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Abstract
The declining trend of international student enrollment in the United States has been investigated from the standpoint of social discrimination, and more recently, by accounting for the compounding effects of COVID-19-based campus closures and remote learning operations. The purpose of this study was to explore whether experiences of campus alienation are related to difficulties international students faced while accessing campus services remotely. A survey was developed and validated for the study. It was completed by 417 international students attending US postsecondary institutions. A canonical correlation was conducted to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between campus exclusion, COVID-19 racism, and country of origin as one set of variables, and difficulties accessing campus services remotely (DASCR) and international travel difficulties as the other set. Results revealed one significant canonical function; this model explained 27% of variance shared between the two variable sets. Indicators of shared variance provided evidence for significant relationships between experiences characterizing campus alienation and DASCR. Implications are drawn in light of policy and program development, and practical examples are provided for postsecondary educators on how to offer pertinent outreach to their international students and advocate for inclusive campus policies in managing international student engagement remotely during campus closure.
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Introduction

Starting in February 2020, the COVID-19 infection started to rapidly spread around the United States upending the daily lives of students, educators, and the general population alike (Fischer, 2020). By April 2020, it was reported to have spread to over 180 countries across the globe (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020). It has shown to have disrupted the ongoing academic progress of international students in all parts of the globe—Canada (Firang, 2020), Portugal (Malet Calvo, et al., 2021), Russia (Novikov, 2020), China (Demuyakor, 2020), Indonesia (Nurfaidah et al., 2020), and Australia (Coffey et al., 2021) to list a few. COVID-19 significantly impacted the delivery of international education and the provision of campus services in the United States as well (Lederman, 2021; Quinton, 2020). The vast majority of colleges and universities located across different parts of the United States announced the immediate closure of campuses during the month of March (Redden, 2020). What followed was a remarkable pivoting in the conduction of all university operations from an in-person to remote learning mode. From classroom learning (Ashfaquzzaman, 2020) to campus services (Chirikov & Soria, 2020), all direct services started to be delivered virtually, regardless of one’s level of study (Levine et al., 2021).

International students in the United States form a substantive population of the total student enrollment with over a million currently enrolled across different parts of the United States (Institute of International Education, 2020). However, their enrollment rates have softened in the last 3 years with analysts attributing the declining trends to sociopolitical changes in the United States (Fischer, 2020; Redden, 2018). In addition, previous research has shown the role of environmental factors that pertain to international students facing social discrimination within and beyond campus (Inyama et al., 2016; Lee 2010, 2014).

Recently, some public health researchers have argued the pandemic has illuminated health and related systemic disparities in academic settings, with Black, Indigenous, People of Color—POC students and international students having been disproportionately impacted due to the prevalent systemic racism and increasing xenophobia in and outside campus environments (Blake et al., 2021). The impact has been noted specifically in the areas of stress management, social support, access to resources (medical), successful maintenance of student visas, and timely completion of career goals (Blake et al., 2021). Similar perspectives that shed light on the role of COVID-19 having worsened the existing disparities in postsecondary education are echoed by other commentators in education-at-large (Arnove, 2020) as well as international education (Fischer, 2020). Thus, this study explores whether and how experiences of campus alienation related to the difficulties international students faced while accessing campus services remotely, during a period of COVID-19 campus closure. More specifically, this study was conducted during the months of March and October of 2020 and international students who were attending a 4-year college or university in the United States were invited to participate.
Campus Alienation

There are multiple forms of alienation in the context of international students; however, this study is aimed at focusing on experiences of campus alienation among international students in the context of COVID-19 campus closures. With regard to emerging research on student engagement and student satisfaction, previous research highlights the unique challenges of international students and presents them as a vulnerable demographic (Perry et al., 2018; Sherry et al., 2010). For example, many international students experience acculturative stress as demonstrated in both historical (Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994) and recent research (Ma et al., 2020; Szabó et al., 2020). Acculturative stress manifests in the form of international students reporting homesickness, racism, and other forms of othering, such as alienation (Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994). There is also research that has shown that with more time, new adjustment challenges can emerge, for example, cultural difficulties in the beginning and career concerns during later stages of education (Hanassab & Tidwell, 2002). Sociocultural underpinnings of international student engagement also include the role of environmental influences that shape the perceptions of international students by creating critical incidents. These incidents can be both subjective and collective and signal to international students whether their campus environment is accessible and responsive to their acculturation and transition toward finding a sense of belonging (Houshmand et al., 2014; Lee, 2006; Strayhorn, 2012). A sense of belonging is also strengthened by ensuring that international students feel supported and visible on campus (de Araujo, 2011; Lee, 2014). Promptly attending to issues that limit international students from feeling excluded and othered is important in maintaining an atmosphere of inclusion on campus. The concepts of campus climate and neo-racism are relevant in the context of campus inclusion.

How international students perceive the environmental culture and climate of their campus can significantly add to their perceptions of safety and community, and henceforth serve as a precursor to their willingness to engage on campus (Glass, 2012; Glass et al., 2015; Williams & Johnson, 2011). A study by Glass (2012) was conducted with 437 undergraduate international students assessing relationships between perceptions of campus climate and other learning indices (e.g., participation in leadership and community service). Results of the study showed that international students who reported more positive perceptions of campus climate also participated in more intergroup dialogs in the classroom.

Neo-racism is a kind of discrimination that occurs as a result of cultural differences, including that of nationality and relationships between countries (Lee, 2006). Studies conducted with samples of international students have shown that the effects of neo-racism constitute much of the bias and discrimination they face (Lee, 2007, 2010). Such negative experiences can adversely impact enrollment. A study by Lee (2010) examined international students’ experiences at a US university and how these experiences might influence them to form an opinion on whether they would recommend or not recommend their university to other potential students from their home country. Results indicated that students hailing from non-European countries (e.g., India and China) had more negative experiences. Given speculations in global media about the origin of
COVID-19 infection having started in Wuhan, China, international students from China and neighboring South-East and East Asian countries became targets of xenophobic hate and discrimination, along with Asian Americans of South-East Asian descent (Litam, 2020; Zhai & Du, 2020). These speculations in the general population would have likely racialized international students from China and neighboring countries who remained in the United States during campus closures (Zhai & Du, 2020). Furthermore, recent studies provide evidence for individuals appearing to be of Chinese ethnicity (Gover et al., 2020, Koo, 2021), including international students of color (Koo et al., 2023) reporting racially unpleasant experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Help-Seeking During COVID-19

In addition to the developmental challenges faced by domestic students, international students face problems adjusting to their campus cultures where local norms of socialization might seem novel and English is the mode of communication (Lacina, 2002; Sherry, et al., 2010). Furthermore, it is likely that problems of language and everyday interactions may impact both stand-alone challenges as well as barriers in seeking help and support. For example, an international student might be socializing only with a peer group from one’s country of origin (CO) and not be aware of local resources that the peer group is not aware of either, especially during a campus closure. Studies have shown that challenges faced by international students affect their willingness to seek and utilize helping resources (McLachlan & Justice, 2009; Olivas & Li, 2006), particularly for concerns pertaining to mental health (Frey & Roysircar, 2006). Such trends in educational and psychological research warrant campus programming, particularly at institutions with higher international student enrollment rates, to address the needs and unique barriers international students might be facing on their campus during COVID-19. Therefore, the researcher determined it would be best to ask targeted questions regarding the impact COVID-19 may have had on international students as they navigated campus closures.

Method

As indicated above, this study was aimed at exploring whether and how experiences of campus alienation related to the difficulties international students faced while accessing campus services remotely, during a period of COVID-19 campus closure. This study employed a correlational research design. A canonical correlation analysis was used to explore potential relationships between experiences of campus alienation and difficulties international students faced while accessing campus services remotely. Data collection was conducted through an online survey. Campus alienation was assessed in the form of experiences that provided evidence for feelings of exclusion and racism on campus. Difficulties in accessing campus services remotely were assessed by directly asking participants to report the extent to which they were able to access campus services and receive the information needed to manage international travel.
Participants and Procedures

An electronic mode of data collection was employed in this study, which was also appropriate for collecting survey data during the outbreak of a pandemic, as the vast majority of students switched to remote learning mode (Quinton, 2020). The criteria for participation clearly specified that potential participants need to be currently enrolled international students at a US institution and at least 18 years of age to complete the survey. In total, 422 international students attempted the survey of which approximately 98% of participants completed the survey (five to seven participants did not complete either all demographic or other sections). Resultingly, the final sample comprised of 417 international students who completed both demographic and other items. The breakdown of key demographic variables is presented in Table 1. Additionally, respondents endorsed a wide variety of majors by listing disciplines from the humanities, sciences, engineering, business, and education. Computer science and mechanical engineering were the top two reported majors by 23 and 16 international students, respectively. Average GPA was reported as above 3.0 and average self-reported ratings on questions asking about English speaking and reading ability were 4.1 and 4.3, respectively. For these items, the range was provided as 1 = “Very Poor” to 5 = “Very Good”. Participants’ responses to the country of origin-CO question generated a long list of over 40 countries, and the top five responses are provided in Table 1. Lastly, the vast majority of participants (almost 98%) reported their student visa category as F1. J1 (exchange scholars) and M1 (vocational studies) were reported as visa types by two and one participant, respectively.

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, the researcher first targeted respondents located at institutions that were nearby the researcher’s location. These were institutions located in a Midwestern state and were members of the state-based international consortium. Institutional representatives of 11 member institutions were contacted, of which 5 agreed to disseminate the study among international students at their campuses. About 76% of the participants who completed the survey attended a public university in this Midwestern state. Next, the researcher contacted institutions whose representatives could be members of an international educator listserv. This led to the remainder of the participants (almost 25%) that comprised the sample. These students also attended a public 4-year university, but in other states.

Instrumentation. The research question of this study was to examine the multivariate shared relationships between campus exclusion (CE), COVID-19 racism (C19R), CO as one set of variables, and difficulties accessing campus services remotely (DASCR) and international travel difficulties (ITD) as the other set. To test this question, data of select items from a newly developed, Likert-type scale questionnaire, the International Students’ Perceived Barriers and Service Utilization (ISPBSU) Survey (Lalwani, 2020) was employed in this study. The ISPBSU survey extended previous research on barriers to student engagement by surveying unique barriers faced by international students while seeking campus services. Given the survey was newly developed, the data were first tested for validity and factor structure, along with checking for
To provide evidence for face and content validity, an expert focus group was conducted first (Lalwani, 2020). Five international education professionals were identified. Each presented with more than 15 years of experience ($M = 17$ years) and three of them listed their current role as Director or Manager. All of the items that were used in the

| Table 1. International Student Participants’ Key Demographic Information. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Demographic category** | **Subgroups** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Level of study | 4-year-undergraduate | 147 | 34.8 |
| | Graduate/master’s | 133 | 31.5 |
| | Doctoral | 97 | 23 |
| | Specialist or certificate | 28 | 6.6 |
| | Other (nondegree, English as a Second Language-ESL), etc. | 8 | 2.4 |
| | Missing | 7 | 1.7 |
| Gender identity | Cisgender man | 172 | 40.8 |
| | Cisgender woman | 231 | 54.7 |
| | Nonbinary | 5 | 1.2 |
| | Transgender woman | 4 | 0.7 |
| | Transgender man | 0 | — |
| | Self-defined | 4 | 0.9 |
| | Missing | 7 | 1.7 |
| Race/ethnicity | Asian | 302 | 71.6 |
| | African/Black | 16 | 3.8 |
| | Caucasian/White | 42 | 10 |
| | First Nations | 0 | — |
| | Latinx | 21 | 5 |
| | North African/Middle Eastern | 30 | 7.1 |
| | Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.2 |
| | Multiracial/self-defined | 4 | 0.9 |
| | Missing | 6 | 1.4 |
| Top 5 country of origin | India | 83 | 19.7 |
| | China | 63 | 14.9 |
| | South Korea | 49 | 11.6 |
| | Japan | 36 | 8.5 |
| | Vietnam | 13 | 3.1 |
| Age | 18–21 | 87 | 20.6 |
| | 22–29 | 238 | 56.4 |
| | 30–33 | 53 | 12.6 |
| | 34 and above | 37 | 8.7 |
| | Missing | 7 | 1.7 |

*Note. $N = 422$.*

reliability (Hair et al., 2014). Results of factor structure analysis are discussed in the data analysis section.
study received an endorsement of “yes” for the validity question by the focus group members. Following the focus group, a pilot administration was conducted with 15 international student participants.

The final ISPBSU survey consisted of 84 items divided into four sections: demographic items (23 items), international students’ barriers (26 items), underutilization of campus services (24 items), and COVID-19 barriers (10 items). Two nonfactor items were included to assess for inattentive responding; for example, asking the participant to choose a certain response from the Likert-type scale (Hair et al., 2014). A few items were worded in the reverse direction as an additional check for inattentive responding. However, data from only select items from this survey were used in the current study.

**Campus exclusion.** This scale Campus exclusion (CE) comprised of three items (see Table 2 for an example). Two items were reverse coded at the time of analysis. As indicated above in the introduction, CE is comprised of perceptions of feeling unwelcomed and excluded on one’s campus. These items were adapted from previous research on international students’ perceptions of campus climate (Glass, 2012; Glass et al., 2015; Williams & Johnson, 2011). All questions required participants to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree.” The data for this scale had a $M=2.13$, $SD=0.94$, and Cronbach’s $\alpha=.79$.

| Variable and scale | Item example |
|--------------------|--------------|
| **Demographics**   |              |
| Institution        | Your current institution |
| Length of attendance| Your length of attendance |
| Gender identity    | Your current gender identity |
| Level of study     | Your current level of study |
| Country-of-origin  | Your country of origin |
| Racial–ethnic group| Your race/ethnicity |
| Age                | Your age |
| **Independent variables** |              |
| CE                 | My campus feels welcoming of me as an international student (to be reverse coded). |
| C19R               | I am treated differently because of my race/ethnicity. |
| Country-of-origin  | Your country of origin |
| **Dependent variables** |              |
| DACSR              | I am able to easily access campus services that are offered remotely (to be reverse coded). |
| ITD                | There is lack of information on how my institution will help me get to my home country in the midst of travel restrictions enforced by various countries during the pandemic |

*Note. CE = campus exclusion; C19R = COVID-19 racism; DACSR = difficulties accessing campus services remotely; ITD = international travel difficulties.*
COVID-19 racism. This scale (C19R) is comprised of four items (see Table 2 for an example). Items on this scale were adapted from the Perceived Discrimination subscale of the acculturative stress scale (Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994). All questions required participants to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree.” The data for this scale had an \( M = 2.34 \), \( SD = 0.99 \), and Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .83 \).

Country of Origin. This scale (CO) comprised simply one item from the demographic section that asked the participants to list their CO. Given the speculations in global media about the origin of COVID-19 infection having started in China, international students from China and neighboring South-East and East Asian countries were being targeted for hate and discrimination (Zhai & Du, 2020). To account for that specific form of discrimination, the responses to this item were binary coded as 1 = China, Vietnam, South Korea, Japan, and 0 = Other Country.

Difficulties Accessing Campus Services Remotely. This scale (DACSR) is comprised of four items (see Table 2 for an example). One item was reverse coded at the time of analysis. Items on this scale were adapted from published accounts available at the time of data collection (Fischer, 2020; Zhai & Du, 2020). All questions required participants to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree.” The data for this scale had an \( M = 2.77 \), \( SD = 0.82 \), and Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .67 \).

International travel difficulties. This scale (ITD) is comprised of two items (see Table 2 for an example). Items on this scale were also adapted from published accounts available at the time of data collection (Fischer, 2020; Zhai & Du, 2020). All questions required participants to respond on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree.” The data for this scale had an \( M = 3.09 \), \( SD = 1.18 \), and Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .88 \).

Data Analysis

The data were first checked for missing responses and those missing responses were eliminated. Descriptive statistics were then computed to check the normality of score distribution for the resulting items. Based on the descriptive statistics, valid responses were identified. Histograms and box plots were employed to identify outliers in the data distribution. Items with skewness and kurtosis of less than an absolute value of one were considered normally distributed for statistical analyses (Hair et al., 2014). A canonical correlation was conducted to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between CE, C19R, and CO as one set of variables, and DASCR and ITD as the other set. A canonical correlation is an appropriate statistical method for this study because it allows the researcher to examine the relationships between multiple predictor variables and criterion variables at the same time (Sherry & Henson, 2005).
Factor analysis. After data checks were completed and before further analysis, the dataset was used to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), that helped in determining which items can be eliminated based on their poor factor loadings or less than .70 coefficient alpha reliability estimate values. Although, an exception was made for one of the scale’s reliability coefficient indexes (see “Limitations” section). Data of the 13 items—7 items of independent variables (CE and C19R) and 6 items of dependent variables—were entered in the data reduction program of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The range was uniform in that all scores were in the range of 1 to 5; where 1 = “Strongly Disagree” and 5 = “Strongly Agree.” Results of EFA with principal axis factoring as the extraction method are provided in Table 3. The results of Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) (.825) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2_{(78)} = 2506.72, p < .000$) indicated adequacy in sample size ($N = 421$) and correlations existing among variables for a factor analysis to be interpreted (Hair et al., 2014). Further, data from the commonalities suggested that the majority of items had an extraction correlation of more than .50, which is the recommended acceptable cut-off (Hair et al., 2014).

Results

As mentioned above, a canonical correlation method of data analysis was used to answer the research question. CE, C19R, and CO were used as the set of predictor variables, DASCR, and ITD as the set of criterion variables. In accordance with Sherry and Henson’s (2005) recommendations, structure coefficients above .45 were interpreted. Results of the canonical correlation, which accounted for 27% of the variance, revealed one significant function: Wilk’s $\lambda = .727$, $F_{(6, 824)} = 23.7$, $p < .001$. The results of this function, including structure coefficients and squared structure coefficients, are available in Table 4. This function $R_c = .514$ ($p < .001$); and the corresponding full model revealed that when international student participants felt a sense of CE and racism during COVID-19 campus closures, they also experienced DASCR and managing international travel. CO did not show as a significant predictor. However, the results confirmed that international students experiencing alienation in the form of CE and racism faced difficulties during campus closures due to COVID-19.

Discussion

As listed in Table 4, indicators of shared variance ($r_s$) for the majority of variables were substantive (CE = 0.921, C19R = 0.835, DASCR = 0.884, and ITD = 0.845), providing evidence for significant positive relationships between experiences characterizing campus alienation and DASCR. These results demonstrate that international student participants who felt unwelcomed, excluded, and endorsed a general lack of support for international students on their campuses were likely to find their campuses insufficiently prepared and unresponsive to their needs during a global health crisis, such as COVID-19. Further, these results also demonstrate that international student participants who experienced racism of both general and incidental kinds (the latter vis-à-vis speculations regarding COVID-19’s origin) were likely to face difficulties
accessing campus services and managing international travel. Specifically, these participants reported feelings of uncertainty, difficulty in accessing campus services, and having campus service providers respond to their requests during campus closure, along with feelings of isolation as a result. Additionally, the participants reported a lack of information on how their institution will help them manage cross-border travel to and from the United States.

These results align with previous research that has addressed the role of environmental stressors in the form of campus climate (Glass, 2012; Glass et al., 2015; Table 3. Results of Rotated Factor Matrix.

| Item code | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CE1       | 0.623 |       |       |       |
| CE2       | 0.784 |       |       |       |
| CE3       | 0.665 |       |       |       |
| C19R1     | 0.846 | 0.455 |       |       |
| C19R2     | 0.871 |       | 0.477 |       |
| C19R3     | 0.551 |       | 0.608 |       |
| C19R4     | 0.453 |       | 0.562 |       |
| DACSR1    |       | 0.852 |       |       |
| DACSR2    |       | 0.785 |       |       |
| DACSR3    |       |       |       |       |
| DACSR4    |       |       |       |       |

Note. N=421; principal axis factoring extraction method. CE = campus exclusion; C19R = COVID-19 racism; DACSR = difficulties accessing campus services remotely; ITD = international travel difficulties.

Table 4. Canonical Solution for Campus Alienation Predicting COVID-19 Difficulties.

| Variables | Function | $r_s$ | $r^2_s$ (%) |
|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|
| Set 1: Predictor variables | | | |
| CE        | $r_s$ | 0.921 | 84.82       |
| C19R      | $r_s$ | 0.835 | 69.72       |
| CO        | $r_s$ | 0.083 | 00.68       |
| Set 2: Criterion variables | | | |
| DACSR     | $r_s$ | 0.884 | 78.14       |
| ITD       | $r_s$ | 0.845 | 71.40       |

Note. Wilk’s $\lambda = .727$, $F_{(6, 824)} = 23.7$, $p < .001$. $r_s$ structure coefficient; $r^2_s$ squared structure coefficient. All but one structure coefficients are greater than .45 and are interpretable. CE = campus exclusion; C19R = COVID-19 racism; CO = country of origin; DACSR = difficulties accessing campus services remotely; ITD = international travel difficulties.
Williams & Johnson, 2011) and neo-racism (Lee, 2010; 2006) in shaping the experiences of international students seeking help and support (McLachlan & Justice, 2009; Olivas & Li, 2006). It underscores the vulnerabilities of international students when compared with domestic students (Lacina, 2002; Sherry, et al., 2010). From a conceptual standpoint, the intersections of environmental stressors (macro) and individual experiences (microlevel) can be explained by using the concept of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1994). Intersectionality theory (Crenshaw, 1994) recognizes the overlapping influences of one’s social identities and lived experiences, allowing for different forms of discrimination and privilege to be acknowledged. It furthers our understanding of international student participants’ accounts as dynamic, intersectional, and nuanced, as opposed to some homogenous set of experiences that lack complexity and plurality in the lived experience (Malcolm & Mendoza, 2014; Patil, 2013).

It is important to contextualize the specific results obtained in this study against the backdrop of previously conducted research as well as pertinent theoretical concepts to suggest relevant and timely implications. Implications provided below focus on continued developmental practices at the level of programming and policy making in the context of service-use barriers faced by international students. As appropriate, practical examples are included for postsecondary educators on how to offer pertinent outreach to their international students, advocate for inclusive campus policies, and manage international student engagement remotely during campus closures in the future.

Implications for Programming

Multiple implications can be drawn at the level of programming to maximize outreach and resource allocation to address the needs of international students during campus closures. First, campus administrators and leaders must actively seek interdepartmental collaborations to ensure that outreach and support are uniform and that the different stakeholders are working together toward a common cause. The results of this study showed that experiences characterizing campus alienation were related to DASCR for the study’s sample. To propose an example based on these results, the researchers would recommend campus leadership to encourage collaboration between the different offices (e.g., international education and international scholar services) that serve international students in varying capacities. This might also include services aimed at providing student engagement, visa maintenance, mental health, and academic support. These can be situated in the offices of diversity and inclusion, multicultural engagement, international student services, counseling services, and academic services.

On a traditional campus, international students could visit or call the different service centers to get their questions answered or to participate in programs to learn about extracurricular activities and other forms of student engagement. Needless to say, when campuses are closed and all operations are pivoted to a remote delivery format, students subscribe to information entirely online (Misirlis et al., 2020). Since most staff are also working remotely during campus closure, it is easier to form collaborations and deliver them in the form of virtual programming. These collaborative programs are likely to bring international students in contact with their domestic counterparts. International
students can share their experiences of isolation with other students and feel seen and heard by peers and staff. From a learning standpoint, not only such collaborations can reduce the incidence of isolation among all students and facilitate resource sharing among students and staff, but programmatically, they can also help different service centers to maximize their programming efforts and avoid duplication of programs and outreach.

A related follow-up to collaborative programming would be in the area of mental and physical health outreach. There is considerable evidence in research published since COVID-19 was declared a pandemic, that resulting campus closures negatively impacted students’ mental and behavioral health (Chen et al., 2020; Firang 2020; Misirlis, et al., 2020). Furthermore, recent research conducted before (Adegboyega et al., 2020) and during (Blake et al., 2021) COVID-19 has spotlighted the unique challenges international students have while seeking medical services for physical health concerns—such as challenges of health insurance literacy. It would be prudent that health experts and staff providing health and counseling services on campus are consulted while developing programs. Additionally, the promotion of telehealth services must be integrated into non-health programming during campus closure. Lastly, as a preventative form of programming aimed at reducing the incidence of campus alienation, forums of diversity and inclusion on campus must include specific topics on ethnocentrism and neo-racism as they apply to the experiences of international students. Such forums must also develop direct programming and outreach to international students and offer international-only programs for these students to empower themselves with knowledge of their experiences of racialization and ethnic discrimination (Althen, 2009).

**Implications for Policy**

Given the findings that showed significant relationships between the sample’s endorsements of exclusionary experiences on campus and DASCR, policymaking must attend to experiences of exclusion among international students. As shown in recent research before and during COVID-19 (Blake et al., 2021; Lee, 2010), many international students find themselves at the behest of institutional-, state-, and federal-level policies to determine individual-level decisions about their careers. During campus closures, these students may be surveying the diverse composition of their institution and the surrounding community. They may well be surveying the policies of government institutions (such as the Department of Homeland Security in the United States) that are tasked to regulate international travel and student visa programs (Blake et al., 2021). That makes policymaking critical not just for one’s institution but the country at large. Therefore, in campus contexts and at institutional levels, the experiences of international students must be woven into policy statements that are delivered by offices of institutional equity as well as offices of diversity and inclusion. International educators employed at institutions of postsecondary education must also engage in advocacy work at the federal level and voice the concerns of their international student stakeholders.
Limitations

The present study had several limitations. The data were collected at the time of campus closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have altered the use of services that are traditionally offered in people, such as library services or multicultural programs. Also, given almost 25% of the sample comprised of international students attending more than seven different institutions, the variable academic calendars, and programs across institutions may have altered participants’ reports on their experiences requesting and accessing campus services remotely. As a clear example, the reliability index (Cronbach’s α) of the DACSR scale, as noted above, was .67, which is below the acceptable norm of .70 (Hair et al., 2014). Another limitation was regarding the assessment of race/ethnicity in this study, in that it did not allow a respondent to choose more than one identifier. Even though an open-ended response option was provided for respondents who wanted to self-define their race/ethnicity, the different options provided (e.g., Asian and Latinx) can be argued as too US-centric and not representative of specific intersectional ethnic heritages that are more familiar to the international student participants. For example, ancestry, indigenous tribe, and caste are used as markers of ethnicity and heritage in other countries, such as the Philippines, Mexico, and India (Morning, 2008). Thus, instead of permitting the choice of one identifier, choice of multiple identifiers should be provided in studies that are assessing for a social identity marker in the form of race or ethnicity.

Conclusion

The results indicated relationships between experiences characterizing campus alienation and DASCR. The factors of exclusionary experiences on campus and C19R offer insights on how to make international education and programming more inclusive and reciprocal during campus closures. The majority of colleges and universities in the United States continue to recruit a relatively large number of international students. Such recruitment has implications for institutions’ revenue, student diversity, and scholarly merit. For instance, in a recent study by Whatley and Castiello-Gutiérrez (2021), the primary finding suggested that private nonprofit institutions’ decision to pivot back to in-person instruction was predicted by the enrollment of international students at their campuses. These institutions identified the need to resume in-person instruction to help international students maintain their student visa requirements, but also maintain tuition inflow for the institution. Such considerations must also be proactively sought while managing campus services during campus closures. Higher education and international education professionals must learn about the challenges many international students faced during COVID-19 while seeking help on campus in the form of availing campus services remotely.
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