Indigenization, Institutionalization, and Internationalization: Tracing the Paths of the Development of Sociology in Taiwan

Mau-kuei Chang, Ying-hwa Chang, Chih-chieh Tang,
Institute of Sociology,Academia Sinica[1]

This paper traces major developments of sociology in Taiwan, from the early twentieth century to present time. It is arranged in five parts in chronological order. The first part deals with early strands of social scientific studies carried out by Japanese researchers that have influenced the later growth of sociological studies.

We point out that sociological studies in Taiwan were first carried out by the Japanese colonial government to survey the land, the folklore, and the populations, without referring to "sociology" in name until 1945. The works left by the Japanese were largely overlooked or kept marginal in the early de-colonization2 process by the incoming nationalistic Chinese government. It was not until the late 1980s that people began to reassign greater importance to these early works in studying the "realistic" and "grass-roots" Taiwan.

Sociology as an academic institution, as a profession, was established by émigré Chinese sociologists who fled communist rule with the nationalistic government in the midst of the Chinese civil war after 1949. The second part of this paper deals with the influences of the Cold War situation and U.S. support of the right-wing regime, which was both conducive and obstructive to the growth of sociology until the 1970s. Sociology departments were rebuilt in Taiwan with U.S. aid during the Cold War era (the 1950s to the late 1970s). During this period, except for perhaps population studies, sociology was largely promoted for the necessity of civil service, social work, or rural development. Like other disciplines in the social sciences, sociology was often regarded as

---

1 All correspondence should be addressed to: Mau-kuei Chang, etpower@gate.sinica.edu.tw.

2 Native critiques of this phase of the "decolonization" of Japan, replacing the colonial Japanese government with a nationalistic Chinese government from mainland China, alternatively describe it as "re-colonization" by another "outsider regime."

insignificant by both the government and general society. The regime kept a close-up watch on college campuses to prevent the infiltration of "communist spies." It was impossible to teach sociological work suspected of having leftist ideas on campus. Surveys conducted by sociologists on laborers and the poor were also monitored carefully.

However, in the late 1970s, industrialization and economic development moved Taiwan into a new era of self-transformation. A young generation of post-war intellectuals emerged amid Taiwan's international setbacks, when, in 1971, Taiwan lost its U.N. seat to the name of the Republic of China. This loss constituted a serious blow to the sovereign status of the Taiwanese state. Working in different cultural and academic fields, young intellectuals converged in the search for identity, finding "roots," and, sometimes, in calling for revitalizing the nation or modernizing the country with democratic ideas.

This moment in the 1970s was known as the "intellectual fervor," with patriotic overtones.3 Collectively, but not always with coordination, young scholars with exposure to the Western social sciences took hints from the "inter-disciplinary" approach and structural-functionalistic ideas from the U.S. to tackle their own problems, or their "particular" national *problématique*. But the movement was ambivalent. On the one hand, they criticized blind-dependence on the West and aimed at self-examination of the historical pasts of the Chinese people, the lack of democracy in contemporary China (in Taiwan), and they shied away from facing "real" social problems in Taiwan society. On the other hand, they advocated "modernization," "social change," and "development."

The third part of the paper thus constitutes one of the major themes of the paper: the "indigenization movement" of this period. The paper suggests two phases of the movement. The first phase was known as "Sinicization" (or "Chinese-nization"), and the second phase began with the choice to quietly substitute the term "indigenization" for "Sinicization" amid the political liberalization movement, which asserted the separate cultural and political identity of the Taiwanese from the Chinese.

By avoiding the term "Sinicization" the movements turned to contemporary or historical "Taiwan," opposing the use of Taiwan as a "surrogate" subject for China. This occurred when the younger generation became more exposed to the realistic situation of their "national" status in real politics, and when the "real" political China (People's Republic) began its opening-up policy, "reappearing" to the

3 The generation was also termed the "returning to reality" generation (Hsiau 2008). (蕭阿勤，《回歸現實的世代》)。

outside world. The overall general feeling edged toward identification with the present society existing in Taiwan when the disillusion with the national myth to use Taiwan to represent "China," and with the national mission to "re-take" China, became self-evident.

The fourth part discusses the second theme of the paper: institutionalization. In this section we focus on the growth of sociology as a profession. The indices of expansion include the increasing number of institutions and the growth of professional interests.

The last part of the paper focuses on current issues around the setting-up of a national evaluation system by the governing body of academics. The uses and misuse of this system have had great impact on the daily life and the practice of sociology in a world emphasizing global competition and "market" advantages.

REVEALING THE HIDDEN ROOTS OF TAIWANESE SOCIOLOGY IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY (ca. 1896 ~ 1950)

The Colonial Beginning of "Taiwan Studies" (1895-1945)

In Taiwan, the production of sociological knowledge came with, and developed along with, Japanese colonial rule (1895~1945). This should hardly be surprising. As a discipline of the social sciences sociology was born in the West after the Enlightenment. Turned into a colony of Japan from a frontier territory of the Manchu Empire, Taiwan did not have the knowledge and basis for modernization. The only capable individuals or institutions that could do social scientific studies in the modern sense were related to the West; for instance, the small number of local elites who were enlightened by the colonists in the post-colonial era, or the colonial ruling administrative agencies.

Accompanying the process of political centralization and so-called scientific control of the ruled society, the Japanese colonial government conducted various official surveys. These were the earliest sociological practices in Taiwan. Guided by social sciences, these surveys basically served the needs of governance. They collected data about the so called "old customs"4 and used statistical techniques to measure the macro-phenomena of population, land, agriculture, commerce, religion, and diseases, etc., in order to investigate the determining factors of these

4 Based on such data, Inō (1994[1928]) wrote his famous book *The History of Taiwanese Culture*.

macro-phenomena. The government could accordingly predict the future and exert its power based on this knowledge. In other words, these surveys in Taiwan were not a pure construction of social scientific knowledge, but indeed a pursuit of the knowledge/power of governance intending to intervene in the daily life of people.

The Head of Civilian Affairs in 1898, Gotō Shinpei (後藤新平), was a typical example of this practice. He had stressed "scientific administration" and initiated massive surveys. Through these practices the Japanese colonial administration had accumulated a large amount of "scientific" surveys and statistical reports. Therefore, Shao-hsing Chen (陳紹馨), a Taiwanese sociologist trained in Tohoku Imperial University, later could claim Taiwan as a treasurable "Laboratory for the Study of Chinese Society and Culture" (1966). He based this claim on the fact that there were voluminous data accumulated from the Japanese era that could further future research in Taiwan.

In spite of the fact that the social sciences were introduced into Taiwan along with Japanese rule, and despite the fact that it always kept a close relationship to colonial rule, colonial governance and academic studies were embedded in different contexts. Japanese scholars, who either first came to Taiwan as military men or served later in the colonial government, published their research both in official reports or journals aiming at exchanging information, ideas, and knowledge among bureaucrats (e.g., *The Journal of the Association of Aboriginal Affairs Studies*, 蕃情研究會誌) and in academic journals (e.g. *The Bulletin of the Tokyo Anthropological Society*, 東京人類學會雜誌). In these two types of writing, official vs. academic, they spoke in different fields and were situated in different contexts (Chen 1998).

In principle, the Japanese colonial government encouraged the Taiwanese to study agriculture and commerce while intentionally suppressing their attempt to learn politics and law. Thus, there was no department of sociology when Taiwan's first university, Taihoku Imperial University, was founded in 1928. In the faculty of literature and politics, however, there were so called "study offices" for sociology, "south culture," and "folklore and ethnology." The last office was directed by Utsurikawa Nenozo (移川子之藏) (Wu 1997). The latter two offices were more active and known by later generations. In fact, after Taiwan became the colony of Japan, Taiwan, as "the new other" within the Japanese empire, soon attracted Japanese anthropologists. But the practices of Japanese anthropology, whose research had concentrated on archaeological and physical anthropology, were oriented in colonial Taiwan towards the direction of ethnology (人種學、民族學) and folklore studies (民俗學). This anthropology, focusing on knowledge

about the rule over others, distanced itself more and more from the anthropological tradition as cultural reflection, namely as reflection of oneself through study of others, as well as from the sociological tradition as critical enlightenment. This development had first to do with the influence of popular evolutionary anthropology and the archaeological finding of the Omori Shell mound (圓山貝塚) in the Japanese homeland. Second, it was influenced by the broader political and societal context: during this time Japan only built its own nation, treating the successively annexed territories of Hokkaido, Okinawa, and Taiwan in a mode of differential incorporation (Chen 1998; Wu 2003).

However, the sociological perspectives containing the ethos of enlightenment and critique were not totally absent. These were reflected in the cultural enlightenment and the social movements that Taiwanese intellectuals had practiced and pursued from the 1920s to the early 1930s. For example, the Taiwanese Culture Association, the Taiwan's People Party, and the Taiwanese Communist Party spread ideas about materialist dialectics, class domination, national liberation and self-determination of the colony, etc., to Taiwanese society. In comparison to the administrative surveys and academic research that was institutionally supported, the knowledge tradition that circulated only among the colonized was weak and limited.

From surviving fragments we now know only that the Taiwanese Culture Association had arranged lectures on "sociology" (Zou 1981). We can also discover some sociological insights in the discourses and the concrete practices of social reform during that time. As the Japanese government prepared to go to war, all of the anti-colonial social movements were suppressed. Interest in this type of knowledge was at that point limited to literature and folklore studies (Wang 1991). There was no crosscutting between these two traditions - the official ethnographic surveys and the "counter-sociology" of the colonized - before the publication of the journal *Folklore Studies* (民俗研究) in 1941. This journal was founded by the Japanese biological anthropologist Kanaseki Takeo (金關丈夫). The Taiwanese sociologist Shao-hsing Chen was among the initiators and was employed later in 1942 as staff in the "Study Office for Folklore and Ethnology" (土俗人種學研究室) of the Taihoku Imperial University.

"De-Colonization" and "Re-Colonization" in the midst of the Chinese Civil War: Restructuring the Political and Cultural Center of Taiwan (1945-1950)

After the Second World War the national government of the Republic of China took over Taiwan in accordance with the Cairo Declaration and the Potsdam Declaration. Taihoku Imperial University was renamed the National Taiwan University. In the currents of the "re-Sinicization"(再中國化), the "Study Office for Folklore and Ethnology" was renamed the "Study Office for Ethnology" (民族學研究室).5 Shao-hsing Chen was one of three people who were in charge of taking over the faculty of literature and politics, and was later appointed to the department of history, leading this study office.

In 1949 the national government and its army retreated into Taiwan. The number of mainland scholars that came to Taiwan increased as well. The Department of Archaeology and Anthropology was founded in the National Taiwan University at this time. Its first director was Chi Li (李濟), famous for his leadership in the digging of the archaeological site of the Shang-Period in Anyang, province Hebei. Most of the teachers in this department had been researching Chinese ancient history, archaeology in mainland China, or minorities in China. Only some paid attention to the aborigines in Taiwan (at that time called 高山族, the Austronesean that lived in the isolated mountain areas). Later, their primary aim was to explain the formation of the Chinese nation and civilization (Huang 1983). The previous "Study Office for Ethnology" was then incorporated into the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology. Chen was subsequently transferred to this department as well.

Meanwhile, the first department of sociology in China was founded in 1918 in Yenching University of Peking. In 1930 the Chinese Sociological Association (中國社會學社) was founded in Shanghai. Sociology had finally begun to develop in China. Most scholars that did sociological studies in mainland China were trained in social anthropology. For example, Hsiao-t'ung Fei went abroad to follow Malinowski and wrote the famous book *Peasant Life in China* (1987[1939]) based on his field study. Therefore, at that point sociology was synonymous with anthropology (Hsu 1944).

Despite this similarity in background training, there were significant differences in the research orientation of Chinese sociologists in the so

5 人種學 and 民族學 are different translations of the same term, ethnology. The translation carries different meanings and imaginations in Chinese. Outside the common connotation of ethnic groups, 人種 was in a sense synonymous with race, while 民族 was synonymous with nation.

called functional and historical schools. The former studied primarily the Han (漢人) and used participant observation to do community studies. This school stresses a combination of theory and field study. With peasants and urban workers as research objects, it had a strong positivistic and critical consciousness and was often in confrontation with the KMT-government. On the other hand, the primary research task of the historical school studies was on the history of the Chinese nation. Paradoxically, in the 1940s in China it was the functional school that criticized the government more often and harshly, although the functionalism later developed in sociology was generally seen as conservative. So, when KMT lost the civil war to the Chinese Communist Party and retreated to Taiwan, the most famous scholars of the functional school did not come to Taiwan. Instead, the sociologists who came to Taiwan belonged either to the historical school with a nationalistic disposition or were radical anti-communists. This selective succession and the political milieu dominated by authoritarianism later suppressed the early development of Taiwanese sociology.

THE COLD WAR AND U.S. AID: SOCIOLOGY UNDER AUTHORITARIAN WATCH (ca. 1951-1970)

Building New Departments in Taiwan and Émigré Chines Scholars

In 1950 the Korean War urged the U.S. to include Taiwan in its strategy to fence off Communism. The émigré government of the ROC in Taiwan survived because of the aid it received from the U.S. A relatively stable period followed. In the same year, some sociologists, including Kung-hoi Lung (龍冠海), Ching-yu Chang (張鏡予), Cheng-fu Hsieh (謝徵孚), and Ji Guo (郭驥), rebuilt the Chinese Sociological Association in Taipei. Conversely, due to the need to train civilian bureaucrats, a department of social administration was founded in the Taiwan Provincial Administrative Junior College (臺灣省立行政專科學校). This was the first department relevant to sociology that was founded in Taiwan after the Second World War. As this college was upgraded to the Taiwan Provincial College of Law and Business (臺灣省立法商學院) in 1955 (later Chung-hsing University, today Taipei University), this department was officially renamed the Department of Sociology.

However, the revival of professional organizations and the limited establishment of sociology departments did not mean that sociology continued to develop smoothly. In fact, the bitter experience of failure in

the civil war made the KMT government very suspicious of sociology and sociologists. Only Tunghai University, supported by the United Board for Christian Colleges in China, was permitted to establish a department of sociology in 1956. Despite the appeal from sociologists, no other department of sociology was founded until the mid-1960s. Through the mediation of professor Martin M.C. Yang (楊懋春), who had taught rural sociology in the U.S. and came to Taiwan during the 1960s, the ministry of education was persuaded to build a department of sociology and an institute of rural social economy in the National Taiwan University, on the precondition that these two units would be subsidized by the American Asian Foundation (Yang 1980).

The *National Taiwan University Journal of Sociology* was founded by the department of sociology of National Taiwan University in 1963. Academia Sinica officially founded the Institute of Ethnology in 1965.6 Generally speaking, the government strictly supervised society until 1970 and the sociologists were no exception. Consequently, they did not have enough professional autonomy. However, the department of sociology in Tunghai University and National Taiwan University, as well as the Institute of Ethnology in Academia Sinica, became the primary agents that influenced the later direction of the development and institutionalization of sociology.

How did sociologists do research during this time? What did they research? As the U.S. helped Taiwan prevent the penetration of communists into the country in the 1950s, the professional staff of the Committee of American Aids to China (Taiwan) saw the need to monitor the reality of the situation of Taiwanese society. Without this knowledge, the U.S. could not push the KMT government to reform in the direction that the U.S. preferred and planned. Therefore, surveys of rural and urban economic situations were conducted respectively from 1952 to 1953. The U.S. not only supported financial and human resources for these surveys, they also directed the concrete survey practices and held the resulting data. The establishment of sociological departments and institutes of rural social economy can only be understood when we consider their adaptation to and dependence on U.S. aid when building their departments.

As the local scholars engaged in the study of Taiwan's society, they gradually developed two primary approaches. One approach focused its research on the urban community. Its representative was the Department

6 This institute was an institute for anthropology. Sociologists were employed in this institute only after 1970 as a result of the interdisciplinary current of behavioral science. See the next section.

of Sociology at NTU, headed by Kung-hoi Lung. The other approach focused primarily on rural studies. Its guiding figure was Professor Martin M.C. Yang in the Department of Agricultural Extension and the Institute of Rural Social Economy. These two approaches succeeded the earlier tradition of community research and rural reconstruction in mainland China. Both approaches shifted the core of their methods from field participation that paid attention to the grass-roots to the social survey method with standardized questionnaires. This reflected the general tendency of sociology in the U.S. after the Second World War, as Taiwan followed the development of American sociology and imitated its research methods. Outside urban and rural studies, the sociologists during this period were primarily concerned with issues of family, population, and social problems. In addition to imitating American sociology, these research topics were oriented to practical concerns.

Since the late Qing, in general, Chinese intellectuals felt the way to save the nation was to pursue military strength and economic wealth. People learned sociology from the West in order to solve real problems in China and to assure the status of China in the world. Following this theme, Chinese scholars not only promoted practical research, but also thought it was necessary to combine sociology with social work and social welfare. This mode of thinking continued in Taiwan after the Second World War. The departments of sociology that were founded in Taiwan after the Second World War had teachers and curricula focused mainly on social work (Chang 1991). Due to political suppression, the rupture of the critical tradition in Taiwan, and influenced by American positivism, sociology in Taiwan developed a stronger character of pragmatism, positivism, and transplantation. Namely, they did their research like "original equipment manufacturers."

Local Intellectual Ferment and Sociology Indigenization at Dawn (ca. 1970~1980)

It is worth it to mention two local sociologists whose works somewhat influenced the later development of sociology in Taiwan. First is Ambrose Yeo-chi King (金耀基), who introduced modernization theory into Taiwan, and second, Shao-hsing Chen, already mentioned above. King's book, *From Traditional to Modernized*, was published in 1966. Originally it was a text for popular talks and could not be counted as serious academic work. In spite of this, his key concern and key argument, to apply sociological knowledge about the rise of modern civilization to the Chinese case, and to put this knowledge in a key position in the transformation of Chinese society toward modernization,

echoed the long term concern of Chinese intellectuals and earned a wide resonance. In addition, this book matched the current of progressive thought, the state's desire for economic growth, as well as the young intellectuals' dissatisfaction with tradition and authoritarian rule at that time, so it had a widespread effect and influenced the collective problematic of later social sciences.

While King was influenced by structural-functionalism à la Parsons, Chen utilized classical sociology. In his article "Social Change in Taiwan," Chen (1979[1956]) analyzed the transformation of Taiwan's society according to the change of the principle mode of social integration. Chen divided the history of Taiwan into three phases: tribal society, folk society, and national or civil society. Knowing that foreign scholars chose Taiwan as a surrogate field for mainland China, at the same time Chen (1966) wrote a Chinese and an English article titled "Taiwan as Laboratory for the Study of Chinese Society and Culture." In this article he softly reminded the field that Taiwan was a self-sufficient object with good research conditions. Taiwan was not only a good laboratory to understand China, but itself also a treasure for social science studies. The article's implication, to seek and to build the subjectivity of local sociology, was a heuristic for latecomers who promoted a more radical indigenous reflection movement.

In the 1970s the residents of some urban areas in Taiwan had enjoyed a relatively wealthy life as a product of industrialization and economic growth. The expectation of people, above all the young that grew up in the period of economic growth after the Second World War, rose correspondingly. These youths were better educated than older generations and expected more political and cultural openness. The tensions and contradictions within Taiwan's society deepened. This had to do, on the one hand, with the insistence of the KMT government on authoritarian rule, and on the other hand, with the diplomatic failure of the ROC in the international world. Although the ROC insisted that it was the only true, legitimate representative of China, and was until now in the United Nations recognized as such, it could not prevent the recognition of the People's Republic. In 1971 its seat in the United Nations was forfeited and given to the PRC. In 1972, Japan recognized the PRC and broke its official diplomatic relations with Taiwan. In 1978 the ROC lost the recognition of its most important supporter and protector in the international political system until now, the U.S.A. This external crisis influenced the internal dynamics and stimulated a demand for reform.

There was some convergence and cooperation between the efforts of the intellectuals of the younger generation during that time, when they

were confronted with this disadvantageous international situation and tried to express their opinions, testing consciously or unconsciously the limits of the tolerance of the authoritarian KMT regime. In the field of literature there was a movement "back to the xiangtu" (鄉土, homeland and country) as well as a realistic current. In the field of arts, Hwai-min Lin (林懷民) claimed that "the Chinese should dance their own dance" and founded the "Cloud Gate Dance Theatre" (雲門舞集). At the same time, the journal *Lionart* (雄師美術) promoted the painting of a lay painter Tong Hong (洪通) so successfully that his paintings were given the opportunity for a special exhibition at the American Cultural Center at Taipei. It meant "international" recognition of the artistic achievements of a native Taiwanese farmer. Even in the field of popular songs, "campus folksongs" (校園民歌) with the slogan "sing our own songs" was widespread. Similarly, a young generation promoted reform in the field of politics. The young reformers within the KMT, including Kuo-shu Yang (楊國樞), Jun-hung Chang (張俊宏), and Hsin-liang Hsu (許信良), gathered themselves around the *Intellectual Magazine* (大學雜誌). Outside the KMT there were opponents such as Shin-cheih Huang (黃信介) and Ning-hsiang Kang (康寧祥) who rose up to the national political stage. Chang and Hsu later became opponents and, together with Huang and Kang, founded *Taiwan Political Review* (台灣政論) in 1975, which became the pioneer of forthcoming dissentient political journals. Since then the opponent movement gradually built its contour.

In this background sociology found a chance to develop. The new generation of social scientists that was born in mainland China, grew up in Taiwan, and was trained in the U.S. gradually earned influence in the academy as well as in other social areas. This generation was, on the one hand, very interested in the interdisciplinary team work that became popular in the U.S.A. during that time. On other hand, however, these young scholars were unsatisfied with the universal propositions of the American or Western style social sciences. They therefore pursued a new thought and a new practice for the study of social sciences, namely behavioral sciences and interdisciplinary studies. Through the team work of scholars with different disciplinary background, they hoped to push the study of the local (Chinese) society toward the direction of progress.

The earliest interdisciplinary attempt in Taiwan was driven by psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and historians.[7] With the

7 It is worth it to mention an important background difference here. In the West, the inter-disciplinary study that became popular in the 1970s aimed to solve the problems of integration that resulted from the professionalization and differentiation of disciplines. There were no such problems in the 1970s in Taiwan. On the contrary, the Taiwanese interdisciplinary study contributed to

base of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, they organized a conference, "The Character of the Chinese," and published their research results with the same title (Li & Yang 1988[1972]). Through this interdisciplinary research they brought the new research method of the social sciences into the Taiwanese academy, different from the traditional historical, literary, or philosophical methods. They attempted to study Chinese Characters (中國人的性格), precisely speaking, the particular social, historical, and psychological properties or situations of the Chinese nation. They questioned themselves: which characters (nationalities) did the Chinese culture, society, and individual have? Why were Chinese characters different than the characters of the Western nations? In answering these questions, Li & Yang (1988[1972]) hinted at the lack of the traditions of democracy and individualism in China and attributed the insufficient modernization to widespread familism and collectivism.

The problematic - what were the particular properties of the Chinese and what problems were the Chinese confronted with - not only echoed the arguments of King's book *From Traditional to Modernized*, but also succeeded the concern about the modernization of China since the May Fourth movement in 1919. But the direct stimulus that pushed these young scholars to understand their own society came from the contemporary political and intellectual milieu. With the tools from the social sciences and behavioral sciences, they found that the Chinese tradition was neither modern nor democratic enough. At the same time they criticized some other scholars as conservative and nationalist, because these scholars lacked the capacity of self-reflection and stubbornly held onto the Chinese tradition.

This problematic assumed, however, that the social sciences in Taiwan were, without doubt, Chinese social sciences, and Taiwan was the self-evident representative of China. Taking this as an unquestioned departure, the earlier ethnological studies about Taiwanese folklores, as well as Shao-hsing Chen's sociological studies – which took Taiwan's society as the subject and searched for Taiwanese subjectivity – were neglected, as these studies were treated as "local" and secondary in the framework of the entire Chinese nation.

The Character of the Chinese was an exemplar of contemporary interdisciplinary study. At this time the sociologists had not yet played a leading role. But on the whole, the sociological circle became far more

---

assembling the sporadic social science researchers and to push the social sciences as a whole forward with collective powers. Only after earning scientific legitimacy with collective efforts was there a differentiation between disciplines.

active. In the middle of the 1970s Chung-i Wen of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, by training a historian, started to do community study with the assistance of some younger sociologists. This younger generation constituted the first critical mass for the sociological study of Taiwan and played an important role in the take-off of sociological studies in the 1980s.8

The institutional expansion of sociology in the academy, however, was only slowly progressing. But finally there were masters programs, the first establishment of a section for rural sociology in the institute of agricultural extension in 1969, then the founding of the Institute of Sociology in National Taiwan University in 1974, in Tunghai University in 1978, and in Soochow University in 1980 (Chang 1996).

Additionally, the Chinese Association Sociological founded the *Journal of Chinese Sociology* in 1971, the pioneer of today's *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology*. However, it was still difficult for this professional association to organize an annual assembly, not to mention an annual conference. In fact, the assembly of all members could take place only every two years during the thirty years between 1951 and 1980. Additionally, there was no continuity to the activities of the association. The only special attempt worth mention was the series of "sociological discussions" that began in 1976 and were organized in turn by different departments of sociology or relevant disciplines in the social sciences (Yang 1978; Chinese Sociological Association 1980). These discussions improved the recognition of sociology by students.

SEARCHING AND FINDING RELEVANT ROOTS: THE "INDIGENIZATION MOVEMENT" (ca. 1980~2000s)

Since the late 1970s there has been significant development in the quality and quantity of sociology in Taiwan. A movement calling for the indigenization of sociological knowledge and studies has changed sociology qualitatively. The increasing number of professional sociologists, along with their teaching and research engagements with other social science disciplines, has changed sociology quantitatively.

8 For the result of this community research see for example Wen (1975a, 1975b), Huang (1975), and Hsu (1977).

The Early Indigenization (Sinicization) Movement (ca.1980~1990)[9]

Today, indigenization is used as a synonym for "Taiwanization," or localization with a Taiwanese-ness political bent. This was not the case in the early indigenization movement in the social sciences in Taiwan. Then, it was about "Sinicization" or "Chinese-nization." The movement started with the Conference on the Character of the Chinese and continued with the published after-conference symposium.[10]

The movement criticized social scientists in Taiwan for lacking the ability to self-reflect in their knowledge activities. Their research at most was only a vassal for Western social or behavioral sciences. The movement's major claim was that Western theories were not applicable to Chinese societies, and that social sciences had to have some Chinese characteristics. The concepts and theories resulting from the study of Chinese societies could contribute to social science knowledge in general, or contribute substantially to international social sciences. Although not explicitly a political movement, it implied an anti-authoritarian patriotism and an agenda for modernization. Paradoxically, the movement on the one hand opposed political conservatism, and on the other hand encouraged modernization and Westernization. Its supporters strongly asserted that only the Westernized Chinese societies, such as Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, were qualified for the discourse of "Sinicization," since they had been "Westernized enough" (Yang and Wen 1982: vi). In other words, for those who had not "entered" Western knowledge in the social sciences, e.g., those unreflecting supporters of traditional learning or communist China, were not entitled to discuss "Sinicization."[11]

The movement reached a high point in the early 1980s with three consecutive and cross-border conferences on the "Sinicization" of social science. The first, titled "Sinicization of Social and Behavioral Sciences," was held at the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, and the second, the "Conference of Modernization and Chinese Culture," was held at the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1983 (Chiao

9 In another article, Mau-kuei Chang (2005) discussed the indigenization in Taiwan intensively.

10 In this paper the term "movement" refers to a new trend of thought becoming a major social discourse which guides and coordinates activities inside or outside the academic community.

11 This viewpoint is incorrect, for Maoism in communist China had long been a sinicized Marxism and Leninism. However, "the West" referred to by communist China is different from "the West" for Kuo-shu Yang.

1985).[12] The third was a small conference on the Sinicization of sociology, organized by Tsai, Yung-mei in 1984. A group of sociologists in the United States and one from Taiwan - Michael Hsiao - gathered at Tempe, Arizona (Tsai and Hsiao 1985).

In addition to these conferences, the issues of locally grounded knowledge and the localization of social sciences have prevailed in Taiwan's community of social sciences, although "the local" now has a different reference.

Recent "Indigenization": Studies about Taiwan Society (after 1990)

Indigenization in the name of Sinicization is not compatible with "Taiwanization" in political movements. However, unlike other humanistic disciplines or political science, sociologists in Taiwan were able to modify their perceptions about studying Taiwan society, which is, incorrectly, thought to represent China. This change of view was rather spontaneous for sociologists, as they had been doing Taiwan studies all along. When people began to stop using the term "Sinicization" the term "indigenization" (*bentuhua*), not "Taiwanization," became the chosen term used in Taiwan's sociological community. The transformation was quiet and was almost without debate, except for very few occasions.[13]

Since 1980, China has gradually opened and sociology has recovered. In the second Conference of Social Sciences and Sinicization, previously mentioned, scholars from across the Taiwan Strait had their first encounter in Hong Kong. Those from Taiwan emphasized the Sinicization of theories and research and critical reflection on Western hegemony. Those from China, on the contrary, due to their long isolated experience with the development of Chinese socialism, were eager to have an open society and learn practical strategies and approaches to social development.

In 1993, the Chinese Sociological Association of Taiwan organized

---

12 After the conference, participants from Taiwan, including Li, Yi-yuan, Yang, Kuo-shu, and Wen, Chung-i, published an edited symposium with selected papers, *Symposium on Modernization and Sinicization* (1984).

13 For example, Chung-i Wen discussed "Sincization," "nationalization," "indigenization," and "regionalization" and the difficulty of finding appropriate words (1991b: 21, fn 2). However, some scholars started to seriously criticize the Sinicization movement. Cheng-kuang Hsu's article on re-evaluating Shao-hsing Chen's studies is a typical example. On the one hand, he recognized and highly praised Chen's Taiwan studies and emphasized its academic value independent of "Chinese Studies." On the other hand, he criticized the advocates of the Sinicization movement, claiming they were not able to see the real life of Taiwan society; they simply indulged in the idealized Chinese culture.

an academic tour with the help and coordination of the Institute of Sociology, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Seventeen scholars visited sociology departments or institutes in the universities or research institutions located in Beijin, Tianjin, Shanghai, Nanjin, and Guangjou. On their return they stopped to meet with sociologists in the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In preparing the tour, the participants discussed names for the group. They decided to call themselves the Sociological Community in Taiwan but only mention it to academic groups they visited (Chinese Sociological Association 1993). When China began to increase its contacts with the international community, the Chinese academic community in Taiwan had to adapt by re-naming itself. At the 1995 congress in Taipei, the name *Chinese Sociological Association* was changed in to *Taiwanese Sociological Association* (TSA). The motion to change the name took less than five minutes to pass and won almost by consensus.

The key ideas throughout the indigenization movement were roots searching, practicing sociology with local relevance, and awareness of blind-borrowing from the West. Large-scale surveys [14] and other fieldwork have become common sociological practices. Digging out social problems and studying social change (and no-change) in Taiwan have been their major concerns. Today, these ideas continue to receive strong support. For instance, in 1995, when the Institute of Sociology began to prepare for its establishment in Academia Sinica, it listed the ideas of indigenization as its paramount organization objective, among others. "[C]ontinuously encouraging Taiwan local research and defining the identity of Taiwan sociology" are the major goals of this institute.[15]

A second example is the establishment of PhD Program in the Research Institute of Sociology in the National Tsing Hwa University. Though the term "indigenization" was not raised, the substantive ideas of indigenization are included in many sentences in the organization's agenda. For instance, its first objective is to "initiate new thinking and to build up new visions for Taiwan Society." The second objective implores the institute to "establish local relevant (indigenous) social theories" and

14 For example, the Taiwan Social Change Survey (a GSS type survey) had its first survey in 1984 and started its second survey in 1990. Since 1990 surveys have been conducted every year. From the first survey, the project has been financed primarily by the National Science Council. Sociologists are in charge of the project. The teams that design the questionnaire include scholars from various disciplines in the social sciences. They conduct island-wide face to face interviews with representative samples. The raw data are released for public use.

15 Its other objectives include comparative studies and area studies. The indigenization agenda did not rule out other research issues.

to be an important base of sociological theories in Taiwan. The third is "to train the first rate sociologists for Taiwan."[16]

We have briefly described the persistency of a major concern of sociological development in Taiwan: knowing and understanding that the development of sociology has been under the shadow of Western social science, many Taiwanese sociologists have tried to be reflexive in their teaching and research, and have attempted to accumulate relevant "local" knowledge and be self-affirmative. They have consciously situated their studies in the context of their local society, and have engaged in meaningful dialogues with the West and with other sociologies developed in other regions of the world.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION: EXPANSION AND DIVERSIFICATION (ca. 1980~PRESENT)

The institutionalization of sociology is a post-movement phenomenon. The early movement had helped sociology establish its legitimacy in studying the "theoretical understanding of the society," "social change," "social problems," the "middle class," "civil society, " "dependent development," "world system, social movements," and "democratization," "stratification," "feminism," and many relevant subjects since political liberalization in mid 1980s. Previously forbidden topics like Marxism, Western Marxism, and the critical schools began to be taught on campus. In the 1990s there was also a surge of interest in feminist theories and cultural studies. Through examining these subjects, Western concepts and theories and Taiwan realities began to dialogue. This sped up the incorporation of sociology into higher education.

Institutionalization can mean several processes. One aspect is increasing interest in sociology in higher education. This leads to the expansion of sociology departments and institutes in different universities. It also implies the expansion of the profession of sociology. Here we can observe the second aspect of institutionalization: the emergence of an autonomous professional organization which can articulate the differentiation of the discipline, and which can accumulate its own domestic knowledge. We will elaborate these two aspects in the next section.

16 The research institute at Tsing Hwa University started a master's program in China Studies in 2003. Although the agenda of its PhD program did not mention China Studies, the program did not rule out concern with societies neighboring Taiwan.

Expansion of Sociology Departments and Institutes

Since the late 1980s, the social sciences have enjoyed a relatively faster growth largely encouraged by political liberalization, a wave of social movements, and growth in the economy. Sociology was able to capitalize on the trend. A survey in 1984 indicated that sociologists ranked the academic status of sociology sixth among eight disciplines (Hsiao 1984). In another survey in 1996, sociology was ranked third by sociologists (Chang 1996). The raise in status between these two surveys implies that sociologists have gained self-confidence and positive responses from the general public. Sociology and sociologists can compete against the most established disciplines now.

Another indicator of the expansion of sociology has to do with the increase in the number of sociologists with a PhD degree. For instance, in the mid-1970s there were only a few PhD holders in various departments and research institutes. The number increased to 35 in 1986 (Chiu 1986), to 132 in 1996, and 314 in 2007. Most of them had their graduate training in the United States. For example, in 2007 about 50.4 percent of the total number of PhDs had their degree from the United States. That is almost double the number of Taiwanese educated PhDs, which claim only 27.41 percent. The remaining PhDs come from the U.K. (8.72%), Germany (8.1%), France (2.18%), Japan (1.56%), and Australia (1.25%).[17]

The figures indicate that dependence on the U.S. for advanced degrees persists, despite Taiwan picking up its own supply of young PhDs in recent years. After the U.S. and Taiwan, doctoral degrees from European countries, counted as one group, make up about 19 percent of the total doctoral degrees.

Another significant development in sociology as a whole is the establishment of the Institute of Sociology at Academia Sinica. Enjoying high status in this country with its richness in tradition and resources, Academia Sinica has not had an institute of sociology before. But by the end of 1980s, Academia Sinica began its own restructuring and development plan. In the beginning fifteen sociologists were hired because of this. But they were spread through different institutions, such as the Institute of Ethnology, the Institute of the Three Principles of the People (later known as the Sun Yat-Sen Institute for Social Sciences and Philosophy), and the Institute of American Studies (later as the Institute of European and American Studies).

---

[17] These statistics were based on Dr. Hei-Yuan Chiu's oral presentation at a special session of the TSA Annual Meeting, December 12-13, 2008.

Prior to this, Academia Sinica had rejected several calls to establish an institute of sociology. A petition from the Chinese Sociological Association was also turned down in 1988. At that time, there were relatively fewer positions in university sociology departments. The sociologists in the Academia Sinica had indirectly helped sociological teaching and research in universities through adjunct appointments. In 1995, the newly established sociology institute was finally approved and it gathered the majority of the existing sociologists in the Academia Sinica. Today it has a total of twenty six full-time sociologists. It thus has more research manpower than all other departments or research institutes of sociology in universities, none of which have more than eighteen faculty members.

In the mid-1980s, the previous government ban on the establishment of new private colleges or universities was removed as a part of education liberalization. With the recognized status of sociology, private universities initiated another wave of founding new departments or master's programs in sociology. The growth of sociology departments has been less dramatic than the more applied-oriented departments, such as social welfare or social work and mass communication. Nevertheless, because sociology as a basic social science is usually included in the teaching program of departments with applied characters, and because sociologists can play an appropriate role in the teaching of a general knowledge program, the demand for sociologists in higher education is in general increasing substantially. In 1996 and 2005, it is estimated that around forty percent of sociologists with a PhD were positioned in the general knowledge program or non-sociology departments. By 2008, the percentage was estimated at sixty.

The increase of research institutes is another obvious development, in addition to the growth of sociologists. In general the number of sociology departments remains almost constant. Nevertheless, research institutes offering master's programs have increased steadily. The first two PhD programs were established in 1981 and 1985, and another two in 2004 and 2005. When the discipline has programs from undergraduate to PhD it demands well trained talent in teaching and in research.

In the mean time social welfare and social work programs, which had been included in sociology departments since the 1950s, began to leave sociology departments to found their respective independent departments, one after another. The trend began in 1983 when a new department of social work was created from the social work program in the Department of Sociology, Tung Hai University. The last separation of a social work program from a sociology department was in 2006, when the Social Work program was removed from the Sociology Department in the National

Chengchi University and became an independent research institute offering master's training. The trend is yet another sign of the professional development of sociology on university campuses.

Increasing Activity and the Rising Capacity of Professional Associations

In addition to the activities organized and promoted by academic departments or research institutes, the performance of a professional association is an important criterion to evaluate the development of an academic community. The Chinese Sociological Association (CSA) was restored in Taiwan in 1951. In the period from 1951 to 1980 they held a meeting every two years. Around 1980, a number of new PhDs from the U.S. worked in the Academia Sinica and some other universities. They, under the leadership of a small number of senior sociologists, organized an active board of members. The main activities were to organize academic conferences in addition to the biannual meetings. Among the twelve conferences held between 1982 and 1992, seven were co-sponsored with local or central governments. The collaboration with government certainly had its financial and strategic consideration. However, in the official journal's special issue celebrating the CSA' s sixtieth anniversary, an article indicated that there was a clear effort by the board members to produce an image of sociologists as professional consultants to the government. Other conferences were more academically oriented conferences, such as "The Historical Study in Sociology," "Confucianism and Chinese Societies," "Weber Series," and "Nation and Society in Democratization," which were co-sponsored with research institutes or sociology departments (Ku & Chang 1991).

Annual meetings and related activities is another indicator used to evaluate the development of a professional association. In the 1980s, only around ten scholars presented their studies, with one or two pages of abstracts in the afternoon sessions of the annual meeting. In 1991, an ad hoc committee was organized to plan a special issue for celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the CSA. It decided to solicit papers on three subjects, "the development of Chinese sociology," "the introduction and evaluation of pioneering sociologists in China," and "the comparison of development of sociology in East Asia." Their effort was in vain. Members of the organizing committee themselves had to present papers on the first two subjects in the biannual meeting of 1991. The papers were later published in the Journal of Chinese Sociology (Wen 1991a, 1991b). In the late 1980s, the size of professional sociological associations was much larger than in the 1970s. However, it was still very difficult to organize a conference for the biannual meetings. This

could mean that the sociological community was rather weak in research in the 1980s.

A turning point was the annual meeting held in January of 1998. A conference, in which sociologists presented the outcome from a research project supported by the National Science Council grants, was organized. Forty-four papers were presented in the conference. Since then, sociology departments in Taiwan have taken turns organizing and hosting the annual meeting and the concomitant conference. The number of submitted papers increased year by year. In the 2004 conference and annual meeting there were fifty three paper presentations and twenty one briefings in round tables. In 2008, there were 119 paper presentations and twenty round table sessions. The newsletter of the association published one or two issues per year before 1997. Thereafter, six issues were published per year for a couple years, and later three or four issues become the standard. The newsletters after 1997 have been rich in content, including short essays presenting interesting ideas on teaching, meaningful reflections on readings, preliminary findings in research, and a variety of opinions on the sociological community. The newsletter is a platform for sociologists in Taiwan to dialogue in an informal context. Based on the smooth and successful management of newsletters and annual conferences, we may conclude that the sociological community in Taiwan has matured since the end of the twentieth century.

Diversification and Differentiation

Despite the gradual increasing of the number of sociologists in Taiwan, the size of the sociological community in Taiwan is relatively small. Currently there are no more than 400 sociologists involved in teaching and research. An estimation in 1996 indicated that the specialized fields, in which more than twenty sociologists are engaged, includes demography, social psychology, gender studies, sociological theory, family studies (including social gerontology), community studies (urban and rural sociology), organizational studies (including studies on medicine, law, and professions), social change and development, and political sociology (including social movements) (Chang 1996). The current size of the sociological community may be double the number in 1996.

According to the TSA's mailing list in 2005, six of the specialized fields had thirty or more sociologists while four other subfields had twenty or more sociologists. Most of these fields are similar to those in 1996. Demography and social psychology were dropped from the list and were replaced by cultural studies, social stratification, and social

mobility. However, we estimate that about half of overall sociologists are actively engaged in research activities. Accordingly, it is quite difficult to organize specialized research committees. Urban sociologists formed a special committee and collaboratively edited a book on urban Taiwan (Tsai and Chang 1997). However, the committee functioned for only a few years.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND ITS RESISTANCES: ISSUES WITH EVALUATION AND GLOBAL COMPARISON FOR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGES

Multi-Dimensional "Internationalization"

In this section we will discuss the "internationalization" dimension of sociology in Taiwan. "Internationalization" is a vague term that can mean many things in different circumstances. For instance, before the 1990s, the term often meant "Westernization" or "becoming modern." Going international meant to catch up to more advanced countries. After the 1990s, when "globalization" became a new frame of reference for people around the world, internationalization continued to be used as a synonym for globalization in daily discourse. In many of the interlocutions of internationalization or globalization, the West, the U.S., and Western Europe often occupy the center stage of reference. This is not a big surprise since siding with the West and supporting the U.S. domination in the region has not only given Taiwan geographical "protection" against the threat of Communist China, but has also helped Taiwan became prosperous with export access for their markets. Socially and politically speaking, social sciences and the modern history of the West, in particular the U.S., have constituted the epistemology for the understanding and practical model(s) of industrialization and modernization, and of the development of democracy, social welfare, and human rights protections.

It is in this larger context that we can understand what the "internationalization of sociology" means. The first way to look at it is to think of it as an "imported" discipline, a part of modernity, coming from the West. This refers to the "Westernization" of the teaching of sociology, the training of professional sociologists abroad, and the publication and writing of sociological research in paradigms lay down by Western sociology establishments. Using a market analogy, local sociologists are often consumers or followers of Western sociology.

For instance, in the 1980s Taiwan sociology was criticized for "blind-

borrowing from the West," a backdrop of the early "indigenization movement." Today, "Western" influences still persist, as indicated by a preference to cite Western literature to Taiwanese peers in journal articles published locally (Chang et al. 1998, 2002; Su 2004). Additionally, in the eyes of many young local PhD graduates, the expatriate sociologists with degrees from Western countries seem to enjoy greater advantages in competition for grants or for jobs. Compared to some thirty years ago, on the other hand, sociologists are now in general relatively keener to local and regional issues (East or Southeast Asia) and pay attention to the relevance of their works when conducting studies in their respective areas.

The second way to discuss "internationalization" is in the dialectical dichotomy of "national" and "international." This usage was found in late Wen, Cong-yi's remarks about his aspirations for a "national sociology" near the end of the first phase of the "indigenization movement" (1991). He thought there was American sociology, Germany sociology, French sociology, and so on, that had already been successfully established. Hence, there must be "our national sociology" also before we could eventually become international and general. He thought that the way to build a "general sociology," the ultimate goal for the indigenization movement, had to first be "national" (meaning of the nation). He attempted to clarify his ultimate goal for "Sinicization," and he cautioned against the danger of falling back into a narrow and comfortable parochialism.

At the present time, Wen's idea, or this mode of thinking in general, has been a target of criticism from deconstructive oriented post-isms, which question the generalizability of knowledge regardless of whether it aims to be at the "national" or at the "general-international" level.

The third aspect of internationalization is to conduct transnational sociological studies in Chinese. Since WWII this has been known as "area studies" or "comparative studies" in the U.S. This includes sending local sociologists to learn about other cultures and societies and includes sociological studies in foreign countries. But the relations between area studies and mainstream (or institutionalized) sociology is contentious since area studies tend to be more concerned with inter-disciplinary knowledge, language, culture, and the history of areas. And mainstream sociology has a hidden tendency to think of sociological studies conducted or constructed in European and Anglo-American contexts as the core knowledge of the discipline, and to think of all else as belonging to "area studies" with lesser scholarly value.

The fourth aspect of internationalization is about "exporting local studies to international markets," figuratively speaking. A wide range of actions could be included, such as publishing local studies internationally

(though almost exclusively in Anglo-American journals), financing programs or institutions overseas to promote "Taiwan studies" (to put Taiwan on the map so to speak), encouraging cross-national and comparative studies, promoting international scholarly exchange and cooperation, and so on.

Global Competition, National Evaluation, and Scorings with "SSCI" and "TSSCI"

It is the last aspect, setting "going international" as a collective goal of academic advancement, and incorporating it into the scheme of a national evaluation system, has drawn much heated debates in recent years. A national evaluative system is about building some sort of general criteria and evaluation objectives that can be applied to all, and that are supposedly justifiable in distinguishing the leading performers from the rest within the country. However, in most cases, natural sciences and engineering seem to enjoy long-term domination in the governing body of the academic field. Their ideas about what constitute efficiency and justifiable criteria in evaluation prevail.

To communicate with the leaders who govern the academic field, emulating natural sciences and engineering, or to have "objective evaluation," is an easy choice. The purpose is to let the larger academic world know where people and the social sciences stand in global comparisons, and how to push for their collective advancement in "global competition." This has been a "normal" practice for many natural science or engineering programs, which are relatively less oriented to social and cultural contexts. Making the social sciences (with the exception of economics, perhaps) and humanities "go international" for global comparison constitutes a very recent phenomenon, and comes from the top down.

This drive for "evaluation" occurred at a juncture of a rising tide of neo-liberalism, the heightened competition for extra government funding, and for competitive faculty and talented students within the domestic, the regional, and the global fields. This need for "distinction" is also associated with trying to be efficient and fair in all competitive games. Above all, it was pushed as if Taiwan's future status in the world "academic market" in the global context was at stake.

The rationale to build nationally general criteria for evaluation can be summarized as the following:

1. As it had been in the past, the government plays the most important role in funding and regulating education and research. The primary

funding agencies for advanced research and higher education in Taiwan are the National Science Council (NSC) and the Ministry of Education (MOE).

As the premier financial resources of research and academic awards of excellence, the NSC constitutes a major arena for competition for scholars in Taiwan. However, natural sciences, arts and humanities, and the social sciences are all included in the same arena and subjected to inter-division competition. At the end of day, the NSC decides on grants, awards, fellowships, supplementary income, and faculty development allowances for qualified individuals grouped in various disciplines. It also looks for new frontiers where resources need to be allocated, for example working with the government to determine Taiwan's "next star industry" after its success in building an IT industry since the late 1970s.

The MOE controls the accrediting system for university professors and for higher education institutions. It sets minimum curriculum contents and regulates tuition hikes. The MOE is also responsible for taking initiatives to improve the quality of education on all levels. For Taiwan's academic and higher education, the MOE and the NSC together constitute the major infrastructure. They have the power to define the needs for the present and for the future, and also the resources to plan and to implement strategies to fulfill those needs. These two agencies often rely on advice from invited members of the Academia Sinica and from presidents of national universities. It is fair to say that they together form a coalition of academic elites and are the *de facto* "governing body" of Taiwan's academic world.

2.The need to drive for excellence in higher education and research is always justified with, or makes reference to, "national" strategic positions and needs for global competitiveness. In recent years, this need for advancement is strategically tied to the alleged "knowledge economy" and globalization. The power of this discourse is thus tied to the collective innate "fear of falling behind" in a world capitalism characterized by high fluidity. In this regard, Taiwan is constantly reminded of the competition pressures from other adjacent countries and about what other countries are striving for. For instance, Taiwan is often compared to South Korea, China, Singapore, and Hong Kong, with reference to selective dimensions of global hierarchy. This hierarchy of "world ranking" is based on indices which often privilege the "front runners" of world capitalism, such as the more advanced European countries and the U.S.

3.Building an efficient and justifiable general evaluation system is

not only necessary for the funding and regulating agencies to know where we stand on a global scale, but also for them to maintain their accountability in the eyes of the larger academic community and the taxpayers. For instance, the MOE needs to allocate its limited resources justifiably and efficiently to institutions that appear to be the most competitive or promising in the eyes of policy makers and legislators. The NSC also leans on standardized review procedures with clear-cut merit standards to hold off lobbying pressures and academic skepticism. As for the field of the social sciences, national evaluation has one additional purpose. In competing for limited funding inside the government, leaders of the field must justify the field's market "worthiness" while facing skepticism from other academic elites, mostly from the natural sciences and those with engineering backgrounds.

The need to have some "objective" indicators for evaluation seems to enjoy wide consensus among scholars and the public. They agree on the urgency of constructing some kind of transparent and justifiable evaluation system. But how to do it and what to include as valid indicators is up for debate. Against this backdrop, the governmental body for the social sciences began to push for objective indices with a commonly agreed rationale that could appeal to the "general" instead of to the "particular."

As a result, these "objective" indices must be easily acceptable to the majority of all fields in the academic community, as well as to the larger society. There is not much choice available when all is considered. First, within a university, the evaluation of the performance and the promotion of faculty members inescapably lead to some competition among disciplines. In those universities dominated by science and technology faculty, the publication of articles in journals is the major criterion in the ranking of performance and the evaluation of promotion. These universities also care about publication in international journals. They expect that social scientists and scholars of the humanities can publish papers in English like scholars from the natural sciences and engineering. Under such an evaluation, scholars of the humanities and social sciences, who publish their works mostly in Chinese, are under pressure and feel uncomfortable. One criterion which can fit most of the above requirements is to use the number of papers that are published internationally, or, in effect, in journals using English. Beginning in the late 1990s, new evaluative policies designated by the two agencies began to form and were gradually implemented beginning in 2000. In that year, the MOE released its plan for universities to "Pursue Excellent Development in Scholarship." In 2005, the MOE raised the stakes and increased the budget three fold for universities which could meet the

standards. In 1999, the division of social sciences and humanities in the NSC, led by members of Academia Sinica including prominent economists, began to push for the "internationalization" of the social sciences in a very narrow way: to judge scholars' performances in terms of numbers or an elaborated system of points from journals published in English.

In this circumstance, publishing an article in SSCI (the Social Science Citation Index) journals became a mark for scholarly achievement. The sole reliance on SSCI journals, however, immediately received critiques from the humanities (especially from historians). The division of History and Social Sciences in the NSC thus began to create a Chinese version of the SSCI, recognizing the special needs and "value" of Chinese writings.

Emulating the SSCI, the citation archive was first designed as the CSSCI (C stands for Chinese), and later, for practical purpose, it became the TSSCI by including Chinese journals published in Taiwan only. Unlike the SSCI, the TSSCI is not only a digital archive of publications but is also an evaluation system that uses carrots and sticks. It credits and includes journals with good standing by its own standard. Individual authors automatically receive credits for publications in these journals. Contributors to journals not credited, or to those excluded from the archive, are not recognized by the regulatory agencies. The system thus has the hidden ability to "weed out" journals that do not meet their standards by discouraging prospective contributors.

The fundamental rationale for evaluation is simple to agree on in a capitalistic world: "pay is tied to performance." However, in practice, this requires an artificial, and sometimes distorting, ranking system. The ranking system breeds inclusion and exclusion almost by definition. Therefore, inclusion and exclusion practices inevitably become a form of domination, which privileges the establishments with evaluators. In the end, the new evaluation system, along with the surfacing of the two performance indices, the "SSCI" and "TSSCI," shook the entire field overnight.

In 2002, the MOE released its first comprehensive evaluation of universities, in which it reported the ranking of national universities in terms of SCI, SSCI, A&HCI, and EI publication counts. The report is the first of its kind to come out of the government in Taiwan's higher education. It drew huge publicity and also strong objections from some universities, especially from the universities which have long traditions in the humanities and social sciences, and which have published primarily in Chinese journals and book form.

Though the MOE refined its ranking strategy at a later stage, the

impact on the field of the social sciences, in which sociology cannot be separated from the others, was very complicated. Many universities and departments began to incorporate SSCI publication counts as significant criteria for internal auditing and promotion. They also use it for recruiting and self-promotion. Some even devised a bonus system for faculty members to publish in SSCI journals. Others rely on SSCI or TSSCI to enlarge regular salary differentiations.

Resistances against the SSCI and TSSCI for Narrowing our Visions

The professed goal of evaluation is always about measuring performance. But how to measure, using what criteria, according to what rationale, who does the evaluation, in addition to all the consequences (stakes) that come after evaluation, inevitably make it a contentious opportunity for power and resource maneuvering. Standardized evaluation on a national scale cannot simply be the tools for driving for excellence; it can be an end in itself, or tools (excuses) for internal control. It is fair to argue that despite all the manifest purposes, evaluation on a national scale stipulated by government agencies is bound to be an arbitrary and disciplinary act.

It really does not require much reasoning to understand the problem of relying on one single measurement for academic performance. Maybe inadvertently, however, the SSCI and TSSCI immediately become the easiest, or the alleged parsimonious way, for comparison and for communicating to the managers and auditors of schools, and to the general public as well. The SSCI can also be used in global comparisons, especially in East Asian countries where everyone is turning their heads to the English speaking world and Western Europe.

So far, many commenting articles and essays have, for different purposes, criticized the uses and abuses of the SSCI and TSSCI in evaluation schemes. The most systematic critiques were collected in a book titled *Globalization and Knowledge Production: Critical Reflections on the Practices of Academic Evaluation* (fansi gongzuo xiaozu 反思工作小組, taishe luntan 台社論壇，2005). In a two-day conference with representatives from the NSC and the MOE, the organizer and contributors vocalized criticisms against the abuses of the SSCI and TSSCI, and the backlash of a young national evaluation scheme. The organizing committee listed their appeals in ten points when the edited volume was published. The main theme was calling for complete abandonment of the use of SSCI and TSSCI indices. Other appeals included devising multi-dimensional and multi-purpose evaluations, giving more credits to book publications, respecting the uses of languages other than English, encouraging studies concerning local relevance,

encouraging the use of Chinese in publications, and demanding respect for the right to education for students.

So far the MOE and the NSC seem to be set on keeping paper counts and the SSCI and TSSCI in the scheme. The NSC continues to fund the practice of crediting "qualified" journals in TSSCI. They deny their intention to an over-generalized use of the indices, but blame individual institutions for reported abuses of the SSCI and TSSCI for their own internal game. Overall, they appear to be aware of the problem and there are signs of modification. For instance, the MOE is willing to let individual institutions set their own organization goals and to give them room for particularistic development, or begin to use different evaluative criteria for research universities and teaching universities. On the other hand, the NSC has quietly given more credits to book publications and have provided subsidiaries for translation projects.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, sociology in Taiwan began as "Taiwan area studies," a colonial subject matter. Later, it went through the rehabilitation period through the rough time under Chinese nationalism. It was at one point almost completely dependent on the U.S., but has gone through a self-reflective indigenization movement. In the 1990s, sociology became a socially prominent and legitimate subject in higher education. It has since diversified in research interests, practical concerns, movement interventions, and has institutionalized through an advocating movement. Today, it is in the tidal wave of global comparison, influenced by government regulations.

To put everything in perspective, Taiwan is situated in part of the "larger structure" on a world scale. By "large structure" we mean historical and fundamental forces that move and influence many parts of the world. For example, Japanese imperialism in the early twentieth century in the region or the clashes between capitalism and communism in the Cold War era. We can also understand this "large structure" in terms of historical trends of "industrialization," "modernization," "economic development," or "globalization."

The most important institutional actor between Taiwan sociology and this large structure is the state. The state mediates between the two. It internalizes pressures and influences from the outside world, takes cues from the more advanced countries and neighboring countries, and coordinates resources (such as those from U.S. aids) to pursue its own development projects. The nature and the capacity of the state also

evolve because of internal and external interplays. When the state begins to transform, it will have an impact on sociology. For instance, in the Cold War and authoritarian era, the state had helped and closely monitored the activities of sociologists in a paternalistic way. In its post-liberalization era, in the 1990s, when academic freedom became reality, sociology was able to diversify and develop institutionally. Now, the state perceives itself in a game called "global competition," a game of survival. It has modified itself by attempting to incorporate neo-liberal ideas in the management of academics. It is hence best described as a "regulatory state," while pursuing global advantages in international competition. In this article we list state agencies like the MOE and the NSC as the chief organizations that carry out this function with the implementation of a national evaluation system.

As was shown, under these structural constrains and the environment shaped by the state, sociologists have been pro-active. They are, to a large extent, "Americanized" because of the historical legacy, but many have adopted reflexive positions and have engaged and intervened in domestic issues. Collectively, they have helped to construct an effective professional community with relative autonomy while taking advantages of the expansion and diversification of the social sciences promoted by state policies. When maturing, they have also voiced disagreement with and taken actions in modifying the national evaluation system imposed from above. However, sociology is also a part of the field of social science, governed by a group of academic elites and by respective institutional managers. People in different institutions, with different positions in the hierarchy, and with different amounts of power and resources, have different ideas about what sociology should be like and what sociologists should be practicing. The conflicting views over whether sociology needs to be "scientific," "objective," or "evaluative," or whether it should be "pro-development," "empirically-based," or "pro-public," "pro-action," or "critical," continue to clash in present day Taiwan. In this regard, power struggles continue in the daily life of sociologists, they never end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chang, Mau-kuei. "The Movement to Indigenize Social Sciences in Taiwan: The Origin and Predicament." In *Localism and Nationalism in Taiwan*, edited by A-qin Hsiau and John Makeham, pp. 221-260. London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2005.

Chang, Ying-hwa (章英華). "Report of the Prospective Plan of the

Sociology Section, the Department of Humanities, National Science Council" (人文處社會學門規劃研究報告). Project Report of the National Science Council. The Preparatory Office of the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, 1986.

-----. "The Life and Academic Achievements of Professor Lung Kung-Hoi as an Example of a Sociologist Shaped by both Eastern & Western Culture" (龍冠海教授的生平與學術：東西文化洗禮下中國社會學家的一個例子). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15 (1991): 41-55.

Chang, Ying-hwa, Yih-jyh Huang, Han-yi Yu, and Wen-hui Luo (章英華、黃毅志、余漢儀、羅文輝). "Ranking of Academic Journals in Sociology" (社會學門專業期刊排序). *National Science Council's Project Report*. The Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinicia, 2002.

Chang, Ying-hwa, Pau-ching Lu, and Yih-jyh Huang (章英華、呂寶靜、黃毅志). "Ranking of Journals related to Sociology, Social Welfare and Social Work in Taiwan" (國內社會學、社會福利與社會工作專業期刊排序). *National Science Council's Project Report*. The Preparation Office of the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinicia, 1998.

Chen, Shao-hsing (陳紹馨). "Taiwan as a Laboratory for the Study of Chinese Society and Culture" (中國社會文化研究的實驗室－台灣). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 22 (1966): 1-14.

-----. "Social Change in Taiwan" (臺灣的社會變遷). In *Population and Social Change in Taiwan*, pp. 495-520. Taipei: Linkingbooks, 1979[1956].

Chen, Wei-chi (陳偉智). *The Politics of Colonial Anthropology: An Enquiry of the Work of Inō Kanori* (殖民主義、「蕃情」知識與人類學：日治初期台灣原住民研究的展開(1895-1900)). MA Thesis. Institute of History, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, 1998.

Chiao, Chien (喬建) ed. *Proceedings of the Conference on Modernization and Chinese Culture*. Hong Kong: Institute of Social Studies & Social Science, Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1985.

Chinese Sociological Association. "A Report about the Administration Affairs of C.S.A. in the last two years" (兩年來社務通訊). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 5 (1980): 157-158.

Chiu, Hei-yuan (瞿海源). "Changing Social Attitude in an Urban Community: A Study of Social Change in Wanhua" (萬華地區的都市發展：萬華地區社會變遷研究之三). *Bulletin of the*

Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica 39 (1975): 57-83.

-----. "The Status Analysis of Sociology in Taiwan" (我國社會學現況分析). National Science Council's Project Report. The Preparatory Office of the Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinicia, 1986.

Editorial Board of the Newsletter C.S.A. "A Note on the Academic Visiting of Taiwanese Sociologists in China" (台灣社會學界大陸學術訪問團紀要). *Newsletter Chinese Sociological Association (Taiwan)* 12 (1993): 16-18.

Fei, Hsiao-t'ung (費孝通). *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in Yangtze Valley* (江村經濟：中國農民的生活). Hong Kang: Chung Hwa Book Co, 1987[1939].

Hsiao, Michael Hsin-huang (蕭新煌). "The Structural Problems in the Sinicization of Sociology in Taiwan Revisited: A Study of the Opinions of Sociologist in Taiwan" (再論社會學中國化的結構問題：台灣的社會學家如是說). *National Taiwan University Journal of Sociology* 16 (1984): 15-39.

-----. "Sociology in Taiwan: From the Loss of 'Tradition' to the Prospect of Sinicization" (社會學在台灣：從「傳統」的失落到「中國化」的展望). In *The Sinicization of Sociology* (社會學中國化), edited by Yung-Mei Tsai and Michael Hsin-Huang Hsiao (蔡勇美、蕭新煌), pp. 271-310. Taipei: Chuliu Publisher, 1986.

Hsiau, A-chin (蕭阿勤). *Return to Reality, Political and Cultural Change in 1970s Taiwan and the Postwar Generation* (回歸現實，台灣 1970 年代的戰後世代與文化政治變遷). Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica, Taipei. 2008.

Hsu, Cheng-kuang (徐正光). "Ecological Change and Economic Activities in Yen Village" (岩村的生態與經濟變遷：一個農村的工業化與社區生活研究之一). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 42 (1977): 1-39.

-----. "The Formation and Changes of Research Paradigm: A Re-Evaluation of 'Taiwan as Laboratory of Chinese Society and Culture' by Chen Shao Hsing" (一個研究典範的形成與變遷：陳紹馨「中國社會文化研究的實驗室 ─ 台灣」一文的重探). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15 (1991): 29-40.

Hsu, Francis L.K. "Sociological Research in China." *Quarterly Bulletin of Chinese Bibliography* 2nd series 4, no. 1 (1944): 12-26.

Huang, Shun-erh (黃順二). "The Growth and Decline of an Urban Community: A Study of Social Change in Wanhua" (萬華地區的都市發展：萬華地區社會變遷研究之一). *Bulletin of the*

Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica 39 (1975): 1-18.

Huang, Ying-kuei (黃應貴). "The Development of Anthropological Study in Taiwan" (光復後臺灣地區人類學研究的發展). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 55 (1983): 105-146.

Inō, Kanori (伊能嘉矩). *The History of Taiwanese Culture* (臺灣文化誌). Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc, 1994[1928].

King, Ambrose Yeo-chi (金耀基). *From Traditional to Modernised* (從傳統到現代). Taipei, Taiwan: Commercialpress Book, 1966.

Ku, Chung-hwa and Wei-An Chang (顧忠華、張維安). "The Chinese Sociological Association in Taiwan" (在台灣的中國社會學社). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15 (1991): 140-169.

Kuan, Chung-ming and Ruoh-rong Yu (管中閔、于若蓉). "The Outline on the Construction of Database of Taiwan Social Science Citation Index" (台灣社會科學論文索引資料庫的建置概況). *Humanities and Social Science Newsletter Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (2000): 66-70.

Li, Yih-yuan, Kuo-shu Yang and Chung-i Wen (李亦園、楊國樞、文崇一), eds. *The Writings about Modernization and Sinicization* (現代化與中國化論集). Taipei: Laureate Books, 1984.

Li, Yih-yuan and Kuo-shu Yang (李亦園、楊國樞), eds. *The Character of the Chinese: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (中國人的性格：科際綜合性的討論). Taipei: Laureate Books, 1988[1972].

Su, Kuo-hsien (蘇國賢). "Social Production of Sociological Knowledge: Invisible Colleges among Sociologists in Taiwan" (社會學知識的社會生產：台灣社會學者的隱形社群). *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology* 8 (2004): 133-192.

Tsai, Yung-mei and Michael Hsin-huang Hsiao (蔡勇美、蕭新煌), eds. *The Sinicization of Sociology* (社會學中國化). Taipei: Chuliu Publisher, 1986.

Wang, Chaowen (王昭文). *Knowledge Community of Taiwan in the Late Japanese Colonial Period of Taiwan, 1940-45* (日治末期台灣的知識社會, 1940-45). MA Thesis. Research Institute of History, National Tsing Hua University, Hisinchu, Taiwan, 1991.

Wen, Chung-i (文崇一). *Social Change in Suburban Village of Taipei* (西河的社會變遷). Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, 1975a.

-----. "Groups and Power Structure in an Urban Community: A Study of Social Change in Wanhua" (萬華地區的都市發展：萬華

地區社會變遷研究之二). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 39 (1975b): 19-51.

-----. "Editorial Note for the Special Issue of the 60th Anniversary of Chinese Sociological Association" (中國社會學創社 60 週年紀念特刊編輯說明). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15 (1991a): i.

-----. "Sociology in China: Internationalization or Nationalization?" (中國的社會學：國際化或國家化). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15 (1991b): 1-28.

Wu, Chyuan-yuan (吳泉源). "A Summary Report about the Annual Meeting of the Taiwanese Sociological Association in 2004" (2004 年台灣社會學年會暨研討會記實). *Newsletter Taiwanese Sociological Association* 54 (2005): 33-36.

Wu, Mi-cha (吳密察). "The Inō Collection Housed at Taiwan University" (台灣大學藏「伊能文庫」). *University Library Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (1997): 4-23.

Wu, Rwei-Ren. *The Formosan Ideology: Oriental Colonialism and the Rise of Taiwanese Nationalism*, 1895-1945. PhD Dissertation, the University of Chicago, 2003.

Yang, Martin M.C. (楊懋春). "Chinese Sociological Society's Activities in the Last Two Years" (兩年來中國社會學社的活動). *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 4 (1978): 176-177.

-----."My Participation in the Establishment of Sociology Department at NTU" (記台大社會學系之創立). *National Taiwan University Journal of Sociology* 14 (1980): 4-10.

Yeh, Chi-cheng (葉啓政). "On Problems and Direction of the Sinicization of Sociological Research from the Inherent Characters of Sociology in China" (從中國社會學既有性格論社會學研究中國化的方向與問題). In *The Sinicization of Social and Behavioral Science Research in China* (社會及行爲科學研究的中國化), edited by Kuo-shu Yang and Chung-i Wen (楊國樞、文崇一), pp.115-152. Taipei: The Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, 1982.

Zou, Li-Min (鄒理民). *The Development of Sociology in China* (社會學在中國的發展). MA Thesis. Institute of Sociology, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, 1981.