

RECRUITING RETURNEES: A STUDY OF CHINESE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FOREIGN-EDUCATED RETURNEES AT CHINESE UNIVERSITIES

MINGSHENG LI*
HONG PU**

ABSTRACT

This study adopted a qualitative approach to examine Chinese university presidents' perceptions on the recruitment of foreign educated returnees and on their performance at Chinese universities. Twenty university presidents participated in the semi-structured interviews in from 2013 to 2015. The study found that all the participants held highly positive views about the quality and performance of the returnees in their universities. In their perceptions, most returnees met the universities' expectations and had made great contribution to the university, such as introducing new programmes, new ideas, new skills, and new courses, new methods, upgrading the academic programmes, raising the quality of research, internationalising the university's programmes, and connecting with foreign universities. At the same time, the participants believed that some returnees had difficulties adapting to the Chinese educational environment.

Keywords: Chinese returnees, re-entry adjustment, internationalisation, higher education, global talent management.

INTRODUCTION

Economic globalization has sped up internationalization of Chinese higher education (HE). Universities are often considered as key drivers of economic development, and it is the Chinese government's ambition to develop its HE to meet the domestic and global demands in its competition with other foreign universities (Chen, 2017). Chinese universities aiming to catch up with the trend of internationalization see a need for a large pool of talent who have obtained higher qualifications from developed countries (Wang, 2005). The best source of internationalised faculty is believed to be the returnee scholars as agents of educational, economic, social, cultural and political transformation in China (Cheng, 2002). They have international learning and working experiences and understand Western cultures, norms, rules, and standards. They are called "glocal

* Senior Lecturer, Massey University, New Zealand. M.S.Li@massey.ac.nz

** President of Qujing Normal University, Qujing Normal University, China. ph1228@hotmail.com

talents" – high-level people with local cultural knowledge and global vision (Zhao & Jia, 2015, p. 1). Attracting the graduates of Chinese origin directly from foreign elite universities is regarded as a shortcut to internationalise Chinese HE (Bie, 2016; Pan, 2016).

In 2015, the Chinese government formulated a national strategy aiming to build first-class universities and first-class disciplines by 2020 to lift the status and standing and international competitiveness of China's higher education system, and to transform Chinese key universities into the best ones in international ranking by 2050 (The State Council, 2015). To fulfil the goal, it is critical to build a large pool of first-class faculty, construct first-class disciplines, enhance the level of scientific research and technological transformation, and promote exchange with world-class universities. In the battle for global talent, many Chinese universities have designed and implemented their global talent management (GTM) policies and strategies. University leaders play an essential role in responding to the government's call to build world-class universities and disciplines. Their voices remain unheard of, and their perceptions and evaluation of the academic and research performances of the returnees working in their universities have not received much attention in HE international education research. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating these research questions:

1. What motivates the university to recruit foreign-educated returnees?
2. What global talent policies and strategies have the universities implemented to attract the returnees?
3. Have the returnees' academic and research performances met the universities' expectations?
4. How are the returnees' teaching and research performances compared with those of the home-grown academics?

Literature review

Zweig and Wang (2013) maintained that "the Chinese government has been the most assertive government in the world in introducing policies targeted at triggering a reverse brain drain" (p. 4). There is an imperative for China to attract foreign-trained Chinese scholars to help enhance its global innovation capabilities that are barriers to constructing world-class universities (Jakobson, 2007). In spite of many ground-breaking innovations, China's global innovation index remains low, ranked 29 in 2015, which is incompatible with the Chinese status as the world's second largest economy.

In order to attract, retain and develop transnational talents, the Chinese government and universities have introduced many preferential hiring and promotion policies, programmes and schemes, such as competitive salaries, awarding of the title of professorship for holders of overseas PhD, and start-up research grants amounting to millions of dollars (Pan, 2016, p. 346). The central government's Thousand Talents Programme has attracted more than 6,000 Chinese top scholars from developed countries since it started in 2008 and local governments' parallel programmes have drawn more than 20,000 experts in the past five years to work in areas such as science and technology, higher education, and high-tech industries (Tang, 2016). China aspires to transform its labour-intensive, low-tech economy into a high-tech knowledge economy to match its status as the second-largest economy by enticing foreign-trained Chinese returnees who have a good understanding of Western research norms, ethics,

standards, and conventions, international financial and labour markets, language and business culture and can “serve as important catalysts” in the transformation of Chinese economy and internationalisation of higher education (Chen & Fang, 2016, p. 2).

The participation of returnee academics in Chinese HE is believed to have lifted academic research standards, transformed teaching and research, upgraded the academic quality of the faculty, educated a large number of scientific and technological research and management leaders, and effectively promoted international academic exchanges (Chen, 2009). Jakobson (2007) agreed that returnees have made outstanding contributions in the realm of S&T development and HE; “their input is pivotal”, and they “have constituted a pillar in the PRC’s success” in the transfer of “Western technological know-how and management practice” (p.21). It is these knowledge workers, rather than capital alone or natural resources, that create, disseminate, apply and transform their own and imported knowledge into technology for production and service (Abella, 2006). The knowledge spill-over by returnees has enhanced the absorptive capacity of local human capital, broken the status quo, and stimulated creativity and innovation (Yang & Chen, 2013).

To attract Chinese graduates from developed countries, China has implemented a number of preferential policies. The new elite returnees in general enjoy better housing, better reward, higher remunerations, faster advancement and promotion, more research resources and start-up funds than local peers and earlier returnees who “suffer from more perception of inequality and more negative social comparison” (He, 2009, pp. 51-52). As a broad preferential treatment, the returnees who just graduated from foreign universities with a higher degree can be appointed as deans, directors or chairs of faculties, departments, or research centres (Maxwell, 2008).

The preferential policies tend to create a culture of unfair competition, inequality, envy, resentment, and jealousy (Sun & Shi, 2016) and tension between returnees and locals (Chen, 2017). The presence of the new returnees becomes a potential threat to the territories, positions, authority, and status of the local peers and earlier returnees who have had a firm control over most of the academic resources not easily available to the new entrants (Chen, 2017). Zweig (2006) stated that “granting returnees preferential policies creates bad blood” between returnees and non-returnees (p. 210). The preferential treatment, criticised as “giving up a son to get a son-in-law”, forms the perception among the locals that to be successful in one’s academic career, earning a foreign PhD that is more valued and rewarded than a domestic one is the only path one can take (Zweig, 2006). To the locals, however, returnees are “losers” who have failed to succeed overseas and have returned to China to reap undue privileges without making any substantial contribution to Chinese education and economy (Rosen & Zweig, 2005). There is a prevalent belief that “the most coveted graduates”, the brightest overseas Chinese scholars and scientists still remain overseas (Pan, 2016; Tang, 2016;) and those who have returned are considered “mediocre” and “C grade turtles” with degrees from “universities of dubious quality” (The Economist, 2013).

Research methods

This research, conducted in Mandarin from 2013 to 2015 in China, applied a qualitative interview approach to collect data to investigate the issues of global talent management concerning universities’ motivations, policies, management, support, perceptions and evaluations of returnees by the Chinese university presidents. The

approach allowed the researchers to listen to the narratives and stories of the participants in the process of inquiry to have a deeper understanding of the complexity of the issues. The interview questions centred on the motivations of the Chinese universities to attract the returnees from developed countries, the universities' global talent management policies and strategies, the strengths and weaknesses of these returnees compared with the domestically trained graduates, and the university presidents' perceptions of the academic and research performance of these returnees.

Participating universities

Twenty university presidents were interviewed: four 985 Project universities, eight 211 Project universities, and eight provincial universities (see Table 1 below). Of the twenty participating presidents, there were nine returnees, holders of master's or doctoral degrees from foreign universities. All the other participants had overseas experiences as a visiting scholar from one to twelve months.

There is a big gap in the investment in the expenditure per student between the Project universities and non-Project universities. This study took into consideration the hierarchy and differentiation in Chinese HE to achieve a balanced response to the research questions.

Table 1: Participating universities

985	211	Other
Beijing Normal University	China Pharmaceutical University	Anhui University of Engineering
Nankai University	Fuzhou University	Anqing Normal University
Shandong University	Hunan Normal University	Sichuan Academy of Fine Arts
Tsinghua University	Northeast Normal University	Xi'an Petroleum University
	Northwest University	Xinjiang Medical University
	Shihezi University	Xinxiang University
	South China Agricultural University	Yunnan Normal University
	University of Electronic Science and Technology of China	Zhejiang Water Conservancy and Hydropower University

Data analysis

All the interviews were digitally recorded for qualitative analysis with the participants' consent, and transcribed verbatim. The transcripts of this study were thematically classified, coded and assigned meaning for data analysis, put into logical and meaningful categories to identify significant thematic structures, analysed through an inductive approach to let the critical themes emerge out of the data, and examined in a holistic fashion. For ethical reasons, we will report the findings, using the codes P1, P2, P3 ... to mean Participant 1, Participant 2, and Participant 3.

Findings

Institutions' motivations, goals, and expectations

There is a consensus from the interviews that global talent management was essential in internalising Chinese HE and upgrading Chinese universities to the world-class level. All believed that talent was a prioritised top resource in the transformation of Chinese HE. These returnees were believed to have global vision, were well trained in the field, possessed high-end technological expertise highly needed to build world-class universities. All participating universities had developed global talent management policies and strategies to attract, retain, and develop the returnees, involving incentives and preferential policies, such as offering of the titles of professorships, competitive salaries, subsidised or free accommodation, settlement fees, sophisticated laboratories, large sums of research start-ups, job arrangements for the spouses, and arrangements for children's education. Accompanying these incentives were high expectations. The returnees were expected to take leadership roles in the areas of teaching, research, and international connections. In teaching, the returnees' expected roles included designing academic programmes and curricula, delivering high-quality teaching, developing new disciplines and programmes, teaching bilingually, and acting as role models for the locals. In research, they were expected to lead research teams, obtain state and provincial research funds, undertake national and provincial research projects, and publish articles in top ranking SCI or SSCI foreign-language journals. In addition, they were assigned a role as international liaisons aiming to develop exchanges with elite foreign universities, facilitate international accreditations, and establish joint teaching and research programmes with world elite universities.

To P5, P10 and P18, the returnees had played a critical role in internationalising their universities, bridging the gaps between Chinese and Western universities and transforming Chinese universities into first-class research universities. Chinese universities could not become world-class universities without internationalisation and without the participation of global talents who could communicate with global universities. P6 stated that his university had formulated a GTM strategy which involved acquiring a large pool of top Chinese expatriates, internationalising the university, localising returnees' knowledge and expertise to achieve cultural fit, organisational fit and personal fit, and raising the standards of teaching, research and management. He observed that the number of top returnees had become a benchmark to achieve the university's strategic goals. As a university of music, P17 reiterated that music did not have a boundary and so it was an imperative to internationalise the university by recruiting global talents to upgrade the programmes and curricula that would benefit the students and the university. P4, P8, and P18 believed that building a world-class university required the participation of the graduates and scholars from world-class universities who had a good knowledge of what a world-class university was and what could be done to achieve the status. These returnee scholars had foreign learning and scientific research experiences, and had a good knowledge of Western research methods, education philosophy and conventions. P12 emphasised that what his university urgently needed were academic and research leaders in the field. P4, P9, P10, P11 and P16 were very much impressed with the outstanding performance of the returnees in their universities. They had achieved much in their teaching and research and had contributed much to upgrading the benchmark standards.

Developing preferential policies as a GTM practice

Developing and implementing preferential policies as a GTM practice to attract high-calibre returnees to fulfil institutional strategic goals of becoming a world-class university has become a shared practice among all the participating universities. Preferential treatments to returnees include higher salaries, housing or housing subsidies, settlement fees, start-up research funds, labs, facilities, arrangements of employment for the spouses and best schools for children's education, and awarding of titles such as professorships, associate professorships, directorships, and assistants to the university presidents.

P19 believed that the preferential treatments were extremely necessary. The returnees had invested heavily in their foreign education. They became global talent as rare commodities with a high price tag on them in the international labour market. The Chinese low remuneration packages would prevent them from returning to work in China. The preferential policies as a kind of economic compensation were instrumental in attracting them back to China. He said,

In the international labour market, they are rare goods. They are sought after not only by Chinese universities, but also by foreign universities. We are running short of such global talents. The labour market requires us to take immediate actions to attract them back to serve the country.

P13 shared the view:

China is a developing country. There is a severe shortage of talents in almost all fields and sectors. There is also a huge gap in HE between China and developed countries. China has an urgent need for these scholars and scientists.

P6 asserted that the economic compensation to the returnees was far from enough to "purchase" these global elites in the international labour market. China should do more to get them back. If they could get a doctoral degree from Western universities, and if they had been successful in Western universities and companies, evidently, they must be very competitive global talents.

Returnees versus locals

The preferential policies towards the returnees have inevitably caused some tensions between the returnees and the locals and led to the who-is-better debates. There is strong evidence from the participants' views which echoed the public perception that returnees were the talents that all university were after and they were far better than the locals who never had any overseas experience and had never received any overseas education. P6 said: "It has become a consensus: In general, foreign-educated doctorates are better than those educated in China." According to P12, doctorates trained in developed countries were indeed much better than those in China. It was not easy to attract top returnees from the international market. There was a strong competition among Chinese universities

P19 said that his university's goal was to build the university into a first-class university. The hope lay mainly in the returnees who might be able to invigorate the research dynamics of the university, overcome the in-breeding stagnation, eventually meet the university's requirements, and achieve the university's goals. P17 maintained that all conditions being similar, the university would prefer the returnees over the locals.

The returnees could bring many benefits to the university that could not be achieved by the locals:

- Serving as change agents for the university's transformation
- Enriching the university's academic and research environments;
- Setting the agendas to gradually internationalise the university;
- Lifting the university's academic and research standards; and
- Supporting the university's endeavour to build itself into a world-class university.

P11 noted that compared with locals, returnees were better performers in teaching and research. They were more committed to their profession, obtained more research funds from the state, the province, and enterprises, and published more high-ranking SCI and SSCI journal articles. For P12, attracting returnees to take leadership roles in upgrading teaching and research was part of the university's internationalisation policy. The university expected returnees to lead teams, aiming to build first-class. Such expectations could not be fulfilled by the locals. He said that returnees in his university were outstanding achievers, and they stood high above locals with their strong research capabilities, professional competence, intellectual intelligence, international perspectives, rigorous training, their commitment to the profession, and their tenacity to confront difficulties.

Negative perceptions of returnees

In spite of the many advantages of returnees, some participants reported their negative perceptions of some of returnees, such as their unrealistic expectations, inability to adapt to Chinese culture and to apply their acquired knowledge to the Chinese contexts, unfamiliarity of the Chinese education philosophy, lack of teaching experience and interpersonal communication skills, and unsatisfactory teaching and research performance.

P7 reported that in his university, some returnees did not know how to teach and how to conduct research. They were not "good" teachers, nor were they "good" researchers. He attributed this to their inadequate overseas trainings in research, teaching, course development, curricular design, education philosophy, and teaching practices. P9 gave a similar example to demonstrate his point: A returnee with a doctoral degree from the University of Edinburgh did not know how to write a Chinese-style research proposal to apply for the state and provincial research funds, how to collaborate with other colleagues, and how to communicate with his students, with his peers and superiors. He had difficulty adapting to the culture of the university. P12 commented that the university had recruited some returnees who just graduated from Euro-American and Japanese universities without any work experience. The new recruits were not regarded as "high-end scholars". They lacked socialising, interpersonal communication and emotional intelligence skills. He said, "In my view, high-calibre researchers with emotional intelligence skills and intercultural communication skills remain overseas. With such skills, they can swim freely like a fish in water, in the USA, or in Japan. Many returnees lack such essential skills". They were perceived to be under-performing. Although they were born and had received much education in China, they did not seem to have a good understanding of the Chinese culture and thus had difficulty readjusting and re-integrating into the organisational culture of the university.

P10 said that some returnees in his university often complained about the poor working conditions and unsatisfactory environments as compared with the universities

from which they had graduated. Their negative attitudes prevented them from effectively socialising with colleagues and from integrating into the local culture (jiediqi). They often held unrealistically high expectations, attempting to recoup in a short time their investments in the foreign education. They complained about low salaries, poor living environments, unhealthy foods, and poor education for their children. When their expectations were unmet, they threatened to leave. They wanted to be leaders, to be deans and directors, and hated being led by others. They felt they were superior to others. P5 and P6 noted that some returnees were self-centred and over-emphasised their personal rather than collective gains and interests. They treated their peers with a haughty air. They lacked adequate social intelligence skills and had difficulties dealing with the complexity of interpersonal guanxi networks. Team work was an important part of the university culture. However, team work and collaboration were difficult with these returnees. According to P12, lack of the guanxi networks as a disadvantage prevented the returnees from obtaining research funds, publishing their research articles, maximising their knowledge acquired overseas, adapting to the local culture, and integrating into the community of practice.

Discussion

The quest for world-class university has become policy priorities at national, provincial and institutional levels. Building a world-class university has been on the agenda of almost all Chinese universities. To achieve a world-class university status, all the universities involved have put global talent attraction on their top agendas. One of the key elements of the Chinese GTM strategies is adoption of preferential policies and the provision of handsome incentives in the form of high compensation schemes: start-up funds, housing subsidies, arrangements for the children's education and spouses' employment, and offers of high academic titles and positions to those with doctoral degrees from Western universities, such as deans, directors, and associate and full professors. The returnees are believed to have contributed significantly to the strategic objectives, and to the transformation of some Chinese universities into top universities of international advanced level, and to the upgrading of the education and research qualities.

Studies have shown that salaries are among the most important factors influencing the global mobility of top academics and researchers (Jaschik, 2012; Rumbley, Pacheco, & Altbach, 2008; Sharma, 2010). Altbach, Reisberg, Yudkevich, Androushchak, and Pacheco (2012) compared the salaries at the entry level and the top of salary hierarchy of 28 countries and found that China offered one of the lowest average entry-level salaries. Heavy teaching loads steal away their time for research. Lack of quality research outputs means failure to meet the universities' goals to build world-class universities. A world-class university cannot be built by the faculty who are poorly paid and who are left to struggle for life (Bie, 2016; Pan, 2016).

It should be acknowledged that not all Western trained returnees can be categorised as "top scholars". The returnees have been stratified into different status groups in the international labour market (L. Zhao & Zhu, 2009), from the very top to mediocre ones. The GTM strategies have targeted top returnees, while a large majority of returnees have been excluded from the GTM programmes and preferential policies. However, with the shortage of graduates with foreign higher qualifications, any doctoral degree holders

from Western countries, experienced or inexperienced in teaching and research, fit or unfit for the positions, have been hotly sought after by Chinese universities.

The returnees' special status becomes a cause of an esteem and equality concern to the home-grown faculty who perceive the participation of the returnees in the academic and research activities as a threat to their career paths. According to Chen (2005), in a collectivistic society like China, "the cultural norms stresses equal value in each member's contribution to the maintenance of group integrity and attainment of group goals", shared values, mutual accountability, and collaboration rather than an individual member's "worthiness", performance, status, and contribution (p. 59). The returnees' status often becomes a barrier to knowledge sharing in the university where the academic community as an "invisible village" is absent and both the returnees and the locals "scramble for resources" and form "the very mentality of mistrust" (Yi, 2011, p. 510).

The returnees cannot thrive without support from the university to further develop their teaching and research capabilities, personal literacy and cultural literacy (Beechler & Woodward, 2009), and to achieve cultural fit, internal systemic fit, strategic fit, and personal fit by aligning their goals and practices with those of the universities (Stahl et al., 2012). Faculty development is of particular importance in China where faculty development is unfamiliar to administrators whose relations with faculty "are often focused on supervision and control, and less on support and development" (Stahl et al., 2012, p. 94). Chinese universities are morally responsible to provide support to help returnees readapt to the education environment, reintegrate them into the Chinese academic communities, and help them resolve issues in teaching, research, and social and interpersonal communication. To build world-class universities entails adopting GTM strategies, creating a culture of organisational learning, gathering a large talent pool, internationalising all aspects of the university, and restructuring university governance and salary compensation schemes.

Conclusion

The discourse of HE internationalization as an imperative and Chinese universities' ambition to achieve world-class university status have led to the adoption and implementation of GTM strategies and practices aiming to attract Chinese graduates with higher degrees from developed countries. Due to Chinese university low salary package schemes, preferential policies and treatments that offer Western style salaries plus other benefits were considered to be a critical measure to attract and retain these higher degree holders. The returnees were believed to outperform the locals in teaching and research. They made outstanding contributions to uplifting the benchmark education standards, internationalising almost every aspect of the university, and introducing Western teaching pedagogy, research methods, education philosophy, and cultural knowledge. However, some returnees had difficulty adapting to the Chinese educational environments to achieve strategic, organisational and personal alignments. It is important to consider the person-organisation fit, and the quality and integrity of the candidates in recruitment. It is equally important to provide opportunities and support to assist the returnees to adapt to the organisational culture, solve problems in their re-entry adaptation and integration, harmonise expectations, develop their talent, create a large local-returnee talent pool, and achieve the university's strategic goals.

REFERENCES

- Abella, M. (2006). Global competition for skilled workers and consequences. In C. Kuptsch & E. F. Pang (Eds.), *Competing for global talent* (pp. 11-32). Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., Yudkevich, M., Androushchak, G., & Pacheco, I. F. (Eds.). (2012). *Paying the professoriate : a global comparison of compensation and contracts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Beechler, S., & Woodward, I. C. (2009). The global “war for talent”. *Journal of International Management*, 15, 273-285. doi:0.1016/j.intman.2009.01.00
- Bie, D. (2016). Global ranking and world class university aspirations in China. In P. Altbach, M. Yudkevich, & L. Rumbley (Eds.), *The global academic rankings game: changing institutional policy, practice, and academic life* (pp. 57-78). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chen, C. (2009). Historical retrospect and prospect of China 's studying abroad since the reform In H. Wang (Ed.), *The report on the development of Chinese overseas educatted talents* (pp. 72-102). Beijing, China: China Machine Press.
- Chen, Q. (2017). *Globalization and transnational academic mobility: The experiences of Chinese academic returnees*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Chen, Y. (2005). A big fish in a small pond or a small fish in a big pond? Importance of intra- versus intergroup status across cultures. In M. C. Thomas-Hunt (Ed.), *Status and groups* (Vol. 7, pp. 43–68). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald.
- Chen, Z., & Fang, T. (2016). Chinese returnees and high-tech sector outward FDI: The case of Changzhou (Vol. IZA DP No. 10045). Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Cheng, X. (2002). On the status and role of the returned graduates in the era of globalization. *China Development*, 2(1), 55-61.
- Jakobson, L. (2007). China aims high in science and technology: An overview of the challenges ahead. In L. Jakobson (Ed.), *Innovation with Chinese characteristics: high-tech research in China* (pp. 1-36). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jaschik, S. (2012). New study analyzes how faculty pay compares worldwide. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/03/22/new-study-analyzes-how-faculty-pay-compares-worldwide>

Pan, S. (2016). Competing for global talents. In S. Guo (Ed.), *Spotlight on China: Chinese Education in the globalized world* (pp. 341-357). Rotterdam: Rotterdam : SensePublishers.

Rumbley, L. E., Pacheco, I. F., & Altbach, P. G. (2008). *International comparison of academic salaries: An exploratory study*. Boston, MA: Centre for International Higher Education, Boston College.

Sharma, R. D. (2010). Building world-class universities. Mysinchew/Asia News Network. Retrieved from <http://news.asiaone.com/print/News/Education/Story/A1Story20100717-227417.html>

Stahl, G., & et al. (2012). Six principles of effective global talent management. *Sloan Management Review*, 53(2), 25-42.

Tang, D. (2016). China tries to end brain drain, lure foreign-educated talent. Associated Press. Retrieved from <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/3f5730814983416fa2baefb4f69132f1/china-tries-end-brain-drain-lure-foreign-educated-talent>

The Economist. (2013). Returning students: plight of the sea turtles. July 6. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/china/21580470-students-coming-back-home-helped-build-modern-china-so-why-are-they-now-faring-so-poorly>

The State Council. (2015). The overall plan for coordinately advancing the construction of world first-class universities and first-class disciplines. Retrieved from http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2015-11/05/content_10269.htm

Wang, H. (2005). *The returning times*. Beijing: The Central Editing and Translation Press.

Yang, H., & Chen, Y. (2013). Returnees reflux in China: knowledge ppillovers and threshold effect. *Population Research*, 37(5), 91-102.

Yi, L. (2011). Auditing Chinese higher education? The perspectives of returnee scholars in an elite university. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31, 505-514. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.03.003

Zhao, H., & Jia, C. (2015). The current situation of the haigui talent and internationalization of Chinese higher education -- A survey of returnee teachers in 10 higher education institution in Shaanxi Province. *Journal of Jiangsu Normal University*, 41(3), 1-8.

Zhao, L., & Zhu, J. (2009). China attracting global talent and local initiatives. *China: An International Journal*, 7(2), 323-335.

Zweig, D. (2006). Learning to compete: China's efforts to encourage a "reverse brain drain". In C. Kuptsch & E. F. Pang (Eds.), *Competing for global talent* (pp. 187-214). Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.

Zweig, D. (2013). Luring back the Chinese who study abroad. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/01/21/the-effects-of-chinas-push-for-education/luring-back-the-chinese-who-study-abroad>

Zweig, D., & Rosen, S. (2003). How China trained a new generation abroad. *SciDev.Net*. Retrieved from <http://www.scidev.net/global/migration/feature/how-china-trained-a-new-generation-abroad.html>