

**Safety and solidarity:  
Governance of higher risk study abroad programs and activities**

Derek Tannis

[Derek.tannis@usask.ca](mailto:Derek.tannis@usask.ca)

University of Saskatchewan & University of Alberta

**Abstract**

In this paper, the role of risk governance is examined in relation to higher risk study abroad programs and activities involving post-secondary students. In the face of increased global uncertainties, post-secondary institutional legal and financial risk thresholds can conflict with an ethic of global solidarity, mutuality and academic freedom. A relational standard of care augments prescriptive diagnostics of informed consent and exemption/appeal structures, safeguarding faculty and student liberty and security through deliberative, informed choice. This approach provides a viable means to pursue ethical internationalization in post-secondary education, as it places value on global human wellbeing through sharing of knowledge, skills and resources, aligning safety with values of solidarity and mutuality.

**Introduction**

The importance of global student mobility in the internationalization of post-secondary education at its highest peak (de Wit, 2002) with outbound student participation rates in Europe expanding and with small, yet noticeable increases in North America (Bond, 2010; Rizva & Teichler, 2007). The range of study abroad program options include term abroad or exchange programs (one or two terms abroad), short-term, faculty taught abroad courses, coop work placements, internships and research-based initiatives (Institute of International Education, 2010; Knight, 2007). According to Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) data (2007), the annual outbound student participation rate across Canada is 2.2% annually, an increase of 1% since 2000. This matches US data at an approximate 1% annual participation rate, with 14% of undergraduate students having a study abroad experience at least once during their study period (International Institute of Education, 2010). Importantly however, Bond (2010) stated that “[f]uture research should specifically look at the racial/ethnic differences (and its intersectionality) with other social identities in relation to both perceptions of and participation in study abroad among diverse student bodies” (Bond, 2010, p. 62). The *Open Doors* 2011 (Institute for International Education, 2010) also addressed this changing reality, reporting that study abroad participation has increased by 8% to African, Asian and the Middle Eastern destination.

In an age of shifting rationales for and demographic participation in global student mobility programs, the dual concepts of duty of care and standard of care must be revisited, as they are the overarching construct and underlying praxis for determining how risk is handled in post-secondary global student mobility. Safety and security concerns were rated third in barriers

to outbound student participation in the NAFSA study, at 11% (2003), and in Bond's (2010) study were identified under the broad banner of lacking "readiness" to go. For the Canadian public, safety abroad was identified as the second most stated reason why studying abroad was a poor idea (Bond, 2010). Inherent risks involved in study abroad need to be addressed without diminishing the intrinsic value and benefits of campus internationalization (Myles & Mitchell, 1998; Hanson & Myles, 1997). Underlying global student mobility programs of varying levels of risk is an accepted risk management framework based on a perceived objective process that aims to consistently and non-exclusively provide for student safety and reduce institutional liability (Hoye & Rhodes, 2000; Myles & Mitchell, 2000; NAFSA, 2008; Smith & Tombs, 2000). Such a framework struggles, however, with the inter-subjective, relational experience of higher risk study abroad activities, where issues of solidarity, community and global social justice often challenge institutional imperatives to ensure a legally acceptable, culturally normalized standard of care (Bates, 2006; Ryan & Rottman, 2007; Brown & Baker, 2007; Renn, 2004). This gap may be more theoretical than practical, as universities across North America take different approaches to addressing higher risk study abroad activities within their policy documents. Exceptional cases of higher risk global student mobility that require policy exemption or special permission may be more common than is generally acknowledged.

In this paper, I investigate and propose an approach to risk governance that incorporates relational, constructive agency to counter-balance purely prescriptive approaches. In the first section, I discuss the concept of duty and standard of care in relation to the field. In the second section, I discuss advantages and disadvantages of the generally acknowledged and practiced standard of care approach for global student mobility, based upon efficiency and objective risk management. I follow this with a discussion on a relational risk governance approach for higher risk global student mobility. In the conclusion, I discuss the practical implications of the relational approach. For the purposes of this paper, the terms study abroad and global student mobility are used interchangeably. This is due to the breadth of programs and activities that fall under what has been historically labelled as study abroad. Under this use of the term and in context to this paper, international degree seeking students, or foreign national/visa students, are included only in relation to their participation in outbound study abroad activities through their home institution (i.e. an international graduate student in Canada participates in their supervisor's reciprocal research program at a Japanese institution).

### **Duty and standard of care**

At first glance, the terms duty of care and standard of care may appear to have normative characteristics. At a meta-analytical level they do have a generic meaning that enables cross-application; however, they are related to how and why things are done in a particular way within organization, rather than what is done with/by for whom, and when and where it is done. In the post-secondary context, duty of care has a historical antecedent at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as *in loco parentis*, described by Cox & Strange (2010) as being an environment "wherein campus personnel were expected to play an authoritative role in students' lives, with close monitoring and careful regulation" (p. 8). The quasi-parental relationship has diminished such that there are few instances where post-secondary institutions can be said to have a fiduciary duty to students or to a specific student (Hanson & Myles, 1997).

It is interesting, however, that as with international student services, the duty and standard of care ascribed to global student mobility is often greater than other student service

areas (Hanson & Myles, 1997; Hoye & Rhodes, 2000; Myles & Mitchell, 2000). It is widely acknowledged that international students require more support than the average domestic student, as a result of language and cultural barriers and other stresses associated with being in a foreign living and learning environment (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010; Turner & Robson, 2008; Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010). Considering the challenges faced by international students, it is understandable that parents have a much higher expectation regarding the institution's duty of care in connection with their child's global student mobility. In this manner, while *in loco parentis* is no longer the norm at the post-secondary level, it is still conceivably possible that an institution may be found to have a fiduciary duty to an outbound student, especially in cases where the student is deemed "vulnerable" and needing "sustenance, support and guidance on a day-to-day basis" from the institution (Hanson & Myles, 1997, p.6).

Furthermore, as Hanson & Myles (1997) wrote, negligence law has vast implications for study abroad. According to negligence law, an institution could be deemed legally negligent if a more effective duty of care could have predicted and could have prevented an accident (Hanson & Myles, 1997). An institution could also be deemed negligent if the standard of care, or the "requisite skill, care, knowledge, attention or expertise" required for implementing an institution's duty of care, is found lacking (Hanson & Myles, 1997, p. 5). Duty and standard of care are further influenced by statutory obligations, which include health and safety legislation that can result in "quasi-criminal" offences, in that legal action is initiated by the state and "legal liability can arise in [cases] where no one is injured, and a breach can be punishable by fine and in some cases, imprisonment" (Hanson & Myles, 1997, p.7). Considering the potential legal liability associated with global student mobility, it is a wonder that post-secondary institutions undertake any study abroad programs. However, as Myles & Mitchell (2000) argued, while "[r]isk is an essential part of any experiential learning, whether at home or abroad" (p. 20), the successful pursuit of international education can be achieved through institutional and student shared assumption of the risks and responsibilities associated with global student mobility.

### **Prescriptive approach**

At its origin, it could be said that risk in study abroad is first mitigated through careful site selection on behalf of the institution in order to: first, reduce risk and liability for the institution; second, to provide presumably safe options for study abroad to students; and third, to manage parental and societal concerns and expectations of the institution regarding students' safety (Bond, 2010; Myles & Mitchell, 1998). Such a centrally structured version of study abroad is one that permeates the field of global student mobility, whereby risk is first reduced by selecting and offering study abroad options that have the least perceived hazards. The approach is arguably quite effective due to its logical nature. The bounded rationality of the institution is deemed the normative base, such that the scope of risk perception and tolerance is matched with a prescriptive duty and standard of care, underscored by a carefully controlled schematic of student development and engagement.

### **Efficiency and objectivity**

At the core of this established approach is that risk management equates with expert risk analysis, top-down institutional risk policy and communication and associated mechanisms to ensure compliance (Power, 2007; Smith & Tombs, 2000; National Academy Press, 1996). Such compliance can be deemed cooperative; however, the underlying definition of risk is unilaterally

determined by the institution with selected input from expert opinion (National Research Council, 1996). The approach is founded upon the rational-scientific paradigm, with risk management a subset of overall post-secondary governance, attenuated to detailed risk analysis and associated interventionist measures to limit exposure to hazards and mitigate potential liabilities (Power, 2007; Rescher, 1983). In this paradigm, risk is best defined by Renn (2004) as “the possible effects of actions or events, which are assessed as unwelcome by the vast majority of human beings” (p. 290). The definition of risk in study abroad is attached to standards of safety and security that presume normative value and portend to be culturally neutral (Myles & Mitchell, 2000). Risk is heightened in association with a “choice of action” to undertake global student mobility where there is a potential “negativity of outcome” and “higher chance of its realization” (Rescher, 1983, pp. 6-7) with respect to the effect of hazards, such as: geo-political stability; socio-economic conditions; environmental factors; crime rates; inter-ethnic tensions’ religious; and political freedoms, among others.

General practices for lower risk global student mobility include basic international travel risk management components of what Myles and Mitchell termed the “Health & Safety Approach” to risk management (Myles & Mitchell, 2000). At the foundation of these practices is a clearly articulated travel risk policy that outlines roles and responsibilities, as well as risk assessment and travel safety measures to be taken at the institutional level. The policy usually outlines site selection screening procedures, based on government travel safety warnings, such as those issues through the Canadian government’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT). This information would be augmented by reliable sources and site partners. Risk mitigation would include such things as: risk management planning for group taught abroad programs, where faculty take students to another country and teach a course in that location; the legal components of waivers, acknowledgement and release forms; a crisis response mechanism through the international travel registry and associated crises response procedures; and a pre-departure orientation. Included in the policy and procedures may be the possibility to appeal the disallowance of a specific site selection, especially in cases where a student or faculty proposes to undertake an activity in a location deemed a no-travel zone by DFAIT.

As a whole, this approach to international travel risk management would conform to best practices in the field (NAFSA, 2008). In terms of implementation, such practices are consistent, egalitarian and measurable, with a clearly articulated duty of care. From a management perspective, responsibilities are drawn along legalistic and behavioural lines, with informed consent for screened study abroad opportunities underlying institutional interests and enacted through legal and instructional measures. Importantly to this discussion, they relegate higher risk global student mobility to the margins, as an appeal or exemption to be reviewed by institutional experts and assessed according to differentiated norms which may or may not be transparent to students. The student, deemed a partner in the risk management process (Myles & Mitchell, 2000), may be viewed as a *newcomer* to the community of practice in international education (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

### **Centralized, restricted agency**

The question arises, however, as to what type of newcomer these ‘best practice’ policy and procedures are geared. From a social-constructivist perspective, young adult, undergraduate students can be viewed as the primary benefactor of a prescriptive policy, being offered situated learning parameters upon which to engage in increasingly complex, riskier global student

mobility experiences (Bruner, 1996; Lave, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978). The policy and practice is grounded in infrastructure that provides a bounded agency for global student mobility, reflected in the bounded rationality of the risk management process itself (Power, 2007). From a student development perspective, this incremental, instructional and quasi-parental paradigm for promotion of student independence aligns with determinants of success for the traditional undergraduate student who, it is presumed, will have had little, if any related international experience to draw upon (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Hamrick, Evans & Schuh, 2002). For student affairs, this integrated student development approach crosses many sectors of student services and curriculum initiatives (Kuh, Kinzie, Shuh, Whitt & Associates, 2005). Increasingly, it is grounded in comprehensive institutional goals, such as developing in students a strong civic identity or instilling ideals of global citizenship, especially in relation to study abroad (Hanson & Johnson, 2009; Jefferess, 2008; Schattle, 2009). The community of practice to which global student mobility is often intertwined is that of global citizenship, a term mired in varying interpretations and in questions of legitimacy as a liberating, post-colonial construct (Abdi, 2011; Dower, 2008; Hanson & Johnson, 2009; Jefferess, 2008).

From a critical perspective, the bounded rationality of the established policy paradigm for global student mobility at Canadian Anglophone universities may be viewed as Anglo-centric, neo-colonial, or elitist, in nature (Abdi, 2011; Dower, 2008). This effectively creates a moral construct that has an impact upon students' identification as global citizens, which unless treated carefully can result in unintended reinforced attitudes, such as ambivalence (Jorgensen, 2011). From a community of practice perspective students are seeking advice, guidance and approval from experts in international education, utilizing the tools and resources made available to them (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1993; Lave, 1997). The socio-cultural framing of global student mobility invariably influences their personal identity and ethics that underlie their cross-cultural interactions and sense of social responsibility (Appiah, 2005; Appiah, 2006). From a social choice standpoint, this bounded rationality shapes the preferences made by students, as they select from available options assumed as normatively rational and, as consequence, this shapes their intercultural capabilities and approach to issues of global social justice (Nussbaum, 2005; Nussbaum, 2011; Sen, 2009).

### **Relational approach**

In practical terms, this conundrum manifests in situations where a student, or faculty with a student(s), wants to go to study/teach at a destination that is deemed too dangerous for the institution. In such a situation, the institution may permit participation if the student acknowledges the risks they are taking and all liability is waived, or may disallow participation regardless of rationale. No matter how well contrived, waivers and informed consent based upon information delivery will invariably rely on a rational choice perspective; whereas, in higher risk global student mobility contexts, the situation is often inter-subjective, community of practice oriented, and socio-culturally /socio-historically grounded. A purely prescriptive decision making process exemplifies due diligence and an objective, systems-oriented risk management, but can miss aspects of the situation that might affect the institution's overall risk analysis.

For example, an international student wants to return home to document the suffering and healing of survivors from the ethnic genocide that gripped his country, and is faced with the university providing funding through a student travel award, but denying credit by not approving the project. Or a medical student resident interested in global health wishes to undertake a

residency in a politically unstable African nation at a clinic founded by a Canadian who is originally from this nation. In order to do so, the student must appeal to the Dean and have the trip approved by the university Provost. The final result may be accepted appeal that includes a modified waiver form outlining details of the threats to her life and safety as a traveller in that country.

In each of these cases, the interactions between students, faculty and administrators remain without formal description in the literature. This dialogical process involves a sharing of knowledge and experience, resources and crisis response and may be accompanied by appreciation for the work being done. This subterranean institutional student support is not acknowledged within a systems-oriented, auditable process. It presents what may be termed a *risk governance* model as described by Power (2007), including a deliberative approach as examined by Renn (2004), and the National Research Council (1996). It involves a process grounded upon dialogue, consultation and structured communication, based upon human dignity, self-respect and self-esteem (Honneth, 1996). It is cognizant of the variance in risk perception across life experience, the social construction of risk within various academic and cultural contexts, and the associated different risk tolerance and risk appetites that exist within an institutional setting (Cabantous, Gond & Johnson-Cramer, 2008; Power, 2007).

### **Equity and integration**

There is a critical difference between top-down risk management and a diversified interest-based and influence-oriented model, best described as risk governance (Power, 2007). The term risk expands Renn's (2004) construct of risk as explicitly tied to hazards. Following the Council of Standards of Australia and New Zealand (2009), risk governance takes a broader approach, terming risk as the "effect of uncertainty upon objectives" (p. 1). Risk is both positive and negative, as it can relate to the appetite of an organization or individual to face known or unknown hazards in order to achieve an anticipated positive outcome; and alternatively, it can also relate to opportunity risk, whereby not undertaking certain activities can have negative consequences (Power, 2007; Stone, 2002). As opposed to risk management being a subset of governance, relegated to specialists and experts, a risk governance model is incorporated into an organization's overall functioning and business model (National Research Council, 1996; Renn, 2004). This includes the integration of structured decision-making tools and approaches in order to balance organizational bias, beliefs and preferences (Cabantous et al., 2008; Fox & See, 2003).

Underlying risk governance is the assertion that risk is a social construct and inheres a particular discourse (Dryzek, 2006), and therefore effective risk mitigation initiatives require deliberative processes, based upon dialogical principles (National Research Council, 1996; Renn, 2004; Smallman, 2000). Active participation in risk planning and mitigation is intrinsic to a governance model, integrated into the fabric of the organizational decision-making processes at every level. Objective calculation of risks are balanced against inter-subjective interpretations and perceptions of risk, based upon individual past experience, knowledge and cultural background (Breakwell, 2007; Kusev & van Shaik, 2007; Slovic, 2000). As stated by Power (2007), the rational-scientific, expert model breaks down in a top-down risk communications application; the model has consistently been shown to be ineffective if not geared to the risk perception of the audience it is targeting (Breakwell, 2007; Renn, 2004; National Research Council, 1996). The complex, pluralist view of decision-making in society is described by Renn

(2004) in his statement that, “[a]t the foundation of society are the needs for effectiveness, efficiency, legitimacy, and social cohesion” (p. 293).

From an institutional risk governance perspective, the cornerstone duties to inform and protect must therefore be matched by a duty to accommodate an international student population, a multicultural student body and a diversity of academic disciplines (Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004; Bartell, 2003). These parallel duties are brought together by a duty to consult and engage in deliberative, participatory governance of risk (Renn, 2004). In this approach, due diligence is part of due process, rather than vice-versa. Subsumed as well is what may be termed due regard or recognition, evidenced by representational justice in decision making on matters that affect specific groups (Fraser, 2009). Duty of care is hence expanded beyond a prescriptive and protective scope comprehensive of the agency of those affected by the policy. In Honneth’s (1996) terms, deep recognition requires that legal relations be extended to include a community of value with may extend beyond one’s own jurisdiction. Simple generalization of rules and moral responsibilities across domains must be balanced in relation to both individualization and the extension of honour or dignity to others, out of one’s sense of social integrity and self-respect and an inter-subjective need for self-esteem (Honneth, 1996). For higher risk global student mobility, equitable, integrated risk governance requires a rethinking of a number of issues and practices. Primarily, it requires a reconsideration of how due diligence is implemented, including a redistribution of resources that favours an inclusive, coordinated agency and decision-making process.

### **Coordinated, constructive agency**

A relational standard of care presents an integrated, inclusive interaction with students, staff and faculty regarding risk analysis and valuation of rewards associated with a particular study abroad program or activity, and the necessary resource allocation and responsibilities to make it feasible. This approach incorporates recognition of diversity in experience, risk perception and cultural background as an integral foundational principle. This represents a shift towards a multicultural competence and social justice in student affairs, educational administration and institutional governance, whereby diversity is not something to be managed, but rather is part of the leadership and governance framework itself (Bates, 2006; Blackmore, 2006; Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004). Differences in value, in terms of risk tolerance, for example, are understood to be inherent to a multidisciplinary, medical-doctoral institution. This includes its student body, which includes undergraduate, mature, graduate, post-graduate, international, aboriginal and recently immigrated students, among other demographic characteristics.

Recognition of such differences in the study body is manifest in reframing policies such that they are inclusive of alternative perspectives. From a student development position, such recognition associated as solidarity and self-esteem (Honneth, 1996), is tied with critical and constructive agency, as described by Blackmore (2006) and Shultz & Abdi (2008). Following Shultz & Abdi (2008), agency can be divided into deliberative agency, critical agency and constructive agency. Deliberative and critical agency in are related to critical social justice discourse. In the first case, deliberative agency refers to how differing voices are welcomed into policy development, but even more importantly it related to the ability of each participant “to engage in processes of dialogue” (Shultz & Abdi, 2008, p. 8). Critical agency relates to a

capacity to be self-questioning, to ask difficult questions and to emerge from a space of analysis and reflection with a context for action. Constructive agency emerges from these skills and discursive practices, and is contingent upon all other principles of critical social justice.

In higher risk global student mobility, such agency is one which enables the student to both critically appraise risk and develop their own contingency, risk planning framework if indeed he or she is willing and wanting to engage in higher risk global student mobility. The framework itself must relate to benchmarks and external thresholds; however, these are diversified in their origination and are focused through an inclusive risk analysis process. The DFAIT Travel Advisory Warning system could remain a principle standard; however risk analysis would also include other discipline specific, or university integrated and determined standards. The discourse of higher risk thus shifts from a pejorative, country-specific orientation that may be tied to neo-colonial worldviews (Dryzek, 2006; Fraser, 2009; Young, 2007) to include broader higher risk categories which would be inclusive of the activities undertaken, purposes of mobility, relationship to studies, and connections to communities of value that extend beyond a purely legalistic framework.

Student identity development is therefore not only attached to the development of personal autonomy, but is expanded to a development of purpose, self-direction and interconnectedness. Chickering and Reisser (1993) described this aspect of student development as being tightly connected with the exploration and aligning with a student's values and beliefs. For Appiah (2006), this clarification of self-purpose must "start[s] with what is human in humanity" (p. 134) and reaches into our imagination to appreciate the contributions of various peoples around the world to our collective civilizations. An Appian cosmopolitan value system assumes a critical, associative, integrative process of personal identity formation that is grounded in kindness, where we actively seek difference to expand our understanding of humanity and thus see ourselves as actors in relation to equitable policy development.

In practice, individual agency in a relational standard of care manifests in contexts where students and faculty are given guidance and direction on how to build a strong proposal for higher risk global student mobility. For example, students interested in research refugee issues may wish to undertake research at refugee camps, which are often associated with higher risk mobility, especially from a Western dominant perspective of being the global protectorate. For such a student, the research experience is part of a personal life goal, but may also be tied to his or her sense of global social responsibility, which may likely be an integral philosophical and social science perspective of their graduate program. With a more open interpretation of higher risk global student mobility, an "avoid non-essential travel" DFAIT warning takes on a different meaning for critical and constructive agency. After careful investigation and reflection, the location under review may indeed be far too dangerous; however, automatic dismissal as a destination would not be a normative practice.

In this approach, higher risk global student mobility may be correlated with an apprenticeship construct, including the rationale and infrastructure for an internationalizing institution (Lave, 1993; Lave, 1997). Experienced international educators who have been involved in higher risk global student mobility are brought into the center and play a key role in decision-making and development of tools and resources. Embarking on what is deemed a

higher risk global mobility program for one's studies would therefore be something that is earned through demonstration of capability as much as it is approved based upon third-party and inter-subjective risk thresholds. The full-spectrum of student experience is integrated, from the third year undergraduate student who has never travelled to the international graduate student who wishes to return to his or her continent and undertake studies in a volatile region. A relational standard of care can and should be responsive and have a holistic view of responsibility in each context, ascribing a standard of care that is attenuated to support the development of student autonomy, purpose and global awareness of self and others.

### **Conclusion**

It is arguable that, no matter how well defined, a student global mobility policy based upon a strict prescriptive risk management approach will, in practice, meet with resistance and may result in perverse incentives (Stone, 2002). Such unintended results may include unreported trips abroad, falsification of information, committee standstill or lobbying to senior administration. In Dworkin's (2011) terms, the intent of mainstream study abroad risk management is to protect students from harm. He posed the question that exemplifies the moral dilemma faced by study abroad administrators: "What scheme of liability responsibility for my choices, and hence for the choices of everyone else, should I therefore endorse?" (Dworkin, 2011, p. 290). He went on to state that this question,

[R]equires us to seek a scheme of risk management that maximizes the control we can each exercise over our own fate, given that we must each recognize and respect the same control in others. We can rank scheme on a scale of risk-transfer magnitude. A scheme is lower in risk transfer the more it allows accidental losses to remain with the person on whom they initially fall and higher in risk transfer the more it places the liability responsibility for such loss on someone else. [...] We should therefore aim to identify a scheme of liability responsibility that achieves the greatest antecedent control, trading off gains and losses in control from both these directions. (Dworkin, 2011, p. 290)

What Dworkin (2011) described is a shared responsibility for risk, inclusive of deliberation and recognition of differing risk perceptions and levels of risk tolerance. From a higher education perspective, where such dialogue and recognition is excluded, the policy and procedures can be antithetical to academic freedom and the pursuit of a socially transformative concept of global citizenship, running counter to certain fields of study and professional expertise and possibly the very mission of the institution (Bartell, 2003; Brown & Baker, 2007; Unterhalter & Carpentier, 2010). The ethics imputed in a prescriptive standard of care may ultimately undercut institutionally identified, moral, ethical and practical global social justice dimensions of international education (AUCC, 2008).

The core issue in higher risk global student mobility is the definition of what higher risk entails. From a policy perspective, this is an exercise in analyzing how the issue is defined, who defines it and how it relates to the internationalization agenda of the institution (Stone, 2002). At the highest level of analysis, the definition of higher risk global student mobility is woven into the internationalization approach of the institution, whether this is tied to goals of citizenship, trade, research or enrolment (Knight, 2004). A legitimated, auditable relational standard of care would be difficult to implement at an institution with a weak organizational culture and a poorly defined international agenda (Bartell, 2003). Equally, in a top-down organizational post-

secondary culture, administrative managerial emphasis can disconnect administration from faculty and divest decision-making authority and capacity for innovation (Shapper & Mayson, 2005; Whitechurch, 2008).

Thus, a key factor in implementing a relational standard of care for higher risk global student mobility is the alignment of powers of authority such that decision-making capability resides not only centrally but within units lower down the institutional hierarchy. Further to this, there must be a consideration of the diversity of representation of interests at the decision-making table. If there is no voice for international graduate students, no voice for international development studies, nor a voice for global health research, among other identified vested interests, there will not likely be a complete definition of higher risk that reflects the inter-subjective risk threshold of the institution. According to Renn (2004), while this deliberative process comes with serious challenges, from added time and costs to the creation of expectations that cannot be met, certain key factors can be integrated that mitigate such potential problems. Through a deliberative, consultative and well-constructed framework, higher risk global student mobility may be integrated into a framework of pre-approved thresholds that be added to such benchmarks as the DFAIT warning system. This pre-approval may include a number of additional requirements for higher risk global student mobility and/or be incorporated into policy as an expanded framework of risk analysis. The process for approval of higher risk global student mobility may include a different initiating procedure for trip approval, more tasks associated with an international travel registry, such as a more detailed travel and risk plan, a more in-depth pre-departure orientation, a structured interview with study abroad personnel and/or completion of a travel experience inventory.

A risk governance model does not, however, only consider degrees of risk. It also includes how the level of risk of a program or activity relates to its intent and overall situated learning and research context. The rewards of reciprocity and attendant issues of global social justice are not considered secondary issues; rather they frame student safety and wellbeing within a larger ethic of care and inter-subjective responsibility. One-way international projects, where expertise from the north is exported to the south, represent a neo-colonial manifestation of international education which may actually increase risk from an intercultural, global social justice perspective. Without strong, purposeful inter-organizational ties, higher risk global student mobility takes place in a more tenuous space, lacking a depth of commitment that can lead to lasting mutual benefit (Bartell, 2003; Knight, 2007). From a risk governance perspective, curricular and research integration should be collaboratively undertaken with academic and non-academic units, with workshops and learning communities developed around the topics of intercultural learning, ethics in international education and global citizenship. Development of a credited course on the topic of global citizenship and the integration of service learning in international education can serve to create personal, professional and academic development opportunities associated with higher risk global student mobility.

Considering the criticality of this topic in relation to post-secondary internationalization efforts, it is important that applied research be undertaken to balance theoretical and industry standard models with evidence-based practices. Bond's (2010) first recommendation from her research on Canadian student mobility continues to be most pressing: there is a need to seek "[a]n institution-wide policy on internationalizing learning within the post-secondary context"

that can effectively “replace the conventional, ad-hoc approach” (p. 61). Specific research needs to be undertaken in relation to the prevalence and nature of various tools and processes associated with higher risk global student mobility such that these practices can be better analyzed and considered for more widespread use by administrators and faculty in the field of international education. Analysis of emergent global mobility patterns and associated international, non-Western, practices of risk management/governance would provide a deeper understanding of global practices and perspectives on the issue.

It is arguable that the field of global student mobility is currently working more from a premise of privilege, assumption and previously established best practices rather than from a critical analysis of current realities. As we continue to see the rise in student mobility in Asia and Africa, with global student flows changing dramatically from south to south, traditional Western constructs of student mobility will be challenged (Bhandari & Blumenthal, 2011; Xinyu, 2011). The opportunity costs are formidable if post-secondary institutions do not reassess their global student mobility risk perceptions and thresholds. This is not to say that tried and true risk measures must be forgone. The purpose is not to discard due diligence, nor to denigrate effective mechanisms to achieve the highest standard of care. Rather it is to integrate process and accommodation to pragmatically and more systematically analyze and acknowledge current practices and challenges in achieving the full spectrum of goals associated with global student mobility in an age of diversity, possibility and uncertainty.

## References

- Abdi, A. (2009). De-monoculturalizing global citizenship education: The need for multicentric intentions and practices. In *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies*, L. Shultz, A. Abdi, and G. Richardson (Eds), pp. 25-39. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Altbach, G. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4), pp. 290-305.
- Appiah, K. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Appiah, K. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company
- AUCC: Association of University and Colleges of Canada. (2007). *Canadian universities and student mobility*. AUCC. Retrieved at <http://www.aucc.ca/wp=content/uploads/2011/05/student-mobility-2007.pdf>
- Bhandari, R. & Blumenthal, P. (2011). Global student mobility and the twenty-first century silk road: National trends and new directions. In *International students and global mobility in higher education*, R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal (Eds.), pp. 1-23. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher education*, 45 (1), pp. 43-70.
- Bates, R. (2006). Educational administration and social justice. *Education, citizenship and social justice*, 1 (2), 141-156
- Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructive diversity discourses in the field of educational management and leadership. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 34 (2), 181-199.
- Breakwell, G. (2007). *The psychology of risk*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, B. & Baker, S. (2007). *Rethinking universities: The social functions of higher education*. Continuum: New York, NY.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cabantous, L., Gond, J-P., Johnson-Cramer, M. (2008). The social construction of rationality in organizational decision making. In G. Hodgkinson & W. Starbuck (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational decision making*, pp. 399-417.
- Chickering, A. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Council of Standards Australia & New Zealand. (2009). *Risk management: Principles and guidelines*. SAI Global.
- Cox, H. & Strange, C. (2010). *Achieving student success: Effective student services in Canadian higher education*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Dower, N. (2008). Are we all global citizens or are only some of us global citizens?: The relevance of this question to education. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Education for human rights and global citizenship*, pp. 39 -54. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dryzek, J. (2009). *Deliberative global politics: Discourse and democracy in a divided world*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Dworkin, R. (2011). *Justice for hedgehogs*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Fox, C. & See, K. (2003). Belief and preference in decision under uncertainty. In D. Hardman & L. Macchi (Eds.), *Thinking: Psychological perspectives on reasoning, judgement and*

- decision-making*, pp. 273-314. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hamrick, F., Evans, N. & Shuh, J. (2002). *Foundations of student affairs practice: How philosophy, theory and research strengthen educational outcomes*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanson, L. & Johnson, M. (2009). Internationalization, social transformation and global citizenship: An evaluation of global health. In R. Trilokekar, G. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global*, pp. 168-193, Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company, Ltd.
- Hanson, L. & Myles, W. (1997). Risk and responsibility in study abroad: An examination of risk assessment and legal responsibility in university and college study abroad programs. *CBIE Research Series*, (11), pp. 1-18. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Honneth, A. (1996). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hoye, W. & Rhodes, G. (2000). An ounce of prevention is worth...The life of a student: Reducing risk in international programs. *The journal of college and university law*, 27 (1), pp.151-185.
- Institute of International Education (2010). *Open Doors 2010*. New York, NY: Institute of International Education. Retrieved at: <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data>
- Jefferess, D. (2008). Global citizenship and the cultural politics of benevolence. *Critical literacy: Theories and practice*, 2(1), pp. 27 – 36.
- Jorgensen, S. (2011). Negotiating the complexity within: Tensions, issues and possibilities of education for global citizenship abroad. In *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies*, L. Shultz, A. Abdi, and G. Richardson (Eds), pp. 184-196. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodelled: Definition, approaches and rationales. *Journal of studies in international education*, 8 (1), pp. 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization: Concepts, complexities and challenges. In J. Forest & P. Altbach, (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*, pp. 207-227. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Shuh, J., Whitt, E., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kusev, P. & van Schaik, P. (2007). Deciding about risky prospects: A psychological descriptive approach. In J. Elsworth (Ed.), *Psychology of decision making in education*, pp. 185-206. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Lave, J. (1993). The practice of learning. In S. Chaiklan & J. Lave (Eds.). *Understanding practice* (pp. 3-34). Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J. (1997). The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding. In D. Kirshner & J.A. Whitson (Eds.). *Situated cognition: Social, semiotic and psychological perspectives* (pp. 17-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E.. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myles, W. & Mitchell, L. (2000). Worth the risk: Four approaches to safety in international

- learning. *CBIE Research Millennium Series, (1)*, pp. 1-23. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2008). *Strengthening study abroad: Recommendations for effective institutional management for presidents, senior administrators and study abroad professionals*. NAFSA. Retrieved online at: [http://www.nafsa.org/File/final\\_imsa\\_taskforce\\_pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/File/final_imsa_taskforce_pdf)
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2003). *Securing America's future: Global education for a global age*. Retrieved at: [http://www.nafsa.org/Document/securing\\_america\\_s\\_future.pdf](http://www.nafsa.org/Document/securing_america_s_future.pdf)
- National Research Council. (1996). P. Stern & H. Fineberg (Eds.), *Understanding risk: Informing decisions in a democratic society*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2005). Beyond the social contract: Capabilities and global justice. In *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism*, G. Brock & H. Brighouse (Eds.), pp. 196-218.
- Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Pope, R. Reynolds, A. & Mueller, J. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Power, M. (2007). *Organized uncertainty: Designing a world of uncertainty*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Raynard, R. Crozier, W. & Svenson, O. (2000). *Decision making: Cognitive models and explanations*. New York: Routledge
- Renn, O. (2004). The challenge of integrating deliberation and expertise: Participation and discourse in risk management. In T. McDaniels & M. Small (Eds.), *Risk analysis and society: An interdisciplinary characterization of the field*, pp. 289-365. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rescher, N. (1983). *Risk: A philosophical introduction to the theory of risk evaluation and management*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Rizva, B. & Teichler, U. (2007). The changing role of student mobility. *Higher Education Policy*, 20, pp. 457-475.
- Ryan, J. & Rottman, C. (2007). Educational leadership and policy approaches to critical social justice. *EAF Journal*, 18 (1/2), 9-23
- Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Shapper, J. & Mayson, S. (2005). Managerialism, internationalization, Taylorization and the deskilling of academic work: Evidence from an Australian university. In *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy*, P. Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.). Hong Kong: Springer.
- Shattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*, pp. 3-20. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shultz, L. & Abdi, A. (2008). Schooling and social justice: A human rights and global citizenship perspective. Pg. 7-11. *Education for social justice*. Canadian Teachers Federation.
- Smallman, C. (2000). Challenging the orthodoxy in risk management: The need for a paradigm shift? In E. Coles, D. Smith & S. Tombs (Eds.), *Risk management and society*, pp. 53-79. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Smith, D. & Tombs, S. (2000). Of course, it's safe, trust me!: Conceptualizing issues of risk

- management within the 'risk society'. In E. Coles, D. Smith & S. Tombs (Eds.), *Risk management and society*, pp. 1 – 30. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Slovic, P. (2000). *The perception of risk*. London, UK: Earthscan.
- Stone, D. (2002). *Policy paradox*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company
- Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. Continuum: New York, NY.
- Unterhalter, E. & Carpentier, V. (2010). *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* Palgrave MacMillan: London, UK.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Whitechurch, C. (2008). Beyond administration and management: Changing professional identities in UK higher education. In R. Barnett & R. Di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives*, pp. 69-93. Routledge: New York, NY.
- Wit, H. de (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe: Historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Xinyu, Y. (2011). Mobility strategies and trends: The case of China. In *International students and global mobility in higher education*, R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal (Eds.), pp. 25-42. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Young, I. (2007). *Global challenges: War, self-determination and responsibility for justice*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.