A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs

By Robert Gough, Pamela Roy, & Farzana Karim-Haji

Pamela Roy
Consultancy for Global Higher Education

THE AGA KHAN UNIVERSITY

Western
UNIVERSITY · CANADA

© 2018

Use of this content for educational and public purposes is permissible with credit to the authors as follows:

Gough, R., Roy, P., & Karim-Haji, F. (2018). A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs. Presented at the 12th Annual Global Internship Conference June 12-15, 2018, Detroit, MI, USA.

Table of Contents

4 Preamble

6 A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs

- 8 Ethically Engaged Partner Relationship
- 9 Ethics of Governance — Led from the Ground
- 10 Co-Develop Pre-Departure Orientation and Materials
- 11 Ongoing Critical and Ethical Co-Engagement and Co-Learning
- 12 Ethical Branding and Communication
- 13 Co-Assessment, Co-Evaluation, and Co-Learning

14 Appendix A: Ethical Dilemmas: Preparing Students to Engage Ethically on International Experiential Learning Programs While Adding Value for Host Communities in the Global South

18 About the Authors

19 References

Preamble

Ethical engagement in mobility programs[1] is a choice. As we know, mobility programs are multidirectional in that various engagements and student exchanges occur between sending and receiving institutions/organizations (i.e., North-North, South-South, South-North, and North-South). The rapid expansion of internationalization efforts in higher education has led to increased student mobility, including practicum, volunteer, and internship placements in development organizations or with community groups in the Global South (Gough, 2018). North-South mobility programs are defined here as Northern-based students travelling to the "Global South" for a range of educational opportunities to study and/or learn practical work and leadership skills through volunteering, experiential learning, cooperative education, or "field school" courses (Tiessen, Roy, Karim-Haji, & Gough, 2018). These mobility programs benefit students by providing them with the critical tools to prepare to be 21st century global leaders equipped to tackle a rapidly changing world by leveraging their leadership and communication skills, intercultural learning, critical and complex thinking, and so on. The goal of mobility programs has historically focused on the benefits to the student from the Global North with little attention paid to ensuring mutual benefit and reciprocity with host partners and communities[2] in the Global South (Karim-Haji, Roy, & Gough, 2016; Tiessen, Roy, Karim-Haji & Gough, 2018; Tiessen & Huish, 2014).

Mobility programs play an important role in institutional partnership building and university internationalization strategies. Given the existence of global inequality and asymmetrical power relations between sending institutions[3] and host partners, ethical issues arise that must be attended to when developing, maintaining, or enhancing partnerships. The good news is that Global South partners are open to receiving students from the Global North for international learning as long as local voices are integrated into the planning and development of these experiences, real community needs are met, and students are prepared at minimum with the historical, political, economic, and social context of the nation(s) and cultures in which the mobility program is situated (Gough, 2018; Tiessen & Huish, 2014).

In 2015, Farzana Karim-Haji (The Aga Khan University), Dr. Pamela Roy (Consultancy for Global Higher Education), and Robert Gough (The Western University in Ontario, Canada) embarked on a path to explore the complexities and risks in North-South partnerships with humble acknowledgment of their own individual fragility and vulnerability (Kozark & Larsen, 2016), as privileged members of the academy, to speak and

[1] Mobility programs encompass international service learning, education abroad, global service learning, study abroad, international exchanges, global internships, research abroad, volunteering abroad, etc.

[2] Host partners and communities encompass in-country NGOs, community-based organizations, academic institutions, staff on the ground, leaders, host families, and local people living in the community (receiving partners).

[3] Sending Institutions are colleges, universities, and third-party providers that send individuals to participate in global mobility programs.

be heard (Shahjahan, 2005). The trio conducted extensive research on the topic of ethics and international experiential learning programs, resulting in a resource guide entitled *Building Ethical Global Engagement with Host Communities: North-South Collaborations for Mutual Learning and Benefit* which was presented at the 2016 Global Internship Conference in Boston, Massachusetts. This guide presented information on the diverse stakeholders' needs, responsibilities, and activities to achieve improved ethical practice in mobility programs. It amassed valuable information about core ethical dilemmas, standards of practice, critical self-reflexivity and reflexive practice, comprehensive pre-departure preparation, and how to develop ethical partnerships. In November 2017, Universities Canada launched a publication entitled North-South Mobility in Canada's Universities, which featured the ten important ethical considerations for North-South student mobility programs based on the work of Karim-Haji, Roy, and Gough (2017). The trio then published an article in the *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education* in collaboration with Dr. Rebecca Tiessen to examine perspectives of host institutions and organizations in the Global South and the breadth of ethical considerations to be analyzed in North-South student mobility programs, offering recommendations for improved institutional practice (Tiessen, Roy, Karim-Haji, & Gough, 2018). Through numerous conference presentations, the trio has helped each other reflect and deepen their respective commitments to embody ethics in their practices and within the context of their work lives. And although this work has been messy and at times ambiguous, they have attempted to embrace their imperfections wholeheartedly and strive to create just partnerships and relationships (Karim-Haji, Roy, & Gough, 2016).

Building Ethical Partnerships

According to the Association of Universities and Colleges Canada (AUCC, 2013), three sets of characteristics of effective and innovative partnerships include: (1) *foundational principles* to guide the establishment of a healthy and solid partnership, i.e., shared vision, strong leadership, power equity, interdependency and complementarity, mutuality manifested through shared decision-making, shared resources and recognition of the importance of all partners' contributions and of the validity of the various types of knowledge, (2) *sustaining processes* such as explicit rules on decision-making, transparent communication, clarity of partners' roles, openness to discussing cross-cultural issues, trust, and the impact of different communication styles on the partnership, and (3) *results and activities* of what's being achieved, added value to the partnership both in terms of relevancy and sustainability, improved capacities, enhanced performance of the partners, new linkages with other like-minded institutions, collaborative research, improved access to donor funds, and so on. In addition to AUCC, several resources provide guidelines for ethical practices of global mobility programs (see for example Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016; Duarte, 2015; Hartman, 2016; Forum on Education Abroad, 2018a; and Forum on Education Abroad, 2018b).

By acknowledging global inequalities and attending to resulting asymmetrical power relations, North-based sending institutions are better able to focus on the voices of their partners in the Global South and pay attention to important ethical considerations such as non-reciprocity, invisible barriers, learning as transaction, exclusion in decision-making, and the burden of resources and time (see Tiessen, Roy, Karim-Haji & Gough, 2018). These ethical considerations "offer a necessary backdrop from which to consider alternative approaches and to reflect on the role of post-secondary institutions in charting the course for ethical global engagement by way of institutional partnerships, programmatically and for individual students" (Tiessen, et al., 2018, p. 13).

A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs

Figure 1:

Gough, R., Roy, P., & Karim-Haji, F. (2018). A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs. Presented at the 12th Annual Global Internship Conference June 12-15, 2018, Detroit, MI, USA.

Building on their earlier work, Gough, Roy, & Karim-Haji (2018) present an evidence-based holistic model for ethical mobility programs (see Figure 1). The model uses a holistic approach to mobility programs by considering the lens, interests, goals, priorities, and needs of the student, the program, the sending institution, and most importantly, the host partner. Noteworthy is that this model is rooted in a partnership-based approach whereby the sending institution and the host partner(s) play a central role in the *co*-planning, *co*-development, *co*-design, *co*-implementation, and *co*-evaluation of the mobility program.

(1) ethically engaged partner relationship;

(2) ethics of governance — led from the ground;

(3) co-develop pre-departure orientation and materials;

(4) ongoing critical and ethical co-engagement and co-learning;

(5) ethical branding and communication; and

(6) co-assessment, co-evaluation, and co-learning.

How to Use This Model

Planning, designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating mobility programs are not straightforward. Partners who work together collaboratively to co-plan, co-design, co-develop, co-implement, and co-evaluate the mobility program undertake a messy, ambiguous, risky and challenging process that may also be deeply rewarding while charting a course for ethical global engagement. How you choose to apply this model may vary based on your intended interest(s) and the nature of the partnership(s) that you seek and/or have. For example, this model may be used by universities who are seeking to partner with community-based organizations or to deepen their reflexive practice with existing partners. The model may also apply to NGOs who aspire to engage with peer NGOs in a neighboring country. This model is not intended to be prescriptive; but rather a starting framework to better understand and evaluate how to engage in ethical partnerships and how to consider the lens, interests, goals, priorities, and needs of not only the student, the program, and the sending institution, but most importantly, the host partner.

Each of the six components of the model is connected to one or more of the 11 ethical dilemmas for improved ethical practices in international experiential education programs while adding value to host communities (see Appendix A; Karim-Haji, Roy, & Gough, 2016).

This model includes examples of practical action to illustrate the types of baseline practices that inhibit ethical mobility programs throughout the program cycle towards the development of critically and ethically reflexive students, and a socially just and ethical program that values and respects the partnership and the local community. The examples are both macro-level practices (policies and values) as well as micro-level practices (i.e., how to develop the program and/or how to work with students). Finally, to further contextualize this model, we have included case studies for each of the six critical components. Many of the case studies draw from the collaboration between the Aga Khan University and the Western University in Ontario, Canada, and while this partnership is solidly rooted in a partnership-based approach, we believe that this model has the potential to be applied to newly forming partnerships, as well as for partners interested in deepening their existing partnerships by engaging in reflexive processes.

Ethically Engaged Partner Relationship

Description*

Establishing a mutually reciprocal partnership between the sending institution and the host partner allows for better transparency and communication, a sense of equal ownership, and, over time, a more holistic experience for all parties involved in the mobility program.

Case Studies

- Engaged Partnership around Communications: Western University in Ontario, Canada and the Aga Khan University have worked together over time to build an engaged partnership based on trust and mutual understanding by discussing and co-developing a strategy for critical reflexivity during the internship process. This has included discussions around program design, student expectations, entitlement, post departure and re-entry.
- Engaged Partnership for Funding: The Aga Khan University has taken a collaborative role in building partnerships from the ground with Canadian institutions, resulting in joint applications for grant funding to co-sponsor internship programs, including sending students from the South to the Northern institution.
- Engaged Partnership of Mutuality & Reciprocity: The Aga Khan University has been working with Canadian partner universities to maintain ongoing communication before, during and after the internship, which has resulted in ongoing feedback, joint student support and a balance in the power dynamics between the partners.
- Engaged Partnership of Longevity: As a result of working with interns and partner institutions, The Aga Khan University has had the ability to work with institutions to learn best practices, improve systems and processes and offer new areas of interest, i.e. faculty exchanges, joint research, technology etc.
- In addition to a formal report, community partners with Western University in Ontario, Canada and women's groups requested a summary of what the student accomplished on the internship and what they learned from the experience. This was provided in the local language to be more accessible and to ensure learning was shared at all levels within the community.

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Jointly plan and develop institutional goals and partnership priorities, sharing information transparently throughout the partnership process.
- ☑ Establish open communication and discuss challenges and opportunities proactively between partners.
- ☑ Develop authentic, in-depth relationships between the partners (i.e. regular communication, conduct site visits, honest and constructive feedback, cultivate the relationship over time to facilitate direct and comfortable rapport).
- ☑ Clearly define mutually agreed upon roles and expectations of the students, the sending institution, and the host partner.
- ☑ Provide the local community with a summary of student learning outcomes in an accessible format and invite them to provide feedback for program improvement.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Inattentiveness to Asymmetrical Power Relationships, Student Privilege and Entitlement, Overemphasis of Career Development and Professionalization of the Experience, 'Revolving Door' Nature of the Exchange Between Students and Hosts, and *Student Voyeurism of Host Communities* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

* We by no means intend to imply that these descriptions are concrete or final, but rather working definitions generated through evidence-based research, scholarship, and practice.

Ethics of Governance – Led from the Ground

Description

North-South mobility programs are often developed, driven and implemented by institutions in the North (sending organizations). Leadership on the ground in the South (host partner) means that the host partner is integral to the development of the mobility program, specifies their capacity to receive students, defines their roles, shares their expectations, and sets the goals of the program in ways that support and enhance the host partner and local community needs while also attending to student learning and the sending institution's goals and priorities. This requires that sending institutions employ hyper-self-reflexive practices to mitigate asymmetrical power relations between partners.

Case Studies

- The Aga Khan University's International Internship Program has flipped its model to lead and govern the program by being clear about its programmatic requirements (i.e., positions, duration, timing and funding) and expectations of its partners, as well as by proactively communicating with partners about student issues and other challenges. One example has been around timing of placements. Most institutions have pushed for shorter placements. The Aga Khan University has insisted on longer placements, holding its ground, noting the value for both the student, communities, and the internship supervisor.
- Western University in Ontario, Canada utilizes an internship proposal form completed by the host partner which includes the internship job description, identifies skills required, and supervision provided. The host partner is actively involved in the selection process of student interns.

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Identify areas of the mobility program where there has been historical exclusion of the partners and actively engage them in providing insights.
- ☑ Create an enabling environment where receiving institutions equally benefit from the mobility program and where the host partner can be unapologetic in advocating for their interests, needs, and expectations.
- ☑ Establish a learning partnership framework that leads to the development of robust programs led by highly-trained and highly-skilled mentors from communities on the ground.
- ☑ Seek leadership from the host partners in co-selecting student participants in the mobility program.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Mobility Inequality, Exploitation of Host Communities as Research Participants, 'Revolving Door' Nature of the Exchange Between Students and *Host Communities* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

Co-Develop Pre-Departure Orientation and Materials

Description

Co-developing program materials and co-implementing student training is likely to reduce assumptions about the host nation(s) and cultures, and better meet the host partner's needs. For the host community this collaboration reinforces joint ownership and provides an opportunity to work with the sending institution to ensure students have a holistic understanding of the political, historical, economic and social contexts of the nation(s) and cultures within which the mobility program is situated. A scaffolded learning program should provide the framework for all participants (not just those in development studies) to engage in reflexive practice around the impact of their presence in the host country and how power and privilege shape the reality of global inequality.

Case Study

A Western University student was placed in an Aga Khan University internship located in the Global South. The student, who was fully aware of their housing stipend prior to participating in the program expressed resentment for receiving a different scholarship amount from the Aga Khan University for their housing stipend as compared to his peers and demonstrated a general lack of understanding that housing stipends vary based on program length and relevant funding sources (grants, scholarships, etc.). The student attempted to pit the sending institution and host partner against each other, which eventually resulted in pre-departure orientation sessions being revamped for the following cycle to proactively address these types of issues. Western University in Ontario, Canada and the Aga Khan University began co-developing orientation modules incorporating content from both institutions to ensure a proactive approach to engaging with students prior to their departure and to continue reflexive practice on the ground. Reflection questions and student responses to their Western University supervisor are shared with Aga Khan University supervisors so that further meaning can be explored with the student within the political, historical, economic and social contexts.

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Jointly review the program components and roles and responsibilities of each institution.
- ☑ Explicitly address how both partners will communicate with, and support each other around student-program-related issues.
- ☑ Prevent students from misrepresenting the program agreement by openly sharing and discussing the agreement with the student and partner during pre-departure orientation.
- ☑ Agree on templates for student reflections, reports and evaluations. Share the student's interests prior to arrival, and support the host partner in placement of the student.
- ☑ Ensure students are consistently prepared for critical and ethical engagement through jointly developed orientation modules and face-to-face sessions.
- ☑ Manage student expectations and support transparent processes whereby students understand the context, issues and challenges.
- ☑ Establish institution-wide safety abroad policies with well thought-out risk management processes which require consistent preparation of students abroad, particularly around issues of ethical global engagement.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Student Privilege and Entitlement, Shallow Student Reflection, Students Perpetuating Stereotypes On-Site, Marketization of Education, Overemphasis of Career Development and Professionalization of the Experience, and *Student Voyeurism of Host Communities* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

Ongoing Critical and Ethical Co-Engagement & Co-Learning

Description

Engaging students (and program leaders) in dialogue about global inequality and immersing them in learning about critical and ethical global engagement can raise awareness of ethical practices in mobility programs and promote critical learning and reflexive practice.

Case Study

A group of students from a North-based university conducted a joint public health campaign with a high school in Uganda. At the celebratory lunch, one of the university students spoke on behalf of the group to thank the high school students for teaching them about the local culture and for their collaboration on the campaign. A student representative from the high school then thanked the university students for their contributions to the local community and for their shared learning. The high school student then stated that their school needed five computers. Many of the university students later expressed anger and felt resentment towards the local community, appalled that they wanted "more" than what was already provided by way of their time, money, and presence. Pre-departure orientation was subsequently revised to engage students in more in-depth critical self-reflection about the political, historical, economic and social contexts so as to better help the students understand the request of the high school student rather than reacting with anger or blame.

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Explicitly educate students about what a solidarity/social justice approach looks and feels like, how colonialism, power and privilege may have shaped the contexts in which they will be situated, and equip students with the tools to address ethical dilemmas during the program and throughout challenging situations (i.e., provide them with prompts to practice solidarity).
- ☑ Embed reflexive practice into the planning, development, implementation and evaluation of the program attending to who is benefiting, privileging local voices, being flexible with goals, and respecting local knowledge.
- ☑ Create post-program opportunities that engage alumni to be brand ambassadors for ethical mobility programs.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Inattentiveness to Asymmetrical Power Relations, 'Revolving Door' Nature of the Exchange Between Students and Hosts, Student Voyeurism of Host Communities, Students Perpetuating Stereotypes On-Site, Student Privilege & Entitlement, and *Shallow Student Reflection* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

Ethical Branding & Communication

Description

Program branding and communication should promote reciprocal engagement among the students, partners, and communities without perpetuating stereotypes, reinforcing clichés, provoking pity, exaggerating learning outcomes, misusing cultural icons, or justifying the continual presence of the mobility program in the host nation(s). Images, videos, social media, and other marketing materials should reflect social justice and equity without sensationalizing the "other" or "glorifying" the presence of students in the community.

Case Studies

- A photo contest for study abroad alumni at a North-based university resulted in a winning photo of a white young woman holding an African child. While the student had an ongoing relationship with the child in the photo, the image reified the narrative of the "giving North" and the "needy South" and reinforced asymmetrical power relations. Steps were taken to educate the selection committee and students for subsequent contests; guidelines and criteria for evaluating photos were revised to reflect social justice values.
- While the Western University in Ontario, Canada program in East Africa operates from a social justice perspective, the university reviewed and changed wording on the website and promotional materials to more explicitly reflect collaboration and solidarity versus helping or 'making a difference.'

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Inform, politicize, and prepare students for a *collaborative* experience, dispelling notions of gift-giving and expectations around helping.
- ☑ Market the program in ways that attract students who are motivated to be educated and genuinely interested in engaging critically and ethically, beginning with the application process.
- ☑ Develop consistent messages about student expectations for respecting local culture, knowledge, and leadership.
- ☑ Ensure that marketing materials and photographs, reflect a collaborative, social justice approach to depicting mutual learning.
- ☑ Equip students to be reflexive practitioners with the tools to deconstruct unethical practices and how to communicate their experiences ethically.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Marketization of Education, Inattentiveness to Asymmetrical Power Relationships, and *Unethical Marketing and Advertising to Promote International Experiential Learning Programs* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

Co-Assessment, Co-Evaluation, & Co-Learning

Description

Establish a process to co-assess the mobility program to occur in concert between the sending institution and the host partner. It should include collaboration to collect data about the program, the partnership, the host community experience and student learning. There must be equal and shared decision-making power to improve and change the program to meet the evolving needs and priorities of the host partner. Partners should share responsibilities in evaluating students' learning and performance and in reporting results to the communities involved.

Case Study

Western University in Ontario, Canada and the Aga Khan University developed a comprehensive approach to their internship program, including engaging students throughout the program beyond pre-departure orientation and re-entry programming. This resulted in strengthened program components, improvements to both the partnership and the program, and numerous learning opportunities. For example, both institutions have developed a common language for the type of students they envision in the program, namely critically and ethically engaged, reflexive students. They have also put into place various strategies to accommodate this vision. Western University in Ontario, Canada has also invited the Aga Khan University to review and provide feedback on all pre-departure modules; the program now includes regular reflections during the internship, the final reports completed by students are shared with the Aga Khan University and the local community, student and program evaluations are co-developed, and deadlines for the internship application process have been modified to account for visa and permit delays.

Examples of Practical Action Throughout the Program Cycle

- ☑ Co-evaluate the sending and receiving institution's (or partner's) needs, priorities, and expectations towards the development of mutually agreed upon goals (i.e., feedback about visa processes or risks are respected and incorporated into program planning).
- ☑ Learn from the host partners, explicitly engaging with local leadership and community members to understand their needs and experiences with students (i.e., engage a local gatekeeper to seek unabashed feedback).
- ☑ Integrate insights from the co-learning, co-assessment, and co-evaluation processes to strengthen and enhance the program, relationship with the host partner, and student experience.
- ☑ Integrate insights from the student's perspectives on how to improve the program and respond to changing needs.
- ☑ Initiate post-experience debriefing *while* the student is at the program site.

Connection to Ethical Dilemmas

Inattentiveness to Asymmetrical Power Relationships, Exploitation of the Host Community as Research Participants, and *'Revolving Door' Nature of the Exchange Between Students and Hosts* in Karim-Haji, Roy & Gough, 2016.

Appendix A: Ethical Dilemmas – Preparing Students to Engage Ethically on International Experiential Learning Programs While Adding Value for Host Communities in the Global South

For full details related to these ethical dilemmas, please reference the following publication: Karim-Haji, F., Roy, P., & Gough, R. (2016). Building Ethical Global Engagement with Host Communities: North-South Collaborations for Mutual Learning and Benefit. Resource Guide presented at the 10th Annual Global Internship Conference June 15-17, 2016, Boston, MA, USA.

Ethical Dilemmas	Definitions*
Mobility Inequality	Students from the global North move relatively freely throughout the world, while individuals from the global South are repeatedly denied entry into countries in the global North (MacDonald & Vorstermans, 2016). Visa-free mobility has increased for OECD countries and decreased for other countries thereby creating a global mobility divide (Mau, Gulzua, Laube, Zaun, 2015). This may reify colonial perceptions that the North is superior; there is a danger of knowledge transfer being unidirectional and reinforcing hegemonic ethnocentrism (Andreotti, 2014).
Marketization of Education	As the economy has increased demand for intercultural competencies, students have begun to seek opportunities for international experiential learning programs (Jorgenson, 2016). Universities are in a race to globalize their students and it is become a profit-driven market, often perpetuated by national and university policies on student mobility (Huish & Tiessen, 2014). Marketization fundamentally affects students' conceptions of what 'doing good' looks like and is often presented as self-improvement through charitable work (Hartman, 2016). Messaging such as "Give a Year, Change the World" or "Develop the World, Develop Yourself" are commonplace.
Inattentiveness to Asymmetrical Power Relationships	Generally, there is a lack of awareness and understanding of the structures and systems within which we all live that contribute to conditions of inequality (Simpson, 2004). This often results in asymmetrical power relationships between the host community and the sending organization/institution. Students are often positioned as the ones who learn and serve (Larsen, 2016). Inattention to the political, historical and economic roots of inequality may result in reproducing colonial relationships and a charitable approach to service which reinforces the power position of the global North to help the poor and less fortunate 'Other.' Host communities are often taking care of students in their charge, keeping them busy at work and or dialoguing with them, which can be burdensome and problematic (Heron, 2016).
Student Privilege & Entitlement	Students need to become highly aware of their social identity privileges and how these may impact their sense of entitlement and their relationship with the host community and international experiential learning experience. Students often pay little attention to understanding how their privilege and the historical relations of power reproduce global inequalities (Larsen, 2016). Students may experience guilt that is triggered when their privileged identity is implicated in the subordination of others; yet their emotional experience of guilt is prioritized, disabling their capacity to critically engage in activist forms of practice (Thomas & Chandrasekera, 2014). Privilege also includes the ability to travel to learn [which is] often predicated on an enactment of privilege and an ability to move across borders (MacDonald, 2014). Northern students carry a sense of entitlement to choose what part of the culture to respect (Heron, 2016).

* We by no means intend to imply that these descriptions are concrete or final, but rather working definitions generated through evidence-based research, scholarship, and practice.

Unethical Marketing and Advertisement to Promote International Experiential Learning Programs	The visual economy of international experiential learning programs and the visual constructs that create and sell stereotypes of development and present them as instances of global leadership continue to perpetuate at universities and learning abroad fairs. In other words, current marketing of international experiential learning programs focuses on the deliberate beautification of an object, subject or scene so as to secure future business for the industry as well as justify the continued presence of learning abroad in the global South (Clost, 2014, p. 231).
'Revolving Door' Nature of the Exchange Between Students and the Hosts	The idea of shorter duration experiences is becoming the norm. The host community often has students coming in and out of their site but is it worth their time, energy and effort? Some evidence exists that longer-term (12+ weeks) student placements are preferred by host communities (Larsen, 2016; MacDonald & Vorstermans, 2016) while others suggest that short-term (fewer than 8 weeks) student experiences are preferred by community members because it gives the greatest economic impact, despite deeper relational benefits (Smedley, 2016).
Overemphasis on Career Development and Professionalization of the Experience	In today's world, as a competitive way to improve the resume, promote career enhancement and international skill development (Tiessen, 2014) universities desire for their students to internationalize and experience a different professional global environment. The emphasis becomes one of professional experiences rather than one creating thick forms of global citizenship defined as fostering understanding of the moral obligations that follow from connections, linkages and shared responsibilities in the realm of justice for all and modeling responsible ethical behavior (Cameron, 2016; Feast, Collyer-Braham & Bretag, 2011; Dobson, 2006).
Student Voyeurism of Host Communities	Some students arrive with the idea that they can fix or change the communities they are visiting and may find themselves in a place of crisis as they are confronted with letting go of their expectations (Agudey & Deloughery, 2016). Moreover, students cannot help but arrive with Western values and beliefs, and this Eurocentric gaze in non-Euro cultures enhances the sense of difference and often superiority (Mohanty, 2006). Yet, this "helping imperative" or "desire to help" is paternalistic and recreates a particular image of people living in the global South as those in need of help or charity (Tiessen & Huish, 2014; Clost, 2014; Heron, 2007).
Students Perpetuating Stereotypes On-Site	Students' values cloud the types of work that the community wishes to conduct on the ground which reifies cultural senses of the North's superiority and perpetuates stereotypes of the global South.
Exploitation of the Host Community as Research Participants	Exploitation of the host community as research participants often encompasses mining of data to advance the goals of the global North. The knowledge and experience of communities in the global South are devalued in favor of research or knowledge from global North universities (Larsen, 2016b). The host community in the global South may not speak critically about the effect of having international students, given the economic stakes involved (d'Arch, Sanchez, & Feuer, 2009; Schroeder, Wood, Galiardi, & Koehn, 2009).
Shallow Student Reflection	Students who are mainly interested in voluntourism and professional development may not reflect deeply on their international experiential learning experience. Ill-prepared Northern students may engage inappropriately in the cultural context of their host communities e.g., through unsuitable ways of addressing elders, transgressing gender norms, public displays of affection, wearing inappropriate clothing and accessories, refusing to eat local food served by the host families, behaviors associated with drinking and smoking irresponsibly (Kozak & Larsen, 2016). The problem with shallow student reflection is that it perpetuates colonial stereotypes, social hierarchies, and western conceptions of North-South relationships (Hartman, 2016).

Sources in This Table

Andreotti, V. (2014). Critical and transnational literacies in international development and global citizenship education. *Journal of Education, 2*(3), 32-50.

Agudey, G., & Deloughery, H. (2016). A cross-cultural conversation about international service learning in Ghana. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cameron, J.D. (2014). Grounding experiential learning in "thick" conceptions of global citizenship. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clost, E. (2014). Visual representation and Canadian government-funded volunteer abroad programs: Picturing the Canadian global citizen. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

d'Arlach, L., Sanchez, B., & Feuer, R. (2009). Voices from the community: A case for reciprocity in service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5-16.

Dobson, A. (2006). Thick cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies, 54*(1), 165-184.

Feast, V., Collyer-Braham, S., & Bretag, T. (2011). Global experience: The development and preliminary evaluation of a programme designed to enhance students' global engagement. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48*(3), 239-250.

Hartman, E. (2016). Fair Trade Learning. A framework for ethical global partnerships. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: Whiteness, gender, and the helping imperative*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Heron, B. (2016). Southern perspectives on ISL volunteers. Reframing the neo-colonial encounter. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Huish, R., & Tiessen, R. (2014). There should be nothing experimental about experiential learning: From globetrotting to global citizenship. In R. Tiessen &R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jorgenson, S.(2016). Orient(aliz)ation: A case study of North American international education programs at the University of Ghana. In M. Larsen (Ed.), *International Service Learning: Engaging Host Communities* (pp.119-130). New York and London: Routledge.

Kozak, J., & Larsen, M.A. (2016). ISL and host communities – relationships and responsibility. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Larsen, M. (2016). International service learning engaging host communities – Introduction. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Larsen, M. (2016b). International service learning in a Tanzanian host community: Post-colonial insights. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

MacDonald, K. (2014). (De)colonizing pedagogies: An exploration of learning with students volunteering abroad. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

MacDonald, K., & Vorstermans, J. (2016). Struggles for mutuality: Conceptualizing hosts as participants in international service learning in Ghana. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mau, S., Gulzua, F., Laube, L., & Zaun, N. (2015). The global mobility divide: How visa policies have evolved over time. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(8), 1192-1213.

Mohanty, C. (2006). *Feminism without borders*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Schroeder, K., Wood, C., Galiardi, J.K., & Koehn, J. (2009). First, do no harm: Ideas for mitigating negative community impacts of short-term study abroad. *Journal of Geography, 108*(3), 141-147.

Simpson, (2004). "Doing development": The gap year, volunteer-tourists and a popular practice of development. *Journal of International Development, 16*(5), 395-421.

Smedley, C.T. (2016). The economic circle. Impacts of volunteerism and service learning on three rural communities in Costa Rica. In Larsen, M. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Tiessen, R. (2014). Career aspirations and experiential learning abroad: Perspectives from Canadian youth on short-term placements. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tiessen, R., & Huish, R. (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Thomas, L., & Chandrasekera, U. (2014). Uncovering what lies beneath: An examination of power, privilege, and racialization in international social work. In R. Tiessen & R. Huish. (eds). (2014). *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

About the Authors

Robert Gough is the Director of International Internships and Development at Western University in Ontario, Canada. Bob was instrumental in creating the Western Heads East program, a collaboration between Western staff, students, faculty and African partners using probiotic yogurt social enterprises to empower women while bringing health to their communities. Today there are approximately 250 community kitchens feeding more than 200,000 people in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda. Working with student interns and community partners in East Africa sparked Bob's interest to pursue a master's degree in Comparative and International Education at Western University in Ontario, Canada, conducting research into perspective transformation, and pursuing mutual and reciprocal relationships in Global North and South partnerships. Mr. Gough may be reached at bob.gough@uwo.ca.

Pamela Roy is Founder of the Consultancy for Global Higher Education, offering project management and strategic leadership in the areas of youth education, diversity and equity, faculty development, and higher education capacity building. Some of her clients have included The MasterCard Foundation, Diversity Abroad, Michigan State University's Alliance for African Partnerships, and Youth Empowerment Programs, Academic Internship Council, Association of American Colleges & Universities, Professionals in Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, and more. Dr. Roy has led numerous education abroad programs for Canadian undergraduate students to South Africa, and co-developed and led a youth leadership summit in Rwanda for pan-African youth, and created the curriculum for and managed the program experience for 8-day Leadership Institutes (in South Africa and in New Zealand) for senior international educators who were interested in gaining skills to better support their global education and diversity-related work. Her professional activities and publications can be accessed at pamelaroy.net. Dr. Roy may be reached at pamelatuliroy@gmail.com.

Farzana Karim-Haji is the Director of the University Partnerships Office at the Aga Khan University. She is responsible for building, and developing the University's partnership strategy with national and international universities. She collaborates with colleagues from across the Aga Khan University and the Aga Khan Development Network. She has also been instrumental in establishing the University's first International Internship Programme aimed at bringing interns to East and North Africa, the Middle East, and in South and Central Asia. Ms. Karim-Haji may be reached at farzana.karimhaji@aku.edu.

References

AUCC (2013). Innovative North-South Partnerships. Synthesis of Findings and Case Studies. Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Available at https://www.univcan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/innovative-north-south-partnerships-idrc-report-2013.pdf.

Duarte, G. (2015). What to look for in global service learning: Six standards of practice to guide your decisions. Nicaragua: Compañeros, Inc.

Forum on Education Abroad (2018a). Guidelines for Community Engagement, Service Learning, and Volunteer Experiences Abroad. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad. Online resource guide available at https://forumea.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Guidelines-for-Community-Engagement-P4.pdf.

Forum on Education Abroad (2018b). Guidelines for Internships Abroad. Carlisle, PA: The Forum on Education Abroad. Online resource guide available at https://forumea.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Guidelines-for-Internships-Abroad-17-for-web.pdf.

Gough, R. (2018, May 10). Do No Harm: Towards Ethical Global North-South Relationships. The Western University in Ontario News accessed on June 8, 2018. Available at http://news.westernu.ca/2018/05/towards-ethical-global-north-south-relationships/.

Gough, R., Roy, P., & Karim-Haji, F. (2018). A Holistic Model for Ethical Mobility Programs. Presented at the 12th Annual Global Internship Conference June 12-15, 2018, Detroit, MI, USA.

Hartman, E. (2016). Fair trade learning: A framework for ethical global partnerships. In Larsen, M. A. (Ed). *International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Karim-Haji, F., Roy, P., & Gough, R. (2017). Ten Important Ethical Considerations for North-South Mobility Programs. In R. Tiessen & Grantham, K. (eds). North-South Mobility in Canada's Universities. Ottawa, ON: Universities Canada. Available at https://www.univcan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/north-south-mobility-in-candas-universities-jan-2018.pdf.

Karim-Haji, F., Roy, P., & Gough, R. (2016). Building Ethical Global Engagement with Host Communities: North-South Collaborations for Mutual Learning and Benefit. Resource Guide presented at the 10th Annual Global Internship Conference June 15-17, 2016, Boston, MA, USA. Available at http://www.pamelaroy.net/uploads/5/0/8/2/50825751/karim-haji_roy___gough_2016_resource_guide.pdf.

Kozak, J., & Larsen, M.A. (2016). ISL and host communities – relationships and responsibility. In Larsen, M. (Ed). International Service Learning Engaging Host Communities. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2005). Mapping the field of anti-colonial discourse to understand issues of indigenous knowledges: Decolonizing praxis. *McGill Journal of Education, 40*(2), 213-240.

Tiessen, R., Roy, P., Karim-Haji, F., & Gough, R. (2018). Expanding Our Understanding of North-South Mobility Programs: Insights for Improved Institutional Practice. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education* 6(1), 1-21.

Tiessen, R., & Grantham, K. (2017). Partnership Building through North-South Mobility Programs. Issues briefs on North-South student mobility. Ottawa, ON: Universities Canada. Available at https://www.univcan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/north-south-student-mobility-building-partnerships-nov-2016.pdf.

Tiessen, R. & Huish, R. (2014). Globetrotting or Global Citizenship? Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.