tives to bring closer collaboration with China and India—including sponsorship of Chinese and Indian research students (master thesis, PhD, and postdoctorate)—with academic cooperation forming a basis for partnership.

The new multi-year plan of the CHE builds on these patterns and aims to expand the intake of two categories of international students: 1) excellent research students with a special focus on China and India; and 2) excellent Jewish students, particularly from the United States and Canada. Policy documents and reports emanating from the CHE reveal the drivers behind these new policies: Israel hopes to build close economic and political relationships with these countries, while strengthening the academic level of its higher education institutions and its R&D capabilities to compete in the "global knowledge economy." It is conspicuous that motives of peace building and cross-cultural understanding are absent, despite the ongoing conflict. The overall outcome is that Israel has an internationalization policy containing two distinct strands: research students, particularly from countries with which Israel wants to improve economic and political ties; and students from the Jewish diaspora, connecting to the identity of the state as the Jewish homeland. This is reflected in the latest CHE statistics from 2016, which show that, overall, there are slightly more Jewish (5,370) than non-Jewish students (4,700) in Israel, and that there is a clear split between the research and nonresearch tracks. Research students (master with thesis, PhD, and postdoctorate) are predominantly non-Jewish, while Jewish students are predominantly in nonresearch tracks (study abroad, BA, taught master).

Challenges

In the current plan, a number of issues receive insufficient attention, such as the historical infrastructures for international students and the potential challenges of attracting and supporting different types of students, and there is little guidance about how the two strands should be managed. The two target groups—with different normative references and personal, ethnic, and religious connections to the country—will pose a challenge to Israeli universities trying to attract, accommodate, and support both groups. In line with institutional missions, there is evidence that some universities are focusing on one group. According to a report from the CHE in 2016, the Weizmann Institute of Science, a research institution, has the lowest percentage of Jewish students, while IDC Herzliya—which specializes in bachelor and taught master programs—has the largest Jewish student population. Universities aiming to attract both populations and with substantial concentrations of both populations may face the greatest challenges in developing a comprehensive internationalization strategy. Will the new international student scheme be a success? Will there be a (further) specialization (and separation) in "research" and "nonresearch" international students? And in this case, is this not a missed opportunity to bridge and reimagine international higher education in Israel?

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10774

Italy: Brain Drain or Brain Circulation?

Chantal Saint-Blancat

Chantal Saint-Blancat is a former associate professor of sociology at the University of Padua, Italy. E-mail: chantal.saint-blancat@unipd.it.

For scientists, mobility has always been evident, as research has no boundaries. International scientific mobility has notably increased in recent times with the globalization of knowledge. At present, Europe is a paradigmatic case. In the past decade, EU policy has shaped, and strongly promoted, scientific and educational mobility by means of the Marie Curie Fellowship Scheme and other scientific grants managed by the European Research Council. Yet, brain circulation involves fierce competition and there is a risk of a growing concentration of "bright minds" in countries that have dedicated more attention and resources to scientific research, such as Germany or the United Kingdom, at the expense of others such as Greece, Italy, or Spain. The EU's open labor market can easily transform itself into a brain-drain/brain-gain situation. In such a context, the Italian case study is particularly noteworthy. Recent data indicates that Italy has an outgoing flow of scientists, that few of them return, and that, unlike other countries, Italy cannot count on an incoming flow of foreign scientists to replace them.

Research funded by the University of Padua and conducted between September 2013 and July 2015 shows relevant results on the complexity of scientific mobility, adding evidence to the existing theory on brain drain and brain circulation. The study drew on 83 in-depth interviews conducted with Italian scientists (mathematicians, engineers, and physicists) working in Europe and on the results of a subsequent survey based on computer-assisted web interview questionnaires sent to 2,420 Italian scientists (gener-

IHE #96 Nov 28 2018 (28)SK NEW PAGE 26.indd 10 11/28/18 3:35 PM

ating 528 responses). It focused on clarifying the reasons why Italian scientists chose to go abroad, and in most cases did not return, as well as how they interpreted their personal and professional experience. The sample was balanced in terms of discipline, gender, and professional status.

Looking Back at Their Career Trajectories

The reasons behind the scientists' mobility were apparently uninfluenced by gender or scientific discipline. Most interviewees did not plan to emigrate for good, they just took up an opportunity to do research elsewhere and gain experience, sometimes because they saw little chance of a career in Italy. Most respondents had moved abroad when still quite young and early in their careers (on average, they were 30 years old when they left Italy). Mapping their trajectories reveals somewhat random processes rather than the outcome of rational decision-making, a willingness to take risks, and even a certain naivety.

The EU's open labor market can easily transform itself into a brain-drain/brain-gain situation.

What they found abroad was exactly what they were looking for and did not encounter at home: a country appreciative of science and research, a society where a PhD degree represented a real value, better research and career advancement opportunities, better salaries, international reputation, meritocracy, and fair recruitment systems. Scientists seek mainly recognition. Their achievements and fulfilment certainly play a major part in keeping them abroad. Nearly all of the respondents stated that they appreciated how their scientific competence was valued in other European countries, and the greater autonomy they enjoyed in developing their own projects. As one scientist underlined, "It's one thing to find any old job, quite another to find a job where your specific expertise as a researcher or your high qualifications are appreciated."

Lifestyle issues and the situation in the country of origin also emerge as key variables among reasons for leaving. Scientific mobility brings into question not only how academic institutions are run, but also the state, the welfare system, and a country's society at large. When asked how they would define brain drain, as many as 90 percent of the respondents stressed that their experience did not fit into this category. They would rather speak of an "asymmetric brain exchange," underlining that their home country is not able to convert brain drain into a brain circulation, as Germany has been doing since 1954, or China more recently. They pointed out some possible strategies to transform Italy's loss into a resource.

The Diaspora Option: A Missed Opportunity?

All scientists who were interviewed in the qualitative part of the study recognized that they had received excellent scientific training in Italy. In fact, most of them continued to collaborate with Italians doing research in Italy or abroad, "not because they are Italian, but because they are good." To improve the Italian higher education system, 50 percent of the respondents indicated that providing incentives for foreign scientists to join the Italian academic system would be the most effective scheme. According to them, the brain circulation logic allows for cumulative processes of academic mobility and collaboration, a perfect setting for brain transformation in terms of innovation and scientific internationalization. From this perspective, building a diaspora knowledge network and enrolling Italian scientists abroad as accessible social capital mediators who could potentially be mobilized, could be a better solution in the long term than "return" policies. But diaspora mobilization cannot be taken for granted.

One of the most significant results of the research is that expatriate scientists felt that while it was important for them to serve as a resource for Italy, they did not think that Italy saw them as a resource. As one of the respondents stated, "What do those of us living abroad represent? We are a unique value ... because we are a sort of antenna, sensors that can capture precisely what is happening outside Italy ... For this to happen, an easy first step is to conduct a census. A network of contacts. And, personally, I can say that I'm strongly motivated to do anything I can to give back to my country a part of all that it gave to me ... but I have never found the way." ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10773

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

IHE #96 Nov 28 2018 (28)SK NEW PAGE 26.indd 11 11/28/18 3:35 PM