https://studentsuccessjournal.org/
Volume **16** (1) 2025 https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.3527

I'll Be There for You: Generating Sustained Student Connectedness from the Beginning. *A Practice Report*

James Wakefield and Simone Grabowski
University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Abstract

This study examines the efficacy of a redesigned induction session to enhance and sustain student connectedness, addressing ongoing concerns relating to student isolation. We socially engineered the group formation process prior to students undertaking a group activity at undergraduate business induction sessions. The intention of the activity was for students to collaboratively problem-solve components of the university experience, learn where to seek information and develop connections with peers from day one of their university experience. Our analysis confirms that the social engineering of groups based on similar interests enabled students to establish more sustained peer connections compared with random assignment, and students are generally more satisfied with their induction. These findings have practical implications for universities, which are accepting and enrolling a greater variety of students as they aim to widen participation.

***Keywords**:* First-year experience; induction; social engineering; student belonging; student connectedness; student transition.

Introduction

While numerous studies present strategies to improve student induction with the specific objective of improving student belonging and, ultimately, retention and success, many challenges remain for students, including isolation and social anxiety (Hullinger & Hogan, 2014). Some attempts have been reported in the literature to better connect students with peers at orientation (Peat et al., 2001; Trotter & Roberts, 2006), although approaches are not particularly systematic or research-informed, nor do they leverage widely accessible technological tools. Accordingly, the objective of this study and the practice we report is to provide an effective and research-informed means of allocating students into small groups at a faculty induction session based on study and personal interests. As well we consider pragmatic factors, including attendance time preferences, with the motivation to facilitate sustained student connectedness.

This practice report contributes to current literature by describing our novel approach, and also reporting on the efficacy of the approach. No studies in the literature report on a multifaceted approach to allocating students to small groups at an induction session, with the specific aim of facilitating sustained connection building. Such an approach is particularly valuable in the reported context, with large numbers of students across the course and few face-to-face class hours contributing to student isolation. Such contextual factors are common across many university faculties, particularly those relating to business and social sciences. Our study is also novel in that we measure whether students are still in touch with peers they meet at the induction session at the end of the first semester of their undergraduate business studies course.

Literature

As social learning theory (Wenger, 2009) and associated communities of practice (Tinto, 2003) have been widely accepted as the way forward for tertiary education, the extent of social integration within such a context is critical. Social integration can be defined as the "extent to which a student feels connected to the college environment, peers, faculty and others in college and is involved in campus activities" (Lotkowski et al., 2004, p. 6). There is a large body of literature that argues social integration substantially impacts student commitment and engagement in tertiary studies (Abdul-Rahaman et al., 2023; Beil et al., 2000; Hausmann et al., 2007; Tinto, 1982, 2003), and thereby underlines the success of learning approaches aligned with social learning theory. While achievement of learning outcomes is often seen as an end goal, it would be remiss to ignore the importance of student belonging and transition generally, including the development of positive friendships (Pittman & Richmond, 2008). Friendship at university is essential to retention, with friends providing emotional support, which can be equivalent to family relationships and buffering support in stressful situations (Wilcox et al., 2005).

There is much literature on the benefits of student induction events. Notably, inductions are found to reduce commencing student anxiety (Hullinger & Hogan, 2014) provide students with initial contact with academics and small student groups (Brooman & Darwent, 2014) and help develop these connections (Rickard et al., 2018), thereby potentially reducing isolation. The focus of induction has, and likely still does in many institutions, relate to student study skills and information dissemination, see, for example, Zeegers and Martin (2001) and Watts (2019). There are calls to move away from information transmission models to a student-centred approach where delivery does not focus on telling students everything they need to know when starting university (Alsford & Rose, 2014), which is important in facilitating enhanced social integration through student connection.

While much literature indicates the importance of student induction, few studies report the practices that help students better connect with their peers. One such study by Trotter and Roberts (2006), reports on induction sessions where students participate in activities aimed at getting to know each other. In an earlier study, Peat et al. (2001) reported on a day-long induction where students were organised in groups based on planned specialisation in their course. These groups were also connected with class enrolment within students' course of study. While there is no doubt that a successful transition to tertiary studies extends well beyond inductions and involves multifaceted strategies throughout the first year (Thomas, 2012), it is surprising that there are not further studies reporting on induction practice focused on student connection from the outset. This is particularly so given that student retention and successful completion are significantly impacted by the extent of their intellectual and social integration at their institution (Johnson, 1994; Tinto, 1982; Trotter & Cove, 2005).

In order to improve student social integration at inductions, much can be learnt from group dynamics in sociology and social psychology, which has a long history (Cartwright, 1951; Tuckman, 1965). The three main methods of group formation are self-selection, teacher-formed, and random. While some studies show no significant group performance differences in these methods (Huxham & Land, 2000), others have confirmed that the formation method matters (Chapman et al., 2006; Seethamraju & Borman, 2009). The grouping of students based on commonalities (homogeneity) is consistent with literature arguing that students who exhibit such commonalities are more likely to develop sustained friendships. Research demonstrates that friendship cliques form around shared interests, including sports, music and studies (Bryden et al., 2011). Based on this research, the potential exists to group students at inductions based on personal and study interests, facilitating a higher degree of social integration, belonging, and retention and a student cohort better attuned to teaching practices aligned with social learning theory. We also recognise the importance of diversity, hence why student groups are not allocated on the basis of factors including gender, ethnic background and religious beliefs, which are randomly assigned. We therefore proceed accordingly in this study.

Intervention

All students at the institution are encouraged to attend a faculty induction. Traditionally, the induction was a didactic delivery of information which students often perceived as 'information overload', consistent with reports in literature (Alsford & Rose, 2014). Therefore, consistent with the concerns relating to social integration and the social learning theory-aligned model at the institution, the induction was redesigned to mimic a collaborative workshop. The induction became a two-hour session in which students connected with peers they were more likely to stay in touch with. In order to facilitate these connections, we designed an intervention.

The first stage of the intervention was inviting students to complete an online pre-induction form. First, students were asked about their entry pathway (for example, recent school leaver), providing a means of assigning students to groups with those

with similar life experiences. Students were then asked which majors they planned to specialise and what class times they preferred to enrol, consistent with the importance of this noted in a prior study (Peat et al., 2001). Students were also asked to indicate their interests from lists provided, relating to study interests (focusing on majors available, e.g., finance, marketing) and personal interests (e.g., fashion, gaming, sport and travel). Finally, students were asked one open-ended question, to provide more detail about their personal interests, as interests like 'sports' or 'art' are quite broad.

Data from the pre-induction form was used to socially engineer (Butterfield & Bailey, 1996) students into groups of five to six. This number was deemed appropriate, given that the groups were not too large, enabling students to have sufficient opportunity to talk with each other (Burke, 2011). In allocating students to groups, students were first separated based on preferred class times because students attending classes at similar times are more likely to stay in touch. Students were then grouped based on entry pathway; recent school leavers and non-recent school leavers will likely identify more with common experience and thereby have more in common. Finally, students were grouped based on their study and other interests. While it would be ideal to use an algorithmic method to group students (Chen & Kuo, 2019; Chen et al., 2012; Moreno et al., 2012), grouping required considerable judgment. There was a large diversity in responses in the pre-induction form. Therefore, it was necessary to go back and forth in identifying the factors to determine groups.

Once in the induction, students were asked to complete an activity collaboratively, consistent with promoting social learning (Wenger, 2009) and social integration, with the hope that students would develop communities of practice as they transitioned to the institution (Tinto, 2003). Students were asked to individually record their responses to each component (accessed via electronic device), however, they were asked to discuss their response logic as they worked through the activity. The activity questions related to; university clubs and societies, subject resources, study spaces, study support, study time commitment expectations, academic integrity, choosing majors and finding work. The activity provided automatic feedback based on responses, allowing students to discuss in their group. This activity thus facilitated a student-centred approach to learning about the university, moving away from a transmission approach of attempting to tell students everything they needed to know (Alsford & Rose, 2014). By collaboratively exploring and discussing the various aspects of the activity, students were more likely to get to know and connect with their peers. Finally, the activity encouraged students to exchange details to keep in touch, to solidify initial connections.

Efficacy Analysis

The three aspects of the intervention we examine[1] are; the extent to which students complete the optional pre-induction form, student satisfaction relating to opportunities to meet peers, and finally, whether students kept in touch with peers they met at the induction during their first semester.

Completion of Pre-Induction Form

Three undergraduate business student inductions were held. Two were situated on campus, with 256 and 199 registering, in large collaborative rooms where students sat at tables where they could have round table conversations. Once students registered, they received an email invitation to complete the pre-induction form. A total of 47.7 percent completed this form before attending their induction. With a personalised invitation to complete the form and reminder, we hoped for a higher response. However, the form was optional, and some may have felt uncomfortable sharing information about themselves even though the information was not disseminated. The low response rate could have also resulted from students not in the habit of regularly checking their new student email.

An induction was also held online via Zoom, with students placed into breakout rooms for the interactive components. A total of 138 students registered to attend, of whom 38.4 percent completed the pre-induction form. This is a lower response than the on-campus attendees, however, based on the Mann-Whitney U-test[2], it is not significantly different.

Satisfaction – Opportunities to Meet Peers

Students' satisfaction with opportunities to meet peers was measured through a survey with a Likert scale question (Table 1), and an open-ended question asking students what they liked and disliked about the induction. The survey was designed following the recommendations from Dillman et al. (2014). A response rate of 23.1 percent was received from students who registered for an induction, although not all attended. Encouragingly, there are high levels of agreement with the Likert scale

[1] All aspects of the method reported in this paper received ethics approval (approval number: ETH22-6673). Consent was obtained from students at each data collection point involving this research.
[2] We refer to the Mann-Whitney U test several times in this report consistent with the ordinal and categorical data analysed.

question, coded from one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied). In terms of the open-ended responses, what stands out is that students liked meeting people (peers) and found the induction interactive, consistent with the intended induction design. Overall, students appeared very satisfied with the opportunities to connect with others.

Table 1

Satisfaction (n = 134)

	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Likert scale questions:				
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students at today's session?	2	5	4.313	0.687
Coded open-ended responses relating to induction:				
Good meeting people	0	1	0.172	0.378
Want to meet more people	0	1	0.045	0.208
Engaging/interactive	0	1	0.119	0.325
Could have been more engaging/ interactive	0	1	0.015	0.122
Happy with breakout room/table	0	1	0.015	0.122
Not happy with breakout room/table	0	1	0.022	0.148
Liked the activity	0	1	0.022	0.148
Didn't like activity	0	1	0.015	0.122

While all students completed the induction activity during the induction, not all had completed the pre-induction form. Students not completing the pre-induction form were allocated to groups randomly. We compared satisfaction based on whether or not they completed the pre-induction form. We did not find any significant difference based on the Mann-Whitney U test. As a further test of differences, we examined only the subsample of students who attended on-campus inductions, given that the majority of students attended an on-campus rather than an online induction. As reported in Table 2, these results indicate significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) satisfaction with opportunities to meet fellow students. This indicates that allocating students to groups based on similar interests leads to better connection opportunities. This also indicates, perhaps unsurprisingly, that the on-campus, face-to-face opportunities are more effective in encouraging students to establish connections. This is compared to the online context[3], where students are sometimes hesitant to connect with peers. In terms of the coded open-ended responses, there were largely no significant differences.

[3] There are no significant differences based on the Mann-Whitney U test for online induction attendees, although, caution needs to be used when interpreting the results given the same subsample size (12).

Table 2

Satisfaction Compared Based on Pre-Induction Form Completion (On-Campus Inductions Only)

	Completed pre-induction form		Difference	
	Yes (n = 98)	**No (n = 24)**	***Z*-stat**	***p*-value**
Likert scale questions:				
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students at today's session?	4.408	4.042	-2.131	0.033
Coded open-ended responses relating to induction:				
Good meeting people	0.184	0.125	-0.703	0.482
Want to meet more people	0.051	0.042	-0.189	0.850
Engaging/interactive	0.133	0.083	-1.249	0.212
Could have been more engaging/ interactive	0.020	0.000	-1.178	0.239
Happy with breakout room/table	0.010	0.000	-0.189	0.850
Not happy with breakout room/table	0.000	0.000	-2.558	0.011
Liked the activity	0.010	0.042	-0.271	0.786
Didn't like activity	0.020	0.000	-0.495	0.621

Post-Induction Peer Connections

All students at the end of their first semester of study were surveyed to understand if attending the induction made any difference to meeting peers. The survey response rate was 28.9 percent. Table 3, Panel A, reports the difference based on students who attended an induction, regardless of mode (on-campus and online). Based on the five-point Likert scale question presented in Panel A, coded from one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied), we did not observe a significant difference in satisfaction with reference to the Mann-Whitney U, associated with meeting fellow students where students attended the induction. When comparing students who attended an on-campus induction to all other students, Table 3, Panel B (regardless of whether they did not attend an induction or attended an online induction), we observed significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) satisfaction with opportunities to meet fellow students during their studies. This indicates greater efficacy of on-campus inductions and, in particular, the opportunities for students to establish meaningful connections.

Table 3

Satisfaction During the Course of Study

Panel A – Attendees and Non-Attendees Compared

	Attended induction		Difference	
	Yes (n = 117)	**No (n = 140)**	***Z*-stat**	***p*-value**
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students during your business studies to date?	3.624	3.479	-1.917	0.055

Panel B – On-Campus Attendees and Non-Attendees Compared

	Attended on-campus		Difference	
	Yes (n = 89)	**No (n = 168)**	***Z*-stat**	***p*-value**
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students during your business studies to date?	3.663	3.482	-1.998	0.046

Further to surveying students about satisfaction with meeting fellow students during their studies, we also asked an open-ended question on how meeting students at induction relates to their overall experience. We coded responses, which are reported in Table 4. Based on the coded responses, 32.4 percent indicated that meeting students at the induction was a positive experience, which is encouraging. Reassuringly, 26.5 and 20.6 percent, respectively, indicated that they were able to make friends at the induction, and this aided their transition to university. Some students specifically mentioned that it is excellent that they were able to make a friend or friends from day one. This is very important, as the majority would not have known anyone at commencement. Students also indicated they were more comfortable and less stressed about starting at university and felt they had a peer support network, noted as particularly important in the literature (Hullinger & Hogan, 2014). In addition, some indicated that meeting peers at the induction made them feel welcome and included, a very important component of university belonging. Only 5.9 percent indicated that meeting students at the induction made no difference.

Table 4

Induction and Overall University Experience

Qualitative comment coded	Mean	Std. deviation
Positive experience	0.324	0.475
Friends	0.265	0.448
Transition	0.206	0.410
More comfort/less stress	0.147	0.359
Peer support	0.147	0.359
Welcoming	0.088	0.288
Inclusion	0.059	0.239
Made no difference	0.059	0.239

One of the critical aspects of our intervention is facilitating sustained student connections. Consequently we asked students a yes or no question about whether they have remained in contact with students from the induction, comparing the average answer based on whether or not students completed the pre-induction form. It was the pre-induction form that was used to allocate students to groups, with the aim of increasing the probability of sustained connections. As reported in Table 5, we find a highly significant ($p < 0.01$) and substantial difference in whether students remain in contact with their peers post-induction. For students who completed the pre-induction form, 39.2 percent kept in touch with students they met at the induction, while this was only 16.3 percent for those who did not. These results are consistent with on-campus induction attendees (Panel B). While we would have hoped for higher percentages, the difference indicates value in pre-assigning students to group with peers they are more likely to connect with, thereby minimising isolation. We did not find a significant difference in the satisfaction with opportunities to meet students during the course of their studies, based on pre-induction form completion. However, it should also be noted that all students were provided with the same networking opportunities during their course, therefore, we did not necessarily expect significant differences, as opposed to differences in sustained connections.

Table 5

Pre-Induction Form Completion and Within-Semester Contact

Panel A: All Students Who Attended Inductions

	Pre-induction form completion		Difference	
	Yes (n = 97)	No (n = 43)	*Z*-stat	*p*-value
Have you kept in contact with students you met at the business school induction? (Binary answer)	0.392	0.163	-2.666	0.008
Likert scale questions:				
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students during your business studies to date?	3.688	3.486	-1.361	0.174

Panel B: On-Campus Attendees Only

	Pre-induction form completion		Difference	
	Yes (n = 80)	**No (n = 22)**	***Z*-stat**	***p*-value**
Have you kept in contact with students you met at the business school induction? (Binary answer)	0.400	0.160	-2.196	0.028
Likert scale questions:				
How satisfied are you with the opportunities to meet fellow students during your business studies to date?	3.687	3.591	-0.760	0.447

Conclusion

We found that significantly and substantially higher proportions of students kept in touch when they completed a pre-induction form enabling social engineering into small groups based on shared interest and pragmatic factors. Overall, social engineering at inductions based on the homogeneity of personal and study interests is worthwhile in aiding student connectedness via inductions and would be expected to facilitate the social integration of students as they commence their course. Such integration is very important in generating the development of student friendships and support networks (Pittman & Richmond, 2008), aiding student retention and success (Beil et al., 2000; Hausmann et al., 2007; Hullinger & Hogan, 2014; Tinto, 1982, 2003; Wilcox et al., 2005). Of course, the intervention we report is one of many interventions to aid student transition (Thomas, 2012), however, it provides an important foundation.

Acknowledgements
We would like to thank our colleagues at the University of Technology Sydney and across the tertiary sector more broadly for their feedback on an earlier version of this paper.

References

Abdul-Rahaman, N., Terentev, E., & Arkorful, V. E. (2023). The tertiary experience: Of social integration, retention and persistence – A review. *Public Organization Review*, *23*(1), 133-147. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-022-00603-2

Alsford, S., & Rose, C. (2014). Practice and policy to enhance student induction and transition: A case study of institution-wide change. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *18*(2), 51-61. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2014.918568

Beil, C., Reisen, C. A., Zea, M. C., & Caplan, R. C. (2000). A longitudinal study of the effects of academic and social integration and commitment on retention. *NASPA Journal*, *37*(1), 376-385. https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1094

Brooman, S., & Darwent, S. (2014). Measuring the beginning: A quantitative study of the transition to higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(9), 1523-1541. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.801428

Bryden, J., Funk, S., Geard, N., Bullock, S., & Jansen, V. A. (2011). Stability in flux: Community structure in dynamic networks. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, *8*(60), 1031-1040. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2010.0524

Burke, A. (2011). Group work: How to use groups effectively. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, *11*(2), 87-95.

Butterfield, J., & Bailey, J. J. (1996). Socially engineered groups in business curricula: An investigation of the effects of team composition on group output. *Journal of Education for Business*, *72*(2), 103-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.1996.10116835

Cartwright, D. (1951). Achieving change in people: Some applications of group dynamics theory. *Human Relations*, *4*(4), 381-392. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400404

Chapman, K. J., Meuter, M., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2006). Can't we pick our own groups? The influence of group selection method on group dynamics and outcomes. *Journal of Management Education*, *30*(4), 557-569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562905284872

Chen, C.-M., & Kuo, C.-H. (2019). An optimized group formation scheme to promote collaborative problem-based learning. *Computers & Education*, *133*, 94-115. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.01.011

Chen, R.-C., Chen, S.-Y., Fan, J.-Y., & Chen, Y.-T. (2012). Grouping partners for cooperative learning using genetic algorithm and social network analysis. *Procedia Engineering*, *29*, 3888-3893. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2012.01.589

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hausmann, L. R., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, *48*(7), 803-839. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-9052-9

Hullinger, M., & Hogan, R. L. (2014). Student anxiety: Effects of a new graduate student orientation program. *Administrative Issues Journal*, *4*(2), 27-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.3

Huxham, M., & Land, R. (2000). Assigning students in group work projects. Can we do better than random? *Innovations in Education and Training International*, *37*(1), 17-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/135580000362043

Johnson, G. M. (1994). Undergraduate student attrition: A comparison of the characteristics of students who withdraw and students who persist. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *40*(3), 337-353.

Lotkowski, V. A., Robbins, S. B., & Noeth, R. J. (2004). *The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention. ACT policy report*. American College Testing ACT Inc.

Moreno, J., Ovalle, D. A., & Vicari, R. M. (2012). A genetic algorithm approach for group formation in collaborative learning considering multiple student characteristics. *Computers & Education*, *58*(1), 560-569. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.09.011

Peat, M., Dalziel, J., & Grant, A. M. (2001). Enhancing the first year student experience by facilitating the development of peer networks through a one-day workshop. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *20*(2), 199-215. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360123888

Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2008). University belonging, friendship quality, and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *76*(4), 343-362. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.76.4.343-362

Rickard, G., Bramble, M., Maxwell, H., Einboden, R., Farrington, S., Say, R., Beh, C.-L., Stankiewicz, G., Campbell, C., & Yeh, C. (2018). Exploring the first-year experience in a diverse population: Using participatory action research to explore strategies to support student transition into fast-track undergraduate degree programs. *Student Success*, *9*(4), 41-51. https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v9i4.653

Seethamraju, R., & Borman, M. (2009). Influence of group formation choices on academic performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *34*(1), 31-40. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801895679

Thomas, L. (2012). *Building student engagement and belonging in higher education at a time of change. Final report from the What works? Student retention and success programme.* Advance HE. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/building-student-engagement-and-belonging-higher-education-time-change-final-report

Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *53*(6), 687-700. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1982.11780504

Tinto, V. (2003). Learning better together: The impact of learning communities on student success. *Higher Education Monograph Series*, *1*(8), 1-8.

Trotter, E., & Cove, G. (2005). Student retention: An exploration of the issues prevalent on a healthcare degree programme with mainly mature students. *Learning in Health and Social Care*, *4*(1), 29-42. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-6861.2005.00084.x

Trotter, E., & Roberts, C. A. (2006). Enhancing the early student experience. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *25*(4), 371-386. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360600947368

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *63*(6), 384. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100

Watts, J. (2019). Assessing an online student orientation: Impacts on retention, satisfaction, and student learning. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *28*(3), 254-270. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2019.1607905

Wenger, E. (2009). A social theory of learning. In *Contemporary theories of learning* (pp. 217-240). Routledge.

Wilcox, P., Winn, S., & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). 'It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': The role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *30*(6), 707-722. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070500340036

Zeegers, P., & Martin, L. (2001). A learning-to-learn program in a first-year chemistry class. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *20*(1), 35-52. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/07924360120043630

Please cite this article as:

Wakefield, J., & Grabowski, S. (2025). I'll be there for you: Generating sustained student connectedness from the beginning. A practice report. *Student Success*, *16*(1), 82-90. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.3527

This practice report has been accepted for publication in *Student Success.* Please see the Editorial Policies under the 'About' section of the Journal website for further information

Student Success: ***A journal exploring the experiences of students in tertiary education*.**