
Training Faculty and Staff to Interact with DACA Students: Applying Communication Privacy Management Theory to Prevent Privacy Turbulence

Maria Chavez Revak

ABSTRACT

College students with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) status face new stressors because of the current state of American politics and the Trump Administration's views on immigration. Recent efforts to end the program have led to DACA recipients no longer feeling safe in their residency status in the U.S. and this holds especially true for the 160,000 DACA students attending college on U.S. campuses. Through the framework of Communication Privacy Management Theory, this paper will propose a training program for college faculty and staff to improve their communication with DACA students. Specifically, the program will instruct college faculty and staff how to interact with DACA students so that they do not experience real or perceived invasions of privacy regarding their DACA status or the status of their loved ones.

Keywords: DACA, Communication Privacy Theory (CPM), legal violence, boundary turbulence, andragogy, self-directed learning

There is a strong need for additional research examining communication between college faculty and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students. The current state of American politics and the Trump Administration's views on immigration has led to DACA students living in fear and experiencing feelings of hopelessness (Nock, 2017). These DACA students, also known as "Dreamers," are subject to a U.S. Immigrant policy implemented in 2012 by President Barack Obama. The DACA program defers, or delays, the deportation of undocumented immigrants from the United States if they arrived in the country as children and meet certain other qualifications (Nock, 2017). Often these individuals attempt to conceal their status as a DACA recipient, along with the status of their loved ones who may not have temporary protection and actually fall under the category of "undocumented."

The way in which college faculty and staff interact with DACA students is crucial. Certain types of discussions between faculty and DACA students may lead to perceived invasions of privacy regarding documented status. These DACA students may even mistakenly view certain questions as solicitation of information regarding their status, not only for them, but for their loved ones. Student answers even to seemingly innocuous questions (e.g., "What is your hometown?") can lead to the disclosure of information regarding documented status for the DACA student or a family member. Disclosure of this type of information increases fear and chances of deportation as others are made aware of the students' situation. Even if the intention of the faculty member is not to expose a students' documented status, the accidental revelation of such information as a result of communication can certainly have consequences for everyone involved. The consequences may include the student experiencing increased discrimination from peers or even the deportation of a loved one.

This proposed training program focuses on communication between college faculty and staff and DACA students and proposes ways to improve these interactions. The ways in which discussions between college faculty and staff and DACA students can lead to perceived invasions of privacy and solicitation of concealed information regarding documented status will be addressed. Along with describing this training, this paper will also examine how fear of exposure of DACA status can act as a communication barrier between faculty, staff, and DACA students. Using the framework of Communication Privacy Management Theory (CPM) (Petronio, 2002), which states that vulnerability and ownership of private information are tied to rules about disclosure, this paper will recommend best practices for communicating with DACA students to protect them from exposure regarding their status. A training program will be developed to guide college faculty and staff to better communicate with DACA students to create a safe environment for these students where they can learn and thrive.

The training program that this paper will describe is designed for adult learners. Because this group of participants will only consist of adults, a foundational theory of adult learning will be used. As in any adult training

program, this training requires adults to take on the role of student and learner to acquire new skills. Self-directed learning states that learners become increasingly self-directed as they mature (Knowles, 1975). Self-directed learning is learning that occurs as part of an adult's everyday life and does not depend on an instructor or a classroom (Merriam, 2011). The faculty and staff that will be taking the training will all be at a stage in their life and career where self-directed learning can be successful.

Beebe, Mottet, & Roach (2013) state that regardless of the training objective, a trainer must keep one thing in mind: Develop and deliver training that meets the needs of the trainee. The training program proposed can accomplish this through furthering college faculty and staff understandings of the DACA program and providing faculty and staff with the ability to avoid or redirect certain topics of conversation so as not to unintentionally expose students' DACA status. This training will provide faculty with these skills through an online and interactive series of instructional modules that will address communication strategies. The modules will include short lectures, embedded YouTube videos, brief readings, and rapid assessments. In summary, the training that the college faculty and staff will receive will give them the ability to communicate with DACA students in ways that will prevent disclosure of private information regarding documented status.

DACA RECIPIENT EXPERIENCES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

There is a strong need for additional research in respect to student-faculty relationships for Latinx immigrant college students and, specifically, those students who have DACA status. DACA are people who are defined as individuals who entered the United States without proper immigration documentation, or as immigrants, but overstayed the terms of their status without authorization (Munoz & Vigil, 2018). Roughly 800,000 immigrants have temporary relief from deportation under the Obama Administration's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (Krogstad & Lopez, 2017). The DACA program defers, or delays, deportation from the United States if the person arrived in the country as a child and if he or she meets certain other qualifications, including (a) entering the U. S. before the age of sixteen and not being older than 31 at the time the executive action was signed, (b) residing in the U.S. since 2007, (c) being physically present in the country the date DACA took effect, (d) attending school or graduating from high school, (e) having participated in the armed forces, and (f) not having a criminal record or having committed any serious crimes (Nock, 2017). Undocumented immigrants who qualify for DACA receive deferred action for two years, which is renewable at the end of the term. During this two-year term, DACA students can legally work in the United States, attend college, acquire a driver's license, and open bank accounts.

Even though some of these benefits for DACA recipients have resulted in increased educational opportunity and access to higher education, there continues to be limitations for these students. These limitations include

access to financial aid and legal services that the process of becoming a DACA student can require (Gonzales and Terriquez, 2013). Dickson et al. (2017) found that as many as 42% of DACA eligible individuals did not even apply for DACA status because they could not afford the \$465 application fee. Further, the researchers also found that some DACA eligible individuals were afraid to apply because it would reveal their status and location. Due to many undocumented students coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, the high cost of college becomes another limitation. There is no federal policy governing access to higher education for undocumented immigrants and many states still charge these students out-of-state or international tuition rates (Dickson et al., 2017). Another limitation to obtaining a college degree is transportation. Although DACA students can obtain a driver's license in some states, the costs associated with owning a car are often too high (Dickson et al., 2017).

When the DACA program was introduced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012, it was created to give this group some protection regarding their residence in the U.S. However, this program is now threatened under the Trump administration. With the Trump administration's recent efforts to end DACA, and their widespread criticism of immigrants that are people of color, those who fall under DACA status no longer feel the safety that the program originally offered. Ending this program means that they will no longer have protected status, and by removing this protection, they become vulnerable to deportation. This vulnerable group would include the 241,000 DACA-eligible college students (Capps, Fix, and Zong, 2017). Thus, if the DACA program is terminated the fear of deportation would be even more present than it already is for DACA recipients who would then also face being ineligible to work.

Due to the current threats to and uncertainty of the DACA program, DACA students have increased levels of stress. If the DACA program were to end, these undocumented students would lack lawful immigration status in the United States and would face very particular challenges navigating not only through life, but through higher education toward degree completion. These challenges would include becoming ineligible for certain forms of financial aid, being ineligible to work, facing uncertain career prospects, no longer being eligible for a driver's license, and the resulting financial pressure associated with those prospects. In addition, the already present familial pressures would increase, such as fear of deportation, the financial means to make ends meet, the ability to complete a college education, and psychological distress related to immigration enforcement (Abrego, 2006, 2008; Flores & Horn, 2009; Perez-Huber & Malagon, 2006; Perry, 2006).

Research has shown that most DACA students experience college with limited financial resources and institutional support, but have high resiliency for academic persistence (Perez et al., 2009). DACA students also experience heightened stress levels due to constantly navigating and negotiating their legal status and uncertainty of future prospects (Gildersleeve & Vigil, 2015; Muñoz, 2015; Perez, 2011; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015; Teranishi,

Suarez-Orozco, & Suarez-Orozco, 2015). In addition, they are faced with racialized experiences on college campuses because of increased anti-immigration sentiments in the United States in the aftermath of the 2016 presidential election (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016). Those who work with DACA students on college campuses should evaluate how anti-immigration sentiments have seeped into the ways that DACA students are served on their campuses. Even though there is a trend for institutions to work on becoming more inclusive, or "undocufriendly" (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2015), DACA students still continue to encounter unhealthy campus climates (Ledesma, 2016; Pérez Huber, 2008). Some researchers use the term "legal violence" to describe occurrences of harm that negatively impact the livelihood of immigrants. Legal violence is caused by the effects of immigration enforcement on three areas of everyday life which include family, work, and school (Menjivar & Abrego, 2012). There has been an accumulation of effects due to harsh immigration laws along with negative stigmatization of immigrants that harm immigrants and their communities. This "legal violence" holds true within the context of higher education because of contemporary immigration laws and deep-seated anti-immigration sentiments in today's American society. These unhealthy campus climates are rooted in anti-immigrant beliefs among students and sometimes administrators. An unhealthy climate demonstrates the need for comprehensive education and training for college faculty and staff concerning the needs of DACA students.

PROJECT RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE

More information must be available to higher education professionals on ways that they can better serve and support DACA students in and outside of the classroom (Munoz & Vigil, 2018). College faculty and staff who experience training to better communicate with DACA students will develop a clearer understanding of the educational plight of DACA students and the ability to avoid conversations that could make DACA students uncomfortable. Further, improved communication between faculty, staff, and DACA students may result in a more positive college experience for DACA students and give them a feeling that they are in a safe environment where they can thrive as individuals (Munoz & Vigil, 2018).

Latinx individuals are the fastest growing ethnic group in the U. S. In 2014, 35% of Latinx ages 18-24 were enrolled in a college, or 2.3 million college students (Krogstad & Lopez, 2017). In 2017 it was estimated that 160,000 of the Latinx college students enrolled in college were DACA students (Barshay, 2017). Even though more Latinx are getting a postsecondary education than ever before, they still trail other groups in obtaining a four-year degree (Krogstad & Lopez, 2017). With increased college enrollment and attainment, the education gap between Latinxs and their white counterparts has widened (Aud, Fox, & Kewal-Ramani, 2010). This gap in degree attainment is due to communication barriers that exist for these students,

such as language, socioeconomic status, cultural, and documented status (Pew, 2016; Christmas, C. & Barker, 2014; Cools, 2006; Munoz & Vigil, 2018).

Latinxs are the largest minority group on the nation's college campuses, a milestone achieved in 2010 (Fry, 2011). However, only 13% of Latinx 25 to 29-year old's have completed a bachelor's degree (Fry, 2011). These low numbers are often due to barriers to gain access to higher education, such as those present for DACA students (e.g., documentation status, financial pressures). There are many communication barriers that exist for Latinx immigrant college students that prohibit a healthy relationship between these students and their colleges. Communication barriers are defined as obstacles that prevent effective exchange of ideas or thoughts (Business Dictionary, 2018). These communication barriers affect educational outcomes for this growing student population. One of the most discussed groups today regarding college attainment for Latinx are DACA students. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) listed DACA students as a top priority issue in 2017 because of President Trump's threat to end the program. Thus, the uncertain status of DACA can create a communication barrier between DACA students and faculty because they may fear what will happen if their undocumented status or the undocumented status of a loved one is unintentionally exposed.

Although some research exists on bridging the gap between the school and these students, additional investigation is needed to demonstrate how to engage DACA students in their education and increase their chances of success. These students face additional stressors in comparison with their native classmates. It is crucial that faculty recognize these stressors and the communication barriers these stressors can create. The fear of deportation for themselves and/or a family member may create a communication barrier that can prevent DACA students from having a more engaged relationship with the college to increase chances for overall success. Student retention in higher education is a concern for this group, with research showing that poor retention rates are due to lack of interaction with faculty (Polinsky, 2002). Although DACA students often face educational challenges, their families highly value education. Healthy communication strategies that foster meaningful engagement between DACA students and their institutions could help universities retain and graduate these students in higher numbers. Increasing their engagement with faculty can help increase the rate of college completion for this group, creating a brighter future for them as well as their families.

Professors and staff need to show sympathy towards certain circumstances regarding some of the issues DACA students may be experiencing. There are chances that many of them come from "mixed" families, meaning that they may have some protection under DACA, but their family members may be undocumented. Thus, DACA students often live with the fear of deportation not only for themselves, but for their loved ones as well. In addition, some have already witnessed a parent, aunt, uncle, relative or friend being deported. Many universities across the country have witnessed

an increase in the number of students seeking counseling for depression and anxiety related to deportation (Fields, 2017). Some universities have created a safe space for undocumented students, a place where they can discuss and explore feelings of anger and fear and they can also talk about the guilt that many of them have. This sense of guilt exists because they are protected but their family members are not (Field, 2017). Tom Peterson, Provost at the University of California at Merced, sent a letter to faculty and staff urging them to be compassionate and empathetic when students had personal concerns and challenges that interfered with their school work (Fields, 2017). He noted that these students were feeling vulnerable as a result of President Trump's new policies to revoke DACA. He also said that colleges need to be cognizant of the multiple academic, social, and personal pressures of the students who are impacted by this period of uncertainty and wrote that help is needed on behalf of faculty and staff to reinforce and amplify a sense of reassurance for these students (Fields, 2017). At the University of Buffalo, the counseling center staff are offering a weekly program called "Let's Talk," where the undocumented students can share their feelings and talk about how they are affected by the current political environment (Fields, 2017).

Services offered by colleges and universities to help DACA students cope with the uncertainty surrounding their status offer students additional ways to communicate how their documented status is impacting their lives and their college experience. The hope is that giving DACA students a forum to discuss their concerns gives these students an understanding that they are not alone and raises awareness on campuses among faculty, staff, and even the rest of the student body (Fields, 2017). In addition, greater attention must be given to the argument that faculty and staff can shape DACA experiences through how they communicate with these students.

Decreasing institutional ignorance, one of the top themes among undocumented students, is needed on college campuses. Research shows that DACA students have expressed how ambivalent their campus was in its position regarding students with DACA status and being confronted by staff and faculty who were unaware of the socioemotional and sociopolitical factors impacting them on campus, with this lack of awareness including all of those who have power on campus (faculty, staff, and administration) (Munoz & Vigil, 2018). In their study, Munoz and Vigil (2018) interviewed twelve DACA/undocumented students at two institutions in Colorado to get a better understanding of their experiences and campus climate. Using the concepts of legal violence and campus climate, they highlighted three forms of racist nativist micro aggressions: (a) institutional ignorance, (b) the reproduction of pervasive invisibility, and (c) hidden/nonpresent communities of support, as ways that colleges reproduce injurious acts. One student in the study attempted to explain to his professor that his dad had been deported and was unable to complete an assignment. The professor said, "Well, I am sorry, but you still have to turn it [the assignment] in" (Munoz & Vigil, 2018, pp. 457-458). Another student described a story

about a time he went off campus to eat lunch. While he was shopping, a police presence made him so frightened that he hid in the bathroom for four hours until he knew the police were gone. His father had already been detained and his brother deported. However, he did not feel like he was able to communicate to his professor the reason that he missed class. Both these stories describe a non-supportive institutional climate that include fear and indecision because of past experiences.

DACA students have expressed frustration because of times that professors have provided incorrect information about the DACA program itself. Further, when these students attempt to educate their faculty with facts about the program, they are often dismissed and are met with a sense of resistance from the faculty member (Munoz & Vigil, 2018). This type of communication interaction could be perceived as dehumanizing and may make it challenging for these students to fully engage on their campus and integrate into campus life and culture.

Munoz and Vigil (2018) recommended that colleges and universities have mandatory training on how to support DACA students to avoid the legal violence their findings supported. There is a need for training and an increase in knowledge on how to communicate with DACA students so they can successfully navigate their university campus. Awareness regarding the socioemotional and sociopolitical issues that can exist on campuses, especially in today's political climate, can have an impact on the racial microaggressions (e.g., subtle insults, overt racism, invalidations of racial realities) that occur on college campuses to DACA students and have unfavorable effects on the student's academic success (Solorzano, et al., 2000). Training faculty and staff to act with courage and leading efforts that reshape the anti-immigrant mindset that permeates today's society is, thus, necessary.

Further examination of the importance surrounding how communication is managed between the faculty and staff member and the DACA student needs attention, including ways to avoid interactions that can lead to real and perceived invasions of privacy and solicitation of concealed information regarding documented status. By using the framework of Communication Privacy Management Theory (CPM), (Petronio, 2002), this paper will propose ways of communicating with DACA students that protect them from exposure regarding their documented status.

LITERATURE REVIEW

How faculty communicate with DACA students regarding privacy disclosures can be understood within a *Communication Privacy Management Theory* (CPM) (Petronio, 1991) framework. CPM is a theory developed to understand the conceptual idea of disclosure (Petronio, 1982). This paper draws upon CPM to understand how college faculty and staff communicate with DACA students about private information, such as a student's DACA status or the undocumented status of a DACA student's loved one.

COMMUNICATION PRIVACY MANAGEMENT THEORY

Communication Privacy Management Theory asserts that people believe they own their private information, and because this information usually has the potential to make a person vulnerable, individuals need to control this information (Petronio, 2002). Control of this information is important because it also gives people the feeling that they have the right to determine what happens to their private information (Petronio, 2002). Ownership and control are fundamental in understanding the way that people define and handle their private information and the tensions that exist between disclosure and privacy, resulting in a process of rule setting, as people determine whether to reveal or conceal their private disclosures (Petronio, 2002).

In order to recognize this process, a better understanding of Communication Privacy Management Theory is needed. There are three main elements of the privacy management system that CPM represents: (a) *privacy ownership*, (b) *privacy control*, and (c) *privacy turbulence* (Petronio, 2013). When combined, these three main elements become a dynamic process of privacy regulation (Petronio, 2013).

Privacy ownership refers to how privacy management is relational in nature through its visualization of the ownership principle via a boundary comparison. Boundaries include individual boundaries around private information and those that are shared. For example, a DACA student's DACA status is an example of private information that he or she may share with a faculty member if the individual is one with whom he or she has a strong relationship. The boundary refers to whom the DACA student reveals or conceals their private information. If the faculty member shares that privacy boundary, then he or she has a shared privacy boundary with the DACA student.

Privacy control refers to either granting or denying access to the private information (Petronio, 2013). It indicates that people oversee private information by using different privacy rules that control individual and collective boundaries. When the privacy boundaries are collective, privacy rules define who gets access and the conditions for how much access each co-owner has. It also defines who else is able to make decisions about disclosure. In the DACA student example, the ability to control who has access to their DACA status demonstrates how individuals may grant or deny access to their private information.

Privacy turbulence refers to when expectations for privacy management are not fulfilled and cause disruptions to the rule management system. Again, a DACA student's sharing of their DACA status can be used to illustrate privacy turbulence. Specifically, if a DACA student tells his or her professor about his or her DACA status and the professor tells another faculty member whom the student does not know, this may cause privacy turbulence. Specifically, the DACA student may have felt that their DACA status was information to be shared between the student and professor and not shared with other individuals because they do not know the other

faculty member's attitudes toward the DACA program or political affiliations. Thus, even if a privacy rule was not stated by the DACA student to the professor when the information was presented, privacy turbulence can still occur. Thus, individuals should clearly state the rules regarding how the private information may be shared to avert privacy turbulence (Petronio, 2013).

Privacy recalibration happens as a result of privacy turbulence and refers to the way in which people adjust their delivery and rules surrounding their private information. A person takes part in privacy recalibration by modifying the delivery and conditions that surround the private information. The coordination and recalibration of rules consists of two characteristics: *privacy rule delivery* and *privacy rule conditions*. Petronio (2002) contended that privacy rule delivery signifies how direct the guidelines are provided by a person regarding how to manage their private information. These guidelines can be direct warnings on whom to share the information with, how much of the information to share, and timing of sharing the information (e.g., "please let this be between you as my adviser and the chair of the department until further notice"). Guidelines can also be indirect in nature, including hints and prompts and are not stated outright and exist as assumptions and not rules (Petronio, 1991).

Privacy rule delivery then refers to the explicitness of rules, hence *privacy rule conditions* explain the parameters surrounding the information. There are three central privacy rule conditions used for negotiation in privacy coordination (Petronio, 2010). First are linkage rules which explain who else should have access to the information. The selection of who this is depends on the relationship type and the relevance of the topic. Next are permeability rules that explain the parameters of how much information should be shared with current and potential owners. These guidelines catch the breadth and depth of the disclosure. This depends on how much control a person wants over their information to limit the risks of information leakage (Petronio, 2010). If the person has low levels of control regarding the information, this means they are comfortable with high permeability (Petronio, 2002). Lastly, ownership rules represent the extent to which the original owner feels about the co-owner's liberty to employ independent rules about future disclosures. There are different levels of ownership rights and their restrictions. These restrictions can include that co-owners do not have any rights regarding the distribution of information. People are expected to collectively maintain these ownership rules once they are created.

Petronio (2000) proposed five criteria that are foundational to rule development and also form the basis for rule development. That is, criteria that influence rule making and contribute to how people produce the rules that regulate their personal private boundaries. The criteria includes: (a) culture, (b) gender, (c) motivations that people have concerning privacy, (d) contextual constraints, and (e) risk-benefit rational. A person's *culture* has its own privacy values that are used in deciding levels of privacy and disclosure. Our culture helps us make sense of ourselves and the world around us and

represents one resource that develops rules about regulating our privacy boundaries. *Gender* can also contribute to how rules are decided regarding privacy boundaries, including differences in how men and women uniquely establish privacy boundaries. Next, *motivation*, influences how rules and boundaries are established and the tendencies on whether to disclose or not, meaning that the needs of an individual have an impact on their choices that are used to establish privacy rules for regulating boundaries. The *risk-benefit rational* occurs when the individual calculates what the risks are in the disclosure of his or her information, such as, documented status (Petronio, 2000). Once risk is determined, and the significance of the risk is measured, the privacy-disclosure rules are established (Petronio, 2000).

The process that contributes to producing rules to regulate personal private boundaries also involves reflection and assessment on whether to reveal or conceal. Rule setting is an ongoing negotiation concerning the management of private information, but because not everyone follows the appropriate or learned privacy rules, CPM has to account for the times that people are not able to coordinate successfully with others regarding their private information. CPM describes this lack of coordination as turbulence, a situation where there are intentional rule violations, privacy dilemmas, and when the boundary lines are not clear (Petronio, 2004). The concept of turbulence can occur for DACA students as they communicate and interact with people on their college campuses, especially college faculty and staff.

The documented status of DACA students and their families amid the current political climate in our country offers challenges for these immigrants as they attempt to protect and manage rules surrounding their privacy and disclosure about their status and the status of their loved ones. In order to avoid serious lapses and errors of communication, inappropriate intrusions, or disclosures, faculty and staff must have a full understanding of when and how to protect these interpersonal "secrets" versus disseminating information learned in an interpersonal exchange (Petronio, 2002). This would hold true especially in a classroom setting, where the disclosure would not be just between the faculty member and student, but the disclosure of the private information would also be to the DACA student's classmates. In general, day to day communication is part of everyday life for students, faculty and staff on college campuses, and most people understand the rules within this familiar context. The ability to function productively even within one's culture can be difficult at times, but in cross-cultural settings, such as those that exist for DACA students on college campuses, the complexity of the communication and the rules surrounding it increase chances of misunderstanding, conflict, and unintentional disclosures of documented status.

Boundary turbulence. The relationship between privacy and disclosure should be seen as a way of regulating boundaries which is directed by a set of rules. But boundary regulation can malfunction, and under certain circumstances causes "boundary turbulence." Boundary turbulence is the inability to develop, execute, and enact the rules of privacy management as coordination becomes asynchronous, disrupting the harmony of boundary

management resulting in the occurrence of boundary turbulence or breaches of desired communication patterns (Petronio, 2002). People manage their public personas by the way they manage their private disclosures. Their private disclosures are maintained and managed in a way to maintain dignity in one's private life (Westin, 1970).

There has been additional research on privacy turbulence that focuses on the contexts and transitions that are at risk for privacy violations (e.g., Afifi, 2003; Child, Haridakis, & Petronio, 2012). This research has noted the context of several relationship examples that can lead to privacy turbulence issues and findings of why the disruptions emerged (e.g., Afifi, 2003; Petronio & Jones, 2006). Examination of the relationship of DACA students and faculty within this framework can result in a reduction of situations that lead to turbulence and privacy violations, leading to more trust in faculty and improved communication overall for these students.

Communication Privacy Management applications to DACA. Managing one's public image along with one's private life allows a person to maintain a sense of dignity (Westin, 1970). For DACA students, maintaining this dignity can mean the difference between college success and completion or not obtaining a degree. The question to reveal or conceal documented status becomes a complicated question for DACA students, who are often not only trying to protect themselves, but the undocumented status of their loved ones. The question becomes when to let others know the private side of their documented status or when to keep it confidential. College faculty and staff must have an understanding that this decision is up to the owner of the information and not anyone else because the DACA student is the rightful owner of this information. DACA students are in a constant balancing act between their campus life and their personal life, thus, it is critical that college faculty and staff have an understanding of the needs of the DACA students they serve on campus. Having a clear understanding through training about the DACA program and using CPM to understand how to manage existing boundaries to avoid boundary turbulence is imperative in aiding this student population. As such, understanding of CPM as a map on understanding how to fully grasp the nature of private disclosures and how these disclosures impact the owners of this private information will assist university personnel in avoiding the undesirable and possible harmful disclosure of private information.

Talking about private feelings and issues in our lives is not easy, and sometimes it can even be risky. The risks include making private disclosures to the wrong people, disclosing at a bad time, telling too much about ourselves, or compromising others. For DACA students, the risk mainly exists in disclosure to the wrong people and compromising others. Even though DACA recipients are protected by law, there can be a strong desire to keep the fact that they are DACA private in the event that the program ends and to also protect loved ones who may not be documented. The DACA student might feel that the disclosure of their own DACA status may put loved ones who are undocumented at risk of being exposed. In

communicating with their students, faculty have to have an understanding of the type of communication that can put the disclosure of the DACA student's private information at risk. When communicating with students, consideration has to be made as to the individual that the communication is taking place with and how any decision to reveal or conceal affects other people. A faculty member may be witness to a communication interaction that appears to consist of dishonesty on behalf of the student regarding their status. Research has identified reasons that people conceal information and supports that people conceal or even at times lie for self-protection or protection of others and protecting face (Metts, Cupach, & Imahori, 1992). This type of behavior should be treated with sympathy and understanding, not judgment, if there is any question about the validity of the student's comments regarding their status or the status of their loved ones.

The cultivation of welcoming environments for DACA students should be part of universities' responsibilities (Muñoz & Maldonado, 2012; Perez, 2011). This requires college administrators to have comprehensive awareness and skills around issues pertaining to DACA students so they can lead critical actions to support and serve them on campus (Contreras, 2009). Change has to be made in regards to college administrators who allow personal prejudice to continue to maintain discriminatory environments for DACA students (Contreras, 2009; Perez, 2011), and studies have shown that college administrators who want to support DACA students often experience retaliation from colleagues and sometimes even from the public (Chen & Rhoads, 2016).

Trust is an important characteristic when it comes to the student-faculty relationship and when this trust has been breached due to privacy violations, it can be a challenge for the student to feel as if they can trust the person with future information because of the chances of additional disclosures. Faculty members who may have DACA students on their campuses, in classrooms, and as advisees should understand the communication behaviors that lead up to and follow a privacy betrayal (Steuber & McLaren, 2015). It is important for those who are working with these students to also have an understanding of how these interactions happen and the affect they have on the relationship between the student and the faculty or staff member. By having a better understanding of privacy turbulence, situations that lead up to turbulence can be avoided (Petronio, 2002). This should include the ability to recognize the communication process that takes place before and after the turbulence.

The relationships that students have on a college campus are important. When students are engaged with their college and the people they interact with, including other students, staff and faculty, their college experience becomes more meaningful and successful. As they build these relationships, they build trust. As a student becomes more trusting, the chances increase that he or she may confide in a faculty member. Because *closeness* is a well-documented predictor of disclosure (e.g., Golish & Caughlin, 2002; Vangelisti & Caughlin, 1997), due to the fact that it fosters feelings of

trust, closeness can be negatively associated with perceptions of risk and corresponds with the willingness to share private information (McLaren & Steuber, 2013). When a person feels this closeness, they are more likely to make a person a co-owner of their information.

Campus faculty and staff need training on how to respond when they find themselves in the situation that a DACA student has shared their documented status or the status of a family member with them. There has to be a clear understanding of what the rules and expectations are on the part of the student and the faculty member concerning the information and what they expect the co-owner of their private information will do or not do with this information. Faculty members have to understand that any type of turbulence caused regarding this shared information can influence the way the student feels about being on campus. Depending on the *relational damage*, the student will have to decide whether they will trust any faculty member in the future, and how this will impact educational outcomes for the student. Relational damage can be defined as an incident that causes worry, distrust, or harm in a relationship (Leary, Springer, Negel, Ansell, & Evans, 1998). Stueber and McLareb's (2015) study shows that the privacy rules most people recall using prior to privacy turbulence are implicit rules. But the study done by Stueber and McLareb (2015) provides a case that the privacy rules people use to manage their information do not actually prevent privacy turbulence from happening (Venetis et al., 2012). When faculty and staff have the ability to regulate the boundary openness and closeness it can only contribute to sustaining the privacy of these students, creating an environment where DACA students can feel safe and have trusting relationships.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING FACULTY AND STAFF

The training program that I propose will consist of teaching college faculty and staff about the DACA program and then training them to understand how to construct appropriate communication and interactions between themselves and DACA students. The training will consist of a series of online interactive modules that will address: (a) the origins and nature of the DACA program, (b) the fears and stressors that DACA students face, (c) CPM theory and its framework's application to DACA, and (d) communication strategies for college faculty and staff to utilize in their interactions with DACA students. Online training and education can reach participants at the trainee's convenience, thus, through offering this instruction online more faculty and staff will have the opportunity to participate (Al-Asfour, 2012). Research shows that online training can be more effective than face-to-face learning for adult learners, which includes college faculty and staff (Whitfield, 2012).

PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

In any training situation, the trainer has to have an understanding of their audience. For the particular training that will take place in this situation, the audience will not vary substantially when it comes to traditional characteristics, as the training will be only for faculty and staff. The characteristics that would be taken under consideration would mostly be age, but could include gender, race and ethnicity, and perhaps political standing.

Due to the educational background of the faculty, they will all be well into adulthood, basically because of the number of years they have spent obtaining advanced degrees in order to hold a faculty position at a university. Staff may vary in age, but will still fall into the adult category. With that being said, research suggests that they share certain characteristics when it comes to learning styles (Nilson, 2010). Most adult learners like to talk about the topic in discussion forums, assignments, and group work with opportunity for reflection (Nilson, 2010). Because adult learners prefer immediate, practical utility and relevance (Aslanian, 2001; Vella, 1994; Wlodkowski, 1993), this training should work well for this group due to its immediate application and use in the classroom and on campus. A pre-test will also be given on the basic terminology used throughout the modules, as studies show that people learn more after being pre-tested on material before they even start learning it (Carey, 2014). Targeted feedback will also be included in the module training to guarantee improved performance through practice (Ambrose, et al., 2010). The material in the training modules will also include material that evokes emotional involvement, as the trainees go through the modules learning more about the obstacles that DACA students have not only in college completion, but also in life. With this understanding, this training hopes to be moving enough to make the material memorable, motivating people to want to learn it (Leamson, 1999, 2000; Mangurian, 2005; Zull, 2002, 2011). Overall, the training will use the approach of two foundational theories of adult learning: Andragogy and Self-Directed Learning (Merriam, 2001).

PROGRAM LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The training plan and goal of this program is for these college employees to apply the learning outcomes to better serve DACA students on their college campus. Upon completion of this training, college faculty and staff will achieve the following learning outcomes:

Define DACA and explain the government policy surrounding the DACA program.

Identify the communication barriers (anti-immigration sentiments due to the Trump administration, unhealthy campus climates, the instability of the DACA program, the documented status of DACA students themselves along with the documented status of loved ones and "mixed" families,

deportation and the psychological distress related to immigration enforcement, legal violence, financial limitations) that exist for DACA students.

Explain Communication Privacy Management Theory (CPM) and the three main elements of the privacy management system.

Awareness on how to manage and construct communication that does not disclose a student's DACA status by applying CPM, such as the ability to construct questions and discussions that avoid perceived invasions of privacy and perceived solicitation of concealed information.

Reflect on the value of empathy for DACA students, especially regarding the sociopolitical and socioemotional environments that exist for DACA students.

REFERENCES

- Abrego, L. (2006). "I can't go to college because I don't have papers": Incorporation patterns of Latino undocumented youth. *Springer Link*, 4 (3), 212-231.
- Abrego, L. (2008). Legitimacy, social identity, and the mobilization of law: The effects of assembly bill 540 on undocumented students in California. *Journal of the American Bar Foundation* 33 (3), 709-734.
- Al-Asfour, A. (2012). Online teaching: Navigating its advantages, disadvantages, and best practices. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 23 (3).
- American Immigration Council. (2010). The DREAM Act: Creating opportunities for immigrant students and supporting the U.S. economy. Retrieved from www.immigrationpolicy.org
- Aud, S., Fox, M., & Kewal-Ramani, A. (2010). Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups (NCES 2010-15). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Barriers to communication. BusinessDictionary.com. Retrieved December 17, 2018, from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/barriers-to-communication.html>
- Beebe, Mottet, and Roach (2013). *Training and development: Communicating for success* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Barshay, J. (2017). Counting DACA students. *The Hechinger Report: Covering Innovation and Inequality in Education*. Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/counting-daca-students/>
- Capps, R., Fix, M., & Zong, J. (2017). *The education and work profiles of the DACA population*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/education-and-work-profiles-daca-population>

- Cardenas, G. A., Bernstein, B. L., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2018). Critical consciousness and the intent to persist through college in DACA and U. S. citizen students: The role of immigration status, race, and ethnicity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 24 (4), 564-565.
- Dickson, L., Gindling, T. H., Kitchen, J. (2017). The education and employment effects of DACA, in-state tuition and financial aid for undocumented immigrants. *IZA Institute of Labor Economics*. ZA DP No. 11109 <http://ftp.iza.org/dp11109.pdf>
- Field, Kelly (2017). Colleges seek to ease immigrant students' stress. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 63 (27). Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Try-to-Ease-Immigrant/239317>
- Flores, S. M., & Horn, C. L. (2009). College persistence and undocumented students at a selective public university: A quantitative case study analysis. *Journal of College Student Retention* 11, 57-76.
- Fry, R. (2011). *Latinos & the economy*. NY, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gildersleeve, R. E., & Vigil, D. (2015). Institutionalizing support for undocumented Latino/a students in American higher education. In M. Freeman & M. Martinez (Eds.), *College completion for Latino/a students: Institutional and system approaches. New directions in higher education* (pp. 39-48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonzales, R. G., & Terriquez, V. (2013). How DACA is impacting the lives of those who are now DACAmented: Preliminary findings from the national UnDACAmented Research Project (Report). Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/howdaca-impacting-lives-those-who-are-now-dacamented>
- Krogstad, J. M., Lopez, G. (2017). Key facts about unauthorized immigrants enrolled in DACA. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/25/key-facts-about-unauthorized-immigrants-enrolled-in-daca/>
- Ledesma, M. C. (2016). Complicating the binary: Toward a discussion of campus climate health. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity*, 2, 6-35.
- Menjivar, C. & Abrego, L. (2012). Legal violence in the lives of immigrants: How immigration enforcement affects families, schools, and workplaces. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/reports/2012/12/11/47533/legal-violence-in-the-lives-of-immigrants/>
- Metts, S., Cupach, W. R., & Imahori, T. T. (1992). Perceptions of sexual compliance-resisting messages in three types of cross-sex relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 1-17.

- Muñoz, S. M. (2015). *Identity, social activism, and the pursuit of higher education: The journey stories of undocumented and unafraid community activists*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Munoz, S. M. & Vigil, D. (2018). Interrogating racist nativist microaggressions and campus climate: How undocumented and DACA college students experience institutional legal violence in Colorado. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11 (4), 451-456.
- Nock, M. B. (2017) The effects of DACA in young migrant's professional carriers and emotions. *Directory of Open Access Journals*, 18 (37), 131-148.
- Pérez Huber, L. (2008). Building critical race methodologies in educational research: A research note on critical race *testimonio*. *Florida International University Law Review*, 4, 159-173.
- Pérez Huber, L. (2011). Discourse of racist nativist in California public education: English dominance as a racist nativist microaggressions. *Educational Studies*, 47, 379-401.
- Perez-Huber, I. & Malagon, H. O. (2006). Falling through the cracks: Critical transitions in the Latino/a educational pipeline (Rep. No. 7) Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center.
- Perez, W., Espinoza, R., Ramos, K., Coronado, H. M., & Cortes, R. (2009). Academic resilience among undocumented Latino students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 3 (2), 149-181.
- Perry, A. M. (2006). Toward a theoretical framework for membership: The case of undocumented immigrants and financial aid for postsecondary education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30, 21-40.
- Petronio, S. (1982). The effect of interpersonal communication on women's family role satisfaction. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 208-222.
- Petronio, S. (1991). Communication boundary management: A theoretical model of managing disclosure of private information between marital couples. *Communication Theory*, 1, 311-335.
- Petronio, S. (2000). The boundaries of privacy: Praxis of everyday life. In S. Petronio (Ed.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures* (pp. xiii-xvi). Mahwah, NJ: LEA.
- Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure*. Albany: SUNY Press
- Petronio, S., Sargent, J., Andea, L., Reganis, P., & Cichocki, D. (2004). Family and friends as healthcare advocates: Dilemmas of confidentiality and privacy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21, 33-52.
- Polinsky, T. L. (2002). The ir-ep: A powerful model for self-assessment

- and planning. *American Psychological Association*, 1-6.
- Solorzano, W. P., Menjivar, C., & Tellez, M. (2000). Violence and vulnerability of female migrants in drop houses in Arizona: The predictable outcome of a chain reaction of violence. *Violence Against Women*, 21, 551-570.
- Southern Poverty Law Center. (2016, November 28). The Trump effect: The impact of the 2016 presidential election on our nation's schools. Retrieved from <https://www.splcenter.org/20161128/trumpeffect-impact-2016-presidential-election-our-nations-schools>
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Katsiaficas, D., Birchall, O., Alcantar, C. M., Hernández, E., García, Y.,
- Teranishi, R. T. (2015). Undocumented undergraduate on college campuses: Understanding their challenges and assets and what it takes to make an undocufriendly campus. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85, 427- 463.
- Teranishi, R., Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2015). In the shadows of the ivory tower: Undocumented undergraduates and the liminal state of immigration reform. *The UndocuScholar Project*. Institute for Immigration, Globalization & Education, UCLA.
- Venkataramani, A. S., & Tsai, A. C. (2017). Dreams deferred: The public health consequences of rescinding DACA. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 377, 1707-1709.
- Westin, A. F. (1970). *Privacy and Freedom*. New York: Atheneum.
- Whitfield, K. Y. (2012). Involuntary commitment application: An online training module. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 10 (3), 18-34.