

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Undergraduate students with and without mental health concerns have different perceptions of disclosing mental health challenges to instructors

J. Michael Sizemore III<sup>1</sup>, Bailey Von der Mehden<sup>2\*</sup>, Elisabeth E. Schussler<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Knoxville, Tennessee, United States of America

<sup>2</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Knoxville, Tennessee, United States of America

\* Corresponding author

E-mail: [bvonderm@vols.utk.edu](mailto:bvonderm@vols.utk.edu) (BVDM)

## 29 **Abstract**

30           A significant proportion of undergraduates report having mental health concerns (MHC),  
31 which are associated with reduced academic success. Students with MHC are encouraged to  
32 seek help from their instructors but may not because of perceived negative reactions by  
33 instructors and peers. This suggests stigma about MHC may differentially impact disclosure  
34 perceptions of students with MHC compared with their peers, yet the perceptions of both groups  
35 have been unexplored. This study surveyed students with and without MHC in the same classes  
36 about their hypothetical disclosure of MHC. Students in several introductory biology classes  
37 were asked whether they identified as having MHC, whether they would or would not  
38 hypothetically disclose MHC to an instructor, and why. Thematic analysis identified reasons  
39 underlying their disclosure choices, which were sorted into the three beliefs of the Theory of  
40 Planned Behavior: attitudes, subjective norms, and behavioral control. Of the 803 respondents,  
41 50% self-identified as having MHC. Students with MHC were less likely to say they would  
42 disclose their MHC to an instructor than students without MHC. Students with and without MHC  
43 who said 'yes' to disclosure gave similar reasons aligned with attitude beliefs. Students with  
44 MHC who said 'no' to disclosure perceived that the instructor wouldn't care (attitude beliefs).  
45 Students without MHC who said 'no' to disclosure talked more about keeping their MHC private  
46 (subjective norms beliefs). Students without MHC who said 'it depends' talked more about  
47 impact on their course performance (attitude) than students with MHC. This research indicated  
48 that students with and without MHC do perceive disclosure differently and suggested that  
49 students with MHC focus more on negative instructor reactions, while those without MHC focus  
50 on privacy and performance. These differential perceptions may contribute to students with  
51 MHC seeing disclosure as a negative social cost versus a positive academic benefit.

52

53

## 54 Introduction

55 A growing number of undergraduate students across the United States are being  
56 diagnosed with mental health concerns [1]. Mental health concerns (MHC) can encompass  
57 many different conditions with varying degrees of severity such as anxiety disorders,  
58 depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and neurodevelopmental disorders, to name a few  
59 [2]. Anxiety and depression are some of the most common MHC experienced by undergraduate  
60 students. A national survey of multiple institutions found that 34.9% of undergraduates reported  
61 being diagnosed with anxiety and 27% reported being diagnosed with depression, including  
62 major depression, persistent depressive disorder, and disruptive mood disorder [3]. As student  
63 MHC increased during the pandemic, researchers found negative relationships with academic  
64 motivation and sense of belonging [4], suggesting negative impacts on student success.

65 Undergraduate students experiencing MHC are at an increased risk of negative  
66 outcomes in their courses and degree programs. Prior research at our institution found that  
67 biology students with higher levels of anxiety also reported a higher likelihood of leaving the  
68 biology major [5-6]. Research at other institutions found that students with depression and/or  
69 other MHC have less successful academic outcomes [7-8]. Given these negative impacts,  
70 students are often encouraged to disclose their MHC to their instructors to seek academic  
71 accommodations when they are needed, such as making up in-class work, extending  
72 assignment deadlines, or receiving make-up exams. However, these academic benefits can be  
73 seen by some students as having costs that weigh on students' decisions to disclose.

74 MHC are one example of a concealed stigmatized identity (CSI), which has been  
75 associated with perceived risks to disclosure [9]. CSIs are identities that students may hold that  
76 can be hidden, but if revealed may change the way people view them and their abilities [9]. One  
77 study, for example, found that students with MHC did not want to request accommodations  
78 because they feared stigmatization by their teachers or other students [10]. A study by Busch

79 and colleagues [11] documented that students with depression were concerned about being  
80 treated negatively or being viewed as making an excuse by their instructor. Thus, students with  
81 MHC must weigh the academic benefits of disclosure with the perceived personal costs when  
82 considering whether to disclose their needs and request an accommodation.

83         These disclosure costs and benefits are weighed by students in a classroom context that  
84 is increasingly evenly split between students with and without MHC [1,3]. And even though  
85 awareness about MHC is higher than in the past, almost half of students with MHC feel a  
86 perceived stigma from others [1]. Yet, studies on disclosure of MHC typically only focus on  
87 perceptions of disclosure by students with MHC and not the accompanying perceptions of  
88 students without MHC in the same contexts, making direct comparisons of perceptions difficult.  
89 To directly compare their perceptions, we asked students with and without MHC in several  
90 introductory biology classes about a hypothetical disclosure scenario to investigate whether  
91 beliefs about disclosure, including attitudes, subjective norms, and behavioral control, differed  
92 among these students. If these beliefs do differ, it confirms perceptions of differences by  
93 students with MHC and informs the types of barriers that students with MHC face as they weigh  
94 disclosure decisions.

95

## 96 **Factors impacting MHC disclosure**

97         Institutions of higher education recognize that MHC can create barriers to student  
98 success. To lower these barriers, they encourage students to seek accommodations to reduce  
99 the impact of MHC on their academic outcomes. The process of getting an accommodation  
100 generally involves two steps: (1) working with the institutional disability office to document MHC  
101 needs, and (2) asking a professor for an accommodation [12]. As the number of students with  
102 MHC have risen in the college population, so has the number of students seeking institutional  
103 assistance [1,13]. Yet, there is still a large proportion of students who do not request or receive

104 support for their MHC [13]. For some students, the difficulty of navigating the healthcare system  
105 to receive proper documentation of their MHC means they lack the ability to complete the official  
106 accommodation process [10]. Even with documentation, however, there are still many barriers  
107 to disclosure.

108         Some barriers that students face are logistical challenges related to institutional  
109 accommodation or treatment. Students in one study had challenges explaining what their needs  
110 were and therefore were unable to advocate for themselves to an institutional disability office;  
111 others did not think what would be offered would be helpful [14]. In a study that interviewed 33  
112 engineering students, they articulated several challenges related to the institutional processes  
113 such as ease in accessing treatment, cost, timeliness, and getting the resources needed to treat  
114 their MHC [15]. Even after institutional approvals, the student still bears the responsibility of  
115 invoking the need for an accommodation with their professor [12]. These logistical challenges  
116 are not the only barrier to disclosure, however; many students also struggle with the way others  
117 might view their MHC.

118         Mental illness is one example of a CSI which include aspects of an individual's identity  
119 that are not visibly identifiable and have negative stereotypes or attributes ascribed to them [16-  
120 18]. Despite increased awareness about MHC and some decline in perceived stigma, one study  
121 found 46% of surveyed students with MHC still perceived stigma about mental illness [1]. These  
122 perceptions of stigma may cause students to view disclosure as having a social cost because of  
123 fears of discrimination or disclosure reactions [16]. Another study found that students chose not  
124 to disclose their MHC to instructors or peers to distance themselves from negative stereotypes  
125 about MHC (such as others seeing them as not being capable), therefore maintaining a  
126 preferred social identity [19]. This indicates that despite the encouragement to disclose their  
127 need for accommodations and receive academic assistance, many students are weighing the  
128 benefits they might receive against the social costs disclosure might incur.

129 Two studies illuminate how college students with MHC weigh the potential support they  
130 might receive from disclosure with the concerns about negative impacts of that disclosure.  
131 Busch and colleagues studied how undergraduate students with depression viewed disclosure  
132 to their online biology instructors [11]. These students recognized that disclosure of MHC could  
133 increase student-instructor communication and add flexibility to their workload and deadlines.  
134 However, the perceived cost of disclosing MHC, such as being treated negatively or being  
135 viewed as making an excuse, outweighed the benefits for many students. Kranke and  
136 colleagues found that students often wanted to maintain autonomy and normality, which  
137 contributed to their reluctance to disclose MHC to a professor [20]. However, students were  
138 willing to talk about their MHC with a professor when they perceived the instructor was  
139 supportive and when they felt their academic performance could be jeopardized [20]. The work  
140 of these two studies provided empirical evidence that there are many factors that impact  
141 intentions to disclose MHC, and many of those perceived costs and benefits seem to be aligned  
142 with theoretical aspects of the Theory of Planned Behavior.

143

## 144 **Theoretical model**

145 The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB, Table 1) theorizes that the intent to enact a  
146 particular behavior is guided by individual beliefs about that behavior [21-23]. These beliefs  
147 include an individual's attitudes, subjective norms, and behavioral control related to the behavior  
148 [22]. TPB is an ideal theoretical framework for this study as it is often used by researchers to  
149 understand how people make decisions about health-related behaviors [23]. In the context of  
150 our study, we are studying students' intentions to disclose MHC to an instructor, which should  
151 be informed by students' attitudes about disclosing MHC, the subjective norms they perceive  
152 about MHC, and their behavioral control beliefs about disclosing MHC (Table 1). Importantly,  
153 this theory can be applied to students with and without MHC in our study because we are

154 presenting them with a hypothetical scenario and asking them about their intent to disclose in  
155 that situation.

156

157 **Table 1. The Three Beliefs of Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior.** The three beliefs guiding  
158 the intention to act are shown with examples specific to disclosing MHC to an instructor. These  
159 beliefs inform the intention to disclose to an instructor, which is aligned theoretically with the  
160 behavior of disclosing.

TPB belief	Beliefs, as contextualized in this study
Attitudes	How does the student feel about disclosing MHC to an instructor?
Subjective Norms	How do others perceive the disclosure of MHC?
Behavioral Control	How comfortable is the student with disclosure of MHC?

161

162

163 ‘Attitude’ beliefs are student perceptions about how *they* might feel (positively or  
164 negatively) about disclosing MHC or their perception about the positive or negative outcomes  
165 that might arise from the disclosure. A student may believe, for example, that disclosing MHC  
166 may result in a flexible deadline for an assignment (a positive outcome), while another student  
167 may perceive that they would feel shame in disclosing their MHC (negative feeling). ‘Subjective  
168 norms’ are beliefs about how an individual thinks *others* will view their MHC disclosure or how  
169 others they respect might act in a similar situation. Thus, a student would have a higher  
170 intention to disclose MHC if those they respected in their social network (i.e., friends, family,  
171 peers) viewed disclosure as a positive and/or acceptable behavior. However, they might be less  
172 inclined to disclose if those in their social network do not disclose MHC despite the need to do

173 so. Finally, 'behavioral control' is the extent to which an individual thinks they have the agency  
174 to disclose MHC, based on their confidence and perceived barriers. A student with high self-  
175 confidence about their ability to disclose MHC to an instructor would be more likely to do so. A  
176 student who perceives significant situational barriers to disclosure would be less inclined to do  
177 so.

178 A recent study used TPB to investigate MHC disclosure to instructors among 311  
179 students in a communications course at a small private California University [24]. They found  
180 that all three TPB beliefs were related to intention to disclose, but subjective norms beliefs were  
181 most strongly related to that outcome. They did not disambiguate the results by those with and  
182 without MHC, however. Their findings support that attitude, subjective norms, and behavioral  
183 control beliefs are perceptions a student with or without MHC would use to react to the scenario  
184 about intention to disclose MHC in this study. Even though beliefs vary by individual, there may  
185 be patterns in how particular populations (e.g., students with and without MHC in introductory  
186 biology classes) relate beliefs to particular intentions (e.g., disclosing MHC). Therefore, we  
187 investigated which of the beliefs might drive intent to disclose MHC in our introductory biology  
188 population, and whether those beliefs differed among students with and without MHC, to explore  
189 potential differences in student perceptions about MHC and its disclosure that might indicate the  
190 potential for stigma.

191

## 192 **Rationale**

193 Prior research provided a foundation for investigating the costs and benefits students  
194 with MHC perceive when they are weighing disclosure of MHC to an instructor [11,20].  
195 However, one study was specific only to depression and disclosure in an online setting [11], and  
196 both studies only probed the perceptions of students with MHC. Our study asked students with  
197 and without MHC about their hypothetical intentions to disclose MHC to an instructor and used



198 the reasons for their disclosure choices to determine their TPB beliefs. We posited that students  
199 with and without MHC would make different choices about intention to disclose that were driven  
200 by different TPB beliefs, with students with MHC mentioning subjective norms more often due to  
201 the stigmatized nature of MHC. To explore this hypothesis, we collected data to answer the  
202 following research questions:

203

204 1) Do students with and without MHC make different choices about hypothetical disclosure of  
205 MHC to an instructor?

206 2) What are the differences in disclosure reasoning for students with and without MHC?

207

208 If disclosure intentions and TPB subjective norms differ between students with and without MHC  
209 in introductory biology classes, it would potentially support perceptions of stigma that impact  
210 whether students with MHC disclose support needs to their instructors. Our findings suggested  
211 evidence for the existence of a stigmatized environment related to MHC disclosure and highlight  
212 a need for instructors to create a classroom climate that decreases these perceptions in order to  
213 encourage support for all students.

214

## 215 **Methods**

### 216 **Courses and participants**

217 This study surveyed students in two large introductory biology courses at one research-  
218 intensive university in the southeastern United States. One of the courses was introductory  
219 biology for non-science majors focused on molecules, cells, and body systems, and the other  
220 was introductory biology for majors focused on ecology, evolution, and biodiversity. The non-  
221 science majors' course is taken as a general education credit by students in many majors, but is  
222 also an option for students in nursing, kinesiology, and psychology. The majors' course is the

223 first in a two-course sequence and is typically composed of about 70% STEM majors and 30-  
224 40% biology majors.

225 Surveys were sent to students in five lecture sections of the non-science majors' course  
226 and two lecture sections of the science major's course. All the instructors were non-tenure track  
227 faculty with several year's experience teaching introductory biology courses. There were three  
228 non-science major lecture sections with 225 students and two with 150 students for a total of  
229 975 students in that course. One of the science major sections had 200 students and one had  
230 225 students for a total of 425. This study was approved under institutional review board  
231 protocol #23-07777-XP.

232

## 233 **Data collection**

234 The data for this study were collected during the fall 2023 semester. The researchers  
235 provided instructors of the classes a recruitment email with survey link and consent information  
236 and asked them to forward the information to their students. Students clicked the link to the  
237 survey, read the consent information, and then clicked yes or no to provide permission to use  
238 their data for the research study (as consistent with a waiver of written consent from our  
239 institutional review board). The survey was distributed to students on November 20, 2023 and  
240 was available until December 5th, 2023. Instructors were allowed to incentivize participation by  
241 offering one point of class credit; classes had 800-1,000 points total. We utilized Qualtrics  
242 Survey software (<https://www.qualtrics.com>) as the surveying platform.

243

## 244 **Survey instrument**

245 The survey questions (S1 Table) were developed by the authors and reviewed by  
246 education research experts for clarity and alignment with the research questions. Students were  
247 first asked, "Do you currently identify as having a mental health concern (whether documented

248 or not), e.g., anxiety, generalized anxiety disorder, depression, bipolar disorder, PTSD, panic  
249 disorder, suicidal ideation?” to which they answered yes, no, or prefer not to answer. Students  
250 were then asked, “Hypothetically or not, if you were experiencing a mental health concern that  
251 was or could be impacting a course task (e.g., meeting a course deadline and/or studying for an  
252 exam and/or taking an exam), would you disclose the mental health concern to your instructor?  
253 Explain Why.” They could answer yes, no, or it would depend. In addition to those questions,  
254 there were questions about course type (non-science major or science major course), race  
255 and/or ethnicity, college generation status, year in college, gender, and major (answer choices  
256 for all demographic questions provided in the S1 Table) that were used solely to describe the  
257 sample.

258

## 259 **Data analyses**

260 Partial responses were removed from the dataset, as well as data from students who  
261 were not 18, who did not give consent for their responses to be used in the study, and who  
262 indicated that they preferred not to respond to the disclosure question. After removing these  
263 data, the final sample size was 803 students.

264

### 265 **Do students with and without MHC make different choices about** 266 **hypothetical disclosure of MHC to an instructor?**

267 We sorted students into those who did or did not identify as having MHC and summed  
268 the disclosure choice (yes, no, or prefer not to answer) for each group. Percentages were  
269 calculated for each, and a chi-square test was conducted to identify whether there were  
270 significant differences in the distribution of disclosure choices between students with and  
271 without MHC [25]. Significance was indicated by a p-value less than alpha which was equal to  
272 0.05.

273

274 **What are the differences in disclosure reasoning for students with**  
275 **and without MHC?**

276 Students followed up their disclosure choice with a written explanation describing the  
277 reason for their choice. Two coders (M.S. and E.S.) inductively analyzed student responses to  
278 create categories of responses that could be named and described, in a process called thematic  
279 analysis [26], and then these codes were matched to the TPB beliefs in a deductive process.  
280 E.S. has conducted biology education research on introductory biology classes for over 15  
281 years, including work on the impacts of anxiety. M.S. is an undergraduate researcher interested  
282 in mental health and well-being who worked with the research lab of E.S. to undertake this work.  
283 B.V.D.M. is a graduate student in the lab of E.S. who also conducts research on introductory  
284 biology classes; she reviewed the process of deductively sorting the codes. The researchers  
285 met weekly through the design, data collection, and analysis of the study. They closely  
286 monitored and discussed their interpretation of the data during the analysis phase.

287 Inductive coding was chosen because the research team wanted the codes to reflect  
288 student voice, versus forcing student voice conform to theory (i.e., using TPB to deductively  
289 code our data). Only after codes were inductively identified were they aligned with TPB beliefs.  
290 To conduct thematic analysis, the two coders started by independently reading the responses  
291 and taking notes on common ideas mentioned by the students. The researchers then discussed  
292 their notes to create an initial codebook, which is a tool to guide the assignment of student  
293 responses to specific categories. Codebooks are iteratively refined through rounds of testing by  
294 the coders until they have evidence, they have reached a minimum agreement percentage on  
295 the assignment of codes; for us, this minimum was set at 70% [27]. In this study, the  
296 researchers went through three rounds of independently coding 50 student responses,

297 discussing the responses, and revising the codebook before they felt comfortable moving into  
298 the final coding phase.

299 For final code assignment, half of the student responses (n=400) were coded  
300 independently by M.S. and E.S. Using the codebook, one student response was considered the  
301 coding frame and was assigned as many codes as needed to represent the ideas being  
302 conveyed by the student. Agreement among codes (as assessed by individual codes and not  
303 the entire unit) assigned to the responses was 72% for this set of responses. The coders then  
304 met to discuss the codes they did not agree on and revised coding decisions to reach 100%  
305 agreement. As they worked, they made minor edits to the codebook descriptions and added  
306 more examples. Having met the standard of 70% agreement, E.S. then worked independently to  
307 code the remaining 403 student responses using the newly refined codebook that consisted of  
308 ten codes.

309 To align the codes identified through the inductive analysis with the three beliefs of TPB  
310 (attitude, subjective norms, behavioral control), all authors read the theoretical descriptions of  
311 each belief and independently placed each code from the codebook into a belief group. After  
312 viewing and discussing this initial sorting, the research group decided to create belief prompts to  
313 aid in the placement of the codes. For attitude beliefs, the prompts were: (1) Disclosure could  
314 make me feel \_\_\_ and (2) If I disclose, this could happen \_\_\_. For subjective norms beliefs the  
315 prompts were: (1) Other people think that disclosing is \_\_\_ and (2) People I know \_\_\_. For  
316 behavioral control beliefs, the prompts were: (1) I feel \_\_\_ about my capability to disclose or (2)  
317 Disclosure will be easier or harder because of \_\_\_. The group used these prompts to sort the  
318 codes again and discussed their placement to consensus. The team agreed that there were two  
319 inductive codes that could be aligned with two TPB beliefs; these were called “hybrid” codes.

320 To answer the second research question, the data were sorted into students with and  
321 without MHC, and then each of these groups was subdivided based on their disclosure  
322 intention: yes, no, or it would depend. Within each of these six groups, the percentage of

323 students who mentioned each of the codes was calculated by summing the code incidence and  
324 dividing by the number of students in the group. In presenting these data, we highlighted >10%  
325 differences in code prevalence between students with and without MHC and removed any  
326 codes with less than 5% prevalence across all six groups.

327

## 328 Results

329 There were 803 respondents to the survey (Table 2). Of these, 422 were from the non-  
330 science majors' course (43% response rate) and 381 were from the science majors' course  
331 (90% response rate). The sample overall was majority women (76.6%), white (81.7%),  
332 continuing generation (85.6%), first-year students (66.3%). Across the entire sample, 50% of the  
333 respondents self-reported MHC; with 49% of the students in the non-science majors course  
334 indicating MHC and 50% in the science majors' course.

335

336 **Table 2. Demographic characteristics of the survey respondents.**

Sociodemographic Characteristics		% (N = 803)
Gender	Woman	76.6
	Man	22.6
	Genderqueer	0.2
	Preferred not to respond	0.5
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	4.6
	Black	3.4
	Hispanic, Latine, or Spanish origin	2.9
	Multiracial	5.9

	White	81.7
	Other	0.5
	Preferred not to respond	0.9
College Generation	Continuing gen	85.6
	First-gen	13.3
	Does not know or preferred not to respond	1.0
Year in College	First	66.3
	Second	23.4
	Third	6.7
	Fourth	2.2
	Fifth +	0.9
	Preferred not to respond	0.5
Major	STEM major	58.0
	Non-STEM Major	41.4
	Preferred not to respond	0.5

337

338

339 **Do students with and without MHC make different choices**

340 **about hypothetical disclosure of MHC to an instructor?**

341 For the hypothetical question of whether MHC would be disclosed to an instructor,  
342 student responses (yes, no, or it would depend) differed significantly between students with and  
343 without self-reported MHC ( $\chi^2(2, N = 803) = 53.47; p < 0.001$ ). Students with and without MHC  
344 were almost identical in their selection of the response 'it would depend' (56% and 57%,

345 respectively) (Table 3). However, those who self-identified as having MHC were less likely to  
346 say they would disclose MHC ('yes') to an instructor (9%) compared with those without MHC  
347 (25%). For those who self-identified as having MHC, 35% said they would not disclose to their  
348 instructor, while 18% of those without MHC said they would not disclose to an instructor.

349

350 **Table 3. Comparison of disclosure choices between students with and without self-**  
351 **reported MHC.**

	Yes MHC (50%, <i>n</i> =398)	No MHC (50%, <i>n</i> =405)
It would depend	56% ( <i>n</i> =223)	57% ( <i>n</i> =231)
Yes	9% ( <i>n</i> =34)	25% ( <i>n</i> =100)
No	35% ( <i>n</i> =141)	18% ( <i>n</i> =74)

352

353

354 **What are the differences in disclosure reasoning for students**  
355 **with and without MHC?**

356

357 **Disclosure codes**

358 The inductive codes from student responses were sorted into the three TPB belief  
359 categories and one hybrid category: 1) Attitude beliefs, 2) Subjective Norms, 3) Behavioral  
360 Control beliefs, and 4) Hybrid beliefs (Table 4). There were five inductive codes in the attitude  
361 beliefs category, two in the subjective norms category, one in the behavioral control beliefs  
362 category, and two in the hybrid beliefs category. Brief descriptions of each TPB belief and code,  
363 along with an exemplar student quote, are shown in Table 4.



364

365 **Table 4. Inductive codes generated from student responses, organized into TPB beliefs.**

366 The codes represent common categories about why students would or would not disclose MHC

367 to an instructor.

TPB belief category and inductive codes	Exemplar student quote for each code
<p data-bbox="183 569 760 674">ATTITUDE: how a student felt about disclosing or about the disclosure outcome.</p> <p data-bbox="183 705 760 873">Prompts: (1) Disclosure could make me feel ___ and (2) If I disclose, this could happen ___.</p> <ol data-bbox="237 974 760 1745" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="237 974 760 1276">1. Embarrassing - student said disclosing would make them feel ashamed or nervous; said it might make MHC worse because of increased anxiety.</li><li data-bbox="237 1377 760 1745">2. Instructor won't help - student said instructor likely wouldn't provide help or accommodation, so there was no use in disclosing; some said it may be because they lacked documentation or diagnosis to validate MHC.</li></ol>	<p data-bbox="805 974 1404 1209"><i>"I know that many instructors are very understanding, but letting one know you need help or are behind because of mental health almost feels embarrassing."</i></p> <p data-bbox="805 1377 1404 1482"><i>"I feel like a lot of professors would not really do anything about it."</i></p>

<p>3. Instructor aware and might help - Student said they would disclose to instructor early in the semester in case they needed help later; thought instructor would help, support, accommodate; they would disclose because mental health is important.</p> <p>4. Impact on performance - student said they would disclose if it was impacting success, learning, or attendance in a class.</p> <p>5. Instructor may or may not care - student said it would depend on whether they thought the instructor would believe them / think the concern was valid; or whether they thought the instructor would care, understand, show concern and respect, listen, and take them seriously.</p>	<p><i>“I would inform each of my professors about it so we could hopefully do what it takes to get around it.”</i></p> <p><i>“It would depend on how much it was impacting the class.”</i></p> <p><i>“But sometimes instructors don't take that seriously and say that you should've known you would struggle and should've come to them sooner...”</i></p>
<p>SUBJECTIVE NORMS: how a student thought others might view their disclosure or</p>	

<p>act themselves. Prompts: (1) Other people think that disclosing is ___ and (2) People I know ___.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Private to student - student would prefer not to disclose because it is a personal concern, not the instructor's; student said they would not be comfortable talking about it.</li><li>2. Perceptions others have - student wouldn't want to disclose because others may view an accommodation as an excuse or special treatment and then see you differently or "less than" in some way.</li></ol>	<p><i>"I typically think of this as private information that is not to be discussed."</i></p> <p><i>"I would tell my teacher, but would try to meet in person so that they didn't think it was an excuse and that I was slacking off on that assignment."</i></p>
<p>BEHAVIORAL CONTROL: how a student felt about their abilities or barriers to disclosure.</p> <p>Prompts: (1) I feel ___ about my capability to disclose or (2) Disclosure will be easier or harder because of ___.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Approachability of instructor - student</li></ol>	<p><i>"Some professors are more open to helping</i></p>

<p>said it would depend on how comfortable they were with instructor, how open the instructor is to talking with students.</p>	<p><i>students...”</i></p>
<p>HYBRID: combination of two of the TPB belief categories</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Severity of MHC - student said they would only disclose if it was having a major impact on attendance; if it was an illness with broad impacts; they often talked about this as a last resort. (hybrid of attitude / control)</li> <li>2. Won't let it impact - student said there would be no need to disclose because they wouldn't let it impact their performance or they would deal with the consequences on their own. (hybrid of subjective norms or control)</li> </ol>	<p><i>“It would depend on what I am going through, as some situations can be more severe than others.”</i></p> <p><i>“I have had issues before and personally I feel that getting used to them, doing what you can to help, or simply dealing with the consequences is something that has to be done on your own.”</i></p>

368

369

370

ATTITUDE codes were beliefs students had about how they might feel if they disclosed their MHC to an instructor (embarrassing) or what outcome they might expect (instructor won't

371 help, instructor aware and might help, impact on performance, instructor won't care). The code  
372 'embarrassing' was the perception that having to disclose MHC might make the student feel  
373 ashamed or nervous. A few students mentioned that disclosing could make their MHC worse  
374 because of the anxiety it would cause them. The code of 'instructor won't help' was when  
375 students said they would not disclose to an instructor because they did not think the instructor  
376 would do anything; students mentioned that this might be because of strict course policies or  
377 their lack of MHC documentation. The code of 'instructor aware and might help' was when  
378 students said they should disclose their MHC to their instructor because MHC advocacy was  
379 important, and the instructor needed to know about their concerns. Many students said  
380 specifically that this was important because the instructor would then work to provide resources  
381 or assistance to help. The 'impact on performance' code was a risk / benefit assessment the  
382 student was making to decide how much class work they could miss before they would need to  
383 ask an instructor for help. The code of 'instructor won't care' was based on student perceptions  
384 of negative reactions by the instructor in response to their disclosure. Some students talked  
385 about the instructor not believing that the MHC was real or that it would cause a problem; some  
386 said that the instructor would not show care or respect or take their concern seriously once they  
387 disclosed the MHC.

388         SUBJECTIVE NORMS codes were beliefs students had about how others might view  
389 their disclosure or what others they respected might do in the same situation. The code of  
390 'private to student' was when students talked about MHC being a personal concern that they  
391 would not want to disclose to an instructor. Students often talked about the comfort level of  
392 disclosure related to privacy. The code of 'perceptions others have' was when students talked  
393 about whether disclosure and subsequent accommodation might result in them being viewed by  
394 their peers or instructor differently because of the special treatment they had received; they  
395 were particularly concerned about it making them appear "less than" others.

396 BEHAVIORAL CONTROL were beliefs about conditions that made it easier or harder for  
397 the student to disclose, or their capability to disclose. The only code in this category was  
398 ‘approachability of instructor’ which was when students talked about how open the instructor  
399 seemed to be with regards to talking with students about concerns like MHC.

400 There were two HYBRID codes which were student beliefs that seemed to cut across  
401 two of the belief categories above. The code of ‘severity of MHC’ was when the participant  
402 talked about their decision to disclose depending on the type of MHC or how severe the MHC  
403 was because that would determine how much school they might miss. This could have been  
404 based on a perceived outcome, but students also talked about this being out of their control, so  
405 they lacked agency. The code of ‘won’t let it impact’ was when students said they would not  
406 need to disclose MHC because it was not something to be used as an excuse to not do their  
407 work; they would do the work regardless of the MHC. On one hand this was showing agency,  
408 but there was also a hint of not wanting to disclose which could reflect perception of a norm.

409

## 410 **Patterns in disclosure explanations**

411 The prevalence of each code, aligned with their TPB belief categories and sorted by  
412 disclosure choice and MHC status, is shown on a heat map (Fig 1). This allows for two  
413 interpretations: (1) which codes and TPB beliefs are driving disclosure choices overall and (2)  
414 how students with and without MHC reason may differ in their disclosure reasoning.

415

416 **Fig 1. Heat map of disclosure reasoning prevalence by student groups.** The heat map  
417 shows the relative prevalence of codes explaining student reasoning for their disclosure  
418 choices, sorted by disclosure choice and whether they do or do not have MHC. The codes are  
419 aligned by the TPB belief categories on the left. Percent prevalence of codes are increasingly  
420 darker with higher relevance, as shown by the key on the right.

421

422            *Disclosure explanations overall* - For each disclosure choice (yes, no, it would depend)  
423 there was one most prevalent code. Students who said they would disclose to an instructor  
424 mostly talked about the need to proactively make the instructor aware of their needs, which was  
425 a TPB attitude belief. For example, one student said, “As someone with anxiety, I always  
426 disclose my health concerns with my professors, as I get extra time for tests and quizzes. I let  
427 them know at the beginning of the semester....” Students who said they would *not* disclose to an  
428 instructor mostly talked about the subjective norms belief of privacy. One student said, “I feel  
429 like society does not view it as a valid reason to miss an assignment.” Students who selected ‘it  
430 would depend’ as their disclosure choice mostly talked about performance impacts, an attitude  
431 belief. One student, for example, said, “I would always disclose this with my professor if I felt it  
432 was impacting my performance. My academic success is my priority and it is important to be  
433 open if something could be interfering with that.” Although these codes were the most  
434 commonly voiced for each disclosure choice, there were differences between students with and  
435 without MHC.

436            *Disclosure reasoning between students with and without MHC* - For students who said  
437 they **would disclose** to an instructor, students with and without MHC had similar code  
438 percentages suggesting similar beliefs about their disclosure choice. For students who said they  
439 **would not disclose**, we highlight three differences. Students without MHC were more likely to  
440 say that MHC were private to them (47.30%) in comparison to students with MHC (34.75%).  
441 Conversely, students with MHC were more likely to say that the instructor would not care or  
442 believe them (21.28%) compared to only 10.81% of students without MHC. One student with  
443 MHC voiced, “Many professors do not understand mental illnesses or simply are not concerned  
444 about it.” Finally, students with MHC were also more likely to say that the instructor would not  
445 help them (17.02%) compared to students without MHC (6.76%). As one student with MHC  
446 indicated, “I have always seen these requests ignored despite having a professional diagnosis.”

447 For students who said **disclosure “would depend,”** there was only one code difference:  
448 students without MHC were more likely (35.93%) than students with MHC (25.11%) to mention  
449 that an impact on their performance was important to their disclosure.

450

## 451 **Discussion**

452 Collegiate courses are increasingly an equal mix of students with and without MHC [1,4].  
453 In the introduction we posited that students with and without MHC in introductory biology  
454 courses would view disclosure intention differently and have different beliefs about subjective  
455 norms that may indicate a stigma associated with disclosure for students with MHC. Our  
456 prediction that students with and without MHC would have different disclosure intentions was  
457 affirmed; students with MHC were less likely to say they would disclose an MHC to an  
458 instructor. We studied the reasons behind these disclosure choices and found that students who  
459 said they would disclose had similar reasons regardless of MHC status. The reasons why  
460 students would not disclose or were uncertain about it differed across MHC status in ways we  
461 did not predict. Those with MHC expressed more concerns about how an instructor would  
462 negatively react to their disclosure (attitude belief), while those without MHC were more  
463 concerned about privacy (subjective norms belief) or performance impact (attitude belief). These  
464 findings provided evidence that students with and without MHC in the same classes perceive  
465 disclosure differently and suggest that attitude and subjective norms beliefs drive these  
466 differences [21-22]. Students without MHC being concerned about keeping MHC private and  
467 students with MHC being concerned about instructor reactions suggests the reality that stigmas  
468 exist in these introductory biology classes and may temper the climate for students with MHC.  
469



470 **Do students with and without MHC make different choices**  
471 **about hypothetical disclosure of MHC to an instructor?**

472 In our study, students with MHC were less likely to say they would disclose to an  
473 instructor compared to their peers without MHC. Others have documented a reluctance by  
474 students with MHC to disclose, even in the face of increasing support and awareness about  
475 MHC [13]. However, our study is the first, to our knowledge, to directly compare differences in  
476 disclosure intentions between students with and without MHC. Interestingly, we found that more  
477 than half of students with *and* without MHC indicated that their disclosure “would depend” on  
478 other factors. This indicates that students without MHC can envision barriers and benefits to  
479 disclosure of MHC, although our results suggest they may be doing so differently from students  
480 with MHC. Almost 10% of students with MHC said they would disclose. Some research has  
481 suggested that prior disclosure makes it more likely for a student to say they would disclose  
482 [24], however, the nature of these prior disclosure experiences matters, with negative prior  
483 experiences leading to increased reluctance to disclose in the future [28]. Given this, studies  
484 focused on how prior disclosure impacts future disclosure would help understand the extent to  
485 which those experiences are contributing to perceptions of stigma in introductory classrooms.

486  
487 **What are the differences in disclosure reasoning for students**  
488 **with and without MHC?**

489  
490 **Attitude and subjective norms beliefs were most prevalent in shaping**  
491 **disclosure perceptions**

492 We aligned our codes of students' rationale for disclosure with the Theory of Planned  
493 Behavior (TPB) [21-23]. We found that for our prompt and this population, attitude and  
494 subjective norms beliefs were most salient to students' intention to disclose. Attitude beliefs  
495 were most often related to the intention to disclose and to the potential positive outcomes from  
496 working with a professor to accommodate MHC disruptions or revealing an MHC when course  
497 performance was being impacted. These results suggest the most prevalent benefit students  
498 were weighing was the motivation to perform well in these courses. Subjective norms beliefs  
499 were most commonly related to a perception that MHC were private and were one of the leading  
500 rationales cited by students who said they would not disclose. Given that the disclosure prompt  
501 was a scenario about MHC impacting course performance, about a third of students were willing  
502 to suffer academic consequences for the sake of privacy. Our results differed slightly from the  
503 recent quantitative analysis relating TPB to instructor disclosure intentions; they found that all  
504 three beliefs were related to intention to disclose, with subjective norms being most strongly  
505 related [24]. However, their data collection involved forced choice responses versus our open-  
506 ended prompts, making the results difficult to compare. The disclosure climate at a small private  
507 college in California may also be significantly different than at a large research-intensive  
508 institution in the southeast. We suggest that there is a need for more research on MHC  
509 disclosure guided by TPB. Specific to our study, we see a need to explore cost / benefit  
510 tradeoffs between attitude and subjective norms beliefs such as performance and privacy.  
511 These could be explored using scenarios with various academic impacts and accommodations  
512 to better understand when students are willing to break norms for potential positive outcomes.  
513

#### 514 **Disclosure reasoning differed by disclosure choice and MHC status**

515 We found few differences in disclosure reasoning among students who said yes to  
516 disclosure, regardless of MHC status. These students often indicated proactive help-seeking,

517 talking about their intention to disclose their MHC to the instructor in advance of any problems  
518 so they could work together in the future. Very few of these students talked about concerns  
519 related to privacy. This mirrors findings by Busch and colleagues [11] that some students saw  
520 the benefits of building relationships with professors to support MHC. Although disclosure  
521 reasoning was similar among those with and without MHC, there were far fewer students with  
522 MHC who said yes to disclosure (9% of students with MHC compared to 25% without MHC),  
523 and disclosure overall was low across both groups. This aligns with reports of low rates of  
524 disclosure even as MHC support has increased [13], but also indicates that even students  
525 without MHC are reluctant to disclose. Interviewing students who are willing to disclose may  
526 provide more insight into whether they see fewer barriers, whether they see them differently, or  
527 how they cope with disclosure concerns that may inform work on interventions to increase  
528 disclosure.

529         Students with and without MHC differed in disclosure reasoning when it came to why  
530 they said 'no' or 'it would depend.' For students with MHC, the perception that instructors may  
531 not care and the belief that the instructor would not help following disclosure was a significant  
532 hindrance to disclosure. Similarly, Busch and colleagues [11] also found that students with  
533 depression feared negative reactions from their instructors. Research has found that students  
534 who had had negative disclosure experiences in the past were less likely to view future  
535 disclosure positively [28], suggesting that past experiences could have driven perceptions in this  
536 study as well. Previous studies also found that students weigh stigma and fear of negative  
537 consequences when deciding whether to disclose MHC to instructors [11,17-18,20], and while  
538 our study found this as well, these perceptions were higher in students without MHC than those  
539 with MHC. As the incidence of MHC have risen in the student population over time, awareness  
540 has also risen about them, and there has been some reduction in perceived stigma among  
541 those with MHC [1]. Our study may have reflected these changes, with students with MHC  
542 voicing fewer subjective norms concerns compared with those without MHC; this may be

543 because institutional accommodation processes already required them to reveal MHC, making it  
544 more of a norm for them [12]. However, the findings that those without MHC were reluctant to  
545 disclose because of subjective norms beliefs hints at the continuing negative perceptions about  
546 MHC held by peers of students with MHC. Overall, the reasons why students might be hesitant  
547 to disclose MHC hint at the ways in which students with MHC navigate in a class environment  
548 where they do not always trust instructors to help and have peers who may not understand their  
549 concerns.

550

## 551 **Supporting students in introductory biology with MHC**

552 Half of the students in each class we surveyed self-reported MHC. These results reflect  
553 the continuing rate of mental health challenges among undergraduate students [1,3] and are of  
554 concern because of the documented negative impacts MHC can have on student success [5-8].  
555 Although there are many institutional units to support these students, instructors play an  
556 important role in how they create classroom climates of support, inclusion, and belonging.  
557 Instructors can build a positive climate early through inclusive policies and syllabi that  
558 communicate empathy and support [29-30]. Classroom communication that welcomes  
559 feedback, promotes dialogue, and conveys approachability and relatability may help students  
560 feel comfortable disclosing concerns because it conveys that the instructor is caring [31]. Anti-  
561 stigma interventions [32] might also be considered as ways to signal openness to hearing  
562 student concerns, but also build understanding across students with and without MHC in a  
563 class. It is also likely that there are different rates of student disclosure among different  
564 introductory biology courses; future research could identify courses where students feel more  
565 comfortable disclosing and identify features that could be emulated in other courses. Care  
566 needs to be taken, however, to support instructors who are already experiencing their own

567 levels of burnout and MHC so as not to add additional workload that could decrease their  
568 effectiveness.

569

## 570 **Limitations and future work**

571 The sample for this study was drawn from a single institution, constraining our ability to  
572 generalize to the larger population of students at other institutions. This study was also  
573 conducted only in introductory biology courses, which are a unique sub-population at our  
574 institution and further bound any inferences we can make. Studies in other classes and at other  
575 institutions, particularly with a more representative sample of students from historically  
576 marginalized groups, would provide additional evidence about whether the differential student  
577 reasoning for disclosure are generalizable to a broader population.

578 This study focused on students' intent to disclose versus actual disclosure. Although  
579 theory suggests a tight relationship between the two, actual disclosure was not studied, nor  
580 could it be given the lack of MHC in half the respondent population. Asking students without  
581 MHC to imagine a scenario where they have MHC may not represent how they would actually  
582 act. However, our results do hint at the differential assumptions held by each group, which  
583 highlight a need to better understand not just reasoning behind disclosure, but also where those  
584 ideas originate. A study on this could probe the relative impacts of prior disclosure, perceptions  
585 of stigma, motivation to perform well in a course, and instructor trust [33], among others.

586

## 587 **Conclusion**

588 Given the percentage of students with MHC at undergraduate institutions [1] and the  
589 negative impacts MHC can have on their collegiate performance, it is important to understand  
590 how their unique perspectives and experiences may differentially impact their success. This  
591 study suggests that students with MHC have different perceptions compared to their peers

592 without MHC about disclosing an MHC to an instructor. Students with MHC indicated negative  
593 perceptions of instructor reactions to disclosure that could act as barriers to help-seeking. Their  
594 peers without MHC were concerned more about privacy and performance when considering the  
595 same hypothetical disclosure question. This suggests students with MHC navigate in an  
596 environment where they may assume less understanding from their instructors and interact with  
597 peers who think MHC should be private. Future research should focus on factors to bridge these  
598 classroom perceptual differences to ensure an environment where students with MHC may  
599 disclose their needs without fear of negative judgment or inadequate assistance.

600

601

## 602 **Acknowledgements**

603 We thank the instructors and students who helped us collect data, feedback on the  
604 manuscript from Dr. Maryrose Weatherton and Hope Ferguson, and inspiration for the project  
605 from Drs. Kelly McDonald and Cathy Ishikawa.

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

## 613 **References**

- 614 1. Lipson SK, Lattie EG, Eisenberg D. Increased rates of mental health service utilization by US  
615 college students: 10-year population-level trends (2007–2017). *Psychiatric services*. 2019 Jan  
616 1;70(1):60-3.
- 617 2. World Health Organization. Mental disorders; 2022. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders)  
618 [room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders)
- 619 3. American College Health Association. American College Health Association-National College  
620 Health Assessment III: Undergraduate Student Reference Group Data Report Spring 2022.  
621 Silver Spring, MD: American College Health Association; 2022. 2024 Apr 08 [Cited 2024  
622 September 2]. Available from: [https://www.acha.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/NCHA-](https://www.acha.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/NCHA-III_SPRING_2022_UNDERGRAD_REFERENCE_GROUP_DATA_REPORT.pdf)  
623 [III\\_SPRING\\_2022\\_UNDERGRAD\\_REFERENCE\\_GROUP\\_DATA\\_REPORT.pdf](https://www.acha.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/NCHA-III_SPRING_2022_UNDERGRAD_REFERENCE_GROUP_DATA_REPORT.pdf)
- 624 4. Marler EK, Bruce MJ, Abaoud A, Henrichsen C, Suksatan W, Homvisetvongsa S, Matsuo H.  
625 The impact of COVID-19 on university students' academic motivation, social connection, and  
626 psychological well-being. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. 2024  
627 Sep;10(3):320.
- 628 5. England BJ, Brigati JR, Schussler EE. Student anxiety in introductory biology classrooms:  
629 Perceptions about active learning and persistence in the major. *PloS one*. 2017 Aug  
630 3;12(8):e0182506.
- 631 6. England BJ, Brigati JR, Schussler EE, Chen MM. Student anxiety and perception of difficulty  
632 impact performance and persistence in introductory biology courses. *CBE—Life Sciences*  
633 *Education*. 2019;18(2):ar21.

- 634 7. Deroma VM, Leach JB, Leverett JP. The relationship between depression and college  
635 academic performance. *College Student Journal*. 2009 Jun 1;43(2):325-35.
- 636 8. Bruffaerts R, Mortier P, Kiekens G, Auerbach RP, Cuijpers P, Demyttenaere K, Green JG,  
637 Nock MK, Kessler RC. Mental health problems in college freshmen: Prevalence and academic  
638 functioning. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2018 Jan 1;225:97-103.
- 639 9. Chaudoir SR, Quinn DM. Revealing concealable stigmatized identities: The impact of  
640 disclosure motivations and positive first-disclosure experiences on fear of disclosure and  
641 well-being. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2010 Sep;66(3):570-84.
- 642 10. Salzer MS, Wick LC, Rogers JA. Familiarity with and use of accommodations and supports  
643 among postsecondary students with mental illnesses. *Psychiatric services*. 2008 Apr;59(4):370-  
644 5.
- 645 11. Busch CA, Mohammed TF, Nadile EM, Witt ML, Vargas C, Tran M, Wolf JG, Brister D,  
646 Cooper KM. Costs and benefits of undergraduates revealing depression to online science  
647 instructors. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*. 2023;22(1):ar9.  
648
- 649 12. Gin LE, Guerrero FA, Cooper KM, Brownell SE. Is active learning accessible? Exploring the  
650 process of providing accommodations to students with disabilities. *CBE—Life Sciences*  
651 *Education*. 2020;19(4):es12.  
652
- 653 13. Abelson S, Lipson SK, Eisenberg D. Mental health in college populations: A multidisciplinary  
654 review of what works, evidence gaps, and paths forward. *Higher education: Handbook of theory*  
655 *and research*. 2022 Feb 23;37:133-238.  
656



- 657 14. Marshak L, Van Wieren T, Ferrell DR, Swiss L, Dugan C. Exploring barriers to college  
658 student use of disability services and accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary Education*  
659 and disability. 2010;22(3):151-65.  
660
- 661 15. Wright CJ, Wilson SA, Hammer JH, Hargis LE, Miller ME, Usher EL. Mental health in  
662 undergraduate engineering students: Identifying facilitators and barriers to seeking help. *Journal*  
663 *of Engineering Education*. 2023 Oct;112(4):963-86.  
664
- 665 16. Quinn DM, Earnshaw VA. Understanding concealable stigmatized identities: The role of  
666 identity in psychological, physical, and behavioral outcomes. *Social Issues and Policy Review*.  
667 2011 Dec;5(1):160-90.  
668
- 669 17. Quinn DM, Williams MK, Quintana F, Gaskins JL, Overstreet NM, Pishori A, Earnshaw VA,  
670 Perez G, Chaudoir SR. Examining effects of anticipated stigma, centrality, salience,  
671 internalization, and outness on psychological distress for people with concealable stigmatized  
672 identities. *PloS one*. 2014 May 9;9(5):e96977.  
673
- 674 18. Cooper KM, Gin LE, Brownell SE. Depression as a concealable stigmatized identity: What  
675 influences whether students conceal or reveal their depression in undergraduate research  
676 experiences?. *International Journal of STEM education*. 2020 Dec;7:1-8.  
677
- 678 19. Gjesfjeld CD, Kahn JH. Self-disclosure of mental illness in the college classroom: the role of  
679 stigma and avoidance. *Social Work in Mental Health*. 2024 Jan 2;22(1):1-6.  
680

681 20. Kranke D, Jackson SE, Taylor DA, Anderson-Fye E, Floersch J. College student disclosure  
682 of non-apparent disabilities to receive classroom accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary*  
683 *Education and Disability*. 2013;26(1):35-51.

684

685 21. Ajzen I. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood cliffs.  
686 1980. Ajzen I. *The Theory of planned behavior*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*  
687 *Processes*. 1991.

688

689 22. Ajzen I. *The Theory of planned behavior*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*  
690 *Processes*. 1991.

691

692 23. Montano DE, Kasprzyk D. *Theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behavior, and the*  
693 *integrated behavioral model*. *Health behavior: Theory, research and practice*. 2015 Jul  
694 1;70(4):231.

695

696 24. White A, Ball H, LaBelle S. Student intentions to engage instructors in mental health-related  
697 conversations: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of American College*  
698 *Health*. 2024 Mar 23;72(3):914-22.

699

700 25. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for  
701 *Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria; 2023. [Cited 2024 November 1]. Available from:  
702 <https://www.R-project.org/>.

703

704 26. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in*  
705 *psychology*. 2006 Jan 1;3(2):77-101.

706

- 707 27. Krippendorff K. Reliability in content analysis: Some common misconceptions and  
708 recommendations. *Human communication research*. 2004 Jul;30(3):411-33.  
709
- 710 28. Meluch AL, Starcher SC. College student concealment and disclosure of mental health  
711 issues in the classroom: Students' perceptions of risk and use of contextual criteria.  
712 *Communication Studies*. 2020 Oct 19;71(5):768-82.  
713
- 714 29. Meyers S, Rowell K, Wells M, Smith BC. Teacher empathy: A model of empathy for  
715 teaching for student success. *College Teaching*. 2019 Jul 3;67(3):160-8.  
716
- 717 30. Gin LE, Scott RA, Pfeiffer LD, Zheng Y, Cooper KM, Brownell SE. It's in the syllabus... or is  
718 it? How biology syllabi can serve as communication tools for creating inclusive classrooms at a  
719 large-enrollment research institution. *Advances in Physiology Education*. 2021 Apr 7.  
720
- 721 31. Miller AC, Mills B. 'If They Don't Care, I Don't Care': Millennial and Generation Z Students  
722 and the Impact of Faculty Caring. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. 2019  
723 Oct;19(4):78-89.  
724
- 725 32. Shahwan S, Lau JH, Goh CM, Ong WJ, Tan GT, Kwok KW, Samari E, Lee YY, Teh WL,  
726 Seet V, Chang S. The potential impact of an anti-stigma intervention on mental health help-  
727 seeking attitudes among university students. *BMC psychiatry*. 2020 Dec;20:1-4.  
728
- 729 33. Cavanagh AJ, Chen X, Bathgate M, Frederick J, Hanauer DI, Graham MJ. Trust, growth  
730 mindset, and student commitment to active learning in a college science course. *CBE—Life*  
731 *Sciences Education*. 2018;17(1):ar10.  
732

## 733 **Supporting information**

734 **S1 Table. Survey questions and associated purpose for the study.**

735

736

737

738

739

	Would Disclose?	Yes		No		Maybe	
	MHC?	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
TPB Theme	Code						
Attitude							
	Embarrassing	0	1.00	5.67	10.81	7.62	3.03
	Instructor won't help	2.94	0	17.02	6.76	9.42	3.46
	Instructor aware and might help	64.71	71.00	0	1.35	4.93	9.09
	Impact on performance	38.24	39.00	3.55	0	25.11	35.93
	Instructor may/may not care	5.88	7.00	21.28	10.81	17.49	7.79
Subjective Norms							
	Private to student	5.88	0	34.75	47.30	18.83	16.02
	Perceptions others have	2.94	0	17.02	12.16	8.97	4.33
Behavioral Control							
	Approachability of Instructor	2.94	9.00	7.09	5.41	10.31	14.72
Hybrid							
	Severity of MHC	0	1.00	0	2.70	19.28	23.81
	Won't let it impact	0	0	19.86	13.51	13.90	7.36

