

Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad

© Dawn Wood

The work is licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Volume 35, Issue 3, pp. 238-273

DOI: 10.36366/frontiers.v35i3.833

www.frontiersjournal.org



Lessons Learned from Low-Income, First-Generation, Technical, and Rural Students (LIFTRs) Who Participate in Education Abroad

Dawn Wood¹

Abstract

Community college student data and stories provide a critical contribution to the narrative of inclusive education abroad. A deficit mindset perspective has precluded historically marginalized student populations' education abroad stories being shared and heard broadly. The community college provides a setting in which accessible education abroad opportunities exist, and in which students with diverse identities participate in education abroad. This mixed-methods study brings forward unique lessons learned from one community college's education abroad student enrollment data and student study abroad narratives. Findings show evidence that students who identify as LIFTRs (low-income, first-generation, technical, rural, or a combination of these four) are indeed likely to participate in education abroad opportunities. A retrospective education abroad survey and semi-structured student interviews collect and amplify LIFTR stories. Education abroad leaders and practitioners are called upon to embrace a capabilities approach to education abroad access and recognize that global learning is a requisite to all students' higher education experience, regardless of personal backgrounds.

¹ KIRKWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IA, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Corresponding author: Dawn Wood, dawn.wood@kirkwood.edu

Accepted date: November 7th, 2023

Keywords:

Anti-deficit narrative, community college, diversity equity and inclusion, education abroad, intercultural experiences, international education, internationalization

Introduction

Education abroad practitioners and researchers alike hold aspirations that education abroad has the potential to serve as an inclusive learning activity central to all students pursuing higher education. These ideas and aspirations have led to research in the growing body of literature focused on inclusive education abroad (Raby & Rhodes, 2018; Van Mol & Perez-Encinas, 2022; Whatley & Stich, 2021). In order to reach this aspiration of inclusivity, more diverse data sets are needed from diverse institutions who engage in education abroad research, particularly from community colleges who serve diverse populations at a higher proportion than four-year universities.

In the U.S., 41% of all undergraduate students study in a community college (AACC, 2022). Globally, 33% of all undergraduate students study in a community college or global equivalent institution (UNESCO-UIS, 2020). Shockingly, only 1.7 percent of U.S. undergraduates who participate in education abroad are enrolled at U.S. community colleges (Institute of International Education, 2021). The dissonance between community college enrollment of 41% and community college education abroad participation of 1.7 percent is staggering and unbalanced.

Community colleges enroll students who are more likely to possess diverse and marginalized identities across a wide spectrum of identity markers including race, gender, age, income levels, first-generation, immigrants, rural, and more (AACC, 2022; Ma & Baum, 2016; Raby & Valeau, 2009). Although marginalized and diverse identities are strikingly prevalent in community college student populations, their education abroad experiences are not being studied, resulting in a gap in the research literature and a general lack of understanding about their experiences. More research is needed about community college students who do participate in education abroad.

A deficit mindset perspective has precluded the potential of historically marginalized student populations' education abroad stories being shared broadly (Perkins, 2020; Raby, 2019). This mixed-methods study serves to fill that

gap through a quantitative analysis of specific identity markers present in education abroad participants at one community college, Case Study Community College (CSCC), followed by a qualitative exploration of their education abroad experiences.

This study utilizes a new acronym: LIFTR. A LIFTR student possesses one or more of the following identity markers: low-income, first-generation, technical study area from a Career and Technical Education (CTE), rural, or some combination of these four identities. Although there is a growing body of research that focuses on community college education abroad and about motivations and/or barriers to education abroad at community colleges (Amani & Kim, 2018) or outcomes of education abroad at community colleges (Raby, et al., 2014), this study is the first to hone in on these specific intersectional identity markers of community college students.

The purpose of this study is to understand community college education abroad populations, what identities they possess, which identities are more likely to participate in education abroad, and what their education abroad experiences are. This study addresses this purpose through a mixed-methods approach, analyzing a comprehensive enrollment dataset at CSCC related to education abroad participation broadly and then exploring the experiences of community college education abroad participants who identify specifically as LIFTRs. The CSCC enrollment dataset includes a high proportion of students with LIFTR identities where 43.1% of education abroad participants are considered low-income, 21% first-generation, 45% are in technical CTE programs and 31.43% are rural.

Intersectionality of identities is integral to understanding education abroad participants and their experiences in a holistic way. Isolation of only one identity such as income level, rurality, race, gender, etc. is also valuable; however, this study seeks to contribute an analysis of a combination of identities, LIFTRs, to create a more holistic view and picture of community college populations and the local communities they serve. This study chooses to focus on intersectional LIFTR identity combinations to gain a broader perspective of how these marginalized identities together and/or separate are related to students' education abroad participation.

LIFTR is one combination of intersectional identities that was chosen by this researcher because of the nature of CSCC's enrollment. Clearly, the

possibilities of researching other combinations of intersectional identities are endless. An infinite array of potential intersectional identities exist. By focusing on one set of identity combinations that is common at CSCC, this study serves to highlight the potential impact of intersectional identities common at community colleges. LIFTR identities and combinations thereof are not often researched in traditional education abroad research.

In order to deliver more effective education abroad experiences to diverse community college students, this article seeks to understand how students with LIFTR intersectional identities at community colleges experience education abroad and thereby how community colleges can uniquely develop programs to attract and serve students from LIFTR backgrounds. This study could potentially lead to further similar studies that focus on a multitude of diverse combinations of marginalized identities in an effort to better understand marginalized identities that are too often missing from the conversation in existing education abroad research.

Two broad research questions guided this study:

- What is the relationship between students' low-income, first-generation, technical, and rural (LIFTR) identities and education abroad participation?
- What are the specific experiences of low-income, first-generation, technical, and rural (LIFTR) community college students who participate in education abroad?

Literature Review

The literature review sets the context of this study by providing a general broad-brush overview of the community college context within the higher education landscape, as well as providing some background on the typical community college student demographic profile. This overview is followed by a review of each of the four LIFTR categories as they have been addressed in the overall education abroad literature, as well as any literature specific to community college education abroad. The literature review illustrates how this study addresses a gap in the literature related to LIFTR students' education abroad participation.

Community College Context

The community college overall context is important to understand as a unique context for this study. Community colleges offer an alternative

educational path and often second chance at education to students not bound for university (Raby & Valeau, 2009). Students at community colleges are more likely to originate from diverse populations including a higher percentage of students from the following non-traditional groups: lower socioeconomic class/low-income students, underrepresented minority students, first-generation students, non-traditional students, single parents, part-time students, working-class students, technical students enrolled in applied science fields of study, students over age 25, and rural students (AACC, 2022; Ma & Baum, 2016; Raby & Valeau, 2009).

Demographic data about community college students who participate in education abroad is difficult to find (Raby & Rhodes, 2018). There are only a few studies that delve into community college student education abroad participant profiles (Raby et al., 2014; Whatley, 2018, 2021; Wood & Whatley, 2020).

Overall education abroad participant profile data is most commonly referenced from the Institute for International Education (IIE)'s Open Doors report (IIE, 2021). Open Doors data consists mainly of data from universities who send large numbers, many 1000+, on education abroad programs. IIE offers a special supplement of data that reports on community colleges; however, among community colleges, there is historically a low reporting rate to the IIE Open Doors census. Certain categories in the IIE collection are not apropos for the community college sector, such as the ability to designate common CTE or technical community college study areas. The IIE census also lacks a category for students who are undecided in their educational pursuits. Enrollment in technical vocational degree programs and/or undecided status represent common student situations in the community college setting which are not categorized in the census collection.

When community colleges do offer education abroad opportunities, they enroll a greater percentage of diverse students from marginalized identity groups in those education abroad opportunities than other types of institutions (Raby & Valeau, 2007). In the following four sections, education abroad literature is summarized for each of the four diverse LIFTR categories to understand each in its own discrete way, while remaining cognizant of the realities of intersectionality. Intersectionality of these four community college identities is new to the field and core to the purpose of this study. Some of the

literature presented in the following sections is from four-year university studies and some is specific to community colleges and will be noted as such.

Low-Income

Low-income status is the first of the LIFTR categories and has been consistently recognized as a factor in participation in education abroad, most often as a barrier rather than as an asset. There have been several studies at four-year universities that focus directly on how education abroad opportunities are accessible or inaccessible to low-income students (Kezar et al., 2015; Simon & Ainsworth, 2012; Walpole, 2003; Whatley & Clayton, 2020). Researchers and international education professionals have often attributed lack of finances to pay for an education abroad as a barrier to participation, especially among underrepresented students (Ballatore & Stayrou, 2017; Brux & Fry, 2010; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2014; Thomas, 2013).

Van Mol and Perez-Encina (2022) explored the concept of inclusive internationalization as it relates to students from lower socioeconomic status. Their study concluded that perhaps not enough is known about low-income students, stating that “If inclusive internationalization strategies are to be truly inclusive, it is essential to first identify the internationalization activities that different social groups of students are interested in, by asking them instead of sailing blindly.” (p. 2536). Although low-income status has been frequently viewed as a barrier, one study found that access to need-based financial aid may actually increase participation by low-income students (Whatley & Clayton, 2020).

All of these studies mentioned in the review above were based on four-year university student populations. Studies that do mention community college students and the low-income identity marker were focused on motivations or decision factors (Amani & Kim, 2018) or learning outcomes (Raby, Rhodes, & Biscarra, 2014). There are two clear gaps that exist in the literature on low-income education abroad. The first gap is the lack of demographic data in general about community college students who participate in education abroad. The second gap is the lack of data about how low-income students experience education abroad as it relates to their low-income identity. In other words, when low-income students do participate in education abroad, what is their experience? Raby & Whatley (2020) conducted a study about inclusivity of education abroad at community colleges and concluded that “the field requires

a greater understanding of existing demographic data, especially as it applies to students who are often stereotyped, such as first-generation or low-income students.” (p. 96).

First-Generation

First-generation college students have been the focus of a growing body of overall research and publications related to student success and overall experience in higher education (Ezarik, 2022; Pascarella et al., 2004). First-generation students and their participation in education abroad has been researched in the overall literature in only a few cases (Andriano, 2010; Soria & Troisi, 2014); however, the focus has been targeted on the multitude of challenges they encounter in higher education (Wick et al., 2019). While this exploration of challenges provided some insight into education abroad decisions, there has been a clear lack of research that tells the actual story of first-generation students who do participate in education abroad.

Research about first-generation students who participate in education abroad has been focused most often on first-generation students enrolled at four-year U.S. universities (Goldstein & Lopez, 2021) and not specifically on community college first-generation students, even though community colleges are the location where a higher density of first-generation students enroll. National level data indicates that community college students are more apt to be of first-generation status and therefore community colleges would be a natural setting for such research (AACC, 2021).

Technical/Career and Technical Education (CTE)

The term “technical student” is used in this article to refer to students enrolled at community college studying in Career and Technical Education (CTE) academic programs. CTE is also known globally as TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training). The CTE and TVET sectors offer one- to two-year pathways to careers such as agriculture, technicians, plumbing, etc., with curricula that align to local needs, focusing on skill building for new and emerging jobs as well as career retraining. In the United States, 41% of undergraduate students study in community colleges (AACC, 2022). Of the total group of community college students, 38% study in CTE programs. CTE educational pathways are typically more accessible to rural populations and attract a more diverse segment of society including lower income, racially diverse, rural and/or immigrant/refugee backgrounds.

Despite common perception, technical and CTE institutions are found to offer education abroad opportunities to their students. Research on international education within U.S. community colleges, specifically CTE, and on their TVET global equivalents is available within the broader internationalization literature (Legusov et al., 2022; Raby & Valeau, 2007). Research focusing on the intercultural experiences of vocational or technical students have been found in a select few publications (Tran & Dempsey, 2017; Tran, 2016; Wood & Raby, 2022). Wood and Raby (2022) showed that CTE/TVET internationalization has been an effective vehicle for impact and inclusivity of historically underrepresented students in international education and emphasized that the spotlighted societal inequities pertinent to students attending CTE/TVET institutions is deserving of more study.

Rural

The final and fourth category of LIFTR is rural. Rural students are a recent phenomenon in the research literature. There is growing literature to be found in general about college students that identify as rural or from a non-metro area (Ardoin, 2018a, 2018b; Byun et al., 2012; Crain, 2018; Schultz, 2004). The South African Rurality in Higher Education (SARiHE) project in South Africa (Leibowitz, 2017) provided an example of a study about rurality and education, noting that rurality, interestingly, is not a strong focus in higher education or secondary education. This is the case even though there are countries such as the United States in which 50% of all school districts are classified as rural.

Studies in the U.S. show that students from rural populations attend two-year institutions at a greater rate than four-year universities (Ardoin, 2018a). This higher propensity to attract rural students at the community college-level has been attributed by deficit-based literature to a lack of choice that pushes rural students to attend community colleges. Koricich et al. (2018) described these deficits as lack of transportation, lack of family support, and other life situations that serve as obstacles. Rural-serving community colleges that do offer education abroad experiences have been under-studied with only a few examples present in the literature (Raby, 2018; Whatley et al., 2022; Wood & Whatley, 2020). In these studies, there was some evidence that rural students do participate in education abroad and in higher proportions than expected.

Theoretical Construct

The theoretical framework of this study relies first on the concept of intersectionality of identities and how LIFTR identity combinations contribute to students' education abroad experiences. In addition to intersectionality, this study leans into an understanding of the deficit narrative as it pertains to community college students and their identities. This study pushes back against the predominant deficit-minded narratives that focus on barriers and instead employs an anti-deficit lens that aligns with the capabilities approach.

Intersectionality

Community college students are complex in their identities. Four unique identities were selected for specific focus in this study due to the unique nature of the CSCC population: low-income, first-generation, technical, and rural. These four LIFTR identities do not exist in isolation. Intersectionality recognizes that multiple identities overlap to create who a person is and the way they experience reality (Abdallah-Pretceille, 2006; Cho et al., 2013).

Intersectional identities among underrepresented students are especially prevalent among the community college population, including those who participate in education abroad (AACC, 2021; Willis, 2016). Intersectionality was first articulated by Crenshaw (1989) in her work in the legal field, noting that multiple social identities make up diverse people's lived experiences and their subsequent treatment as members of society. Intersectional identities allude to the idea that it is not possible to isolate an individual identity marker. One identity influences another identity, which influences another identity, and so on. Each community college student is a unique human being and is complicated in their multiple identities. Intersectionality as a concept, in its recognition of the multiplicity of identities, aligns well with the nature of the community college students in this study who identify as low-income, first-generation, technical, and rural students.

Deficit Theories

Deficit perspectives perpetuate stereotypes and create a process whereby historically oppressed populations are held responsible for the challenges and inequalities that they face (Patton Davis & Museus, 2019). Deficit theories have historically been applied in education abroad four-year university literature to explain why certain groups of marginalized students do not participate in education abroad (Brux & Fry, 2010; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2014;

Salisbury et al., 2009; Simon & Ainsworth, 2012). Barriers to education abroad such as lack of finances, lack of family support, or lack of social/cultural capital have been documented in higher education literature to explain the reasons for low education abroad participation data, particularly among marginalized groups.

Deficit theories such as Bourdieu's social reproduction theory (Bourdieu, 1986) and the stratification of higher education theory (Bloch & Mitterle, 2021) are two examples of theoretical frameworks subscribing to a deficit approach. Both of these theories indicate that the students themselves are considered lacking in some way (in forms of capital and/or access to educational opportunities). There is a focus on what students themselves lack rather than what problems or barriers may be systemic within the educational systems themselves.

Capabilities Approach

The capabilities approach provides a contrasting anti-deficit perspective with a framework that approaches each human being in terms of what is possible rather than what is lacking. The capabilities narrative considers the well-being of each and every individual and assumes that every human being has the capability and opportunity to thrive. First introduced by Amartya Sen (1985), the capabilities approach asserts that people have freedoms to achieve what they value in life (Gale & Molla, 2015; Sen, 2009). The capabilities approach critiques a resources- and utility-based assessment of human well-being and disadvantage (Gale & Molla, 2015). Gale and Molla (2015) indicate that the capabilities approach is a useful tool for analyzing the perspective of individuals and also analyzing individuals' agency in society and in moulding their own life experience.

The capabilities approach aligns with this study's viewpoint that every student is valuable and has agency. Students of diverse backgrounds, such as LIFTRs, are valuable and have agency to participate in education abroad. LIFTRs have the same agency as non-LIFTRs if given the opportunity. Fakunle (2021) draws a very relevant connection between Sen's capability approach and education abroad opportunities as transformational wherein she states that rationales for education abroad include four dimensions: educational, experiential, aspirational, and economic. In Fakunle's article she explains that her connection between the capabilities approach and understanding

educational policies “proposes an expanded framework for understanding the student rationales for studying abroad, beyond dominant economic narratives” (Fakunle, 2021, p. 675).

Methods

The method employed by this study was an explanatory sequential mixed methods approach, which collected data from one case study community college institution with strong commitments to education abroad. The explanatory sequential research design had two phases. The first phase was the collection and analysis of the quantitative enrollment dataset at the institution. The second phase was the collection and analysis of qualitative data from education abroad participants in order to expand on the first-phase quantitative results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). The case study institution is referred to in this article simply as Case Study Community College (CSCC). This article was part of a larger study that used a mixed methods explanatory sequential research design to analyze community college enrollment data at one institution and then unpacked LIFTR intercultural experiences to expand upon the quantitative results.

Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis

To address the first research question of this article regarding the relationship of LIFTR identities to education abroad participation at CSCC, descriptive statistical methods, inferential statistical models, and tests described the data found in the complete enrollment dataset from the past ten years. The study analyzed a complete college enrollment dataset of over 62,000 students from CSCC over a period of ten years. A multi-step data collection approach was utilized whereby descriptive statistics and regression analysis detailed student demographics of education abroad students with and without LIFTR identity markers.

The procedures included the use of frequency charts, chi-squared test models, and regression models and analysis. Frequency distribution tables described the participation profiles and presented a comparison of education abroad participation across multiple demographic categories including LIFTR identities. Chi-squared testing was also conducted to test for significance and regression analysis was conducted to analyze the relationships among the variables. Two regression models were performed on the enrollment dataset utilizing SPSS software.

These quantitative findings about LIFTR identities and their participation in education abroad then informed the development of the qualitative data collection tools. Finding a surprising association between LIFTR identity markers and participation in education abroad caused the researcher to conduct surveys and interviews to help explain the unexpected result.

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

In a mixed methods explanatory sequential design, the quantitative results inform the qualitative portion of the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In this study, the quantitative findings about LIFTR students informed the development of the interview protocols in order to explore the students' perceptions of how their LIFTR identities played a role in their education abroad experience. Specifically, questions were designed in the interviews to allow the student interviewees to reflect on their identities as they related to their education abroad experience. Survey questions were designed and selected from previous surveys to be reflective and open-ended to allow broad reflection, while interview questions were written specifically asking students to reflect on how their LIFTR identities played a role in their education abroad experience and subsequent impact.

Qualitative data in this study was collected through two means of data collection: a survey of education abroad alumni, and interviews of a smaller subset of education abroad alumni. The longitudinal survey tool included several open-ended questions and was administered by email to all 891 students from the dataset who had engaged in education abroad in the past ten years. There was a 21.4% response rate with 191 total survey responses received out of the 891 sent. Of the 191 total survey responses, 105 identified as low-income, 63 identified as first-generation, 88 identified as technical, and 99 identified as rural.

The survey included open-ended questions that asked participants to explain more about their education abroad experience and how it impacted their personal and professional lives. The survey questions used for this study's qualitative analysis included three open-ended prompts. The questions were as follows: "Reflecting on your education abroad experience, what was the experience's impact on you personally?" "Reflecting on your education abroad experience, what was the experience's impact on you professionally in your every-day work?" and "Please use this space to write about add any reflections

and/or comments you have about your education abroad experience and its impact on you.”

The second method of qualitative data review included semi-structured interviews conducted via Zoom video with 18 students who participated in education abroad while at CSCC. These 18 students were recruited from the larger dataset of 191 students who completed the survey and indicated a willingness for a more in-depth interview. All of the student interviewees possessed some combination of at least one of the LIFTR identity markers. See Table (1) for a profile of interview participants and their LIFTR identity markers.

Pseudonym	Education				
	Abroad Country	Low-Income	First-Generation	Technical	Rural
Brett	Vietnam	yes	no	yes	yes
Cyrus	China	no	yes	no	no
Dante	Denmark	yes	no	no	no
Darla	Australia	no	no	yes	no
Faith	Italy	yes	yes	yes	yes
Fatma	Peru	yes	yes	no	no
Iris	Australia	yes	yes	yes	yes
Lana	Denmark	yes	yes	no	no
Lara	Belize	yes	yes	yes	yes
Lucy	Guatemala	yes	no	yes	yes
Marci	Denmark	yes	yes	yes	no
Max	Brazil	yes	no	yes	yes
Nell	Vietnam	yes	no	yes	yes
Nolan	Costa Rica	yes	no	yes	no
Paul	Australia	yes	yes	yes	no
Penny	Guatemala	yes	yes	no	no
Valentina	Ireland	yes	no	no	yes
Wes	Italy	yes	yes	no	yes

TABLE (1): STUDENT INTERVIEWEES PSEUDONYMS AND LIFTR IDENTITY MARKERS

Interview protocols used a semi-structured interview format with open-ended questions to allow for in-depth responses. See Appendix for interview questions. Interview transcripts were collected and analyzed for themes utilizing a Dedoose mixed methods software platform, which sorted codes into themes by category. Two different methods of categorical sorting were used to establish reliability. The first inductive approach involved reading the full interview transcripts and then labelling relevant words, phrases and sections that were deemed important. In vivo tags were added in Dedoose to ensure that the exact wording of participants and the voice of those surveyed would be

understood (Saldaña, 2016). From the in vivo codes, some natural categories and themes emerged to create the findings of this study.

In addition to employing Dedoose for the coding and analysis, a secondary method of coding was completed using a spreadsheet to code responses by listing the in vivo codes from the surveys and interviews, then categorizing them in sets of categories, then counting the frequency of the codes to gain an understanding of which words and phrases were appearing more often. This spreadsheet method of coding was then compared to the Dedoose coding, comparing differences and similarities, and eventually resulting in one list of codes organized into broader themes for comparison.

Validity/Trustworthiness

The survey was designed by utilizing questions from previous published surveys and interviews conducted with education abroad participants in past studies (AIFS Foundation and IIE, 2018; Raby, et al., 2014; Robertson, 2016). Selection of open-ended reflective questions was intentional in order to collect reflective data to help explain the quantitative results. Triangulation of statistical, survey, interview, and research memos established trustworthiness and member checks confirmed the correctness of the responses, establishing reliability of results.

Limitations

Because this study focused on one particular community college, generalizability to other institutional contexts may be difficult to ascertain. Case Study Community College provides a unique window into one particular institution's enrollment in education abroad. The quantitative data also had some limitations in that some of the collected variables were missing data due to the data collection method. The rurality variable, for example, had several null responses noted in the frequency table due to its connection to the students' high school of record. Because high school is not a required field on the institutional application for admission, in some cases it is unknown. The first-generation variable had a similar limitation whereby the data was collected on the admission application and was not a required field for entry.

Researcher Positionality

This research study was based in a community college where the author serves as the Senior International Officer (SIO). As an insider, the SIO's

knowledge of the institution definitely guided the data analysis, influenced data interpretation, and provided unique insight to the study, that of an insider to the institution and population being studied. The author's own background is one of a low-income, first-generation, rural student who participated in education abroad during college. Positionality is not considered a limitation (Bourke, 2014). It is instead a recognition of the author's unique perspective and how the research is shaped by the author's own experience.

Findings

Case Study Community College Education Abroad Student Profile

CSCC provided a unique opportunity to analyze a large comprehensive enrollment dataset and compare it to the smaller select education abroad subset. The findings are illustrated in the frequency table presented in Table (2). The comprehensive enrollment dataset included a total of 62,022 students enrolled at CSCC from 2010 to 2019. The education abroad subset included 891 CSCC students who participated in education abroad during that same time period, representing 1.44% of the total enrollment.

	Total Dataset	Education Abroad Participants
Number of Students	62,022	891
Percent of Total Case Study Community College Dataset	100%	1.44%
Location of High School (Rurality)		
Non-Rural	53.69%	55.33%
Rural	21.20%	31.43%
Null	24.55%	13.24%
Academic Program (CTE or ASH)		
Career and Technical Education	31.35%	45.01%
Arts, Sciences or Humanities	63.41%	54.99%
Demographics		
White	53.81%	66.78%
Non-White	22.92%	9.65%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	23.28%	23.57%

Male	49.30%	34.46%
Female	50.70%	65.54%
Under 25 Years Old	79.44%	90.12%
25 or Older Years Old	20.49%	9.88%
In-State Student	85.11%	91.02%
Out-of-State Student	10.37%	7.97%
International Student	4.51%	1.01%
First-generation Student	25.16%	20.99%
Academic Characteristics		
Full-time enrolled	28.06%	66.11%
Part-time enrolled	71.94%	33.89%
Non-degree Seeking	5.24%	0.00%
First-term GPA	2.99	3.30
Financial Aid		
Received a Loan	40.18%	51.40%
Eligible for Pell	38.50%	43.10%

TABLE (2): CSCC EDUCATION ABROAD PARTICIPATION (2010-2019)

Table (2) compares the full CSCC enrollment dataset to the subset of those students who participated in education abroad. Table (2) presents findings related to a wide range of variables, including LIFTR variables. For example, racial and ethnic data indicates that 22.92% of all students were classified as non-white, while the education abroad dataset contains only 9.65% of non-white students. Gender data in Table (2) shows that 49.30% of the total population was male and that only 34.46% of the education abroad population was male. Similarly, those under 25 years old made up 79.44% of the population, while in education abroad those under-25-year-olds constituted 90.12% of the total who chose to education abroad, confirming evidence from previous research that those younger than 25 are more likely to participate than non-traditional adult students. This data supports previous research and IIE Open Doors data reported (IIE, 2021; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2015; Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011).

LIFTR Variables and Chi-squared Analysis

Chi-squared analysis was performed on all of the four LIFTR identities separately to determine whether the results were significantly different than expected for each of the four LIFTR identities. In the Chi-squared analysis, the dependent variable was participation in education abroad and the categorical independent variables being studied were the LIFTR categories. The results of

the Chi-squared analysis on each of the four LIFTR variables as well as the Chi-squared analysis of LIFTR intersectionality is presented in the following paragraphs.

Table (2) indicated that the first LIFTR identity of low-income status, measured as students who identified as Pell-eligible, represented 38.5% of the total enrollment whereas, in the education abroad dataset, the frequency of low-income students was more predominant at 43.1%. Chi-squared testing verified that this is a significant difference where Pell Eligible participation rate (1.6% observed, 1.4% expected) was significantly different ($\chi^2 = 8.073$, $p = .004$) than Non-Pell Eligible participation rate (1.3% observed, 1.4% expected).

In the LIFTR category of technical students pursuing CTE degrees, the full dataset indicated that 31.35% of students at CSCC were considered CTE students. Within the education abroad dataset, 45.01% fit the criteria of CTE students. Chi-squared testing of this differential showed that the rate of education abroad participation within the CTE category (2.1% observed, 1.4% expected) was significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 77.952$, $p = .000$) than the non-CTE participation rate (1.2% observed, 1.4% expected).

The LIFTR identity marker of rural was indicated as 21.2% of the total enrollment dataset. In the education abroad dataset, 31.43% (10.23 percentage points higher) were rural students. This is noteworthy because it showed a subset, i.e., rural students who are typically portrayed in the literature as not participating in education abroad, did participate at a significant level at CSCC. Education abroad participation among students with the rural identity marker (3.4% observed, 1.7% expected) was significantly different ($\chi^2 = 19.203$, $p = .000$) than non-rural participation rate (1.6% observed, 1.7% expected).

First-generation students, the final of the four LIFTR identities, showed the opposite result illustrated in Table (2) where those with a first-generation identity comprised 25.16% of the total population but only 20.99% of the education abroad population. Chi-squared testing was conducted to see if this was significant and found that the first-generation participation rate (1.2% observed, 1.9% expected) was significantly different ($\chi^2 = 75.899$, $p = .000$) than non-first-generation participation rate (2.5% observed, 1.9% expected). In this case non-first-generation identity marker was more likely to participate in education abroad than first-generation.

The findings in the above four paragraphs corresponding to the four LIFTR variables were analyzed distinctly, one LIFTR variable at a time. In addition to considering how each distinct LIFTR variable predicted education abroad participation, the set of findings presented in the next paragraph considers how the four LIFTR variables taken together impacted education abroad participation. As discussed in the theoretical framework, intersectionality is the phenomenon ascribed to such overlapping identities.

In order to better understand the overlap of LIFTR variables, a Chi-squared test was run on all of four of the LIFTR variables together. Students who possessed any combination of the four LIFTR identities were compared to those that did not possess any of the LIFTR identities. If students didn't fit into any of these LIFTR categories they were assigned a zero, all others were assigned a 1. The Chi-squared analysis revealed that the difference between these two groups (LIFTRs and non-LIFTRs) was significant. The target group (LIFTR) participation rate (5.3% observed, 2.6% expected) was significantly different ($\chi^2 = 4.195$, $p = .041$) than the alternate group (non-LIFTR) participation rate (2.5% observed, 2.6% expected).

These LIFTR intersectionality findings indicate that possessing one or more LIFTR identities increases the likelihood of participation in education abroad at CSCC. In other words, a student at CSCC who possesses one or more LIFTR identity is more likely to participate in education abroad at CSCC than a student who does not possess one or more LIFTR identities.

Regression Analysis

To further explore this study's findings about LIFTR students and their participation in education abroad, a binary logistic regression analysis showed how the LIFTR categories influence participation in isolation. The four independent variables in Table (3) were chosen based on the results of the frequency table indicating that three of the LIFTR variables indicated a higher likelihood of participation including low-income, rural, and CTE. The one variable that indicated a negative relationship was first-generation and therefore non-first-generation was added as the fourth variable in the model. The regression analysis was run on the full dataset of CSCC enrollment focusing on the dependent variable of education abroad participation. The resulting regression model is shown in Table (3).

Variable	Beta	Standard Error	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
Low-income	-.388	.083	1	.000
Rurality	.648	.186	1	.000
CTE	.318	.081	1	.000
Non-first – generation	.670	.090	1	.000
Constant	-4.320	.104	1	.000

TABLE (3): REGRESSION MODEL

Results from the binary logistic regression analysis utilized education abroad participation as the dependent variable and the four LIFTR variables as explanatory variables. The overall model was significant and explains 2.2 % of the total variance in education abroad participation (Nagelkerke R Square = .022). Non-first-generation status ($B = .6702$, $p = .000$), CTE enrollment ($B = .318$, $p = .000$), and rurality ($B = .648$, $p = .000$) were found to have a positive influence on education abroad participation while low-income ($B = -.388$, $p = .000$) was found to have a negative influence.

The R square value of .022 in this first regression analysis was low, which is not surprising given that it is very likely that there are other non-LIFTR variables that explain some of the variance in education abroad participation. This study does not assume that LIFTR variables are the only predictor, only that they are indeed a predictor in the case of CSCC. Because of the low R square value received in the initial regression, I ran another regression analysis to include other demographic variables contained in the enrollment dataset including student loan status, first term GPA, expected degree, enrollment status, ethnicity, race, age, and gender. The resulting regression model is shown in Table (4).

The second binary logistic regression model resulted in a higher R value explaining 13.7% of the variance in study abroad participation. The second regression model results are shown in Table (4). By adding in these additional variables, the four variables of significance to this study lost some of their significance. Low income and CTE status were no longer significant, but rurality and non-first-generation were still significant as a predictor of education abroad participation. The other variables which were not necessarily a focus of this study that were significant are first term GPA, expected degree, enrollment status, age, and gender. These findings were consistent with commonly accepted study abroad predictors such as first-term GPA, age, and gender.

In the analysis of the dataset, a correlation matrix was run in SPSS to test if any of the demographic variables showed a strong correlation with any of the LIFTR variables. An analysis of the correlation matrix did not reveal any strong correlations. The fact that the variables of interest are mostly binary in nature may be a limitation of the correlation examination, but nonetheless a strong correlation was not found.

Variable	Beta	Standard Error	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
Loan	-.089	.088	1	.309
First Term GPA	.842	.062	1	.000
Expected Degree	-.245	.096	1	.010
Enrollment Status	-1.038	.107	1	.000
Race	.278	.102	1	.006
Ethnicity	-2.42	.151	1	.109
Age	.778	.137	1	.000
Gender	-.574	.090	1	.000
Low-income	-.016	.086	1	.852
Rurality	.401	.190	1	.035
CTE	-.865	.473	1	.068
Non-first – generation	.241	.093	1	.010
Constant	-5.421	.801	1	.000

TABLE (4): REGRESSION MODEL

Summary of Analysis

In summary, the results from the frequency table and Chi-squared testing showed that low-income, technical, and rural were all three LIFTR identities that led to a higher predictability of education abroad participation. First-generation status produced the opposite result showing that non-first-generation students, when looked at in isolation, were more likely to participate in education abroad according to the frequency table and Chi-squared tests.

When the four identities were combined into one variable and chi-squared test were run, the intersectionality chi-squared test found that a student at CSCC who possessed one or more LIFTR identity is more likely to participate in education abroad at CSCC than a student who does not possess one or more LIFTR identities.

The regression analysis that included only the four LIFTR variables produced a different result, indicating that two of the individual four LIFTR identities are positively related to education abroad participation (rural and technical) while two of them are negatively related (low-income and first-

generation). The second regression analysis where non-LIFTR variables were added in for a more robust statistical analysis, showed that when other variables are included in the analysis, the rurality variable and the non-first-generation variable still showed a statistically significant predictor of education abroad participation. Clearly, when the regression analysis added in additional variables, the results changed considerably indicating that first-generation students are less likely to participate in education abroad and rural students are more likely to participate in education abroad. The other LIFTR variables, low-income status and CTE status, did not significantly predict education abroad participation.

Community College Student Stories

In order to address the second research question about the experiences of LIFTR students who participate in education abroad, the next phase of the research was qualitative, gathering data from the stories of student education abroad experiences. The quantitative results presented in the previous section indicated that several of the LIFTR identities and combinations thereof were related to education abroad participation in a positive way. Because of the surprising results about LIFTR identities actually predicting participation, survey questions and interview questions were intentionally designed to be open-ended and ask students to reflect on how their LIFTR identity impacted their participation. This qualitative investigation was designed to allow participants to more fully explain the surprising quantitative results.

The findings presented in this section resulted from the inductive coding process described earlier in the methods portion of this article. Findings from the student survey and semi-structured interviews indicated several strong themes. The three most dominant themes were the experience of profound impact, LIFTR identities as asset, and gratitude for the opportunity. To maintain confidentiality of the student respondents, interview excerpts are referenced in these findings by LIFTR student pseudonyms as shown in Table (1) and survey excerpts are referenced by the student's survey number prefaced by a "P" for participant (i.e., P70).

Profound Impact

The first theme evidenced in both the survey responses and interviews indicated that LIFTR community college students experienced profound impact from their education abroad experiences. All 18 student interviews expressed

how the experience was life-changing, changed their career direction and set them on a new path for their future.

Education abroad students shared an increase in flexibility, open-mindedness, and confidence. P150 shared "I am much more open minded to things happening outside this country. I also don't jump to conclusions as quickly as I used to. I hear people's story out more." P69 noted, "I crave learning more about different cultures, and also to know that I am capable of more than thought." Finally, the personal imprint on Lucy, a low-income technical rural education abroad participant, extends to her wearing a necklace with the dates of her education abroad experience illustrating how she reflects on the experience regularly, integrating it into her daily life although it happened years ago.

Survey responses about personal and professional impact were lengthy in response, totalled thousands of words, and repeatedly indicated the profound impact that the experience had on their futures. One example is in Nell's interview, where she shared that she identifies as a low-income, technical, and rural student and that her education abroad experience opened up career options for her:

You know, you get stuck in a little bubble sometimes of, you know, this is where you are and everything is so narrow vision that once you get out there, it definitely opened it up for me. And I think that in my career too I have been able to you know, it's not just this narrow walking where there's a bunch of walks of life and I've been able to experience that.

Darla, an education abroad alumna pursuing a two-year technical degree, shared how her career perspective was changed by the experience:

I would still be working night shift in a factory. After my first study abroad, I knew I wanted something better for myself. I recognized how big the world is, and how many options there truly are out there. I was not restricted to my location and circumstances anymore.

Survey respondents in the education abroad alumni group shared similar sentiments. P85 shared the following about the education abroad experience "It gives me more opportunities for other career options if I were to leave my current position." P76, an agriculture student, said it "made me realize

even more that I want to work within the agriculture industry". P94, a technical student, indicated "I got to build a house while abroad, so that sparked my interest in architectural technology".

LIFTR Identities as Asset

Students expressed in their qualitative responses a sense that their LIFTR identities served as assets to them in the experience rather than deficits. All 18 student interviewees expressed this sentiment when asked directly to reflect on how their identity impacted their experience. Throughout the interviews and responses from students, community college students indicate that the very attributes that are often viewed as deficit for education abroad experiences are indeed the assets that propelled them forward in their experience.

Lucy, a low-income, technical, rural education abroad participant, indicated that it was actually the fact that she was from a small town that motivated her to participate in education abroad. She shared, "we just mostly stick to our little corner of the world and don't do anything out of the ordinary, so I think being from a small town and maybe pushed me like let's go do this like let's go see the world besides like living in small town and before we settle down kind of thing."

Another interviewee, Valentina, said, "I was low-income which means I worked really hard." Fatma stated that "Being low-income, I wanted to help someone who was worse off than me." Fatma also shared in the excerpt below that it was indeed difficult for her to obtain the financial means to participate, but her family was her asset, and they served as her support to make it happen. She even said that it was "worth it" for the experience, and she stressed how she "begs to differ" about anyone saying that she cannot. She said that she can and is capable because of her strong family and other assets. In her words,

Even with the scholarship and the help, I still had to pay for my own airfare. So it was a huge financial burden for me that I couldn't pay. But I love my family because we're very family oriented. And like I said, they're very supportive. So together they came up with, we just gave all that they could. And I did what I could. And that's how I was able to make the journey. I would have never been able to go if it weren't for their help and their sacrifice. When you are in this, I guess bigger group (low-income), it's easy to think that you can't do something like education abroad, that it's too much of a fantasy. There's just too many

variables. I would beg to differ that it is possible and the wealth of experience that you learn about yourself and about other countries but about yourself as well, is totally worth it.

Even when asked to talk about being low-income, Fatma did not express that being low-income was a hardship. Instead, she indicated, “I am very privileged.” She stated that she comes from a “hard working family that stays at the same level of income no matter what they do.”

Survey respondents also provided written responses that directly pointed to their LIFTR identity as an asset. One example from a low-income, technical, and rural survey respondent (P70) that clearly articulated how their deficit mindset had been switched to capability or asset stated:

It's daunting to come from a small town and a family that didn't have the money to send their kids to college or abroad. Having the study abroad advisors [at Case Study Community College] show me how I could afford to not only get myself through college, but also study abroad really encouraged me to crave learning more about different cultures, and also to know that I am capable of more than thought.

Gratitude for the Opportunity

Another theme that emerged from the participants in education abroad was the theme about how grateful LIFTRs were for the opportunity to engage in education abroad. The take-away from the LIFTRs expressions of gratitude evidenced that when opportunities are provided to LIFTR students, they seized those opportunities and maximized them.

Seven of the 18 interviewees and twelve of the open-ended survey question responses explicitly discussed how “grateful” and/or “thankful” they were for the experience and opportunity to participate in education abroad. For example, Lana, a low-income first-generation education abroad alum, shared how her rural and low-income identities made her feel a strong sense of gratitude that she was able to do something different. She shared:

I think as a first-generation I'm really, really grateful for the opportunity... I am still very grateful for the opportunity to meet everyone I did and experience what I did. I feel like it's kind of hard to explain.

Survey responses included:

I am forever grateful for this experience and all it did for me. Thank you [Case Study Community College] for making it possible! (P80)

This experience overall was by far one of my best experiences at [Case Study Community College] ... I am eternally grateful I had this experience.” (P74) Another survey response indicated “I am so thankful that I was able to travel abroad, make new friends, and increase my understanding of the world in general.” (P11) And another shared “I loved every second of it, even the hard parts. It was something I will always be thankful for and never forget! (P10)

Another interviewee, Wes, an education abroad alum with low-income, first-generation, and rural identities, shared that it was “like a whole new world opened up to him” and an “experience I wouldn’t trade for anything” and that he typically “gets emotional because it is an important part of my life”. Valentina, an education abroad alum with a rural background, pointed out that the intercultural experience was a “highlight of my [Case Study Community College] experience”.

Penny, a student who possessed all four LIFTR identities, said in her interview that she was grateful for the opportunity she was first given at community college and how it grew to other possibilities in her future. She indicated how her capabilities were opened up due to the participation she experienced. She shared how she was thankful that the faculty and staff at the college shared with her how she was capable of studying abroad and how it has impacted her life. In her words, she shares:

So it was the first week of class, and they had a study abroad table out. And I was like, hey, I want to study abroad, thinking that I wouldn’t be able to go anyway but then they told me about how affordable and they showed me a cost breakdown. And so, through talking with staff, I was able to make a plan to make this opportunity a reality for me. My initial experience studying abroad kind of lit the light bulb... I’m no longer afraid. I mean, I had the opportunity to go other places.

Reflecting on this sense of gratitude expressed by students and the heightened level of appreciation for the opportunity exhibited in so many excerpts from the surveys and interviews, it is critical to note that this gratitude was not expressed by LIFTRs in terms of students being in deficit. On the

contrary, the gratitude was genuine due to the students' ultimate desire and wishes to engage in education abroad as part of their higher education experience being realized and their capabilities being acknowledged. In this recognition that they had the capability to participate in education abroad, they expressed candid gratitude for the impact derived from it. In other words, they were thankful because they experienced education abroad, did the work to engage in it, experienced personal and professional impact, and reaped the rewards of intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand community college education abroad student populations, what identities they possess, which identities are more likely to participate in education abroad, and what the education abroad experiences are through a mixed-methods approach. This study of CSCC's population clearly challenges the deficit narrative, challenges stereotypes of community college students, and elevates a capability approach that validates the unique and intersectional nature of the identities that comprise each and every community college student.

Results from the quantitative analysis suggest that LIFTR students at this community college were more likely to participate in education abroad than non-LIFTRs, challenging existing LIFTR student stereotypes, and reversing typical perspectives that education abroad is an activity not suited to community college student populations. Qualitative interviews and surveys found that LIFTR students themselves do not perceive their own LIFTR identities as a deficit but rather as a strength in their experience participating in education abroad. The impact of the experiences on their lives was profound and students expressed a sincere feeling of gratitude at the opportunities provided at the community college where they attended.

The mixed-methods approach proved effective in that the qualitative data collected after the analysis of the enrollment dataset helped to explain some of the surprising quantitative results. The quantitative results were surprising because the identity markers of low-income, first-generation, technical, and rural were not expected to produce a higher likelihood of education abroad participation. Past research has shown the opposite results for low-income and first-generation populations and little or no research has discretely looked at technical, rural, or intersectional LIFTR identities.

Rural students in this study produced some of the strongest findings related to their likelihood to engage in education abroad. Quantitative findings indicated that rural students are more likely to participate in education abroad at CSCC than non-rural students in both the frequency table results and the robust regression analysis. The qualitative results supported the idea that possessing a rural identity did not deter students from participation but actually influenced rural students to engage. At CSCC, rural students indicated in their interviews that their rural identifier was a motivator rather than a barrier, pushing them to take the opportunity. Rural students saw education abroad at the community college as an opportunity that they were grateful to the CSCC for providing them as part of their education. In several cases, rural students indicated access to education abroad at the community college is the reason they had the opportunity to engage in intercultural learning and that without it, they may not ever travel to another country. Little attention has been given to rural students' education abroad experiences in the greater study abroad literature and more study is warranted given these findings at CSCC. Community colleges who serve rural populations should take a closer look at opportunities for these students to engage in education abroad.

In this study, the low-income students also gave voice to how their low-income identity propelled their participation in education abroad. Low-income students indicated in their interview responses that being low-income was actually a motivator for them to participate in education abroad at CSCC, explaining why low-income students in the frequency table appear more likely than non-low-income students. The high percentage of low-income students who participated in education abroad also debunks the assumption that low-income students are not interested in education abroad. By hearing the stories of those low-income LIFTRs who did participate in education abroad, students emphasized that their low-income status only motivated them more to take the opportunity to participate. Taking the opportunity brought a realization of their capabilities.

This study is one of few studies to investigate the global experiences of CTE or technical students at community colleges. The high percentage of CTE students participating in education abroad at CSCC as shown in the frequency table results should cause community college leaders to consider how programs and policies can be developed to ensure that education abroad is available to CTE students. The relevance of global learning for CTE students is important to

their careers and to the community's ability to produce global workforce-ready graduates. Program design is important to the participation of CTE students in that career-relevant programs with hands-on opportunities in their CTE field that ensure the education abroad experience is an authentic and relevant learning experience. CSCC has focused on this intentional design of CTE education abroad programs that attract CTE students and ensure practical hands-on activities such as construction management education abroad in Germany at a master carpenter training facility, welding global learning experiences that include comparisons of welding techniques, comparative agriculture programs in Brazil that involve collaborative agricultural science project with Brazilian agriculture students, automotive technology exchange programs with Australia that involve comparative techniques and hands-on classroom experience with Australian cars, trucks, and automotive students.

At CSCC, the quantitative analysis of all four LIFTR categories together indicated that LIFTRs were more likely to participate in education abroad than non-LIFTRs. This combination of the four identities in an intersectional way allows a new perspective on how these identities intersect and contribute to one another. The frequency table and regression analysis found differing significant results for low-income students when taken in isolation; however, by focusing on the intersectional identities, a new understanding of the data revealed how intersectionality tells a more holistic story of who students are and the identities they possess. This type of intersectional analysis allows for a more nuanced understanding of the student population at CSCC and their education abroad experiences rather than isolating individual variables on their own.

Although it is not necessarily possible to generalize these findings beyond CSCC, these findings should cause international educators at other community colleges and other higher education institutions to take pause and challenge existing assumptions about who participates in education abroad, what stereotypes are currently being perpetuated in their own institutions, and where education abroad can thrive in the future of the field. Community college administrators and international education practitioners should challenge themselves to create international opportunities, marketing materials and outreach activities to reach students with LIFTR identities and/or other intersectional marginalized identities that are relevant to their context, careers, and community.

Unquestionably, there could be policy and institutional differences at CSCC that are influencing the findings of this study. CSCC has a long history of promoting education abroad and a culture of comprehensive internationalization that has been built over time. Policies and practices are in place to incentivize and support all faculty, both Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty and Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty to engage in internationalization activities such as education abroad leadership, virtual exchange, and integration of international activities in the curriculum. These practices undoubtedly contribute to the findings of this study where the intersectionality of LIFTR identities in students were found to be more likely than non-LIFTR students to participate in education abroad at CSCC. Even though individual identity markers such as low-income and technical on their own did not represent significant predictors, the combination of the four LIFTR identities did serve as a predictor. Community college leaders need to analyze their own policies to determine if deficit-thinking and systemic structures are precluding CTE students at their own institutions from the global learning experiences they and their communities expect to gain through their education.

Conclusion

Education abroad has the potential to serve as an inclusive learning activity available to all students in all sectors of higher education, including community colleges. Past deficit-based literature has painted a picture of how underrepresented groups, who do not mimic the profile of the typical 4-year undergraduate education abroad student, simply do not participate and/or engage in education abroad in high numbers due to their lack of identity markers and/or social capital (Brux & Fry, 2010; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2014; Salisbury et al., 2011; Simon & Ainsworth, 2012). This deficit narrative is debunked by this research's illustration of how it is not necessarily the characteristics of the students who influence participation propensity but rather the opportunities and offerings of the institutions that influence participation. Institutions that align relevant opportunities and offerings with the needs of LIFTRs are able to involve this diverse population in education abroad.

These results have implications for community colleges interested in increasing access and equity to education abroad experiences with keen attention to their own unique local student population, whether they are LIFTRs

or some other combination of identities. Community college administrators should champion efforts to remove systemic barriers that inhibit LIFTR students and other marginalized students from participating in education abroad. By employing an approach that acknowledges and motivates students' true capabilities, broader participation can be achieved.

Central to their mission, each individual community college serves students from a distinct and defined local community. Each community is unique in its population where diverse students with distinct identity markers live, work, and thrive. Intersectional identities in that community's population will overlap in complex ways as this study exemplifies in the example of LIFTR identities. Each local population, on analysis of enrollment datasets or population datasets will be different in terms of their students' most common intersectional identities. Each individual student is complex and unique. These identities and their intersectionality must be acknowledged in the design and implementation of education abroad programs, particularly in the case of those identities that are marginalized or perceived as deficit. In this study, LIFTR identities were a common intersectional identity in the student population that attended CSCC, thus the attention of this study on first analyzing the identity data and subsequently gathering their education abroad stories and impacts. Given the results of this study, the field of international education is called upon to recognize that community colleges are an ideal site for additional research on student intersectional identities that have been omitted from traditional education abroad research.

This study substantiates that community college education abroad is an effective vehicle for fostering inclusivity of historically underrepresented students in global learning opportunities. If inclusive education abroad and inclusive internationalization is to be the future vision of the field of higher education internationalization, then research and inquiry must be focused on community colleges and like-institutions globally that serve diverse populations.

References

- Abdallah-Pretceille, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education*, 17(5), 475–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980601065764>
- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2022). *American Association of Community Colleges 2022 Fact Sheet*. May, 1–2. <https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/2018-Fast-Facts.pdf>
- American Institute for Foreign Study (AIFS) Foundation & Institute for International Education. (2018). *Study abroad matters linking higher education to the contemporary*

- workplace through international experience* [White paper]. <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications/Study-Abroad-Matters>
- Andriano, B. R. (2010). *Study abroad participation and engagement practices of first-generation undergraduate students*. [Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/17aa63d6c6c9a6703cb73ce46e8a19d3/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Ardoin, S. (2018a). *College aspirations and access in working-class rural communities*. Lexington Books.
- Ardoin, S. (2018b). Helping poor- and working-class students create their own sense of belonging. *New Directions for Student Services*, 162(Summer 2018), 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20263>
- BaileyShea, C. (2009). *Factors that affect American college students' participation in study abroad*. (Publication No. 3395372) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Ballatore, M., & Stayrou, S. (2017). Internationalisation policy as a (re)producer of social inequalities: The case of institutionalised student mobility. *Rassegna Italiana Di Sociologia*, 58(2), 251–281. <https://doi.org/10.1423/87309>
- Bloch, R., & Mitterle, A. (2021). On stratification in changing higher education: the "analysis of status" revisited. *Higher Education*, 73(6), 929–946. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0113-5>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(33), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1026>
- BruX, J. M., & Fry, B. (2010). Multicultural students in study abroad: Their interests, their issues, and their constraints. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(1997), 1–6.
- Byun, S. Y., Meece, J. L., Irvin, M. J., & Hutchins, B. C. (2012). The role of social capital in educational aspirations of rural youth. *Rural Sociology*, 77(3), 355–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2012.00086.x>
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 785–810.
- Crain, A. (2018). *Serving rural students*. NACE Center for Career Development and Talent Acquisition Web Page. <https://www.naceweb.org/career-development/special-populations/serving-rural-students/>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine. In *Feminist theory and antiracist politics, university of Chicago legal forum* (No. 1, pp. 138-167).
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Deisigning and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ezarik, M. (2022). First in the family make their mark in college. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/07/19/first-generation-students-describe-paths-college-success?>
- Fakunle, O. (2021). Developing a framework for international students' rationales for studying abroad, beyond economic factors. *Policy Futures in Education*, 19(6), 671–690. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210320965066>
- Gale, T., & Molla, T. (2015). Social justice intents in policy: an analysis of capability for and through education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(6), 810–830.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.987828>
 Institute of International Education. (2021). *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. <https://opendoorsdata.org/>
- Kezar, A. J., Walpole, M., & Perna, L. W. (2015). Engaging low-income students. In S. J. Quaye & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations* (pp. 237–255). Routledge.
- Koricich, A., Chen, X., & Hughes, R. P. (2018). Understanding the effects of rurality and socioeconomic status on college attendance and institutional choice in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 41(2), 281–305.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0004>
- Legusov, O., Raby, R. L., Mou, L., Gómez-Gajardo, F., & Zhou, Y. (2022). How community colleges and other TVET institutions contribute to the United Nations sustainable development goals. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(1), 89–106.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2021.1887463>
- Leibowitz, B. (2017). Rurality and education. SARIHE working paper.
- Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2014). Predictors of study abroad intent, participation, and college outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 56(1), 29–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-014-9338-7>
- Ma, J., & Baum, S. (2016). *Trends in community colleges: Enrollment, prices, student debt, and completion*. College Board Research.
<https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/trends-in-community-colleges-research-brief.pdf>
- Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(3), 249–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11772256>
- Patton Davis, L. & Museus, S. (2019). What is deficit thinking? An analysis of conceptualizations of deficit thinking and implications for scholarly research. *Currents*, 1(1), 117–130. <http://dx.doe.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.110>
- Perkins, C. (2020). Rewriting the narrative: An anti-deficit perspective on education abroad participation among students of color. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study abroad*, 32(1), 148–165. <https://10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.438>
- Raby, R. L. & Rhodes, G. (2018). Promoting education abroad among community college students: Overcoming obstacles and developing inclusive practices. In H. B. Hamir & N. Gozik (Ed.), *Promoting Inclusion in Education Abroad* (pp.114.132). Stylus.
- Raby, R. L. & Valeau, E. J. (2007). Community college international education: Looking back to forecast the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2007(138), 5–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.276>
- Raby, R. L. & Valeau, E. J. (2009). *Community college models: Globalization and higher education reform*. Springer.
- Raby, R. L. (2018). Adult students studying abroad through community colleges. In *Critical Perspectives on Education Abroad: Leveraging the Educational Continuum*. Stylus.
- Raby, R. L. (2019). Changing the conversation: Measures that contribute to community college education abroad success. In G. F. Malveaux & R. L. Raby (Ed.), *Study abroad opportunities for community college students and strategies for global learning*. (pp. 1–21). IGI Global.
- Raby, R. L., Rhodes, G. M., & Biscarra, A. (2014). Community college study abroad: implications for student success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(2–3), 174–183.
- Robertson, J. (2016). *The community college student's social construction of global learning in the*

- Florida college system*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida]. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 4869. <http://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4869>
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Salisbury, M. H., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. T. (2011). Why do all the study abroad students look alike? Applying an integrated student choice model to explore differences in the factors that influence white and minority students' intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(2), 123–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9191-2>
- Schultz, P. F. (2004). Upon entering college: first semester experiences of first-generation rural students from agricultural families. *The Rural Educator*, 26(1), 48–51.
- Sen, A. (1985). Well-being, agency and freedom : The Dewey lectures 1984. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 82(4), 169–221. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2026184>
- Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Simon, J., & Ainsworth, J. W. (2012). Race and socioeconomic status differences in education abroad participation: The role of habitus, social networks, and cultural capital. *ISRN Education*, 2012, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/413896>
- Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(3), 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315313496572>
- Thomas, M. (2013). The problematization of racial/ethnic minority student participation in U.S. education abroad. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(2), 365–390. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0016>
- Tran, L. T. (2016). Mobility as 'becoming': a Bourdieuan analysis of the factors shaping international student mobility. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(8), 1268–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1044070>
- Tran, L.T., & Dempsey, K. (2017). Internationalization in VET: An overview. In L. T. Tran & K. Dempsey (Eds.), *Internationalization in Vocational Technical Education and Training: Transnational Perspectives* (pp. 1–15). Springer, Cham. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47859-3>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics (UNESCO-UIS). (2020). *UNESCO Student participation by regions share of students (both sexes) in tertiary education 2014-2018*. <https://data.uis.unesco.org/>
- Van Mol, C. & Perez-Encina, A. (2022). Inclusive internationalisation: do different social groups of students need different internationalisation activities?. *Studeis in Higher Education*, 47(12), 2523-2538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2083102>
- Walpole, M. (2003). Socioeconomic status and college: How SES affects college experiences and outcomes. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(1), 45–73. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2003.0044>
- Whatley, M. (2018). Exploring the relationship between institutional context and community college education abroad. *WES-CIHE Summer Institute Proceedings*.
- Whatley, M. (2021). Who participates in the internationalized curriculum? An exploration of access at one community college. *American Educational Research Association*.
- Whatley, M., & Clayton, A. B. (2020). Study abroad for low-income students: The relationship between need-based grant aid and access to education abroad. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 49(2), 1. <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/jsfa/vol49/iss2/1>
- Whatley, M., & Raby, R. L. (2020). Understanding inclusion and equity in community college education abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Education abroad*, 32(1), 80–103. <https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.435>
- Whatley, M., & Stitch, A. (2021). From exclusive to inclusive: A mixed-methods investigation of

- study abroad participation and practices. *Journal of Higher Education*, 92(1), 140-167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1768778>
- Whatley, M., LaVenture, S., & Russell, N. (2022). *Assessing access and outcomes in community college virtual exchange*. <https://www.stevensinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Assessing-Access-and-Outcomes-in-Community-College-International-Virtual-Exchange.pdf>
- Wick, D., Willis, T. Y., Rivera, J., Lueker, E., & Hernandez, M. (2019). Assets-based learning abroad: First-generation Latinx college students leveraging and increasing community cultural wealth in Costa Rica. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Education abroad*, 31(2), 63-85. <https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v31i2.455>
- Willis, T. Y. (2016). Microaggressions and intersectionality in the experiences of black women studying abroad through community colleges: implications for practice. In R. L. Raby & E. J. Valeau (Eds.), *International education at community colleges: Themes, practices and case studies* (pp. 127-141). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wood, D., & Raby, R. L. (2022). Community college career and technical education internationalization: Diversifying comparative and international education. In *Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2021* (pp. 205-224). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-36792022000042B011>
- Wood, D., & Whatley, M. (2020). Community college study abroad: Institutional context, geography, and field of study. In S. Saubert (Ed.), *NAFSA Research Symposium Series* (pp. 4: 102-117). NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Author Biography

Dawn Wood currently serves as Dean of Global Learning at Kirkwood Community College. With over 25 years of international education leadership experience at a variety of institutions and institutional types, she enjoys furthering the ideals of intercultural exchange and inclusive internationalization. Dr. Wood recently received her PhD in Higher Education Internationalisation and continues to pursue research on the impact of intercultural experiences on diverse populations. She has authored numerous publications and has presented at a variety of professional conferences

Appendix: Interview Questions

INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

- Tell me a bit about yourself and your background. Where are you from and how did you come to be a student at Case Study Community College? Tell me about your path.
- Are you working outside of your classes and what kind of job / work are you doing?
- What are your career goals after you complete being a student at Case Study Community College?
- Tell me your story about study abroad . . . when did you study abroad and where did you go? Tell me all about the program you participated in.

DEMOGRAPHICS / IDENTITY

- According to my notes, you are (*technical applied degree students, rural or small town background, low income or Pell eligible, first generation or first in your family to attend college*). I am interested in hearing more about how you identify with one or more of these groups (at the time of your study abroad). How do you relate to these groups?
- Please talk about what it is like to be from one of these groups at community college...

MOTIVATIONS

- Why did you choose to participate in study abroad?
- Do you think your motivations had anything to do with you being part of the (CTE, rural, low income, first gen) group? Tell me about that.
- Do you think intercultural experiences should be part of college education? Why or why not?

CHALLENGES

- Describe an example of an experience you had during the study abroad experience that was a particular challenge for you? How did you adapt?

- Describe an example during your study abroad experience where you believe your values were questioned or you were forced to think about something very differently when you were abroad than you would normally.
- How did you **change** as a result of the intercultural experience?
- Reflecting on your intercultural experience, tell me about how it impacted you **personally** and who you have become?
- What about **professionally** and who you have become?
- In your current work or school, tell me about how you do or do not work with people from other cultures. Examples..

IMPACT

- Talk about how this intercultural experience impacts how you now or will work with people from other cultures... in your work? In school?
- Empathy is the ability to see/feel things from another person's perspective or "live in their shoes". Tell me about your level of empathy. . . do you think that experience may have impacted your level of empathy? Why or why not? Examples...
- Intercultural competence is a term that applies to people who are comfortable moving across borders and working within different cultural settings... do you think your experience increased your level of intercultural competence? Why? Do you have examples?
- What additional comments do you have about your study abroad experience?