations for disabilities and harassment and discrimination policies, this statement conveys not only the care and concern of the instructor but also provides an appropriate resource for students who find themselves struggling throughout the semester. Such statements could address other precarities by directing students to information on childcare services or food pantries at the university, if applicable. As others have noted (Goldman, 2018), including such statements in the course syllabus not only establishes a culture of open and supportive communication, but can be used to set boundaries and expectations for appropriate discussions between teachers and students. Together with the use of regular check ins and updates regarding student services and self-care, these actions help to create a supportive environment in the classroom.

Teaching Behaviors that Create a Supportive Environment

In addition to structural elements, the research on communication and instruction suggests a number of effective teaching behaviors that can be used to mitigate issues surrounding student precarities in and outside of the classroom. Although it is not possible to provide an overview of all of these behaviors in this brief essay, a few evidence-based strategies for cultivating supportive and open environments will be highlighted. Namely, research in communication and instruction suggests two avenues for fostering positive communication environments in the classroom: a supportive teacher-student climate and a perception of classroom connectedness among students.

Focused on student perceptions of instructor communication, classroom climate is determined by the social and psychological context in which instructors and students interact in either supportive or defensive ways (Hays, 1970; Rosenfeld & Jarrard, 1985). Teachers' use of behaviors such as self-disclosure (Mazer, Murphy, & Simonds, 2007), constructive feedback

(Kerssen-Griep, Trees, & Hess, 2008), and affinity-seeking strategies (Myers, 1995) result in more supportive communication climates. Instructors also play an important role in developing positive and supportive climates in online courses, by being present, available, understanding, and providing clear instructions and expectations in the course (Kaufmann, Sellnow, & Frisby, 2016). Importantly, students who perceive a positive communication climate are more likely to actively participate, interact, and engage in class as well as collaborate and connect with their peers in and outside of class (Myers et al., 2016).

A second aspect of the classroom environment, classroom connectedness, focuses on the ways in which students connect and interact with one another. Classroom connectedness refers to the perception of an open, supportive, and cooperative communication environment among students (Dwyer et al., 2004). Connectedness has been positively related to a variety of student outcomes such as affective learning (Ifert-Johnson, 2009), cognitive learning (Frisby & Martin, 2010), and participation (Frisby & Martin, 2010). Students who feel connected to their peers are also more likely to participate (Frisby & Martin, 2010) and be more involved in the class (Sidelinger & Booth-Butterfield, 2010), and engage with their teachers for participatory reasons (Myers & Claus, 2012). Although student connectedness is a student-centric construct, research has successfully examined the role that teachers play in developing and maintaining perceptions of classroom connectedness. Teacher behaviors that display confirmation (Sidelinger & Booth-Butterfield, 2010) and nonverbal immediacy (Ifert-Johnson, 2009) are positively related to higher perceptions of connectedness.

As instructors, our primary goal is student learning. We need to focus on the fostering environments that support learning, and eliminating barriers that might prohibit them from doing well in the classroom. This type of supportive, open, and connected environment should

therefore not lead to a permissive and rule-free classroom. In fact, creating structure and clear boundaries will be important in helping students to thrive. Let's take, for instance, the case of the tardy student as discussed in Bahrainwala's essay. Instructors approach to tardiness should be to lead with empathy and help the student form viable solutions to their problem. Instead of immediately deducting from the students' grade for their tardiness, ask a student who is repeatedly late to class to speak with you and work with the student to find reasonable solutions and consequences to the problem. Instructors are most effective when they are both assertive and responsive, as both communication styles are positively associated with students' affective learning (Allen, Long, O'mara, & Judd, 2008), and motivation (McCroskey, Richmond, & Bennett, 2006) in a course. Further, as Johnson, Claus, Goldman, and Sollitto (2017) note, approaching students who engage in misbehaviors (such as tardiness or handing in late work) is a helpful means to assist at-risk or struggling students to identify resources and strategies to help them succeed.

The demographic of the college classroom is changing, and so too must our approach to both teaching and researching effective instruction. Fortunately, as communication and instruction scholars, we have a canon of effective teaching behaviors that can help us to make these needed adjustments to our pedagogy, our approach to teaching, and our communication in and outside of the classroom. The responsibility we share to our students to practice positive teacher behaviors is mirrored by our responsibility to share our disciplinary knowledge of these effective teaching behaviors with our fellow educators across disciplines. Perhaps the most effective way to do this is through our scholarship, to which I turn next.

Scholarship that Illuminates

Despite offering a number of pedagogical strategies and teaching behaviors that can be used to mitigate issues related to student precarity in higher education, the fact is that much of the research in communication and instruction was not conducted with these populations in mind (Rudick & Golsan, 2014; Sprague, 1992). For scholars of communication and instruction, therefore, there is a responsibility to conduct research that will illuminate these issues and develop specific communication strategies for this population to thrive. As communication and instruction scholars, we can and should lead conversations about student precarity. One potential means of doing this is by focusing our efforts on understanding affective learning, or students' feelings, values, and motivations toward course content (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1964). As argued by Waldeck and LaBelle (2016), communication and instruction scholars should embrace their role as experts on affect in the classroom, embracing the crucial role of communication and relationship building in instruction. By focusing our research on specific, easily implemented pedagogical strategies that can best serve students struggling with precarities, we can contribute to a crucial and necessary reshaping of higher education.

One way in which we can do this is by prioritizing research conducted to understand and facilitate learner-centered teaching (Weimer, 2013). Rather than examining teaching as a one-way transmission of what a teacher knows and believes to a passive classroom of students, learner-centered teaching prioritizes student responsibility for mastery in their own learning experience. To do this, learner-centered teaching redistributes power in the classroom to include students in building a classroom community. This might include offering assignment options and allowing students to select the ones they want to complete, asking students to brainstorm and agree on ground rules for classroom dialogue, or even allowing students to select their own assignment due dates or to generate and collectively agree on course policies for in-class

technology use or late work. Other suggestions include surveying students on their primary interests within the content area of the course in order to determine how much time the class will spend on various topics, and inviting students to bring relevant materials they encounter outside of class to enhance in-class discussion (Weimer). In addition to giving students a sense of shared ownership and responsibility in the course, these strategies might help to illuminate issues previously not considered in classroom structure and rules, which Bahrainwala illustrates in her essay as creating a lack of citizenship for nontraditional students at universities.

Learner-centered teaching also includes helping shape students' abilities to think critically and deeply about course material by sharing our own reading, studying, and learning habits with our students (Weimer, 2013). Rather than assuming students' have an effective system for taking notes or studying, take a few minutes at the end of class to discuss effective techniques for understanding material and/or let students share their successful strategies with their peers. Instructors should also give students time to teach one another what they understood about a lesson before moving on to the next. These moments of connection and collaboration not only foster a deeper level of learning, but also help students in the course to build communities of learning that will help connect them to the course and each other. As researchers, we should strive to empirically test the associations of these simple strategies on student outcomes such as motivation, efficacy, and perceived and actual learning.

Indeed, many of these behaviors resonate with research being done in communication and instruction. Specifically, Bolkan and Goodboy (2011) explored teacher behaviors that "inspire and intellectually stimulate" students to be their best (p. 11). They found that students enrolled in courses with teachers practicing the communication behaviors of transformational leadership are more involved, engaged, and participatory in the class (2009). Finn and Schrodtt

(2016) studied discussion, a pedagogical strategy that encourages student responsibility, engagement, and critical reflection. They found that five teacher communication behaviors could contribute to effective discussion (i.e., affirming students' contributions, organizing discussion, provoking discussion, questioning students, and correcting students). These and other studies in communication and instruction offer an example of how our scholarship can be used to forward learner-centered pedagogy across disciplines, and to the benefit of students who experience themselves as non-citizens in one way or another.

Conclusion

The title of this essay terms addressing student precarities as a "responsibility." The suggestions offered in this essay should not be viewed as something to do in excess of already heavy teaching loads or scholarship requirements; instead, prioritizing student precarities in our teaching and scholarship should be viewed as enhancing the work we are already doing. In fact, addressing students' precarities should be viewed as *part of* not *in addition to* our effective teaching. Effective teaching is achieved when teachers strategically utilize behaviors that not only maximize positive student outcomes (i.e., affective learning, cognitive learning, motivation, efficacy/empowerment, interest) but also foster a positive teacher-student relationship, therefore inspiring students to become self-motivated and responsible for their learning in the course.

I also note in my title two positions on the topic: teachers, and scholars. I will add a third role we play: members of our university and academic communities. Ultimately, universities must have the resources to help students in need, such as food pantries, education on managing student loan debt after graduation, and affordable housing and childcare. However, it is also our responsibility as instructors to be knowledgeable of these resources and share them with students. This approach can be as simple as sharing links to existing resources on your course's

web management system or using opportunities in the classroom to let students engage with one another and build systems of support that will connect them to each other and the university. It can also be as involved as being an advocate for students facing such challenges – provide a voice for these students in faculty governance, in our committee work, and in the ways in which we shape our curriculum and advising structures within our academic units. Finally, as our understanding of student precarities grows, so too much our outreach to other educators, both within our discipline and outside of it. These precarities do not just exist in the communication classroom. The myriad ways in which we, as instruction and communication scholars and educators, can engage in mitigating and addressing student precarities are endless. It is our responsibility to engage in them.

References

- Allen, J. L., Long, K. M., O'mara, J., & Judd, B. B. (2008). Students' predispositions and orientations toward communication and perceptions of instructor reciprocity and learning. *Communication Education, 57*, 20–40. doi:10.1080/03634520701670908
- American College Health Association. (2019). National College Health Assessment II: Reference Group Executive Summary Spring 2019. Silver Spring, MD: American College Health Association.
- Berchick, E. R., Hood, E., & Barnett, J. C. (2018). Current population reports. P60-264. Health insurance coverage in the United States: 2017. U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2018/demo/p60-264.pdf>
- Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*, 296-306.
- Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2011). Behavioral indicators of transformational leadership in the classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 12*, 10-18. doi:10.1080/17459435.2011.601520
- Carton, S. T., & Goodboy, A. K. (2015). College students' psychological well-being and interaction involvement in class. *Communication Research Reports, 32(2)*, 180–184. doi:10.1080/08824096.2015.101614
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). College health and safety. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/family/college/index.htm>

- Dwyer, K. K., Bingham, S. G., Carlson, R. E., Prisbell, M., Cruz, A. M., & Fuss, D. A. (2004). Communication and connectedness in the classroom: Development of the Connected Classroom Climate Inventory. *Communication Research Reports, 21*, 264-272. doi:10.1080/08824090409359988
- Eisenberg, D., Downs, M. F., Golberstein, E., & Zivin, K. (2009). Stigma and help seeking for mental health among college students. *Medical Care Research and Review, 66*, 522–541. doi: 10.1177/1077558709335173
- Eisenberg, D., Gollust, S. E., Golberstein, E., & Hefner, J. L. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and suicidality among university students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 77*, 534–542. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.77.4.534
- Finn, A. N. and Schrodt, P., (2016). Teacher discussion facilitation: A new measure and its associations with students' perceived understanding, interest and engagement. *Communication Education, 65*, 445-462. doi:10.1080/03634523.2016.1202997
- Freudenberg, N., Goldrick-Rab, S., & Poppendieck, J. (2019). College students and SNAP: The new face of food insecurity in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 109*, 1652-1658.
- Frisby, B. N., & Martin, M. M. (2010). Instructor-student and student-student rapport in the classroom. *Communication Education, 59*, 146-164. doi: 10.1080/03634520903564362
- Goldman, Z. W. (2018). Responding to mental health issues in the college classroom. *Communication Education, 67*, 399-404. doi:10.1080/03634523.2018.1465191
- Hays, E. R. (1970). Ego-threatening classroom communication: A factor analysis of student perceptions. *Communication Education, 19*(1), 43-48. doi: 10.1080/03634527009377791

- Ifert-Johnson, D. (2009). Connected classroom climate: A validity study. *Communication Research Reports*, 26, 146-157. doi:10.1080/08824090902861622
- Johnson, Z. D., Claus, C. J., Goldman, Z. W., & Sollitto, M. (2017). College student misbehaviors: an exploration of instructor perceptions. *Communication Education*, 66, 54-69. doi: 10.1080/03634523.2016.1202995
- Johnston, H. (2010). Transition from high school to college: Research brief. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED538705.pdf>
- Kaufmann, R., Sellnow, D. D., & Frisby, B. N. (2016). The development and validation of the online learning climate scale (OLCS). *Communication Education*, 65(3), 307-321. doi: 10.1080/03634523.2015.1101778
- Kerssen-Griep, J., Trees, A. R., & Hess, J. A. (2008). Attentive facework during instructional feedback: Key to perceiving mentorship and an optimal learning environment. *Communication Education*, 57(3), 312-332. doi: 10.1080/03634520802027347
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of education objectives: Handbook II. Affective domain*. New York, NY: McKay.
- Martinez, S. M., Frongillo, E. A., Leung, C., & Ritchie, L. (2018). No food for thought: Food insecurity is related to poor mental health and lower academic performance among students in California's public university system. *Journal of Health Psychology*. doi: 10.1177/1359105318783028
- Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on "Facebook": The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and

- classroom climate. *Communication Education*, 56, 1-17. doi:
10.1080/03634520601009710
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Bennett, V. E. (2006). The relationships of student end-of-class motivation with teacher communication behaviors and instructional outcomes. *Communication Education*, 55, 403–414. doi:10.1080/03634520600702562
- Mojtabai, R., Stuart, E. A., Hwang, I., Eaton, W. W., Sampson, N., & Kessler, R. C. (2015). Long-term effects of mental disorders on educational attainment in the national comorbidity survey ten-year follow-up. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 50, 1577–1591. doi: 10.1007/s00127-015-1083-5
- Myers, S. A. (1995). Student perceptions of teacher affinity-seeking and classroom climate. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 192-199. doi:10.1080/08824099509362056
- Myers, S. A., & Claus, C. J. (2012). The relationship between students' motives to communicate with their instructors and classroom environment. *Communication Quarterly*, 60, 386-402. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2012.688672
- Myers, S. A., Goldman, Z. W., Atkinson, J., Ball, H., Carton, S. T., Tindage, M. F., & Anderson, A. O. (2016). Student civility in the college classroom: Exploring student use and effects of classroom citizenship behavior. *Communication Education*, 65, 64-82. doi:
10.1080/03634523.2015.1061197
- Rosenfeld, L. B., & Jarrard, M. W. (1985). The effects of perceived sexism in female and male college professors on students' descriptions of classroom climate. *Communication Education*, 34(3), 205-213. doi: 10.1080/03634528509378608

- Rudick, C. K., & Dannels, D. P. (2018). Yes, and...: continuing the scholarly conversation about mental health stigma in higher education. *Communication Education, 67*(3), 404-408. doi: 10.1080/03634523.2018.1467563
- Rudick, C. K., & Golsan, K. B. (2014). Revisiting the relational communication perspective: Drawing upon Relational Dialectics Theory to map an expanded research agenda for communication and instruction scholarship. *Western Journal of Communication, 78*(3), 255-273. doi: 10.1080/10570314.2014.905796
- Sidelinger, R. J., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2010). Co-constructing student involvement: An examination of teacher confirmation and student-to-student connectedness in the college classroom. *Communication Education, 59*, 165-184. doi:10.1080/03634520903390867
- Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education, 41*, 1-25. doi:10.1080/03634529209378867
- Tran, A. G. T. T., Mintert, J. S., Llamas, J. D., & Lam, C. K. (2018). At what costs? Student loan debt, debt stress, and racially/ethnically diverse college students' perceived health. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 24*(4), 459-469. doi:10.1037/cdp0000207
- Turner, A. L., & Berry, T. R. (2000). Counseling center contributions to student retention and graduation: A longitudinal assessment. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 627-636.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2018). Food insecurity: Better information could help eligible college students access federal food assistance benefits. Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/696254.pdf>

- Waldeck, J. H. & LaBelle, S. (2016). Theoretical and methodological approaches to instructional communication. In P. L. Witt (Ed.), *Handbooks of communication science: Vol. 16. Communication and learning* (pp. 67-101). Berlin, Germany: DeGruyter Mouton.
- Warnecke, A., & Lewine, R.. (2019). First semester academic functioning of college students: The role of stressful and traumatic life events. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(2). doi: 10.20429/ijstl.2019.130208
- Weber, K., Martin, M. M., & Myers, S. A. (2011). The development and testing of the instructional beliefs model. *Communication Education*, 60, 51-74.
- Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- White, A., & LaBelle, S. (2019). A qualitative investigation of instructors' perceived communicative roles in students' mental health management. *Communication Education*, 68(2), 133-155. doi: 10.1080/03634523.2019.1571620