Article

OJED
OPEN JOURNALS IN EDUCATION

Journal of International Students
Volume 13, Issue 1 (2023), pp. 1-21
ISSN: 2162-3104 (Print), 2166-3750 (Online)
ojed.org/jis

Campus Sexual Violence: A Comparison of International and Domestic Students

Ihssane Fethi
University of Montreal, Canada
Isabelle Daigneault
University of Montreal, Canada
Manon Bergeron
University of Quebec in Montreal, Canada
Martine Hébert
University of Quebec in Montreal, Canada
Francine Lavoie
Laval University, Canada

ABSTRACT

The current study used an intersectional framework to investigate international students' experiences of sexual violence and examine differences in contexts, consequences, and disclosure between international and domestic students. Secondary analyses (chi-squares, multivariate logistic regressions) were conducted on previously collected data. The sample consisted of 6,554 students, including 764 international students. Compared with their domestic peers, international students of all ages, genders, sexual orientations, minority status, grade levels, and time spent at university faced an increased likelihood of being the target of sexual violence. Contexts and disclosure of victimization did not vary by student status. International students reported more PTSD symptoms after campus sexual violence. Future studies are needed to determine why perpetrators target international students. Prevention and intervention efforts need to acknowledge diversity among international students and potential victims who could be men, women, LGBTQ+ students, undergraduate and graduate students.

Keywords: campus sexual violence, disclosure, international students, intersectionality, posttraumatic stress

Campus sexual violence occurs at overwhelmingly high rates in postsecondary institutions in North America (Burczycka, 2020; Fedina et al., 2018), Europe

(Hamel et al., 2016; Ortensi & Farina, 2020), and Australia (Australian Human Rights Commission [AHRC], 2017). The current state of knowledge on campus sexual violence informs prevention and intervention programs but omits the experiences of marginalized populations, such as international students (Brubaker et al., 2017). Investigating international students' experiences of campus sexual violence is essential to fill the "critical gap" in the literature (Bonistall Postel, 2020) and to warrant accurate and inclusive prevention programs.

Sexual violence refers to sexual acts with or without physical contact against someone who does not consent, is unable to consent (e.g., while intoxicated), or is unable to refuse (e.g., under threats of physical violence) and covers a spectrum of experiences, including sexual assault, sexual harassment and unwanted touching (Basile et al., 2014). Sexual violence occurs in different contexts (e.g., in intimate relationships) and settings (e.g., in workplace environments). Campus sexual violence centers around sexual violence committed against students enrolled in institutions of higher education. Furthermore, campus sexual violence can cause detrimental physical and mental health consequences (e.g., injury, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder), academic repercussions (e.g., decrease in academic performance), and the use of alcohol or drugs to cope with the harmful effects of sexual violence (Burczycka, 2020; Flack et al., 2007; Molstad et al., 2021). Despite its damaging effects, campus sexual violence remains largely underreported, and students rarely disclose campus sexual violence to official authorities (Sabina & Ho, 2014).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on campus sexual violence has grown exponentially over the past decades yet remains centered around the experiences of cisgender heterosexual white women and interpersonal dynamics to understand sexual violence (Harris et al. 2019; Linder et al. 2020). This results in scholarly work that fails to include the experiences of nondominant populations or marginalized populations (e.g., LGBTQ+ students, students with disabilities, international students) and to discuss the dynamics of power and dominance as the root causes of sexual violence (Linder et al. 2020). Using an intersectional framework allows for a critical examination of campus sexual violence and acknowledges the role of interlocking systems of power that produce violence and oppression. Crenshaw's (1991) work on intersectionality demonstrated how intersecting systems of power and oppression (i.e., racism and sexism) shape the experiences of Black women and, as such, differ from those of White women and Black men. Intersectionality thus posits that a person simultaneously holds multiple social identities (e.g., age, race, class, gender identity, sexual orientation, class, immigration status, dis/ability), some identities conveying privilege and others oppression (Brubaker et al., 2017).

An intersectional approach to campus sexual violence recognizes that individuals who belong to marginalized social groups are disproportionately affected by campus sexual violence and have a reduced likelihood of reporting or seeking services (Brubaker et al., 2017; Linder et al., 2020; Pease et al., 2020;

Sabina & Ho, 2014). For instance, while any student can be a victim of campus sexual violence, marginalized students are targeted at higher rates than others. These include LGBTQ+ students, visible minority students (i.e., nonwhite students), students with disabilities, and students with a history of sexual victimization (Coulter et al., 2017; Fedina et al., 2018; Moylan & Javorka, 2020). An intersectional framework also considers that the needs for prevention, reporting, and support are qualitatively different for marginalized students (Harris, 2020). Failing to include accurate descriptions of the experiences of marginalized students such as LGBTQ+ students, visible minority students (i.e., nonwhite students), or international students results in incomplete information about campus sexual violence and may foster ineffective strategies to address this issue (Brubaker et al., 2017; Harris et al. 2019; Linder et al. 2020). Using an intersectional framework, this article examines international students' experiences of campus sexual violence.

International Students

An estimated five million international students currently attend postsecondary institutions, and their number has been growing exponentially around the world (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020), albeit with variations across countries (Johnson, 2020). International students choose to relocate for various reasons, such as improving their quality of life, seeking new experiences, and benefiting from different perspectives (Bista, 2019). These students may face challenges in the host country or university (e.g., adjusting to different cultural norms or education systems); they may struggle with language proficiency, social interactions with local peers, perceived discrimination, feelings of isolation, and financial insecurity (Brunsting et al., 2018; Glass et al., 2014; Jackson et al., 2013). International students typically report stress related to their adjustment, and these challenges may result in mental health disorders such as anxiety or depression (Jackson et al., 2013; Smith & Khawaja, 2011).

Extending Crenshaw's (1991) framework of intersectionality, several scholars argue that international student status intersects with multiple identities (e.g., gender, race) to create unique experiences of vulnerability due to interlocking systems of power (e.g., sexism, racism, colonialism, xenophobia, etc.) (Forbes-Mewett & McCulloch, 2016; Hutcheson, 2020; Park, 2018). While these students share the same international status, their experiences vary according to gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, class, and country of origin, thus representing a heterogeneous population. For instance, compared to their male counterparts, female international students are less likely to be victims of nonsexual physical assault and verbal threats (Daigle et al., 2018). International students of color are more likely to face discrimination than White international students (Lee & Rice, 2007), and LGBTQ+ international students face challenges related to discrimination, homophobia, and heteronormativity (Nguyen et al., 2017).

International Students' Experiences of Sexual Violence

There are multiple accounts and growing evidence supporting international students' vulnerability to crime, exploitation, and campus sexual violence (Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015; Funnell & Hush, 2018; Ortensi & Farina 2020; Tamborra et al. 2020). Studies investigating the link between international student status and campus sexual violence are scarce, and differences in findings suggest that the role of international status is complex to understand. Scholl et al. (2019) conducted a study among 829 students (13.5% international students) and found that 5.5% of international students experienced sexual violence. The authors found no association between student status and lifetime sexual violence, which they attributed to the small sample size (Scholl et al., 2019). A large-scale national study with over 30,000 university students in Australia revealed that 22% of international students experienced sexual harassment and 5.1% sexual assault over the course of one year (AHRC, 2017). Rates of campus sexual violence among international students were slightly lower compared to domestic students in some contexts (e.g., within the university) and higher in others (e.g., while commuting to university) (AHRC, 2017). Two other large-scale studies have reported higher rates of campus sexual violence among international students. A study in Canada indicated that 41.6% of international students had experienced some form of sexual violence compared to 35.5% of domestic students (Bergeron et al., 2016). Another study in Italy found twice as high rates of sexual violence among foreign-born students (Ortensi & Farina, 2020).

Variations in sexual violence rates between these studies could be attributed to differences in definitions of sexual violence, contexts of occurrence, and assessment methods. For instance, while sexual violence is acknowledged universally, labeling an experience as such depends on individual and sociocultural factors and can influence underreporting (Kalra & Bhugra, 2013). Studies inquiring about a wide range of acts and using behaviorally specific questions may yield more accurate estimates (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Koss et al., 2007). Previous research suggests that the underreporting of sexual violence among international students may be due to feelings of shame or not knowing if the behaviors they were subjected to were sexual harassment or part of the host culture (AHRC, 2017; Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015). Asking about specific behaviors is important to capture international students' experiences, as these questions do not require respondents to use their own definition of sexual violence or label their experiences as such.

Contexts of Sexual Violence

To better understand international students' experiences of campus sexual violence, an examination of who the perpetrator is and where the sexual violence occurred is needed. International students report being assaulted while living in housing accommodations and within the first few months of arriving in the host country (Funnell & Hush, 2018; Pedersen et al., 2021). Previous research on perpetrators was limited to determining if they were locals or another student and

did not assess relationships (e.g., intimate partner, professor) (Kimble et al., 2013; Pedersen et al., 2021). The body of knowledge could then benefit from a comparison of contexts of sexual violence to identify whether international students report different contexts and perpetrators compared to domestic students.

Consequences and Disclosure

Campus sexual violence has detrimental effects on victims, and the impacts on international students need to be assessed. Since these students are more likely to report acculturative stress and subsequent depression or anxiety (Brunsting et al., 2018), they could experience more severe mental health consequences. The potential mental health effects on international students are especially concerning because they are less likely to seek help for mental health issues (Hyun et al., 2007; Nguyen et al., 2019) and perceived as less likely to disclose sexual violence to service providers (Brubaker et al., 2017; Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015). Consequences for international students may even be more damaging, as they could impact their ability to fulfill academic requirements and jeopardize their stay in the host country. Furthermore, disclosing sexual violence and receiving appropriate support can alleviate some negative consequences (Sabina & Ho, 2014). Thus, documenting the impacts of campus sexual violence on international students, the type of help they want, and the disclosure of events is essential to ensure that they receive appropriate care.

Students' Characteristics

Only a few studies have examined the intersecting effects of student characteristics such as gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation among international students. For instance, using an intersectional framework, Forbes-Mewett and McCulloch (2016) found that international female students were particularly vulnerable to sexual harassment, domestic violence, and sexual exploitation, and their study highlights how the intersection of gender, class, and international student status creates a unique vulnerability to gender-based violence. Hutcheson (2020) and Park (2018) drew attention to the intersection of gender, race, and status to show how perpetrators of sexual violence target racialized international students. Other characteristics need to be explored, as higher rates of sexual violence were found among bisexual foreign-born women (Ortensi & Farina, 2020), among study abroad students who are men (Hummer et al., 2010), undergraduate women (Kimble et al., 2013) and women with a history of sexual victimization (Pedersen et al., 2021). These results highlight the importance of moving beyond a binary analysis of status (international vs. domestic) and exploring intersecting identities.

The Current Study

There is growing evidence suggesting that perpetrators of campus sexual violence target international students. This study seeks to comprehensively

examine international students' experiences of campus sexual violence using an intersectional framework. The current study expands on analyses conducted on a large sample of university students (Bergeron et al., 2016) and specifically aimed to:

1. Investigate international students' experiences of sexual harassment, unwanted sexual contact, and sexual coercion while accounting for students' characteristics.
2. Examine differences in contexts of sexual violence, consequences, and disclosure between international and domestic students.

Comparing international and domestic students would help determine how campus sexual violence affects international students. Such an analysis is important given that international students may be experiencing more significant challenges or unequal opportunities to education that would need to be explicitly addressed. The study seeks to contribute to the current efforts to intentionally include the experiences of marginalized populations (Linder et al. 2020). Intentional efforts to include marginalized students are essential to understand and end campus sexual violence for all students.

METHOD

Participants

The current study used previously collected data from a large-scale survey of campus sexual violence in six francophone universities in Québec, Canada (Bergeron et al., 2016). Following ethics review board approval, members of the six participating universities were recruited via online solicitation, posters, and email invitations between January and May 2016. A total of 9,284 students, faculty, and staff members completed the large-scale survey. The current study used the data of the student sample, which comprised 6,554 students, including 764 international students.

Measures

Campus Sexual Violence

Sexual violence was measured using a French adaptation of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1999; SEQ-DoD). The questionnaire uses behaviorally specific questions on different types of sexual violence and is widely used to measure sexual violence with good psychometric properties (Fitzgerald et al., 1999). The measure includes a total of 21 items (α =.89) and three subscales: (1) sexual harassment (i.e., verbal and nonverbal insults and hostile degrading behaviors), (2) unwanted sexual contact (i.e., verbal and nonverbal behaviors of a sexual, offensive, unwanted, or nonreciprocal nature, including attempted rape and sexual assault) and (3) sexual coercion (i.e., blackmail involving promises of future benefits related to jobs or studies). The sexual harassment subscale (α =.84) consists of eight items (e.g., "Did someone

make insulting or hurtful comments that were sexual in nature?"). The unwanted sexual contact subscale (α =.83) has seven items (e.g., "Did someone try to have sexual relations with you against your will"). The sexual coercion subscale (α =.86) has six items (e.g., "Did someone make you suffer negative consequences because you refused to engage in sexual activities with them"). For each question, participants were asked if they had experienced that type of sexual violence by someone from their university in the last 12 months ("yes" or "no"). Subscale scores were dichotomized (0 = no victimization and 1 = at least one event).

Contexts of Sexual Violence

Participants who reported campus sexual violence were asked additional questions regarding the context of these experiences. They answered questions to indicate the status of the perpetrator ("another student", "a professor or advisor", "an intimate partner or ex-partner") and questions on the physical context of sexual violence. Participants could indicate multiple responses to eight choices of context: "in class or during study-related activities," "while doing my tasks at work (i.e., university employment)", "during university initiations (i.e., social events organized during the first week of university)", "at on-campus parties or other social activities", "during athletic activities", "during volunteering activities", "online", or "in another context" (e.g., at home).

Consequences and Disclosure

Respondents who reported campus sexual violence also answered questions about the consequences they endured following the event. The Primary Care PTSD (Prins et al., 2003) was used and consisted of four yes/no items to evaluate the presence of traumatic symptoms such as flashbacks, avoidance, or hypervigilance (e.g., "have you experienced nightmares related to this event or unwittingly thought about it"). The total score was calculated by adding their responses to the four items, and a score higher than two reflected a clinical level of PTSD. All participants were asked what type of help they would want if they ever experienced sexual violence by someone from their university and could select multiple options. The choices examined in this study include "no help" and "psychological help at the university." Participants who reported sexual violence were asked whether (yes/no) they had disclosed the event to someone.

International Student Status

Following Shapiro et al.'s (2015) definition of international students, all those who came to the province from another country to pursue university studies and reported being international students were considered as such. Respondents indicated if they were international students (yes/no). Those who scored yes to the question were coded as one, and all other students were coded as zero (domestic students).

Control Variables

Participants indicated which age category they were in (18-25, 26-35, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, or 56 or more). Gender was determined by asking respondents whether they identified as "man", "woman", "nonbinary", "trans", or "other". Answers were then recoded into men, women, and gender minorities, including trans and nonbinary individuals. Sexual orientation was obtained using eight choices ("heterosexual", "homosexual, gay or lesbian", "bisexual", "bispiritual", "queer or pansexual", "asexual, "uncertain", "other"). Answers were divided into two categories: heterosexual and sexual diversity. Participants were asked if they identified as a visible minority ("yes" or "no"), which refers to someone who identifies as or is identifiable as nonwhite (Statistics Canada, 2015). Individuals also reported their grade level (undergraduate or graduate) and the number of years they had been attending their current university ("less than one year", "between 1 and 3 years", "between 3 and 5 years"). Prior victimization was measured by asking participants if they had experienced unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault before 18.

Analytical Plan

Secondary analyses for this study were conducted with IMB SPSS Statistics 25. We conducted a series of chi-square, binary, and multiple logistic regression analyses for the first objective (i.e., investigate international students' experiences of sexual harassment, unwanted sexual contact, and sexual coercion while accounting for students' characteristics). We first examined whether international students differed from domestic students on control variables and then assessed the odds of experiencing each form of sexual violence by status and students' characteristics. Consistent with an intersectional framework and to investigate the effects of intersecting identities (Rouhani, 2014), we created six two-way interaction terms using international student status and students' characteristics (i.e., age, gender, sexual orientation, visible minority, grade level, attendance). Each two-way interaction term (e.g., international student by gender) was subsequently used in multiple logistic regressions to assess campus sexual violence outcomes. For the second objective, we conducted a series of chi-square analyses to examine differences in contexts of sexual violence, consequences, and disclosure between international and domestic students.

As would be expected in a large-scale online survey, some missing data were found, mainly in the sociodemographic section. Analyses showed that data were missing completely at random, which was addressed using listwise deletion as usually recommended (Dong & Peng, 2013). The final sample used in the analyses consisted of 6,498 students who provided information about their experiences of campus sexual violence.

RESULTS

Objective 1: International Students' Experiences of Campus Sexual Violence

Age, gender, sexual orientation, minority status, grade level, and time spent at the current university significantly varied across student status. As shown in Table 1, international students were younger, with more than half under 25 years old. A greater percentage of international students identified as male and not heterosexual. Compared to domestic students, international students were more likely to self-identify as a visible minority, be graduate students, and have attended their current university for less than one year. Prior victimization did not significantly vary across student status, as both groups reported similar rates of unwanted sexual contact or rape before the age of 18.

Table 1: Students characteristics by status

	Internationals (n = 764)	Domestics (n = 5,790)	$\chi 2$
Age			9.73*
18-25 years old	65%	65%	
26-35 years old	28%	26%	
36-45 years old	5%	6%	
45-55 years old	2%	2%	
56 + years old	0%	1%	
Gender			20.5**
Male	31%	24%	
Female	67%	75%	
Gender minorities	2%	2%	
Sexual orientation			5.5**
Heterosexual	81%	85%	
Sexual diversity	19%	15%	
Visible minority			94.46**
Yes	16%	6%	
No	84%	94%	
Level of study			98.34**
Undergraduate	49%	67%	
Graduate	51%	33%	
Time spent in current university			80.23**
≤ 1 year	36%	24%	
> 1-3 years	43%	41%	
> 3-5 years	14%	19%	
> 5 years	7%	16%	
Prior sexual victimization	26%	25%	0.46

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Rates of campus sexual violence significantly varied across student status (Table 2). Compared to domestic students, international students reported more sexual harassment (30% vs. 24%) and more unwanted sexual contact (17% vs. 12%). Both student groups had similar rates of sexual coercion (2%). The results of binary logistic regressions are reported in the text. Overall, all variables significantly predicted sexual harassment, except for visible minority status. When tested together, student status was associated with sexual harassment, p <.001 odds ratio [OR] = 1.33, 95% confidence interval [CI] [1.12, 1.57], and visible minority status was not (p =.58). Similarly, binary logistic regressions with student status and student characteristics significantly predicted unwanted sexual contact, except for being a visible minority student. Being an international student significantly predicted unwanted sexual contact, p <.001 odds ratio [OR] = 1.54, 95% confidence interval [CI] [1.25, 1.9], and visible minority status did not (p =.77). Being an international student did not predict rates of sexual coercion.

Table 2: Campus sexual violence, consequences. and disclosure by status

	n[a]	International students	Domestic students	X^2
Sexual violence	6,498			
Sexual harassment		30%	24%	10.22**
Unwanted sexual contact		17%	12%	16.77**
Sexual coercion		2%	2%	2.41
Perpetrator	2,318			
Professor or advisor		20%	18%	0.66
Another student		86%	85%	0.34
Intimate partner/ex-partner		11%	9%	1.3
Physical contexts	2,312			
In class/study-related activities		44%	44%	0.01
At work		18%	14%	2.14
University initiations		10%	17%	9.02*
Social activities off/on campus		56%	54%	0.51
Athletic activities		4%	4%	0.22
Volunteering activities		16%	16%	0.01
Online		18%	19%	0.2
Other		20%	18%	0.51
Consequences	2,330	-	-	-
PTSD Symptoms		12%	8%	9.77*
Disclosure (yes)	2,295	62%	64%	4.34
Type of help	6,219	-	-	-
No help		10%	8%	4.27*
Psychological at the university		42%	50%	13.75**

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$. [a] The number of participants varied according to number of experiences and section completion.

The results of multivariate logistic regressions (Table 3) were all significant. International student status specifically predicted the odds of experiencing sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact while controlling for age, gender, sexual orientation, visible minority status, grade level, and time spent at the current university. For these analyses, effect sizes ranged between 0.05 and 0.12. Being an international student significantly increased the likelihood of experiencing sexual harassment by 45% and experiencing unwanted sexual contact by 65%. Student status did not predict sexual coercion when students' characteristics were included.

Table 3: Multivariate logistic regressions

	Sexual harassment			
	B (SE)	Wald's χ^2	*OR*	95% CI
International student	0.37 (0.09)	16.29**	1.45	[1.21, 1.74]
Gender (male)		66.76*		
Female	0.61 (0.07)	61.76**	1.84	[1.58, 2.14]
Nonbinary	0.95 (0.22)	18.56**	2.59	[1.68, 3.99]
Age (55+ year old)[a]		62.5**		
18-25 years old	1.1 (0.53)	4.31*	3.02	[1.06, 8.59]
26-35 years old	0.76 (0.53)	2.05	2.15	[0.75, 6.13]
36-45 years old	-0.11 (0.61)	0.02	1.08	[0.36, 3.2]
46-55 years old	-0.01 (0.12)	0.03	0.90	[0.27, 2.98]
Sexual minority	0.66 (0.08)	74.07**	1.94	[1.67, 2.26]
Visible minority	-0.02 (0.12)	0.02	0.98	[0.78, 1.2]
Grade level (undergrad)	0.17 (0.08)	4.86*	1.19	[1.02, 1.39]
Time in university (5+)		13.26*		
Less than one year	-0.14 (0.12)	1.22	0.87	[0.69, 1.11]
1-3 years	0.13 (0.11)	1.34	1.14	[0.91, 1.42]
3-5 years	0.09 (0.7)	0.7	1.10	[0.88, 1.38]
Constant	-2.87(0.54)	28.48**	0.06	
Model	χ^2 (13, *N*=6,554) = 301.28**			

Note. S.E. = standard error, *OR* = odds ratio, CI= confidence interval. *p <.05 **p <.001. a. Age levels were invariant across groups, and estimates were invalid.

Table 3 (continued) Multivariate logistic regressions

	Unwanted sexual contact			
	B (SE)	Wald's χ^2	*OR*	95% CI
International student	0.49 (0.11)	19.32**	1.65	[1.32, 2.06]
Gender (male)		57.34**		
Female	0.82 (0.11)	53.81**	2.28	[1.83, 2.85]
Nonbinary	1.2 (0.26)	18.96**	3.18	[1.89, 5.36]
Age (55+ year old)[a]		45.62**		
18-25 years old	1.74 (1.01)	2.98*	5.7	[0.78, 41.82]

26-35 years old	1.1 (1.02)	1.59	2.99	[0.41, 22.06]
36-45 years old	1.12 (0.61)	1.18	3.08	[0.41, 23.3]
46-55 years old	1.18 (0.12)	0.02	1.19	[0.13, 11.06]
Sexual minority	0.49 (0.1)	25.96**	1.65	[1.36, 2.01]
Visible minority	0.11 (0.14)	0.56	1.11	[0.84, 1.48]
Grade level (undergrad)	0.13 (0.1)	1.58	1.12	[0.92. 1.37]
Time in university (5+)		2.95		
Less than one year	-0.1 (0.6)	0.34	0.91	[0.66, 1.26]
1-3 years	0.07 (0.15)	0.2	1.07	[0.79, 1.45]
3-5 years	0.09 (0.01)	0.01	0.16	[0.73, 1.36]
Constant	-4.45 (1.02)	18.93**	0.01	
Model	χ^2 (13, *N*=6,554) = 204.69**			

Note. S.E. = standard error, *OR* = odds ratio, CI= confidence interval. *p <.05 **p <.001. a. Age levels were invariant across groups, and estimates were invalid.

Table 3 (continued) Multivariate logistic regressions

	Sexual coercion			
	B (SE)	Wald's χ^2	*OR*	95% CI
International student	0.38 (0.29)	1.69	1.46	[0.83, 1.59]
Gender (male)		5.89		
Female	0.62 (0.29)	4.46*	1.86*	[1.04, 3.3]
Nonbinary	1.17 (0.6)	3.83*	3.23*	[0.99, 10.49]
Age (55+)[a]				
18-25 years old				
26-35 years old				
36-45 years old				
46-55 years old				
Sexual minority	0.49 (0.25)	3.83*	1.63	[0.99, 2.67]
Visible minority	0.31 (0.35)	0.81	1.36	[0.69, 2.67]
Grade level (undergrad)	0.01 (0.3)	0.01	1.01	[0.58, 1.77]
Time in university (5+)		16.47**		
Less than one year	0.33 (0.52)	0.41	1.39	[0.5, 3.82]
1-3 years	1.01 (0.48)	4.41*	2.72	[1.07, 6.92]
3-5 years	-0.2 (0.58)	0.25	0.75	[0.24, 2.31]
Constant				
Model	χ^2 (13, *N*=6,554) = 47.47.69**			

Note. S.E. = standard error, *OR* = odds ratio, CI= confidence interval. *p <.05 **p <.001. a. Age levels were invariant across groups, and estimates were invalid.

Subsequent multivariate logistic regressions were performed to explore interaction effects between student status and students' characteristics (i.e., age, gender, sexual orientation, visible minority status, grade level, and time spent at the current university) in both sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact

outcomes. Two-way interaction terms (e.g., international status by gender) were not significant across all variables. Thus, international students of all ages, gender, sexual orientation, minority status, grade level, and time spent at university face an increased likelihood of being the target of sexual violence compared with their domestic peers.

Objective 2: Differences in Contexts of Sexual Violence, Consequences, and Disclosure

Contexts of sexual violence aimed to examine who the perpetrator was and where the sexual violence had occurred. The results (Table 2) show that 86% of international students reported that the perpetrator was another student, 20% indicated that the perpetrator was a professor, and 11% of them answered that they were an intimate partner or ex-partner. Perpetrator status did not significantly vary among participants who had experienced campus sexual violence. Physical contexts of sexual violence (e.g., during study-related activities) were selected at similar rates across student status, except for university initiations (i.e., social events organized during the first week of university). International students were significantly less likely to report sexual violence during faculty initiations than domestic students (10% vs. 17%).

The results associated with the presence of PTSD symptoms are presented in Table 2. International students were more likely to report at least two out of four symptoms than their domestic counterparts (12% vs. 8%). The results related to the type of help participants need after experiencing campus sexual violence are presented in Table 2. International students were significantly less likely to want any help (10% vs. 8%) or psychological support at their university (42% vs. 45%). Most of the sample indicated that they had disclosed their experiences of campus sexual violence (Table 2), and no differences were found across student status.

DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to (1) investigate international students' experiences of sexual harassment, unwanted sexual contact, and sexual coercion while accounting for students' characteristics and (2) examine differences in the contexts of campus sexual violence, consequences, and disclosure between international and domestic students.

Overall, the results of this study add to the literature by confirming high rates of campus sexual violence among domestic and international students. Consistent with previous research (Fedina et al., 2018), several student characteristics were associated with sexual violence, specifically being young, being female, being an LGBTQ+ student, and being an undergraduate student. As suggested by previous research, international students face greater odds of campus sexual violence (Kimble et al., 2013; Ortensi & Farina, 2020; Pedersen et al., 2021). Specifically, these students seemed to be the target of sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact. The likelihood of experiencing campus sexual violence remained high for

international students while accounting for age, gender, sexual orientation, visible minority status, grade level, and time spent at university.

Several student characteristics were associated with campus sexual violence among international students. Similar to previous findings (Kimble et al., 2013; Ortensi & Farina, 2020; Pedersen et al., 2021), international female and male students and international undergraduate students experience some form of sexual violence. Our study's unique findings were that both international graduate students and LGBTQ+ international students reported sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact. Our study did not replicate findings on prior sexual victimization as a predictor of sexual violence (Pedersen et al., 2021).

Campus sexual violence did not vary based on the length of stay among international students. Previous evidence pointed to a higher likelihood of being the target of sexual predators during the first few months of arrival (Funnell & Hush, 2018; Pedersen et al., 2021). The current study retrospectively assessed campus sexual violence in the last 12 months and not incidents relative to arrival. Thus, it could not correlate sexual violence occurrence with the length of stay. A prospective design investigating the association between length of stay and campus sexual violence would further our understanding of international students' experiences.

Unique to our study was the finding that campus sexual violence did not vary according to visible minority status, showing that both White and non-White international students are the target of sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact. Research on study abroad students mostly sampled White students and did not report differences based on ethnicity (Kimble et al., 2013; Pedersen et al., 2021). Students from diverse backgrounds (e.g., ethnic or religious backgrounds) may face an additional vulnerability not accounted for in the current study. For instance, evidence suggests that international women of color, specifically Asian females, could be more targeted (Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015; Park, 2018).

Additionally, the physical contexts of campus sexual violence did not vary across student status, with one exception. Faculty initiations (i.e., social events organized during the first week of university) emerged as a context where international students, compared to domestic students, were less likely to report sexual violence. While faculty initiations and party settings have been identified as risk factors for university students (Moylan & Javorka, 2020), they do not seem to apply to international students in the current sample. Since faculty initiation parties are organized for undergraduate students, international students may have been less likely to participate, as they were primarily graduate students. Last, perpetrator status (i.e., professor, another student, ex/current romantic partner) did not significantly vary among participants who reported campus sexual violence. These findings add valuable knowledge on international students' contexts of sexual violence and can inform prevention programs.

Mental health consequences were assessed by examining PTSD symptoms in both student groups. For international students specifically, the number of symptoms indicative of PTSD was higher, suggesting that they are more likely to report severe mental health consequences. This is consistent with Flack et al.'s (2015) study, which found a positive correlation between sexual violence and

PSTD in a sample of study abroad female students. Although our study did not assess direct aspects of acculturation, it is possible that related factors such as stress and anxiety due to being in a new environment, being isolated, and having a limited support system contribute to the severity of the symptoms. It also emerged that international students are less likely to want any help and psychological support from their current university. International students may have concerns regarding confidentiality and fear suffering consequences on their status if they disclose sexual violence to their university. These results are alarming, and universities should be aware of this to provide adequate support services and address underlying concerns that prevent international students from seeking help.

Furthermore, disclosure rates were similar across student status. This finding somewhat contrasts with the perception that international individuals would be less inclined to disclose sexual violence (Brubaker et al., 2017; Forbes-Mewett & McCulloch, 2016). Since the study did not specifically distinguish informal disclosure (e.g., to friends) from official reporting (e.g., to the police), disclosure of events among international students should continue to be explored.

Several factors seem to impact international students' likelihood of experiencing campus sexual violence, and future studies are needed. While sexual violence happens everywhere, behaviors that are considered unacceptable vary across cultural contexts and are socially determined (Kalra & Bhugra, 2013). Cultural differences have been previously related to the identification of abuse (Ahmad et al., 2004), and lack of familiarity with the host country could hinder the identification of potentially dangerous situations. Unfamiliarity with the host country has been previously discussed in sexual harassment (Forbes-Mewett & McCulloch, 2016) and vulnerability to various crimes, such as robbery and property theft (Tamborra et al., 2020). While understanding the role of familiarity with the host country is relevant, experiencing sexual violence may not be reduced to cultural differences or misunderstandings.

Such a reduction risks over-emphasizing interpersonal dynamics as a cause of campus sexual violence among international students and omits the role structural dynamics of power and dominance that allow sexual violence to thrive. Future studies are needed to determine why perpetrators target international students to address campus sexual violence effectively. Examining the structural dynamics of power that privilege individuals of majority groups may help identify the factors contributing to the perpetration of campus sexual violence against international students.

Strengths and Limits

While this study is among the first to our knowledge to extensively document international students' experiences of campus sexual violence, it does bear some limits. The study relied on previously collected data and missed some relevant information, such as data on the country of origin or perpetrators outside the university. This study aimed to provide a nuanced understanding of the experiences of international students by using an intersectional framework and

only focused on two intersecting identities (status and gender). Since there is evidence to support vulnerability among female racialized international students (Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015; Park, 2018) and female bisexual international students (Ortensi & Farina, 2020), it would be relevant to include more than two intersecting identities. Last, effect sizes were small, and analyses were correlational; thus, they should not be interpreted causally.

Despite these limitations, the current study has several strengths. It included a large sample of international students, which amounts to the proportion usually found in Canadian universities. The study assessed several forms of campus sexual violence and provided valuable information on the contexts of sexual violence, consequences, and disclosure. Most notably, using quantitative data and a sample of domestic students, the study provided insight into how campus sexual violence impacts international students

Implications

The present study provides several avenues for prevention and intervention. Existing sexual assault prevention programs have not been developed to represent the experiences of marginalized populations, including international students (Brubaker et al., 2017). Services intended for international students (e.g., welcoming and support services) should consider addressing campus sexual violence. Such prevention needs to acknowledge diversity within international students and potential victims who could be men, women, LGBTQ+ students, undergraduate and graduate students. International students need to be informed of their rights and support services, both inside and outside the university. Concerns over confidentiality and immigration must also be addressed. Effective interventions need to discuss perpetration against international students without reinforcing inherent deficit narratives. The tendency to view international students as deficit-holding in the context of sexual violence conveys the idea that they are responsible because of a lack of knowledge. Such victim-blaming narratives have been previously documented (Forbes-Mewett et al., 2015; Hutcheson, 2020) and lead to ineffective support. International students who come forward to disclose their experiences of sexual violence should be met with the level of care given to domestic students.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, F., Riaz, S., Barata, P., & Stewart, D. E. (2004). Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women. *Violence Against Women, 10*(3), 262–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203256000

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2017). Change the course: National report on sexual assault and sexual harassment at Australian universities. https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/AHRC_2017_ChangeTheCourse_UniversityReport.pdf

Basile, K., Smith, S., Breiding, M., Black, M., & Mahendra, R. (2014). Sexual Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 2.0. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv_surveillance_definitionsl-2009-a.pdf

Bergeron, M., Hébert, M., Ricci, S., Goyer, M.-F., Duhamel, N., Kurtzman, L., Auclair, I., Clennett-Sirois, L., Daigneault, I., Damant, D., Demers, S., Dion, J., Lavoie, F., Paquette, G., & Parent, S. (2016). Violences sexuelles en milieu universitaire au Québec: Rapport de recherche de l'enquête ESSIMU Université du Québec à Montréal. https://chairevssmes.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/124/Rapport-ESSIMU_COMPLET.pdf

Bista, K. (2019). Exploring the field: Understanding the international student experience. In Bista, K. (ed.), *Global Perspectives on International Student Experiences in Higher Education: Tensions and Issues* (pp. 1–16). Routledge.

Bonistall Postel, E. J. (2020). Violence against international students: A critical gap in the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 21*(1), 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838017742385

Brubaker, S. J., Keegan, B., Guadalupe-Diaz, X. L., & Beasley, B. (2017). Measuring and reporting campus sexual assault: Privilege and exclusion in what we know and what we do. *Sociology Compass, 11*(12), e12543. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12543

Brunsting, N. C., Zachry, C., & Takeuchi, R. (2018). Predictors of undergraduate international student psychosocial adjustment to U.S. universities: A systematic review from 2009-2018. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 66*, 22–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.06.002

Burczycka, M. (2020). Les expériences de comportements sexualisés non désirés et d'agressions sexuelles vécues par les étudiants des établissements d'enseignement postsecondaire dans les provinces canadiennes, 2019 (No 85-002 X). Statistique Canada. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00005-fra.htm

Coulter, R. W. S., Mair, C., Miller, E., Blosnich, J. R., Matthews, D. D., & McCauley, H. L. (2017). Prevalence of past-year sexual assault victimization among undergraduate students: Exploring differences by and intersections of gender identity, sexual identity, and race/ethnicity. *Prevention Science, 18*(6), 726–736. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-017-0762-8

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Daigle, L. E., Hoffman, C. Y., & Johnson, L. M. (2018). The extent and risk of violent victimization among international college students enrolled in the United States: A gendered analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(19), 3053–3073. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516633686

Dong, Y., & Peng, C.-Y. J. (2013). Principled missing data methods for researchers. *SpringerPlus, 2*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-222

Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 19(*1), 76–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016631129

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4), 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1704_2

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: the sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ—DoD). *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 243-263. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp1103_3

Flack Jr, W. F., Daubman, K. A., Caron, M. L., Asadorian, J. A., D'Aureli, N. R., Gigliotti, S. N., Hall, A. T., Kiser, S., & Stine, E. R. (2007). Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students: Hooking up, alcohol, and stress response. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22(2), 139–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506295354

Flack Jr, W. F., Kimble, M. O., Campbell, B. E., Hopper, A. B., Petercă, O., & Heller, E. J. (2015). Sexual assault victimization among female undergraduates during study abroad: A single campus survey study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(20), 3453–3466. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514563833

Forbes-Mewett, H., & McCulloch, J. (2016). International students and gender-based violence. Violence Against Women, 22(3), 344–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215602344

Forbes-Mewett, H., McCulloch, J., & Nyland, C. (2015). International students and crime. (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Funnell, N., & Hush, A. (2018). The Red Zone Report: An investigation into sexual violence and hazing in Australian university residential colleges. End Rape on Campus (EROC) Australia. https://apo.org.au/node/134766

Glass, C. R., Gómez, E., & Urzua, A. (2014). Recreation, intercultural friendship, and international students' adaptation to college by region of origin. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 42, 104–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.05.007

Hamel, C., Debauche, A., Brown, E., Lebugle, A., Lejbowicz, T., Mazuy, M., Charruault, A., Cromer, S., & Dupuis, J. (2016). Rape and sexual assault in France: Initial findings of the VIRAGE survey. *Population & Societies, 538*(10), 1–4. https://www.cairn-int.info/journal-population-and-societies-2016-10-page-1.htm

Harris, J. C. (2020). Women of color undergraduate students' experiences with campus sexual assault: An intersectional analysis. The Review of Higher Education, 44(1), 1-30. doi:10.1353/rhe.2020.0033.

Harris, J. C., Cobain, K. P., & Karunaratne, N. (2019). Reimagining the study of campus sexual assault. In Perna L. (Eds). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 1–47. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11743-6_12-1.

Hummer, J. F., Pedersen, E. R., Mirza, T., & LaBrie, J. W. (2010). Factors associated with general and sexual alcohol-related consequences: An examination of college

students while studying abroad. Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 47(4), 421–438. https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.6134

Hutcheson, S. (2020). Sexual violence, representation, and racialized identities: Implications for International Students. *Education & Law Journal, 29*(2), 191–221. http://ezproxy.usherbrooke.ca/

Hutcheson, S., & Lewington, S. (2017). Navigating the labyrinth: Policy barriers to international students' reporting of sexual assault in Canada and the United States. *Education & Law Journal, 27*(1), 81-98. http://ezproxy.usherbrooke.ca/

Hyun, J., Quinn, B., Madon, T., & Lustig, S. (2007). Mental health need, awareness, and use of counseling services among international graduate students. Journal of American College Health, 56(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.3200/JACH.56.2.109-118

Jackson, M., Ray, S., & Bybell, D. (2013). International students in the U.S.: Social and psychological adjustment. Journal of International Students, 3(1), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v3i1.515

Johnson, K. (2020). 21st century international higher education hotspots: International student mobility growth in nontraditional destination countries. *Journal of International Students, 10*(1), v–viii. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1851

Kalra, G., & Bhugra, D. (2013). Sexual violence against women: Understanding cross-cultural intersections. Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 55(3), 244–249. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.117139

Kimble, M., Flack Jr, W. F., & Burbridge, E. (2013). Study abroad increases risk for sexual assault in female undergraduates: A preliminary report. Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 5(5), 426. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029608

Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31(4), 237–270. https://doi.org/10. 1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00385.x

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. Higher Education, 53(3), 381–409. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3

Linder, C., Grimes, N., Williams, B. M., & Lacy, M. C. (2020). What do we know about campus sexual violence? A content analysis of 10 years of research. The Review of Higher Education, 43(4), 1017-1040.

Molstad, T. D., Weinhardt, J. M., & Jones, R. (2021). Sexual assault as a contributor to academic outcomes in university: A systematic review. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211030247

Moylan, C. A., & Javorka, M. (2020). Widening the lens: An ecological review of campus sexual assault. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 21(1), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018756121

Nguyen, H., Grafsky, E., & Lambert-Shute, J. (2017). The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer international students: A systematic review. Journal of

Underrepresented & Minority Progress, 1(1), 80–94. https://doi.org/10.32674/jump.v1i1.39

Nguyen, M.-H., Serik, M., Vuong, T.-T., & Ho, M.-T. (2019). Internationalization and its discontents: Help-seeking behaviors of students in a multicultural environment regarding acculturative stress and depression. Sustainability, 11(7), 1865–1885. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11071865

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). What is the profile of internationally mobile students? In Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators (pp. 226–241). https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en

Ortensi, L. E., & Farina, P. (2020). Sexual violence victimisation among university students in Italy: A gendered intersectional quantitative approach. Genus, 76(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41118-020-00101-7

Park, H. (2018). Violence against international students on North American university and college campuses: An intersectional, structural and global analysis. Canadian Woman Studies, 32(1–2). https://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/view/37692

Pease, B., Goldingay, S., Hosken, N., & Nipperess, S. (Eds.). (2020). Doing critical social work: Transformative practices for social justice. Routledge.

Pedersen, E. R., DiGuiseppi, G., Klein, D. J., Davis, J. P., Farris, C., D'Amico, E. J., LaBrie, J. W., & Griffin, B. A. (2021). Sexual violence victimization among American college students studying abroad. Journal of American College Health, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2021.1950733

Prins, A., Ouimette, P., Kimerling, R., Cameron, R. P., Hugelshofer, D. S., Shaw-Hegwer, J., Thrailkill, A., Gusman, F. D., & Sheikh, J. I. (2003). The primary care PTSD screen (PC-PTSD): Development and operating characteristics. *Primary Care Psychiatry, 9(1*), 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1185/135525703125002360

Rouhani, S. (2014). *Intersectionality-informed quantitative research: A primer.* Institute for Intersectionality Research & Policy, Simon Fraser University.

Sabina, C., & Ho, L. Y. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence: Disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,* 15(3), 201–226. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521322

Scholl, J. A., Cogan, C., Micol, R. L., Steward, J., Hancock, K., & Davis, J. L. (2019). Physical and sexual violence on college campuses: Considerations for international students. *Journal of American College Health, 69(3*), 331-334. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2019.1668398

Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R., & Tomas, Z. (2015). *Fostering international student success in higher education.* TESOL International Association.

Smith, R. A., & Khawaja, N. G. (2011). A review of the acculturation experiences of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 35(6), 699–713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.08.004

Statistics Canada. (2015). Visible minority of person. Immigration and ethnocultural diversity. http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=45152

Tamborra, T. L., Baker, A. N., Jeffries, S., Tempio, M., & Campbell, E. (2020). Criminal victimization experienced while studying abroad: An examination of

rates and other relevant factors. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 24*(5), 573–588. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319861354.

Author bios

IHSSANE FETHI, BA (Hons) is a PhD candidate in clinical psychology at the University of Montreal (Canada). Her research interests include sexual violence among marginalized populations, intersectionality, and sexual violence prevention. Email: ihssane.fethi@umontreal.ca

ISABELLE DAIGNEAULT, PhD, is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Montreal (Quebec, Canada). She runs the research laboratory on the trajectories of health and resilience of sexually assaulted youth (TRAJETS). Her research projects are related to the resilience and health of youth who have experienced sexual assault and processes influencing the life trajectories of young victims. Email: isabelle.daigneault@umontreal.ca

MANON BERGERON, PhD, is an associate professor at the Département de sexologie at the Université du Québec à Montréal (Quebec, Canada). She holds the Research Chair on sexist and sexual violence in higher education. Her research projects address sexual violence in higher education and prevention of sexual violence. Email: bergeron.manon@uqam.ca

MARTINE HÉBERT, PhD, trained as a psychologist and professor at the Département de sexologie at the Université du Québec à Montréal (Quebec, Canada), is the Canada Research Chair in interpersonal traumas and resilience. Her main research interests center on sexual abuse and teen dating violence. Her current projects explore personal and familial factors related to recovery following sexual abuse and the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programs in collaboration with different practice settings. Email: hebert.m@uqam.ca

FRANCINE LAVOIE, PhD, is a professor in community psychology at Université Laval, Québec. She has also developed and evaluated two prevention programs on dating violence (ViRAJ and PASSAJ) for high school students. Her more recent work was on violence in Nunavik and on sexualized social activities in adolescence. She is a fellow of the Society for Community Research and Action (American Psychological Association). Email: francine.lavoie@psy.ulaval.ca