BLOOMSBURY HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH

Changing Higher Education in East Asia

Edited by
Simon Marginson
and Xin Xu

BLOOMSBURY

Changing Higher Education in East Asia

Bloomsbury Higher Education Research

Series Editor: Simon Marginson

The Bloomsbury Higher Education Research series provides the evidence-based academic output of the world's leading research centre on higher education, the ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE) in the UK. The core focus of CGHE's work and of the Bloomsbury Higher Education Research series is higher education, especially the future of higher education in the changing global landscape. The emergence of CGHE reflects the remarkable growth in the role and importance of universities and other higher education institutions, and research and science, across the world. Corresponding to CGHE's projects, monographs in the series will consist of social science research on global, international, national and local aspects of higher education, drawing on methodologies in education, learning theory, sociology, economics, political science and policy studies. Monographs will be prepared so as to maximise worldwide readership and selected on the basis of their relevance to one or more of higher education policy, management, practice and theory. Topics will range from teaching and learning and technologies, to research and research impact in industry, national system design, the public good role of universities, social stratification and equity, institutional governance and management, and the cross-border mobility of people, institutions, programmes, ideas and knowledge. The Bloomsbury Higher Education Research series is at the cutting edge of world research on higher education.

University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; Pedro Teixeira, University of Porto, Portugal; Jussi Valimaa, University of Jyvaskyla, Finland; N. V. Varghese, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India; Marijk van der Wende, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands; Po Yang, Peking University, China; Akiyoshi Yonezawa, Tohoku University, Japan

Also available in the series:

The Governance of British Higher Education: The Impact of Governmental, Financial and Market Pressures, Michael Shattock and Aniko Horvath

Changing Higher Education for a Changing World, edited by Claire Callender, William Locke and Simon Marginson

Changing Higher Education in India, edited by Saumen Chattopadhyay, Simon Marginson and N. V. Varghese

Changing Higher Education in East Asia

Edited by
Simon Marginson and Xin Xu

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, BLOOMSBURY ACADEMIC and the Diana logo are
trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain, 2022
This edition published 2023

Series design by Adriana Brioso

Cover image © Setthasith Wansuksri/EyeEm/Getty Images

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Marginson, Simon, 1951-editor. | Xu, Xin, 1991-editor.
Title: Changing higher education in East Asia / edited by Simon Marginson and Xin Xu.
Description: London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022. |
Series: Bloomsbury higher education research |
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2021035351 (print) | LCCN 2021035352 (ebook) |
ISBN 9781350216242 (hardback) | ISBN 9781350216259 (pdf) |
ISBN 9781350216266 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Education, Higher–East Asia. | Educational change–East Asia. |
Education and globalization–East Asia.
Classification: LCC LA1143.C464 2022 (print) | LCC LA1143 (ebook) | DDC 378.5–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021035351
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021035352

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3502-1624-2
PB: 978-1-3502-1628-0
ePDF: 978-1-3502-1625-9
eBook: 978-1-3502-1626-6

Series: Bloomsbury Higher Education Research

Typeset by Newgen KnowledgeWorks Pvt. Ltd., Chennai, India

Contents

Figures

Tables

Contributors

Thomas Brotherhood received a DPhil from the Department of Education at the University of Oxford, UK, in 2020 and is currently Assistant Professor at Rikkyo University, Japan. His research is concerned with the internationalization of higher education, with a particular emphasis on the roles and experiences of mobile actors such as international students and foreign-born faculty.

Huyen Bui is Postdoctoral Research Fellow in the School of Education at Deakin University, Australia. Her research interests include the internationalization of higher education, international student acculturation, student mobility and international graduate employability.

Arzhia Habibi is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education at the University of Oxford, UK. She uses Mandarin to conduct her research in the Chinese higher education context, with a specific focus on exploring the rooted and local expressions of global and world citizenship education. Her fieldwork is generously funded by the Sino-British Fellowship Trust and Universities' China Committee in London, UK.

Christopher D. Hammond received a DPhil from the Department of Education at the University of Oxford, UK, in 2020 and is currently Associate Professor in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tokyo, Japan. His research focuses on studies of higher education internationalization and regionalism in the context of East Asian international relations.

Futao Huang is Professor in the Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University, Japan. Before he came to Japan in 1999, he taught and conducted research in several Chinese universities. His research interests include internationalization of higher education, the academic profession and higher education in East Asia, focused on China and Japan.

Julie Chia-Yi Lin is reading for her DPhil at the University of Oxford, UK. She has eight years of experience working in higher education and has been an administrator in international affairs at National Taiwan University, Taiwan, and an academic publisher. Her current research focus is on the internationalization of higher education, and university strategy and governance in East Asia.

Nian Cai Liu is Director of the Center for World-Class Universities and Dean of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China. His research interests include world-class universities and research universities, university evaluation and academic ranking, globalization and internationalization of higher education. His recent books include *World-Class Universities: Towards a Global Common Good and Seeking National and Institutional Contributions* and *Matching Visibility and Performance: A Standing Challenge for World-Class Universities*.

Simon Marginson is Professor of Higher Education at the University of Oxford, UK, director of the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education, joint editor-in-chief of the journal *Higher Education*, a lead researcher with the Institute of Education at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia, and a professorial fellow of the University of Melbourne, Australia. His work is mostly focused on international and global aspects of higher education, the global science system, the contributions of higher education and higher education and social equality.

Yunkyung Min completed her PhD project in educational administration and policy studies for her research on the governance policy of national universities in South Korea and is currently Programme Coordinator at the College of Liberal Studies, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.

Ka Ho Mok is Vice President and concurrently Chair Professor of Comparative Policy of Lingnan University, Hong Kong. He researches and publishes on higher education policy and governance, comparative development and policy studies, and social development in contemporary China and East Asia. Ka Ho was named Changjiang Chair Professor of Comparative Education and East Asian Studies by the Ministry of Education in China in 2010.

Olga Mun is working on her doctoral dissertation on internationalization of research at the Department of Education, University of Oxford, UK. She is a co-convenor of the Comparative and International Education Special Interest Group at British Educational Research Association (BERA) and was previously a teaching fellow at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK.

Huong Le Thanh Phan is Research Fellow in the School of Education at Deakin University, Australia. She obtained her PhD in education at Deakin University, Australia, in 2020. Her research interests include language and cultural issues, graduate employability and international education with a specialisation in the internationalization of the curriculum.

Lin Tian is Assistant Professor in the Research Institute of Education Science at Hunan University, China. Her research interests include the functions of

world-class universities, and the globalization and internationalization of higher education.

Ly Thi Tran is Professor in the School of Education at Deakin University, Australia, and an Australian Research Council Future Fellow. Her research focuses on internationalization of education, international students, international graduate employability, learning abroad and Vietnamese higher education.

Xin Xu is Research Fellow in the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education in the Department of Education at the University of Oxford, UK. Her research focuses on the academic research, internationalization and globalization of higher education, and Chinese higher education.

Lili Yang received a DPhil from the Department of Education at the University of Oxford, UK, in 2021. Her postdoctoral work in the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education is focused on higher education and the public good. In her doctoral thesis, she explored the similarities and differences between notions of 'public' in Sinic and liberal Anglo-American traditions, and the implications for higher education.

Series Editor's Foreword

Changing Higher Education in East Asia is the fourth book to be published in the Bloomsbury Higher Education Research book series. This series brings to the public, government and universities across the world the new ideas and research evidence being generated by researchers from the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education.[1] The Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE), a partnership of researchers from ten UK and international universities, is the world's largest concentration of expertise in relation to higher education and its social contributions. The core focus of CGHE's work, and of the Bloomsbury Higher Education Research Series, is higher education, especially the future of higher education in the changing global landscape.

Each year this mega-topic of 'higher education' seems to take on greater importance for governments, business, civil organizations, students, families and the public at large. In higher education much is at stake. The role and impact of the sector is growing everywhere. More than 220 million students enrol at tertiary level across the world, four-fifths of them in degree programmes. Almost 40 per cent of school leavers now enter some kind of tertiary education each year, though resources and quality vary significantly. In North America and Europe, this ratio rises to four young people in every five. Universities and colleges are seen as the primary medium for personal opportunity, social mobility and the development of whole communities. About 2.5 million new science papers are published worldwide each year, and the role of research in industry and government continues to expand everywhere.

In short, there is much at stake in higher education. It has become central to social, economic and political life. One reason is that even while serving local society and national policy, the higher education and research sectors are especially globalized in character. Each year 6 million students change countries in order to enrol in their chosen study programme, and more than a quarter of

[1] The initials ESRC/OFSRE stand for the Economic and Social Research Council/Office for Students and Research England. Part of the ESRC funding that supports the Centre for Global Higher Education's research work was sourced from the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the ancestor body to the OFS and RE.

all published research papers involve joint authorship across national borders. In some countries, fee-based international education is a major source of export revenues, while this results in some other countries losing talent in net terms each year. Routine cross-border movements of students, academics and researchers, knowledge, information and money help to shape not only nations but the international order itself.

At the same time, the global higher education landscape is changing with compelling speed, reflecting larger economic, political and cultural shifts in the geostrategic setting. Though research universities in the United States (especially) and UK remain strong in comparative terms, the worldwide map of power in higher education is becoming more plural. A larger range of higher education practices, including models of teaching/learning, delivery, institutional organization and system, will shape higher education in future. Anglo-American (and Western) norms and models will be less dominant, and will themselves evolve. Rising universities and emerging science systems in East Asia and Singapore are already reshaping the flow of knowledge and higher education. Latin America, Southeast Asia, India, Central Asia and the Arab nations have a growing global importance. The trajectories of education and research in Sub-Saharan Africa are crucial to state-building and community development.

All of this has led to a more intensive focus on how higher education systems and institutions function and their value, performance, effectiveness, openness and sustainability. This in turn has made research on higher education more significant – both because it provides us with insights into one important facet of the human condition and because it informs evidenced-based government policies and professional practices.

CGHE opened in late 2015 and is currently funded until October 2023. The centre investigates higher education using a range of social science disciplines, including economics, sociology, political science and policy studies, psychology and anthropology, and it uses a portfolio of quantitative, qualitative and synthetic-historical research techniques. It currently maintains ten research projects, variously of between eighteen months and eight years' duration, as well as smaller projects, and involves about forty active affiliated individual researchers. Over its eight-year span, it is financed by about £10 million in funding from the UK Economic and Social Research Council, partner universities and other sources. Its UK researchers are drawn from the Universities of Oxford, Lancaster, Surrey, Bath and University College London (UCL). The headquarters of the centre are located at Oxford, and there are large concentrations of researchers

at both Oxford and UCL. The current affiliated international researchers are from Hiroshima University in Japan, Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China, Lingnan University in Hong Kong, Cape Town University in South Africa, Virginia Tech in the United States and Technological University Dublin. CGHE also collaborates with researchers from many other universities across the world through seminars, conferences and exchange of papers. It runs an active programme of global webinars.

The centre has a full agenda. The unprecedented growth of mass higher education, the striving for excellence and innovation in the research university sector, as well as the changing global landscape pose many researchable problems for governments, societies and higher education institutions themselves. Some of these questions already figure in CGHE research projects. For example: What are the formative effects on societies and economies of the now much wider distribution of advanced levels of learning? How does it change individual graduates as people – and what does it mean when half or more of the workforce is higher educated and much more mobile, and when confident human agency has become widely distributed across civil and political society in nations with little state tradition, or where the main experience has been colonial or authoritarian rule? What does it mean when many more people are becoming steeped in the sciences, many others understand the world through the lenses of the social sciences or humanities while a third group is engaged in neither? What happens to those parts of the population left outside the formative effects of higher education? What is the larger public role and contribution of higher education, as distinct from the private benefits for and private effects on individual graduates? What does it mean when large and growing higher education institutions have become the major employers in many locations and help to sustain community and cultural life, almost like branches of local government while also being linked to global cities across the world? And what is the contribution of higher education, beyond helping to form the attributes of individual graduates, to the development of the emerging global society?

Likewise, the many practical problems associated with building higher education and science take on greater importance. How can scarce public budgets provide for the public role of higher education institutions, for a socially equitable system of individual access and for research excellence, all at the same time? What is the role for and limits of family financing and tuition loans systems? What is the potential contribution of private institutions, including for-profit colleges? In national systems, what is the best balance

between research-intensive and primarily teaching institutions, and between academic and vocational education? What are the potentials for technological delivery in extending access? What is happening in graduate labour markets, where returns to degrees are becoming more dispersed between families with differing levels of income, and graduates from different kinds of universities and different fields of study? Do larger education systems provide better for social mobility and income equality? How does the internationalization of universities contribute to national policy and local societies? Does mobile international education expand opportunity or further stratify societies? What are the implications of populist tensions between national and global goals – as manifest, for example, in the tensions over Brexit in the UK and the politics of the Trump era in the United States – for higher education and research? And always, what can national systems of higher education and science learn from each other, and how can they build stronger common ground?

In tackling these research challenges and bringing the research to all, we are very grateful to have the opportunity to work with such a high-quality publisher as Bloomsbury. In the book series, monographs are selected on the basis of their relevance to one or more themes of higher education policy, management, practice and theory. Topics range from teaching and learning and technologies to research and its organization; the design parameters of national higher education systems; the public good role of higher education; social stratification and equity; institutional governance and management; and the cross-border mobility of people, programmes and ideas. Much of CGHE's work is global and comparative in scale, drawing lessons from higher education in many different countries, and the centre's cross-country and multi-project structure allows it to tap into the more plural higher education and research landscape that has emerged. The book series draws on authors from across the world and is prepared for relevance across the world.

CGHE places special emphasis on the relevance of its research, on communicating its findings and on maximizing the usefulness and impacts of those findings in higher education policy and practice. It has a relatively high public profile for an academic research centre and reaches out to engage higher education stakeholders, national and international organizations, policy-makers, regulators and the broader public in the UK and across the world. These objectives are also central to the book series. Recognizing that the translation from research outputs to high-quality scholarly monographs is not always straightforward – while achieving impact in both academic

and policy/practice circles is crucial – monographs in the book series are scrutinized critically before publication, for readability as well as quality. Texts are carefully written and edited to ensure that they have achieved the right combination of, on one hand, intellectual depth and originality and, on the other, full accessibility for public, higher education and policy circles across the world.

Simon Marginson
Professor of Higher Education, University of Oxford
Director, ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education.

Preface and Acknowledgements

It is exciting to be working on higher education and knowledge in East Asia at this time because rapid developments are taking place, agency and capability are advancing and much is being achieved in the different countries. East Asian systems are also becoming more proactive at the global level. We sense it is early days yet in the formation of a more plural higher education world, where many cultural strands will mingle on the basis of equality of respect in *he er bu tong* (和而不同, meaning 'harmony without uniformity'). Nevertheless, if that happy outcome is to be achieved, the continuing local, national and global evolution of higher education in East Asia will be central to the process – in conjunction with the development of higher education, science and dialogic scholarship throughout the world.

In developing a more plural and constructive global conversation about higher education and knowledge, there are formidable obstacles to overcome. First, we are all constrained by the fact that higher education and science at the global level are still largely practiced as a Euro-American English-only monoculture, something we seek to problematize and challenge with this book, and in all our work. Second, there is the geopolitical dimension. *Changing Higher Education in East Asia* was prepared in and around the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education and the Department of Education at Oxford University where the spirit of East/West engagement is mutually humanist, positive and intellectually stimulating. Yet the book was also prepared in 2020–1, at a time of sharply worsening relations between the United States and its closer allies, on one hand, and China, on the other. Signs of a new cold war were beginning to impact the UK where we are based. The determination of the US government to 'contain' China so as to maintain American global primacy as an end in itself, as if the United States has all the answers to humanity's problems and Chinese civilization has little to contribute, and the active pressures to decouple China and the United States in science and technology, including the stigmatizing of Chinese scholars and students in the West as 'spies' and 'dupes', are unlikely to be realized as intended. But these moves could do formidable damage to global cooperation and make mutual learning and global problem-solving much more difficult to achieve. *Changing Higher Education in East Asia* has been prepared in

the conviction that no single culture, civilization or country has all of the answers and the world does not need a single hegemon. Both Chinese civilization (with its deep influence and various manifestations across East Asia) and Euro-American civilization have profound strengths. Each provides certain things that the other lacks. Other traditions also have vital contributions to make. Global West, East, North and South (terms all too simplistic to capture the complexity) have much to learn from each other. Unless that process of engaged and mutual learning takes place in higher education and science, it will not take place anywhere, and if it does not take place, there will be no viable global solutions to the existential global problems that we all face. Deep global cooperation: simple and obvious in conception, yet we inch towards it so very slowly.

In preparing this book, we have benefited from the generous and speedy responses of our authors throughout the process and have been enriched by their original insights and fine writing. Critical feedback and revisions have significantly improved the book. We thank them all most sincerely. We thank Ly Tran, Soyoung Lee and Ikuya Aizawa for their help with the information about the characters opening each part of this volume. We are grateful for the reviewers' helpful feedback. We also thank each other for the happy and enriching experience of working together on this book and on the concurrent teaching and scholarly writing. The planning, administration, editing and writing of Chapter 1 were shared equally. The order of the authors' names reflects the alphabetical convention used in books and papers related to the work of the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education.

At Bloomsbury, we benefited from the wise guidance of academic editor Alison Baker and the help of Evangeline Stanford. We also appreciated the work of production editor Zeba Talkhani and designer Charlotte James.

Abbreviations

A&HCI	Arts and Humanities Citation Index
AEARU	Association of East Asian Research Universities
AIMS	ASEAN International Mobility for Students
AIT	Asian Institute of Technology (Thailand)
ARWU	Academic Ranking of World Universities
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ATUP	Aim for the Top University Program
BRI	BRI Belt and Road Initiative
CAMPUS Asia	Collective Action for the Mobility Program of University Students in Asia
CCIP	Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Paris
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
Covid-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CSSCI	Chinese Social Sciences Citation Index
CSTI	Council for Science, Technology and Innovation (Japan)
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party
ESI	Essential Science Indicators
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
FICHET	Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education of Taiwan
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GBA	Greater Bay Area
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
JSPS	Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
KAIST	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology
KEDI	Korean Educational Development Institute
KMT	Kuomintang
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Japan)
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology

MOE	Ministry of Education
MOET	Ministry of Education and Training
NIAD-QE	National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education
NRF	National Research Foundation (Korea)
NSB	National Science Board (United States)
NSFC	National Natural Science Foundation of China
NSR	New Silk Road
NTD	New Taiwan Dollar
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OFSRE	Office for Students Research England
OKAS	Oxford Korean Academic Society
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
PRC	People's Republic of China
QS	Quacquarelli Symonds
RCEP	Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership
REF	Research Excellence Framework
RMIT	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
RU	Research University
SAR	Special Administrative Region
SCI	Science Citation Index
SPROUT	Sustained Progress and Rise of Universities in Taiwan
SSCI	Social Sciences Citation Index
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
TCS	Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat
THE	Times Higher Education
TPP	Trans-Pacific Partnership
UASR	University Alliance of the Silk Road
UCL	University College London
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization
UNNC	University of Nottingham Ningbo China
VND	Vietnamese Dong
WCU	World-Class University
WoS	Web of Science
WTO	World Trade Organization

8

Internationalization of Higher Education in Taiwan

Julie Chia-Yi Lin

Introduction

Internationalization of higher education has caused significant changes to the Taiwanese higher education system, from the specific talents that it cultivates to the core concept of higher education. To some, internationalization is a means to attain global recognition and to enhance national competitiveness in East Asia (Lo and Hou 2020; Chan and Lo 2008; Shin and Harman 2009; Mok and Yu 2013). States have engaged in a series of construction projects designed to enhance the international competitiveness of their higher education sectors. This happened in Taiwanese higher education in the early 2000s when national higher education funding projects were launched with a 'heavy emphasis on internationalisation' (Song and Tai 2007: 324). Governmental funding policies aimed at building internationalization soon followed, demonstrating Taiwan's enthusiasm to take a larger, more active role in an interconnected world.

There is a strong interrelation between sociopolitical changes and higher education reforms in Taiwan, as noted by Mok (2002) and Lin and Yang (2019). At times, these changes seem to be the primary driving factor behind the internationalization process (Law 1996; Weng 1999; Mok 2002). Papers discussing the development of internationalization in Taiwan have largely focused on governmental policies and programmes. While these are crucial to understanding internationalization in Taiwan, this near exclusive focus on the role that government has played excludes other major drivers of the process, resulting in an incomplete understanding of how Taiwan has positioned its higher education systems towards the goal of deeper international connections and competitiveness. Marginson and Rhoades (2002) argued that the literature on

internationalization has not 'adequately address[ed] the local dimension' (286). Their 'glonacal agency heuristic' proposed that in order to fully understand all perspectives in the internationalization of higher education, one must consider the significance of global, national and, of course, local dimensions. Too few studies of internationalization in Taiwan have presented the institutional – that is, local – perspective on internationalization.

There were rapid and unexpected global changes in 2020. It is apparent in the interviews reported in this chapter that responses to the Covid-19 pandemic have had a large impact on Taiwanese institutions' capacity for internationalization. Restrictions on international travel and new measures limiting campus entry both created barriers to international participation and recruitment. Despite this, Taiwanese universities have developed a number of means to counteract the stifling effect of the virus and the various national responses to it. Innovations have included opening up Taiwanese university facilities to students from foreign universities, setting up virtual courses for incoming exchange students who are unable to travel to Taiwan and ensuring that students who are unable to re-enter their home countries have access to the same student activities available to Taiwanese students. These changes, each of which was made through individual institutional policy rather than through government decree, have had a net positive effect on Taiwan's overall ability to internationalize.

This chapter examines recent higher education internationalization developments in Taiwan and presents an array of Taiwanese universities' perspectives on their individual strategies in order to supplement the available research done from national policy and geopolitical angles. It also notes how discussions on the 'national identity' in Taiwan are affecting higher education. Interviews were conducted with deans, heads, and vice presidents of international affairs from five different Taiwanese universities. Interviewees explained their university's internationalization strategies, and their responses to the Covid-19 crisis, and considered the impact of the sociopolitical climate regarding national identity.

The Changing Environment of Internationalization

Developments in Higher Education Policy

As in other East Asian states, in the past two decades the internationalization of higher education in Taiwan was accelerated by government policies. It was also

shaped within the larger evolution of the higher education system, which was again government led.

Taiwan's higher education system experienced substantial changes in the past half century. After the adoption of democratic governance in the 1990s, Taiwan moved from the fully government-controlled system of the 1980s to the current democratic system. The best documented reforms in Taiwanese education occurred during the 1990s, with a series of changes led by the Ministry of Education (MOE). This is often referred to as 'The Democratisation' (Law 2002). From 1993 on, the inclusion of more Taiwan-based content in textbooks brought a clear shift from the early Kuomintang (KMT) government era where the 'Republic of China identity' was the only perspective allowed in schools. In 1995, the University Law was amended and higher education institutes were granted more autonomy including the power to elect their own leaders. The MOE also reduced its funding of national universities to 80 per cent, asking higher education institutions to fund the remaining 20 per cent. This was widely considered to be an advanced move, especially among Asian governments which have a reputation for keeping strict controls over their schools. This movement, combined with the inclusion of local languages in the curriculum, was described by some as 'Taiwanization', '[a] democratic education movement [that] creates "space" for local identities, issues, and characteristics that ha[ve] been suppressed in the past' (Law 2002: 72). However, Mok argues that these changes led Taiwan to a 'state supervision model' (2002: 151) without dispensing with all state-led governance. The elected university or college presidents still required approval from the MOE before their appointment was formalized. Furthermore, the funding reduction was not aimed to lessen university dependence on the MOE, but was related more to fostering marketization.

Internationalization first became known to the broader Taiwanese society in the mid-2000s when the government launched the Aim for the Top University Program (ATUP) project in 2006. The project and its funding caught the public's attention and showed the government's determination to internationalize Taiwan's higher education. ATUP focused on two goals: advancing Taiwanese universities into the World University Ranking top 100, and founding research centres in crucial fields. ATUP ended in 2016, having distributed a total of USD1.6 billion to twelve universities and thirty-four research centres.

The ranking-centred goal of ATUP received wide criticism from the public, the media and the academic world. Besides the possibility that the funding's focus on ranking would further enlarge the stratification between leading comprehensive

universities and smaller, private universities, people were also concerned that the vanity involved in chasing ranking/status improvement could become obstacles to higher education's ability to explore more important improvements, such as teaching quality and admissions equity. The government was criticized for 'committing too many public resources on international research excellence and for caring too little about local development' (Yang 2019: 17). Scholars also raised concerns that the pursuit of world university rankings would promote elitism (Hou et al. 2020: 9), and that because the rankings are 'often funded by Western standards and systems' (Shreeve 2020: 922), measures to pursue them might not fit Taiwan's needs.

At the end of the ATUP programme period, the MOE reported that seven universities had been included in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) top 500 universities, and eleven of the twelve funded universities were included in the QS World University Ranking's top 500 in 2015, including National Taiwan University which was ranked seventy. The MOE therefore concluded that the project had shown achievement (MOE n.d.). Fu, Baker and Zhang (2020) found that between 2006 and 2010, non-funded institutions saw increases in their publications, showing that the whole system experienced improvement, and growth was not limited to funded institutions alone.

When the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) took office in 2017, ATUP was replaced by a new national higher education project. The Tsai administration launched an all-inclusive project in 2018 called Sustained Progress and Rise of Universities in Taiwan, also known as the Higher Education Sprout Project or SPROUT. Its main objectives were to 'enhance the quality of universities and encourag[e] its multifaceted development' and to 'elevate international competitiveness and to build leading research centers' (MOE 2019). Endowed with $86.85 billion dollars (NTD) over four years, SPROUT continues to fund research centres, but has broadened its scope for improving university quality.

SPROUT defines university quality in four sections: (1) university features, (2) social responsibility, (3) teaching, and (4) transparency. University social responsibility is a new criterion in the development of higher education in Taiwan. Internationalization is listed under university features. Teaching is an individual section, broadening the emphasis in higher education institutional development from research alone. Transparency, or 'making resources more public' (MOE 2019), focuses on self-evaluation, publication and information sharing, as well as admission for less-advantaged students. After the first selection cycle, seventy-five universities, eighty-five universities of technology and junior colleges, and sixty-five research centres received SPROUT funding,

and four comprehensive universities were granted whole-school programme funding.

In the transition from ATUP to SPROUT, policies for development grew more detailed with finer divisions for budget items. One of the main criticisms of ATUP had been its quantity-led focus. When higher education is simplified down to numerical indicators on world university rankings and citation indices, there is a risk of creating surface growth with no actual cultivation of students, researchers or the institution itself. SPROUT set out to build real-world connections by stressing spheres of university social responsibility and strengthening university-industry cooperation. With an emphasis on teaching, and a core mission to 'secure students' equal right to education' (MOE 2019), it demonstrated a stronger concentration on talent cultivation at home.

By addressing local needs, SPROUT attempts to fill the gap created by global competition motives that ignore the social dimension. Having moved from funding a few comprehensive, research-intensive universities, to evaluating universities, universities of technology and junior colleges within one programme, the new SPROUT approach has been described as 'egalitarianism' (Hou et al. 2020). Moving away from the ranking mindset can also be read as steering away from elitism in higher education (Lo and Hou 2020). The introduction of university social responsibility has also funded many who have deep engagement with their local communities, further combining the higher education sector with broader society. Lo and Hou (2020) pointed out that the policy shift aims to 'enhance the publicness of higher education' (503) and with the number of selected universities expanding from 12 to 158, 'all types of higher education providers are eligible for the government funding grants' (Hou et al. 2020: 6). Compared to ATUP's heavy emphasis on world rankings, SPROUT applied strategic planning 'to stop the move towards homogeneity and promote diversity' (Lo and Hou 2020: 500). It has shifted towards encouraging diversified development and is intended to cultivate uniqueness in higher education institutions. In the past, research from science, technology, engineering and medical science (STEM) fields received more financial support, leading to criticism that the policy directs all universities towards becoming research-intensive, comprehensive institutions (Hsueh 2018). SPROUT is aimed differently, and supports exploration and the development of each university's own specialties. For example, in an interview, an officer from the MOE encouraged private universities and colleges to establish research centres for social sciences or humanities (The Central News Agency 2018).

Despite these changes, there are concerns about the new national projects among both the public and scholars. President Tang from Chinese Medical University called for the list of evaluation committee members to be published (Wu 2020). However, no information regarding committee members, the quantitative and qualitative evaluation indicators, or the comparisons made between institutions was released. Announced information included only the funding distributed and the names of the schools who received it. Some have also noticed a re-emergence of government control. To better supervise universities, the government often increases quantitative and qualitative key performance indicators for projects, and it publishes increasingly detailed constraints and budgetary requirements (Fu and Chin 2020: 3). These more detailed budgetary items which gave the government greater capacity to monitor higher education institutions raised a heated discussion about academic autonomy. In 2018, the MOE rejected the appointment of a new president of National Taiwan University. The government-supervision model nominated by Mok in 2002 has become quite relevant in this new government-academic context.

Societal and Identity Changes, and Their Influence on Higher Education

The overall policy shift from ATUP to SPROUT reflects intensified local focus and can help Taiwanese identity building. This reflects broader changes in Taiwanese society.

From the democratization of the 1990s to internationalization projects of the 2000s, national identity has remained a core value for Taiwanese higher education. Different policy foci have been introduced and shifted to make room for the nation's developing understanding of itself. It is useful to look deeper into the role of national identity in higher education internationalization, how it is defined and how it has influenced internationalization in Taiwan. This has not been sufficiently discussed.

The discussion surrounding national identity often relates back to the definition of a 'nation' or 'nationalism'. For some, a nation is formed by ancestral ties, and the central feature of national identity should be ethnicity or common ancestry. Connor (1994) described a nation as a self-aware ethnic group (see also Dahbour 2002: 19). Anderson (1983) argued differently. While noting that there are some unchangeable factors including ethnicity, he asserts that the decisive elements defining a nation lean toward a mutually recognized consensus or comradeship among a group of people. He famously referred to a nation as an

'imagined community' (1983) and stressed the socially constructed aspect that it carries.

In Taiwan, identity has been a complex issue without one absolute definition. Given the number of nations that have ruled over it, from the Netherlands, to the Qing Dynasty, to Japan, until the current Republic of China, different combinations of cultural identities coexist on the island. The lack of clear identity persists today. Law (2002) noted the struggle:

> 'Taiwan has suffered from a dual identity crisis. At home, Taiwanese people have lacked consensus on their 'national' identity since the KMT's assumption of power. This is reflected by ethnic conflicts over places of origin (Taiwan or the Chinese mainland) and struggles for Taiwan's independence from, or unification with the Chinese mainland'. (Law 2002: 65)

Wu's (1996) research asked interviewees about their support for Taiwanese independence and about reunion with China. He grouped interviewees into three categories: Chinese nationalists, those who supported union with China and denied Taiwanese independence; Taiwanese nationalists, those who supported independence and denied union with China; and practicalists who supported both. He found that Taiwanese nationalists were not firm supporters of nationalism, but showed more support for general separatism and self-determination. Wu interpreted this as meaning that their values were not centred on the nation, but on liberty. Identity continued to shift in the 1990s when Taiwan's first presidential election was held. Society started to emphasize commonalities among the Taiwanese people: 'Taiwan[ese] government no longer uses people's differences in the place of origin and time of settlement in Taiwan to maintain the domination of the mainlanders over native Taiwanese' (Law 2002: 75).

The Election Study Center of National Chengchi University has conducted yearly surveys on Chinese/Taiwanese identity recognition since 1992. In 2020, support for Taiwanese identity reached a record high of 67 per cent, while those who identify themselves as both Chinese and Taiwanese dropped to 27.5 per cent. Taiwanese identity supporters first surpassed those who support both identities in 2008. The gap between the two groups widened at an accelerated pace from 2018 through 2020 (Election Study Center, National Chengchi University 2020). Muyard noted that 'a new Taiwanese national identity defined by civic nationalism and multiculturalism has emerged in the past two decades' (2018: 55). Sullivan and Lee (2018) claimed that 'although the 2016 campaigns were fought predominantly on economic issues, national identity remain[ed]

the core issue and the major cleavage in Taiwanese politics' (5). This is generally recognized as being true for the Tsai government's second election in 2020.

Education is often used as a tool for government to cultivate belief or consensus in the public (Vikers 2011 cited in Hammond 2016: 555). Hammond looked closer and captured how national identity is applied in higher education. He pointed out that 'the dual policy agendas for national identity formation and HE [higher education] internationalization appear to go hand in hand' (2016: 556) when viewed from an economic standpoint. Law (1996) further narrowed the scope down, claiming that Taiwan sees 'sociopolitical tasks of higher education to be as important as economic considerations' (390).

It is also important to include cultural and philosophical factors in the discussion since Confucian values have deeply influenced Taiwanese society and have a profound effect on the Taiwanese identity (Lin and Yang 2019). In Lin and Yang's research, many interviewees noted that Confucian values were the foundation of their institutions. Highly influential though it is, the researchers also noticed that Confucianism was more of a 'cultural heritage' that remained 'as the way of life' (152) and not an identity-forging tool. Lin and Yang (2019) noted that there has been a recent de-Sinicization trend in Taiwanese higher education, where the '"new" Taiwanese cultural identity' (152) was being fostered and where Chinese cultural factors were downplayed due to the political tension with the People's Republic of China. However, Confucianism is still the main value-set in the education sector. This further demonstrates that Chinese cultural factors do not equal Confucian values in Taiwanese society.

In 2019, a protest broke out in Hong Kong against the government's attempt to amend their Extradition Law. Many in Hong Kong opposed the amendment, concerned that it 'may reduce the city's freedom and autonomy' (Lo 2020). Social movements have strengthened the changing values and identities of both the people in Hong Kong and Taiwanese citizens, bringing the two societies closer together in mutual protest 'against erosion of their democratic rights' (Lai 2020: 7). Members of Taiwan's higher education sector have evidenced their values through their responses to the Hong Kong protests. In November of 2019, universities in Hong Kong closed as a result of the ongoing civil unrest. Seeing this, seven Taiwanese universities offered special visiting student programmes allowing all students attending Hong Kong universities to study in Taiwan instead. The MOE later established a special programme to facilitate students in Hong Kong to transfer into Taiwanese universities for degree programmes. 'The internal consensus was that politics is separated from the rights to education' stated a Taiwanese scholar (Tian 2019). By this bottom-up response, Taiwan's

higher education institutions demonstrated their determination to defend the rights to, and the value of, education, a central idea in Confucian thought and a value that transcends political disputes.

Institutional Strategy

Another missing core issue is institutional strategy. Given both executive power and strategy, Taiwan's internationalization of higher education can be more focused and competitive. Without strategy, project execution is scattered and lacks focus (Chiang 2008: 68). The MOE encouraged a more strategic approach and urged schools to establish methods beginning in 2015 (Lee and Fu 2017: 1), but the question remains as to whether or not Taiwanese higher education operates with a fully developed strategic framework at the local level.

Mintzberg (1987) formulated the 5Ps concept in a discussion of strategic theory: Strategy as Plan, Ploy, Pattern, Position and Perspective (11). Plan, Pattern and Position apply better in the higher education context than the other two. Plan is a 'consciously intended course of action' (12); Pattern is an action that repeats, whether intended or not, though both can entail the performance of a strategy; Position is a way to connect the organization to the environment, acting as 'a mediating force' (15). Chiang (2008) also considered strategy to be a map for action (68). Han and Zhong (2015) combined two popular methods for examining university strategy: Balanced Scorecard and Strategy Map Approach, and analysed the top 100 universities in the Times Higher ranking. Their research categorized the Strategy Maps from universities into five categories: Comprehensive, Core, Technical, Service and Special. Based on the premise that higher education institutions are 'non-profit and intelligence-based organisation[s]' (942) and have different priorities than businesses, Han and Zhong concluded that the Strategy Map approach 'can be a tool for improving university management' (949) but had some problems when used for higher education institutions, such as misuse of terms or a full method adoption without differentiation from business institutions.

Since the 2000s, academic publications have seen increased coverage of university strategy according to the Scopus index. In 2015, at least fifteen institutions in the top 100 universities as ranked by the Times Higher Education World University Ranking in 2013–14 have comprehensive Strategy Maps (Han and Zhong 2015). However, strategy has not been a popular topic in Taiwanese literature. Most literature discussing internationalization in East Asia concentrates on national projects and governmental policies, given that there are

'close alignments in Asia between universities' and governmental goals' (Lin and Yang 2019). Chiang (2008) comments that there are only policies, proclamations and activities of internationalization of higher education in Taiwan. Strategy has not been formed (47).

Adopting a strategic internationalization approach can help universities build 'an effective conceptual process … and maximiz[e] its efficacy and effectiveness to help the university achieve better quality and compete in the global market for favorable standings' (Han and Zhong 2015: 941). With the MOE encouraged the establishment of institutional research offices back in 2015, Hu (2017) also noted that there was an increasing number of research offices being established within higher education institutions that were reporting directly to the president or vice president.

Methodology

To capture the changes in Taiwanese higher education, including internationalization, it is necessary to address policies, laws and state-wide projects. Policy documents, governmental website announcements, news and academic papers all figure in the present study.

In addition, interviews bring in local-level voices from higher education institutions. The study includes five administrative heads of international affairs from different universities – they were drawn from national universities, private universities as well as universities of technology. The national universities were chosen from those which received grants from both ATUP and SPROUT, with a concern for geographical diversity. Only one university of technology and six private universities were included in ATUP, and the funding was aimed at only one research centre in the universities. The selection standard for universities of technology and private universities was different. Invitations were sent out to those with a stronger focus on internationalization, and the first to respond to the invitation was included in the case study.

In sum, three of the universities selected, Universities A, B and C, all are national universities. All three have received funding through both ATUP and SPROUT to encourage internationalization. They are all research-focused, comprehensive universities. University D is a small-scale private university and has a Catholic origin, with internationalization being listed as one of its core

developments. University E is a national university of technology with a focus on industrial education.

Administration staff also joined the interview at University B and E, while the head of international office was the only interviewee at Universities A, C and D. Out of the total eight interviewees, five were female and three were male. Out of the five heads of international affairs, three had held their position for a year or less, but all were scholars who had been actively promoting internationalization on campus for a considerable amount of time beforehand. The interviews lasted from thirty to sixty minutes.

The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format. Questions were mostly centred on two topics: institutional strategy towards internationalization, and whether the growing attention in society towards national identity has influenced higher education institutions and their internationalization processes. The five interviews were conducted between July 2020 and September 2020. In order to understand the universities' internationalization strategies, interviewees were asked three questions derived from Mintzberg's 1987 discussion on the definition of strategy. The first question was designed to ascertain the 'Plan' aspect of strategy, a simple, straightforward question asking them to describe their university's internationalization strategy. Second, the interviewees were asked to provide 'keywords' to describe their institution's strategy, in order to bring out 'Purpose'. The third question asked interviewees what they felt was unique about their institution's experience of internationalization, in order to understand the 'Position' aspect. Following the strategy-related questions, representatives from the institutions were asked about their Covid-19 countermeasures, and about how and responses to it had affected higher education, in general in relation to internationalization and specifically in relation to international cooperation. Lastly, interviewees were asked about the relationship between internationalization of higher education and national identity, and whether the sociopolitical changes since 2019 had impacted on this topic.

Findings

Institutional Strategy

When asked about their internationalization strategy, most interviewees provided answers related to the substantial inter-institutional cooperation or programmes they have been implementing. Their answers were similar. They all addressed

strategy according to the definition of 'Pattern': 'consistency in behaviour, whether intended or not' (Mintzberg 1987: 13). University A mentioned that internationalization strategy is always a part of, and operates in order to support, institutional development goals. Of the five schools, only University C had a strategy office within the university management structure. That office leans towards the role of organizer for institutional development, rather than being an internationalization-focused independent entity. University C was also the only university surveyed whose Office of International Affairs website listed 'core values' and used them as a guideline to direct future development so as to mitigate influence from changes in leadership.

None of the interviewees mentioned a more value-based approach, such as 'Perspective' or 'Positioning'. Most sounded as if their current strategy was derived from past actions, matching what Mintzberg called 'Pattern produced Perspective' where the repetition of a series of actions creates an unintended pattern that then forms institutional perspective.

Universities A, B and C all mentioned that the earlier internationalization development during ATUP focused too much on quantifiable elements ('numbers'). Each claimed that though their institution was able to grow bilateral agreements – the number of students sent abroad or the number of foreign students on campus – the actual impact that these 'improved scores' represented was limited. All had turned to valuing the quality of internationalization and investing more into substantial cooperation programmes rather than into easily quantified memorandums of understanding. Universities B, C and E elaborated on detailed double/joint degree programmes. University A provided an example where they co-researched disaster prevention with scholars from more than three countries. This research then led to engineering projects as well as to a co-founded course module.

Students seem to be at the centre of internationalization. All five universities brought up students in their interviews, yet intriguingly their foci were vastly different. University A discussed how they provided local students with administrative internships, allowing them to practice the skills they had learnt, while at the same time facilitating the internationalization of the institution. University B focused on the quality of life and rights of foreign students, but also viewed their alumni as a crucial link in internationalization cooperation. University C emphasized recruitment and how to acquaint foreign students with the culture and campus, maximizing their experience in Taiwan as well as promoting learning, research and potential employment. University D enhanced at-home internationalization. While providing the students with chances for

overseas exchange and internships, they also worked on infrastructure and projects on campus to deepen interactions between the local students and exchange students. University E ran many problem-based learning projects and brought students from country to country, studying and prototyping in different labs with in-depth involvement from business enterprises. Naturally, many student activities were consistent from school to school, but the answers indicated differentiation related to aims.

The same finding of broader similarities with specific differences continued into the way the universities described their internationalization goals. Most cited their past activities in support of a general mission statement rather than laying out specific future goals. University A, the one university that had a goal-oriented definition of internationalization, called their internationalization mission 'solving global problems' with partners. University B stated that no one could ultimately know what constituted internationalization, but by implementing internationalization cooperation, projects and programmes, and adjusting them as needed, they have achieved good results. University D had not yet thought about it, but repeating their student-focus, stated that their university would be a platform for interaction and communication between Taiwan and the rest of the world. University E, with its strong industrial connections, stated out that cultivating students, skills and bringing them together with international industry was one of their goals. All of the national universities (A, B and C) stressed their research-intensive status in the internationalization process; but in reference to their past actions, they do not have a definitional understanding of internationalization.

Common difficulties also emerged. Universities C, D and E all found it difficult to support their foreign students, given the strict regulation of post-graduation work visas. Universities C and E pointed out that, with protectionism-based policies, it was hard to recruit foreign talents. Education and work opportunities were not linked up. University D raised the issue of difficulty in launching new degree-granting courses online and recruiting non-degree students who wish to learn Mandarin.

Cross-office communication was a shared difficulty. Universities A, D and E all mentioned cases where anything related to English was seen as a task only the Office of International Affairs should handle. The lack of team support made it difficult to promote internationalization. Much time was wasted on internal negotiations.

Administrators played an interesting though hidden role in internationalization. All five universities mentioned the participation of international administrators during their interview. University A used

'empowerment' as a keyword specifically in reference to empowering administrators and stressed the importance of open communication as well as 'decision support' from the experienced administrators. When empowered, these people would proactively propose better, more on-ground measures in projects. University B noted that policy implementers (i.e. administrators) were every bit as important as leaders, stressing that without capable team members, a lot of the policies would not be realized as speedily. Universities C, D and E agreed that the key to sustainability comes from the administrators. In Taiwan, administrative offices are managed by appointed scholars from different backgrounds, but the history and experience of these offices are often passed down through the administrative staff. Out of the five interviews, two (Universities B and E) had an administrative staff member present during the interview. For Universities A and B, the staff had prepared a summary of meeting materials beforehand.

Covid-19 and National Identity in Higher Education

Covid-19 had brought about changes to the way higher education operates. In Taiwan, universities are responsible for student health, campus security and members' well-being. The MOE published guidelines regarding Covid-19 for higher education institutions on 31 March 2020 in order to regulate the conditions and the countermeasures to be taken (FICHET 2020). Higher education institutions reacted rapidly in the beginning, with many closing their campus to external visitors and requiring all students and faculty members measure their temperatures daily at the building entrances. Lectures with more than a hundred people were either broken into smaller classes or moved online.

Taiwanese universities were also asked to take turns sending representatives to pick up students who were entering Taiwan. The institutions had been deemed responsible for the commute from airport to quarantine accommodations. If universities missed first contact with a student at the airport, they were subject to punishment by the MOE. University B commented that without leadership, especially from the president, who wasn't previously a part of the traditional administrative system, this speed of response would have been nearly impossible. To University D, social media, especially communication software, was central to information sharing. With both the school's leadership and its administrators involved in group chats, implementation and delivery was almost immediate once decisions are made. University A further emphasized that the response and action from experienced administrators had played a crucial role in effectiveness.

The pandemic had prompted innovative internationalization activities even while international mobility declined. University D had launched a series of virtual courses with credits specially for the incoming exchange students unable to travel, ranging from culture and language to basic courses on engineering. University B cooperated with its sister schools, and it enrolled degree students from a list of US universities to study for a year or a semester in Taiwan, acting as their 'temporary boarding school'. This allowed students who could not travel back to their home schools to continue their education without delay. Facilities such as libraries, sport centres and student activities were all open to those temporary degree students as well, providing a full university experience for scholars from around the globe. Through these new forms of cooperation, we see the value that Taiwanese institutions of higher learning place on education beyond national borders. This can be considered another demonstration of the Confucian spirit underpinning Taiwanese society.

The Covid-19 travel ban prevented many Chinese students from returning to Taiwan for their studies. Most flights between China and Taiwan were halted starting in February and were only reopened after October under restrictive terms. Political tensions had also prevented students from travelling across the strait, when Taiwan and China had disagreements over what university titles were appropriate to put on travel documents. The Chinese government objected to the term 'National' being used by Taiwanese universities. China announced in April that it would 'pause degree students' return to Taiwan in 2020' (MOE 2020), and Taiwan waited until August to allow students from China entry to the country.

China is an unavoidable topic when discussing Taiwan's national identity. However, most interviewees did not find that their internationalization had been affected by the vast change in the Taiwanese public's view of its own national identity in recent times. Certain incidents were reported, including visas to travel to China being cancelled at the last minute (University C), publication affiliations altered without notification (Universities A and E) and obstructions to overseas recruitment events (University E), but most international interactions and activities did not see many changes. University C observed that the larger changes came from the pandemic and not political disputes. Universities A and B both believed that education and politics should be separated, but while University A only mentioned this concept in theory, University B called for equal rights of education for Chinese students. This can be interpreted in two, distinct and mutually exclusive ways, either a pro-China mentality that urges better rights for Chinese students in order to draw Taiwan closer to China, or

the assumption that China is a separate country, and that by removing special regulations that only apply to Chinese students, these students can be treated as an objective third party like other foreign students. This type of non-committal vagary is a hallmark of Taiwanese politics, though again, both interpretations are in line with Confucian philosophy.

A special case occurred in 2019 when some Taiwanese universities published announcements offering to take students from Hong Kong. When asked about the decision-making process, Universities B and D replied that all parties agreed on the importance of students continuing their studies, and the consensus had built quickly. Universities A and C had sister schools in Hong Kong, so the aid progressed naturally. University B also received sister universities' inquiry about the possibility of transferring their incoming foreign exchange students to Taiwan. This close communication not only shows that, in almost all circumstances, educational values in Taiwan transcend borders, but also today's internationalization of higher education has become deeply rooted.

Conclusions

Through almost two decades, the internationalization of higher education in Taiwan has progressed with national support and government attention. Efforts have moved from a focus on international ranking to the promotion of egalitarianism and a diversity of research fields. Higher education institutions are now required to seek connections with their local communities and industries, which in turn builds local awareness of higher education, which then leads to both internationalization at home and a stronger voice for Taiwanese identity. The research demonstrates that despite an increasing Taiwanese national identity, the higher education sector has retained Confucian values and agrees that education should be a human right to be prioritized above international disputes.

Many higher education institutions in Taiwan develop their internationalization strategy based on past behaviour, and they have a practical interpretation of the concept rather than a set of clear definitions and long-term goals. While many scholars have emphasized a more balanced and effective internationalization strategy for the broader higher education sector as well as for individual universities, the research shows a need for more cross-office integration within universities based on the institutional research offices' development plans, allowing resources to be applied in a way that maximizes

effect and growth. The interviews also brought out a less visible node in internationalization, the silent administrators. The talk of empowerment and the act of inviting them to either join or prepare for the interviews shows a trust in their professional service, though in literature this group is hardly ever addressed. It will be important for future research to look into the implementation side of internationalization, including the role and effect of administration within higher education institutions.

With government supervision gradually increasing, there seemed to be an underlying anxiety in the academy about political influence on higher education. Academic autonomy had been, and will continue to be, a delicate issue. On the other hand, governance at the institutional level had proven effective at countering the impact of the global pandemic. With advanced technology, communication was more timely and less hierarchical. Decisions were speedy and unburdened by bureaucratic procedures, and they were implemented almost immediately. Even as the pandemic created difficulties in the academic world and blocked travel opportunities, some international activities have seen innovations that had strengthened the network of global universities and had helped to develop an international academic community that was more cooperative and interactive online. At-home internationalization, a topic that has been nearly ignored in Taiwan, is now being explored, and it is reasonable to believe that future research will lead to an expanded discussion on this topic.