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Introduction: The Anxiety Epidemic
In a February 2018 feature article, The Chronicle of Higher Education called attention to the growing epidemic of anxiety among college students. Titled, “‘I Didn’t Know How to Ask for Help’: Stories of Students with Anxiety,” the article shared first-hand accounts of students’ experiences with anxiety, many of which highlighted struggles related to academic work and the classroom.1 If a student doesn’t speak in class, the article notes, “they may still be engaged, just terrified.”2 One student shared that, “depending on the situation, it could be hard for me to hear things. It’s hard for me to listen or understand.”3

Beyond this anecdotal evidence, empirical evidence of an increase in student anxiety is plentiful. The Health Minds Study for the 2017-18 academic year reported severe anxiety among 13% of students, and moderate anxiety among an additional 18%, at 48 campuses surveyed using the GAD-7 screening tool.4 Both of these measures represented a five percent increase over the initial 2014 Healthy Minds Study.5 Similarly, the Higher Education Research Institute report The American Freshman: National Norms Fall 2016, recorded over one third of first-year students responding that they frequently felt anxious during the previous year.6 While the 2016 study was the first to include anxiety measures, a question asking students if they often felt overwhelmed has been included since 1985, and has increased from 16% in that year’s survey to over 40% in the 2016 report.7,8 Providing a longer-term view, Jean M. Twenge (2000) conducted a study of anxiety rates among birth cohorts from 1952-1993.9 Performing meta-analyses of studies of college students and children over this time period, Twenge found that rates of anxiety among both groups increased linearly over time. The increase in anxiety among children was so stark, “that by the 1980s normal child samples were scoring higher than child psychiatric patients from the 1950s.”10 Coupled with the more recent studies above, these results suggest that our present moment is unique in recent history for the incidence of anxiety among young people. This paper aims to raise awareness of the scope of this problem, examine potential social forces contributing to its rise, with an emphasis on the way these forces come to bear in educational settings, and finally, share potential pedagogical alternatives that have been offered in response to these factors.

Student Anxiety & Library Instruction
While library anxiety continues to be a frequent topic of conversation in our field and developments like LIS Mental Health Week have brought increasing attention to the mental health of library workers, student anxiety in the library classroom has been little discussed.11,12 Referring back to the student testimonials provided to the Chronicle, the manners in which anxiety can function as a barrier in the library classroom become apparent.13 Anxiety may prevent otherwise engaged students from speaking or openly participating, or it may impede students’ immediate understanding of the information being conveyed. Of particular concern to student anxiety in
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the library classroom is the continuing predominance of the one-shot as the primary vehicle for library instruction. Not only does the one-time nature of these sessions mean that students having difficulty understanding or concentrating are unlikely to have another opportunity to absorb the information, but the introduction of unfamiliar elements inherent in the one-shot model may serve to exacerbate or even trigger anxiety among certain students. In a 2018 post to the ACRLog, Arellano-Douglas made just this point after reflecting on an instance in which her regular yoga class had a substitute instructor. During the class, Arellano-Douglas recalled, “the usual relaxation and freedom from anxiety weren’t quite there.”15 Arellano-Douglas goes on to write, “what I was feeling in class is likely akin to what students must feel during one-shot library classes. They may be in an unfamiliar setting (the library classroom), with a teacher they’ve never seen before (me!), whose personality, communication style, and pedagogical approach might be completely different (or just different enough) from their regular professor’s that it throws them off (partially or completely).”16 As library instruction pursues the active, engaged, and participatory instruction methods encouraged by developments such as the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education and critical information literacy, we run the risk of leaving anxious students behind if we do not incorporate an awareness of student anxiety into ongoing conversations surrounding library pedagogy.

Why Students are Anxious: Autonomy, Responsibilization, and the Formation of Selves

A meaningful response to the problem of anxiety requires us to first investigate what might be behind the dramatic increases observed in recent generations. As Twenge states regarding her study, “if levels of anxiety have changed over a 30-year time span, the most likely cause is changes in the larger sociocultural environment.”17 Examining this hypothesis, Twenge found that increases in anxiety were preceded by indicators of cultural changes, specifically decreased social connectedness and an elevated rate of overall threat.18 These findings align with Kandel’s definition of anxiety as “a normal inborn response either to threat … or to the absence of people or objects that assure or signify safety.”19 But what lies behind the increased sense of threat and absence of social connections? In recent years, scholars and cultural critics have offered interpretations of our anxiety epidemic that point to the individualistic, competitive orientation of contemporary life, an orientation that is often inculcated, reinforced, and reproduced in educational spaces.

Central to ideas about changes in the sociocultural environment driving increases in anxiety is the role that sociocultural factors play in precipitating changes in the way we conceive of ourselves. Rather than being a constant of human history, our concept of the self as consisting of “an inner life of the psyche, in which are inscribed the experiences of an individual biography” is an invention borne of a particular cultural and historical context.20 Thus, the ways in which we experience our lives as beings are quite different from those of bygone eras and cultures, and given the significance of lived experiences and biographies to the formation of individual selves, important differences exist even compared to the more recent past. Indeed, Twenge’s study suggests that significant shifts can occur in the space of a few generations.21 Drawing on Hacking’s concept of historical ontology, a form of analysis “concerned with revealing the conditions, at a particular time and place, that provide possibilities for being a person,” the following will discuss some of the social and educational conditions under which the selves of recent generations of college students have been formed.22

In his discussion of our age of anxiety, education scholar De Lissovoy focuses on the conditions of autonomy and responsibilization.23 Together, these serve as a useful frame for the ensuing discussion, as they encapsulate the above anxiogenic elements of threat and isolation. While the notion of individual autonomy is not new, the form it takes in contemporary life is a more recent development. Educational psychologist Hickinbottom-Brawn
argues that this autonomy arises from what she calls “enterprise culture,” which “suggests well-being is achieved not through political or social planning, but through the actions of autonomous individuals.” Grounded in this ethic, in which forging a life for oneself within the strictures of a capitalist economy is the ultimate exercise of freedom, autonomy is primarily exercised via the individual’s freedom to make choices in a market of options. By extension, responsibilization is an idea that, as individual outcomes arise as a result of these freely made choices, each individual bears sole responsibility for their own situation. For the autonomous, responsibilized individual, social connections become less meaningful, since you can ultimately only rely on yourself, and threats are magnified and must be constantly monitored. When poor outcomes do occur, individuals must not only face whatever material consequences they entail, but also emotional consequences in the form of self-directed blame. In order to avoid negative consequences, individuals are exhorted to become entrepreneurs of the self, and thus must learn to be self-surveilling, self-directing, self-managing, and self-assessing economic agents. Seale has argued that information literacy as a topic of instruction is a direct outcome of this type of thinking, writing that behind it lies the logic “that because individuals can choose to become information literate and because information literacy can resolve social and economic inequities, those inequities are ultimately the fault of those individuals.” Enright, Nicholson, and Beilin have levelled similar critiques, connecting information literacy to human capital and narratives of responsibilization under the umbrella of the political system of neoliberalism. When examining the roots of anxiety, we can see that the results of this way of thinking play a role in the formation of students’ selves well before they reach the library classroom.

**Human Capital and Enterprise Culture in the Classroom: The Student as Commodified Self**

Harris argues that more than just economic actors making choices in a market, individuals themselves represent assets in the form of human capital. Developed by several American economists during the 1950s and 1960s, human capital theory conceives of people in terms of their usefulness as productive components in the economy. Crucially, an individual’s human capital is not given and inherent, but is compiled throughout a lifetime and includes the “stock of skills, knowledge, education, and even personal attributes” that one possesses. As Harris explains it, “human capital’s rough paper analog is the resume: a summary of past training for future labor.” For young human capital assets, education is thus an element of labor, an intrinsic piece of their future role as economic agents. Harris refers to the cloaking of this labor in the guise of education as the “pedagogical mask,” and the time students spend on this form of work has increased over the last several decades. Hofferth has found that children’s free time declined considerably from 1981 to 2003, while time spent studying and attending school has increased, which she suggests is a result of increased pressure to achieve in school spurred by political developments like No Child Left Behind. Later developments, like the Obama Administration’s “Race to the Top,” have continued to place high stakes upon children’s educational achievement. Throughout their childhoods, today’s college students tend to have been stretched further, enjoying less free time and putting in more work than their predecessors. Just as with overworked adults, the pressure such a situation creates, and the concomitant threat of failure to achieve, often leads to greater stress and anxiety.

Once students arrive at college age, we can see further evidence of human capital theory in the student debt crisis and the disappearance of entry-level jobs. Potential employees are expected to arrive on the job market fully-formed, having leveraged their potential future earnings in exchange for loans to cover the costs of their own education and training. Students who wish to be competitive in a job market of other individuals—and they will need to be, if they are to ever repay their student loans—must understand themselves as human capital commodities (even if not consciously) and accrue value accordingly, making the choices and investments that
will make them marketable and desirable to potential employers. Under the framework of human capital, “life itself is a personal and permanent commercial project that requires business ambition to generate future income and avoid losses.”

As with Hickinbottom-Brawn, the notion of enterprise culture is central to the argument Martin and McLellan advance in their book, *The Education of Selves* (2013). They argue that a series of developments in educational psychology has led to the ideal of what they call the “triple-E” student, who is “expressive, enterprising, and entitled.” Under this model, the ideal students are expressive, in that they have the self-esteem necessary to express their inner selves, enterprising, in that they are self-disciplined, self-directed, self-regulated, and self-managed, and entitled, in that they understand the above as their inherent rights as individuals. In the classroom, this plays out in a focus on individual skills and achievement, even in the context of collaborative work. For triple-E students, agency is understood primarily in individualistic terms. They are self-sufficient, poised to maximize their own assets (i.e., their human capital) and develop their own future. Martin and McLellan are careful to acknowledge that there is good in each of the triple-E attributes, but that when prioritized at the expense of other values, students emerge interiorized, less connected to ideas of community and the common good.

Keating refers to this interiorization as “self-enclosed individualism,” a result of our current sense of self as characterized by a binary, oppositional, orientation that “sets up a hierarchical relationship between self and other, where the individual is entirely disconnected from all other human and nonhuman life.” Self-enclosed individualism is driven by what Keating calls the “status-quo story of solipsistic individualism,” which tells us that “each individual is fully responsible for his or her own life.” In classroom discussions with students, this plays out in what Keating sees as a callous disregard for others, as students are all too often willing to assign blame to individuals who fail to succeed. While Keating focuses on the external application of this way of thinking, when directed inwardly, it is the logic of anxiety—the ever-present threat of failure, and the knowledge that when it arrives, you are on your own.

**Pedagogical Responses to the Age of Anxiety**

Though some are directly addressing anxiety and others are not, all of the above thinkers hit upon themes that resonate with Twenge and Kandel’s characterizations of anxiety as stemming from a sense of threat and absence of connection. Oriented toward amassing human capital in an enterprise culture, young people are guided to form senses of self that privilege self-reliance as the correct response to the threat and instability present in the world. As the system described above constitutes “the decisive symbolic and discursive terrain on which education has no choice but to operate in the present,” the goals and methods of much mainstream pedagogical practice are inherently wrapped up in it. However, the scholars who have called attention to these problems have also suggested steps toward possible alternatives. Before engaging with these, however, it will be instructive to investigate a couple of responses to student anxiety and its pedagogical abettors that are currently circulating in the professional conversation.

Practices like mindfulness, meditation, and deep breathing have been offered in both the library and education literature as tools for improving student focus and cognitive engagement. These techniques have been shown to be effective tools for coping with stress and anxiety, as well as preparing students to learn, and on a purely instrumental level, they would appear to be one answer to the problem of student anxiety. However, when examined in the larger context outlined above, they exist as a further extension of the requirement for self-management. If triple-E students are getting burnt out, mindfulness is a tool they can deploy to help set them back on their productive path. Matthiesen refers to the deployment of these practices in schools as “therapeutic socio-educational technologies.” Matthiesen argues that these practices breed passivity and acceptance,
directing students to work on themselves, rather than the world around them, and teaching them that life is but a series of problems to be managed with the correct techniques. Matthiesen also shares Craig’s warning that introducing these practices to the classroom places the instructor in the role of “surrogate psychologists or mental health workers.” While these techniques can be effective in helping individuals cope with anxiety, they ultimately do not address anxiety’s deeper sociocultural roots, and their deployment in the classroom places yet another responsibility upon educators.

Prompted by a concern for many of the same factors identified as driving student anxiety, including a lack of focus on social goods and an atmosphere of commodification (of information, education, and students), teaching librarians have increasingly turned to critical pedagogy as a response to the goals and orientations of mainstream educational practice. In the form of critical information literacy, the use of critical pedagogy in library instruction aims to “question and resist the damaging effects of capital-centered education on learners, teachers, and society, and encourages librarians to develop an information literacy theory and practice that recognizes students’ personal agency and attempts to create positive personal and social change.” However, De Lissovoy has called into question the efficacy of Freirean critical pedagogy in addressing our anxious climate. If the ways in which selves come into being are contingent on social, temporal, and political contexts, we must be mindful of the ways in which Freire’s context differed from our own. For Freire’s students, members of a peasant class living under an oppressive political regime, a lack of individual agency was precisely the problem that critical pedagogy aimed to address. In our current context, De Lissovoy argues, anxiety is the symptom of an excess of emphasis on individual agency, and Freirean critical pedagogy’s focus on ideology does not offer an answer to this problem. Rather, a critical pedagogy for today “must undertake a reorganization of being.”

Despite his misgivings regarding critical pedagogy, De Lissovoy does not dismiss it, but rather aims to reimagine a version of critical pedagogy that stays true to Freire’s vision, while modifying its practice for our present contexts. A significant piece of this version of critical pedagogy is resisting the “collective compulsion toward incessant communication and interactivity.” The requirement that enterprising selves always be in action, and the attendant guilt that can accompany “unproductive” periods of inaction, tend to crowd out opportunities for contemplation and the formation of meaningful connection. It also stigmatizes students who may find themselves overwhelmed with anxiety and thus have difficulty performing active engagement, placing them in the position of problems needing to be solved. Creating a learning environment in which students understand that it is okay to not be in constant action and communication can provide a break from the obsessive management of the self, and open space for deeper engagement and more meaningful dialogue.

Like De Lissovoy, Keating sees critical pedagogy as inadequate to rectifying this situation, characterizing it as an inherently oppositional model that focuses on critique and ideological, dialectical thinking. Rather, Keating employs what she terms “pedagogies of invitation,” in an attempt to reorient students toward selves that reflect the radically interconnected nature of being in the world. Pedagogies of invitation invite students to consider different perspectives and to undergo self-transformation without imposing either upon them. Keating introduces students to stories that demonstrate interrelatedness and relational perspectives, and thus provide opportunities for reframing self-enclosed, status-quo ways of thought. Keating also highlights modeling on the part of the instructor as an important component of pedagogies of invitation. Following an exchange of ideas and sharing of perspectives in the classroom, the instructor should be willing to share the ways that their own perspectives have been informed through this interaction, demonstrating these transformation can be a natural result of the learning process. In their focus on connection and post-oppositional orientation, Keating’s pedagogies of invitation hew closely to De Lissovoy’s call for pedagogy that moves beyond ideological wrangling to allow for the reconfiguration of the self.
Offering an alternative to education aimed at forming the triple-E student, Martin and McLellan draw on the educational psychology of George Herbert Mead. Mead’s theories of education and the self differ from those driving education today, Martin and McLellan argue, in that they placed the social formation of the self prior to the interior formation. Where the triple-E model aims to orient the interior self so that it may then be properly educated, Mead believed that social experiences and interactions contributed significantly to the creation of the self, and that this should be reflected in the education of students. Mead saw the self as coming into being through its encounters with multiple perspectives and aimed to replicate this in his educational method.

The Meadian pedagogy that Martin and McLellan propose is built on a problem-posing model, with a focus on students navigating and negotiating through multiple perspectives—“of others, societies, and the organized knowledge and methods of different disciplines and domains of knowledge and inquiry,”—as they work toward a solution. In such an arrangement, the teacher provides the problem, then serves as a mediator in the dialogue between the perspectives provided by the students’ own experiences, and those from the appropriate broader social or disciplinary context. The instructor’s role is one way in which this Meadian problem posing model differs from the way problem posing in critical pedagogy is often practiced in a first world context. Rather than serving as a facilitator, the instructor retains a clear authority in relation to the content under discussion. Another significant difference is primarily one of intent. Rather than seeking to awaken individual agency in oppressed students, this problem posing model aims to create in students an awareness of their position as communal agents in an interconnected world.

Conclusion
While acknowledging that it will take more than pedagogical interventions to overcome the structural problems contributing to student anxiety, we do have the option to develop our practice in ways that recognize these problems and both resist actively contributing to them and use the time we have with students to model other possibilities. Perhaps the most important step that we can take in the short-term is simply integrating into our practice the knowledge that there are likely students suffering from the symptoms of anxiety in any given classroom. Further, we might think about how we can provide the content of our sessions in as many formats as possible, so students who are having difficulty processing in the classroom may have other opportunities to engage with it. De Lissovoy’s suggestion to resist the compulsion toward constant activity provides another low-stakes opportunity for modifying our current practice. This may include providing more space for reflection, finding alternatives to interactions with screens, and recognizing that students do not need to be visibly active or communicative in order to be engaging with the content. The ongoing conversation around critical librarianship suggests that many librarians are searching for alternatives to mainstream educational practices. In investigating these practices in light of student anxiety, this paper has introduced new voices to the conversation, and the alternatives they suggest provide new avenues for reimagining our pedagogical practice.
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