

Diseases. It is interesting that in disciplines such as Oncology and Infectious Diseases, we did not find cases of only one affiliation in the researchers' profiles. Top authors in these disciplines had at least two affiliations associated with their profiles.

Mobility between countries does not seem to have the same impact as affiliation mobility. There are some disciplines such as Environmental Geology, Arts & Humanities, and Business that see more benefits from country mobility than others. This could be because of the more global nature of these disciplines.

The results presented in this study are limited to the top 100 authors in each defined discipline, 700 in total.

Therefore it seems important that researchers move from one affiliation to another during the course of their careers. This can probably be explained in terms of gaining experience and expanding one's networks. The number of affiliations, a researcher moves to (whether two or three) might not make a significant difference. Country mobility does not seem to have a significant impact, except in specific disciplines such as Arts & Humanities, Business, and Environmental Geology.

Looking at the most common trends per discipline, we can summarize them as follows:

- Neuroscience sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations and two countries.
- Mechanical Engineering sees the most benefit when researchers move between three affiliations within one country.
- Oncology sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations in one or two countries.
- Business sees the most benefit when researchers move between two or three affiliations in two countries.
- Arts & Humanities sees the most benefit when researchers move between three affiliations in two countries.
- Environmental Geology sees the most benefit when researchers move between two or three affiliations in two countries.
- Infectious Diseases sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations in one country.

The results presented in this study are limited to the top 100 authors in each defined discipline, 700 in total. Further study should be conducted on authors in each discipline with an average or low production. Comparing authors with a high, average, and low production might reveal more about the effect of mobility on output and impact. Our results also show that the relationship between mobility and productivity and impact cannot be generalized across disciplines. Therefore, there is a need to examine each discipline in more detail, by looking at subdisciplines within it. Aggregating subdisciplinary results from the bottom up might shed more light on the overall trends within the discipline as a whole. In addition, our study was limited to five years only. Further study into year ranges going further back could shed light on the evolution of mobility and its effect on productivity and impact.

The Scholar-Practitioner Debate in International Higher Education

BERNHARD STREITWIESER AND ANTHONY C. OGDEN

Bernhard Streitwieser is an assistant professor of international education at the George Washington University. E-mail: streitwieser@gwu.edu. Anthony C. Ogden is the executive director of Education Abroad and Exchanges at Michigan State University. E-mail: aogden@msu.edu. This article is abbreviated from Higher Education's Scholar-Practitioners: Bridging Research and Practice (Symposium Books, 2016), edited by the authors.

Heightedened competition between higher education institutions and changes in their traditional structures in recent decades have created new challenges and opportunities for faculty and administrators. In the United States since the 1970s, there has been a gradual decrease in tenured or tenure-line research faculty, but substantial growth of contract faculty, adjuncts, and those straddling academic and administrative responsibilities. Cost-cutting measures and declining public funds have meant fewer openings for traditional faculty-line positions; university priorities and operating procedures have shifted as a result. These changes have had a significant influence on the individuals who work in the broad range of professional categories in today's academy; increasingly, conventional faculty-administrator divisions have become blurred.

Today, many who aspire to work in higher education are no longer classified only as faculty or only as administrators; instead, they function as *blended or third-space professionals*, a term coined by UK researcher Celia Whitechurch. In the United States, a more common label is the *alternative-academic*, or “alt-ac,” professional.

NEW ROLES IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE

Traditionally, universities comprise four key stakeholders: faculty with tenure, tenure-line, contract, and adjunct status; upper-level administrators in leadership positions such as president, provost, deans, center directors, and department chairs; mid-level staff who carry out the mandates of key decision-makers and assist departments, administrative offices, and programs and projects; and students. Within this arrangement there are two overarching categories of professionals: The faculty scholars who produce research, publish, and teach in their areas of study; and the administrators who manage and facilitate the functions and productivity of the academy writ large.

Today, hyperconsciousness of rankings in particular drives much of the decision-making in international higher education activity. Institutions have sought to keep pace through innovations in study abroad and student exchange, university partnerships and branch campuses, and internationalization at home. Massification of higher education globally, and, in the United States, continued growth in study abroad participation and international student enrollments, has led to the establishment of more specialized offices staffed by highly trained personnel. The demands of fee-paying students also calls for higher-order skills in the managers and staff charged with their academic and psychosocial well-being.

In this climate, universities have had to effectively and efficiently manage all aspects related to comprehensive internationalization. To do so, they have increasingly hired highly trained professionals to fill key leadership posts, who in turn have selected specialized staff to carry out their mandates. Many who now work in this complex environment exemplify a new class of professionals with higher-level academic training at the master’s or PhD level, combined with finely tuned administrative skills. This combination exemplifies a hybrid scholarly and administrative profile—the “scholar-practitioner”—who did not exist on the same scale in previous generations.

TRAINING SCHOLAR-PRACTITIONERS FOR THE FUTURE

Recent analysis of the scholar-practitioner phenomenon shows how early innovators in international education critically shaped the direction of the profession to its present day form. Meanwhile, training programs for international educators have grown significantly since 2000. Today 277

graduate, degree-granting programs in higher education prepare graduates around the world with competencies in comparative studies, globalization, and internationalization, among other domains. In the United States, scores of graduate-level programs offer specific preparation for careers in student affairs, international education management, and administration.

Prospective employers increasingly seek candidates with specialized graduate education and preparation. In a 2013 Forum on Education Abroad survey of its membership, more than half of respondents held a master’s degree and another 27 percent a PhD or EdD. A 2014 survey of senior international officers affiliated with the Association of

Today, many who aspire to work in higher education are no longer classified only as faculty or only as administrators; instead, they function as *blended or third-space professionals*.

International Education Administrators (AIEA) found that 81 percent held a doctoral or professional degree. Given this depth of academic training, scholar-practitioners are ideally situated to identify practical research questions and work in a space between data and decision-making, which gives them exciting potential.

The many activities that fall broadly under internationalization provide a constant stream of quantitative and qualitative data useful for analysis. If this data is shared, it can broadly inform the field. And yet, in a large survey conducted by Mandy Reinig using the social media platforms of several prominent international education professional associations, she found that while 52 percent of respondents held a master’s degree and 22 percent a PhD or EdD, only 25 percent conducted research as part of their jobs, citing lack of time as their main impediment.

And yet, through an increasing number of established academic journals, book publishers, and online platforms that now exist, thoughtful professionals facilitating internationalization, education abroad, and international student exchange are well positioned to disseminate their evidence-based insights and advance the enterprise.

TIME FOR A PARADIGM CHANGE?

Encouraging nascent scholar-practitioners to engage in greater dissemination of their thinking will require important changes in the current paradigms that dictate

the scope of work for administrators. However, if institutional decision-makers are willing to modify existing reward structures, hiring practices, and budgetary priorities, much can be gained by capitalizing on the unique potential scholar-practitioners bring to bear. The momentum in recent decades toward internationalization has created new opportunities for the scholar-practitioners of international higher education. *Third-space professionals* are increasingly required to have scholarly credentials, conduct research and evaluation, and even engage in various forms of teaching and service. Contemporary higher education should more systematically recognize and value the contributions they can make.

Further studying the place, purpose, and potential of scholar-practitioners in other educational contexts outside of the United States has much to teach us. Indeed, many higher education systems around the world are responding to increased global mobility by offering lower tuition, more flexible and multilingual learning environments, and innovative administrative structures. In the recruitment of faculty and staff, promotion of junior talent, and contract and employment arrangements, new ideas are being tested out. Heightened competition for talent and external prestige worldwide are changing both the demands on the professoriate and the possibilities for the administrative estate. Understanding the pathways of those who enter the academy as faculty, administrators, or in positions straddling both worlds, as more individuals now do, can provide important lessons about the changing nature of higher education throughout the world.

■

The State of Internationalization in Canadian Higher Education

KAREN MCBRIDE

Karen McBride is president and CEO of the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE), which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. E-mail: KMcBride@cbie.ca.

In the past decade, internationalization has become a core strategy for most Canadian institutions, supported by robust policies and practices. Over the past 50 years, as the national voice advancing international education on behalf of its 150 member institutions ranging from K-12 to uni-

versities, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) has encouraged, assisted, and closely monitored internationalization in Canada. We take a look here at what this success entails and at the prospects for Canada's next 50 years in international education.

INTERNATIONALIZATION BY THE NUMBERS

CBIE's 2016 membership survey identified the top three internationalization priorities as: international student recruitment (66 percent); increasing the number of students engaged in education abroad (59%); and Internationalization at Home, including internationalization of the curriculum (52%). In a survey conducted by Universities Canada in 2014, 95 percent of Canadian universities indicated that internationalization or global engagement is included as part of strategic planning, with 82 percent identifying internationalization as a top five priority. In addition, 81 percent offer collaborative academic programs with international partners. Moreover, Canada has twice the world average of international coauthorship—43 percent of Canadian papers are coauthored with one or more international collaborators.

Given the value placed by Canadian institutions on internationalization—and the centrality to that effort of hosting international students on campus—it comes as no surprise that there are more students from abroad in Canada than ever before. In 2014, the country hosted 336,000 international students holding study permits (all levels combined: K-12, college, university undergraduate and graduate), an 83 percent increase since 2008 and an increase of 10 percent over 2013. This number does not include short-term students such as exchange or second language students, who do not require a study permit, and therefore significantly underrepresents Canada's international student population.

Unfortunately, the increase in inbound students to Canada is not mirrored in the outbound student population. Canadian students have traditionally not studied abroad in large numbers and Universities Canada reports that annually fewer than 3.1 percent of full-time Canadian students at all levels have an education abroad experience. This is despite reports from Canadian students who have studied abroad, on the transformational nature of the experience, its many contributions to their academic and career achievements, and its value in enhancing their communication skills, self-awareness, and adaptability. Institutions are on board: 78 percent of universities provide funding to support student participation in study abroad programs and both colleges and universities are finding innovative ways to offer more flexible learning abroad options.