

Post-print

Chou, Chuing P. (2021). *Academic Culture in Transition: Measuring up for What in Taiwan?* In Stack, Michelle (Editor). *Global University Rankings and the Politics of Knowledge*. Canada: University of Toronto Press. pp. 95-108. ISBN 978-1-4875-3040-2

**Academic Culture in Transition:
Measuring Up for What in Taiwan?**

Chuing Prudence Chou*

Abstract

Beginning in the mid-1990s, departments of social sciences and humanities in many countries have been responding to an increasing demand for “world-class” universities, a movement which attempts to create comparable cross-national indicators of research quality. Pressure from this initiative reached a boiling point in Taiwan in the early 2000s. Despite the Taiwanese government’s intention to utilize globalization as a method of enhancing contact and exchange of information,

*The author is indebted to Philip Henderson for his editing assistance and input to this chapter.

values, and common goals, the “world-class” trend has created significant tensions and contradictions within academic culture in Taiwan. This chapter illustrates the side effects of corporate rankings on academic culture through an analysis of how National Taiwanese higher education policies have re-oriented the academic culture in two departments – ethnology and education – within a leading public university in Taiwan. Research findings indicate that Taiwan’s new higher education policies are geared toward the metrics used by global rankers and have had substantial impacts on academic culture and research practices.

Key words: University Ranking, Research Output, Journal Publication, World-Class University, Faculty Evaluation, The SSCI Syndrome, Taiwan’s Academic Culture

Introduction

Prior to 1994, higher education in Taiwan was under extensive state control in order to spur national economic development and maintain political stability (Mok, 2014). An unprecedented expansion in Taiwan’s higher education occurred in the mid-1990s as a response to increased global competition, domestic political elections, demands from civil society, and significant social change. As a result, Taiwan reached the world’s second-highest enrollment rate of 18–22 year-olds in the world (MOE, 2013). Amendments applied to the University Law in 1994 altered the governance of the HE sector and allowed higher education institutions (HEIs) greater autonomy, which granted increased freedom in admissions, staffing, and policies (Mok, 2014; Chou & Ching, 2012).

Since the 1980s, private investment in higher education has grown more prolific as neo-liberal policies became more widely utilized around the world and in Taiwan (Chou, 2008). Increasing private investment in higher education resulted in HEIs competing among each other for such investment. Governments have also contributed to this climate by developing policies to enhance their universities’ competitiveness in academia, facilitate global competitiveness, and expand their international visibility (Chou, Lin & Chiu, 2013).

Globalization and the entrenchment of a neo-liberal economic order have had a profound effect on higher education, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region (Chou, 2008). HEIs have pursued internationalization to strengthen their global competitiveness and the achievement of “world-class” status to increase their international clout and access to markets. In addition, the pursuit of “world-class” status facilitated a growing demand for the development of comparable and cross-national indicators of research quality. Within this wider context, rankings and indexes are

已註解 [AEM1]: Have acronym on first use, see above

viewed with such importance that governments have formulated policies to reward HEIs that are successful in moving up the rankings. Across the Asia-Pacific region, some of the QS highest ranking HEIs are located in China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan (QS Top Universities, 2017). This indicates that HEIs in the Asia-Pacific region have enacted successful reforms to internationalize and pursue “world-class” status as defined by rankers. However, the quantifiable and unquantifiable cost to HEIs and governments who seek to achieve this status remains obscured in the media and government records.

In the case of Taiwan, the HEI rankings originate from the Taiwanese governments’ shifting of its governance philosophy over HE from ‘government control’ to ‘government supervision’. This came to fruition through the development of quality-assurance mechanisms and promotion of a performance-driven culture. In the early 1990s, Taiwan’s Ministry of Education (MOE) commissioned several agencies to conduct evaluations of programs offered by HEIs (Lo, 2014). These early evaluations were conducted on an institutional basis; however, limited resources of these institutions restricted their capability to manage their evaluations. In response, the Taiwanese government implemented a revision to the *University Law* in 1994 to transfer responsibility of conducting evaluations of HEIs to the MOE (Lo, 2014). Further reforms, such as the establishment of the Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan (HEEACT) in 2005, brought MOE and HEI funding together in maintaining an independent agency to conduct HE evaluation and accreditation. In 2011, the HEEACT’s role expanded in the HEI ranking system by conducting institution-based evaluations. The aims of such evaluations are to clarify the goals and missions of HEIs, to identify HEIs’ strengths and weaknesses, and to provide suggestions for their improvement. In order for departments of HEIs to survive, they must pass their evaluations as departments who fail for two consecutive years will be requested by the MOE to terminate their enrollment and operations (HEEACT 2012).

Such an evaluation system raised concerns of how institutional autonomy is maintained within HEIs in Taiwan. Despite some HEIs being granted the status of self-accreditation and HEIs having authority to establish their own regulations on evaluation, the University Evaluation Regulation of 2007 stipulates that HEIs are under obligation to be evaluated by the MOE and its agency (HEEACT) (Lo, 2014; Chou & Ching, 2012).

Additionally, the establishment of the Taiwan Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI) is considered a breakthrough in the establishment of a research-oriented performance culture in Taiwan’s HE system (Lo, 2014). The purpose of the establishment of TSSCI was to help HEIs achieve “world-class” status since “world-class” university rankings are predominantly research-oriented. As a result, the

measurement of HEIs' performance in Taiwan placed great emphasis on research output. Citation indices, particularly SCI and SSCI from the United States, were considered strong indicators reflecting the research performance of faculty members. However, the local academic community put up strong opposition to utilizing citation indices based in foreign countries for the purpose of faculty performance evaluation (Chou, 2014). Since all major citation indices were developed upon journals in English, many academics in Taiwan struggled to publish their research within these journals due to language restrictions and cultural bias. Taiwan academics also question how suitable these journals are for local studies (Lo, 2014).

The issue of HEI rankings in Taiwan not only has repercussions domestically, but can also within the Asia-Pacific region. As cross-strait issues, China-Taiwan relations, are a major focus of geopolitical concern, HE is also a field of contention between the two sides (Chou & Ching, 2015). Owing to Taiwan's rapidly aging society and low birth rate, Taiwanese HEIs face a crisis in enrollment shortages (Hsueh, 2018). Taiwan is faced with an issue of brain drain regarding students and academics. Taiwanese academics are also increasingly seeking opportunities abroad thanks to the pressures of rankings and stagnant wages in Taiwan. One particular issue for Taiwan is the recruitment of Taiwanese academics and students to China due to generous offers from Chinese HEIs (Hsiao, 2017; Cheng, 2018; Hsueh, 2018). Therefore, this study provides an excellent case study to analyze how HEI rankings affect geopolitical issues within the Asia-Pacific region. In this case, China, with its greater financial resources, is capable of attracting HE talent from Taiwan which would hurt Taiwan's competitiveness within the region and globally.

This chapter compares the change in the academic culture of two departments at National Chengchi University (NCCU). The aim is to examine how faculty research performance has changed since the implementation of initiatives aimed at achieving world-class universities in Taiwan. To be ranked world-class in any of the three major ranking systems (QS, ARWU and The Times Higher Education) requires that faculty publish in top-ranked journals, namely journals written in the English language. The result is new pressure on faculty to conduct research and write up results in a manner accepted by English language editors. NCCU was chosen for this study because its focus is primarily social science and the humanities, fields which have been acutely affected by recent policy changes. NCCU includes nine colleges including Liberal Arts, Law, Commerce, Science, Foreign Languages, Social Sciences, Communication, International Affairs and, Education. There are 34 departments, and 48 postgraduate institutes. NCCU has long been among the top universities in Taiwan and is renowned for its Liberal Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, Management, Politics, International Affairs, Communication, and Education programs. Consequently, a great number of

alumni have worked in the government sector. The two interviewees selected was based on their seniority of more than 25 years in each department, their service as former administrators, and their experiences sitting on many university promotion and hiring committees. Both have authority and experience in university policymaking and dealing with academic rewards and publications. As indicated by the interviewees of this study, NCCU's reputation was much more prestigious on a national level before the shift in policy toward achieving "world-class" status as scholars at the university have shifted their research interests to more global issues. This change in status has been accompanied by reduction of public funding, degradation of social prestige, and a decline in the morale of its faculty, (Chou & Yang, 2016).

已註解 [AEM2]: In what sense "prestigious"? Please clarify.

Two initiatives promoted by Taiwan's MOE informs what research is funded and rewarded by universities and government: The World-Class Research University Project (2003) and the Higher Education for Excellence Plan (aka, the Five-Year-Fifty-Billion Plan). The latter was valued at approximately US \$1.6 billion invested in twelve leading Taiwanese HEIs in 2005. Many institutions received a renewal of additional funding in 2011 (Chou & Chan, 2016). Over time, these initiatives have prompted a shift in research away from Mandarin publications and locally relevant topics, toward international, English-language publications with significantly less relevance to Taiwanese interests.

University Quality Assurance

Beginning in the 1990s, many vocational/technical colleges were upgraded to "comprehensive universities," meaning they were no longer singularly focused on technical and vocational training and education (TVET) but shifted some resources toward four-year bachelor programs. This direction runs counter to their original purpose of spurring Taiwan's economic development. The broadened focus has negatively affected the quality of higher education in Taiwan, a concern expressed by many since that time, (Chou, 2008; Hayhoe, 2002). In response to this concern, the University Law was again revised in 2001, shifting the basis of budget allocation to a system of evaluations. In 2005, a professional evaluation association was commissioned in order to establish and strengthen quality assurance (QA) systems in Taiwan's HEIs, (Hou, 2015). In order to improve Taiwan's international academic visibility and competitiveness, most of the QA criteria used was meant to be standardized and quantifiable according to the international rankers (Chou & Chan, 2016). The indexes utilized by the QA systems also derived from journal publications in data sets such as in SCI (Science Citation Index), SSCI (Social Science Citation Index), and the Taiwan Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI). All of these evaluation criteria are paper-oriented, quantity-driven, and mostly benefit STEM fields, but it has

created an environment wherein quantitative research is highly favored. Fields which rely more on intensive, longitudinal, qualitative research face a disadvantage under criteria that favor quick results and frequent publication.

Research Framework

This study compares the change of the academic culture via faculty publication profiles in two departments of NCCU in Taiwan in order to measure the impact of the recent emphasis on global rankings in Taiwanese higher education. The departments surveyed were the Department of Education and the Department of Ethnology. The two reacted differently to the changes in recent decades. These departments were chosen as part of an international research project published in *Higher Education Policy*, the quarterly journal of the International Association of Universities (IAU) and funded through the World Universities Network (WUN). They were selected under the assumption that the drive for international research and publication had begun much earlier in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields, but that research in education and ethnology had traditionally been conducted with strong national rather than global interests in mind before recent shifts in national and institutional priorities toward global competitiveness, (Post & Chou, 2016).

Two instruments were used to account for these changes: In-depth interviews with two senior faculty members (one from each department) and extensive documentation database of faculty publication over the course of two decades. Each faculty's journal publications were recorded for 1993, 2003, and 2013 in order to examine how faculty research performance has transformed under the world-class university ranking and global competition. Yearly publications per faculty member were averaged for each of the two departments in order to illustrate changes in research behavior. Each publication was tabulated for 1) language of publication (English, Mandarin, Japanese, or other language), and 2) whether the research was ultimately published in a national or an international journal.

In-depth interviews were conducted with senior faculty members from each department in order to gain further insight into faculty morale, accessibility to the means of career advancement, changes in the character of academic labor within the specified fields, and changes in the goals and direction of knowledge production. The open-ended questions used for these interviews are listed in the appendix

Short-Term Outcomes of World-Class Policies

Each individual university, along with Taiwan's Ministry of Education (MOE), must be compliant with the new QA systems which monitor publication records of individual faculty members in international and domestic journals. In response, each university in

已註解 [AEM3]: Give full name.

Taiwan established its own strategy to increase international visibility, enhance scholarship, and increase scholarly contributions (Mok, 2014). In terms of quantity of publication, these measures have been remarkably successful. In 1981, only 543 academic papers were published in Taiwan, accounting for 0.12% of global publication in that year. By 2012, that number had increased to more than 26,000, 2.07% of global publication (Kuo, H.F. & Liu, H.Y., 2014). According to the interviewee from the Department of Ethnology at NCCU, measures taken by the university since 2013 have made the department, “more comprehensive,” with a “faculty that has more diverse backgrounds and research interests. We have anthropology, education, history, geography, linguistics; we are more like a comprehensive way to observe ethnic culture.”

已註解 [AEM4]: Throughout the paper, it would be good to give some broad identification of the interviewee, for instance, one male professor of ethnology....

Although these measures have contributed to improved rankings and global exposure in the short term, academic staff in Taiwan’s leading universities, especially those in social sciences and humanities, are increasingly experiencing pressure to “publish globally or perish locally” (Hanafi, 2011). The interviewee from the Department of Ethnology explained: “Those who embrace and benefit from this international journal game reinforce it and contribute to the pressure for all to comply if they want to survive.” Interviewees indicated that new hires to their departments were hired in large part because of their perceived potential to publish in international journals, indicating a significant shift toward a global perspective for the next generation of faculty.

Owing to various initiatives implemented by the government and HEIs in Taiwan, scholarly publications, international visibility, Taiwan’s university rankings, and overall publications in Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) recognized journals have risen. In the 2015 QS World University Rankings, National Taiwan University (NTU) ranked 70th in the world and has been in the top 100 universities since 2009 (Quacquarelli Symbols, 2015). Simultaneously, Taiwan’s research publication output in SSCI-recognized journals increased by over 56% from 2,298 to 3,590 between 2008 and 2013 (World of Science, 2014). Despite its increase in publication output, Taiwan’s academic impact rankings have improved only incrementally, gains which may not justify the cost to nationally-focused scholarship and faculty morale. All the while, Western nations such as the United States continue to maintain their dominant position in terms of academic impact. This indicates that, despite Taiwan’s ambitious policies toward achieving world-class universities, its research has not improved in terms of international competitiveness based on the criteria of WOS (World of Science), a major “world-class university” citation database, (World of Science, 2014).

已註解 [AEM5]: Introduce full term on first use.

已註解 [AEM6]: Not sure about this statement. It seems too generic to be understood. Is it really that such policies either have or not an impact? Instead, it might be better to discuss on what fronts things may have worked and on what fronts not, or less. As well, with regard to the USA, it seems that taking it as a measure is far too stretched given the size and scope of its economy and higher education, including its structure.

Three Decades of Publication

Findings suggest that although international visibility has improved over the period in question, overemphasis on rankings and citation indices have strained the morale of

academic labor, narrowed the pathway to academic career advancement, and encouraged research that favors global trends over national interests. As shown in Table 1, the publication rates remained constant in both departments **prior to 2003 when policy incentives to publish in English or in international journals had yet to be implemented. After these incentives were introduced, university faculty in the Department of Education published significantly more journal articles. There was also an increase of journal publications among faculty in the Department of ethnology, but to a much lesser degree.

Table 1: Three Decades of Publication in Two Departments

Year	Ethnolog.	Education
1993	0.78	1.48
2003	0.78	1.67
2013	1.3	4.17

*Average number of papers published per faculty member per year.

Examination of the papers published in academic journals support these conclusions. In the three years examined (1993, 2003, and 2013), 89 published papers were surveyed from the Department of Education (32 in 1993, 25 in 2003, and 32 in 2013), and 27 papers (7, 7, and 13 papers in each respective year) from the Department of Ethnology. In education, articles submitted to Mandarin publications shifted from 90.6% in 1993, to 100% in 2003, and to 65.6% in 2013. In ethnology, only one paper was published in English in the years surveyed.

In the Department of Education, the papers submitted in English in 1993 came from only a handful of faculty members, most of whom were junior faculty who specialized in statistics or quantitative research methodologies. In 2013, however, there was a significant increase in submissions to English-language or international journals as well as co-authorships from a larger percentage of faculty. This may be due, in part, to the increased pressure to publish in internationally recognized journals, especially considering the institution of a probationary period for newly hired faculty in 2005 that gave strong incentives to publish frequently and globally. However, in Ethnology, the publication of journal articles fluctuated in the years surveyed. Only 7 publications were noted in 1993 and 2003 respectively, and although four new faculty members were hired, that number only increased to 10 in 2013.

已註解 [MOU7]:

已註解 [MOU10]: Is including the table helpful?

已註解 [AEM8]: The asterisk would better be here, not in the column.

已註解 [PH9R8]: Not sure what the reviewer is suggesting here. Please clarify.

已註解 [PH11R10]: We think that the table is useful to visualize the change in publication numbers that occurred after the policy changes, but if the reviewers think that it is not helpful in this discussion we are prepared to discuss further.

已註解 [AEM12]: As you have only three points in time, is the ascertaining of the trend warranted?

已註解 [AEM13]: Is it a period or in these three years?

Within the two departments, there was a significant divergence in the source of publishers utilized to publish research articles. In the Department of Ethnology, 28.3% of publications were published through Taiwanese publishers in 1993, while the other 71.7% of articles were published in Mainland China. However, researchers surged to Taiwan in 2003 and 2013, inverting the trend completely. In the Department of Education, faculty members published mostly through Taiwanese publishers before 2003, but shifted their attention to international journals afterwards. As discussed above, the shift to international journals and to higher expectations for frequency of publication has coincided with higher strain on faculty members and a likely divergence from research priorities that are aligned with local and national interests in favor of those of more global significance.

Faculty Voices

Two senior faculty who had been working in each department for more than 25 years participated in an extensive interview based on the questions indicated above. The interviews suggest that between 1993 and 2013 hiring and faculty promotion became more dependent on English writing ability and journal publication rates. Additionally, interviewees indicated that anxiety and morale have worsened, and the role of the “public intellectual” has diminished in Taiwanese society as expectations for publication in SSCI-recognized journals has risen. Despite the efforts and sacrifices made to achieve the goals of these recent policy changes, those interviewed expressed doubts about the benefits that have been reaped from them.

One interviewee from the Department of Education expressed misgivings about the impact of Taiwanese academics both domestically and internationally, despite the proliferation of international research in recent years. “There is a growing international presence, but what kind of impact is there for the international community? I think that there is no significant growth in the field of education. In academic circles abroad, the academic influence of Chinese scholars is still insufficient. As for domestic academic circles, their English periodicals cannot be read. On the contrary, scholars of the older generation has a chance to be accepted by the Taiwanese public because of their publication of a Mandarin book.”

The themes of research topics include the term “global” more often as the audience targeted by faculty in Taiwan consists predominantly of international journal editors in the USA and UK. This suggests that researchers may be forgoing research on issues that specifically affect Taiwan in favor of more broadly global issues. The interviewee from the Department of Ethnology asserted that, “Internationalization of journals is not a bad thing, but I think... that Taiwan’s politics should be internationalized, and academics should be localized. We are doing it backwards. Localization is not to say that [a researcher] can only do Taiwanese research, but... after you take root [in Taiwan],

you can go abroad and present your ideas. It will be more meaningful than it otherwise would have been to the international academic community.”

Greater numbers of publications in international journals have also shifted the language used in writing up research in Taiwan. International publications often require academic research to be published in the English language, which makes such research less accessible for Taiwanese audiences. The interviewee from the Department of Education described this, saying, “In the past, the university was not at all interested in English. But now it is swinging to the other extreme: you have to contribute mainly in English. If you submit in English, you will be more prominent.” As observed in Taiwan, English language writing ability now acts as a proxy measure for academic merit despite that it is a non-English-speaking academic community. The same interviewee went on to explain that the emphasis on English-language publication deters researchers from publishing in the way that they had before the trends of globalization took hold: with books. “Focusing on English publications, and disregarding special books, means that local people cannot benefit from their research.” Overemphasis on international publication also limits the time and energy academics have for social engagement, teaching, and public discourse.

Regarding the language of publication, in 1993 and 2003 all publications from Education were in Mandarin, and the department was focused on publication of books, rather than papers in academic journals. The professor from the Department of Education explained that, “At that time, a lot of books were published, because they could take books to the National Science Council and apply for rewards.” In fact, “It would be very strange to use English. Local journals may not even accept submissions in English. However, after 2003, research published by the faculty in Mandarin declined from 100% to 74% and were replaced by papers published in English, (Chou & Chan, 2017). Alternatively, faculty in ethnology continued to publish their research in Mandarin throughout the period and publication rates remained relatively low compared to the rates seen in education (1.3 papers per person in 2013). “We have poor research performance based on the current evaluation criteria but teaching quality is good... The teachers of the ethnic minority, as a whole, are very good at teaching,” explains the ethnology professor. “Our service in terms of social participation and contribution, especially to Minority people and communities, is impressive and typically well received. We serve many leading policy makers on minority studies but lack academic visibility.”

Between the two disciplines, there were significant differences in promotions. In the Department of Ethnology, promotions were less common than in the Department of Education. Factors that contribute to this disparity between the two departments may include a number of things, such as: unique culture within the respective departments;

已註解 [AEM14]: Do you have data for all publication years?

已註解 [MOU15]: Can you clarify? A number of Chinese publications stopped publishing?

已註解 [MOU16]:

已註解 [MOU17]: Part of sentence is missing . What comes after common, ?

已註解 [AEM18]: Elsewhere you use the term “Chinese” language. Here, you use “Mandarin”. Whichever you decide is fine, but be consistent.

已註解 [AEM19]: There are a series of quotes here, which are listed in sequence. Please make sure you situate them.

已註解 [AEM20]: This is a confusing statement, compared as well to the previous one. On top, how is this related to the issue under discussion. Perhaps it is a coincidence?

different methodologies favored by their respective fields of study which may favor or inhibit higher frequency of publication; or even each department's level of morale, but the data and interviews from the two departments indicate that research output in internationally recognized English-language journals contribute to promotion success, (Chou & Chan, 2017).

Responses from the interviewees reinforced this correlation. The interviewee from the Department of Ethnology explained their feeling of frustration with the lack of recognition for publications that were not in English, saying, "I have three very important papers, all of which I published in journals that yielded zero credit. Qinghai, Ningxia, and Gansu, China, three of the best academic journals." The interviewee from the Department of Education also expressed misgivings, explaining that, "Because of the publication pressure at NCCU, the newer faculty are driven to publish more journal articles, especially for SSCI credit, so they can get promotions as soon as possible." The interviewee goes on to lament what they believe has been lost in this process, saying, "NCCU used to be proud of producing books, and the faculty wasn't encouraged to publish journal articles before 2003. Although NCCU has expanded the publication of journal articles, books are shrinking to a great extent."

Conclusion

Almost a decade has passed since the 2010 higher education reforms have been implemented in Taiwan to improve higher education quality and increase international visibility and competitiveness. Various effects can be observed within Taiwan's HE system, and although international visibility has improved, there are some trends of concern regarding research publication, accessibility of research for local audiences, and the role of teaching in academia. The linkage between these factors also impact epistemic viability of knowledge produced by Taiwanese universities. As seen in the findings above, journal publications have now become the task of utmost importance for university and college faculty. Promotions and rank are now more dependent on the number of SSCI, Science Citation Index (SCI), and Taiwan Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI) publications an academic has published. This has led to a gradual diminishing and devaluing of the teaching and 'public intellectual' role of an HEI faculty member and funneled academic labor into a mentality of publication for the sake of career advancement rather than for epistemological advancement or national interests, (Chou & Chan, 2017).

A 'winner takes all' environment amongst colleagues has emerged in Taiwan's HEIs. As a result, in certain departments, promotions are dependent on a narrow set of criteria, and many faculty members lack opportunities for such promotions. Due to promotions being overly dependent on the publications of faculty member and whether

已註解 [AEM21]: In what sense should we understand "0 credit"? What does this person mean?

已註解 [PH22R21]: As stated just before the quote, this interviewee was expressing "frustration with the lack of recognition for publications that were not in English." It is not a formal measurement, but an expression of the interviewee's feelings.

they are published in SSCI, SCI, or TSSCI-relevant journals, such output is produced by a small number of faculty. In the case of the Department of Education, faculty members published significantly more articles than they did prior to the enactment of higher education reforms. Further research could clarify the implications of this trend, which may suggest that research topics are being geared to appeal to journal editors despite not being locally relevant. In the case of the Department of Ethnology, its low publication rate and predominantly Mandarin-language medium indicates that certain disciplines are less vulnerable to institutional pressure to meet standards deemed necessary for institutions to become “world-class universities.” As suggested in the above, this may be due to a number of factors, including the academic culture within the Department of Ethnology, and the different methods of ethnological research.

The Taiwanese government’s response to the pressures of competitive university rankings has been to introduce a series of reform policies that emphasize quantitative research, and new probation and self-evaluation system designed to monitor faculty research output. The phenomenon of “publish globally or perish locally” has thus emerged, especially in the humanities and social sciences, which comes at the expense of local policy issues and academic visibility to taxpayers. Although there is evidence that policymakers are responding to the issues discussed in this study, (Chou, Lin & Chiu, 2013) further reform would be welcome, especially by faculty from institutes of technology whose practical skills and knowledge have been neglected in the current promotion system. Though the SSCI-focused mentality has been imbedded in all faculty reward and evaluation systems across Taiwan, social concerns and awareness over the preceding issues have been more and more evident and accepted as grounds for change. It is likely that additional multi-channel alternatives will come into effect in future, and It is hoped that the “publish globally and perish locally” phenomenon will be considered along with the inevitable drive for global talents and human resources in forthcoming policy. NCCU, as one of Taiwan’s most vulnerable HEIs under the current paper-driven policy, should also take the lead in researching world-class university rankings from post- modern perspectives.

Ultimately, this research hopes to highlight the costs that have been incurred as a result of Taiwan’s increasing pursuit of “world-class” status HEIs. Despite the number of publications increasing overall, the lack of increase in the international academic impact at the expense of local relevancy and academic diversity indicates that publication quantity is being pursued while academic quality and excellence is yet to be achieved. The current world- class university policy is not justifiable and comprehensive enough to convince many academics in Taiwan. It will be of the utmost importance for policymakers in Taiwan to consider how past reforms have placed greater academic strain on faculty members and may be directing research goals away

from those aligned with local and national interests toward more global issues. These issues have already caused damage to morale in many academic settings and have the potential to exasperate the gender disparity in education and direct the valuable academic talent available in Taiwan away from its original goal: the improvement of Taiwanese society. When considering renewing old reforms or enacting new ones, it will be of significant benefit for policymakers to take the outcomes of past reforms into consideration in order to enhance Taiwan's higher education for the benefit of all in Taiwan.

References

- Cheng, J. (2018). Professor Flight? '30 Million RMB Can't Buy Democracy and Academic Freedom'. *CommonWealth Magazine*.
<https://english.cw.com.tw/article/article.action?id=2005>: accessed 3 January 2020.
- Chou, C.P. (2008). 'The Impact of Neo-Liberalism on Taiwanese Higher Education', in D. Baker and A. Wiseman (eds.) *The Worldwide Transformation of Higher Education*, Bingley, UK: JAI, pp. 297–312.
- Chou, C. P. (2014). The SSCI Syndrome in Taiwan's Academia. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22 (29). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n29.2014>.
- Chou, C.P. and Ching, G. (2012) *Taiwan Education at the Crossroads*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chou, C. P., Lin, H. F. & Chiu, Y. J. (2013). The impact of SSCI and SCI on Taiwan's academy: An outcry for fair play. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14, 23–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12564-013-9245-1>.
- Chou, C. P. & Ching, G. S. (2015). Cross-Straitization of Higher Education: Voices of the Mainland Chinese Students Studying in Taiwan. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 5(2): 89-94.
- Chou, C. P. & Chan, C.F. (2016). Trends in Publication in the Race for World-Class University: The Case of Taiwan. *Higher Education Policy*, 29(4), 431-449. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-016-0016-6>.
- Chou, C. P. & Chan, C.F. (2017). Governance and Academic Culture in Higher Education: Under the Influence of the SSCI Syndrome. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 6(2): 63-75.

已註解 [AEM23]: Could you also offer some prospective assessment, or even speculation, regarding the implications/consequences of these reforms on the meanings and practice of scholarship and the academic workplace in Taiwan?

http://www3.nccu.edu.tw/~iaezpc/publications/C_publications/Journals/journal_2017Governance.pdf.

Chou, C.P. & Yang, Y.F. (2016). How Taiwan's Higher Education Caught in the World-class University Rankings: From NCCU's perspective of the Consolidated Curriculum Reform. *Taiwan Educational Review Monthly*, 5(1): 111-118.

Hanafi, S. (2011) 'University systems in the Arab East: Publish globally and perish locally vs publish locally and perish globally'. *Current Sociology*, 59(3): 291–309.

Hayhoe, R. (2002) 'Teacher education and the university: A comparative analysis with implications for Hong Kong', *Teaching Education* 13(1): 5–23.

Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan (HEEACT). (2012). www.heeact.edu.tw: accessed 3 January 2020.

Hou, A.Y.C. (2015). 'The Quality of Mass Higher Education in East Asia: Development and Challenges for Asian Quality Assurance Agencies in the Glonacal Higher Education', in J.C. Shin, G.A. Postiglione and F. Huang (eds.) *Mass Higher Education Development in East Asia: Strategy, Quality, and Challenges*, Singapore: Sense, pp. 307–324.

Hsiao, T.F. (2017). 'Farewell, Taiwan'. *CommonWealth Magazine*. <https://english.cw.com.tw/article/article.action?id=1649>: accessed 4 January 2020.

Hsu, P.J. & Hsieh, B.H. (2017). The changing profile of gender and number of university students and faculty within the system and rank in Taiwan for the last 25 years. *Evaluation By-monthly*, 65. Available on-line at: <http://epaper.heeact.edu.tw/archive/2017/01/01/6682.aspx>

Hsueh, C.M. (2018). Higher Education Crisis in Taiwan. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view/higher-education-crisis-taiwan>: accessed 3 January 2020.

Kuo, H.F. & Liu, H.Y. (2014). An analysis of the overall academic publication capacity in Taiwan for the last twenty years. Available on-line at: <https://portal.stpi.narl.org.tw/index/article/28>

Lo, W.Y.W. (2014). *University Rankings: Implications for Higher Education in Taiwan*, Springer: Springer Singapore.

Ministry of Education, Republic of China (Taiwan) (2013) Education statistics, Taipei: MOE. [https:// stats.moe.gov.tw/](https://stats.moe.gov.tw/); accessed 6 June 2018.

Mok, K.H. (2014) 'Promoting the global university in Taiwan: University governance reforms and academic reflections', in C.P. Chou (ed.) *The SSCI Syndrome in Higher Education: A Local or Global Phenomenon*, Rotterdam: Sense, pp. 1–23.

Post, D. & Chou, C. P., (2016). Preface: Measuring up for what cause? *Higher Education Policy*, 29(4), pp 423–429.

Quacquarelli Symonds (2015). QS World University Rankings 2015/16.

Retrieved from QS Top Universities:

[http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2015#sorting=rank+region="+country="+faculty="+stars=false+search=national](http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2015#sorting=rank+region=), Taiwan University

World of Science (2014) *Science Citation Index*, New York: Thomson Reuters.

Appendix

Interview Questions:

1. *What has been the research direction of faculty from your department from 1993 to 2013? What are the main forms of publication?*
2. *What are key factors that have changed your academic publications in terms of topics and languages selected since your first publication? How may these factors be related to the regular appraisal/publication assessment implemented by your university?*
3. *NCCU has encouraged faculty to publish papers in international academic journals. How has this requirement affected your department?*
4. *Is there considerable pressure on your department to meet deadlines or quotas for research? Specifically, what are the constraints and expectations on young faculty members?*
5. *What is the ratio of submissions to domestic and foreign journals in your department? What is the ratio between Chinese and foreign language publications?*
6. *What changes have you observed in publication topics and languages over the years since 1993 by your colleagues in your own department? Similar or dissimilar, and in what ways?*
7. *How is the regular appraisal/publication assessment in your university related to the national scheme of research assessment or ranking if there is any?*
8. *What are the advantages and disadvantages of the research assessments used in your university since the 1980s?*
9. *What problems have you and the other members of your department's faculty encountered regarding promotion?*
10. *How have hiring practices changed for your department? What qualifications and experiences does NCCU look for when hiring new faculty?*

已註解 [MOU24]: Perhaps just include the question that you deal with in this paper or put questions in Appendix?

已註解 [AEM25]: The questions can be appendix.