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Abstract

This project maps and compares how sociology as an institutionalised discipline of teaching and research has been introduced, developed and practiced in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. It sets out to interpret the observed trajectories in light of social-historical contexts. The three cases presented share some similarities in their colonial pasts, Chinese-populated demography, and development trajectories as “Asian tigers”. However, they demonstrate a sharp contrast in post-war geopolitics, political context, and identity.

Three levels of analytical categories are involved in the analysis: geopolitical, state-institutional, and (collective) practitioner-level. On the one hand, this project attempts to look beyond the national container to introduce various trans-border factors (e.g. scholarly migration, foreign funding and knowledge flow) into the analytical scope under the conceptual framework of a “world system of knowledge network.” On the other hand, the explanation sought is to be grounded on a sympathetic understanding of the actors and their psychological perspective.

The data analysed includes literature and archive material, bibliographic and demographic datasets, interviews with 56 sociologists stratified by bibliographical factors and a few informative talks, and some ethnographic observation in the field study.

How sociology was introduced and institutionalized in three locations along the post-war geopolitical structure will be traced. The “domestic disciplinary identity” will be explored based on a systematic bibliographic review. A survey of the various modes of public engagement of sociologists is interpreted and the thesis relates some observed patterns to contextual factors. It further assesses the impact of recent higher education reform under managerialism and academic globalism on sociology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Chinese Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJSS</td>
<td>Asian Journal of Social Sciences</td>
<td>亚洲社会科学研究杂志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Chinese Communist Party</td>
<td>中共委员会</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJS</td>
<td>Chinese Journal of Sociology (Taiwan)</td>
<td>中国社会学刊 (台湾)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Central Policy Unit, Hong Kong</td>
<td>(香港) 中央政策组</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Chinese Sociological Association (Taiwan)</td>
<td>中国社会学会 (台湾)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUHK</td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>香港中文大学</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP</td>
<td>Democracy Promotion Party</td>
<td>民主進步黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKBU</td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
<td>香港浸会大学</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKPU</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
<td>香港理工大学</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKSA</td>
<td>Hong Kong Sociological Association</td>
<td>香港社会学会</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKSAR</td>
<td>Hong Kong Special Administrative Region</td>
<td>香港特別行政區</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>Hong Kong University</td>
<td>香港大学</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMT</td>
<td>Kuo-Ming-Tang, or the Nationalist Party</td>
<td>國民黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>National Cheng-Chi University, Taiwan</td>
<td>國立政治大學</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Science Council, Taiwan</td>
<td>國家科學委員會</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>國立台灣大學</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU(SG)</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>南洋理工大學</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>Nanyang University, Singapore</td>
<td>南洋大學</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>新加坡國立大學</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>People Action Party, Singapore</td>
<td>人民行動黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
<td>中華人民共和國</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGC</td>
<td>Research Grant Council, Hong Kong</td>
<td>研究资助委員會</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROC</td>
<td>Republic of China (in Taiwan '49-)</td>
<td>中華民國</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAJSS</td>
<td>Southeast Asian Journal of Social Sciences</td>
<td>东南亚社会科学研究杂志</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJS</td>
<td>Taiwanese Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>臺灣社會學刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>Taiwanese Sociological Association</td>
<td>臺灣社會學會</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC</td>
<td>University Grant Council, Hong Kong</td>
<td>大學資助委員會</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>英国</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>美国</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note on Chinese Names

My respects are paid to local costume in the Romanization of Chinese names. The proper spelling was sought in the following order: (1) personal website or online profile, (2) local literature, (3) translation in local convention. In other words, no single standard was imposed, and an identical Chinese word may be Romanized differently. For instance, the Mandarin surname Chen (陳) is spelled in Hokkien dialect Tan in Singapore. Similarly, the Mandarin surname Wu (呂) is spelled in Cantonese as Ng in Hong Kong. When a full Chinese name is cited in the text, I follow the Chinese convention of placing the surname in front, followed by the hyphenated given name without a comma. For instance, I will write “Lui Tak-Lok” instead of “Lui, Tak-Lok” or “Tak-Lok Lui.” The decision to omit the comma was made to avoid the excessive use of commas when a series of names appear. The later appearance of the cited figure will be referred to by the surname or by the surname followed by an initial combination without a period—for instance “Lui TK” instead of “Lui T.K.”. A particular exception was Yang Chin-Kun, a professor in Pittsburg who is widely known as CK Yang and will be referred as such. If a figure has a widely known Western name, the ordering of names will follow the Western convention—for example Ambrose King, instead of “King Ambrose” or “King, Ambrose”. A list of Chinese names is produced as Appendix C.
Introduction

Sociology has no uniform. If conceived as a historical current of knowledge and modes of inquiry united under a disciplinary label, sociology has its role and boundaries frequently redefined by its leading thinkers. Yet a consensus is never reached. Over time, we have seen paradigms built and deserted, leaving a community fragmented by a variety of contested issues. There has been a constant lingering between seeing sociology as science or art (Wallerstein 1991), and between considering society as fact or imagination (Delanty 1997). There has been struggles between focusing on the macro or the micro (O'Neil 1973), and between relying on numbers or narratives. We were now used to the attempts made to rewrite its intellectual genealogy, the persistent tension around its borders against neighbouring disciplines, and the ongoing disputes over its political and public roles. In tracing the geographic spreading of sociology, we see schools of thought bearing the name of particular cities, as well as ample literature on “national traditions” (Genov 1989). Both suggest that what is called sociology might be understood quite differently from place to place.
The identity fluidity and local diversity of sociology make the comparison of
histories of sociology in different locales a necessary step toward a more
comprehensive understanding of the discipline. Such comparison also has a great
potential in making contribution to the domain of sociology of knowledge. Finally,
the trajectories of sociology more or less reflect the transition in broader
historical context.

The Project: Definition and Purposes

This project took the perspective of the sociology of knowledge to compare the
institutional framing of sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. The
thesis has three objectives: (1) to empirically map how sociology was developed
and practiced (with both intuitive and theory-driven categories) since its
introduction, (2) to induce conceptual categories and frames by contrasting the
observed patterns, and (3) to construct interpretations of the observations by
relating them to certain institutional factors and broader historical context.

The Framing of Sociology

The term “framing” refers to the process by which the particular configuration of
contextual factors leads to an inclination towards a particular pattern of
disciplinary formation. The “contextual factors” include significant institutional (political-economic, social, cultural, and organizational) characteristics and historical incidents. It must be noted that some aspects of the disciplinary formation could be seen as contextual factors that frame its future formation. To stress the “configuration” of the contextual factors is to acknowledge the inter-factor interaction. The word “inclination” is also carefully chosen to suggest a more sophisticated, and moderate, version of causality and to avoid any forms of determinism. The “disciplinary formation,” the subject matter to account for, refers to the emergence and evolution of the institutional buildings and activities labeled with the disciplinary tag into a particular form. The aspects covered in the following chapters include the trajectory of institutional development, the demographic structure of the professional community, the outlook of research publications, the discursive agenda, the public engagement of sociologists, and impacts under recent higher education reforms.

In more concrete examples, the issues I shall discuss include the political legitimacy for institutionally supporting this discipline, the patterns of scholarly migration and transnational flow of expertise, identity politics and the framing of the disciplinary identity, cultural heritage and attempts to develop indigenous
scholarship, the public interface of this profession, the mechanisms of academic funding and evaluation and the implications of publication channels and professional associations. Even when I came across important concepts or theories generated at the local level, I tried to place these back into a historical context to interpret what challenges were they proposed to respond to.

Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore

The choice of the three cases reflects the author’s personal interest. But it is also justified by the current insufficiency of literature on the history of sociology in this region,¹ and more importantly, the analytical potential promised by the delicate mixture of similarities and differences of the three cases. On the one hand, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore share many similarities. They were all brought into modern history under colonial order; historically populated by Chinese immigrants and influenced by the Chinese culture. They demonstrated comparable trajectories of economic development after World War II (discussed as the 'Asian little dragons' along with South Korea, see, for instance, Vogel, E.F. 1991). The discipline of sociology was introduced and institutionalized within

¹ See Section 5-3 for detailed survey.
each by migrant scholars; further developed under the influence of Western paradigms. On the other hand, the three societies show clear variation in terms of their size, geopolitical status, and post-war identity formation. The dealt with colonial legacies differently, and are subject to distinctive modes of governance. Considered together, the three case studies produce a meaningful supplementation of our knowledge on the history of sociology that has long been centred on the Euro-Anglo world. Contrasted with each other, they provide a valuable opportunity to compare how the variant contextual factors are associated with the development of patterns of sociology.

*Levels of Analytical Categories: Geopolitics, States, and Practitioners*

Deriving its perspective from the sociology of knowledge, this research is characterised by its attempt to look beyond the state-societal container and situate the cases in broader geographical contexts, paying attention to factors working at the transnational level and how they interact with the domestic social processes of each case. Geopolitics (O'Sullivan 1986; Parker 1998), a term borrowed from international relation studies, is understood as a way of looking at the world to consider the power relation as being embedded in the spatial structure (size, distance, adjacency) of geographical territories. The geopolitical
gaze takes a state-centric perspective but focuses on the international and transnational factors at work. The emphasis reflects the recognition of the fact that sociology in the three locales has, since the start, been imported along geopolitical power lines (colonial encounters and scholarly migration) and has subsequently developed without ever severing the umbilical cord to external sources of expertise, theories, categories and even the legitimacy for the domestic studies. Moreover, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore are three island states that have their fates deeply entangled within the post-war geopolitical structure in East Asia. It is inconceivable to narrate their post-war histories without making reference to the recession of colonialism, the Chinese Civil War, confrontations during the Cold War, the economic boom in the West Pacific Rim, and the post-Cold War competition in the knowledge economy. As we shall see in the following chapters, many state-institutional factors considered influential in shaping domestic sociology were, themselves, dependent on a wider regional-structural context.

With this broader picture in mind, I also aspire to see from the perspectives of the key actors, namely the sociologists of different generations, and to observe how they interact with other agents (such as funders, administrators and policy
makers) within given historical contexts. This aspiration is emotionally rooted in my interest and concern on people. It also reflects my intellectual conviction that any explanation of a more complex system would be too “thin” if without a micro foundation; examples include the social studies that explain their observations only by demonstrating their statistical correlation with other aggregate variables (Wan 2011:148). In other words, the sociological analysis I seek to deliver should at least incorporate, if not be based on, an understanding of the perceptions, motivations, assumptions, logics of action and interactions at the actor level.

Nonetheless, I do not assert an absolute form of methodological individualism in empirical studies since the psychological data at the individual level is usually difficult to exhaust. This is particularly true for a comparative historical project like this one, in which our knowledge about the actor psychology behind documented activities is always limited and can only be inferred.

The demand to look beyond the state-societal level and the aspiration to observe the actors’ perspectives forms the two pillars that stretch the “scale of gazing” across three levels of analytical categories: the regional-geopolitical, the State-institutional, and the practitioner-level. Each pair of adjacent levels could be seen as a structure-agent set. Hence a State could be seen as a collective agent in
the structure of regional geopolitics, while it (along with its institutions) also constitutes the structural environment in which individual or collective sociologists work\(^1\).

*The Purposes: Empirical, Theoretical and Political*

This project serves multiple purposes. At the *empirical* level, this research mapped the development of sociology in the three Asian states in ways not attempted before. It involves the generation of various datasets for the first time and fills some knowledge gaps in our understanding of Asian sociologies. At the *theoretical* level, the comparative study provides some analytical leverage for examining the institutional and historical framing of sociology in the Asian context. The analysis can make contributions to the theorizing in the sociology of sociology, the broader sociology of knowledge, and Asian studies. Arguments to be made in individual chapters might also be constructive towards the theoretical refinement of specific issues such as the public sociology, managerialism and academic globalism.

---

\(^1\) The state-institutional level could be further differentiated into a structure-agent pair of *state* and *institutions* if we focus on how different institutions (e.g. universities, now seen as agent) operate within particular state-framed context. But for most of the analysis, the universities will be treated as an integral part of the state-institutional complex.
The insights generated inevitably have a political dimension. The research also aims to contribute to a critical reflection of the status quo of sociology, and to invite normative debates on how academics should be understood and governed, at least in the three places. This research is also produced for professional colleagues in other post-colonial areas. I intend to introduce this study to dialogues with comparable efforts made elsewhere. Finally, I have a specific readership in mind: the emerging group of sociologists in China. China has, over the past two decades gradually restored sociology as an officially recognized discipline\(^1\), and in recent years it has witnessed struggles and debate as to where Chinese sociology should go. In this regard, I hope the cases of the three Chinese-dominated societies will provide some sobering lessons.

A Historical Portrait

*Historical Emergence through Colonial Encounters*

Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore were all brought onto the map of modern history by their colonial encounters. Taiwan, located on the West Pacific island chain between Japan and the Philippines, some 150 kilometers off the Chinese

\(^{1}\) The institutionalized research of sociology was abolished in 1952 soon after the birth of communist China. In 1980, Nan-Kai University restored the first sociology department among the major Chinese universities. (Zheng, HS and Li 2003)
mainland, had attracted Dutch, Spanish and Koxinga (a loyalist of the Ming Empire) to build settlements before its 1682 annexation to the Chinese Empire of the Qing Dynasty, which ruled the island for two centuries and ceded it to Japan in 1895. The British arrived at Singapore in 1819 and acquired Hong Kong Island from China in 1842, making both places entrepôts in its imperial trading network. Located on the tip of Malaya Peninsula, Singapore (as part of the “Strait Settlements” that also include Penang and Malacca) was developed as a hub linking West, India, Australia and East Asia, bringing an influx of Chinese workers and entrepreneurs whose decedents now form its demographic majority. At the mouth of Pearl River Delta, Hong Kong became a portal to China and this led to a rapid growth in population. Following the outbreak of Pacific War, Japanese troops swiftly overtook Hong Kong (25 Dec 1941) and Singapore (15 Feb 1942) and continued ruling over both places until the War ended in 1945.

Post-1945 Trajectories: The Legacies of Wars

The post-1945 trajectories of the three places were deeply influenced by the legacies of a series of wars including the Pacific War, the Chinese Civil War in 1945-49, the Malayan Emergency in 1948-60, the 1950 outbreak of Korea War and the subsequent Cold War. Taiwan was in 1945 handed over to the Republic of
China (ROC) ruled by the Kuo-Ming Tang (KMT, "Nationalist Party," led by Chiang Kai-Shek) in accordance with the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations. The island soon became the regime's last stronghold after its landslide defeat by the Chinese Communists Party (CCP) in 1949. In 1945-49, around two million Chinese troops and war refugees rushed into Taiwan. Their cultural contrast with the six million local inhabitants who had mostly grown up under Japanese rule caused many frictions and some brutal conflicts (Roy, 2003, Ch3). The KMT government spared no effort in promoting Chinese Nationalism and official ideology to convert these former colonial subject to its nationals. It also enforced Martial law in 1949 as the war against the communists was yet to be concluded (ibid, Ch4).

The outbreak of Korea War gave Taiwan renewed significance. Once abandoned, it was considered by the United States in the wider context of the Cold War. Hence, American troops and aid started to arrive Taiwan, helped the KMT-regime to stabilize its post-war political and economic instability.

The British raced to take over the control of Hong Kong ahead of China (ROC), as the latter was trapped in the struggle with the communists (Tsang, S 2007:134-138). The establishment of the communist People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949 placed Hong Kong in a precarious footing. Both Beijing and Taipei
(backed by US after 1950) claimed sovereignty over Hong Kong, but only used
the colony as a convenient place to spy and generate propaganda. So as not to
offend either the PRC or the US, Britain maintained impartiality on the China
issue (Welch, 1993: 441). The ongoing confrontation between the “two Chinas”,
nonetheless, made Hong Kong a battleground for struggles between the right
(pro-KMT) and left (pro-CCP) camps— leading to the 1956 anti-communist riot
and the 1967 left-wing riot. Economically, an “entrepôt crisis” was experienced
as the late 1940s Chinese warfare and the 1950s American embargo against PRC
abruptly interrupted trade with China. On the other hand, the massive
immigration of Chinese entrepreneurs and workers provided the conditions for
domestic industrial development.

The British also reclaimed Singapore, but only to find its legitimacy undermined
by its failure to defend against an Asian power. Anti-colonial sentiment and
political awakening were rampant. The colonial government declared a State of
Emergency in 1948-1960 (known as “Malaya Emergency”) in response to the
insurgency of the Malaya Communist Party, taking strict measures. But eventually,
a state of self-governance was granted to Singapore in 1959. The elected
Singaporean politicians chose to merge with the Malaysian Federation in 1963,
but they were soon expelled due to subsequent racial tensions, leading to the reluctant creation of an independent Republic of Singapore in 1965. Facing a multiracial new state, the ruling People’s Action Party (PAP) enforced a series of policies for nation-building (Hill and Lian 1995).

_Economic Development_

During the period between the 1960s and 1980s, all the three places demonstrated impressive economic growth that attracted later analysis of them (along with South Korea) as Asian “Dragons” (Vogel, 1991), “miracles” (World Bank 1993) or “newly industrialized economies” (NIEs, see e.g. Chowdhury and Islam 1993). The Taiwanese economy soon recovered under the planning of Chinese technocrats, advised by American experts, on the basis of Japanese colonial infrastructure. Taiwan laid its industrial foundations in the 1950s with the capital earned from agricultural and textile exports (a strategy known as “import substitution”), and took a series of subsequent measures that successfully transformed the Taiwan export-oriented industrial economy—including the 1958 monetary scheme on stabilizing exchange rate, 1960 tax reward for venture on manufacturing, and the 1966 establishment of export-processing zone (Rubinstein 1999:367). In the 1970s, Premier Chiang
Ching-Kuo announced “Ten Major Projects” to strengthen infrastructure and to neutralize the impact of the energy crisis on the economy (ibid: 373). The oil shock also drove Taiwan to focus on “strategic industries” that have “low energy consumption and high technological density”— among which, the information technology industry proved to be most successful (ibid: 374). This economic success, however, was challenged in the late 1990s as economic integration with China motivated many firms to relocate their factories across the strait.

Hong Kong's manufacturing sector also grew rapidly from the 1950s as the migrant Chinese entrepreneurs brought in capital and technologies while the massive influx refugees provided cheap labouring force (Chiu, SWK and Lui 1995). The colonial administration then, however, did not engage in active industrial planning (Schenk 2008). Mounting social issues associated with the rapid industrialization and urbanization, ignited by the Chinese Cultural Revolution, led to the 1967 left-wing riots (Cheung, 2009). Alerted by the riot, Murray MacLehose, the new Governor (since 1971) made large-scale investment on housing, education, transportation, medical and social services, anti-corruption and so on, greatly improving the infrastructure for economic development (Carroll 2007:161). The 1978 reform adopted by the new Chinese
leader Deng Xiao-Ping further changed the economic role of Hong Kong. The integration with mainland China accelerated as many factories were relocated back north to costs down, while Hong Kong took strategic role as the commercial and financial service provider linking China to the world (Schenk 2008).

By comparison, Singapore’s post-war economic recovery was initially delayed by the Malaya Emergency in the 1950s. The Economic Development Board was established in 1961 to promote industrial development, but its function was still hindered by the unstable regional politics. The 1965 separation from Malaysia, its major hinterland, rendered the earlier plan of “import substitution” infeasible. Hence Singapore repositioned itself in the late 1960s as a production site for multinational corporations, announcing various incentives to attract foreign investments (Ho 1995:114-115). With its strategic location and well-established infrastructure, Singapore became a major oil refinery base in the 1960s, and developed a strong electronics industry in the 1970s. These upgraded to high-tech industries in the 1980s (ibid: 116). The service industry also grew. The Singaporean port became one of the busiest worldwide, and Changi airport opened in 1981 soon became an international hub. The city state also became an Asian commercial and financial centre.
Political Transitions

The KMT government in Taiwan, dominated by mainlanders, faced relentless challenges from the Taiwanese community despite its economic achievements. To win more international support, it also faced pressure to improve its political profile. In the 1970s, the KMT leaders promoted a few Taiwanese elite to higher ranks, and opened up limited democracy, granting space for individual candidates (Roy, ibid: 152-155). The death of Chiang Kai-Shek in 1975 further signalled a new era. With the loosening climate, a scattered network of political opposition known as Tang-wei (黨外, literally “out-of-party”) emerged, calling for democratization, the abolition of Martial Law, cuts to military spending, improvements to environmental and welfare standards, and Taiwanese self-determination (ibid: 158-160). This momentum grew, with setbacks, over the next decade and led to the eventual foundation of the opposition Democracy Progressive Party (DPP) in 1986. Eventually, President Chiang Ching-Kuo abolished Martial Law in 1987 and removed restrictions on press in the next year shortly before his death. Enormous dynamism erupted in forms of publication or protests, leading to a wide array of political reforms. The first Presidential Election was held in 1996, and the first DDP President was elected in 2000.
The British knew that Hong Kong would be indefensible if Beijing wanted to reclaim it. They were aware they could keep the colony only because Beijing founded it valuable to leave it there (Tsang, S 1997:77). The Hong Kong issue remained untouched for three decades—so long that some Hong Kong residents even had the wishful impression that the PRC might allow the status quo to continue (ibid: 79). In 1979, Governor MacLehose was invited to visit Beijing and the Hong Kong issue emerged on the agenda. In 1984, after two years of negotiation, the Sino-British Joint Declaration was signed, announcing the fate of Hong Kong (ibid: Ch5). The development stirred Hong Kong society, leaving in the colony a contested sense of identity, an awareness of the absence of democracy, and an anxiety about the future. Such anxiety was further exacerbated by the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident, leading to massive rallies, protests and a subsequent wave of emigration. Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the PRC in 1997. The, economic and social integration with China accelerated, bringing both economic dynamism and public discontent on the penetration of Chinese influence and insufficient democracy. An annual protest is now being staged on every 1 July to demand more political right for people in Hong Kong.
Political stability in Singapore was often credited as a factor behind its economic success. Critics would focus on its authoritarian culture. Less well known is that, Singapore had enjoyed vibrant political and intellectual dynamism in the first three post-WWII decades (Barr and Trocki 2008). During the mid-1970s, however, the climate changed. Several journalists were arrested for "stirring sympathy for Communism," and student activists were convicted for "inciting riots". Opposition politicians were prosecuted for either "receiving foreign funds" or for "defamation" (Haas 1999:22-24) The government also and took control of the media (ibid: 25) and dealt a "fatal blow" to student activism by amending the university Constitution (Huang, JL 2008:196). Nonetheless, in the 1980s, a few opposition politicians managed to get elected into the parliament, while the government further introduced initiatives that, in effect, disadvantaged non-PAP candidates\(^1\). The government also clashed with some foreign press, and imposed circulation restrictions on those considered as “interfering” with internal politics. The 1987 “Operation Spectrum,” in which 22 citizens were arrested and detained for an “alleged” Marxist Conspiracy, reminded many of the boundaries of

\(^1\) In 1985, for instance, the government announced that public housing upgrading will be provided last for constituencies where non-PAP Members of Parliament (MP) was elected (Haas, ibid: 26). Another controversial measure was the Group Representation Constituency (GRC)—area where the MPs are voted as group. Introduced in 1988 to ensure the representation of ethnic minorities, GRC in effect it disadvantage opposition parties because of the difficulty of forming a team of competent candidates (Mauzy and Milne 2002:145).
agreeable conduct. Lee Kuan-Yew passed the seat of Prime Minister to Goh Chok-Tong in 1990, but remained in the cabinet as senior minister. His son, Lee Hsien-Loong, succeeded Goh in 2004. A few notable cases of defamation lawsuits continued to occur. The PAP’s vote dropped as low as 60% in some elections, but has never lost more than five seats in the parliament.

Table I-1 summarised the major historical similarities and contrasts of Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore discussed in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Past</td>
<td>Colonial Past, Chinese immigrant as the demographical majority</td>
<td>&quot;Asian Dragons&quot; – comparable economic developmental trajectories</td>
<td>Sociology as an imported discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Role</td>
<td>Japanese colony, base for southern expansion</td>
<td>Portal to China for British colonial trade</td>
<td>&quot;Asian crossroad&quot; in British colonial trading network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post-war Geopolitics | KMT stronghold against the PRC, | Return Colonial, Neutrality between China/Taiwan | Anti-colonial Mvt, Self-government ‘59 Malaysia Fed ‘63-65 Republic of Singapore ‘65-
| Post-war Geopolitics | | | |
| Post-war Geopolitics | | | |
| Identity Politics | Chinese nationalism imposed by KMT | Colonial de-nationalism, Rise of HK identity, ‘70s Struggle of HK/ Chinese identity | Multi-racial Nation-building, selective inheritance of ethnical heritage |
| Economic Development | Import Substitution ‘50 Export-Oriented IT industry | Industrial 50s-70s Integration with China Financial and Commercial Centre 80s- | Export-Oriented Strategic Industries Financial and Commercial Centre |
| Political Transition | Authoritarian with Martial Law ’49-’87 Democratization ’80s- | Sino-British Joint Declaration ‘84 Handover to China ’97 | Political Pluralism suppressed ‘mid 70s- PAP Dominance |
| Population | 23 million | 7 million | 3.5 million |

Table I-1: Comparison of Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore
The Personal Pursuit

Many sociological inquiries bear the biographical marks of authors. This project was first conceived as a way to respond to the personal confusion I had when I began to consider an academic career in sociology in 2006. The perspectives adopted also reflect the broader intellectual concerns I developed in the various biographical roles I took before. In the following section, I provide a brief account of my intellectual trajectory that led to the current inquiry.

A Curve Path to Sociology

I travelled along a curved path to sociology. I was admitted to National Taiwan University with a major in chemistry after winning a Gold Medal from the 1993 International Chemistry Olympia, only to change my focus to major in psychology two years later. I liked chemistry – in particular the sense of order and beauty I experienced whilst seeing the world through the lens of chemistry. However, I soon became convinced of the greater significance of human behaviours in shaping our future, and psychology seemed key to furthering my understanding in this respect. Shifting my gaze from the molecular to the mental level, I was yet to find themes of greater scale.
I started to feel attracted to the sociological way of thinking after leaving the campus. In just a few years, the world seemed to change rapidly. The dot.com craze hit when I was doing my compulsory military service, and I remember how anxious computer-illiterate colleagues were when facing the much-hailed “digital age”. Leaving the army, I witnessed the sudden rise of the discourse of “globalization” against the worst ever economic set-back in Taiwan in 2001.

Working for a leading Taiwanese publisher, I could not help but ponder how the explosive information supply and the resulting “scarcity of attention” would shape our collective life. Then, of course, the shock of 9-11 and the consequent “war on terror” both drastically challenged how the role of the United States in the world was perceived.

To make better sense of those transitions, I read extensively and found myself much inspired by the sort of writing that relates our everyday lives to broader historical, politic-economic, social or technological contexts. I attended the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) in 2002 to study for an MSc in sociology. It was my first formal encounter with this discipline, but the purpose then was to learn more about topical issues such as globalization, its governance, the social aspects of media and technology and so on. It was not for
the disciplinary training of sociology per se. The sociological perspectives I acquired, nonetheless, proved to be insightful when I took up subsequent roles as a parliamentary assistant, election campaign manager, and writer.

My first book was published in 2006, at the age 30 and at this stage I paused to rethink my career orientation. I reflected upon the issues that I had been concerned with, and the roles that I had played, and I concluded that everything centred on the common theme of the “sociological dimension of knowledge.” The things that I have been thinking and doing across the years, I found, all involved the social mechanism or consequences of how certain forms of knowledge were produced, distributed, accessed, mobilized, negotiated or even distorted or exaggerated in our contemporary society. I felt compelled to look deeper into this complex dynamic, and I started to consider an academic career in sociology.

The Academic Evaluation Dispute

I decided to become a sociologist. However, back in 2006, my knowledge about Taiwanese sociology remained minimal. So I consulted some bibliographic resources for hints.
Then, unexpectedly, I came across a book that struck me, *Globalization and Knowledge Production* (Taskforce for Critical Reflection Conference 2005). The book was an edited version of the proceedings of a conference convened in 2004, “Critical Reflection on Higher Education Academic Evaluation (in Humanities and Social Sciences).” The trigger for this conference was a mindless “university ranking” published by the Taiwanese Ministry of Education in 2003 which ranked higher education institutions solely based on statistics obtained from the Science Citation Index (SCI), Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and Engineering Index. The original purpose was produced to show how Taiwanese universities “perform” in the “leading” journals covered, and this manoeuvre was even welcomed by some who have long demanded a more accountable academia. But soon it attracted widespread concern, especially amongst humanity scholars and social researchers, for its underlying rationale and its potential implication in the forthcoming university evaluation. Substantial levels of criticism were raised at the 2004 conference, based on the accusation that dependence on SSCI in either ranking or evaluation would reduce the merits of HEIs to the quantity of one particular type of publication, and excluded consideration of books, publications in Chinese, teaching, and public engagement. It was argued that such practices would prioritize a language (English) that was less suitable at capturing the
subtleties of local social life, and less accessible to local knowledge users. There were also concerns over a perceived forced conformity to the foreign research agenda and the subsequent loss of intellectual autonomy. The conference and its later published proceedings only marked the beginning of a series of contestation and negotiation between government, universities and the scholarly community as to how academics should be governed. The contested discourses reflected two dilemmas that troubled Taiwanese sociologists—the inherent epistemological dilemma in appropriating Western sociological paradigms in researching the local, and the newer strategic dilemma between pursuing internationally-recognized excellence and the protection of academic autonomy in responding to locally relevant issues.

Questions in Mind

The dispute was disturbing for one heading towards an academic career. The struggle over the academic institutional design rendered any potential future as a sociologist difficult to predict. I started to wonder what it really means, in practical terms (in contrast to the various theoretical-normative formulation in textbooks) to be a sociologist- in particular in the Taiwanese context. How have Taiwanese sociologists responded to the two dilemmas and what paths have
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been explored? Why was the controversial initiative taken and was there proper justification? Moreover, Taiwan could not be the only place facing these issues. How were sociologists in other Non-Western countries reacting? Were there some alternative models that I could draw reference from? If there were different patterns of responses, were they related to the historical and social context?

I felt a thirst for answers to these questions, and I needed to access enlightened judgments on the various contested issues if I was to proceed. Yet soon I found my concerns not adequately addressed in the existing literature. By 2006 the published material on the history of sociology in Taiwan had not included any discussion of the impacts of higher education transition. The critical literature raised thought-provoking points, but was often of a polemic nature and lacked solid empirical material to sustain the claims being made. Besides, I was almost ignorant to sociology in other places. It seems that I could only answer the questions by carrying out a research project.

*The Project and Personal Pursuit*

Here my career confusions and my intellectual interests met. I was accepted into University of Warwick in 2006 with a research proposal titled *Negotiating*
Western Sociology in East Asia and the Challenges of Academic Globalization:

Comparison of Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. The idea was to compare how contemporary sociologists in these three places responded to the two dilemmas outlined earlier, and to interpret the observed patterns in light of the historical contexts and institutional factors. The title was later revised to Framing Sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore: Geopolitics, States and Its Practitioners (1) to bring in more historical depth so that the observed patterns could be accounted for more adequately, (2) to avoid the simple dichotomy between “Western Paradigm” and “Asia” (3) to drop the problematic geographic unit “East Asia”, (4) to downplay the emphasis on recent higher education transition (academic globalization) and (5) to highlight the interplay of factors at the three levels of analysis— geopolitical, state-institutional, (collective) practitioner-level.

It was anticipated that the project would make academic contributions at empirical, theoretical and even normative levels. But in the end I saw it as a process of self-cultivation— a journey that enables me to think through a wide array of issues fundamental to my discipline. A personal reflection is included in the Epilogue of the Thesis.
Structure of the Dissertation

The first chapter elaborates on the theoretical maps upon which this project is pursued. Sociology will first be defined as a “historical entity”, and, operationally, an “institutional entity”, for the purpose of the project. The chapter will subsequently situate the study within the tradition of the sociology of knowledge and will review the various attempts to theorise social sciences in an Asian context before introducing the over-arching frame of “world system of knowledge network”. Later, precedent discussions will be related to a reconsideration of the characteristics of colonial modernity in Asia. The second chapter details the methodological considerations. Besides introducing and justifying the research design and methods employed, this chapter also covers a number of ontological and epistemological issues. In particular, I will sketch a framework of “ontological layers of social reality” (perceived, social-constructed, performed, and materialized) for the proper anchoring of the diverse empirical material I sought to analyse. The last two sections of the chapter will elaborate in more depth upon two methodological particularities of the project; the power relation between the researchers and the informants, and the tricky issue of securing confidentiality (and its potential clash with the “ethics of credit”).
The following five chapters are allocated to a substantial analysis of the empirical cases. Chapter Three traces how sociological knowledge and expertise were introduced to this part of the world via the colonial order. It reviews, first, the status of sociology in the four major powers that are influential in the region (Japan, China, UK and the US). It also reviews the traces of sociological investigation and teaching in the three pre-war colonies. Finally, the chapter explored the post-war migration of sociologists and social anthropologists from China, the UK and the US. Chapter Four sketches the institutionalization and maps the cohort structure of sociologists of Taiwan, Singapore, and two leading universities in Hong Kong (CUHK and HKU). Chapter Five features a systematic review of four types of bibliographic resources; domestic sociological journals, edited collections of sociological studies of the domestic society, historical and reflexive writing of domestic sociology, and normative-epistemological reflections of the application of Western paradigms. The observed pattern was analysed by profiling the “domestic disciplinary identity” of each place and this will be further related to the broader context of post-war identity politics.
Chapter Six focuses on the public interface between the sociological community and the public sphere. Starting from a critical review of Burawoy’s scheme (2005), this chapter proposes an elaborated and revised “sorting template” for the systematic review of various modes of public engagement in the three places.

To account for the observed pattern, I will discuss three particular contextual aspects: the presence of critical mass, institutional factors and intellectual tradition. Chapter Seven assesses how recent higher education reforms characterised by both managerialism and academic globalism are reshaping intellectual life, and the professional outputs, of sociologists. The responses of sociologists in these cases will also be compared, and related to numerous established theses relating to for example domestic disciplinary identity and tradition of public engagement outlined in earlier chapters. Before leaving the chapter, I will develop a critique of the implications of both ideologies.

The Concluding chapter summarises major finding and arguments from the empirical chapters. It further relates the empirical observations to the theses of
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1 Between the current chapter, five and six, there was originally another projected chapter titled 'Negotiating the Western Paradigms'. This chapter was unfortunately not included in the current version due to time constraint. I shall seek to incorporate the chapter in a later version revised for formal publication.
“world system of knowledge network” and “colonial modernity” discussed in chapter one, and revisit the subtitle with an extended discussion about the dialectic between geopolitics, state and sociologist. Direction for future research will also be suggested. In the end, the Epilogue included a personal account.
Ch1. Theoretical Maps

This chapter provides a rough theoretical “map”. The word “map” was deliberately chosen to reflect how I understood the connection between the theoretical construct and my empirical research. A map is an abstracted, simplified, form of representing empirical reality. It is drawn with purpose and presumptions and it is useful because its omission, and even distortion, brings more cognitive clarity. A map invites a “gaze” on both the map itself and the world it projects. A first time tourist follows a published map. An explorer, on the other hand, could only draw a rough map before the expedition, and revise it along the journey. All these characteristics are applicable to theories.

There are maps of different scales and functions published, ranging from grand atlases and city centre map, to detailed hiking trail finders. This metaphor is still applicable to theories and their use in empirical research. Theory could be the testable propositions often seen in positivistic projects with well-defined questions, conducted following the Popperian doctrine of scientific knowledge

1 The underground maps, for instance, is useful because it represent the relative positions of stations in a simplified way that requires the distortion of the actual geographical proportion.
(Popper 1959; 1963). Theory could refer to the heuristic devices employed in interpretive projects, or the sensitizing concepts in the grounded approach. Theory of course includes the conceptual framework that has guided the collection of data and formulation of a meaningful narrative grounded in observations. Theory, at its most fundamental level, includes the ontological and epistemological question about how I position myself and my project in relation to the social realm of the subject matter.

The multiple layers of theoretical gazes could all be relevant to any project, but their relative importance, nonetheless, varies based on the nature and scale of the particular project. This inquiry, as the first historical-comparative project attempted of its subject (the framing of sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore), was not pursued with a motif to answer any pre-defined theoretical question—although testable propositions did emerge and were sometimes tested (to a variety of satisfactory degree) during the fieldwork. Its purpose was (1) to observe the empirical patterns, (2) to induce some conceptual themes and frames by contrasting the recorded pattern, and (3) to construct interpretations that can lead to future debate. The entire research process was characterised by constant traveling between the empirical realm and the theoretical imaginaries.
The empirical observation often led to the formulation of new propositions and revisions of the previous conceptual map, which, conversely, guided the search for new evidence in the collected materials. This reciprocal process gradually refined the conceptual map for a “closer” match to empirical observations, “tightening-up” the logical links between the two spheres. It continued up until the date of writing, revealing some patterns never observed before while leaving some gaps to be explored in future.

Of the various scales and versions of maps, this chapter only aims to identify the source of inspiration that I begin with, and to outline the broad conceptual framework and major themes that remain constant. I shall first define sociology as a subject matter, and then anchor the project in the traditional sociology of knowledge. I will next reviews various meta-theories about the state of Asian social sciences, before I move on propose a “world system of knowledge network” as an overarching frame to fix the deficiencies of the earlier-reviewed literature. I shall ultimately introduce modernity as a pivotal concept in this project and elaborate on the links between Asian sociologies and colonial modernity in respective countries.
Meta-theoretical issues are not addressed in this chapter, but are instead considered in the methodological chapter. Specific propositions that emerged and were tested in the research process will also be covered in later chapters.

1.1 Sociology as Subject Matter

What is Sociology? Numerous thinkers involved in its development have provided various definitions. August Comte first proposed the word *sociologie* to replace his earlier term *physique sociale* to designate the new science “which bears on the positive study of the totality of fundamental laws proper to social phenomena”. Following Comte, Durkheim (1938) made great efforts in establishing sociology as a discipline devoted to the study of objective, thing-like “social facts”. Weber approached social life from a subjective point of view, hence he defined sociology as a science which aimed to “interpret the meaning of social action and thereby give a casual explanation” (Weber 1978:7). Giddens added some historical depth, describing the main focus of sociology as “the study of the social institutions brought into being by the industrial transformations of the past two or three centuries” (Giddens 1982:9). Definitions of this sort sought

---

to draw a *normative* boundary of this discipline by defining its meta-theoretical core – either in terms of its subject matter, epistemological style, methodology or objectives. For the purpose of this project, however, no definition of this sort is drawn. At a conceptual level, I observe sociology as a *historical entity* of intellectual activities – a collection of knowledge and activities of inquiry that is embodied under a common disciplinary tag that is repeatedly redefined in both intellectual and institutional ways. In empirical research, I narrow the scope of investigation to the writing, activities, and views of a “core circle of sociologist” defined by their *institutional affiliation*. I shall elaborate on both decisions later.

1.1.1 Sociology as Historical Entity

Observing sociology as a historical entity involves two conceptual concessions from adhering to any versions of conventional definition. The first is a *constructivist* turn – that is, I reframe myself from adhering to any *real* definition of sociology and accept the multiplicity of how this definition could be theoretically-constructed. This stance allows me to examine most scholarship claiming to be sociology. The second step is a *historical* turn\(^1\) – that is, I notice

\(^1\) The Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of Social Sciences (chaired by Wallerstein) also took a similar historical approach in their report, 1996, Ch1.
the constant practice of disciplinary genealogy-compiling that not only produces varied versions of historical views of the discipline, but also makes reference to works of earlier authors who rarely identified themselves as “sociologists” (or even perished before the birth of the term). This stance allows me to compare versions of historical narratives and discuss the politics of inclusion/exclusion.

The historical trajectory of sociology can be mapped at four interrelated layers. The first involves the evolution of categories and theories along the intellectual milestones such as key thinkers, ground-breaking works that led to new paradigms and significant academic events in which fundamental issues were debated. The second involves the expansion and transition of an institutional basis that include departments, institutes, professional associations, journals and even sources of funding and mechanism of the academic evaluation. The third involves the accumulation of sociological knowledge (empirical and mid-range theoretical) generated through substantial research in various topical areas. The last involves the shifting patterns of professional practices that are manifest in research, dissemination, teaching and public engagement. If sociology is imaged as a virtual persona, the four layers roughly correspond to its spirit (theory), body (institution), knowledge (knowledge) and behaviour (practice).
An historical account of the first layer can be found in the opening chapters of many sociology textbooks whereby the origin of the discipline is conventionally traced back to a list of European thinkers. Other examples include Abraham’s (1973) attempt to trace the “origin and growth of sociology”; a recent book to tell the “story of sociology” by McLennan (2011); and the various volumes that review the development of sociological thoughts and theories (e.g. Aron 1965; Callinicos 1999). In Asian countries, however, the history of domestic sociology is generally narrated from the second layer and detailed attention is paid to the founding of major departments, associations, publication platforms, and projects for research or intellectual exchange\(^1\). These institutional bases were often considered prerequisites for the research and teaching of this imported discipline to emerge in a significant sense. In the third layer, systematic reviews of sociological studies by sociologists bounded in any geographical or institutional unit requires, first, a sufficient quality of research already produced to make such an undertaking possible, and second, a sense of community or collective identity being formed to warrant the review unit legitimate. The recent collections *The Making of Singapore Sociology* (Tong and Lian 2002) and

fall into this category. Finally, some surveys of the practices of sociologists (their ways of doing research, publishing, teaching or public engagement) were undertaken by either academic administrators, professional associations, or individual academics interested in professional issues.  

1.1.2 Sociology as Institutional Existence

In this inquiry I operationally define my scope of investigation in institutional terms (such as in departments, institutes, association, conferences and journals bearing the disciplinary name) to empirically focus on the composition, activities, and intellectual output of those who constitute the core circle of sociologists. Occasional reference will be made to those outside the “core circle” (such as the pioneers prior to the establishment of the first department, foreign scholars, or scholars in other departments), but such reference is made only to those whose works were cited within the “core circle” as influential to the current state of domestic sociology. This prioritization of the institutional status reflects considerations on several fronts. First, the institutional establishments have a concrete and visible form of existence compared. In tracing trajectories in other
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1 See also 4.1.2
layers, we often need to rely on the institutional tag (for example the publications of scholars affiliated to sociology departments) to filter out the material relevant. Sociologists certainly remember the early European thinkers who wrote before the institutionalization of sociology (e.g. Marx, Weber) but left a significant legacy to this discipline. However, their works could not have been canonized if sociology had not been institutionalized as a legitimate discipline in the first place. Second, as mentioned in the previous section, in Asian countries where sociology was introduced, the history of sociology often starts with the history of its institutionalization. By adopting the institutional definition of sociology, further, I avoid the issue associated with imposing an external researcher-standard and accept how sociology is practically defined in local contexts. Third, when we consider “the sociology of a country,” what we have in mind is usually the works of scholars affiliated to the institutions there. Perhaps we can expand this to include the academic events held, and the journals or books published there. All the links between the geographical locale and the portion of sociological scholarship bearing its name are institutional. In comparison, where an empirical study is conducted and where sociological knowledge is to be consumed are seldom considered as criteria for labelling particular works with a national tag.
1.2 Sociology of Knowledge

The historical trajectories of sociology at the four layers shall be mapped to provide the empirical basis for analysing their framing. “Framing” in this context refers to the process by which the particular configuration of contextual factors leads to inclinations towards a particular pattern of disciplinary formation. The words “formation” and “trajectories” both imply a sequential transition of patterns (in the four observable empirical layers) and may sometimes be used interchangeably; although the former implies more about the internal dynamics that led to the transition, while the later refers primarily to the observable transitional path. This research question has an affinity with the broad tradition of the sociology of knowledge (and some of its later derivatives).

1.2.1 The German Origin: Scheler and Manheim

The sociology of knowledge emerged as a new field of study from the Weimer Germany when the post-WWI disillusion, repeated political crisis, and a prevailing “tragic consciousness” drove various thinkers, in particular Max Scheler and Karl Manheim, to reflect upon how human thoughts were connected

\(^1\) Lenk 1987, see also Meja and Stehr 1990, 4
to the social context. The idea bear the legacy of Marx, who used (1977 [1859], Preface) the concept pair of Basis (Base, e.g. economics, state, race) and Überbau (Upperbuilding, e.g. ideas) to argue that human consciousness was determined by one’s social location in the economic structure. Marx also made a critique (1932 [1846]) of ideology as distorted consciousness that conceals contradictions in the interest of the dominant class and therefore needs to be “unmasked”. The concept of ideology was refined by later Marxists like Lukasc (as a projection of the ruling class’s consciousness) or Gramsci (as a product of cultural hegemony). The Marxist doctrine of ideologies became so prevalent in Weimar Germany that political parties often used this conceptual device to “unmask” the positions of others as interest-bounded ideology, eroding any confidence in the objectivity of knowledge claims. This was the crisis that the sociology of knowledge was to overcome.

The invention of the term Soziologie des Wissens (sociology of knowledge) was generally credited to Max Scheler, who proposed the field as a part of his broader vision of the “sociology of culture” (1980 [1960], Ch1). He formulated a new

discipline for the “...analysis of those regularities of the social processes and structures that pertain to intellectual life and to modes of knowing” as an attempt to transcend the relativity of historically and socially bounded knowledge (Berger and Luckman 1967:7-8). Scheler (ibid: Ch1) began elaborating over the new field with an outline of “three possible basic relations that knowledge has to society”: (1) The knowledge that members of a group have of one another and the possibility of their mutual understanding is an element that co-constitute “human society.” (2) Any group has a knowledge of its own existence, no matter how vague, and a knowledge of generally accepted values and ends (e.g., there is no class without class consciousness). All knowledge somehow determines the nature (Sosein) of society. (3) All knowledge is also conversely determined by society and its structure (1980). The latter two points suggest that Scheler noted the reciprocal shaping of knowledge and society. But he might be best remembered for his stance in the third aspect— the thesis that the Realfaktoren (real factors, e.g. race, state and economy) regulate the emergence of certain Idealfaktoren (ideal factors, e.g. idea, theory), facilitating or impeding their generation and diffusion, but not determining their content and

1 Summary by Meja and Stehr, 1990, p67
validity. ¹ This thesis recaptures Marx's concepts of Unterbau and Uberbau with a more reserved stance on the suggested connection in between.

Karl Manheim (in *Idiologie und Utopie* published in 1929) proposed another version of the sociology of knowledge which eventually cast a more far-reaching influence. Manheim defined the sociology of knowledge as a theory that sought to analyse how human thoughts were *seinsverbunden* (existentially connected). He described this field as "closely related to, but increasingly distinguishable from, [Marxists'] theory of ideology." The older theory of ideology, he argued, has a particular conception of ideology because it seeks to unmasking specific assertions as either distortion or conscious deception. The new science he proposed was based on a total conception of ideology that tackled the "mental structure in its totality," addressing the inevitable variation of knowledge formed in different social and historical settings (Mannheim 1936, Ch V, Sec 1). Manheim discussed (1929:108) the crisis of repeated "ideology-unmasking" between political parties in Weimer Germany. His undertaking can be seen as an effort to pave a path towards possible mutual understanding between groups by

reframing their contradictions as the *inevitable difference* of knowledge of varied social origin, rather than the *conscious deception* of any side that was interest-serving (Meja and Stehr 1990a:5). Manheim was considered more “critical” than Scheler because he acknowledged the content and validity of knowledge (except that of mathematics and some natural sciences) as socially-determined.

Manheim’s work provoked extensive debate around its inheritance and rupture from Marxism and historical materialism, the implied epistemological issue of the validity of human knowledge, and the relationship between knowledge and politics – a series of controversies known as the “sociology of knowledge dispute (Meija & Stehr, 1990).” This dispute, however, was brought to a premature close in the early 1930s, as many of its participating thinkers were either forced into exile or silenced by the rise of Nazism in Germany. This very historical force that troubled these German thinkers was soon felt in the rest of the world and this, ironically, brought their concerns to a much wider audience (Wirth 1936:x).

1.2.2 The American Reorientation: Merton, Berger and Luckmann

The sociology of knowledge was introduced to the United States with the 1936 publication of *Ideology and Utopia* (translated by the immigrant German
sociologist Louis Wirth and his assistant Edward Shils) and a subsequent article

Robert Merton published on *Iris* in 1937 in which he presented a critical

introduction of the field. Wirth, in a preface to the translated book, noted that the

*problem of objectivity* (of knowledge), the central issue underlying Manheim’s

work, was generally overlooked by American sociologists, although it had been
discussed by some American philosophers (e.g. James, Peirce, Mead, and Dewey)
and incorporated into certain social psychological studies, (Wirth 1936: xviii).

Merton, while generally acknowledging the importance of studying the social
dependence of knowledge, also rejected the early (German) epistemological
preoccupation as “excessive and fruitless.” “The social genesis of thought,” he
wrote, “has no necessary bearing on its validity or falsity” (1937:493). The

indifference of American sociologists towards epistemological issues might be
related to the status of American sociology as a more institutionally established
discipline and the clearer division of labour with its neighbouring disciplines.

Merton constructed a revised agenda of the sociology of knowledge that
integrated its approach to that of *structural functionalism*. He traced the
intellectual genealogy of the field not only back to the German thinkers, but also
to the writing of Durkheim and Sorokin. He also applied the functionalist concept
of manifest/ latent function to the sphere of ideation (1963). Merton also made
some ground-breaking studies into a special branch of the field; the sociology of
science (1973). Major contributions include identifying CUDOS (Communalism,
Universalism, Disinterestedness, and Organized-Scepticism) as the core
normative values of science (pp267-280) and coining the term Matthew Effect
(or “cumulative advantage”, the phenomenon “the rich get richer”) to explain why
eminent scientists got disproportionate credit (pp439-459).

In Social Construction of Reality, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann proposed
(1967:1) a distinct reorientation of the sociology of knowledge towards an
analysis of the processes of how “reality” is socially constructed in everyday life.
They defined reality in a phenomenologist’s perspective as “quality appertaining
to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our own
volition,” and knowledge similarly defined as “the certainty that phenomena are
real and that they possess specific characteristics” to render this concept relevant
to “the man in the street.” Their proposal marked three significant departures
from the previous tradition of the field: (1) a departure from the past empirical
attention paid to the intellectual history of elite thought towards a renewed focus
on the knowledge of laypeople, (2) the characterisation of the epistemological
and methodological questions as part of philosophy, hence this was excluded from the scope of the “empirical discipline of sociology (p13),” and (3) a transition of concerns from how knowledge was socially conditioned to how knowledge constructs perceived social reality.

Both Merton’s functionalist revision and Berger and Luckmann’s phenomenologist reorientation of the sociology of knowledge downplayed the traditional preoccupation with epistemological issues as work for philosophers and they redefined the objective of the field toward a narrower vision that was considered more “sociological”. Both can be seen as attempts to “normalize” the subject field within the established division of labour in American academia (Meja and Sther, 1999). The American transformation of the “sociology of knowledge” is itself an excellent case for the study of sociology of knowledge.

1.2.3 Scholarly Currents, Post-1960s

The sociology of knowledge, despite the success of works by its pioneers, did not flourish as a vibrant subfield of sociology in America. The percentage of sociologists with interest in the field had actually declined by the early 1980s. Its limited appeal might be explained by the mismatch between the field and
American academia. The suspicious link of the field to epistemological *relativism*, for instance, conflicted with the mainstream scientific doctrine among American academics that there exist universally-valid truths which could be verified by rigorous procedures. Its grandiose formulation at its initial inception did not ‘fit’ the higher degree of professionalization and specialized division of labour in American academia, which tended to limit sociological inquiries to a narrower scope. Perhaps the most fundamental reason was the central role of “human thoughts” in many aspects of our social life, which made the sociology of knowledge a domain of concerns that is relevant to almost all sociological inquiries, rather than a self-contained specialty that should best be studied in its own right. Therefore, while the sociology of knowledge declined as a distinctive sub-field, many of its major concerns or perspectives received continuous elaboration in several interrelated fields.

At least three currents of such legacies can be outlined. First, the objectivity of knowledge; the *epistemological* issue central to the German sociology of knowledge, was continuously debated with regard to the special domain of scientific knowledge. In the fields of the “philosophy of science” and “sociology of scientific knowledge” (SSK), harsh confrontation resumed between the
relativist’s challenges on the epistemological prestige of science and the various conceptual solutions proposed to save it.

Second, the thesis that knowledge can “determine the nature of society” (Scheler 1980[1960]: Ch1) or “construct the social reality” (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) was carried over to numerous ontological treatises. Berger and Luckmann inspired numerous social constructivists to depart from the conventional realist doctrine that approached the social as objective facts, to see the social phenomena and their meanings as something constantly accomplished by actors and hence never free from their thoughts. Realist John Searle (1995) rejected some constructivist’s views (notably Derrida) as conflating facts and statements about facts, but he conceded that certain elements of our contemporary society existed only because of our knowledge and belief of them (for example money and law which he called social reality).

2 Strategies of such efforts include (1) to dissociate the origin of knowledge from its validity, (2) to distinguish scientific knowledge from the irrational thoughts, reserving social analysis for the later only, e.g., Laudan (1979), (3) to postulate an incremental model for scientific progress, e.g. Popper (1977), and Lakatos (1959), (4) to assert and structuralist stance on the existence of certain universal feature that anchor our knowledge, e.g. the development of philosophical anthropology and recent surge of sociobiology. See Meja and Stehr 1990:288-291.
Third, the link between knowledge and politics, an issue that troubled the founding thinkers of sociology of knowledge, also attracted continuous works on relevant themes such as ideology, various “men of knowledge” (intellectual, expert, academic profession), the power of modern organizations (e.g. universities, libraries, foundations) in the production and dissemination of knowledge, and the political entanglement of various knowledge claims.

1.2.4 Grounding the Project

This review has demonstrated a fluctuating genealogy of the sociology of knowledge and a range of derivative scholarship. How is my current project grounded in this literature terrain? First of all, this project shares the basic question central to the sociology of knowledge since its initial inception: how are human thought and knowledge connected to the social context. However, it does not share the philosophical preoccupation of original German tradition. Second, the epistemological and ontological debates this tradition inspired, nonetheless, served as resourceful references for devising my own stance at both levels (See Ch2). Third, the theoretical debates around ideology, intellectual and expert, and the role of modern organization were illuminating, explicitly or implicitly, in my inquiry of the “domestic disciplinary identity” (Ch5), the public roles of
sociologist (Ch6), and the impact of contemporary managerialism and academic
globalism (Ch7). Finally, in this empirical investigation, I sought to map and
analyse the institutional foundation of sociology in ways that fall within the
functionalist tradition set out by Merton, and approach the memories, intentions,
ideas and rationales of the actors (sociologists) in ways influenced by the
phenomenological tradition inspired by Berger and Luckmann.

1.3 Theorizing Sociology in Asia

The tradition of the sociology of knowledge and subsequent related scholarship
form a rich source of inspiration. However the entire corps of literature reviewed
so far has ignored the geographical dimension of knowledge, in particular the
geography-bounded power relation between the former colonial powers where
modern science was first invented and the former Asian colonies where such
scholarship was introduced. Syed Farid Alatas (2006:Ch2)\(^1\) attempted a review
of a variety of meta-analysis of the state of the social science in relation to the
Asia, sorted in a 2 by 2 table (see Table 1-1) defined by the two dimensions

\textit{internal-external} (to social science) and \textit{cognitive-institutional}. The first

\(^{1}\) Syed Farid Alatas, a Native to Malaysia, teaches in the sociology department of National
University of Singapore (NUS). His father, Syed Hussein Alatas, who also had taught (Malay
Studies) in NUS, was a respected public intellectual in Malaysia and contributed some of the
discourses his son cited.
dimension distinguished factors relating to the internal characteristics of scholarship of Asian social sciences (including theory construction, methodology, empirical and applied studies) from the factors that influence social science externally. The second dimension separates the ideal aspect (e.g. ideas, concepts and values) and institutional components (e.g. funding, technology, terminology and publication channels) related to social sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Captive Mind (SH Alatas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientalism (Said)</td>
<td>Pedagogical Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurocentrism</td>
<td>Modern Colonial Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcolonial Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Theories of Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Academic Dependency: Idea and the Media of Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dependency: Technology, Aid and Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Imperialism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-1 Theorizing Asian Social Science: A Typology of Meta Analyses
Source: Table by the author based on Alatas (2006, Ch2)

The category Internal-Cognitive refers to approaches that critically examine the ideas internal to social scientific discourse. The Orientalism thesis (e.g. Abdel-Malek 1963; Said 1978), for instance, argued that the Western discourse of the Orient, produced along the process of colonial European power, was constructed in a way that reflected how the Orient was imagined by Westerners, clearly bearing the presumptions of seeing the Orient as ontologically different.
and essentially inferior. A similar bias could be found in many social theories and contemporary ideologies, which, according to the critique of Eurocentrism, positions Europe as unique and superior in world history and, explicitly or implicitly, justified European expansion alongside notions of “manifest destiny” (of the Europe) and “the White man’s burden” (Amin 1989). Similar concern was also expressed by Connell (2007) who cited various underrepresented “southern theories” and Bhambra (2007) who urged a critical rethink of the concept of modernity. The postcolonial criticism of the discourses (e.g. modernization) prevailing in the Third World revealed an underlying power which not only justified the existing order, but also led to the “normalization” and disciplinary control of the people. Such discourses are often based on knowledge about colonial subjects that approaches them as “objective of control... examined, measured, categorised, made the target of policies of normalization”. All these critiques echoed the rhetorical theories of social sciences that destruct the various wording techniques employed to present the narrated version of reality as “attractive, edifying, obvious, [and] compelling (Baehr and O’Brien 1994:62).” The external-cognitive category includes approaches that examine the ideas,

attitudes, values and mentalities external to social sciences which nonetheless exert influence over scholarship. Malaysian sociologist Syed Hussein Alatas, for instance, proposed the thesis of captive mind to describe those “victim of Orientalism and Eurocentrism... characterised by a way of thinking that is dominated by Western thought in an imitative and uncritical manner.” This mental captivity can be clearly observed in many developmental studies, which imitate Western development studies in terms of how subject matters are conceptualized, empirically examined, explained and generalized, without critical reflection over their political implications. One major mechanism which led to such mental captivity is education, which, as Ian Illich (1973) criticized with his notion of “hidden curriculum” in Pedagogical theories of modernization, trains children with the dominant values of modern social order through discipline and regimentation. The Modern colonial critique (e.g. Freire and Fanon) interpreted pedagogical practices as serving the interests of the oppressors who are inclined toward changing the mentality of the oppressed, rather than changing oppressive conditions.

1 Alatas, SF, ibid, p47. The idea was first proposed by SH Alatas, 1972
The second row labelled *institutional* deals with structural components relating to social science. The discussion here focuses on the *academic dependency* of the developing (peripheral) countries on the industrialized (core) ones. Alatas listed six dimensions of such dependency as: a dependency on ideas, on media of ideas (e.g. journals, conferences), on the technology of education, on research aids, on educational investment, and on the Western demand for the skills of Third World researchers (Alatas SF 2006: 64). The first two dimensions were considered internal to social science, while the rest were considered as external. Also discussed in the internal-institutional category was the theory of *Intellectual Imperialism*; another concept elaborated on by SH Alatas to refer to the “domination of one people by another in their world of thinking” (ibid, 52).

The approaches reviewed by SF Alatas provide a wide array of perspectives for critical reflection over the sociological discourses about, and social scientific scholarship in, Asia. The common focus was the power relation between the West (the colonizers, the First World) and the East (the colonized, the Third World). However, a built-in dualistic imaginary made these constructs limited in their ability to capture the more complex patterns of how social scientific expertise and knowledge spread across the world, and the historical trajectory of how such
patterns came into being. The geopolitical framing of such trajectories that involve multiple powers was excluded from the picture. Consider sociology in Taiwan and Hong Kong for instance. Its initial introduction as a teaching subject was largely achieved by post-war emigrant Chinese sociologists. Moreover, the pre-war Chinese sociology was developed with great dependence on works translated from Japanese literature. The mediation of both Japan and China left some marks on the initial post-war sociology in Taiwan and Hong Kong, which nonetheless are easily neglected if we only conceive of sociology as a Western product. Moreover, assuming such a dualist vision would make it difficult to fully comprehend the cases of Hong Kong and Singapore, which are themselves products of a mixture of both the East and the West. The two former colonial entrepôt appeared Asian for Westerners, but they also function as gateway to the West for people from the surrounding hinterland in China and Southeast Asia. Most of their sociologists were trained in the first world, but they also train the students for the neighbouring, “less developed” countries. To cope with these problems, I shall situate the inquiry within an imagery of broader scope called the World System of Knowledge Network.
1.4 World System of Knowledge Network

The framework to be introduced was inspired by concepts like “world system” (Wallerstein 1974; 2004), “network society” (Castells 1996), “knowledge network” (Altbach 1987), and “cultural capital” (Bourdieu 1986). The world system analysis, an approach popularised by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) in his classic account of the historical expansion of capitalism from its genesis in Renaissance Europe to a modern “integrated world economy,” is an attempt to transcend the structure of social sciences inherited from the 19th century. Several epistemological boundaries were challenged. The distinction between social science and history was reconsidered to bring the latter back in the scope of social inquiry; the division of social sciences deriving from the Hegelian division of society (state, market and civil society) was merged for an interdisciplinary approach; and the perspective of seeing the modern nation-state as the default unit was replaced by a transnational, systemic approach. The core concept “world system” was defined by Wallerstein (1974), in a structural functionalist tone, as a “social system with boundaries, structure, member groups, rule of legitimation, and coherence (p229).” Yet the emerging picture, a world of countries differentiated along a core-peripheral hierarchy by patterns of trade
links and capital flow, clearly has the imprint of Marxist critique on imperialism. The world system analysis was initially conceived to illuminate the evolution of economic relations at a world scale, but the metaphor of core/peripheries was soon applied in the analysis of other sectors, including the production and distribution of knowledge. Altbach (1987), for instance, wrote about the “international dissemination of knowledge” that is characterised by the “gulf” between the “Western industrialized world which produces knowledge and the vast hinterland of consuming nations of the Third World (p xii).” The figurative metaphor Altbach used, however, was not a “system” consisting of nation-states as key components, but a “context” (in the book title) or a “network” (in introduction and conclusion) of educational institutions, libraries, publishing houses and journals as constitutive elements. The “network” perspective marked one more step away from the state-centric perspective, and it was further elaborated upon by Castells (1996) in his thesis of network society as a new type of social morphology in the Information Age.

---

1 The concepts “core/peripheral” was first used by Lenin 1916. The metaphor was also used in the dependency theories proposed in 1960s (e.g. Paul Baran, Andre Gunder Frank, Theotonio Dos Santos, Fernando Henrique Cardoso) as critique of the modernization theory. The world system analysis can be seen as a expanded version of dependency theory.
Both the world system analysis and network society thesis stressed the transnational aspect that transcends the traditional assumption of seeing national containers as the default unit of analysis. However, three major contrasts should be highlighted. First, the “network society” thesis focused on the distinctive social morphology of one particular type of network created by the wide-spreading information and communication technology, and this was relatively less concerned with historical trajectory before its emergence. Second, the retreat of historical concern was paralleled by a tendency of “depoliticising” globalization, downplaying the earlier Marxism-enlightened concerns of the core-peripheral relations by theorizing around the structure in the more abstracted and objectified terminology of networks and nodes (Marcuse 2002). Finally, as its major strength, the network thesis has the potential of presenting a more sophisticated multi-level picture of the dynamics at various scales.

The world system of knowledge network proposed here, borrowing ideas from both perspectives, provides a conceptual framework for narrating the historical expansion of knowledge enterprise from the first few modern Western universities to a vast global network of knowledge production and dissemination. Knowledge, for the purpose of this project, is practically narrowed to the output
from the academic community. It does not include the folk “knowledge” of lay people, journalist stories circulated on media, web content, the scattered data compiled by various social agencies and so on—unless they were transcribed into a scholarly text or came from scholarly sources. I adopt the imaginary of network to acknowledge the multiple (not just the “inter-national”) level of social entities and relations embodied in this system. Therefore, its node could be a country if national settings and policies are concerned, a city in the geographical network of transportation, a university or a department in the institutional network, a publisher, a database service, a website, or even a single scholar in the interpersonal network in academia. The links between nodes represent a flow of knowledge in numerous possible forms— for example the transport of physical media (e.g. books, journals), translations between languages, personnel migration (international students, visiting staff, conferences or guest ‘talks’), publication submission, or citation. Above all, the term “world system” retains emphases on the relevancy of history in social inquiry, on the interdisciplinary approach to transcend the conventional division of social sciences, and on the concern of the core-peripheral inequality and its reproduction.
This framework will serve as a background imaginary in which the research questions throughout the dissertation will be anchored. The particular analyses to be delivered in these chapters, therefore, shall be seen as attempts to assemble the overall picture of the historical formation, structural outlook, and social mechanisms of this system. However, as Wallerstein acknowledged, macro concepts like the world system are extremely difficult to verify in rigid, quantifiable manner. Similarly, I have no intention of translating this background heuristic device into quantitative indicators in a systematic way in this project.

1.5 Colonial Modernity and Asian Sociology

The above sections defined sociology as a subject matter, outlined various meta-analyses of Asian social sciences after a review of the sociology of knowledge, and proposed the “word system of knowledge network” as an over-arching conceptual imagery. A pivotal theme that penetrates the three layers of discourse, as I shall discuss in this section, is “modernity.”

1.5.1 Modernity and Sociology

Modernity (the character of the modern society) was clarified by Giddens (1998, 94) by offering three characterisations: (1) A certain set of attitudes towards the
world as open to transformation by human intervention; (2) a complex of
economic institutions, especially industrial production and a market economy; (3)
a certain range of political institutions, including the nation-state and mass
democracy. The three themes can be traced back respectively to the
Enlightenment and scientific revolution, the industrial revolution, and the French
(democratic) revolutions. The idea of modernity presumed a rupture of the
“modern European” from the earlier era, and its distinction from the pre-modern
societies in Asia and Africa (Bhambra 2007).

The historical emergence of sociology has, since the start, intertwined with the
development of modernity. On the one hand, sociology took modernity as its
primary subject of inquiry. The initiation of the new discipline was driven by the
tremendous social transformation following the “dual revolutions” (the industrial
French) (Giddens 1982). The major themes include various facets of the
emerging “modern society”— for example industrialization, capitalism expansion,
urbanization, the rise of large institutions and the nation state. On the other hand,
sociology is itself a manifestation of modernity. The intellectual enterprise is
sustained within the modern institutions of universities with government
funding. It aims to make sense of, and exert control over, modern society in a
rational way. The faith in rationality and attitudes to exert human knowledge to intervene in the social, and the reliance on large institutional and on national fiscal systems all bear the gene of modernity.

1.5.2 Colonial Modernity and Asian Social Sciences

The emergence of modernity was closely tied up to colonialism in several ways (Bhambra 2007). First, the presumed distinction between the modernized Europe and the rest of the world which was pre-modern created a perception of European mandate that legitimized the projection of colonial power. Second, to a large extent the more sophisticated achievement of European modernity was made possible by the material resources harvested from the exploitive trading system created by the colonial expansion. Third, the colonial powers exemplified a version of modernity through the demonstration of their technological capability, military power, and the material affluence brought by industrial production to the Third World. They introduced various modern institutions in the territories directly under the colonial control, and inspired the post-colonial modernization projects pursued in many Asian countries.

The version of modernity developed in such a context, however, should not be
seen as a mere reproduction of Western modernity. First, the colonial administration never transplanted the entire political, legal and educational system from their home country to the colonies. Instead they selectively adopted a combination of elements that best secured the colonial interest. Second, in many parts of the colonized world, the encounters with Westerners created a psychological complex that combined agony from exploitation and slavery, envy for Western power backed by modern technologies, and anxiety over losing traditional culture, values and identity. This complex lived on into the post-colonial era and formed the axis of debate about the modernity project pursued by many post-colonial countries. Therefore, I have adopted the term “colonial modernity” (Barlow 1993) to recapture the unique trajectory of modernization that was framed by both the “filter effect” under colonial rule and the constant presence of anti-imperialist and nationalist sentiment.

The interconnection between modernity and the emergence of sociology invites further examination into the connection between the form of colonial modernity and the formation of sociology in the respective countries. This aim is a return to the themes discussed in the previous two sections. The theoretical diagnosis of the state of Asian social sciences outlined in Sec 1.3 could be seen as a
manifestation of discontent with the modern social scientific discourses of Western origin. This discontent mirrored the ambivalence of Western modernity in a wider context. To a greater or lesser extent, these diagnoses left their mark on the later trajectory of domestic scholarship. The world system of knowledge network (Sec 1.4) was so conceived to depict the historical expansion of a modern knowledge network from Europe to its colonies. The conceptual framework invites an analysis of various transnational structural dynamics in this process. Such structural dynamics also frames the development of domestic scholarship. To be more specific, the framework drew attention to the following colonial-related themes:

(1) The production and dissemination of sociological knowledge about the colonial territories and subjects by scholars who were either associated with, or were supported by the colonial administrations.

(2) The colonial installation of knowledge intensive institutions (e.g. higher educational institutions, libraries and academic societies) and its legacies for both the structure of higher education and intellectual horizons.

(3) The hierarchical structure of knowledge flowing between the colonial core and peripheries.
The colonial geopolitics and their impact on the production and flow of knowledge.

The colonial network and the post-colonial patterns of knowledge flow (e.g. the scholar/student migration, submission to foreign publisher or journal).

The following chapters will demonstrate how these themes affect the development of sociology in the three cases examined.

1.5.3 Four Principal Powers in East Asia

Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore all emerged in modern history as strategic nodes on the map of confrontation between the various imperial powers competing in this region. Their modernization was initiated by external colonizers, and, even after the decolonization of Taiwan and Singapore, continued on a path constantly shaped by the shifting balance and relationships between these regional powers. There were four principal forces that played significant roles in regional history and these were. First, China has historically been the source of migration and cultural influence in the region. Second, the European colonial powers (Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish and in particular the British) came through the Melaka Strait since the 17th century. Third, Japan, the first modernized power in East Asia, rose in late 19th century. Fourth, the United
States, the hegemony merged in the Pacific region in the 20th century. The short “historical portrait” in Introduction suggests that all three places had some sort of encounter with the four imperial forces. Table 1-2 summarised these encounters. Different shading is used to indicate my subjective evaluation of the relative significance (duration and mode of impact) of the influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial Force</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td>Chinese Migrant 16thC onward Qing Empire 1683-1895 Republic of China, 1945-</td>
<td>Historical Territory of Chinese Empire Chinese Migrant HKSAR, PRC ‘97-</td>
<td>Chinese Migrant Labour, 19th C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire and the Circle of Confucian Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia circle of Co-Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-War US Hegemony</strong></td>
<td>American Ally against the Communist China</td>
<td>American Hegemony</td>
<td>American Hegemony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Colonial Powers</strong></td>
<td>Dutch and Spanish Settlements in 17th C</td>
<td>British colony 1842-1997</td>
<td>British colony 1819-1959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-2, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore: Historical Encounter with Four Imperial Forces

**Summary**

This chapter reviews a series of theoretical “maps” relevant to the study. To define the subject matter, I first accepted sociology as a *historical entity* by allowing anything that had been claimed as part of the discipline into the horizon.
For empirical research, I operationally defined my scope of investigation in

*institutional terms* to focus on a core circle of sociologists. This inquiry was

anchored within the tradition of the sociology of knowledge. I reviewed the

German origin, reorientation in the United States and various post-1960s

legacies of the sociology of knowledge; but I also noted its ignorance of

gеography dimension of knowledge, in particular the power relation between

the former colonial powers and their colonies. Various approaches of theorising

the state of social science in Asia (Alatas 2006: Ch2) were subsequently reviewed

but were considered limited by their built-in dualistic image of East-West

dichotomy. To address the theoretical shortage, I borrowed from Wallerstein

(1974), Castell (1996) and Altbach (1987) to propose a “world system of

knowledge network” as an overarching theoretical frame to place my inquiry. The

framework retains the Wallerstinian emphases on history in social inquiry, on an

interdisciplinary approach, and on a concern of the core-peripheral inequality;

but it avoids a state-centric approach and acknowledges the multiple levels of

social entities and relations embodied in the system. The concept “modernity”

was in the end introduced as a pivotal theme, relating the project about Asian

sociology to the forms of colonial modernity in the region.
Ch2. Methodological Note

This methodological chapter outlines the research design and describe the methods employed of data collection. It elaborates the methodological rationales and limitations and reflects upon the ethical dimension. The conventional practice of its writing is to deliver a neatly-organized “design” with clearly defined objectives and procedures to defend the scientific rigor and disciplinary identity of the project. This practice however tends to present the research as a well-controlled process that follows a pre-determined blueprint, and therefore downplays (if not conceals) the expected frustrations, inevitable compromises, and decisions of reorientation in the actual course of research. This is what I shall avoid. In fact, one characteristic of this project was my constant doubt of whether I, still a trainee in this profession, was suitable for undertaking such a task that involved researching many senior colleagues. The precarious researcher- subject power relation proved challenging. Hence in the following sections, I will incorporate a more personal perspective to dialectically reflect upon my positionality in this project and restore a historical dimension of the research process to acknowledge how the blueprint has been revised towards a more feasible proposition. This chapter proceeds with a discussion of the “comparative
design” and the “historical turn” (an extension in time scale to bring more history into analysis) of the project. The methods employed will be reviewed in detail in Sec 2.2, followed by an account of ontological and epistemological issues in the next section. Two ethical particularities will be elaborated upon in Sec 2.4 and 2.5: the researcher- informant power relation and the issue of confidentiality.

2.1 Research Design

2.1.1 Comparative Design

Comparison is essential to any intellectual attempt to construct analytical explanations of things. Comparison could take place between entities at any level, distinguished by any conceptual dimension; and wherever we compare, this mental operation always highlights aspects of variation, shows their potential association with other factors and suggests directions for possible casual explanation that leads to the refinement of a theoretical framework. The comparison of outcomes at the collective level, however, shall not be taken as sufficient proof of a suspected causal connection. Instead I agree that a proper casual explanation should have a micro foundation. The goal to compare sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore aims to provide more analytical
leverage than simply studying one case. The three cases were chosen, as discussed in the introduction, because the combination presents a delicate mixture of similarities and contrasts that seems promising for more sophisticated forms of comparative analysis.

2.1.2 The Historical Turn

The project started with a relatively humble idea of comparing the attitude and activities of sociologists in the three places. However, having spent some time in the three fields for the first round, I soon realized that many of the observed patterns can never be adequately understood if the analysis is not grounded in more historical depth. After an initial survey of the material collected, I was convinced that this project should at least trace the trajectories of sociology back to its initial introduction as an institutionalized discipline in the 1950s-60s. This judgment marks a “historical turn” in the course of research.

The reorientation brought this project closer to the tradition of historical sociology, which tends to reward its practitioners with the intellectual delight of having a broader picture but troubles them with three methodological challenges: First, Goldthorpe (2000, 44) once warned that the researcher committed to
historical sociology must “get ready for a harder life”— because such research is typically conducted, as historian Jerome Clubb (1980, 20) put it, “below the data poverty line.” This project is no exception. Although compared with other projects that purely rely on historical relic, I have the edge of being able to interview many who participated in, or witnessed the part of history that I am most concerned with; I often faced an insufficiency of evidence in verifying some tentative hypotheses emerging from the research.

Second, practitioners of historical sociology are particularly troubled by the tension between historical interest that pays attention to details with an aim to interpret the unique, and the sociological interest that works with theoretical categories with an aim to discover the typical. Barrington Moore, for instance, acknowledged “a strong tension between the demand of doing justice to the explanation of a particular case and the search for generalizations” in his classical work of historical sociology (Moore 1967, xvii). This conceptual distinction can be traced back to the 19th century German methodenstreit which marked the emergence of the Austrian school of economics as a “nomothetic” discipline against the erstwhile prevalent, “idiographic”, historical school. This distinction between social science and history was shared by many earlier
developers of sociology (McLaughlin, IC 1926), and was recently defended by
Goldthorpe (2000, Ch2). On the other hand, the rise of historical sociology in the
1960s-1970s represented discontent with this conventional stance. Wallerstein
(1991) called for rethinking of the division of social sciences and history
inherited from the 19th century and sought a more holistic approach. In the UK,
both Phillip Abrams (1982) and Anthony Giddens (1979, 230) considered history
and sociology indivisible. While I agree that history and sociology could be
conceptually distinguished in terms of their emphasis, this project still takes a
more integrated approach. It was possible to calibrate the project to make it
more 'sociological' (or historical), but that would not have answered my initial
questions that were associated more with my personal confusion than any
disciplinary agenda. In practice, I found an adequate response required a
constant, dialectical journey between historical details and conceptual
abstractions.

The third challenge faced by most macro-comparative historical analysis was
“scientific validity” or causality. Goldthorpe (2000, Ch2), for instance, challenged
the “link... between evidence and argument” presented in many recent “grand
historical sociology” as “tenuous and arbitrary to a quite unacceptable degree”
(p39, italic original). By “grand historical sociology”, he was referring to the batch
of works emerging in 1970s, such as those advanced by Moore (1967),
with Goldthorpe that some arguments presented in many macro-sociological
works might not have been sufficiently supported by evidence. However, if the
strict criteria for scientific validity for any argument were to be required from
every piece of work, we would have little choice but to confine ourselves to
smaller-scale projects, with better access to data and perhaps with more relevant
literature around to support the necessary logical claims. In other words, we
would be discouraged from adventuring into fields of less readily-available data
and literature, from attempting to answer questions of a larger scale, and from
providing risky but thought-provoking theses. The current project is not as broad
as those works cited above, but I was often troubled by the unavailability of
critical data or literature needed to complete the desired comparison. The
analysis delivered in this dissertation, therefore, might not always meet the most
rigorous standard for scientifically-proven knowledge. Rather it will be a mixture
of confirmed facts, evidence-supported explanations, interpretation, and
abstracted imaginaries— basically knowledge of the best possible degree of
confidence to complete a picture.
2.2 Research Methods

This project employed a multi-strategy design (Bryman 2001) that sought to assemble the whole picture by integrating qualitative and quantitative materials collected via a variety of approaches, during visits to Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore between March 2008 and March 2010. The research methods employed include (1) literature and archival studies, (2) demographic profiling, (3) bibliographic analysis, and (4) semi-structured interviews with sociologists. Some less formal talks and participatory observation during my research visits were also used as source of supplementary insight. A questionnaire was considered but abandoned because the small population of sociologists and the questionable response rate made the chance to yield meaningful data not particularly high. I will describe the employed methods in this section, and elaborate the underlying epistemological and ontological views in Sec 2.3.

2.2.1 Literature and Documentary Material

The inquiry started with a review of what has already been written about the historical development of sociology in the three Asian societies. Aside from those texts accessible in libraries, I was indebted to many senior colleagues who helped me locate some less obvious material (e.g. conference papers and class handouts)
during my research visits. The availability of relevant literature in the three
places varied. This variation itself was analysed as an indication of what I
conceptualize as “domestic disciplinary identity” (Ch4). To reconstruct a more
symmetric historical picture, the literature from three cases were contrasted to
identify what was missing from the account of particular cases, and to point to
where specific information shall be sought via alternative sources (such as
interviews and archives). The texts were read critically to distinguish the factual
accounts and the narratives bounded to the particular historical context in which
they were produced.

Official publications from major universities¹ and the regulating government
authorities² were subsequently surveyed to reconstruct the major transitions in
the institutional setting in which sociology had been developed. Special attention
was paid to the change in institutional structure (e.g. the emergence of new
departments or research centres), major projects, visits from distinguished
sociologists, significant academic events, initiatives in academic management (e.g.

¹ The attention was focus on the four leading institutions (all has a sociology department),
namely National Taiwan University, National Singapore University, Chinese University of Hong
Kong, Hong Kong University. The private Tunghai University (Taiwan) is also a centre of sociology
but its institutional publication was less complete.
² For example, National Science Council and Ministry of Education in Taiwan, University Grant
Council in Hong Kong, and Ministry of Education in Singapore.
evaluation and funding), and the associated discourses accompanying these. As a source of supplementary data, I occasionally consulted press archives to familiarise myself with discursive climate of a particular time.

2.2.2 Demographic Datasets

This research also involved the generation of various sociologist datasets, which provided the basis for both informant selection and some demographic analysis. There were multiple ways in which the boundaries for inclusion could have been theoretically drawn. One could have decided to define the scope by institutional affiliation or by the qualifications (advanced degree in sociology) held by participants. But in practice the dataset created was restricted by data availability.

To begin with, I try to focus on the “core circle” of sociologists defined primarily by institutional affiliation. I compiled a list of all full-time members of the sociology departments and institutes based on their institutional website. In the case of Hong Kong, I included sociology PhD holders in the various departments of (applied) social sciences because this subgroup includes several leading members in the Hong Kong Sociological Association. The dataset (Dataset CCS,
core circle sociologist), compiled in 2008, included 134 names in Taiwan\(^1\), 80 in Hong Kong\(^2\) and 40 in Singapore\(^3\). The data set contained columns of key bibliographic data (such as name, gender, title, country of PhD training, year of graduation and specialisms) but its completeness was restricted by the inconsistent format of staff profiles across department websites. Nonetheless, it was useful in constructing a stratified selection of informants and generating descriptive statistics of the general demographic patterns and trends of the sociology community studied. The limited sizes made most advanced statistical techniques not applicable. While I had no way of compiling a list of sociology PhD holders in Hong Kong and Singapore, for the Taiwan part, I was indebted to Prof. Hei-yuan Chu (瞿海源) who generously shared a dataset he compiled in 2007 with a survey completed and returned by 329 (almost all) sociology PhD holders in Taiwanese academia\(^4\) (Dataset CHU). The two datasets both excluded those

---

1 This list include the faculty members of the ten sociology department or institute in National Taipei University, Tunghai University, National Taiwan University, Catholic Fujen University, National Cheng-Chi University, Soochow University, Academia Sinica, Tsinghua University, Nanhua University, Fo-Guan University. The later founded National Sun-Yat-Sen University was not included then.
2 The list not only included the staff members of four sociology department (CUHK, HKU, HKBU, Shu-Yen University) in Hong Kong, but also the sociology PhD holders in the Dept. of Politics and Sociology (later renamed Sociology and Social Policy) in Lingnan, the Department of Applied Social Sciences in HKPU, the Division of Social Sciences in HKUST. However I was not able to count in the Hong Kong City University because the staff webpage did not specify their field of specialization.
3 Institutions included are the Department of Sociology in NUS and Nangyang Technology University.
4 Chu’s dataset expanded the scope to sociologists employed in other institutions (e.g. education,
who had retired or left. While there was no archive from which I could map the historical demography of the sociologist community, I was able to reconstruct the staffing dataset for the sociology departments in four leading universities in the region— the National Taiwan University, Hong Kong University, Chinese University of Hong Kong, and National Singapore University1 (Dataset SLD, staff of leading departments). This data base will be used to demonstrate the “flow of expertise” in different (in particularly the earliest) stage of the development of sociology (Ch3), the discussion of the “cohort structure” of sociologists and its implications (Ch3-4), and in the assessment of the impact of higher education managerialism and academic globalism (Ch7).

2.2.3 Bibliographic Analysis

Compared with the demographic patterns of the sociology community that were studied, the pattern of their output is far more difficult to picture. There was no ready compiled bibliography or database that reflected the overall output of the labour, media studies, general education centres), provided more bibliographic details (institution and year of the first and master degrees) for those surveyed but excluded the non-sociology PhD holder employed in sociology department.

1 Data obtained from the Annual Report’70 of Univ. of Singapore, the General Information’81-’00 (with ’89, ’90 missing) and Bulletin’05 of (The) National University of Singapore, the Prospectus’74, General Information’75-’84 (with missing years), Handbook’86-;’98 (with ’95-;’97 missing) and the website (’06-) of its Sociology Dept, the Calendar of Hong Kong Univ.’67-’09, the Handbook of the General Information’64 and Calendar ’65-’00 of Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong, and the Staff Address Book of the National Taiwan University’60-’08.
sociologists in any of the three places; hence I had to draw evidence from a variety of sources. (1) The most convenient source of data was the commercial citation index service such as the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). The dataset enable me to search for articles published on its listed journals by the combination of various indicators. However, it was of very limited use in accessing the outputs of the sociological communities. First, obviously, the database only includes a small fraction of published journals, let alone publication in other formats (e.g. books). Second, the closest I could get to approximate the output by sociologists of a particular country was to search for articles published on “sociology” in journals by author(s) with an address there. Note that the two domains do not really match—a sociologist could be publishing in journals in the areas of management, education or other fields and an article published in sociology journal could equally be written by a scholar from a neighbouring discipline. (2) The publication list provided in department publications or websites are of varied criteria and length. These inconsistent inclusion criteria made both intra-institutional comparison and data merging extremely tricky, leaving only chronological or inter-cohort comparisons within the same institution more sensible. Analysis based on this sort of data is inevitably restricted to the leading institutions which tend to make their research
outputs more accessible, and which are not generalizable to all institutions. (3)

The domestic publication platforms of sociology. These include various sociological journals, working paper series, and domestic publishers involved in publishing books on sociology\(^1\). Material of this sort shows, first, the general pattern and trends (of the research topic and method) on these publication platforms, and second, the strength of domestic publications (in relation to publishing elsewhere). (4) The various topical essays or bibliographies produced by domestic scholars to review their collective output. The material is valuable in their digested representation of domestic research traditions and the identification of the key studies and figures in topical areas. Finally, a few less systematic surveys were also attempted on various newspaper archives to access the public exposure of sociologists in newspaper.

2.2.4 Interviews

While I rely on literature and documentary materials to outline the historical trajectory of sociology, and use various demographic and bibliographic dataset to sketch some structural patterns, it was the interview that filled the canvas with colours and details, with narratives and meanings. Interview is a process of

\(^{1}\) See Sec 5.1-5.4
purposive conversation with people who could inform the researcher with the particular knowledge they possess. Its format could be distinguished by its level of structural rigidity. A structured interview (e.g. in an interview survey) produces standardized data that is easy to compare and process at the expense of flexibility. A non-structured interview gives the researcher freedom to explore but increases the difficulty in data analysis. A semi-structured interview lies in between, making compromise between the advantages of the two extremes.

In this project, I conducted 71 semi-structured interviews with 59 informants which led to more than 150 hours of recording. “Semi-structured” mean the use of an interview guideline consisting of major themes (Appendix A) while in actual interviews allowing a high degree of flexibility and open ends. The informants include 56 academic sociologists (24 in Taiwan, 21 in Hong Kong, 11 in Singapore ) stratified by their affiliation, seniority, country of PhD training and gender (see Appendix B). Also interviewed were a Taiwanese publisher, an education researcher in Hong Kong, and a Singaporean humanities scholar. The selected informants in each place included at least a few academic administrators and journal editors. Where there is a significant presence of foreign expatriates (in Hong Kong and Singapore), I ensured a fair representation.
The selection of informants sought to reflect the widest range of possible attitudes and interpretation, so I also tried to reach people known for their oppositional views on contested issues.

Approaching prospective informants was not straightforward initially. I started my field work in Hong Kong in 2008, and of the first batch of ten interview requests I sent I only received two replies—both sympathetic rejections as they happened to be away during the period of my visit. Luckily, in both places, I soon succeeded in securing some appointments by showing up at some academic events and approaching the targeted scholars in person. A similarly low rate of response was observed in my first visit to Singapore, and it was not solved until my second visit as a visiting researcher affiliated to NUS. This sense of apathy perceived initially might be attributed to the fact that I was too junior and unheard of for those established sociologists to seriously consider sparing some time in their tight schedule. Also some informants suggested that potential controversies in such a project might have deterred some.

The obstacle to access was gradually mitigated through strategies that enhanced the informants’ sense of familiarity with me—for instance, physically meeting up,
affiliation with local institutions, and writing more personalized emails. As I
spent more time in the field, a number of informants accepted my request
because they had already learned about my project from their colleagues.
Nonetheless, I encountered a few upfront rejections either because the
respondent considered his/her position too sensitive, or they challenged the
feasibility and merit of this project\(^1\).

The interviews, in general, proceeded in three stages. The first is a initializing
stage that I sometimes described as a *pre-interview viva*, in which those
professional sociologists questioned (even challenged) my research aims,
rationale, methodology, choice of informants, and even political implications as if
they were evaluating the extent to which I was qualified for this project. Having
the interview contextualized in those professional terms meant we could move
into the second stage of *informative talk*. This is a stage whereby the informants
were invited to talk reflexively about their intellectual trajectory, their memories
of earlier academic climates and events, and their experiences as professional
sociologists in a particular country and institution. Gradually and inevitably, we

\(^1\) One rejection described this ‘sociology of sociology’ type of inquiry as ‘navel-gazing.’
would come to a number of contested issues (e.g. major intellectual debate, roles of sociologists, academic evaluation and politics) and a third stage of critical dialogue that is characterised by a more engaging style of conversation with some mild confrontation. The trick of the last stage is the delicate balance between inviting deeper elaboration and running the risk of being offensive.

This tricky balance at this stage of critical dialogue and the perception of the pre-interview viva alongside some initial difficulty in approaching prospective informants concerned one characteristic of this project: the power relation between the researcher and the researched. I will discuss the issue in Sec 2.4.

### 2.3 Ontological and Epistemological Note

The views represented in the interviews were inevitably contradictory. “How would you deal with the sharply different views, academically and privately?” asked a professor who declined to be interviewed¹. To address this issue, I shall clarify how I approached the empirical material epistemologically. This entailed the need to state my ontological stance on the nature of society.

---

¹ Correspondence on 28, April, 2008.
The core feature that sets social studies apart from the natural sciences was that everything we analysed as “social”, no matter how objective they seem to be (e.g. the demographic structure, GDP, voting pattern, or urban layout), all involved decisions made by numerous human agents and therefore these were not free from their subjective beliefs, values, memories, emotions, anticipation intention and all other mental constructions. This characterisation embodies two conceptual dimensions central to intellectual debates about the ontological nature of, and the epistemological approach to, the social world: objective-subjective, and structure-agents.

2.3.1 The Objective-Subjective Dimension

The first dimension divided the two broad epistemological camps in contemporary social science; namely the orthodox positivistic social scientists and the followers of the interpretive tradition. The first camp tends to focus on structure and patterns of the objective side of social realms, and they apply a similar approach to the subjective side—often by taking snapshots of the subject’s mental world to objectify the subjective sceneries though means of survey or structured interviews. Society, in its imaginary, is a relatively static and objective reality existing independent of our knowledge of it, and what the
researcher is supposed to do, just like their colleagues operating with natural
subjects, is to accurately describe and explain the social world with rigorous
methods\(^1\). The various paradigms broadly grouped as the _interpretive_ tradition,
on the other hand, were more concerned with the subjective meanings social
agents associated with the perceived social realm and social actions. They
portrayed the social world in this tradition as being composed of phenomena
constantly accomplished by its actors, and hence embodying their subjective
perceptions, memories, knowledge, anticipation and various mental
constructions that are of richer texture and greater fluidity. This is an ontological
stance now often called _social constructivism_\(^2\). The extreme versions of
constructivism could go as far as to claim everything in the observable world was
nothing but “text” or “discourse” (e.g. Derrida, Potter). Both traditions, in my
view, only deal with one side of the totality of the social world. I am discontented
with orthodox positivistic sociology because it is inclined to tell little about the
reported patterns of observation, overstating objective certainty and necessity,

\(^1\) Some authors (e.g. Bryman) describe this ontological stance as _realism_, overlooking the
contradiction between the epistemological ground of positivism—_empiricism_ (reducing reality to
what you can empirically observe, a stance promoted by Hume), and the full implication the term
_realism_ could mean (there is a reality even if you can’t see it). I shall call this ontological stance
_shallow realism_, to be distinguished from the deeper forms of realism, e.g. _critical realism_
elaborated by Bhaskar (1978) and Archer (2010).

\(^2\) This term shows their affinity to Berger and Luckmann.
and downplaying the fluidity of social phenomenon. But I remain positive about various methods developed in this tradition as the structural patterns at the aggregate level often have certain stability and "inertia" to individual wills that allows them to be studied as a "natural thing". I equally disagree with the extreme forms of constructivism because of their rejection of any common ground of reality, which I believe still holds at least in the physical and material layer. But I consider the interpretative approaches a necessary component in making our social understanding complete. Therefore, the two approaches should be seen as complementary, not contradictory, in forming a complete understanding of our interested topics.

2.3.2 Structure-Agent

Debates around the second dimension focused on the interdependence between structure and agents from two opposite directions, which can be summarised in two interrelated questions: (1) the "ontological/methodological question" of whether the structure is reducible to the sum of the individual, and (2) the "philosophy of history question" of how much agency individuals really have against structural determinants and constraints.
The first question penetrates the debate between individualism and collectivism/holism (O’Neill 1973). The first stance sees the conscious individual as the “ultimate constituent of the social world,” and considers every complex social institution and event as the “result of a particular configuration of individuals, their dispositions, situations, beliefs and physical resources and environment.” The second stance, by contrast, believes the existence of certain “macro-laws which are essentially sociological in the sense that they are sui generis and not to be explained as mere regularities or tendencies resulting from the behaviour or interacting individuals” (Watkins 1957, 106).

I have in the Introduction (of “levels of analytical categories”) stressed that the social analysis I seek should incorporate an understanding at the micro level, but I have also rejected extreme form of methodological individualism that assert any social analysis should be based on individual mechanism. This stance should be further unpacked by making three points. First, ontologically, I consider individual actors as the building element of the social world, and therefore should not be excluded from the analysis of the later. However, when a collective is being constituted by individuals, certain structural patterns not reducible to the properties of the individuals emerge (Archer 1995; Wan 2011). Second, even
for social aspects that can be reducible to individual dispositions, thought and action, it is often *cognitively economical* to deal with aggregate categories rather than handling the massive data obtained from the individual level. Third, as discussed in Introduction, the data at the individual level is not always available, particularly in a comparative historical project.

The second question could be illustrated by Karl Marx’s comparison of the historical writings of Victor Hugo and Proudhon about coup d’état (overthrow of the government) by Napoleon. Victor Hugo’s *Napoleon le Petit*, commented on by Marx, saw in the incident “only the violent act of a single individual... makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him a personal power of initiative unparalleled in world history.” Poudhon’s writing, on the other hand, “seeks to represent the coup d’état as the result of an antecedent historical development... falls into the error of our so-called objective historians¹.” Marx argued that “men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already,

given and transmitted from the past.\textsuperscript{1} Marx in his writings, however, switches between ascribing the primary drive of historical change to the objective relation of production (structure), on the one hand, and to class struggle (agency), on the other hand (Anderson, P 1983). How much agency men and women really have in making history in the given circumstance thus became a central issue of debate in Marxism— for instance between the French structuralist Marxist Louis Althusser (1970) who asserted history as “a process without a subject” and his major critic E. P. Thompson (1978).

The issue of agency was important in this project and was of both sociological and historical interest. At its sociological front, I aimed to analyse the structural framing of sociology in the three cases. At its historical front, I tried not to dismiss the individual who casts lasting impacts. I responded to this dilemma, drawing from the structuration theory by Giddens (1984), by examining (1) how these individuals were restricted and enabled by structural factors, and (2) how their actions constitute the new structure that conditioned later actions. This approach sees structure and action as both constitutional to each other, therefore

\textsuperscript{1} Marx, 1852, Ch1, \textit{The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.}  
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/ch01.htm
resolving the tension in prioritizing them. But I also agree with Archer (1995) that structure and agency remain ontologically and analytically distinguishable.

2.3.3 Layers of Reality

In this project, I conceptualize the social world as consisting of four layers of ontological existence. I will start from the “perceived reality” in the psychological realm of individual agents, through the layer of “socially constructed reality” by agreement and “performed reality” of actions, to the “materialized reality” in the physical world. This sequence of elaboration might sound like an individual reductionist, but I found in each layer new properties emerging that are not reducible to simple aggregation at a lower layer. The epistemological implication of this four-layer framework will be discussed later. The four layers are illustrated as follow:

*Perceived reality* is whatever is thought to be true at the individual level. It might be a faithful, biased, or illusionary representation of the world, of other individuals or of the thinker. There could be, therefore, multiple perceived “realities” referring to one particular theme. This layer includes memory, impression, belief, consciousness, thought or misconception — categories that
might have been excluded from legitimate subjects for social inquiry in some doctrines (better to be studied in psychology). Nonetheless, perceived reality has real consequences for the social action that individuals take; hence it should not be left out from the analysis.

The *socially-constructed reality* emerged when two or more individual agents form some sort of agreement about what they perceive to be real. Such consensus could be formed among different sizes of populations and via a variety of media that lead to different levels of *certainty*. I differentiate this sort of reality according to the “size of population (scale of unit)” involved, which ranges from interpersonal, community or group, to societal level, and the “mode of bounding” (type of media) that ranges from implicit, oral, written to formal/legal, as shown in Table 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructed Reality</th>
<th>Implicit</th>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Formal, Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society-Scale</td>
<td>Norm, Cultural Codes</td>
<td>Rumour, Oral Heritage</td>
<td>News Literature</td>
<td>Law Credit System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Community</td>
<td>Group Norm</td>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>Group Statement</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Implicit Understanding</td>
<td>Oral Consensus</td>
<td>Written Agreement</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-1. Modes of Constructed Reality
This layer is where the reality most constructionists discuss falls within (e.g. Berger and Luckmann). Emerging on the basis of agreement, those forms of reality are essentially a calibrated form of the perceived reality, and hence never free from illusion, bias and fluidity. The subtypes on the right end of the table are formulated in a more sophisticated political process and they possess more stability, rigidity and bounding capacity that come closer to a form of objective reality. The “social reality” elaborated upon by Searles (1995) is located here.

Note that whilst this table contains “rumour, statement, contract, law, and news,” it was the articulated “content” that falls within the category, whilst the act of rumour and the various physical documents belong to the next two layers.

The layer of performed reality refers to social actions, for instance the behaviours of speaking, dating, shopping, voting and traveling. Those actions shall be distinguished from the (individual or collective) material consequence they entail, which fall into the fourth layer. The materialized reality includes the product of labour; the disappearance of consumed food, a house or a baby, and at the collective level, the industrial infrastructure, the commodities chain, the urban layout, and changing demography. The last two layers were distinguished from the first two as they both refer to “seemingly objective” phenomena in the
The four layers interact with each other in various ways, some of which are summarised in Table 2-2. The multiple relations among the four layers of reality reject any form of one-way reductionism or determinism. Each of the four layers have some ontological uniqueness, and none of them can be reduced to a function of another. A common belief, for instance, should be seen as merely the sum of the perceptions of groups of individuals because this perspective overlooks the “mode of bounding” (type of medium) and the strength of certainty in collective thought. A social action, while naturally reflecting the perception and thoughts of the actors, is also conditioned by physical rules and material factors such as available resources and technology. The material reality of the social world is shaped by human activities, but in a way that is dependent on the natural order such as geography and ecology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Description of relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1→2</td>
<td>Consensus forms through mediated communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2→1</td>
<td>Collective thought socialize individual mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1→3</td>
<td>Perceived reality motivate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2→3</td>
<td>Collective thought frames patterns of social action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3→4</td>
<td>Activities cause material consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4→3</td>
<td>The material circumstance conditions the possibility of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 3→1, 2</td>
<td>Individual perception/collective knowledge about social actions and material world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2 Layers of Social Reality: Inter-layer Interaction

2.3.4 Epistemological and Methodological Implications

The ontological view implies an epistemological stance that is characterised by the recognition of the need for multiple forms of knowledge about the different layers of social reality. Social patterns that existed in materialized or performed layers, on the one hand, can surely be observed “as objects” and even quantified in ways that conform to the positivistic doctrine. Even the views of social actors could be “objectified” via means of questionnaire or coded interviews. Knowledge generated in this way provides a baseline sketch that we can have some confidence in. However, it does not form a comprehensive picture of the totality of the sociological subject that interests us, which could further be enriched by the understanding of the subjective and versatile perceptions, emotion, (potentially biased) recollection and sense of meaning from the perspectives of the social actors involved. These psychological experiences, given
their ontological nature, can hardly be ascertained in any reproducible methods
that meet the rigid scientific criterion. The best knowledge about them, therefore,
would be an inter-subject understanding obtained via an interpretative approach.
The epistemological stance I subscribed to, in other word, is associated with a
version of methodological pluralism.

The distinction between the four ontological layers of social reality also serves as
a reminder of the proper rationale in analysing research material of various
kinds. The interview transcript, to start with, will only be read as a statement of
the perceived reality of the informant, which, if matched with the interview data
obtained from other informants, would be seen as evidence for a sort of
socially-constructed reality. The statement of certain physical fact, if confirmed
by alternative sources of evidence, would be seen as adequate evidence to
establish a statement in the layers of performed or materialized reality.

2.4 Power Relations between Researcher and Informant

Most textbooks that deal with the "power relation in interview" only discuss the
situation of "interviewing down"—that is, interviewing people with less power
than the researcher. Researchers are reminded to be aware of their relative
power and to avoid the abuse of such power. Most sociological studies fit with
this picture of “powerful researcher vs. vulnerable subject” because scholars in
general have a higher social status, and sociology has traditionally been more
concerned about the underprivileged. There were, however, studies produced
with reversed power relations between the researcher and the researched. For
instance, a current of policy research that involved interviews with the political
elite emerged in the 1990s. Methodological elaboration of “interviewing up”
hence followed, such as Researching the Powerful in Education edited by Walford
(1994) and the discussions on “elite interviews” (e.g. Richards 1996).

Placed in this context, the current project still has its particularity. I am a doctoral
student in sociology, and the people I interviewed were not just “powerful,” but
figures established in the profession I was trying to join. The “informants” are of
the generation of my teachers. They will be the primary reader group if I publish
any work from the project. They hold the power to challenge my writing in
professional venues, and to decide whether my papers submitted to journals are
worthy of publication. They even have a voice on my future employability for
academic vacancies. If I am lucky, they might become my colleagues. The
multiplicity of our possible relations complicated the dynamics of the interview,
during which I often felt the fluidity of our relative roles.

The *evaluative power* the informants have over me was one dimension that I clearly felt throughout the process of research. I encountered a few upfront rejections to my interview request challenging my project even from its basic worth. I had to start most interviews with an initial phase that I called “*pre-interview viva*,”. In writing the research, I am also aware that this text will be read by my informants. Some informants even kindly advised me to consider the career risk of carrying out this project. The perceived exposure to such evaluative power was getting so overwhelming at times that I doubted whether I could guard against the *intellectual integrity* of my writing against the fear that I might compromise my career prospect.

Yet gradually, I began to appreciate the unease I felt as a starting point to reflect how privileged we sociologists generally were in most empirical research. We collected “data” from informants and rewrote them in a theoretical context, circulating the outcome with our professional colleagues, and left most informants with little access to, let alone opportunity to challenge, how their accounts were represented and analysed. This privilege assumed two
foundations: the dissociation of a “disinterested” academic circle from the relevant, concerned, public, and therefore the epistemological privilege of scholarly discourse when compared with lay knowledge. Here in my research, both conditions do not exist. The research is about the communities where the output will be consumed, and I can hardly claim any epistemological superiority over the informants who are established scholars in the discipline. I realize that the critical step to cope is to fully recognize the political dimension of my project. There will be no shield of “for academic purpose only”. To do this project is to engage with the politics. Moreover I am not Pierre Bourdieu (1988) nor Alvin Gouldner (1970) when they turned their critical mind to our profession. I needed to rethink what leverage I had when I waded into the minefield of academic politics.

I came to find my leverage by revisiting a simple question: why were those established sociologists willing to spare a few hours sharing their experience and interpretations with a doctoral student? Recalling all the interviews, I concluded three factors: the benevolence to help, the curiosity as to how other colleagues responded to my inquiry, and some discontent with the status quo and a willingness to give a voice. Here I discovered sources of my faith. First, these
sociologists accept interview invitations out of good will, and in general I felt I was trusted and encouraged during most interviews. I believe that they do not want to crush me even if there is a disagreement. Second, as the research proceeded, I gradually developed stronger faith in the analytical originality my research could deliver, and I developed a sense of how it could help senior colleagues to see their familiar life with a renewed “sociological imagination” of sociology. And finally, I promised myself that this research should deliver impact to not just scholarly debates, but the public deliberation on professional issues (see Epilogue). I believe this is the only way to answer those who share their discontent and aspirations with me.

The principal faith discussed above enable me to proceed. However, challenges still emerge when it come to some harshly-contested issues. During the interviews, it was not rare to feel pressure to reveal where I stood. The conventional principle of neutrality was not effective as it undermined the sense of trust, nor was it really desirable as a more engaging attitude is often necessary to invite a deeper dialogue. Practically, I sought to reduce the risk of being unnecessarily offensive by placing myself in a “subjunctive” mood (Sennett 2012:22-24) during the interview. I often invited informants to comment on
“accounts from another informant” or “my tentative impression” instead of being declarative of any particular view. In writing, I tried to deliver a discursive space in which oppositional perspectives could be contextualised and accommodated sympathetically—a character I call *transcendental synergy*.

2.5 Confidentiality

The confidentiality of informant privacy sounds like a common sense ground rule in qualitative research—it seemed so self-evident that, before entering the field, I had only considered how confidentiality could be secured without giving much thought to why, and even whether, it shall be regarded as unquestionable. However, my simple faith in this principle was soon challenged by some observations, and I was driven to reflect over the *ethics of confidentiality* against an alternative rationale that I shall call the *ethics of credibility*.

2.5.1 Challenges to Confidentiality

There were three major challenges in securing confidentiality in this project. First, the sociological communities in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore were not three cases that can be examined with anonymity. There is also an embedded interest in their historical particularities, which I believe any sophisticated
analysis should be based on. Such historical interest is also extended to a lower level of analysis, as particular institutions or individuals might have played a critical role in the dissemination and development of sociology. Here the consideration of confidentiality should be balanced with intellectual demand.

Second, the sizes of the sociologist communities are small, making it even trickier to ensure confidentiality. In Taiwan there are about 340 academic sociologists - roughly half worked in sociology departments. In Hong Kong the number of sociologists employed in the four sociology departments and three social science departments was just above 80. In Singapore there was only one sociology department until 2005, and now there are two hosting about 40 sociologists. With a pool of this size, any simple description of one informant, despite being unnamed, can easily reveal his/her identities. Finally, the research subject in this project is part of its readership. It can be anticipated that once the work is published, some reader would inevitably start to guess who the informants were.

2.5.2 Strategies and Cost

Since I promised absolute confidentiality in my initial request for interviews, and a number of informants explicitly confirmed this principle, I took extra care, both in fieldwork and in research writing, for its protection. In approaching the
potential informants, for instance, I declined a few kind offers of cross referrals to other colleagues by some informants, just to ensure that the identity of each informant was only known to both of us. Special caution was also exercised when an interview took place in the informant’s department. To avoid unnecessary speculation from other department members, I always look for the informant’s office in advance and returned exactly at the agreed time in order not to be seen waiting at the door. I also paid attention to the hallway step before leaving their office in order to minimize uninvited attention. A tricky scenario is the encounter with informants in academic events, especially in the initial stage of my field work when I was known to just a few. Despite the natural sense of familiarity with the informants that I interviewed, it often seemed that none of us were sure how to properly interact with each other when there were others around. This perceived tension, luckily, gradually eased in the later stages when I became known to more academic colleagues.

In writing, confidentiality is not guaranteed by simply removing or replacing names, but it calls for a careful calculation of how specific the descriptions (e.g. type of institution, functional post, seniority, country of professional training, views on contested issues, knowledge of specific incident, style of articulation)
associated with one informant, in combination, could be. Citing from “the head of
a prestigious sociology department”, for instance, in Taiwan narrows the
candidates to just a few, in Hong Kong two, and in Singapore one. To lower the
risk of confidentiality breaches, in using interview data I opted to follow the
principle of minimal disclosure — to include only the details judged as necessary
for argumentation. This principle can be translated into several writing strategies
as follows:

- Shorten, or even avoid direct quotes. Paraphrase the key message with my
  own words whenever possible.
- Replace descriptors with broader categories (e.g. “senior member” in place of “head” or “professor”) whenever necessary
- Dissociate sensitive materials with other quotes from the same informant.
- Down-play the historical details with more abstracted narrative when the
  only source of data was from an interview.
- Drop accounts of any incident known to just a few people.

These strategies, however, have their cost. The type of rich description seen in
many qualitative works is less plausible in this project, which deprived the room
for subtler theorisation at the actor-level. The evidence power of data to support
my argument is more or less compromised.
2.5.3 Moments of Doubts: The Ethics of Credit

Committed to the principle of confidentiality, however, I had a few moments during the course of research that I felt doubt. I was first struck by the fact that not just few informants directly asked who else I had talked to. Once I declined to answer, they either appeared embarrassed by their initial question, reaffirming “it should be confidential,” or just doubted the feasibility of the rule. These intuitive responses suggested the deeper contradiction of the confidentiality rule with human nature in that scenario— the psychological instinct to estimate what the visitor already knows (who he had talked to), why me, and where the conversation is located within the scope of research. The second observation was that a number of informants claimed that they did not mind the issue of confidentiality. “If you quote from me even without my name, everybody would know that’s me (SG9).” The informant expressed scepticism on the feasibility of securing confidentiality in the small academic circle, and a sense of pride of his/her distinctive voice. The third striking observation I made was that, despite all my efforts to secure confidentiality, in subsequent academic occasions, numerous informants voluntarily introduced me to other colleagues or students by mentioning my research and their contribution. This action reflects the
psychological intuition to be straightforward and honest (it is cognitively demanding to hide), but also, at least in some cases, the voluntary exposure embodied a psychological need to claim credit.

These moments of doubt drove me to reflect over the very ethics of confidentiality; in particular, against a competing rationale I called the “ethics of credit”. On the one hand, those informants are fellow scholars who are accustomed to be credited for what they said and wrote. On the other hand, if I am allowed to relate the interview accounts to its provider, I can deliver more credibility in analysis. Can I really take their knowledge to be incorporated it in my analysis without paying due credit, under the principle of confidentiality? How close was this behaviour to a form of plagiarism?

Both ethical rationales deal with the connection between knowledge and its provider, but with very different imaginaries about the consequences if such connections are revealed. When confidentiality is demanded, we think of vulnerable informants who are at risk if their connections to the disclosed accounts are revealed. While granting credit, we think of creditable authors whose intellectual right might be infringed if their ideas were not properly cited.
There was, however, a sense of confusion as to which ethics should be more applicable to my project, as the potential consequences of disclosed identity varied depending on the informant’s status and the nature of the accounts provided. Some scholars (especially those in their junior rank) requested an absolute guarantee of confidentiality, while others, as I mentioned previously, voluntarily disclosed their role as interviewees.

I had no choice but to follow the ethics of confidentiality universally in this project for three reasons. First, I have promised confidentiality initially, and a number of informants explicitly reconﬁrmed this principle. Second, given the compact size of the sociological communities and the complex interaction within, there could be some unforeseeable risk of conﬁdentiality breach even for those who did not mind so much about conﬁdentiality. Third, while it is possible to approach confidentiality based on the preference of individual informants, in practice the idea involves a lot of work and there is a risk of mistakes being made. Nonetheless, for the insightful comments that I feel uneasy to quote anonymously, the alternative was to search to ﬁnd if the same informants expressed a similar idea in any published material. Whereas available, cite it.
Summary

This chapter outlines the research design and justifies its rationale and limitations. Also, it covers a range of ontological, epistemological and ethical issues. The beginning of the chapter focuses on the comparative-historical design of this project. It discusses the use of "comparison" in analysis and assesses three challenges associated with the use of historical data: availability of data, tension between sociological and historical interests, and the “scientific validity” of the theses generated from such a project. The project took a multi-strategy approach.

Four methods employed were reviewed: literature and archive research, the demographic analysis, bibliographic analysis and interviews. A note on various ontological and epistemological issues followed, including discussions about the objective/subjective knowledge and the dialectic between structure and agent.

In particular, I elaborated an ontological view characterised by the distinction of four layers of social reality: the perceived, socially-constructed, performed and materialised forms of reality. The ontological view leads to an epistemological stance that recognizes the need for multiple forms of knowledge, which entails a version of methodological pluralism. In the end two particular ethical challenges in this project were considered: the “reversed” researcher-informant power
relation and the ethics of confidentiality. The vulnerability I perceived in this project (researching senior sociologists) drove me to reflect on the ordinary privilege enjoyed by sociologists and to rethink the justification of my inquiry. Confidentiality was strictly secured in this project, but its necessity was reconsidered against an alternative rationale I called the “ethics of credibility.”
Ch3 Dispersion of Sociology:

Imperial Entanglement and Scholarly Flow

Tracing the origins of sociology means different tasks in Europe and Asia. In Europe, this task was conventionally pursued by identifying the main intellectual currents that lead to the formation of the discipline. In Asia, it generally means locating when and how this discipline was imported—usually in terms of key texts translated into Asian language, sociological courses taught by immigrant teachers, empirical social investigations by missionaries, anthropologists or colonial administration, and most critically, the founding of sociology departments in universities (an introduced form of modern organization). The path via which the subject was introduced varies in different places, and tracing such paths often provides insight to the characteristics and later trajectories of sociology in a particular place.

This chapter aims to trace the origin of sociological investigation and sociology knowledge in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore before the institutionalization of

---

1 There were occasional attempts to marshal the domestic intellectual heritages for an *ex post facto* reconstruction of an indigenous history of sociological thoughts, but such work could only emerge *after* the idea of sociology had been properly established.
the discipline. The core argument is that sociology, just like other elements of modernity, had been introduced to the three Asian societies in ways that were mediated by their entanglement with the imperial structure in East Asia. Four major forces were identified as bearing significant influence over the modern history of this region, and in particular the histories of the three island countries: China, the United Kingdom, Japan and the United States. Sec 3.1 provides a succinct review of the transnational dispersion of sociology into the four power countries in the first half of the 20th century. Sec 3.2 examines evidence for any sociological investigation and sociology teaching in the three colonies before WWII, and Sec 3.3 investigates the transnational flow of sociological expertise and knowledge by tracing three major trends of scholarly migration in 1950s-60s: the emigration of Chinese sociologists, the British anthropologists with colonial links, and the surge of American researchers in Taiwan and Hong Kong. In each section, I shall demonstrate how these observed patterns were interrelated to the geopolitical context in the region.

3.1 The State of Sociology in the Four Powers

I shall start this chapter with a succinct review of the transnational dispersion of sociology in the first part of the last century; in particular the state of sociology in
the four powers. I shall point out that by the first half of the 20th century, sociology has been introduced and developed in the United States, Japan, and China with considerable levels of institutionalization. The three national versions of sociology have very different characters. Britain, on the other hand, was far behind the three Pacific countries in establishing sociology within its higher education system, despite the crucial role the British thinker Herbert Spencer played in promoting sociology beyond its European origin.

3.1.1 Sociology across the Atlantic

Sociology as a field of study emerged in 19th century Western Europe as an intellectual reaction to massive social transformation following the “dual revolutions” (Giddens 1982:26-28). The term “sociologie” was introduced in 1838 by the French philosopher August Comte to describe his proposal for a positivistic science of society, which inspired Émile Durkheim who made significant efforts in establishing this subject into a proper academic discipline with an institutional basis. Comte also inspired the English social evolutionist Herbert Spencer to write the *Study of Sociology* and *Principles of Sociology*— both turned out to be quite influential in promoting this young discipline into Asia and America. Contemporary German thinkers like Marx, Tönnie, Simmel and Weber
might not identify themselves strictly as sociologists, but they produced works
that deal with similar problems and these were canonized as the founding texts
of this discipline.

The idea of sociology was introduced to the United States in the late 19th century
along with the writing of some European thinkers, notably Comte and Spencer.
The idea of a science of society soon became popular in the context of rapid
industrialization and urbanization in post-Civil War America (Hinkle and Hinkle
1963:2-3). The first sociology department was established in the University of
Chicago in 1892 by Albion Small, who also founded the first sociology journal, the
American Journal of Sociology (AJS), in 1895, and the American Sociological
Society in 1905. The new discipline saw an explosive growth in the subsequent
three decades in the context of higher education expansion, lifting society
membership from 115 in 1906 to 1812 in 1929 (ibid:39). American sociology
went on a distinctive path from its European cousin – one that is characterised by
its belief in natural law and empirical emphasis; its faith in progressive social
change and reformism, and an individualistic hue in theoretical orientation (ibid,
Ch1).
3.1.2 Development in Japan: The European Heritage

Japan saw the emergence of sociology at the same time as it emerged in the United States. The Meiji Restoration (明治維新) in the late 19th century motivated its scholars to learn from the West through studying the works of many European thinkers, including Spencer. His *Principle of Sociology* was translated in 1883 and the notion of "social evolution" resonated with the psychological needs of the nation aspiring to modernity. Dr Toyama Masakazu (外山正一) started lecturing on this text in Tokyo Imperial University in 1886, and eventually took the first chair of sociology newly-created in the same institution in 1893— only one year behind the creation of the Chicago department. Many universities began to provide sociology courses before the turn of century (Becker 1936; Steiner 1936). Despite its comparable temporal trajectory with its American cousin, Japanese sociology remained closely tied in with its European (especially German) roots and was primarily concerned with philosophical debates rather than empirical realities (Steiner; 1936: 713).

3.1.3 China: Social Evolutionism

China saw the idea of "sociology" introduced in 1890s— slightly later than
Japan— by a group of political reformists (維新派, Wei Xin Pai) who attempted to search for ways of modernizing the Qing Empire through absorbing Western technologies and scholarship. The pioneering scholar Yen Fu (嚴復) translated numerous works of Western social science including Spencer’s *Study of Sociology*, and the notion of “social evolutionism”. These held similar appeal to Chinese intellectuals trapped in the national suffering. In the 1900s, waves of students studied in “advanced” countries. The largest share went to Japan; the newly-modernized Asian neighbour who had just defeated the Qing Empire in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-95). Many took sociology courses there, leading to a proliferation of Japanese books and syllabuses translated in just few years (including the Japanese version of Franklin H. Giddings’s *Principle of Sociology*).

The Western missionaries and schools they founded also served as critical vehicles for promoting sociology in China. The first sociology course was offered in 1905 by the Yale-graduated missionary Arthur S. Mann in St. John University in Shanghai (founded by Protestant Episcopal Church, US), and the first department was established in 1913 by another missionary; Daniel Kulp in Shanghai Baptist College and Theological Seminary (renamed the University of Shanghai in 1914). In the 1920s, the first batch of returnee scholars with foreign degrees provided
momentum to the institutionalization of sociology within Chinese universities. A total of thirteen departments were created in a decade.

However, it must be noted that a significant portion of the “sociology” practiced in 1920s China came closer to what is now understood as “anthropology.” One of the leading “sociologists” Fei Xiao-Tong (費孝通) actually studied with Malinowski in the London School of Economics and brought his influence to the various ground-breaking studies by Fei (1939; 1945; 1948) and his followers of Chinese rural villages. Such villages, even decades later, remained the primary social setting in which most Chinese people lived. In other words, if (European) sociology is understood as a discipline about modernity, its Chinese cousin had to adapt itself to the pre-modern reality, and a bit more borrowing from anthropology was the solution.

3.1.4 UK: Limited Institutional Recognition

The above paragraphs support the critical importance of Spencer's writings in promoting sociology beyond Europe. However, in Spencer's homeland, Britain, the institutionalization of sociology in universities was way behind the above mentioned countries. The first sociology department was founded in 1907 in the
London School of Economics, and it remained the only one of its kind until the end of WWII. To be sure, at the turn of 20th centuries, there was already a widespread interest in the UK in developing a sociological science to address social problems. The generally held vision then “accept[ed]... the Comtean (and Spencerian) desire for a sociology resting on a synthesis of all the sciences,” and it led to what Halliday (1968: 337) termed a “sociological movement” and the establishment of the Sociological Society in 1903. The Society attracted participants of at least three strands initially: (1) “a school of ethical or social work sociologists” concerned primarily with solving social problems with an approach derived from the Oxford ethical philosophy (e.g. Hobhouse, Charles Booth and Charles Loch), (2) the “civic sociologists or town planners” (e.g. Geddes, Branford), and (3) the “radical sociologists” associated with Francis Galton and the eugenic agenda. The three groups of people joined together to “emancipate sociological science from the oversight of academic economists and British anthropologists” (ibid: 379-380).

This uneasy cooperation turned out to be short-lived. The eugenicists establish their Eugenic Education Society in 1907 as their “social Darwinism” approach proved unacceptable for the mainstreamers. The other two groups also divorced
after Hobhouse, instead of Geddes, took the newly founded Chair at the LSE (Evans, 1986, Ch4). Literally the “town planners” became the only group remaining active in the Society. The momentum of the Society can further be traced down to the activities associated with the Le Play House founded 1920 (which conduct the first regional surveys in Britain) and the Institute of Sociology founded in 1930 (Evans 1986, Ch5-6). But these activities, like the eugenicists, remained excluded from universities.

The limited institutionalisation of sociology within British universities may be partly attributed to the fact that the traditional British universities only took a small number of elite students so overall capacity and diversity was consequently limited. Moreover, the few long-standing universities were ideologically prone to serving the elite and might not have welcomed the addition of a new discipline that was concerned with “drink, drainage and divorce” (Collini 1983: 199) It was only when the 1963 Robbins Report opened up the era of higher education expansion that the number of sociology departments started to soar.
3.2 Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore: Before WWII

Historical accounts of sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong or Singapore generally start from the establishment of their first sociology department in the late 1950s and 1960s, with occasional reference made to earlier teaching and empirical investigations after WWII. This is also a period of history that this dissertation is mostly concerned with. There was, in comparison, very little record of teaching and researching sociology before WWII, despite the fact that higher education institutions already emerged in all three colonies. The reason for this absence is however complicated.

I shall demonstrate that: In Singapore, the history of accumulating sociological knowledge can be traced back to the activities of the Strait Branch of Royal Asiatic Society (RAS) in 1877 and the operation of the administration’s “Chinese Protector” office since 1869. However, their influence on post-war sociology

---

1 Examples include the historical accounts of sociology in Taiwan by Michael HH Hsiao (1987), in Hong Kong by Rance Lee (1993) or Catherine Chiu (2007), and in Singapore by Benjamin (1991).
2 Hong Kong University was founded in 1911, incorporating the former Hong Kong college of Medicine for Chinese funded in 1887, to compete with other great powers opening universities in China. In Taiwan, the Japanese colonial government established the *Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku* (Taipei Imperial University, now National Taiwan University) and in 1928, incorporated an agriculture school founded in 1919, and in 1936 it annexed a medical school founded in 1897. Higher education in Singapore was developed relatively late, with the first university (the University of Malaya) formed in 1949, merging the King Edward VII College of Medicine founded in 1905 and the Raffle’s College (initially a teacher training college) founded in 1928.
(which started in 1965) was very limited because of the destruction of archives during the war and the shifting focus of the RAS branch. In Hong Kong, there was little pre-WWII sociological studies about the port city although a RAS Branch which existed between 1847 and 1859. Interpretation based on geopolitical factors will be explored. In Taiwan, the Japanese colonial administration conducted systematic social investigations and even introduced the teaching of sociology in the University, but their legacies had been largely ignored by the post-WWII sociologist community.

3.2.1 Hong Kong and Singapore

The higher education institutions in Hong Kong and Singapore were established to meet the practical demand for training professionals and teachers. The University of Hong Kong was founded in 1911 to compete with other universities established in China by other Great Powers. It has four faculties, all established before WWII—the faculties of medicine, engineering, art and science. The British Malaya had two colleges— the King Edward VII College of Medicine founded in 1905 and Raffle’s College (of art and science) founded in 1928. They were merged to form the University of Malaya in 1949, which is the precedent of today’s National University of Singapore. There was no institutional presence of
social sciences, let alone sociology; a discipline still striving for recognition even within contemporary British universities. The absence of institutionalized sociology, however, was not equal to the lack of sociological investigations.

The production of sociological knowledge in the British Strait Settlements (established in 1826-1946, including Singapore, Penang and Malacca) dated back to the early 19th century, when Western explorers, colonial administrators and missionaries started to keep a record of their observations of local customs and behaviour (Quah 2003; Lew 2011). More formal works emerged following 1877, when the newly established Straits Branch of Royal Asiatic Society set up its journal (Tan 2006) and included in the first issue a paper about the Chinese Secret Society (Pickering), among other pieces of geography, natural history and linguistics. In 1879, colonial administrator Jonas D. Vaughan published The Manners and Customs of the Chinese of the Straits Settlements. A second source of literature came from the government publication. In particular, the colonial government appointed British experts on Chinese languages to the new post “Protector of Chinese” created in 1869 to oversee the Chinese community on behalf of the government (with its function enhanced to include statutory powers in 1877). The unit necessarily accumulated knowledge about how
Chinese society operates. Much of those government archives, however, were burned when the Japanese took Singapore in 1942 (Freeman 1957:8).

Hong Kong became a British colony in 1842 and just five year later a “China Branch of Royal Asiatic Society” was established in the frontier port of the British imperial territory— a quarter of a century earlier than the setup of the RAS Branch in Singapore (which is nearer to London). The reason for this difference was evidently the greater interest in China, the ancient Empire which might have warranted the legitimacy of scientific investigation. This Branch ceased to function in 1859 as two of its core members died. For an entire century, Western intellectual interest in Hong Kong remained low—until Freeman and Topley visited the colony in 1955 and a new Hong Kong Branch was established in 1959. Jarvie edited a collection of sociological studies of Hong Kong in 1969, in which he assessed the dearth of sociological literature and attributed (page xix) this to, among others, (1) the presence of China proper which always overshadows Hong Kong, (2) the limited interests of

1 [http://www.scholarly-societies.org/history/1847rashkb.html](http://www.scholarly-societies.org/history/1847rashkb.html)
2 [http://www.scholarly-societies.org/history/1857ncbras.html](http://www.scholarly-societies.org/history/1857ncbras.html) Also, it happened to be the year before another North China Branch of RAS opened in Shanghai, though the possibility for any causal connection between the two incidents is yet to be tested.
Commonwealth scholars and students in Hong Kong while the “vast tracts of Malaya, Africa and New Guinea remained unstudied” because the former “wasn’t underdeveloped, wasn’t poor, was very small,” and (3) the relative reluctance of the Hong Kong government in collecting the basic social data that were generally gathered elsewhere. He observed that Hong Kong “is well known as a place; but almost unknown as a society.”

3.2.2 Taiwan as a Japanese Colony

The Japanese colony of Taiwan contrasted with the two British entrepôt both in the extensiveness of the empirical studies carried out into social life in Taiwan, and in the inclusion of sociology in its university curriculum. When surrendered to Japan in 1895, Taiwan was the first colony of this young empire. An island rich in resources, Taiwan is an experiment lab for testing colonial rule and a base for future southward expansion (Tsai, HYC 2009). It was larger than the two British settlements, and the purpose of acquisition was far more complex than just providing trading ports. The efficient governance and cultivation of the new colony under a modernized regime required systematic scientific knowledge about its natural resources and social condition. Hence a variety of official surveys were conducted to serve the political purposes, generating statistical
data about Taiwan’s demography, land, agriculture, commerce, religious scene
and diseases and ethnographic data of “old customs” 1. Meanwhile, Taiwan, as the
first tropical field in Japanese territory also attracted batches of scholars seeking
an “academic expedition” (Yeh, BL 2010:1), including researchers of ethnology,
linguistics, folklore studies and history. Parallel to the accumulation of official
reports, was the evolution of ample literature published in journals for
bureaucrat readers (e.g. The Journal of the Association of Aboriginal Affair Studies)
or for academic colleagues (e.g. The Bulletin of the Tokyo Anthropological Society)
2. This literature body, mostly associated with disciplines of anthropology or
ethnology3, kept precious record of the social life of colonial Taiwan.

The 1928 establishment of Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku (Taipei Imperial University
台北帝國大學) served as an institutional solution to advance the studies of the
“southern”; an initiative in accordance with the Japanese national strategy of
southern expansion (Yeh, BL 2010). The faculty structure, as clarified by Hiroshi

1 Chang MK, Chang YH and Tang CC (2010). Some of the content were rewritten from Tang, CC, 2008, pp563-567.
3 This association with anthropology was typical to colonial scholarship of the other, the underdeveloped, colonial object, while sociology was conceived to be a subject of the modern society (See Wallerstein, 1996). Moreover, readers should be reminded that the ‘sociology’ in pre-WWII Japan, following the German tradition, remained predominantly a philosophical instead of an empirical enterprise.
Shidehara (幣原坦), the chairperson of its establishment committee and later the first president, was planned for “the research that takes Taiwan as its central object.... The Faculty of Literature and Politics contained the “southern history” which is not attainable in other imperial universities. Also, the establishment of the Chair of Folklore and Ethnology (民俗學與人種學講座) is particularly meaningful in Taiwan.¹” A distinctive structural feature that sets the Taipei Imperial University apart from its post-war counterpart was the combination of “chair” (講座, unit for research and teaching) and “subject program” (科, program for degree). A “chair” corresponds to a “study office” (研究室) that contains a chair professor, an assistant professor, and 1-3 assistants that are specialized in one particular subject. A “subject program” represents a particular requirement of course-taking before getting a degree. The Faculty of Literature and Politics contains four “subject programs” (literature, history, philosophy, and politics) and 24 chairs, among which are the offices of “folklore and ethnology”, “language”, and “southern history”. These contributed extensively to the empirical studies of Taiwanese people. There was no “subject program” and no “chair” of sociology established, but the university started offering sociology courses taught by Okada

¹ Proposal for establishing university, submitted to Cabinet, cited in Matsumoto Takashi (松本巍) 1960 The History of Taipei Imperial University, p7.  http://tinyurl.com/3o5ujc6
Yuzuru (岡田謙) in 1930 under the philosophy program. The lecturer later published two books based on his empirical works in Taiwan.

A popular view was to account for the limited institutional presence of sociology by reference to the colonial government’s intentional suppression of its access to Taiwanese people. Tang CC (2008, 564-565), for instance, attributed the absence of a sociology subject program to “the colonial government's concern over allowing the colonial subject to learn sociological knowledge that often embodies critical spirit.” Chang MK, similarly, wrote (2010, 161) “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 .. [in] Taihoku Imperial University”. This view, however, requires more cautious reconsideration. First, the student body of Taihoku Imperial University was predominantly Japanese; therefore, access for Taiwanese student to any particular disciplinary knowledge was not the focus of consideration in designing its faculty structure. If this view was to be true, how should we account for the presence of a program of politics? Second, the sociology practiced in pre-WWII Japan was very different from what it came to be understood as in post-war Taiwan. Heavily influenced by the functionalist
perspective and the German preoccupation with philosophy (which can be reflected in the fact that the sociology course was placed under the philosophy program), pre-War Japanese sociology did not necessarily embody a critical component as is often assumed about this discipline nowadays. Instead, I think the limited institutional presence of “sociology” only reflected the relative restricted scope of utility of a philosophy-laden sociology in the colony whereby empirical investigations (e.g. by ethnologist) were prioritized.

Such intellectual heritage was largely overlooked by the post-war sociological community. One the one hand, Japanese scholars formerly based in Taiwan had to return home following the defeat of their country, causing some rupture in the continuity of the tradition they had created. Only one individual who possessed knowledge of the colonial scholarship remained;—Dr Chen Shao-Hsing (陳紹馨), the first Taiwanese sociologist trained in Tohoku (Japan) who was among three people appointed to take over the faculty of literature and politics after the Japanese surrender. On the other hand, the post-war sociological community consisted of primarily immigrant Chinese sociologists and their students who were illiterate of the Japanese literature and perhaps reluctant to acknowledge the scholarly achievement of their war-time enemy. It wasn't until the 1980s that
the values of the earlier colonial scholarship were rediscovered by historians and ethnology researchers. And it was only in recent decades that texts about the history of sociology in Taiwan made attempts to reveal the “hidden root of Taiwanese sociology” (Chang MK 2010, 160; Tang CC, 2008) back to Japanese colonial time in the first half of 20th century.

3.3 Post-War Geopolitics and the Scholarly Flow

The end of the Pacific War in 1945 and the subsequent warfare in Asia, as outlined in introduction, drastically changed the historical trajectories of the three colonies. The historical trajectories of the three colonies reflect the changing roles of, and the relations between, the four major imperial powers in a broader scope. The shifting geopolitical structure further reshaped the flow of sociologists and sociological knowledge in the area.

3.3.1 Balance of Powers and the Scholarly Flow

Japan, as the first modernized Asian empire collapsed and it did not regain its influence until three decades later. Its defeat brought Japanese scholars in Taiwan back home, leading to a severing of the scholarly tradition they created.
China, after the civil war was divided into two regimes competing for recognition as the “legitimate government” of the ancient empire. The Republic of China (ROC) founded by the nationalist party in 1911 was essentially overruled by the communist party which founded the new People’s Republic of China (PRC) except on the recently-regained former colony island of Taiwan. The uncertain future of communist rule made some Chinese sociologists to leave. Whilst some followed the KMT government to Taiwan, others went to Hong Kong or the US. In Taiwan and Hong Kong, the immigrant Chinese sociologists became the first major force to introduce and institutionalize sociology (Sec 4.1).

American dominance in the West Pacific became overwhelmingly significant in the emerging Cold War structure. Its alliance with Taiwan against communist expansion was a critical condition for the survival of the defeated KMT Government. American confrontations with communist China had three bearings on scholarly flows. First, this confrontation created a strong demand for knowledge about Chinese society and culture, and the closure of China to Western investigators made Taiwan and Hong Kong popular surrogate fields. Also, the successful containment of expanding communism depended on securing Taiwan and Hong Kong, and this strategic objective demanded
knowledge about the two locales for their own sake (Sec 3.3.3). Second, with the
general conviction that the development of sociology could help Asian societies
to resist the invasion of communism, numerous American Foundations (e.g. Asia
Foundation, Fulbright and Yale-China) sponsored American sociologists to teach
in Asia on a short-term basis or even provided critical sponsorship in the initial
institutionalization of the discipline. Those financial interventions, coupled with
endowments from various American Christian organizations and the devotion of
numerous missionary sociology teacher, promoted sociology in Asia. Third, as the
leader of the liberal camp, the United States became a major destination for
students from non-communist Asian countries seeking for advanced training.

The historical dominance of Britain in this region, on the other hand, was in
decline. The British did not seek to promote sociology with comparable
enthusiasm since the discipline was still striving for institutional recognition in
its own universities. Nonetheless, British social anthropologists contributed a
significant current of empirical works in the post-war studies of their former
colonies (Sec 3.3.3), and the scholarly network existing within the former
commonwealth country also played a role in mediating the flow of sociological
expertise in Hong Kong and Singapore (Sec 3.4.3).
3.3.2 Chinese Sociologist at the 1949 Crossroad

The defeat of the Nationalist Government (KMT) by the Chinese communists placed the Chinese scholar at a crossroads; to stay facing an uncertain future or to leave. Of the sociological community, the majority eventually stayed (Hsiao, Michael H.H. 1987:342; Yan 2004:225), which should at least partially be attributed to their intellectual concern with the underprivileged, political discontent with the corrupted Nationalist government, and ideological sympathy for the communists in 1940s China (Yan ibid, 225-235). The leading sociologist Fei, Xiao-Tong (費孝通), for instance, saw this political turmoil as a result of the long-suppressed farmers standing up for their rights, and he chose to stay on the scene to observe and explain this process of transition. Another influential figure was Tao Meng-He (陶孟和), who had long been criticizing KMT's corruption and incapability and was strongly opposed to KMT's plan to move Academia Sinica, China's national academy, to Taiwan. His decision encouraged the leaders of numerous institutes of the Academia Sinica to stay—including the entire Institute of Sociology (ibid, 232).

---

The minor group who left (or who at least did not return if they were abroad) might have ended up staying in Taiwan, Hong Kong, the United States or even Japan. The sociologists moving to Taiwan included Lung Kung-Hoi (龍冠海), Hsieh Cheng-Fu (謝徵孚), Chang Ching-yu (張鏡予) and Guo Ji (郭驥)\(^1\). The first three played a critical role in founding sociology in Taiwan while the latter primarily served in the KMT or the government. Those who went to Hong Kong included Wong Shau-Lam (黃壽林), Leung Tsun (冷雋) and Hu Chia-Chien (胡家健) (Lee, RP-I and Lau 1993:3). They all taught in the colleges founded by other Chinese scholars-in-exile. Those who moved to the United States included C.K. Yang (楊慶堃), Martin C. Yang (楊懋春), Huang Wen-Shan (黃文山), Hsu Shi-Lian (許仕廉) and Yu Tian-Hsiu (余天休)\(^2\). C.K. Yang went to teach in Pittsburg and he contributed greatly in helping CUHK building its sociology department. Martin C. Yang taught in Cornell, Stanford and Columbia before being invited to move back to Taiwan in 1958. He played a critical role in institutionalizing sociology in Taiwan.

\(^1\) Martin Yang (1976) counted up to ten who taught sociology in the 1950s. But as Yeh CC (2003) pointed out, the list included two social anthropologists, two social work/administration scholars, a Japanese-trained Taiwanese scholar, an American missionary and Martin Yang himself who returned Taiwan in 1958. Yang’s list did not include Guo Ji.

The choice of destination might reflect one's linguistic capability, social
connections, or even some contingent factors\(^1\). But at a collective level, it has
been suggested that the decision to migrate, particularly from China to Taiwan,
was associated with the ideological or even intellectual leaning of the scholars in
question. Tang Chih-Chieh (2008, 568), for instance, argued that those
sociologists and social anthropologists who came to Taiwan tended to be more
opposed to communism, or to have stronger nationalist sentiments. In a
historical account of anthropology, Huang Ying-Kuei (1987: 393-399) observed
that the Chinese anthropologists who came to Taiwan belonged to “historicist
camps” who studied the tradition and histories of ethnical minorities for the
completion of a national historical narrative, while members of other
“functionalist camps” who focused on the practical problems faced by
contemporary society, did not come. Both authors suggested that the *partial
inheritance* of Chinese scholarship had some framing effect on the post-war
development of corresponding disciplines in Taiwan.

---

\(^1\) Wu Wen-Tsao (吳文藻), for instance, had been concerned of the potential ideological clash with
the communist party and he accepted a job offers in Yale along with a Rockefeller grant in 1951,
but he was in the last minute halted by a rejection of his US visa application. See Yan Min 2004,
233-235.
3.3.3 Western Scholarly Expedition

The first batch of post-WWII social studies was produced by British and American anthropologists and sociologists who arrived in the 1950s-1960s, when the domestic research capacity was yet to be formed. In the early 1950s, a few British anthropologists came to Singapore because of their connection (service, or marriage with a colonial officer) with the colonial administration; some of them later extended their steps to Hong Kong. In the 1960s, a few more British researchers joined, but the dominant trend was a wave of American researchers arriving at Taiwan or Hong Kong either to learn about traditional Chinese society, to observe the process of modernization, or, in the case of Hong Kong to investigate what was taking place behind the “bamboo wall” through interviews with Chinese refugees. The sudden attention paid to the two tiny places, as mentioned in 3.3.1, reflected an emerging Cold War structure. It would be an interesting project to examine how these Western researchers imagined, approached, and presented their Asian subjects and to ask how the framing of their research agenda is related to a larger context. But in this section I only seek to provide an outline of the major historical figures and trends with a discussion of their legacy for domestic sociology.
The Western scholarly gaze was not something unseen before in Singapore and Hong Kong. Indeed, the Royal Asiatic Branch had set up their branch in the 19th century. Yet when this part of the world gradually recovered from the impact of World War II, its social condition faded from the Western intellectual map for decades. The RAS branch in Hong Kong has long ceased to function, and the former Strait Branch was also renamed Malayan Branch in 1923 to reflect the expanding engagement of the British over the Malay Peninsula (Tiew 1998).

The 1950s-1960s saw the arrival of a new batch of Western investigators—beginning from the few British anthropologists who came to Singapore because of their links to the colonial government. Maurice Freeman, a social anthropologist from the London School of Economics (LSE) spent two years between 1949 and 1950 in Singapore “informally attached to the Department of Social Welfare” to conduct a government-commissioned study about the Chinese family (Freeman 1957:7-9). His wife, Judith Dejamour, was also commissioned to write a report about the Malay family. She later wrote her PhD thesis based on this research (Djamour 1959). Marjorie Topley1, another LSE graduate married

to an officer in colonial service, came to Singapore with her husband in 1951. She took up post as the curator of anthropology in Raffles Museum and carried out research on a Cantonese immigrant community. The fieldwork formed the basis of the doctoral thesis Topley later (1958) wrote under the informal supervision of Freeman. Little significant studies were undertaken thereafter, until the founding of the sociology department recruited a new batch of social researchers in the mid-1960s.

Both Freeman and Topley came to Hong Kong in 1955. Freeman noted its value as a promising study field in his short visit (Freeman 1958:140) but was not able to return to research until 1963. Topley came with her husband who continued his career at the Hong Kong colonial administration. While not affiliated, she remained active in field research and got involved in the revival of the Hong Kong Branch of Royal Asiatic Society¹ (RASHKB) in 1959. In a paper published in 1964, Topley was able to name (1964:158, fn151) three Western social anthropologists who had been or were doing research there—Barbara E. Ward (華德英, graduate

¹ The RASHKB was re-established in 1959 with its history traced back the RAS China Branch operating a century ago. The RASHKB set up its journal in 1961 to communicate empirical Hong Kong studies of a variety of disciplines by Western investigators and published seven symposiums proceedings on various topics in 1964-1980. The society See http://www.royalasiaticsociety.org.hk/
of LSE) on the “boat people” (1954; 1958; 1985b), Jean Pratt from Cambridge on a Hakka village, and Jack Potter from Berkeley on a Cantonese clan village (1964; 1968). They were soon joined by Hugh Baker from SOAS who studied the Hokkien clan village (1968). The small circle was soon expanded with the arrival of a batch of American doctoral students like EN Anderson (1967; 1969), Maurice Anderson, John Brim, and James Watson in the late 1960s¹, and the establishment of a new Faculty of Social Sciences in the HKU in 1967. Topley edited several symposium proceedings (RASHKB 1964; 1967; 1972) for both RASHKB and the Centre of Asian Studies (CAS, 1967-) of HKU. Jarvie, another young lecturer of the HKU who edited a volume titled Hong Kong: a society in transition (1969). These collections provided timely surveys of the anthropological and sociological studies of Hong Kong in the 1960s.

The earlier studies mostly focused on traditional Chinese social organization and culture based on ethnographic works conducted in the new territory of Hong Kong— which, after China closed its door, was then the only accessible field where the Chinese villagers still kept the traditional social customs practiced for

centuries\(^1\). These works attracted significant attention in the West but had relatively little impact on domestic sociology (Traver 1984:40; Lee, RPL 1996). In the 1970s, rapid industrialization and urban expansion in Hong Kong soon motivated some researchers to shift their attention towards this transitional process. For example, Ward shifted her focus to the internal organization of factories and the behaviour of labourers (Ward 1985b). Graham Johnson studied political structures and civil organizations in a new town, and Janet Salaff (Berkeley) studied female labour participation in the process of industrialization (Salaff 1981). These works received increasing attention amongst the domestic sociologists, who were in general more concerned with the process and challenges of modernization than traditional ways of life (Lee, RPL 1996:40)\(^2\).

Meanwhile, with its openness to the West and the proximity to China, Hong Kong soon became a frontier site for data collection about China during the Cold War. Throughout the late 1960s and the 1970s, numerous American sociologists visited Hong Kong to learn about what was behind the “bamboo wall” by

\(^1\) James Watson made this point in a presentation in HKU during my visit. See also Waston, 1975.
Taiwan was also a popular site for anthropological studies for similar subject, there were significant difference. The Taiwanese villages were mostly built by Chinese male migrant (via the risky sea cruise) and the marriage with aboriginal female was popular, while the villages in new territory were built by entire migrant clan family and its social structure were better preserved.

\(^2\) Barbara Ward taught in CHUK in 1979-82, leaving more legacy to the younger domestic sociologists. There was also an edited collection of her translated works published in Hong Kong (Ward, 1985b).
interviewing new immigrants (Lee, 1996: 41)—for instance Ezra Vogel (1969), William Parish and Martin Whyte (1978), and later Andrew Walder (1986). Given the erstwhile scarcity of information about China, these studies were highly regarded in the American circle of contemporary China studies, but largely ignored by contemporary Hong Kong sociologists who were more concerned with the study of domestic society.

Cold War geopolitics brought even more scholarly attention to Taiwan, which was the last stronghold of the Nationalist ROC and American allies in its West Pacific frontier. The island further host the largest accessible field inhabited by Chinese immigrants. To understand how to better equip its strategic ally, the American government dispatched experts to conduct social surveys in Taiwan. For instance, the Sino-American Joint Commission of Rural Reconstruction (JCRR 中國農村復興聯合委員會) conducted two social-economic surveys in the 1952 and 1959. There were also a growing number of American doctoral students conducting a field study in Taiwan. In 1959-1970, at least fifteen PhDs in sociology and

\footnote{A ROC-US joint initiative to reconstruct the rural economy in China founded after US Congress passed the China Aid Act in 1948. The JCRR moved to Taiwan with the defeated KMT. The institution was annexed to the ROC Council of Agriculture when the US ended its official diplomatic tie with ROC (Taiwan) in 1979. See Shen, 1970; Yagger, 1988.}
anthropology were awarded to “non-Taiwanese” students by American universities for studies about Taiwan. The next decade saw this number double.\(^1\) The subjects covered, similarly, reflected a basic orientation of either looking for ‘tradition’ or researching the process of modernization. In terms of the first category, notable works include studies of traditional religious rituals (1969; 1972; Ahern 1973; Wolf, AP 1974), traditional family with particular emphasis on economic functions and gender (Cohen 1967; Wolf, M 1972; Cohen 1976; Klein 1978), and ethnographies of some Taiwanese villages (Diamond 1969; Sangren 1980). Of the later categories, the studies covered issues like the impact of modernization on traditional marriage and kinship (Parish, William Lucious 1970; Schak 1975), the changing demography and birth control (Mohapatra 1966; Kindermann 1969) and land reform and urban development (Bessac 1967; Crissman 1973).

Those studies form a solid body of literature from the Western perspective and some were cited later by Taiwanese sociologists who obtained their final qualification in the US. However, the impact on the initial development of domestic sociology was marginal. First, these works were published primarily in

\(^1\) Murray and Hong compiled a list of US awarded PhDs in social sciences on Taiwan studies up to early 1990s. I compiled an approximated list of ‘foreign doctoral students’ by excluding the Romanized Chinese names. See Murray, 1994:215-228.
the US and their circulation back to the geographical origin of the knowledge was minimal given the restricted library budget and severe political restrictions and control during the 1970s. Second, the language for instruction in Taiwan is Chinese Mandarin and the use of English texts was not popular before a wave of US-trained sociologist returned in the 1980s. Third, perhaps more importantly, the intellectual agenda behind this research primarily represents the ways in which these Asian locales were imagined, observed and appropriated from certain Western perspectives. The development of indigenous scholarship, on the other hand, was at least initially oriented towards a more practical agenda based on local social issues. In 1986 two young sociologists edited a collection (Ting and Ma 1986) of fifteen essays translated from English (of the 1980s). The collection became a popular channel for domestic sociology students to learn about how their society had been studied in the other linguistic world. This collection, however, was also the last of its kind, since both access to English literature and the availability of domestic research were greatly improved in the 1990s. Despite such improved access, familiarity with these early texts among Taiwanese sociologists remained limited.

---

1 Ting Tin-Yu for instance, noted the scarce availability of English text when he studies in NTU in mid 1970s and his ‘shock’ upon the discovery of the rich resource of literature about Taiwan when he went to the United States. See Ting, 1986:2.
Summary

This chapter first noted the varied developments and orientation of sociology in the four regional powers, specifically the USA, Japan, China and the UK, to provide an external reference for subsequent discussion (3.1). Evidence for pre-WWII sociological investigations and sociological teaching in the three colonies was subsequently surveyed with their variation noted. There was little impact on the later development of sociology (3.2). Three post-war currents of scholarly migration that represented the flow of sociological expertise and knowledge were traced (3.3): the immigration of Chinese sociologists to Hong Kong and Taiwan (and beyond), the expedition of British social anthropologists with the auspice of colonial administrations in Singapore and Hong Kong, and the surge of American researchers that studied Taiwan and Hong Kong as surrogates of the inaccessible Chinese society. Those Chinese sociologists played a critical role in later institutionalisation of the discipline in Taiwan and Hong Kong, while the remaining two currents were involved in the generation of sociological knowledge to be exported and consumed in the Anglophone world, while leaving a limited legacy for the domestic tradition of sociology via an indirect path.
The fourth chapter sets the scene for the remaining chapters by sketching the institutional development of sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. The eventual institutionalization of sociology in the three places followed two modes. The first was driven by Chinese sociologists moving to Taiwan and Hong Kong in the late 1940s who played a critical role in introducing sociology first as a teaching subject, and subsequently as an institutionalized discipline in both places. The endowment of American Christian organizations and Foundations were critical in both cases. The second mode took place in the two (former) British colonial universities. They both incorporated social sciences in their faculties in the mid-1960s, following their increased institutional recognition within the British Commonwealth and against the multiple social problems emerging alongside rapid post-war industrialization and urbanization. The two departments were both founded with initial staff consisting of mainly expatriates, but their later trajectories diverted in the 1970s as the political contexts were different. This chapter will review the two modes of institutional development.
4.4 is concerned with the demography of the sociological communities.

4.1 Chinese Sociologists and American Endowments

4.1.1 Taiwan, Sociology Established with Cold War US Aid

In Taiwan, the Nationalist government took over the Taihoku Imperial University and renamed it the National Taiwan University (NTU). It soon became the institutional base for many immigrant Chinese scholars. The Chinese sociologist Lung Kung-Hoi joined the university, but was allocated, along with Dr. Chen Shao-Hsing and an American missionary sociologist Albert O’Hara, to the Department of Archeology and Anthropology. These three and some other Chinese sociologists “re-established1” the Chinese Sociological Association (CSA)2 in 1951, and sent an appeal in name of the CSA to the NTU, urging the establishment of a sociology department in the university. However, their requests were repeatedly turned down. When Martin Yang arrived at NTU in 1958, he observed the “low morale” of the three sociologists (1976, 6). Yang (ibid,

---

1 There was a general trend of launching every “national” organization on the side of the Strait as “the authentic one” against the “false one” remaining (if still) in the communists China. Due to the limited number of ‘sociologist’ who actually came to Taiwan, the initial CSA members include scholars that would be sorted by later standard as social anthropologist, ethnologist, and people of social work/administration.

2 Due to the limited number of ‘sociologist’ who actually came to Taiwan, the initial CSA members include scholars that would be sorted by later standard as social anthropologist, ethnologist, and people of social work/administration. See Yang, M, 1976, 2
6) recorded that the three sociologists saw unfavorable perceptions of sociology held by some key academic leaders as major obstacles to the advancement of the subject. But as Hsiao (1987, 343) observed, the “passiveness and apathy” of government toward sociology should be structurally explained by (1) the lower priority given to sociology in the critical decade of economic and political restoration, (2) the lack of influential sociologists moving to Taiwan (most stayed in China), and (3) the government’s suspicions of sociology since many leading Chinese sociologists had been openly critical of the KMT during the civil war era.

The eventual institutionalization of sociology dates back to 1955 when the young Provincial Junior College of the Administration (台灣省立行政專校) was upgraded to become the Taiwan Provincial College of Law and Business (台灣省立法商學院) and its "social administration" programme was granted the new status of “sociology department¹.” This department, however, remained a training centre of social administrators. The first department with more rigid disciplinary commitment was officially established in the next year as part of the founding faculty of Tunghai University (東海大學), a private liberal art institution

¹ The College was later incorporated into the Chung-Hsing University in 1961 as its ‘Taipei campus’. In 2000 the college was upgraded to be a new independent National Taipei University.
established by the (American) “United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia” (UBCHEA, 亞洲基督教高等教育聯合董事會) to substitute the Christian higher education institutions the board had sponsored in pre-war Chinese mainland. The financial autonomy and the symbolic (and political) prestige of the American organization in the 1950s gave the initiative an edge against possible suspicions from the government. Yet this nominally-established department did not have any staff until the appointment of Prof. Chang Ching-yu as its first chair in 1958.

The National Taiwan University (NTU) finally approved the appeal, and set up a sociology department in 1960, only after Martin Yang successively secured an endowment from the Asia Foundation (TAF). Yang was connected to the Foundation during his participation in the 1959 2nd JCRR socio-economic survey (see Sec 3.3.3) of which the Foundation was a collaborator (Yang 1976:7). Yang recalled that, after participation in the survey, he was asked by Richard Miller (TAF representative) to suggest ways in which they could assist the development

1 This organization (often simply called ‘United Board’ 聯董會) originated from the ‘United Board for Christian College in China’ founded in 1922 in New York. By 1949 it has sponsored a total of thirteen higher education institutions in China. The organization changed its name in 1952 to reflect its shifted geographical focus as it was unable to continue the work in China.
of social sciences in the Republic of China. He proposed launching a sociology department in NTU and it was approved. This path of initiation provided three conditions which made the new department possible: First, most apparently, the financial grant guarantee solved the obstacle of insufficient resource in 1960. Second, the successful conduct of the JCRR survey demonstrated the value of sociological expertise, granting the discipline the legitimacy it needed. Third, the collaboration with a foreign party reinforced a point which had been articulated in the earlier appeal to define the department— that “sociology was a discipline widely recognized internationally,... [hence the] absence of a qualified institution for international collaboration would disadvantage our national status” in the imagined competition against the rival across the Strait (Tang 2008:570). Yang further persuaded the NUT to establish a Graduate Institute of Rural Socio-economic Studies (鄉村社會經濟研究所) with support from TAF. The institute later became the Department of Agriculture Extension (農業推廣系), a centre of rural sociology.

In terms of the nature and agenda of TAF, the key sponsor of the process, it was later revealed that the Asia Foundation was a “Central Intelligence Agency proprietary... established in 1954 to undertake cultural and educational activities
on behalf of the United States Government in ways not open to official U.S.
agencies. The foundation originated from the Committee for Free Asia initiated
in 1951 by a group of California businessmen who sought to combat the
expanding communist regime with initiatives such as Free Asia Radio. A private
body, TAF was nonetheless “sanctioned by the National Security Council and,
with the knowledge of congressional oversight committees, supported with
covert indirect CIA funding.” In 1954, when it became apparent that communism
would not be defeated easily, the committee reorganized itself into a public
charity named Asia Foundation. Covert funding from the CIA nonetheless
continued until it was revealed by the US media in the 1967 (Ashizawa 2006). A
principal aim of the 1960s Asia Foundation was to promote democracy in Asian
countries, and the strategic tasks included assisting the development of
indigenous social sciences. I shall resist some radical stance of “funder
determinism” that establishes a critique simply by unmasking the hidden agenda
of the funder— rather, what had been expected by the funding agency may not
really be reflected in what was pursued with the grant. But it would be safe to say

1 U.S. State Department, Document 132, in Johnson Administration, Foreign Relations 1964-1968,
http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-68v10/d132
that the birth of sociology in the most prestigious university in Taiwan is achieved with resources made available by Cold War geopolitics.

The mid-1950s also saw the “reestablishment” of numerous universities which traced their histories back to universities previously existing in China, often with the help of the staff and alumni of the later institutions (despite their remote connection). Three departments devoted primarily to sociology were set up in this batch of universities. These included the fourth sociology department in the Catholic Fu-Jen University (1969), the Department of Ethnical Sociology (upgraded from the former Department of Frontier Administration) in the National Cheng-Chi University (1970), and a fifth sociology department in the Soochow University (1973).

4.1.2 Hong Kong: Growth with Chinese Postsecondary Education

The few Chinese sociologists arriving in 1940s Hong Kong faced an institutional circumstance different from Taiwan. The University of Hong Kong remained the only higher education institution in the colonial port city, which was apparently inaccessible to those Chinese-speaking immigrants. But on the other hand, the British colonial government imposed little control over the private initiatives of
establishing schools or colleges. There was little resource, but there was little restriction either (not to mention the sort of “suspicion on sociology” noted of the KMT authorities in Taiwan). A number of colleges were soon established to meet the explosive demand created by Chinese immigrants, providing the space for many Chinese scholars to carry out their vocation to teach. Sociology courses was offered in Chung-Chi (崇基) College from 1951, in Baptist (浸會) and United (聯合) Colleges from 1956, in New Asia (新亞) from 1959 (Lee, R, 1993, 3), and in the later-established Lingnan (嶺南) and Shu Yen (樹仁) colleges. It is worth noting that half of these colleges (and arguably those which supported sociology the most) were connected to Christian organizations. Chung-Chi (literally “worshiping Christ”), the first college to introduce sociology, was founded by Protestant Churches in Hong Kong with a rationale similar to that of the founding of Tunghai in Taiwan. The Baptist, too, had a strong Christian heritage. The later established Lingnan was also historically connected to the Lingnan College (Canton) founded by the American Presbyterians (North) Council in 18891.

The 1950s economic developments created a strong demand for higher

____________________________________________________

1 Of the other three, New Asia was initiated by Chang Chi-yun (張其昀), the former Minister of Education of ROC, and recruited a number of influential scholars who had previously worked for the national universities. The United was formed by merging five schools of Canton origin. Shu-yen was founded by educator Chung Chi-yung (鍾期榮) who formerly the Dean of Faculty of Art and Social Sciences, Baptist College.
education that exceeded the capacity of Hong Kong University, driving the colonial government to consider a second university\(^1\). In 1963 the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) was created with Chung-Chi, United, and New Asia as its member colleges under a federation structure. This move has also been attributed to the adjustment of colonial policies following the wave of independence movement in the 1950s and the changing British discourse about the higher education marked by the 1963 Robbins report (Chen, FC 2000:26-27).

Government endowment provided the critical resources for developing sociology in Hong Kong.

A key figure in the process was Yang Ching-Kun (楊慶堃, generally known as C.K. Yang), a Chinese sociologist teaching in Pittsburg University, who was concerned about the abolishment of sociology in communist China and decided to help the CUHK training young sociologists as a seed stock for reviving Chinese sociology in the future. Yang assisted with a redesign of the sociology teaching program and built a formal link between CUHK and Pittsburg (leading to the creation of the Centre of International Studies in the latter) that brought Pittsburg

---

\(^1\) Wong Ting-Hong (2008, 194) also argued that the establishment of CUHK marked the colonial government’s last step to cut the reliance on higher education in Taiwan or China. See also 5.6.2.
sociologists to Hong Kong to teach on a short basis and sent CUHK students to Pittsburg for PhD training (Lee, RPL 1996; Holzner 2006).

To facilitate empirical research in Hong Kong, three research centres were established in the three member colleges of CUHK in the mid-1960s, namely the “Center for Rural Village” Research of Chung-chi, the “Center of Urban Studies” of the United, and the social psychology-oriented “Sociological Lab” of the New Asia. The three units were merged to form a single “Center of Social Research” later in the 1960s, which subsequently received grants from the Hong Kong government, Asia Foundation, Harvard-Yenching Institute and Lingnan Foundation. The research centre and its later derivative institutions played a critical role in supporting and publishing Hong Kong social research in the decades to come.

4.1.3 Singapore: Sociology in Nangyang University

The post-war wave of migrant sociologists did not reach the shore of Singapore, but the victory of the Chinese communists had some impact on the Chinese community in the southern colonial settlement. The initial policy of the British colonial administration to ban communication with communist China cut the supply of Chinese teachers to the Strait Settlements and the channel for local
Chinese students to pursue tertiary education in Chinese universities.

Consequently, an initiative to build a Chinese university was proposed by the philanthropic business leader Tan Lark Sye (陳六使) and this attracted much support from the Chinese community in Southeast Asia, leading to the birth of the Nangyang University (南洋大學) in 1955 (Wong, TH 2005:203). The university established a Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences in late 1970s, but the entire university was “merged,” against resistance from the Chinese community, with the University of Singapore to form the new National University of Singapore (NUS) in 1980. As English remained the language for instruction in the merged university, only part of the Nangyang faculty members were absorbed— including sociologist Mak Lau Fong (麥留芳) and Mdm. Tai Ching Ling (戴慶齡).

4.2 The British Colonial Universities: University of Singapore and HKU

The two (former) British colonial universities started to incorporate sociology into their faculty in the second half of the 1960s, though some courses of

---

1 Nangyang (南洋) literally means ‘Southern Ocean’
2 Mak LF had taught in University of Singapore for three years before moving to Nagyang. Tai CL was married to Peter Chen, the director of the department of University of Singapore before the merge.
sociology had been offered earlier\(^1\). The University of Singapore established its sociology department in 1965— “a coincidence, though not insignificant, ... in the same year that Singapore was expelled from Malaysia” (Tong and Lian 2002). The Hong Kong University established its Faculty of Social Sciences, which included departments of sociology and of social work, in 1967— a year remembered for the iconic left-wing riots.

4.2.1 Historical Context in the 1960s

The considerations behind the decisions were difficult to reconstruct in detail\(^2\), but there are two contextual clues worthy of attention. First, both departments were established within historical context highlighted by social instability. In Singapore, the ethnic conflicts following its 1963 merge with Malaysia created much political tension, which eventually led to its expulsion from the Malaysian Federation. In Hong Kong, social problems created by the massive influx of

\(^1\) In University of Singapore, the training program in social work “contained substantial amount of sociological material” since 1952 (1995). The teaching in sociology was provided by a special unit within the Department of Economics, which later became the independent Department of Social Studies (renamed Department of Applied Social Studies). Also, the Dutch-trained sociologist Syed Hussein Alatas had “introduced a sociological bias to teaching and research in the Department of Malay Studies (Benjamin, 1989).

\(^2\) Writing about the history of sociology in Singapore, Khondker (Clammer 1985) stated “one can only speculate as to why sociology was adopted as an academic discipline in Singapore.” A book published by to the Faculty of Social Sciences of HKU to celebrate its own 30\(^{th}\) anniversary stated “in the existing literature, there is no description of the various considerations behind the establishment of the Faculty of Social Science.” See HKU FSS, 1997, Section ‘History’.
Chinese immigration and rapid industrialisation were turning more unbearable. The discontent provided the condition for the 1967 riot. The decisions to set up sociology department in both cases are of course not related to either the independence of Singapore or the Hong Kong riot. However, they were made within the identical social contexts that led to the two incidents, and may be seen as response to the instability within such contexts.

Second, the 1960s saw the mass institutionalization of sociology in the UK and in some commonwealth countries. In the United Kingdom, a phase of institutionalizing sociology evolved between 1950 and 1967, in particular after the 1963 Robbins Report that suggested the expansion of tertiary education (Halsey 2004:89-). Australia had its first sociology department established in the University of New South Wales in 1959, and the Australian Sociological Association was founded in 1963 (Western 2005). New Zealand, too, experienced a “founding period” of sociology during the 1960s (Crothers 2005). This trend, which was easily communicated through the network of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, might have granted the young discipline more legitimacy to warrant department status. Writing about the founding of sociology in Singapore, Khondker reflected (2000, 106) “probably, the desire to keep up
with the image of international or global norm of liberal education that by then routinely included sociology and anthropology ... play a role.”

4.2.2 University of Singapore

The University of Singapore opened its sociology department with Murray Grove, an Oxford-trained Australian social anthropologist, appointed as the first Chair Professor. There were a few temporary assistant lecturers hired to supplement the teaching in 1966¹. Geoffrey Benjamin, a British anthropologist who had carried out field work in Malaysia, became the first full-time lecturer in 1967. The next year saw four sociologists from the United States appointed as full-time lecturers— Joseph Tamney, Peter Weldon, John McDougall, and Rias Hassen. The four are all intellectually or personally connected to the region. Tamney had an interest in Chinese studies, Weldon lived in the Philippines before, McDougall carried out research in Sabah and Hassen was a Pakistani. In 1970, Peter Chen became the first Singaporean appointed lecturer in the department (Benjamin 1989). Of the six founding expatriates, however, four left within just a few years, including the chair who “at the end of 1968... went on long term leave and declined to return” (ibid, 24). (Grove later took up the chair of sociology at the

¹ Douglas Murray, Mark Hobart, Peter Metcalf and Prof. Jerome Manis. See Benjamin (1989).
Hong Kong University). While instability amongst expatriate teachers was not rare, the climate of this colonial university in the 1960s context of nation-building was not easy. The decolonization sentiment had led some university staff of local origin to break away from the Academic Staff Association to form a new body of local identity in 1964. The next year a wave of expatriate professors resigned for the perceived uncertainty of future.

On 7, Feb, 1966, Lee Kuan-Yew delivered a speech in the University of Singapore, in which he describe the university as lacking “the corps of informed thinking to lead, formulate and guide national thought on constructive lines” (Lee, KY 1966).

Lee reflected upon his reading of a seminar proceeding by the university staff and said he was struck by the fact that “so many were not our nationals... By their very ground they cannot have the same feel for the aspirations on the ground (ibid:7).” He then condemned some papers by national scholars which seemed “indifferent to what we are facing”— a “particular frame of mind” which impeded this university to play its role. Lee concluded (ibid:11):

1 Strait Times News clipping. Enright, 'Why the expat dons are leaving?' 31, March, 1965
“...having a national university means more than just having nationals manning that university. It means an organism which responds to the needs and the challenge of our time in this particular part of the world and in this society.”

The urge to make the university more responsive to the national need implicitly rendered the expatriates even less relevant – though the extent to which this climate was associated with the departure of these sociologists is unclear.

However, back in the early 1970s, there were simply very few Singaporeans with a qualification in sociology. The reliance on expatriates was still inevitable. The vacant chair of sociology was filled in 1971 by the German sociologist Hans-Dieter Evers, and there was a continuous stream of Western expatriates appointed thereafter. Nonetheless, perhaps as a second-best choice in the search for “relevant” faculty members, a significant demographic shift was observed in the department’s faculty structure. In the short span of 1971-1973, the department recruited six Chinese scholars who had studied in either Hong Kong or Taiwan before obtaining their final degree in the US or Canada. The localization of its faculty was only pushed forward in the 1980s with the recruitment of a batch of its own graduates (Sec 4.5.4).
4.2.3 University of Hong Kong

The HKU sociology department was founded by Prof. Keith Hopkins (MSc Cantab, 1934-2004) and Henry Lethbridge (BS London) in 1967. They were joined by three other British-trained lecturers, Chaney, Podmore, and Han, D.W.T. (韓榮德). Murray Grove joined in 1969 to take the chair when Hopkins returned to LSE.

The early 1970s saw the arrival of four US-trained expatriates, diluting the British character of this department. They included David Levin and Harold Traver who stayed for three decades. Some of these expatriates came with an interest in China Studies, but the life style of the Hong Kong University in early 1970s was also described by an informant (HK16) as an incentive:

“[It was] extremely colonial... very relaxed. You can have two hour lunch with the head of the department, drinking down to... sometimes not coming back in the afternoon around five. Students were from upper middle class A type. English very good! Most of them well travelled... different from what they are now.”

The first Hong Kong scholar recruited was Wong Siu-Lung (黃紹倫), who studied in Oxford before becoming a lecturer in 1975. A few domestic teachers recruited, but they remained a minority in the department until very recently.
4.3 Institutional Expansion

4.3.1 Taiwan: Post-Authoritarian Expansion and Institutional Diversification

In Taiwan, higher education expansion has gradually accelerated since the political liberalization in late 1980s (see 8.2.1). The number of sociology departments did not increase immediately, but expanding programs in many applied fields (e.g. social work, social welfare, communication, education) and the growing demand for “general knowledge education” (通識教育) created considerable institutional space for sociologists. While these sociologists were institutionally unrelated, many remained connected to the core sociological community through their participation in TSA events. It was estimated that 40% of sociologist were working in non-sociology departments in 1996, and this ratio has risen to 58% in 2008.

A new batch of sociology institutes (or departments) were founded in a variety of institutions following the mid-1990s, including Academia Sinica (中央研究院).

---

1 An idea similar to liberal art education. Some universities established “Centre of General Education” with vacancies for teachers in art and social sciences if they do not have corresponding departments.

2 See Chang YW, 1996 for the statistic that year. 58% is calculated by comparing the Dataset CCS and Dataset CHU, See Sec 2.2.2.
National Tsing-Hua University (清華), Nanhua University (南華), Fo-Guang College (佛光 upgraded to university in 2006) and the National Sun Yat-Sen University (中山). Three points can be observed from the list:

First, the “revival” of the Institute of Sociology in Academia Sinica signified the recognition of this discipline in the highest academic institution of the nation. The Academia Sinica had an institute of sociology. However, it refused to move to Taiwan in 1949. Since then there had been a long absence of sociologists in the institution. In the mid-1970s, the Institute of Ethnology started to recruit some sociologists and psychologists for the envisioned interdisciplinary project on the study of Chinese character\(^1\). Later the Institute of “Three Principles of People” (三民主義研究所) and Institute of American Studies (renamed Institute of American and European Studies in 1991) appointed a few sociologists. Despite the increasing number of sociologists, the Academia Sinica turned down several calls to revive the Institute of Sociology, including one sent by the Chinese

\(^1\) The 1972 symposium proceedings *The Character of Chinese People: An Interdisciplinary Approach* outlined this agenda. (Li and Yang 1972)

\(^2\) “Three Principles of People” is a political theory by revolutionist Sun Yat-sen who had been iconized by the ROC authority as the “father of the republic.” There were numerous institutions set up to encourage the studies of his theory, which all face the challenge in the post-authoritarian era (1987-). This particular institute was renamed “Sun Yat-Sen Institute of Social Science and Philosophy” (中山人文社會科學研究所) in 1990, which was again merged with other unit to form the interdisciplinary Research Center for Humanities and Social Sciences (人文社會科學研究中心) in 2004.
Sociological Association in 1988. The vision was finally actualized in 1995 with the setting up of a preparatory office, and the formal establishment of the new institute in 2000. Now hosting 26 academic members, the institute is the largest institution of sociology in Taiwan. Second, in terms of geographical dispersion, the first batch founded in 1955-1973 was all located in or near the capital Taipei except Tunghai (in Taichung City). This batch of five, by contrast, only had one (Academia Sinica) in Taipei. The two national universities are located in the northern high-tech industrial city Hsin-Chu and the southern port city of Kaohsiung and the two private institutions are located in rural areas in Chia-Yi and Yi-lan. This reflected a discontent with the earlier concentration of sociological expertise in Taipei, and the suspected geographical bias in the production of scholarship. In fact, National Sun Yat-Sen University declared a vision of “Southern sociology” as its self-definition. Third, the two private institutions were both funded by Buddhist organizations, joining their Christian counterparts in Taiwan. The two institutions, disadvantaged by their private status and geographical distance from major cities (both unfavorable factors among Taiwanese students), were of lower prestige. But the spatial isolation

1 See the Department’s website http://www.gios.nsysu.edu.tw/en_cont.asp
ironically created a rare sense of collegiality among colleagues. Amongst these was a higher ratio of locally-trained or theory-minded scholars and together these contextual factors framed a distinctive alternative tradition in the sociological community. In 2008, there were 329 sociologists employed in Taiwan, and of these, some 134 were employed by departments or institutes of sociology.

4.3.2 Hong Kong:

In Hong Kong, institutional expansion took two forms. First, a number of interdisciplinary social science departments were formed in institutions directly founded by government. The School of Social Work of Hong Kong Polytechnic was renamed the Department of Applied Social Studies (later modified to the Department of Applied Social Sciences) to broaden the scope of training in 1986. The City Polytechnic of Hong Kong (upgraded to the City University of Hong Kong City in 1994) also employed a number of sociologists in its Department of Applied Social Science and Department of Asian and International Studies. The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, an ambitious initiative by the government to cope with the emerging knowledge economy, included a division of social sciences from 1996. Finally, the Open University of Hong Kong
(upgraded from college status in 1997) had a Division of Humanities and Social Sciences and appointed one sociologist for related courses. Second, the numerous privately-initiated colleges that hosted sociology were upgraded to university status, and therefore were granted more resource and space for developing their faculty. This included the upgrading of Baptist in 1994, of Lingnan in 1999, and of Shuyen in 2006. The sociology department Baptist is now a third major centre for the discipline. Lingnan hosts a Department of Sociology and Social Policy (formerly Department of sociology and Politics). Shu-Yen, the only private university in Hong Kong, hosts a sociology department and a centre of qualitative research. Catherine Chui, the HKSA president between 2008 and 2010, recorded (Chiu, C 2009) that the nine institutions mentioned above (including CUHK and HKU) had a total of 86 sociologists (not including the anthropologists in HKU, which were counted in Dataset CCS I compiled). While there were sociologists in other departments, the author could only estimate that the total number “should be” above 100.

4.3.3 Singapore: The Second Sociology Dept. in Nangyang Tech Univ

Narrative about sociology in Singapore has long been dominated by the history of the NUS department. The monopoly has only recently been changed with the
2005 establishment of a Division of Sociology in Nang-yang Technological University\(^1\). While there were some sociologists employed in the department of social work, communication, and institutes of area studies, they were generally not connected into a network. In 2011, the two departments hosted 41 sociologists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociology Department</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955 Taiwan Prov. Sch. of Law and Business</td>
<td>1956 Tung-Hai Univ</td>
<td>1965 HK Baptist College</td>
<td>1965 Univ of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 Nat. Taiwan Univ</td>
<td>1969 Fu-Jen Univ</td>
<td>1965 HK Chinese Univ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Nan-hua</td>
<td>1996 Ling-nan Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Nat Sun-Yat Sen</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sociological community (data 2008)</th>
<th>141 FT staff in sociology depts.</th>
<th>55 in sociology depts. Only 80 include. HKPU and HKUST</th>
<th>40 HKSA member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>244 TSA member list</td>
<td>330 Sociology PhD in Higher Edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1 Key Sociology Institutions and Size of Professional Community

\(^1\) Not to be confused with the Nan-yang University (1955-1980). The Singapore government set up a Nanyang Technological College (NTC) on the former campus of Nanyang University soon after its forced merger with the University of Singapore. The NTC inherited the name, the campus, and one historical building from the precedent university, but it marked a rupture from the former in terms of their orientation, personnel, financial arrangements, motto and even the language of instruction. The NTC and the Institute of Education was merged to form the Nanyang Technological University in 1991.
4.4 Cohort Structure of Sociologists

This section traced the demographic patterns of the sociological communities based on available datasets (See Sec 2.2.2). I primarily rely on the staffing dataset of the leading departments (*Dataset-SLD*) because, first, it was the only dataset that shows a reliable picture of the historical transition, and second, the leading departments’ staffing was itself indicative of small sociological communities as in the three cases. This was particularly true in Singapore, where the history of sociology almost equates with the departmental history of the (National) University of Singapore. In Hong Kong, the sociology departments of CUHK and HKU covered roughly 40% of the domestic professional community. Given their institutional prestige and longer standing status of their departments, their data should provide a meaningful, though not comprehensive, indication of the transition of sociologist demography. For Taiwan, I also consulted the dataset compiled by Hei-yuan Chu (*Dataset-Chu*). This dataset covered most of those employed following the late 1970s when there were more institutions emerging. The data obtained from NTU, on the other hand, presents an accurate picture of its earlier cohorts when this institution played a more dominant role in the professional circle in Taiwan.
To analyse this, I tried to look for the cohort structure of the sociologists in the four datasets. The discussion of the cohort structure of sociologists can be found in numerous historical writings of sociology in Taiwan (Hsiao, Michael H.H. 1986). The concept of cohort was never clearly defined in these writings, but it was generally understood as the collective of the sociologists who joined full time academic faculties within a particular temporal phase and therefore showed similar patterns of career trajectories that were distinctive from their senior or junior colleagues. In Taiwan, there was a general consensus around what constituted the first of three cohorts, but less agreed criteria on the division between later cohorts\(^1\). In this project I first seek to identify any significant transition in the demographic composition of the appointed faculty members in each of the four datasets, and to group the cohorts of 10-15 years by significant.dividers (for instance, major changes in composition or significant historical incidents). Secondly, I compare the cohort phase identified in the four trajectories to look for signs of similar trends or divergent paths.

\(^1\) Chen Dong-Shen (Professor, NTU), for instance, provided in his lecture hand-out a framework of five cohorts defined by the presence of teacher-student relationship between the members of adjacent cohort. This table was of limited generalizability as it focused on those who were associated with the NTU department only, but it served as a point of reference when I was choosing the dividing years for phases.
4.4.1 Taiwan

First Cohort: 1950-1965, Chinese Immigrants and American Missionaries

The first cohort of sociologists consists of the Chinese immigrant scholars, a few American missionaries (Albert O’Hara and Mark Thelin) and the only native, Chen Shao-Hsing. Most of these scholars have received doctoral training abroad, and subscribed to positivism and pragmatism.

Second Cohort: 1966-1978, Staff Promoted from Students

The “second cohort” are students of the first cohort. They joined the teaching force immediately after graduation and were promoted to associate professorship (the rank “Assistant Professor” was not yet introduced) during 1966-1978. This group of sociologists only had Bachelor and Masters Degrees and their intellectual orientation to a large extent reproduce that of their teachers. Most of the first two cohorts of sociologist have either retired or died at the time of writing. Moreover, there were a few American sociologists teaching in Taiwan on a short term basis during this period\(^1\).

\(^1\) The NTU Sociology Dept., for instance, recorded Wolfram Eberhard (艾伯華 1967), Pauline V Young (楊寶蓮 1970), Allan Schwartzbaum (許華朋 1971), James A Beaudry (包祖詒 1972), as visiting faculty member in the staff phone book.
Third Cohort: 1970s-1987, Taiwan Grown-ups with American PhD

The third cohort were born and educated in post-war Taiwan. They obtained a PhD abroad and returned during the mid-1970s-1987. In 1977, Yeh Chih-Chen (葉啟政), a Taiwanese native with a PhD obtained from Minnesota ('73) joined the sociology department in National Taiwan University, marking a milestone of the rise of sociologists with post-war foreign (mostly American) PhDs. This group, including notable figures like Kao Cheng-shu (高承恕), Maicheal Hsiao (蕭新煌), Chiu Hei-yuan (瞿海源), form the senior rank of sociologists at the time of writing. Compared with their senior colleagues, this cohort tends to have a stronger Taiwanese identity as they did not have any living memory of China. Intellectually, they were educated under the dominant influence of positivism, but had already been exposed to emerging critical theories.

Fourth Cohort: 1987-1995, Post-Authoritarian Cohort and Rise of Local PhDs

The dividing year 1987 marked the abolishment of the Marshall Law and the

---

1 The NTU Department of Agriculture Extension under the headship of Martin Yang played a central role in the early development of local faculty. It has, since its founding, systematically trained its best students as tutors and send them for doctoral training abroad, producing the earliest batch of returnees with PhDs, e.g. Haung Da-chou (黃大洲 PhD Sociology, Cornell '71) who first taught in the original department and later became Taipei Mayor; Yang Siao-Lung (楊孝嶺 PhD Mass Communication, Wisconsin '71) who played a critical role in the founding of sociology in Soochow University, and Chiang Yu-Long (江玉龍 PhD Gottingen) who joined Tunghai. However, none of these entered the NTU sociology department which was of greatest symbolic prestige (but was under the control of the second cohort of sociologists who did not possess PhDs), and therefore were often neglected in the historical writing of Taiwanese sociology.
graduation of the first Taiwan-trained sociology PhD (Chang Wei-An 張維安).

Political liberalization opened up space for research into a wide range of issues that would be considered sensitive in the past—for instance, ethnicities, social movements, historical sociology and political sociology. The emergence of locally-trained sociologists provided an institutional basis for furthering the hailed indigenization of social research.

Fifth Cohort: 1996-2005, Student Movement Generation

The cohort refers to those who has the opportunity to participate or witnessed the 1990 “Wild Lilly Student Movement” (野百合學生運動) (Wright 2001) as college or high school students. Having the experience of initiating social reform from campus, this cohort was characterised by a stronger sense of vocation when they chose sociology. They showed a strong commitment to the public and the confidence of critical knowledge as an instrument of reform. A second pattern was the diversification of educational attainment. Political liberation also lifted the former restriction on study abroad, leading to waves of students heading to destinations other than the USA for advanced training in sociology. German

______________________________

1 Synthesis of interview with TW10, TW15 TW16 TW18.
trained sociologists emerged after 1995, which might partially be attributed to improved political stability after German reunification. A number of scholars with degrees from Canada, Australia and France also joined the sociological community at this time. UK trained sociologists appeared sporadically in the 1990s and their numbers surged after 2002. On the other hand, the average number of recruited sociologists trained in the USA dropped by 60% in the 2000s (compared with the 1990s). Possible factors include competition with students from China for offers and scholarships, the emergence of alternative destinations and the gradual development of a more critical attitude toward the American hegemony in Taiwan.

4.4.2 Chinese University of Hong Kong

The CUHK host the largest sociology department in Hong Kong. Between 1963 and 2009, 58 appointments at the lecturer/assistant professor level were made.

First Cohort: 1945-1966, Migrant Scholars from China

The first cohort of sociology teachers primarily consisted of Chinese immigrant

1 Tzeng, Albert 2010 ‘Where Have Taiwanese Sociology PhD Came From?-An Trend Analysis of the Country for Degree Attainment’ Blog Post in Patterns of Mind http://wp.me/p17Hsv-55
2 I excluded nine psychologists and anthropologists who was temporarily affiliated to the department in 1978-1980 before being transferred to the Psychology Department and Anthropology Departments they helped to establish in 1981.
scholars. Most of them obtained their first degree in China and subsequently a Masters in the United States. Some had PhDs. They were primarily focused on teaching and institution building (e.g. finding resources, making rules and recruiting talents), and few of their writing is available today.

Second Cohort: 1967-1980, Hong Kong-Educated, Concerned of China

In 1967 Aline Wong (黃簡麗中) became the first sociology lecturer in CUHK to hold a degree obtained in Hong Kong (HKU), but she soon went to Singapore.

Rance Lee (李沛良) became the first CUHK alumni appointed to the department and the next year saw the arrival of nine sociologists, most of who received their first degree in Hong Kong¹ and obtained the final degree in United States.

Meanwhile, there was a steady flow of eighteen Western (mostly American) teachers who came to teach on a short-term basis. The rapid economic development and social reform under the governance of Sir Murray MacLehose (Hong Kong governor 1971-1982) provided opportunities for empirical studies of Hong Kong—notably a project that involved extensive literature and field research in a newly industrialized town named Kwun Tong (觀塘) (King and Lee)

¹ Two Exception—Ambrose King obtained bachelor and master in Taiwan before his PhD in Pittsburg, and Liang Chok-King (梁作檠) who swan to Hong Kong after obtaining the first degree in China.
1981). The contemporary Cultural Revolution (1966-1978) in China triggered greater concerns around social issues and China (reflected in the slogan 关社祖, literally “care the social and know [or identify] your mother country”) in the university, motivating some sociologists to pay more attention to their northern neighbours. Compared with their juniors, most of this cohort inherited a greater sense of relevancy either because they were, themselves, migrants from China, or because they had fresh memories of the migration tide from China. A team of nine sociologists (with one anthropologist and one psychologist) conducted field research into the Chinese “people’s commune” in the late 1970s (Lee, RPL and Lau 1981). Later in the early 1980s, many sociologists from this cohort helped the reestablishment of Chinese sociology, and some continued to write with greater China as the primary frame of reference.

Third Cohort: 1980-1995, Baby-Boomer with Stronger Hong Kong Identity

The cohort entering Academic jobs after 1980 belong to the generation of post-war baby-boomers. They spent their student life during the MacLehose years. They experienced a growing pride on the economic and cultural prominence of Hong Kong, while their impression of China, the home countries for most of their parents, was tainted by the Cultural Revolution. They tended to
develop a stronger sense of identity to the city they grew and lived, instead of the northern country. While commencing in academic careers, they witnessed in Hong Kong a prevailing sense of uncertainty following the Sino-British negotiation (about Hong Kong’s future) in 1982-84, and the subsequent surge of interest in searching for the voice of Hong Kong. In general, this cohort of sociologist showed more intellectual concern and commitment to Hong Kong studies and domestic public affairs. Notable figures include Lui Tai-Lok (呂大樂), Stephen Chiu (趙永佳) and Chan Kin-Man (陳健民). They were among the few Hong Kong sociologists who were mostly involved in public dialogue.

Fourth Cohort: 1995 (2005)–, Post-RAE Generation

The fourth cohort was conceptualized as those who entered academia after the introduction of the Research Assessment Exercise in 1994 and 1996. This cohort had to face unprecedented evaluative pressure. Of the current (2011) staff, only two were recruited in 1995-2005, while a batch of nine Assistant Professors were appointed between 2006-2008, following the retirement or changing mode of appointments of the second cohort. Of the nine new members, remarkably, only one was of Hong Kong origin, while there were five US-trained Chinese sociologists, two Korean and one American.
4.4.3 University of Hong Kong

The University of Hong Kong has a relatively small sociology department. Since its inception in 1967, the number of academic staff (above lecturer level) reached double figures almost two decades later, and has remained at around 10 to 12 for the next two decades. Its compact size made it senseless to talk about “cohorts”, but still, I will split its history into four phases and characterise the patterns of employment in each phase. Overall, the HKU sociology department kept a strong presence of UK-trained scholars (still the majority today), while there seems a tendency towards diversification in educational backgrounds. Staff members of local origin were first employed in 1975. Their representation has historically been low, but has gradually been lifted to half.

First Phase: 1967-1975, Founding Cohort of Expatriate

This founding cohort, as described in Sec 4.3.3, consisted of primarily Western expatriates. The department started with a batch of six British-trained scholars, who were joined by five American trained colleagues in early 1970s.
Second Phase: 1975-1982, Recruitment of HKU Graduates

The year 1975 marked the appointment of the first HKU alumni, Wong Siu-Lung (黃紹倫), as a lecturer. Two other alumni appointed later; Benjamin Leung (梁啟平) in 1978 and Thomas Wong (黃偉邦) in 1982. The three all received final degrees in UK. Also recruited in this period were two expatriates.

Third Phase: 1985-1995, Diversification in Background

Eleven scholars were appointed during this period, but five expatriates stayed only shortly. The remaining six showed a greater geographical diversity in terms of their professional training. There were members trained in France, Australia, the UK and the USA. This trend also diluted the “British” character of the department. The ratio of UK-trained faculty member dropped to less than half for the first time in 1995.

Forth Phase: 2005-onward: Staff Restructuring in Institutional Expansion.

The staff structure remained relatively stable for the decade following 1995. Only one appointment was made in the decade. Since the mid-2000s, five retirements (Han, Levin, Traver, Wong and Leung) preceded a wave of new appointments. The HKSAR policy to adopt the four year curriculum (in accordance with the Chinese
system) created more vacancies. In the four years between 2005 and 2009, ten
new faculty members were recruited, accounting for two thirds of the enlarged
department (of fifteen members in 2009). It is not yet known how the
restructuring will shape the department.

4.4.4 National University of Singapore

The Department of Sociology in the (National) University of Singapore is a large
unit with a high staff turnover. Between 1965 and 2009, there were a total of 90
scholars who were appointed above the level of lecturer/assistant professor and
roughly half of them worked there for over six years. Also at least 28 visiting staff
was recorded in the annual books across the years.

First Cohort: 1965-1968, The Founding Expatriates

The sociology department, as described in Sec 4.2.2, was founded by Murray
Grove (Oxford) as the chair professor, followed by the appointment of Geoffrey
Benjamin (Cantab) and four US-trained sociologists. Of the founding batch of six,
four left after just a few years, including the Chair. Despite their transient
presence, Quah argued that (1995, 89) the founding cohort has imprinted on
the department the “combined influence of both European and American styles”
and established a “close relationship between sociology and anthropology” within the department.

*Second Cohort: 1970-1979, Chinese Staff and Legacies of Hans-Dieter Evers*

Peter Chen, the first Singaporean lecturer arrived the department in 1970, and Hans-Dieter Evers, a German sociologist who had taught in the US¹, was appointed to the department Chair in 1971. Peter Chen marked the beginning of a batch of eleven (55% of appointees) staff recruited from other Chinese societies (e.g. Taiwan, Hong Kong) in the 1970s². Six of them remained in the department for around two or three decades, and they were often referred to, along with Hassan and Benjamin, as “the first generation” (e.g. Quah 1995; Khondker 2000:109) of Singaporean sociologists. There were also eight (or 40% of total appointments) Western expatriates recruited throughout the 1970s, but most stayed shortly³.

Hans-Dieter Evers, the youngest chair professor in the university, was “ambitious, enthusiastic and full of ideas (Chen, PSJ 1991, 18)” . Staying for just a year, Evers

---

¹ [http://www.uni-bonn.de/~hevers/intro.htm](http://www.uni-bonn.de/~hevers/intro.htm)

² Notable figures include Aline Wong (王簡麗中), Chin Kwet-Hom (陳國漢), Chang Chen-Tung (張振東), Eddie Kuo (郭振羽), Mak Lau-Fong (麥留芳) and Ong Jin-Hui (王仁慧). Chen, Wong and Chin all had studied in Hong Kong, and Chang, Kuo and Mak had studied in Taiwan, before obtaining their final degrees in North America. Ong was the first recruitment of the department’s own graduate.

³ For example John Clammer, Michael Walter, Anthony Walker and Frederic Deyo. One major reason why expat tended to stay shorter was the difficulty of getting tenure. The tenure system for expats was introduced in 2001-02.
injected a momentum in the new department with numerous initiatives—such as formalizing the departmental Research Seminar\(^1\), establishing the *Working Paper Series* in 1972 (Sec 5.1), and emphasizing the development of a postgraduate programme. He was also described as an “excellent stimulator of local research” with his “on-the-ground familiarity with Sri Lanka, Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia” (Benjamin, ibid). Intellectually, the core (Chinese) members of this cohort were mostly “trained in the United States under and intellectual climate dominated by Parsonian structural-functionalism and empiricism,” leading to the “domination of American style quantitative and problem-solving sociology” in the formative years (Khondker 2000:109).

Politically, the 1970s was still in the initial stages of nation building whereby the authorities’ demand for sociological knowledge and expertise was high. Many sociologists were involved in government funded projects (ibid). The Department’s *General Information 1979/80* stated that (p11) “the research programme generally takes its focus from pressing day-to-day problems of rapidly changing societies rather that from problems posed by current sociological theory.”

\(^1\) The Seminar was first initiated a few years ago by a master student, Chiew Seen-Kong. Evers formalized the practice in a time when such event was still rare in the university.
Third Cohort: 1980-1989, Localization

The University of Singapore was merged with the Nanyang University in 1980, but this had a limited impact on the department (Sec 4.1.3). The most significant trend in this phase was the increased recruitment of the university’s own graduates. A critical endeavour that contributed to the trend was the “Senior Tutor Scheme” introduced in 1980, which sought to build a local faculty by supporting selected graduates from the departments during their PhD studies.

Also recruited in this decade were Chua Beng-Huat (蔡明), a Singaporean who completed all degrees in Canada, three scholars from Hong Kong, and a Bangladeshi scholar, Habibul H. Khondker. Overall, ethnic Chinese scholars maintained a demographic majority (60% of all new appointments). While a total of six Western expatriates (24%) were recruited, only Roxana Watson became a more stable member of the department. There were also a few Southeast Asians appointed (12%). Intellectually, the 1980s cohort includes a few members who were more exposed to critical theoretical discourses which affected their subsequent writings.

---

1 Including two of its own PhDs, Stella Quah (Columbia) & Nirmala Purushotan; five former master students, Chiew Seen-Kong, Hing Ai-Yun, A Mani, Vivienne Wee (黃麗嫣) and Ho Kong-Chong (何光中); some who only studied at the undergraduate level here, e.g. Tong Chee-Kiong (唐志強) and Tan Ern- Ser (陳恩賜).

2 Ko Yiu-Chung, Chan Kwok-Bun (陳國賁) and Choi Siu-Kay (蔡紹基)
**Forth Cohort: 1990-2000, Increased Southeast Asians**

The faculty members recruited in the 1990s reflected the continued emphasis on local faculty. The twenty appointments made in the decade included six graduates from the department (five on Senior Tutor Scheme) and three other Singaporeans. There were also three overseas Chinese recruited from Malaysia and Hong Kong. While ethnic Chinese still accounts for the majority of the appointees (55%) there was also an increase in appointments of other South/Southeast Asian ethnical staff. Four new members recruited in this decade were originally from countries like Malaysia, the Philippines and India. Of the Singaporean nationals appointed, one was of Malay ethnicity and one of Indian background. The ratio as a percentage of total appointees therefore rose to 30%. The remaining three (15%) were Western expatriates.

**Fifth Cohort: 2001-, Rise of Western Expatriates Again**

The first decade of the 21 century saw a dramatic shift in the demographic structure. The department made nineteen new appointments in 2000-2009. The presentation of Western expatriates jumped to 59% (eleven) from 15-20% in the previous two decades, while the ratio of both Chinese (10.5%) and Singaporean nationals (21%) dropped significantly (See Ch. 8).
Table 4-2 summarised the cohort structure outlined in Sec 4.4.1-4.4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Univ. of Singapore/ NUS</th>
<th>HKU</th>
<th>CUHK</th>
<th>NTU/Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1965, M Grove founded the dept. with five expatriates with British or American training. Only Benjamin &amp; Hassan stayed</td>
<td>I. Scholars from China, US-trained</td>
<td>Visiting/short-term US Scholars ’65-’75.</td>
<td>I. Scholar from China, A few Missionary Sociologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I. ’67, K. Hopkins and British social anthropologist M.C. Grove joined ’69</td>
<td>II. ’68-’77 Chinese scholar, mostly with BA from HK &amp; PhD from US, e.g. R Lee, Lau SK, Cheung TS, Also King YC (BA, TW), Leung (BA, China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I. ’71-’74 Ever, H.D as chair professor ’70-’73 ethnical Chinese Scholar from HK, TW, SG &amp; ML, w. US or Canada PhD</td>
<td>II. HKU Graduates with UK final degrees: Wong SL, B. Leung, T Wong</td>
<td>II. Students of the first cohort hired, e.g. Levin &amp; Traver</td>
<td>III. Late 1970s onward Taiwanese with post-war US PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>II. ’80-’89 Localization with own graduate and nationals recruited</td>
<td>III. ’88-’95 Diversification of training bkgd, with PhDs from France (Evans), Australia (Kuah, Broadbust), UK (Ng CH), US (Laidler, Chu)</td>
<td>III. ’85-’94 Baby boomers with stronger HK identity e.g. Lui TL, Stephen Chiu, Chan KM</td>
<td>IV. ’87- Post-Authoritarian Cohort with rise of TW PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>IV. ’90-’99 More non-Chinese Southeast Asian (e.g. Malay, Indian, Philippine) presented</td>
<td>IV. ’95- Post RAE Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V. ’95- ‘Student Movement’ Cohort with training diversification German PhD ’94-UK PhD ’00-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI. ’05- Post-Evaluation Cohort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.5 Comparative Summary

By comparing the cohort structures presented so far, a number common patterns and contrasts can be revealed. Despite some variations, four broad stages of the demographic transition (Table 4-3) can be identified as follow:

First, the founding cohort of sociology teachers, as illustrated in this chapter, consisted of purely *immigrants* either from China or from the West (missionaries, visiting scholars, and expatriates recruited by the two British colonial universities) who arrived at the three countries between the late 1940s and 1970.

Second, between 1970-1980 a wave of Chinese sociologists with post-war training arrived at the universities of the three “Chinese-populated” societies. Many of them belong to a population that might be described as “*displaced Chinese scholars*”. Those people were forced to leave China during childhood or in their teenage years because of war. They might have ended up in Taiwan or Hong Kong where they completed undergraduate education before heading to the United States (or other Western countries) for advanced training. They tended to have a firmer Chinese identity, but were less attached to any particular place, and
therefore were more prone to migrating within the Chinese diaspora.

Intellectually, they were trained under the influence of Parsonian structural functionalism and empiricism. Research-wise, they participated much in the pioneering empirical studies in the three societies—particularly on practical issues related to rapid industrialization and urbanization.

Third, between 1980 and the late 1990s, there were various forms of localisation of the demographic structure across the three sociological communities. In Taiwan, this involved the emergence of the cohorts (3rd-onward) of Taiwan-born scholars. In Hong Kong, localisation was associated with the 3rd cohort sociologists in CUHK (baby-boomers with a stronger Hong Kong identity) and the gradual increase of local staff in HKU. In NUS, the Senior Tutor Scheme and the appointment of the department’s own graduates contributed to an initial stage of localisation. The broadening of ethnical representation in the 1990s can be seen as a different form of localisation. Intellectually, this was the cohort who was more exposed to a variety of critical theories.

Finally, into the 21st century arrived a cohort who was most influenced by higher education reform (See Ch7). Significant demographic changes were observed in
the three universities in Hong Kong and Singapore which may be associated with
the respective redefinition of the three departments. No comparable shift was
observed in Taiwan; probably because the managerial measures were imposed
later compared with the other cases (See Ch7 for more discussions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s-1970 Founding cohort of immigrant Chinese/Western Sociologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1985 Chinese sociologist with post-war training (Displaced Chinese scholar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-2000 Variety of localization (identity, or demography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010 Cohort under higher education reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3 General Patterns of Demographic Shifts of Sociologists

On the other hand, a number of contrasts could be found in these universities.
The sociology department institutionalized in the two modes (Sec 4.1-4.2) have
different staffing patterns. The sociology departments in the two former British
colonial universities (HKU & NUS) retained a persistent presence of
anthropology in its faculty (and curriculum). Those departments founded by
Chinese scholars with American support, by comparison, kept a clear disciplinary
distinctiveness. The former have historically recruited more sociologists trained
in the UK, Canada, Australia and other European countries than the latter group.
The HKU and NUS departments also showed diverted trajectories in their staffing, despite a similar start. The HKU remained a small department, dominated by expatriates with a higher presence of British-trained scholars until the 1990s. The NUS department, as the only sociology department in the new Republic, was enlarged with substantial recruitment of many Chinese or local scholars, and its academic orientation was Americanized.

At last, the sociological community in Taiwan differed from the three universities in various ways. First, the Taiwanese sociological community remained largely homogenous in terms of nationality and ethnicity. As the only case where the language of instruction is not English, there has always been a limited presence of expatriate sociologist in Taiwan. Second, Taiwan was about a decade behind Hong Kong and Singapore in the recruitment of post-war PhDs. Some earliest PhD holder from Taiwan actually went to Hong Kong or Singapore. Reasons included the austere political climate in early 1970s Taiwan\(^1\) and the reluctance of some 2\(^{nd}\) cohort sociologist to recruit more junior colleagues with stronger

\(^1\) A few senior informants acknowledged the suppressive ruling by KMT in early 1970s as an unfavourable condition for considering career in Taiwan.
qualification\textsuperscript{1}. Third, political democratization in the late 1980s (a unique episode in Taiwan) was described as decisive for the collective identity of sociologists. The fourth and the fifth cohorts were both defined in relation to significant incidents in the process (1987 abolishment of Martial Law\textsuperscript{2} and the 1990 Student movement). See Ch6 for more discussion.

\textbf{Summary}

This chapter sets the scene for the rest of the dissertation by outlining the institutional development of sociology and the cohort structure of sociologists. The chapter started by portraying two modes of the institutionalisation of sociology in the three locales (4.1-4.2): the collaboration between Chinese migrant scholars and aid from various American Foundations and Christian Organizations (Taiwan, and the Chinese-medium colleges in Hong Kong), and the two former British colonial universities (NUS and HKU). Discussions of the first mode noted the contrast of political contexts between Taiwan (the state’s distrust of sociologists) and Hong Kong (little intervention from the colonial

\textsuperscript{1} One earlier post-war PhD was turned down while applying for job in NTU sociology department. The reason cited for rejection was “our temple too small for Buddha” (小廟請不起大佛), meaning that the applicant was considered overqualified.

\textsuperscript{2} Chen Dong-Shen and Michael Hsiao both take 1987 as a definitive year in constructing their version of the sociologists’ cohort structure. This decision is supported by the comparison of the career narratives provided by sociologists of different cohorts.
government), the critical role of Martin Yang and CK Yang, and the anti-communist agenda behind the American Foundations. On the second mode, the eventual institutionalisation of sociology was related to, first, the rising status of sociology within the British and the Commonwealth universities, and second, the social unrest associated with the rapid industrialisation and urbanisation in both port cities. Meanwhile, the political context between colonial Hong Kong and the newly-independent Singapore was also contrasted, and related to the demographic characteristics of the two sociology departments. A subsequent section (4.3) traced institutional expansion in the 1980s and beyond. The chapter ended (4.4) with a detailed portrait of the cohort structures of the sociological communities in the University of Singapore, the HKU and CUHK, and Taiwan. Despite the variation, four broadly defined episodes were identified.
Identity, the sense of self, is generally based on the *perceived* distinctiveness that makes a person or a social collective distinguishable from others. The perception of such distinctiveness requires *reflexive awareness*. An individual formulates a sense of identity when s/he becomes aware of her/his name, gender and other social categories (nationality, ethnicity, profession). The collective identity is also constructed when the sense of belonging defined by certain distinguishable commonality is being communicated, either directly or in mediated forms, among its members. The theme of this chapter, the *domestic disciplinary identity*¹, is defined as the perceived characteristics that set a locality-bounded disciplinary community and its scholarly activities apart from others. To put in a straightforward way, this concept involves asking whether or not there is a distinguishable (tradition of) “Taiwanese sociology” (or counterpart of other locality), and if so, what it looks like.

¹ If I were to compare sociology in Britain, Germany or Japan, it would be simpler to say ‘national disciplinary identity.’ However, applying the latter term on the three cases would be complicated by the controversy on whether Taiwan or Hong Kong should be considered an independent nation. Therefore I opt for the softer alternative ‘domestic disciplinary identity’.
Four points can be extrapolated from this definition. First, the sense of identity is a form of “perceived” reality (See Sec 2.2.3), which means that content could vary according to the observer. There is, however, a fair chance that observers of one scholarly community form, through the mediation of publications and platforms of communication, a shared perception on their distinctiveness (a socially-constructed reality). Second, the sense of identity emerges most often when the perceiver is to compare, and therefore its nature is usually framed in a relative way to something called the other. A diamond looks brighter when placed on a black curtain, so is the sense of identity stronger when contrasted with alternatives. Third, a particular observer may conform to, or resist this perceived collective identity. S/he may form a particular normative conviction as to what the sociologists working there should do and in particular what s/he personally must do. In the end the individual choices help to shape the future collective identity. Fourth, the third point implies that the domestic disciplinary identity at the collective level may evolve, acquiring different orientation in a way that reflects the changes in its member composition, the domestic institutional environment, and external reference point.
The concept of *domestic disciplinary identity* emerged as an interpretive apparatus when I sought to comprehend the patterns observed from a comparative bibliographic survey of the sociological literature produced in the three places. Originally I was expecting some theoretical categories to pertain to the nature or structure of the bibliographic outputs so that I could characterise their pattern. The eventual decision to derive a conceptual tool from the term “identity” (a category conventionally used in mental or socio-psychological level) reflects my conviction that any adequate interpretation of the framing of the observed patterns should be grounded in an (inferred or confirmed) understanding of the actor psychology. Therefore, the category identity not only served as a descriptive instrument in translating the scattered technical (more quantitative) data into a more coherent statement, but they also served as a logical joint, situated at the social- psychological level, that links the observed bibliographic patterns and the framing factors I would suggest.

What, then, is the ontological relation between the bibliographic pattern and the *domestic disciplinary identity*? One the one hand, the bibliographic output is a form of materialized product of the mental activities that were framed by the sense of identity at both the individual and collective level. On the other hand, the
published resources constitute a representation of the scholarly tradition upon which the new cohorts of disciplinary practitioners could (but did not necessarily) construct their sense of disciplinary identity. Whether the domestic stock of published material still possesses the influence in the process of identity formation depends both on their accessibility (e.g., the presence of review work) and the general attitude held toward the particular publication within the scholarly circle. I will in the next few sections review four types of domestically-published bibliographic resources in a comparative way, and include some supplementary evidence regarding the historical background and reception of particular publications obtained from the interviews. I shall in Sec 5.6 portray a coherent description of the domestic disciplinary identity by synthesizing the observed patterns.

The four domains of publications that I considered as definitive to the domestic tradition of sociology are (1) the domestic professional journal or publication series, (2) edited collections of sociological research about the domestic society, (3) historical accounts of local sociology, and (4) epistemological-normative reflection on the appropriation of Western paradigms. I shall in Sec 5.1-5.4 provide a detailed review of the four categories of bibliographic resources.
identified from the three places. These patterns will be sum up in Sec 5.5 by portraying the “domestic disciplinary identity” of their respective sociological communities with a conceptual framework consisting of three layers of subjectivity: geo-disciplinary, geo-epistemological and civilizational. The last part, Sec 5.6, will be devoted to a discussion of divergent post-war identity politics as a key framing factor for the observed pattern.

5.1 Journals

Professional journals (and publication series) associated with an institution or place provide a focal platform for scholarly dialogue, agenda setting, and reflexive reviews of the collective output. Such publications also enable external observers to have a glance at the activities of the domestic community. Table 5.1 listed the journals or publication series that will be surveyed in the section.

5.1.1 Taiwan: The Evolution of Journals

The history of academic journals of sociology in Taiwan dates back to the 1963 debut of the *National Taiwan University Journal of Sociology*, followed by the *Sociology Journal* published by Tung-hai in 1968. The trend of establishing journals on an institutional basis continues with the sociology journals launched
Table 5-1 Sociology Journals (or Paper Series)

Taiwan

1963 NTU Journal of Sociology
merged with TSR to form
Taiwanese Sociology ’00

1968 Sociology Journal
renamed Tung-hai J. of Soc ’78
discontinued ’85

1971 Chinese J of Sociology
renamed Taiw J. of Soc. ’96

1984 The NCCU J. of Sociology

1988 Taiwan: A Radical
Quarterly in Soc. Studies

1992 Soochow J. of Sociology,
discontinued in 2008

1997 Taiwanese Soc. Review
merged with NTUJS to form
Taiwanese Sociology ‘00

1997 Academia Sinica, Inst of Soc
merged with NTUJS to form
Taiwanese Sociology ‘00

2002 Societas - A Journal for
Philosoph. Study of Pub. Affairs

2006 State and Society

Hong Kong

CUHK, Centre of Soc. Research
Restructured CHKS & CCAS’ 82
merged HKIAPS’ 90

1966 Occasional Paper-

1973 Working Paper Series
1973 Southeast Asian J. of Soc
Sci (Renamed AJSS’00)

1986 Sojourn: J of Soc Issues in
Southeast Asia Univ. of Sing.

1993 HKJ Soc. Sci.,

1998 J. Soc Theory,

2000 HKJ Sociology, renamed
The Social Transformations of
Chinese Societies ’03

Singapore

NUS Dept. of Sociology

1971 Chinese J of Sociology
renamed Taiw J. of Soc. ’96

1986 Sojourn: J of Soc Issues in
Southeast Asia Univ. of Sing.

1984 The NCCU J. of Sociology

1997 Academia Sinica, Inst of Soc
merged with NTUJS to form
Taiwanese Sociology ‘00

2002 Societas - A Journal for
Philosoph. Study of Pub. Affairs

2006 State and Society


Many of these journals, however, faced the challenges of insufficient submission,
in particular when the National Science Council established the Taiwanese Social Science Citation Index (TSSCI, 1998-) that only ‘counted’ in the journals that met certain formal criteria (hence considered “better established”). To date, only the journals of NTU and Academia Sinica “nominally survived”—but merged to form the new journal *Taiwanese Sociology* (台灣社會學) in 2000. The Chinese Sociological Association re-established in Taiwan in 1951 (see Sec 3.4.1) also published its official journal, the *Chinese Journal of Sociology* from 1971. In accordance with the renaming of the association to the Taiwanese Sociological Association (TSA) in 1996, the journal was renamed the *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology* (TJS 台灣社會學刊). Continuously published for four decades, this association official journal provided a focal platform for communicating both original research and a number of texts critical to the professional development of Taiwanese sociology (e.g. the president’s address), leaving a record of major milestones and transitions of the academic discourses. Both TJS and Taiwanese Sociology are nowadays constantly counted as the two more prestigious journals in the official ranking\(^1\).

\(^1\) See, for instance, Hsiung (2007). Those ranking however have constantly been criticized for its underlying ideology and assumptions. See, for instance, Huang HM (2005).
A third journal influential in sociology, titled *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies* (台灣社會研究季刊), was initiated by a group of returnee scholars who had studied at Columbia University (e.g. Fu Da-Wei) and nearby institutions in 1988, immediately after the political strongman Chiang Ching-Kuo (son of Chiang Kai-Shek) abolished the “martial law” and re-enforced the Constitution in 1987 (Fu 1995). The journal, as its title suggests, followed an interdisciplinary and radical approach that is aimed at timely engagement in pressing issues. A fourth journal relevant to sociology is *Societas: A Journal for Philosophical Study of Public Affairs* (政治社會哲學評論). Established in 2002, the journal soon became a platform for theory-minded scholars of social science disciplines.

5.1.2 Hong Kong: Publication Platform framed by Area Studies

Hong Kong only came to have its own “sociology” journal in 2000, when the founding of Hong Kong Sociological Association also gave birth to the bilingual Hong Kong Journal of Sociology. This journal was however transformed into an English-only journal under the new title *The Social Transformation of Chinese Societies* (華人社會變遷) a few years later, and its publication and distribution

---

1 The journal is often abbreviated as ‘台社’ (*Taishe*), which combined *Tai* (台), the initial of Taiwan, and *She* (社), the initial for ‘society’. The term *Taishe* could refer to both the journal and the ‘society’ (a social group) responsible for its editorial work and publication.
was signed to Brill, in a controversial process (Fu 1995). There were two other journals related to sociology founded slightly earlier in the 1990s, namely the Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences (HKJSS 香港社會科學學報) founded by the Hong Kong City University in 1993, and the Chinese-medium Journal of Social Theory (JST 社會理論學報) founded by theory-minded Ruan Xin-Bang (阮新邦) of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in 1998. Both journals, however, were described as being “of questionable credit for some Hong Kong sociologists simply because it was not founded by the more prestigious CUHK or HKU” (Interview HK14. Also the HKJSS attracted only a few contributions from sociologist in Hong Kong. The JST was further challenged by the dearth of theoretical research in Hong Kong. The two journals nonetheless succeeded in establishing themselves in regional scholarly network. The outcomes should be attributed to the conventional impression of Hong Kong as an “internationalized” node on the regional map. Such impression granted the journals published here more prestige than many domestic ones in neighbouring countries.

[1] See Liu Tak-lok 2006:63 for a brief account of the decision to transform the journal. He described the original bilingual journal was “discontinued without even becoming an agenda item for discussion and debate among members in [HKSA’s] annual general meeting” Notice also the editorial footnote that defended the decision as being endorsed by the HKSA Council.

[2] Interview HK14. Also the HKJSS attracted only a few contributions from sociologist in Hong Kong.

[3] I suggested this interpretation based on my talk with some scholars and students from China, Taiwan and Korea during various regional conferences.
While a viable disciplinary journal as a common platform is not yet available, there were a few institutions that regularly published works by Hong Kong sociologists. The most influential series was occasional papers published by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia Pacific Studies and its precedents (Centre of Hong Kong Studies and Center of Contemporary Asian Studies in 1982-1990, and Centre of Social Research in 1966-1982) of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The Centre of China Studies of the Hong Kong University founded in 1967 also published monograph series which occasionally included sociological titles. The third noticeable institution was the Royal Asiatic Society Hong Kong Branch “re-established” in 1959, which set up its journal in 1961 to communicate empirical Hong Kong studies of a variety of disciplines by Western investigators. They published seven symposium proceedings on various topics between 1964 and 1980. What these publication channels had in common was that they were positioned either in the domain of areas studies (a post-war institutional

---

1 See ‘CAS Publication’ webpage at [http://www0.hku.hk/cas/cas.html](http://www0.hku.hk/cas/cas.html). The CAS in HKU was “to promote interdisciplinary research on Asian topics... and to serve as a focal point of contact for Asian studies scholars around the world.” In the past four decade, the centre has managed to produce a resourceful stock of publication that include 166 monographs, 24 specialist bibliographies and research guides, and several topical paper series.

2 The society traced its origin to the RAS China Branch operating in Hong Kong in 1847-1859, which, apparently, was only nominally connected to the current one ‘re-established’ a century later. See [http://www.royalasiaticsoociety.org.hk/](http://www.royalasiaticsoociety.org.hk/) Two first two RASHKB symposium were on the topics of ‘Aspects of Social Organization in the New Territories’ and ‘Some Traditional Chinese Ideas and Conceptions in Hong Kong Social Life Today’, See RASHKB 1964, 1967. Also, a recent bibliography of Hong Kong society and culture listed 64 items published by RASHKB. See
innovation of American origin aimed to train area specialists to serve the geopolitical need) or as a continuation of colonial scholarship. Both are characterised by multi-disciplinary approaches and the implicit assumption of subordinating the local as “cases” for the scrutiny of “international” (mostly Western) readers.

5.1.3 Singapore: AJSS and Working Paper Series

The sociological community in Singapore is even smaller—roughly equal to the department of the (National) University of Singapore before 2005. But this department had two closely-associated regular publications that served as a basis for anchoring its sense of its identity since— the Asian Journal of Social Science (AJSS, formerly Southeast Asian Journal of Social Sciences) and the departmental Working Paper Series. The AJSS was founded in 1973, deriving from an earlier journal produced by the students’ Sociology Society; the Southeast Asian Journal of Sociology. The Working Paper Series, an initiative by Hans-Dieter Evers when he was appointed Chair of Sociology in 1971, was only intended to “facilitate the circulation of ideas within as well as beyond the Department in more or less draft format”. Over the years, however, the stock of material and ideas preserved in this body of literature gradually formed a solid basis of
reference for later researcher; and the subscription for the Series also grew rapidly, as the source of sociological knowledge in this region was scarce. In 1991, the department published an edited collection of thematic reviews of the first one hundred issues of the Working Paper Series to serve as a source book under the title Explorations in Asian Sociology.

5.2 Edited Collection of Social Studies of Domestic Society

The second genre of publication to be surveyed is the edited collection of social studies of domestic society. Two subtypes are distinguished, collections of original essays of studies on different social issues, and collection of thematic reviews of past studies in different sociological domain. Those publications were generally produced to indigenize the teaching material.

5.2.1 Singapore: Regular Institutional Review of Sociological Studies

The sociological community in Singapore is the smallest, but it has contributed to several edited collections to provide timely reviews of its scholarly output. These include three volumes of original sociological studies, two volumes of thematic reviews, and two individual chapters (Chen, PSJ 1986; Yee and Chua 1999) included Singapore Studies and Singapore Studies II compiled by NUS Faculty of Art and
Social Science. The collections of original studies include an early volume *Analysis of an Asian Society: Singapore* (Hassan and Tamney, year not specified), the 1976 *Singapore: Society in Transition* (Hazzen), and the 1997 *Understanding Singapore Society* (Ong). The NUS Sociology Department also coordinated two projects of thematic reviews: The *Exploration of Asian Sociology* (Chan, KB and Ho) published in 1991 to review the first one hundred issues of their departmental Working Paper Series, and *The Making of Singapore Sociology* (Tong and Lian 2002) published a decade later as an updated and expanded review of sociological studies by Singapore sociologists. These collections were compiled to provide teaching text with localized material, but they also served to celebrate of the academic achievements of the department (or the Faculty).

5.2.2 Hong Kong: Collection compiled in Diverse Scholarly Networks

A number of essay collections about Hong Kong society were assembled within several unrelated scholarly networks. Most of these volumes do not have a clear

---

1 I was first attracted to this genre of publication during my first visit to Singapore, which reflected its relative insignificance in my personal exposures to the sociological literature in Taiwan. Later I found some comparable titles in Hong Kong and in Taiwan, but it was only in Singapore that this sort of publication delivered a sense as a historical milestone of the national scholarship.
institutional character, and none bears the word “sociology” in its title. This genre of publication started from three collections edited by (former) expatriate staff of HKU. These include an early collection *Hong Kong- A Society in Transition* edited by two philosophy teachers (Jarvie and Agassi 1969) and two subsequent collections edited by sociology department staff— one on the industrial scenes of the colony (Hopkins 1971) and the other on the social stability and change of Hong Kong (Lethbridge 1978). Contributors to the three volumes were mainly Western visiting researchers, expatriate members of HKU, or colonial administrative officers. Some editors already left Hong Kong when their work was published. Throughout the 1970s, the available readers on Hong Kong society were dominated by the text written by those passing Westerners.

The first collection initiated by domestic Chinese scholar was the 1981 collection *Social Life and Development in Hong Kong* (King 1981), involving primarily contributors from CUHK. This collection focused on the structural development of Hong Kong as an emerging metropolis and its institutional characteristics. This collection included widely-cited essays on “administrative absorption of politics” and “utilitarianistic familism” (Lau 1981). Alex Y.H. Kwan (關銳煊), lecturer of City Polytechnics, also edited a reader for the course “Hong Kong Society” taught
at the polytechnics level (1986). This volume invited twelve contributors from a variety of institutions to write about social aspects of Hong Kong, but none of the four sociology departments existing then were involved. Back in HKU, Benjamin Leung, a second generation sociologist, made a timely contribution by editing an essay collection on the social issues of Hong Kong (1990) and writing a comprehensive review of studies of Hong Kong society (1996).

Compared with these English titles, the scholarly volume in Chinese language appeared late on. The proceedings (Sinn 1995) of the conference “Hong Kong Society and Culture” convened by HKU Center of Asian Studies in 1991 was a pioneering text. It is now considered that “the volume proclaimed the formal initiation of indigenous cultural studies within an academic institution”. The actual systematic review of Hong Kong society in Chinese, however, did not really appear until the 2002 publication of Our Place, Our Time - A New Introduction to Hong Kong Society (Tse 2003), a volume involving nineteen contributions from a wide spectrum of institutions. The literature was further enriched by the proceedings of the conference series “Hong Kong Culture and Society” organized by Ng Chun-Hung, Lui Tak-Lok and Eric Ma (Sec 6.3.3).
5.2.3 Taiwan: Delayed Emergence of Indigenized Teaching Text

In Taiwan, despite its sizable sociological community and vibrant empirical research, there had been fewer edited collection of domestic sociological studies published before late 1990s. There were several volumes compiled to survey studies about the “social problems” in Taiwan (Yang, KS and Yeh 1978; 1984; 1991; 2005), which was often assigned for students in social policy, social welfare or social works. The pathological and practical perspective presented, however, placed these volumes in a different context to those that genuinely approached domestic society as a “legitimate epistemological object” for its own sake. The collections edited by Ting Tin-yu and Ma Kang-chuan (1986) and Hsiao, Cheng et al. (1989), both focused on the industrialization of Taiwan society, have a purely sociological perspective. But the former was actually a collection of articles translated from English texts on Taiwan Studies, and the latter embodied the proceedings of an “international” conference attended by Taiwanese and American scholars.¹ Neither represented the output of the domestic sociological scholarship. The absence of an adequate sociological textbook that reflected social reality in Taiwan was finally addressed with the publication of *Sociology*

¹ Participants from US institutions include sociologists like Richard Barrett, Gary Gereffi, Thomas Gold William Lavely, and Alejandro Portes, but also political scientist George Crane and Peter Evans.
and Taiwanese Society (社會學與台灣社會) in 1999—"a delayed innovation that... changed the situation that sociological texts were dominated by Anglophone authors." (Tseng 2010, italic added). A systematic review of domestic sociological studies, which was also long overdue, was finally attempted in the Interlocution published in 2008.

5.3 Historical and Reflexive Writing of Domestic Sociology

The historical writings of a discipline constructed a version of the common past of the professional community, providing a narrative basis on which the sense of tradition and collective identity could emerge from. Throughout my interviews I found the informants’ self-portrait in relation to the domestic sociological community was constantly associated with his/her understanding (or ignorance) and interpretation of the domestic disciplinary history. There were of course individual factors embedded in the personal career trajectory, but what counts more at the collective level was perhaps the relative availability of historical writing and the perspectives presented. The purpose of this section is to contrast the literature resources in this regard. Readers should now be reminded of the four ideal-typical layers distinguished in 1.1.2: the evolution of ideas, institutional developments, substantial research, and the professional practices
of sociologists. The following review will not be organized in this typology since
many cited works cover more than one aspect, but their relative emphasis should
be discussed.

5.2.1 Taiwan: Strong Tradition in Historical and Meta-Analytical Writing

The literature about the history of sociology is ample in Taiwan ¹, dating back to
Martin Yang’s early but comprehensive account (Ng, Ma et al. 2005a) of the
post-war sociology development in Taiwan in the third issue of the newly
established CJS². Michael Hsiao contributed to the field with his review and
reflection over the studies of social problems (1976), the sociological empirical
research (1981), and later the general condition of sociology (1982), in Taiwan.

In the last piece, Hsiao took a historical-structural perspective, paying special
attention to, first, the “breakage” from the genealogy of pre-war Chinese
sociology, and second, the implication of Taiwan’s peripheral position and its
dependency on the US in the world system structure (1987). Yeh CJ, a leading
theorist, also provided critical reflection on the development of sociology (1988),
social theory (1996), and even the “dominance of US-trained scholar” in the

¹ Most of the cited texts are in Chinese. The English texts include Yang (1976), Hsiao M (1998),
Chang MK (2005), Chang MK, Chang YH and Tang CC (2009), and Tai MC (2010).
² Yang as a key figure in institutionalizing sociology in Taiwan provided detailed personal
account of the process in this text, which was originally prepared for a ISA meeting.
“knowledge-power struggle” among sociologists (2003). Commissioned by the National Science Council, Chang Ying-Hua in 1996 (2003) compiled a disciplinary planning report on sociology. Both his colleagues, Chang Mau-Kuei (2005; 2006 with Wu Hsin-Yi) published systematic reviews of an important historical episode of Taiwanese sociology, the indigenization movement of social science, and Tang Chih-Chie (2008) further traced the issue of “indigenousness” (or locality) of Taiwanese sociology in a longer historical frame. The last three authors recently co-authored a historical account of sociology in Taiwan with emphasis placed on the themes of indigenization, institutionalizations and internationalization (Chang MK et. al 2010). These works cited\(^1\) constitute a current of historical writing that covers the institutional development, the evolution of a particular current of thought (indigenization), and some meta-analysis of the research output. Their length as articles, however, restricted their scope. Therefore, the 2008 publication of the edited collection Interlocution (Shieh 2008) marked a significant addition to the literature body. This collection emerged from a three year collective project that involved twelve authors from five institutions who provided the first systematic review of the substantial

\(^1\) All the cited authors and editor (including Shieh) were affiliated to either the Academia Sinica or the National Taiwan University. The two institutions, with their ample resource, were sometimes portrayed as the ‘power core’ of Taiwanese sociological community
sociological studies by Taiwanese sociologists in ten thematic fields.

The introduction of the TSA Presidential Address (published in the association’s journal) in mid-1990s created another platform for reviewing and communicating professional issues about the sociological community. These addresses did not seek to count as historical literature per se due to their limited length, but most of them departed from a historical review of the professional community from some particular perspective. Michael Hsiao (1995) talked about changes in sociology in relation to the transitional society. Lin Rei-Sui (1996) assessed sociology’s prospect from the point of view of institutional development and student intake. Chiu Hei-yuan (1998) reviewed the design of sociology teaching programmes and the development of Taiwanese social research. Chang YH (2000) provided a “sociologist’s participatory observation” of academic publications and evaluation and discussed the implications for the development of scholarship. Ku Chung-Hwa (2005) elaborated upon the openness and public purpose of social sciences. A stream of scholarly works were produced in the last decade from the perspective of “sociology of sociology” to assess the condition of the discipline within the institutional setting. Su Kuo-Hsian (2004), using network analysis, demonstrated
the citing patterns and the “invisible colleges” within sociology’s professional community. Tsai MC (2005; 2010) tried to use statistics to answer “who gets the NSC sociology research grants and why”, and Chang YH et al (2010) addressed how academic evaluation is now being experienced by sociologists working in different institutional settings by extensive interviews.

5.2.2 Hong Kong: Limited Availability

There were fewer texts attempted a systematic review of the history of sociology in Hong Kong. An early title that seemed relevant, *Anthropology and sociology in Hong Kong* (Topley 1969), actually embodied the proceedings of a symposium convened to discuss some early field projects by foreign investigators. The choice of the title in fact reflected the relative immaturity of domestic research in the late 1960s. Harold Traver (1984) contributed a review of social research in Hong Kong fifteen years later, when there were much more domestic studies accumulated, but he did not cover the institutional aspect of sociological development. The first, and perhaps the only, reliable source of historical accounts of sociology in Hong Kong was by Rance Lee of CUHK, who in the three relevant articles (1987; 1993 with Lau SK; 1996 in Chinese) reviewed the transplantation, institutional development, domestic cultivation and the diverse
achievement of sociology in Hong Kong. These texts, however, more or less took
CUHK as the centre stage in their narrative and seemed to under represent other
institutions. Recently, Catherine Chiu provided an updated summary (2009), of
the current state of sociology in a conference talk she gave as the president of the
Hong Kong Sociological Association.

5.2.3 Singapore:

The scarcity of writing about the Hong Kong history of sociology is even more
obvious if compared with Singapore. A compact state with a shorter history of
institutionalized sociology, Singapore however hosts a sociological “community”
(actually a department in 1965-2005) that regularly reviews their achievements
and developments. The publications reviewed in 5.2.1 were all of historical
interest. The two essay collections (Hassan 1976; Ong, Tong et al. 1997) were
accepted as historical milestones of the national scholarship. The review articles
included in the two volumes of Singapore Studies were, themselves, a form of
historical writing (Chen, PSJ 1986; Yee and Chua 1999). In particular, the
collection Exploration of Asian Sociology (Chan, KB and Ho 1991) included three
short pieces of historical interest—Geoffrey Benjamin contributed a photo essay
(in anthropological style) about past and present of the department, Hans
Dieter-Evers wrote a personal account of the founding of *Working Paper Series* (pp16-17) and Peter Chen outlined the departmental history with a substantial elaboration of the critical role of the working paper series in the sociological tradition in Singapore (pp18-25). Moreover, there were a number of specially written articles or essays that reviewed or assessed Singaporean sociology or the sociological community from some particular aspect (e.g. institutional, demographic, and ideological). Benjamin wrote a few pieces narrating the history of Singaporean sociology (1989; 1991). Quah (1995) contributed a more structured survey of the “areas of work” (theoretical perspective, dissemination avenues and professional activities) and social norms of Singaporean sociologists. Khondker (2000) critically reviewed the evolution of sociology in three phases.

### 5.4 Normative-Epistemological Discussion

The fourth genre I sought to compare is the normative-epistemological discussions of sociology, particularly in relation to the application of Western theory and paradigms in studying the Asian society. In this section I will only provide an overview of the evidence for the existence of such discussion, leaving some of the core themes to be discussed in more depth in the next chapter.
5.4.1. Taiwan: Sinicization to Indigenization

The first initiative to reflect upon the Western paradigms was the 1980 Taipei conference *Sinicization of Social and Behavioural Sciences* organized by psychologist Yang Kuo-Shu (楊國樞, b. 1932), sociologist Wen Chung-I (文崇一 b. 1925) and anthropologist Li Yi-Yuan (李亦園, b. 1931), who were all affiliated with the Institute of Ethnology of Academia Sinica (Yang, KS and Wen 1981). The three scholars played a central role in the 1970s agenda to investigate the “character” of Chinese people from an interdisciplinary, but behaviouristic and positivistic, approach (Li and Yang 1972). Central to this project was the concern of “modernization” (Li, Yang et al. 1984, Preface); they studied Chinese people in order to fathom the prospect for their modernization. Within a few years, they developed a discontent with their own works (and works of colleagues) which “blindly borrowed from Western concepts, theories and methods” and “failed to reflect the social and cultural particularity of the ‘Chinese’ societies” Therefore, their works became “…nothing but ‘vassals’ of the Western social and behavioural science” (Yang, KS and Wen 1981, i). In response, Yang and Wen urged to “Sinicize” social and behavioural sciences in order to “transcend the stage of absorbing and imitating and move into the era of self-innovation” (ibid, ii).
The conference attracted sixty plus social scientists to attend and 21 papers were presented by 13 authors from Taiwan, seven from Hong Kong and one from Singapore. Yang and Wen concluded the conference with four objectives (ibid, v), which included (abridged) (1) To improve the validity and reliability of research about Chinese society and people by paying attention to its historical, cultural and social features. (2) To solve the various practical issues of Chinese society (3) To restore the independence and critical capacity of Chinese scholars to enhance their self-respect, confidence and professional consciousness. (4) To make unique contributions to world scholarship through correcting the inclination of "over-Westernization" (in particular Americanization) and the "vassal" status of Chinese scholarship. These stated objectives reflected the intellectual orientation of the key leaders, which was characterised by the assumed positivistic doctrine (with the emphasis on validity and reliability), pragmatism, nationalist sentiment, and an ultimate faith on universalism.

---

1 Notable participants that are more relevant to the interest of this project included Chiao Chien (乔健, anthropologist, b. 1935) Ambrose King (金耀基, sociologist, b 1935), Ho Hsiu-Hwa (何秀煌, philosopher, b 1938) and Rance Lee (李沛良, sociologist) from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, sociologist Eddie Kuo (郭振羽, sociologist, b. 1940) from National University of Singapore, Huang Guang-Guo (黄光国, psychologist, b) and Yeh Chi-Jeng (sociologist, b. 1943) from National Taiwan University, Kao Cheng-Shu (sociologist, b. 1947) from Tunghai University, and Chu Hei-yuan (b 1944) and Michael HH Hsiao (sociologist, b. 1948) from Academia Sinica.

2 It was stressed that Sinicization was not a form of "chauvinism, ethnocentrism or isolationism ... [or] regionalism". It was NOT an attempt to "construct Chinese social and behavioural science. Science had no boundary. Eventually the research outcome of all nations will be united in one disciplinary system, and became part of human knowledge" (Yang and Wen,
It is worth noting at this point that Yang and Wen expressed a dialectical view about the epistemological connection between the Chinese and the West. It was claimed that only those who had been working within the Western scholarly tradition could appreciate the need for, and discern the appropriate approach to, Sinicization (ibid, vi) By taking this position, Yang and Wen implicitly narrowed down the legitimate participants for this movement to sociologists in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and perhaps the West, excluding those in the Chinese mainland, where sociology had just been re-established after being abolished for almost three decades.

5.4.2 The Indigenous Turn in Taiwan

The 1980 “Sinicization” conference attracted participants from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, but its subsequent reception in the three places varied greatly. In Taiwan, the agenda initiated by the movement received continuous discussion, but the catch word “Sinicization” was gradually replaced by the term “indigenization” into the 1990s— a process reflecting shifting social identity following political liberation in the late 1980s. The importance of “indigenous fitness” (本土契合性) of social research has become widely accepted and
incorporated into the teaching of sociology nowadays. However the approaches developed to reach this goal diverted. Attempts of at least three levels\(^1\) could be distinguished: First, positivist categorical indigenization: A series of social psychology studies of the cultural-specific concepts such as “face” (面子) and “yuan” (緣) advanced by Yang KS and his followers\(^2\). This approach sought to replace imported categories with localized categories without challenging the core theories or positivistic doctrine of the social and behavioural sciences.

Second, methodological reflexivity in grounded theorisation: This approach, advocated by Shieh GS with his ethnographic works, incorporated an interpretive approach and stressed the grounded theorisation and critical reflexivity in appropriating Western theories and categories in study of the domestic subject.

Third, theoretical indigenization: This broad approach was pioneered by Yeh CJ and his followers (Yeh, CJ 2001). They criticized the first two approaches for their empiricist bias (Huang, HM 2010) and instead sought to extract inspiration from Asian intellectual traditions. Some writers in this school even sought to make meta-theoretical propositions based on Asian religions or philosophy. However, 

\(^1\) I intended to address the three approaches in another chapter, ‘Negotiating Western Paradigms,’ which was unfortunately not to be included in the current version due to time constraint and word limit. I will seek to incorporate the chapter in a more finalized version prepared for publication.

\(^2\) They established the *Journal of Indigenous Psychology* (本土心理學研究) in 1993 as a major platform.
these approaches diverted from the sociological paradigm at different level (categorical, theoretical, and meta-theoretical). They shared little common ground and there was no sign for any convergence.

5.4.3 Hong Kong: Platform for Dialogue among Chinese Societies

The movement of Sinicizing sociology attracted great attention among the second cohort of Hong Kong sociologists and their contemporary colleagues, who shared concerns around how social science could help Chinese modernization. As one of the agreements in the 1980 Taipei conference, a follow-up conference titled “Modernization and Chinese Culture” was organized in Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1983. The conference convener, Chiao Chien (喬健), made two significant decisions about the agenda. First, he replaced the catchword “Sinicization” with the concept pair “Modernization” and “Chinese Culture,” taking a more neutral position by downplaying the imperative tone because the former “lacked the appeal” in colonial Hong Kong. Second, making use of the strategic role of Hong Kong, he invited some scholars from the Chinese mainland to participate, notably Fei Xiao-Tung, who had been in charge of rebuilding

1 Chang MK (2005, en33) suggested that the conference sponsor, Rockfeller Foundation, may prefer an agenda more open to the West rather than one with “nationalistically” anti-Western sentiments.
Chinese sociology since 1979 (Qiao, 1985). This led to the first post-war encounter of sociologists across the Taiwan Strait. The conference marked the beginning for Hong Kong playing the role as a platform for pan-Chinese societies’ scholarly dialogue (People’s Republic of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and sometimes Macao) before the cross-strait interaction could be normalized in the 1990s. The conference “Modernization and Chinese Culture” became a series with some of its later sessions held in different cities in China. However, the intellectual tradition embodied by this series of conference attracted limited enthusiasm among later cohorts of Hong Kong sociologists, let alone the initial agenda of Sinicization. The younger generation was mostly aware of the presence of the Sinicization discourse and these conferences but described them as “things discussed by our teachers, not us (HK18).” Instead they either considered the agenda infeasible, irrelevant, or even problematic.

There were a few figures committed to furthering efforts in the broad direction. Cheung Tak-Sing and Chan Hoi-Man, both of CUHK, sought to integrate sociology

---

and Chinese intellectual tradition in different ways. Cheung (1989) employed sociological concepts in a systematic reinterpretation of the Confucius doctrine, proposing the idea of a “order complex”. Chan (2002) devised an ideal typical framework of the core value, orientation and boundaries of “Enlightenment” in his mega treatise of Chinese Enlightenment. Yet these works attracted limited readership among their sociologist colleagues in Hong Kong. Ruan, Xing-bang of HKPU is also noteworthy. He wrote a monograph on the indigenization of social science (2001) and established the Journal Social Theory to promote theoretical dialogue in the Chinese-speaking world. But soon after that he moved to China.

5.4.4 Singapore: Critical Discourse by Malay and Indian Sociologists

Singapore was originally included in the project envisioned by Yang et al., since it is often (questionably) imagined as “another industrialized Chinese society” from the perspective of Taiwan. But the response to this agenda was not enthusiastic at all. Eddie Kuo, who had studied in Taiwan before, was the only participant from Singapore who attended both conferences and he remained marginal. In

1 Multiple interviews with HK sociologists. One comment “they would never make professorship with publication of that sort (HK14).” By contrast, some occasional in-field chats with CUHK student suggested that both teachers were highly regarded among students. One described them “rare models of the traditional Chinese-style scholar, civilized, full of knowledge.”

2 I, admittedly, made the identical false assumption when I started the project.
general the sociologists in Singapore (dominated by the batch of Chinese sociologists entering in early 1970s by then) did not buy into the agenda. Khondker (2000,) also noted that “Singaporean social scientists in the early stages of the development of sociology very rarely engaged in nationalist discourse, or call for indigenization etc.”

The critical discourse on Western paradigms started to be represented in the NUS sociology department from the Malaysian sociologist Syed Farid Alatas and his Indian colleague Vineeta Sinha. Both arrived in the 1990s. Soon after his arrival, Alatas wrote a series of articles that considered the “indigenization” of academic discourse (1993), the idea of “relevancy” (1995), the tension between Western theories and Eastern reality in social sciences (1998), the problem of Eurocentrism in the teaching of sociological theory (2001, with Sinha) and the “global division of labour” of the social sciences (2003)— a series of writings were later compiled in a volume dedicated to “Alternative Discourses” in Asian Social Sciences (2006). Sinha, too, attempted a re-conceptualization of social science in non-Western setting (1997) and urged practitioners to move beyond critiques and attend to the task of restructuring the institutional base of the social sciences (Sinha 2000 ; 2001 ). The relatively late emergence of such
discourse in the sociology department, however, did not imply the total absence of similar critique in Singapore. In fact, Prof. Syed Hussein Alatas, father of Syed Farid, had already contributed his critiques of the “captive mind” in the erstwhile prevalent “development studies” (1972) and urged for an “Asian social science tradition” (1979) when he was the head of the NUS Malay Studies Department.

5.5 Domestic Disciplinary Identity

The presentation in the previous sections is summarised in Table 5-1. To make sense of it, I devised the idea of domestic disciplinary identity illustrated in the opening paragraphs as a heuristic device to translate the observed bibliographic outcome into a set of interpretive, coherent characterisation of the respective sociological communities, both in terms of their institutional structure and shared culture. Such a characterisation would also serve as a logical joint to bridge the bibliographic patterns and the contextual factors suggested in Sec 5.6. In the next three subsections I will summarise the patterns of each case presented in the first four sections, after which I will portray the respective domestic disciplinary identity. I shall in 5.5.4 propose three types of “subjectivities” as a conceptual framework to characterise the varied domestic disciplinary identity on a comparable basis.
Table 5-2 Summary of Bibliographic Resources in Four Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Journal</td>
<td>Strong Tradition of institutional journals NTUJS since 1966</td>
<td>CUHK CSR, Occasional Paper</td>
<td>NUS Sociology Dept., Working Paper Series, ‘73- (S)AJSS, ‘73-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TJS (CJS) ’71-Taishe ‘89-Societa ‘02-</td>
<td>HKJSS ’93- (CityU) J Soc Theory ’98- (PolyU)</td>
<td>IEASS, Sojourn ’86 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited Collection</td>
<td>Earlier collections on ‘Social problems’ or ‘industrialisation. Later appearance of collection of indigenized teaching text</td>
<td>Collection of topical essays assembled via a variety of scholarly networks with less institutional and disciplinary character</td>
<td>Institutional-Collective Projects aimed to provide a timely review of their research outputs on Singaporean society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Writing</td>
<td>Strong Tradition since ’76 More focus on the institutional aspects</td>
<td>Limited Availability</td>
<td>Regular since’84- More focus on the substantial research output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection of Western Paradigm</td>
<td>Sinicization ‘80s Shifting discourse to Indigenization ‘87- Principle of ‘indigenous fitness’ widely assumed, different approaches developed but little sign of convergence Continuous discussion among theory-minded group of mostly TW/German PhDs</td>
<td>‘Modernisation &amp; Chinese Culture’ Conference series as a direct response to the Sinicization agenda. HK as platform of Pan-Chinese societies talk Endeavours by a few marginalized scholars</td>
<td>Little discussion in NUS sociology dept. till 1990s A significant current by Alatas and Sinha, which however was domestically overlooked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.1 Taiwan: Strong Aspiration for Its Own Tradition

Summary: Taiwan has several sociology journals long-established (e.g. TJS, the TSA official journal dates back to 1971), a strong tradition of historical and reflexive writing that focuses on the institutional aspects of the discipline, and vibrant normative- epistemological discussions on the appropriation of the Western paradigm as shown in the 1980s “Sinicization” agenda and the later,
more localized, “indigenization” discourse. However, it did not produce its first textbook using indigenized material and any systematic review of collections of domestic sociological studies until the last decade.

Analysis: The clearest impression from the bibliographic survey was a sense of strong aspiration for developing its own tradition of sociology, in particular before the 1990s, when the sense of disciplinary identity was tied up with the nationalistic and civilizational frame of China. The motif was apparently associated with competition between ROC (Taiwan) and PRC for legitimacy as the “authentic China.” One of the reasons cited in the appeal for establishing a sociology department in NTU, for instance, was to create a corresponding unit for international collaboration for sociological researches in order not to lag behind the communist side in the competition for international recognition (Tang 2008: 570). This nationalist agenda might not be shared by all who live in Taiwan, but it was certainly shared by those first and second cohorts of sociologists of whom the majority were Chinese immigrants. The psychological bearing of the nationalist sentiment was significant. A small group residing on a small island, the sociologists in Taiwan however have a much larger “imagined collective self”
which was characterised by the sense of pride associated with its historical and cultural depth, and the sense of sorrow of the nation's agony since the 19th century. This explained why a "Chinese Sociological Association" was considered necessary when there were only ten members (some were actually anthropologists), and why a "Chinese Journal of Sociology" was launched once the size the scholarly community allowed for its operation. There was a perceived need to write the history of "Chinese" sociology, tracing its genealogy from 1920s China all the way to the post-war development in the "Free China" (Taiwan). When the discontent of the 1970s positivistic studies arose, the solution was to "Sinicize" the social and behavioural science (while in the West the response was to produce critical and interpretive paradigms).

The symbolic "China" as a dominant category in framing discourses was gradually challenged from the late 1980s, following, first, the rise of post-war Taiwan-born sociologists who have never stepped on the soil of the Chinese mainland (the third cohort), and second, the political democratization that gradually loosened political control over freedom of speech. Chang (2005) also pointed out the historical significance of the 1983 Hong Kong conference (Sec 5.4.2) in noting that the "Chinese sociologists" from Taiwan had the first
opportunity to meet the sociologists from the Chinese mainland. The historical encounter between the symbolic and the real China, Chang inferred, inevitably drove Taiwanese sociologists to reconsider the meaning of continuously claiming to be Chinese sociologists. In 1987, a year that marked the lifting of the Martial Law and the restoration of every human right protected by the constitution, Yeh CJ (1987) published a reflection on some fundamental issues of sociology with the catch word “indigenization.” The term gradually replaced the original Sinicization in the critical discourses on negotiating Western paradigms in the ensuing decade. The renaming of CSA to TSA in 1996 marked a consolidation of Taiwanese identity within the sociological community.

The transition of national identity in the 1990s was perhaps associated with the delayed inception of publications like *Sociology and Taiwan Society* and *Interlocution*—despite the ample accumulation of empirical studies on Taiwan society much earlier. My thesis is that in earlier times, when China was the dominant framing category in defining the national (geographical, cultural) boundary, social studies in Taiwan were ascribed a lower epistemological status so that they only served as “cases” (e.g. for the study of industrialization) or knowledge for solving practical problems (hence the publication of several
volumes on “social problems”) — instead of a sort of knowledge worth pursuing in its own right. Therefore, Taiwan was hardly considered a legitimate geographical unit that warranted a disciplinary textbook when there were already versions of *History of Chinese Social Thought* (e.g., Yang, SJ 1982; Yang, MMC 1986)

5.5.2 Hong Kong: A Fragmented “Community”

*Summary:* Sociologists in Hong Kong did not have their own disciplinary journal until the recent, ill-fated *HKJS*. The historical or reflexive writing of the state of the discipline in Hong Kong was limited. There were a number of collected volumes of sociological studies about Hong Kong assembled within several unrelated personal scholarly networks which was of limited institutional character and little disciplinary tag (none include the term “sociology” in its title).

While there was initially an enthusiastic response to the 1980s Sinicization agenda initiated from Taiwan, the momentum was carried on in the conference series on “Modernization and Chinese Culture” which was ideologically more conservative and geographically detached from Hong Kong, and demographically an agenda only of interest to the senior (second) cohort of sociologists.
Analysis: It was elusive to talk about a domestic disciplinary identity of the “sociological community of Hong Kong”. Sociologists in Hong Kong have historically operated within at least two (or more) minimally-interrelated networks, situated in distinctive institutional environments\(^1\). The British-trained expatriates working in the colonial institution of HKU, for instance, generally did not have much contact with those American-trained Chinese sociologists working in CUHK— and there was little inter-institutional collaboration\(^2\). The topology of these discrete networks can be roughly mapped by the contributor lists of the numerous collections cited (Sec 5.2.2) — and each collection more or less bears the particular perspective of the network from which it was produced. The only general trend was the dominance of English text until recently. There was little historical writing that constructed a common past for sociologists in Hong Kong (the most reliable texts by Rance Lee appear to be too CUHK-centred), and no common platform for community building until the last decade.

The three factors— institutional segregation, the absence of a more inclusive

\(^1\) Although a few trans-institutional personal networks did exist and they were critical for a number of initiatives. Of the second cohort, Lau Siu-Kai (CUHK), Wong Siu-Lung (HKU) and Lee Ming-kun (HKPU), who had been classmates, remained in close contact throughout their career. Of the third cohort, Ng CH (HKU) and Lui Tak-Lok (CUHK, before his move to HKU in 2009) were two initiators in establishing the Cantonese-medium Cultural Studies Forum.

\(^2\) Some anecdotal story suggested the cultural clash between some key figures of HKU and CUHK department impeded an early proposal of fostering inter-department collaboration.
historical account of the discipline, and the lack of common platforms made description of sociologists in Hong Kong as a “community” questionable.

The initiation of the Hong Kong Sociological Association in 2000 and its associated annual conference and journals of course marked a significant move towards community building among Hong Kong sociologists. However, despite the relentless effort of some of its active members, its effectiveness has so far remained limited. The HKSA annual conference, for instance, was overlooked by the majority of sociologists in Hong Kong—the target group it was intended to serve. I compared the 2008 annual conferences of HKSA and TSA, and found that about 45% (65 participants) of the “core circle of sociologists” in Taiwan attended the TSA event, whilst only 19% (14 participants) of the Hong Kong counterpart attended the HKSA conference. The majority of these attending Hong Kong sociologists were themselves members of the organizing council and participated as either host or session chairs. Only four made presentations in the conference (2008). A senior informant admitted that to present in this

1 “Core circle sociologists” is operationally defined to include, in Taiwan, all the staff members of sociology departments and institutes plus the Graduate School of Social Development of Shi-Hsin University (143), and in Hong Kong, that plus the sociology PhD holders in the HKPU Department of Applied Social Science, HKUST Division of Social Sciences, and Lingan Dept. of Sociology and Politics (75).
conference “feels like an insult... as it’s now a venue for postgraduate students and Chinese mainlander scholars (HK11).” The limited attendance amongst Hong Kong scholars was ironically compensated for by the participation of a significant ratio of presenters (junior staff or postgraduate student) from neighbouring countries seeking the experience of presenting at “international conferences.”

The function of HKSA conference as a “hub” with an “international outlook” resembled the roles played by the *Hong Kong Journal of Social Science* and *Journal of Social Theory*. These platforms all reflect the symbolic character often attached to this city — a venue for regional or international flows to converge — but not necessarily in ways engaging the city itself.

The changing identity frame from China to Hong Kong was also observed in the transition from the second to third cohort (excluding the expatriates)— but in a weaker version on both ends. The authors of the second cohort demonstrated a higher cultural affinity and even personal commitment to China; they tended to write with “Chinese culture” or “Chinese people” as the reference frame although they conducted numerous empirical studies on Hong Kong, and many, in

1 Conversation with participants from Korea and Japan during my attendance in 2008 and 2010.
particular those in CUHK, actively participated in the restoration of Chinese sociology in the 1980s. But this sense of cultural affinity was not institutionally reinforced in ways seen in Taiwan. On the other hand, the “sense of Hong Kong identity” of the third cohort emerged as a perceived affinity with the impressive economic achievement of the city during the 1970s and the growing contrast with the China under the Cultural Revolution (Lui 2007a). It was not created through political confrontation (e.g. the post-authoritarian surge of Taiwanese identity) or political mobilization (e.g. the Singaporean identity).

5.5.3 Singapore

**Summary:** The sociological community in Singapore (NUS sociology department), despite its compact size, has established two regular publication channels (the *Working Paper Series* and *AJSS*), was involved in a series of institutional collective projects that reviewed sociological studies in Singapore, and accumulated a significant body of historical writing about the discipline in the city state. On the other hand, there was little critical discourse on the Western paradigm in the department until the arrival of Alatas and Sinha in the 1990s.

**Analysis:** The two publications associated with the NUS department (the *Working
Paper Series and the AJSS) and the regular institutional-collective reviews of their outputs provided a focal literature body that traced the activities of members, and therefore constructed a sense of institutional, and also a national disciplinary, identity. A salient character of Singaporean sociology repeatedly stressed in the review texts was its close connection to the “broader national concern”— and, in particular in the earlier period (before the 1980s), to the “policy agenda” aimed to facilitate the process of modernization and to mitigate its negative consequences (Yee and Chua 1999, 229). Lian & Tong (2003: Introduction) illustrated the connection by anchoring Singapore sociology back to its coincidental founding during a year when the city was expelled from Malaysia and became a “state without a nation” (ibid: 1). They wrote:

“It is against this political backdrop— a society reluctantly dragged into nationhood and forced to stand on its own feet economically— that ... sociology [was] established. It should therefore be unsurprising that ... the development of sociology in Singapore reflects local concerns framed against the exigencies of building a society that could be economically viable, yet possessing a measure of self-confidence which accompanies a people who may yet come to share a common collective identity” (ibid: 3)
Khondker (2000:114), writing from a critical angle, considers the involvement of policy-oriented studies “made sociology relevant to the government... secured the status of sociology as a discipline in Singapore and the suspicions about the “liberal” image gave way to admiration.”

With their close association with the nation-building agenda, sociologists in Singapore, before the early 1980s, (the second cohort) were described (Yee and Chua, 1999, 229-231) as relying heavily on “the conceptual framework of modernization theory and structural functionalism (p229)” and they focused on empirical work rather than “systematic theorizing” (p231). Since the mid-1980s the theoretical orientations introduced to the department had been gradually diversified with the return of a new cohort (Sec 4.4.4), but in a review of the publication by Singaporean sociologists in 1990-1994, Quah (1995, 91) still observed a general ignorance of critical sociology among the mainstream sociologists, and their “analysis ... tends to be centred on the building blocks of theory rather than on the construction of theoretical frameworks.” The absence of critical discourse on the Western paradigm before the 1990s could perhaps be seen as a manifestation for the limited engagement in theorizing.
The institutional concentration of the national sociological community in one department was consequential. It made any review, or historical writing of the department automatically a text about the “national scholarship;” it also granted the institution a more dominant role in the process. I was reminded by an informant (SG 12) that “the sense of identity was to a great extend created by the university or the department through... project,” instead of being formulated though the collective self-searching of the academics. The informant in fact cast doubt on whether or not there was such a thing called “Singapore sociology” (despite the use of this phrase) as he observed limited interactions amongst colleagues due the department’s size and the demand for publications.

Nonetheless, I am convinced that the portrait of Singaporean sociology is reliable at least for the second cohort who joined the department in the 1970s when it was much smaller and more involved in state initiatives.

Throughout the 1970s-1980s when sociologists were involved in state research initiatives, there was a smaller yet continuous stream of Western social anthropologist (e.g. Benjamin, Evers, Clammer, Walker, Waston) who added to the

---

1 Another factor suggested for the cohort difference on interaction was the ‘spatial design’ of the department buildings between the old and new campuses (moving in 1980).
department, with their field studies in neighbouring countries, a flavour of a “hub of social studies” of a greater geographical coverage. This character might be associated with the historical role of the city as a trading hub within the British Commonwealth network, and was certainly reflected when Evers (1991, italic added) described how the department wanted to prove itself as “the best sociology department east of Suez.” The naming of its new journal with the geographic unit “Southeast Asia,” instead of “Singapore,” showed a similar attitude, which was also instilled in placing the title *Exploration of Asian Sociology* for a volume in which the content was in fact concentrated in Singapore and Malaysia¹. The ambition, despite being part of the department’s self-definition for decades, only came to be more fully actualized in the past decade.

5.5.4 Comparative Summary: Three Dimensions of Subjectivity

To sum up the portraits presented in the previous three subsections, I proposed three ideal-typical layers of “subjectivity” as a conceptual framework to dissect the three particular formations of *domestic disciplinary identity* (Table 5-3).

---

¹ Of the 99 papers reviewed, 51 were about Singapore, 14 on Malaysia, 6 on Southeast Asia in general (by Evers), 4 on Indonesia, 3 on China, 6 on other places like Fiji, Thailand, India, Hong Kong, Ethiopia and 18 were geographically non-specific (e.g. theory, bibliography). There was no paper from West, Central and North East Asia. (p2)
Geo-disciplinary subjectivity refers to the “social fact” that the disciplinary practitioners of a particular locale considered, or acted, as if they were of one bounded community. The sociologists in Taiwan were employed by a wide range of institution, but a tangible disciplinary community was constructed by the numerous disciplinary journals, the strong tradition of historical and reflexive writing about the discipline, a vibrant professional association and its newsletter and annual meetings. All of these created a sense of what sociology in Taiwan is about. The sociologists in Singapore, on the other hand, were physically employed in one institutional community, and a sense of disciplinary subjectivity was presented in the series of publications related to Singapore sociology.

Sociologists in Hong Kong, by contrast, were historically fragmented in several unrelated networks and the new HKSA was yet to create a sense of community among the disciplinary practitioners.

Table 5-3 Dimensions of Domestic Disciplinary Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo-disciplinary</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L, developing</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo-epistemological</td>
<td>L &gt; H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emerging in 1990s</td>
<td>emerging mid-1980s</td>
<td>since 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilizational</td>
<td>H (Chinese)</td>
<td>(M*)L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: H, M and L stand for high, medium and low
The *geo-epistemological subjectivity* refers to the constructed norm of seeing a particular geographical domain as a legitimate epistemological subject by its domestic scholars\(^1\). This sense of subjectivity can be observed from the extent to which there existed edited collections, textbooks, journals, conference and organizations dedicated to the sociological studies of the particular place. Taiwan, for instance, is considered to be ascribed lower geo-epistemological subjectivity before the 1990s compared with the dominant category China, while Singapore has, since its independence, been regarded as of high epistemological priority. Hong Kong, in comparison, attracted a stream of works on its sociological aspects. But the early pieces before the 1980s were dominated by English texts authored by shorter-term foreign expatriates, and the domestic production, in particular those in Chinese language, only came into being very recently.

The *civilizational subjectivity* refers to the sense that a particular practitioner (or a collective group) perceived that they belong to a civilizational background distinctive from the dominant civilizational frame (the West) of sociology. The sense of civilizational subjectivity, I shall argue in Sec 5.6, provides an intellectual

\(^1\) The “domestic scholar” consisted primarily of the national scholar or scholars of permanent residency. The criterion was defined to exclude the foreign investigators who came to study on short-term basis.
ground to critically engage the Western paradigm and it therefore enabled the emergence of normative-epistemological discourse. The Sinicization movement initiated in Taiwan is a sign of the high level of *(Chinese)* civilizational subjectivity.

In Singapore, by contrast, this dimension remained dormant until the urge for Asian “Alternative Discourses” by two immigrant scholars from Malaysian and Indian background in the 1990s. The case of Hong Kong was a bit complicated since there were a few CUHK-based scholars participating in the Sinicization agenda, but the two key figures (King and Chiao) both came from Taiwan.

What makes the patterns of the observed domestic disciplinary identity? The portraits in the previous section suggested two factors: *institutional morphology* and the broader *identity politics*. The former involves the size and the degree of network integration among the disciplinary practitioners residing in one locale; as discussed above. I will now devote the last section to the latter.

**5.6 Identity Politics**

Identity politics, a concept emerging in the 1970s discourse on social movements for minority rights, was conventionally used to refer to “the political activity and theorizing founded in the shared experiences of injustice of members of certain
social groups.” Its political momentum was based on a *reclaimed* understanding of the “distinctiveness [of the group] that challenged dominant oppressive characterisation, with the goal of greater self-determination.” The term “appropriated” here, however took a more inclusive view that refers to all politics that concerns the redefinition of “who we are” in relation to the world, regardless of whether the initiator was a radical social activist or the state. This appropriation was necessary because, throughout the majority of the post-war histories of the three (former) colonies, the states have always assumed a dominant role in defining their territory and people in relation to other geopolitical forces— although, it could be challenged, and changed, by the various grass roots attempts to engage the arena.

The state-led agenda in identity politics did not determine directly how individual sociologists constructed their sense of identity, but it cast a framing effect on the formation of the sociological community and scholarship in a number of ways. First, the official rhetoric devised to construct the desired set of collective identity casted a framing effect on the discursive circumstance the

---

member of the society lived in. The discursive practice led to a perceived pressure for conformity, which tended to be intensified when the nature of the state was, to a degree, authoritarian and the consequences of non-cooperation were less predictable. Some authors in Taiwan, for instance, concealed the argument for “indigenization” or “Taiwanization” under the more agreeable catch of Sinicization in the 1980s. The choice of the title “Modernization and Chinese Culture” for the 1983 conference (Sec 5.4.2) could also be seen as a strategic decision made in light of the organizers’ judgment on the context.

Second, the official ideology was constantly reflected in the state’s use of various material-based agenda-setting tools, such as institutional development, the provision of purposive grant, and so on. The material measures reinforce the power of the discursive framing through the repetitive process of proposal-making, applications and reporting. Third, identity politics often involves a selective reproduction on the cultural heritage that is reflected in a wide array of educational (e.g. curriculum in language, history, and classics) and cultural policies. The inheritance of such cultural heritage is a prerequisite for the formation of the *civilizational subjectivity* I discuss previously.
The post-war identity politics of the three societies, interestingly, were more or less associated with the establishment of the People's Republic of China. I shall briefly characterise their variant pattern and suggest the links with the domestic disciplinary identity:

5.6.1 Taiwan Imposed Chinese Nationalism vs. Rising Taiwanese Identity

Overtaking Taiwan in 1945, the KMT government faced six million local inhabitants who had been living under Japanese colonial rule for the most of their life time. The government made great effort to convert them Chinese nationals. Chinese Mandarin was announced as the “national language”, Chinese classics, history and geography were stressed in school curriculum, and national symbols like its flag and anthem were promoted (Wilson 1970). Chinese nationalism had dominated Taiwan for four decades, until it was challenged by the rising expression of Taiwanese identity in the process of democratisation (Wachman 1994). Some points could be made in relation to the three dimensions of “subjectivity“ of the domestic disciplinary identity. First, the sense of identity promoted by the KMT, which was competing with the communist over the sovereignty of China, was not just “we belong to China” but “we represent China.” This sense is associated to the psychological bearing that led to the
“re-establishing” of a Chinese national association and journal for sociology.

These moves represented a strong sense of geo-disciplinary subjectivity framed in the unit of China. Second, a collateral effect of the imposed Chinese nationalism was the emphasis on Chinese classics. In particular, a major campaign “Chinese Cultural Renaissance” was staged in 1966 to contrast against the Cultural Revolution in China. Regardless of its original purpose, the campaign in effect secured a continued familiarity of Taiwanese people with the Chinese cultural heritage, providing the intellectual grounds for developing a strong civilizational subjectivity. Last, prioritizing China as the dominant frame unintentionally suppressed the geo-epistemological subjectivity of Taiwan until the 1990s.

5.6.2 Hong Kong: Colonial Denationalization and (Soft) Hong Kong Identity

The establishment of PRC created a different problem for the British colonial government in Hong Kong. It needed to create a psychological distinction between itself and the newly founded PRC, and mitigate the growing tension between the pro-KMT and the pro Communist camp in Hong Kong. In the 1950s, the Hong Kong government took steps to reduce their dependability on either Taiwan or China for the provision of textbooks and higher education (hence the establishment of CUHK). They sought to localize teaching materials, and
re-contextualize China merely as an epistemological object deprived of any sentiments – in short, to *denationalize* the curriculum (Wong, TH 2002, Ch7).

Chinese nationalism was suppressed, but the alternative Hong Kong identity only came to emerge in this refugee city in the 1970s, when resident in Hong Kong started to have positive experiences with the city following the growth of its economic prosperity and cultural prominence (Hong Kong movie and pub music).

However, as Lui (2007b, 30-31) noted, the Hong Kong consciousness “lacked a core—it was not a rebellion consciousness, nor the continuation of a cultural tradition.” It was a weaker form of identity compared with the sense of identity forged by common agony caused by intruders (e.g. Taiwanese nationalism triggered by authoritarian KMT rule, or the Chinese nationalism triggered by Japanese invasion), or those constructed by state-led agenda (e.g. Singapore nationalism, and the Chinese nationalism in Taiwan). The lack of a strong collective identity may explain the limited sense of *geo-disciplinary subjectivity* that renders sociologists in Hong Kong as a community. The sense of *civilizational subjectivity* was more an individual (e.g. of those educated in Taiwan) than a collective sense. Ironically, the lack of a collective disciplinary subjectivity did not prevent the appearance of “multiple” intellectual endeavours that approached Hong Kong society as an *epistemological subject*. 
5.6.3 Singapore: Nation-making with Selective inheritance of Ethnical Heritage

Post war Singapore embarked on a painful process of decolonization that was characterised by the tension and political contestations among its ethnical groups, of which coexistence was merely an artificial product of the colonial time (Wong, TH 2002, Ch6). When Singapore was expelled from Malaysia in 1965, the primary challenge for its leader was the task of making a nation out of its four people. This involved, among other measures, the adoption of “bilingualism” and the setting of English as the default working language. It involved the merger of vernacular schools taught in four languages into one integrated national system, and the scripting of a national ideology (Hill and Lian 1995). These measures sought to construct a collective identity, but it was achieved by systematically filtering (suppressing) the ethnic-specific language, heritage, and historical memory to forge a common ground. The insufficient attention paid to cultural heritage finally led to moral crisis and worries about excessive Westernization, and the 1982 revitalization movement represented by the introduction of the required “Religious Knowledge“ course into the school curriculum. However, this movement was not successful (Kuo 1996). As a new nation with much demand for national scholarship on its society, there was little surprise that the output of
sociologist in Singapore demonstrated a strong sense of geo-disciplinary and
geo-epistemological subjectivity. Meanwhile, the suppressed familiarity with any
Asian intellectual tradition deprived its national scholars of an intellectual
ground on which the alternative discourse could be anchored.

Summary

This chapter characterises the local traditions of sociology based on a systematic
review of four critical sorts of bibliographic outputs: domestically published
journals and publication series, edited collection of sociological studies of the
domestic society, historical or reflexive writing of the local tradition of sociology,
and normative-epistemological discussions about the dominance of the Western
paradigms. The observed pattern was summarised in Table 5-2 and
characterised in Sec 5.5. The notion ‘domestic disciplinary identity’ was coined as
a heuristic devise for analysing these observations. The sociological community
in Taiwan demonstrated a strong aspiration for its own tradition, represented by
the vibrant current in most of the surveyed bibliographic domains—except the
late emergence of edited collections of sociological studies and indigenised
teaching texts that could be associated with a shift in social identity. The
counterparts in Singapore, on the other hand, produced a clear current of
empirical studies of Singapore society that was easily traceable through its flagship journal, the *Working Paper Series* and the regular publication of institution-initiated output review. The scholarship was characterised, at least initially, by its close tie to nation building. But the level of normative-epistemological reflection on Western paradigms remained limited until the 1990s. Sociologists in Hong Kong, by contrast, are harder to describe as a ‘community.’ There was an absence of a disciplinary journal until recently and little historical and reflexive writing about the discipline. The edited collections reflected fragmented scholarly networks and perspectives. The notion of ‘domestic disciplinary identity’ was further unpacked with the proposal of three layers of ‘subjectivity: (1) *geo-disciplinary subjectivity*, the degree to which sociologists of a particular locale were considered (or acted) as if they belong to one bounded community (strong in Taiwan and Singapore), (2) *geo-empirical subjectivity*, the constructed norm of seeing a particular geographical domain as a legitimate epistemological subject (strong in Singapore, moderate in Hong Kong), and (3) *civilizational subjectivity*, which is strongest in Taiwan. The pattern was in the end related to the post-war identity politics in each place.
Public Sociology, an agenda advocated by Michael Burawoy (2005), has attracted extensive normative debate, primarily amongst the global academic “core”, about how sociology should be balanced between the pursuit of scientific professionalism and commitments to public causes. Writing from Hong Kong, Lui Tai-Lok (2007c) considered the call a “timely” discourse at a time when sociologists in East Asia were under enormous “...pressure... from institutional and organizational restructuring”. However, Lui raised three issues “from the margin”: First, advocacy for public sociology should consider the organisational milieu in which sociology is practiced. Recent higher education restructuring in many Asian countries, however, has significantly reshaped the environment in ways that reflect the problematic core-margin power relation— for instance the prioritization of professional output on venues published in the “core” (and counted in rankings) over local publication in local languages. The process marginalises the practice of public sociology at the local level (p60-62). Second, Lui questions (ibid: 63) the default association between “public” and the ideas of “open-minded”, “critical” and “reflexive” reflected in Burawoy’s call (2005, 8) for
a “sociology of publics”. Lui (ibid: 64) suggested that the, “...[p]ublic can be conservative... our public domain is more often overwhelmed by groups and foundations, which are resourceful in terms of finance, political influence.. and connectivity, with a conservative orientation than those that are critical and/or radical”. Third, consequently, he considered the agenda of “global public sociology” problematic given the multiplicities of civil societies on a global scale.

The next two chapters can partially be seen as an empirical verification of Lui TL’s argument. This chapter explores the public sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. It involves a reconsideration of the concept “public” in developing a more symmetric, comprehensive framework for documenting the various modes of sociological public engagement observed in the three locales. The findings also demonstrate how differences in the formations of civil societies framed the patterns of public engagement. The next chapter investigates the impacts of institutional restructuring under the dual influence of “managerialism” and “academic globalism.” The prospect of public sociology will be discussed.

To begin, I will situate the discourse of “public sociology” in the context of the history of sociology. I will review its major critiques, and present a revised
conceptual frame for the empirical investigation. In Sec 7.2-7.4, I will discuss the historical patterns of public sociology in Singapore, Taiwan and Hong Kong. A comparative analysis will be presented in Sec 7.5.

6.1 Public Sociology in Perspective

6.1.1 The Public Commitment of Sociology

The agenda of public sociology is of recent origin, but the tension over the dual identity between the scientific pursuit of sociology and its public commitment could be traced throughout the history of the discipline back to those who were canonized as its founders. Comte and Durkheim, on one hand, were credited for establishing the professional status of sociology as a “positivistic science of society,” which, according to their doctrine, should focus on delivering scientific explanations of social facts and hence be differentiated from the ideology-laden attempts of social reform (Durkheim 1938). On the other hand, Marx, despite his great endeavour to construct a “science” of the capital (1972), passionately argued “the point is to change [the world]” (Marx 1854). Standing somewhere in between, Weber emphasized the distinction between “politics” and “science” with his notion of “value neutrality”, but showed ambitious commitment on both
(Portis 1986). With the varied stance, nonetheless, those thinkers shared similar aspirations to make their intellectual endeavour, as Burawoy put it (ibid, 5), “an angel of history, searching for order in the broken fragments of modernity, seeking to savage the promise of progress.”

The intellectual vision of these 19th century European thinkers was developed into an institutionalized discipline in the United States. As the first generation of American sociologists fought for recognition within academia, however, they were driven by the demand for more scientific status and for a more specialised division of labour to pull back from the initial ambition, which, eventually, was described in 1950 by Lipset and Smesler as the “moral prehistory” of sociology replaced by the “path to science” (1961, 18). This ambition was reclaimed in the 1960s activism, but again alienated from sociologists. In Burawoy’s words (2005: 5) it was “...channeled into the pursuit of academic credentials”. Burawoy referred to this trajectory as “the dialectics of progress” and clearly positioned his call for public sociology within this context as one latest return to the initial moral bearing of this discipline.
6.1.2 Burawoy and His Critiques

Mediating between the conservative mainstreamers that insisted on a professional core and a radical camp that urged a more engaging doctrine, Burawoy tackled the tension by proposing a “division of sociological labours” to grant visibility and legitimacy to its four categories divided by the factors of “audience” (academic vs. extra-academic) and the “type of knowledge” (instrumental vs. reflexive): the professional, critical, policy and public sociologies (Table 6-1). These conceptual dimensions were related to two questions raised by Alfred McClung Lee (Lee, AM): “sociology for whom?” and “sociology for what?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Audience</th>
<th>Extra-Academic Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Knowledge</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive Knowledge</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Burawoy, 2005, Table 1

Table 6-1 Division of Sociological Labour

The case Burawoy presented soon stirred discussion and invited critiques from five perspectives. The first, from the more conservative wing, argued that the agenda may compromise the professional integrity of sociology (Brady 2004; Tittle 2004). One of the “extreme” critics, Mathieu Deflem, even set up a website...
entitled “save sociology” as a “…response to the various forms of attack on sociology as an academic discipline… especially since the advent of so-called ‘public’ sociology.” On the other hand, numerous practitioners of critical sociology welcomed the proposal but expressed discontent around the central status of “professional sociology” in Burawoy’s formulation (e.g., Acker 2005; Ghamari-Tabrizi 2005)— this constitutes the second current of critiques. The two currents of critique reflected the continued relevance of the scientific-public debate today.

The third current stepped back from the ideological confrontational line and questioned the practical feasibility of public sociology given the various institutional constraints (see, for example, Scott 2005)— an attitude that might be termed as “sympathetic reservation-ism”. The fourth current of response challenged the clarity of the conceptual frame. Mclaughlin et al (2005; 2007), for instance, pointed out several conceptual ambiguities in Burawoy’s framework (e.g. the questionable link between “public” and “reflexive”) and discussed its

1. [http://www.cas.sc.edu/socy/faculty/deflem/Savesociology/default.html](http://www.cas.sc.edu/socy/faculty/deflem/Savesociology/default.html) [Assessed 16, 9, 2011]
2. A personal statement of my stance is included in the Epilogue.
inadequacy as a framework for empirical studies (e.g. its failure to consider institutional contexts). Instead, they proposed (2007) a “synthesis model,” which was derived from Steven Brint’s “spheres of knowledge production (Brint 1994), that took into account the academic, disciplinary, audience and institutional setting in an integrated analysis.

I share with third group of critics concerns about the institutional constraints of public sociology, but these writings on Western academia reveal little about the Asian situation. While I agree with McLaughlin and his colleagues on several analytical points, I did not find their sophisticated framework suitable for illuminating the particularities of the investigated cases. The review now leads to the last strand; one I call the “trans-societal critiques”. These critiques take Burawoy on his US-centric bias, pointing out how the power structure at the world scale and cultural and political multiplicities affect the prospect for public sociology. The argument by Lui TL cited in the opening paragraph, as well as the following analysis, embodies this dimension.
6.1.3 Practical Challenges in the Field

I encountered three major challenges when trying to apply Burawoy’s conceptual formation to the empirical study. First, in interviews I found the intuitive grasp of the term “public” among informants varied. There was often initial confusion as to whether “service in the government” or “expert consultancy” (which came closer to the category “policy sociology” in Burawoy’s terms) should be counted as “public”. In fact, quite a number of informants intuitively counted these activities as such. This perceptual variation should not be attributed to the lack of familiarity with the “public sociology” discourse; instead I consider the intuition as a reflection of the cultural bearing of Confucius’ intellectual tradition, which considers “service in the government” a respectable way to serve the public (Sec 6.5.3). In other words, the term “public” in some Asian contexts does not necessarily evoke the impression of “opposition to the powerful.” I agree that a distinction between the two types of extra-academic engagement should be maintained conceptually. However, imposing this narrower definition of “public” in the Asian context had three practical problems. First, a number of figures (such as discussed in Sec 6.2.3) exert their public influence through a delicate mediating between their role as a government partner and as a public
intellectual. Delineating the two roles as distinct failed to reflect the internal coherence some practitioners felt. Second, given the moral ground the term “public sociology” is now acquiring, excluding these practices from the legitimate scope of “public sociology” could be seen as a violent exertion of the researcher’s interpretive power. Third, it runs the risk of being Anglo-centric.

The second challenge, also related to the distinction between policy and public sociology, was that it confounds two conceptual dimensions: type of knowledge and audience. While Burawoy defines the distinction with the former (instrumental vs. reflexive), the primary audience of the ideal typical cases of the two categories also differ (state authorities or corporate clients vs. civil public), despite the fact that both are extra-academic. A plausible reason for this confusion is the affinity between the two aspects as they are both about the political stance in the power relation with the established, the powerful, paradigms or institution— those serving the authorities might tend to impose instrumental knowledge without challenging the basic assumption, whereas those engaged with the civil public were more inclined to employ critical capacity. However, the presence of such affinity will not justify the neglect of those practices whereby the political stances in institutional and epistemological fronts
do not chime together. Examples include advisors who address the authorities with critical challenges to the rationale underlying the current policies, and those serving communities with their instrumental expertise.

Third, the distinction between “traditional” and “organic” public sociology, an aspect that I shall call depth of engagement, can find its counterpart on the policy side. We can consider the “commissioned policy research” and “research briefing to authorities” as “traditional” policy sociology because these modes by nature only involved the dissemination of research findings. By contrast, service as an officer (on secondment), advisor, or board member in government or public bodies could be seen as “organic” policy sociology, since these modes involve closer connections and direct dialogue with extra-academic parties.

6.1.4. Toward a Sorting Template

To cope with the challenges identified above, I appropriated the concept “public” more inclusively to include any engagement with “extra-academic” audiences, which encompassed the right half of Burawoy’s 2x2 table. The revision might slightly depart from the Western etymology of “public”, but it reflects more faithfully how the term (and its translation) was understood in some Asian
context. To distinguish between modes of public engagement amongst sociologists, an ideal-typical framework was devised with three binominal variables: (1) audience: powerful clients (state authorities or corporates) vs. the civil society, (2) the depth of engagement: the traditional, mediated dissemination of sociological knowledge or research outputs (press commentary, website) vs. the organic, direct engagement in an organised way (such as activism or service), and (3) type of knowledge: instrumental vs. reflexive. The three variables create eight possible combinations (see Table 6-2), each of which corresponded to a few modes of practice that were considered fitting to the criteria that define each cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State/Corporate Client</th>
<th>Civil Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Mediated)</td>
<td>Expert Testimony</td>
<td>Expert Account on Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Letter to Authorities</td>
<td>Critical Commentaries on Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Direct)</td>
<td>Expert Consultancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflex. Service in Independent Org</td>
<td>Advocacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service as Gov Advisor</td>
<td>Petition and Protest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2. Modes of Public Engagement of Sociologists
While applying this framework on coding empirical data, the greatest challenge appeared to be the determination on the third dimension (type of knowledge) for two reasons. First, many of the empirical cases examined employed both instrumental and reflexive knowledge, and the difference that could be noted was a matter of degree. Second, the actual coding of each case requires closer scrutiny of the textual evidence from the projects, which made it difficult in the general comparative survey attempted here. Therefore the third variable was dropped from the ‘Sorting Template’ ultimately adopted in the empirical study, which consists of four principal categories defined by the variable “audience” and “depth of engagement.” Each cell includes a number of conceivable modes of practice listed below (see Table 6-3, the second column), from which, however, the relevant data might not be available (the third column, X indicated data unavailability).

This template was used as a guiding apparatus in my field investigation in the three locales. The data availability varied, and those surveyed did not necessarily represent the complete picture. Notably, I have not acquired sufficient data on the “community service” sector to suggest a presentable conclusion. Nonetheless, some significant patterns and contrasts can already be confidently established.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Categories</th>
<th>Mode of Practices</th>
<th>Data Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State/Corporate</td>
<td>Service as Officers or Advisor to Gov/Public Body</td>
<td>Departmental Hand book, Website, Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Commissioned Policy Research</td>
<td>Publication List, Interview, Meta-Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Testimony</td>
<td>Record not available X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Advice to Authorities</td>
<td>Discreet nature X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>Books for Public Readers</td>
<td>Library directory, observation in bookstores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Sociological Website</td>
<td>Online Directory, Searching Engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Commentaries</td>
<td>Interviews, Newspaper database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Talks</td>
<td>Interviews, internet data-mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>Departmental Hand book, Website, Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Advocacy Group</td>
<td>Departmental Hand book, Website, Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petition and Protest</td>
<td>Interviews, Internet data-mining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3: Sorting Template of Public Sociology

### 6.2 Singapore

I will start with Singapore, since this is where the original concept of public sociology was first found inadequate. Singapore is a state known for its "culture of control" (Trocki 2006), "enthralled media"(Seow 1998) and questionable freedom of speech. The reputation makes numerous external observers (informants in Taiwan or Hong Kong) question the possibility for public

---

1 Note that the ordering of the four categories roughly corresponds to the ordering of the "distance to power" — therefore the direct involvement in state or corporate client was placed first, followed by the more detached, traditional mode of "public dissemination" of research to both sort of audience, and at last the organic engagement in the civil sphere which might be strongly oppositional to the authority.
sociology in Singapore. However, when confronted with questions about public sociology, numerous sociologists in Singapore disagreed with the stereotyped impressions suggested and stressed that many colleagues were committed to public causes. Singaporean sociologists, it was argued, were just making their contribution via different channels—usually the more institutionalized, politically-agreeable channels. This systematic bias leads to a discussion of the alleged “state control” and the mechanism of self-censorship (Sec 6.2.2).

Nonetheless, there were a few Singaporean sociologists who managed to exert a critical influence over the public discourse (Sec 6.2.3).

6.2.1 Policy Research/Consultancy vs. Limited Public Dissemination

Sociology in Singapore has historically engaged closely in public issues, in particular in the 1970s-1980s when sociological expertise was in great demand in numerous state-funded projects to meet the challenges of nation building (Sec 5.5.3). As one interviewee (SG12) put it, the “…state was the systematic employer of sociology, and it took an applied approach. This particular variation of public sociology believes that the contribution of sociology was to shape public policy”.

The research orientation then had four domains of concentration: (1) industrialization, (2) urbanization, (3) changing demographic structure, and (4) so-called “sociocultural patterns”—such as national identity, ethnic relations, and multilingualism. The department also emphasised its active role in providing consultancy. On the other hand, general public access to sociological expertise and knowledge was fairly limited. Although Singaporean sociologists wrote numerous interesting books about Singapore, their availability via most retailing channels is limited. With a few exceptions (Sec 6.2.3), it was neither a common practice for Singaporean sociologists to write commentary in newspapers, to accept media interview or to address a public audience. A few sociologists were involved in advocacy groups—for instance, Vivian Wee and Nirmala Purushotam in the AWARE (Association of Women for Action and Research). But I am not aware of anything seriously critical to authority attempted by sociologists in Singapore.

---

2 National University of Singapore, Department of Sociology, Handbooks 1984-1998
3 I sampled several sizable bookstores during my visiting stay, including the Kinokuniya bookstore on Orchard Road (the largest in the city), Borders, two branches of Popular Bookstore, and all the bookshop in the Bras Basah Complex (the major book shopping complex). However, I found limited writing on Singapore Society. There were only two retailers more resourceful in this respect, the NUS press bookshop in the NUS campus, and the Select bookshop which was hidden among many upscale art piece shops in a quiet building on Tanglin Rd. Both were not in convenient location for ordinary consumers, and the owner of the latter was alleged to “have been told not to stock certain titles (SG4).”
6.2.2 “OB markers” and Self-Censorship

A persistent theme was the practice of self-censorship. It was generally agreed in Singapore that there were certain “OB markers” (out of bound markers) you are not supposed to transgress. The perception of where these lines really are, and what consequence and offenses they imply, were however varied. Some considered certain topics too sensitive to write about (for example migrant workers, the integrity of juridical system, or “issues related to Lee KY family”), while others consider only “stepping out of your role as an academics (SG2)” as risky. The latter was simply implied in citations of a few notable cases, for instance one expatriate recalled an incident in 1985 in which:

“... there were two researchers who had worked for a long time on the labour relations in Singapore and they have gave a what is supposed to be a close door talk on the ‘history of labour movement’ in Singapore... and suddenly they were told to leave within 24 hours (SG7)”

Seeing incidents like this, the informant “… consciously chose not to write anything about Singapore.” Two often cited cases were of Christopher Lingle and
Chee Soon-Juan. Lingle, a former NUS economist who was charged with “contempt of court” for an essay he wrote for the *International Herald Tribune* in 1994, in which he accused an unnamed Asian regime of relying on a “compliant judiciary to bankrupt politicians”. He flew to United States after being interrogated to avoid paying the enormous fine (Haas 1999:32). Chee Soon-Juan, a former NUS psychologist, joined the oppositional Singaporean Democratic Party in 1992, and was fired a few months later by the Department Head (a PAP member of Parliament) for allegedly “misuse” of research funds to send his wife’s doctoral dissertation to the United States (Tamney 1996:64). More recently, anecdotal accounts about the departure (in some case because of the unexpected termination of contract) of some former colleagues who happened to have written critically were occasionally told with varied interpretations; however there was no way to ascertain the causal connection.

These stories shared the core feature that they inevitably contained known facts, claims made by the person involved which were potentially distorted, and speculation. Indeed, there was no certain way to objectively fathom the extent to which the government exerted the degree of control interpreted by some observers. In other word, the perceived risk of falling victim to state action was at
least partially (and inevitably) constructed by actors within the system. This was not to say that the sense of fear was ‘fake’— instead they are based on certain facts, and any suspected exaggeration was due to the questionable transparency of, and the lack of trust in, the official account. A senior informant explained the elusive nature of the mechanism:

“...The line was naturally difficult to map. If you ask those who are in power, they can’t neither specify where it is. Different people observed different lines; the objective line others set for you also varied. (SG10)”

In short, the perception of the existence of certain boundaries was prevalent, but such boundaries were, to a large extent, a “reality” constructed in the dynamic process that might involve exaggeration, speculation, and a reinterpretation of various agents in a few extreme cases. It can hardly be proved in any objective way. The uncertainty of such boundaries however made it rational to step back in order to prevent risky consequences and this tends to create a politically conservative culture. One senior informant (SG2) observed “there were very few people in Singapore, academic included; who are really able to be seriously critical to PAP... they think too highly of themselves, they think the government
would go after them.” In fact, he observed that academic freedom in Singapore is
greater than many had assumed. Moreover, as I will demonstrate in the next
section, these boundaries are, to a degree, negotiable.

6.2.3 Trading in the Middle: the Art of being Critical

There were, despite the prevailing sense of ‘state control’, a few sociologists who
engaged with the public more often—sometimes in ways critical to the
government. Chua Beng-Huat (蔡明發) was often the first name suggested when
informants were asked to identify those colleagues who were known to be
openly critical about the government. Chua, a Singaporean, completed
postgraduate studies in the University of York in Canada in the 1970s, where he
was exposed to rising critical theories. His university web profile¹ described
that he “returned to Singapore in 1984 to take up the Director of Research post at
the HDB but was fired from that job for his critical writings on Singapore politics.”
He subsequently joined the NUS where he “brought Foucault and postmodernism
to the department” and continued to write critically on issues like housing and
the privatization of education (Khondker 2000:116) Chua was often considered
to be the target of a remark Lee Kuan-Yew made in his 1992 Chinese New Year

speech, in which he expressed concern as to the influence of some contemporary Western thoughts on young academics. “Do not just accept what Western liberal sociologists tell you. Ask how it has worked in Singapore,” Lee said (Strait Times, 9 Feb, 1992). A later article by Chua (Sunday Times, 3, Oct, 1993) on rising living costs in Singapore was mentioned in the Parliamentary Debate. Lim Boon-Heng, then a Minister in charge of the Cost Review Committee, chided “As a sociologist in our university, he should read the Report before he passes judgment” (Parliamentary Debates, 1993, 718). The two incidents made Chua “the most publicly-scolded sociologist in the country,” and there was speculation that Chua would soon be fired (SG2). However, he stayed on, and instilled a critical angle in his academic writing; for example Communitarian Ideology and Democracy in Singapore (1995) and Political Legitimacy and Housing (1997).

Another figure was Kuo Kien-Wen (郭建文), whose commitment to public affairs could be traced to his earlier involvement in the 1970s student movement. Kuo returned Singapore in 1991 and continued to appear as an invited speaker on various occasions organized by various civil groups—including the radical journal Tangent and the independent centre for critical art The Substation.

Meanwhile, he kept a tractable record of services in government-related bodies
like the National Heritage Board and National Archive.

The first two figures were often considered as the prime examples of the critical engagement of sociologists in Singapore, however, my browsing of their writing to date gave me the impression that they were still operating within a ‘softer’ range of issues (such as specific policy, culture and consumerism) without engaging deeper on the hard core ones that directly confronted the legitimacy of PAP rules (for example the election system, judicial system). Even on occasions where they came across more sensitive themes, the wording was fine-tuned within a range that avoided being provocative. This impression was supported by a number of informants I interviewed. A senior scholar commented on Kuo and Chua as “relatively critical, but they did not touch on hard issues, which was the bottom line. That remained untouchable in Singapore. In particular, teaching in the universities made you to be considered part of the institution (SG10).”

Another informant described Chua as successful in “striking a balance between criticism and involvement ...[and]... trading in the middle (SG12).”

There were some others who were of relatively higher visibility in the mass media. They, too, demonstrated the art of balancing between “criticism and
involvement.” Eddie Kuo (郭振羽), now Emeritus Professor of Nanyang Technological University, had studied and taught in Taiwan and the United States before joining the NUS Sociology Department in 1973. He became the Founding Dean of the School of Communication and Information at Nanyang in 1992-2003, and subsequently served in the Council of the University. He had also chaired various government committees related to publishing regulations and media policies. His high profile in sectors of higher education and media made him a popular interviewee on issues related to the two sectors— which was occasionally critical. Eddie Kuo had reminded his junior colleagues that the comments he gave didn't guarantee that it would be acceptable for these juniors to say the same thing. What Eddie Kuo “had done or said before,” the informant explained, “secured the qualification to say things at a certain level without getting into trouble... (SG10).”

Syed Farid Alatas, who was actively involved in the statutory body Majilis Ugama Islam Singapura (MUIS, Islamic Religious Council in Singapore), often gave public lectures and press commentaries on issues related to the Muslim community. He might say things critical in the interviews, but as one observer indicated, Alatas “was not subversive and... the government know enough about [him]” (SG9).
6.3 Hong Kong

Compared with their colleagues in Singapore, Sociologists in Hong Kong were rarely approached by the colonial government for policy consultancy (Sec 6.3.1), and there was no perceived risk of criticising the government. Many scholars who came to Hong Kong after WWII noted the clearer sense of “freedom” in the colony—especially when compared with either Chinese mainland or Taiwan where the ideological confrontation placed strict constraints on expressions of thought (e.g., Yu 1998). Though not part of the main stream, there were a number of sociologists who engaged the audience beyond the academic circle via various modes. But the recent higher education restructuring, as Lui indicated (2007c) placed some challenges on stakeholders, and triggered quite complicated responses.

6.3.1 Distance to Power

The sociologists in Hong Kong were never involved in the policy process in any comparable level like their Singaporean colleagues. An informant who had served at the university senior administrative level described:
“...the British colonial government basically did not trust, and was not willing to commission, the domestic scholars for research. There might be certain political considerations— not willing to disclose too much information, and was reluctant to have domestic scholars involved in politics. (HK15)"

The more popular practice, by contrast, was to commission a few scholars from the UK or other commonwealth countries to write a report based on a short research visit. Similarly, there had been no academic sociologists who had served any significant role within the colonial administration. After 1997, the engagement of academic sociologists in the policy process remained fairly limited. On the one hand the universities were given the mission to pursue “international excellence;” on the other hand, the administration had developed its own system of research and evaluation. However, there were a few sociologists absorbed into the institution – notably the appointments of Lau Siu-Kai (CUHK) and Li Ming-Kun (HKPU) to the Central Planning Unit (CPU). I will discuss these in the next section.

---

1 Some early administrators, on the other hand, showed their sociological interests and contributed to either the activities of HKRAS (Sec 3.3.3) or the first few collections of sociological studies of Hong Kong (Sec 5.2.2).
6.3.2 Public Intellectuals (Second Cohort)

There were a few sociologists in Hong Kong who communicated beyond the academic audience. Of the senior sociologists, Ambrose King had already made his name in Taiwan before arriving in Hong Kong because of his earlier but influential collection about the modernization of China (King 1966). In 1977, after the termination of the formal diplomatic relationship between the United States and the Republic of China (Taiwan), King wrote a commentary published on both Mingpao Monthly (明報月刊) and on the China Times in Taiwan\(^1\) — marking the beginning of his continuous political writing about Taiwan, Hong Kong and Chinese mainland (King 2001). His achievement certainly embodied an ideal as a public intellectual, however, the audience he was addressing, and the influence he achieved, was perhaps greater in Taiwan and later in the broader Chinese speaking world—instead of Hong Kong itself. In fact, most of his monographs were actually published in Taiwan.

Of King’s cohort, Lau Siu-Kai (劉兆佳) and Lee, Ming-kwan (李明堃) were two sociologists with a more visible public profile on issues relating to Hong Kong.

\(^1\) He contended that the diplomatic setback would not stop Taiwan from finding a way of survival, disseminating an optimism to the island when it was most needed.
The pair shared similarities in their career trajectory.—They became HKU classmates (with Wong Siu-Lun) in the newly founded Faculty of Social Science in the aftermath of the 1967 left-wing riots, where they all joined the student publication *Undergrad* (學苑) as editors. Lau and Lee were both known for their writing on Hong Kong politics and society (Lau 1982; Lee, MK 1987), and both wrote extensively for public readers in relevant topics — in particular issues related to the erstwhile forthcoming handover in 1997. A journalist of *Wide-Angle Len* magazine suggested the writing of both "brought sociological theories to the local, lived context," and acclaimed them as “truly sociologists of Hong Kong’ (Wong, KK 1985). Their prominent public profile placed them (along with Wong Siu-Lun) on the short list of “Hong Kong Affair Consultants!” employed by the Chinese government to “provide advice on the peaceful transition and the maintenance of prosperity and stability.” After the handover, they were both appointed to the Central Policy Unit (CPU), an advisory institution inherited from the colonial administration. This political move represented an attempt of the HKSAR government (or the Chinese government behind it) to broaden its political legitimacy. The cooperation, therefore, was

---

1 This title was controversial. It was seen as official recognition from the Chinese government and was highly sought for in some cases, but on the other hand, the list had been criticizes as lack of opposition and ideological diversity.
controversial. It could be seen as an institutional path to contribute to the public good, but some more radical observer inevitably considered the accepting of such appointment as a manifestation of their compliance to the new regime.\(^1\)

6.3.3 Public Intellectual (Third Cohort): Three Currents

Of the third cohort of sociologists (the baby-boomers with stronger Hong Kong identities), there emerged more sociologists with higher public visibility, who can roughly be sorted into three types: (1) Lui Tak-Lok (呂大樂) and Ng Chun-Hung (吳俊雄) who wrote about the culture and society of Hong Kong, (2) Chan Kin-Man (陳健民) who took a more engaging approach in the development of civil society in greater China, and (3) the HKBU-based triad of Fred Chiu (邱延亮), Luk Tak-Chuen (陸德泉) and Leung Hon-Chu (梁漢柱), who represented the radical wing of activism among sociologists in Hong Kong.

Lui and Ng shared lots of similarities in their career trajectories. They were both born in Hong Kong and both grew up in the “MacLehose Years”. They developed great interest in popular culture before entering the university, and became

\(^1\) Liu SK, after joining the government, had publicly announced his “four no principle”- no comment on Beijing’s policies, no comment on other minister’s words and act, no confrontation with the government, and no objection to the HKSAR policies. See http://www.com.cuhk.edu.hk/ubeat_past/031259/political_ppl_01.htm
editors (like Lau SK and Lee MK) of *Undergrad* while studying in HKU. They went to England in the early 1980s and returned to teach after the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration about Hong Kong’s future was announced. Ng obtained a PhD in Essex in 1990 when he was in HKU and Lui got DPhil from Oxford in the next year when he was teaching in the CUHK. Lui and Ng both became widely known in Hong Kong for their public writings, news commentaries, radio talks, and Lui also chaired the Hong Kong think tank ‘SynergyNet’ (新力量網路). Compared with Lau SK and Lee MK, Lui TL and Ng CH paid more attention to culture and its meanings (see, for instance, Lui 1983; Ng and Cheung 2002)— even in Lui’s writing about the cohort structure (2007a) and social class (2004). In 2002-2003, Lui, Ng, and Eric Ma (馬傑偉) initiated the Chinese (Cantonese)-medium conference series “Hong Kong Culture and Society” to communicate and encourage Hong Kong studies in the local language. The triad have so far, rotated the role of first editor and have produced three conference proceedings from the conference series (Ng, Ma et al. 2005b; Ma, Ng et al. 2009; Lui, Ng et al. 2010).

1 Lui joined HKU in 2009.
2 See the committee list on SynergyNet’s website http://www.synergynet.org.hk/b5_about4.php
3 Noteworthy, a number of observers pointed out that Lui could managed doing so by conducting a “double life”— he wrote hard core dry, empirical analysis of the social class and mobility for academic journals to establish himself institutionally so that he could wrote the inspiring, interpretive pieces for the general public (HK5, HK22).
4 PhD London, Professor in Mass Communication, CUHK
which have greatly enriched the literature of Hong Kong in the local language.

Their focus on culture might be associated with the broader “cultural turn” in sociology after the 1980s, or with their British training background. But the cardinal factor should be that they grew up in an era when Hong Kong started to develop a cultural consciousness (Ng, Ma et al. 2005a, 1), and this sense of cultural particularity was found to be the only secure ground for anchoring their sense of identity when the political fate of the entire colony was deprived from their hand. Ng (2005, vii) recalled his return to Hong Kong in 1985:

“... The China-UK Joint declaration was already settled. The Brits were retreating, the Chinese were in the future, and Hong Kong people were looking for themselves. I looked around: the labour in Hong Kong remained barely visible, the politics was staggering under the renovated colonial administration, the only thing inspiring turned out to be Anita Mui, Alan Tam, and my schoolmate Chow Yun-Fat. ... then I had a big fever, an obsession with the Hong Kong pop culture...”

This enthusiasm with culture however was accompanied by a frustration

---

1Anita Mui (梅艷芳), Alan Tam (譚詠麟) and Chow Yun-Fat (周潤發) were all Hong Kong pop singers or movie stars.
deriving from a lack of agency in the political process towards the reunion with China. In one of his recent best-selling titles (2007b), Lui concluded the core message was “to continue voicing how we felt about Hong Kong, whether it is politically correct or not.”

There were others, meanwhile, who took the reunion with China as an opportunity for broader engagement. Chan Kin-Man, for instance, has managed to conduct a career of public engagement in both Hong Kong and China. Chan had studied in CUHK and Yale before started teaching in 1993 in CUHK. His publications reflected an intellectual trajectory gradually moving from an early interest on corruption to the later concern of NGOs and civil sphere in Chinese societies¹. He has engaged with the public not only through his frequent commentaries on the mixture of media², but also through direct involvement in various government committees, forums, corporations (as an independent member of board) and civil groups in both Hong Kong and China³. Notably, he collaborated with a group of intellectuals and professionals in the founding of the

¹ See his publication list on http://chankinman.wordpress.com/academic/ [Assessed 21, Sept, 2011]
³ http://chankinman.wordpress.com/about_me/
“Hong Kong Democratic Development Network” (香港民主發展網路) in 2002.

Compared with Lui and Ng, Chan represented a deeper (or more “organic”) mode of engagement in both the government and the civil fronts, and he focused on the more hard-core issues of politics and democracy. But his concern expanded to greater China, diluting the thin scholarly attention Hong Kong received.

Sociologists in Hong Kong rarely became involved in activism of a more radical or confrontational nature beyond press commentaries or involvement in civil groups. There was however an episode of exception which took place in the 1990s Hong Kong Baptist College (University). The Baptist College was upgraded from a 2-year institution to a 3-year state-funded college in 1990. The upgrading demanded more staff. William T. Liu, a Chicago-based psychologist, was appointed as the Dean of Faculty of Social Sciences, and five members were subsequently recruited from the United States to serve the sociology department—including the critically-minded Fred Chiu, Luk Tak-Chuen and Leung Hon-Chu. The “accidental” synergy of the three, under a supportive Dean and Department Head, was consequential. They offered teaching course of more critical nature, brought students on field trips to factories, helped establish the Staff Union, contributed a current of left-wing critiques on the media, and at their
height, got involved in staging the student protest against the 2005 WTO conference in Hong Kong (interviews HK5, HK6, HK22).

6.3.4 Managerialism and Academic Globalism: Impacts and Reactions

Despite the growth of public engagement among the third cohort of sociologists, the higher education institutions were simultaneously restructured in a way that reflected a penetrating “managerialism” and “academic globalism,” greatly restricting the space for practicing public sociology (See Ch7 for more detailed discussion). In 2008, the Hong Kong Sociological Association (HKSA) devoted the first session of its new initiative “HKSA Public Seminar” to the topic “Public Sociology in Hong Kong,” and invited Ng CH and Eric Ma, two speakers “experienced in practicing public sociology” to share their view. The talk, however, turned out to be a lament of the difficulty of practicing public sociology within the current institutional circumstance in Hong Kong. In particular, the speakers stressed that they were at least people “on the shore” (with tenure), and the pressure for junior staff was only greater.

---

The three currents of public participation reviewed above had different trajectories. First, Lui and Ng, both with secure institutional positions, made great efforts to encourage (or rescue) Hong Kong studies and their public dissemination. The “Hong Kong Culture and Society” conference series was one major, and to a degree successful\(^1\), attempt. The HKSA ‘Public Seminar’ established in 2008 was an initiative that evolved in a similar vein. In the short run, these reactions ironically created a resurgence of scholarly interests around Hong Kong, but a pessimistic sense about the future was still evident even amongst the most devoted practitioners. Second, the northbound projection of public engagement in China represented by Chan KM was brought forward by a few younger scholars. A notable case was the series of ‘action research’ undertaken by Pun Ngai\(^2\) (潘毅) and Ku Ho-Bun (古學斌). Both Pun and Ku had migrated from China in childhood, studied in SOAS, taught in HKPU (which has established firm ties with numerous Chinese institutions), and had a commitment to the underclass in China. They took the action research approach

\(^{1}\) Some students I met described the popularity of these texts in their generation.

\(^{2}\) Pun won the C Wright Mills Award in 2005 for her study of the female migrant worker in Southern China. She was doing well in the prestigious Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, but decided to join Ku in HKPU— a less prestigious institution which was historically specialized in training social workers. It was suggested by an observer that the decision was made because HKPU has closer tie with numerous social welfare institution in China and less demand on publishing. So “she can really focus on what she think is worthy” (HK10).
to set up a restaurant-pub in a migrant labour community in Beijing suburb as a base for both researching and empowering. Third, the current of radical activism in HKBU, however, was largely extinguished. The HKBU administrative team, under the mounting pressure of assessments, replaced the Department Head to implement its policies. Eventually Fred Chiu and Luk Tak-Chuen both left the department.¹

Before closing this section, a passing observation about Hong Kong could be noted. During my visits there, I have participated in a few events held in the "HK Reader bookstore" (序言書室) or "HKFS Social Movement Resource Centre", arguably two important hubs within the emerging civil network in Hong Kong today. I conversed with some activists or civil group participants on these occasions about their concerns and their perceptions of the contribution of sociologists to the issues in question. The general impression was a feeling that many pressing public issues did not receive sufficient attention from sociologists. The demand of discourse is now met by civil intellectual and media commentators whose writing is however limited by their lack of a more rigorous

¹ Chiu moved to the Institute of Ethnology of Academia Sinica in Taipei. Luk worked for Oxfam for a couple of years and move to teach in China.
methodological or theoretical training. Those people I met acknowledged the contribution of the figures I reviewed, but considered (from their more radical perspective) Lui and Ng “too conservative” and argued that they did not engage in harder issues where more confrontation is needed. Chan was described as “relevant” but “too busy”¹. These rudimentary observations invite more inquiries into the issues of access to sociological knowledge within the civil sphere.

6.4 Taiwan: Vibrant Civil Engagement since 1980s

Sociology was re-established in Taiwan accompanied with a general distrust from the government. Its involvement in policy remained limited considering the size of the nation and the community. Self-censorship was also common, but a stream of press commentaries by a few sociologists emerged in the 1970s. This current of public engagement acquired much of its energy in the process of political democratization in the late 1980s, and has now evolved to include a wide array of practices that range from press commentary, public talks, involvement in various civil groups and occasional confrontations with authority. Even their scholarly sociological writings are more available to public readers in forms of monographs or edited collections distributed to major bookstores.

¹ Field note, 28, Nov, 2009
6.4.1 The Weak Link with the Government

The commitment to public and political engagement was integral to the pre-1949 Chinese sociological tradition. This legacy, however, was only partially brought to Taiwan as the critical wing among the Chinese sociologists tended to stay in China (Sec 3.3.2). Those who moved to Taiwan still possessed a conviction to contribute sociological knowledge for the public good, but only in politically agreeable ways (particularly under the suppressive KMT-surveillance). An emphasis on the applied value of sociology (on social work and social policies) was evident in the early development of sociology. A significant portion of the faculty members had related expertise.

Collaborations between sociologists and the government were however not common, especially when compared with Singapore, partially due to the historical tension between the KMT and sociologists back in 1940s China (Sec 3.3.2). The government’s familiarity with the discipline remained limited when it was restored in Taiwan (Lung 1963). A mid-1980s survey asked 35 sociologists how they evaluate the “government’s impression on sociology,” and 17 opted for either “persistent ignorance” or “persistent misunderstanding” while only one
identified “persistent emphasis”\(^1\) (Hsiao, Michael H.H. 1987, 368). Throughout the 1980s and 90s there were only about one hundred policy research projects commissioned amongst sociologists, which was of an insignificant ratio in relation to the amount of commissioned research and the size of the professional community. The number further dropped after 2000 (Wang, JH and Chu 2003).

Through the years, only a few sociologists got involved in government service while retaining an academic identity\(^2\). Michael Hsiao (蕭新煌), for instance, had been appointed Presidential Advisor for a decade, serving the national leader of both parties. His colleague in Academia Sinica, Yi Chin-Chun (伊慶春), had been a board member of the Taiwan Provincial Government\(^3\).

6.4.2 Political Democratization and the Emerging Civil Space

On the other hand, sociologist, in particular those of the third and later cohorts,

---

\(^1\) Other responses: 12 tick “growing understanding” and 3 tick “growing emphasis.”

\(^2\) There were, by contrast, a number of sociologists switching to the career of professional politics. Guo Ji (郭骥), one the first few who migrated from China, continued a career within the KMT party. Huang Da-Chou (黃大洲), one of the first few sociologist trained post-war later became Taipei city mayor. Pang Chien-Kuo (龐建國), Ting Tin-yu (丁庭宇) and demographist James Hsueh (薛承泰) all had full-time teaching job in NTU before pursuing political career. Pang and Ting were both legislators, Ting is now the Deputy Mayor of Taipei City. Hsueh has served as the head of Bureau of Social Affair in Taipei City Government and is now a cabinet member.

\(^3\) Lin Wan-Yi (林萬億), who been affiliated to the NTU sociology department, was another often mentioned case. He had served as the Deputy County Chief of Taipei County and is a main architect behind the social welfare policies of the Democracy Promotion Party (DPP). But he is by training a social welfare expert.
found a larger stage in the broadly conceived civil space that consisted first of a number of mainstream newspapers and magazines, and later the enriched possibilities of activism in various sorts of organised ways. This current of influence can be traced back to late 1960s during which a number of scholars after returning to Taiwan with American PhDs started to form a small network through their participation in *Thought and Words* (思與言), a journal of the humanities and social science, and the *University Magazine* (大學雜誌). In the mid-1970s, they were invited to contribute columns for *United Daily* (聯合報) and *China Times* (中國時報), two mainstream newspapers founded by intellectual entrepreneurs with a sense of humanistic idealism (See 6.5.3), and the later founded *Independent Evening News* (自立晚報).

This group of writers, influenced by both traditional Chinese intellectual idealism and the American idea of democracy, played a critical role in disseminating concepts such as liberty, equality, democracy & pluralism under authoritarian rule. They were therefore referred to as the “liberal scholars” (自由派學者) to signify their standing in relation to the conservative authoritarian regime, and they were considered as one constructive force to eventual political democratisation in the late 1980s (Chiu, HY 1999). A few sociologists of the
second (Wen CI) and third cohort (Hsiao M, Chiu HY and Yeh CJ) joined the group in the 1970s. Hong Kong-based Ambrose King also made regular contributions. Some junior sociologists attributed their interest in the profession to the contributions of these practitioners. However, writing under such a suppressive climate, they made some compromises to avoid being excessively provocative¹. Hence they were also criticised by later writers from more radical stances for “waging (a) political stance” when “mediating between the KMT and the Tang-wai” (黨外 literally 'out of the party', referring to the grassroots opposition force which later became the basis for the rise of DPP) (Fu 1995).

The abolition of Martial Law in 1987 opened up a more secure space for public engagement amongst sociologists in a more organized way. Some younger intellectuals who were discontented with these liberal scholars founded the radical society Taishe (台社 Sec 5.5.1) and its associated journal in 1988 (Fu, ibid).

In 1989, twenty one academics broadly identified as the “liberal scholars” formed the Taipei Society (澄社) which was remotely modelled on Fabien Society with

---

¹ Michael Hsiao recalled that his had to conceal writing about “indigenization” (a forbidden theme as it imply an separation from China) in the disguise of “Sinicization.” The writing of these liberal scholars under the authoritarian time often involves a delicate balance in order not to be riskily offensive, which shows some resemblance with the art of “mediating in the middle” demonstrated by the public-minded Singaporean sociologists reviewed in Sec 6.2.3.
two different orientations: the ideological leaning to a “modernized liberalism” instead of the moderate socialism that characterised Fabien, and it remained a “limitedly politicized” role with the stated principle of “commenting without directly engaging the politics” (論政不參政) (Yang, KS 1989).

The 1980s was also remembered by many sociologists of the younger cohort as a definitive period for anchoring their vocation in the discipline. An informant who attended university in the 1980s recalled why he chose sociology for career:

“It was out of question why study sociology in our cohort... The student movement was rampant, and many social movements were emerging. The student activists of our cohort sought answers in scholarly writing. Sociology simply became popular at a time of tremendous transition... (TW10)”

The sociology department of the National Taiwan University then was described as an “oasis of student movement (TW18).” The Wild Lilly Student Movement staged in March, 1990, marked a significant milestone. The demand made by the student protestors was responded to favourably by the President Lee Teng-Hui...
leading to a series of political reforms. Many sociologists had participated in, or witnessed the incident either as students or staff, and that had therefore inherited the conviction that knowledge has the power to lead social reform.

6.4.3 Contemporary Practices: Dissemination and Engagement

This momentum was carried on in the next two decades, and the public engagement of sociologists multiplied in many areas. Chui Hei-yuan, a high profile sociologist who wrote 31 press commentaries between 1979 and 1987, contributed over six hundred articles on press in the 1990s. He and other sociologists made a visible contribution to newspaper columns and forums.

There were 370 domestic books in sociology published in the 1990s, which counted for 56% of all published titles in the second half of 20th century (Wang, CZ 2002, Appendix Table 2-5). Almost all these books were written in Chinese.

---

1 The favourable reception by Lee Teng-Hui, however, should be contextualized for proper interpretation. Lee had just succeeded the perished former leader Chiang Chin-Kuo in 1988. As the first Taiwanese native political leader leading a regime largely controlled by mainlander immigrants, he was in need for more political legitimacy. Moreover, the peaceful resolution of the Wild Lilly Movement showed a desired contrast with the Tianmen Square Killing not long before.


3 I searched the database of the two mainstream newspaper corps (United Daily and China Times) for contributions (2000-2004) in which the author was identified as affiliated to a sociology department or institutes. I found a steady flow around 40-50 contributions annually. This is still an underestimate as there were often cases in which the departmental affiliation is not specified.
and many were easily available in major bookstores. While there were no reliable statistics, most informants indicated that they, or their colleagues, have been involved in delivering talks to non-academic audiences in various occasions organized by bookshops, media, public bodies, civil groups or high school. With the growth of internet technology in the last decade, sociologists became increasingly involved in establishing a number of topical websites aimed at facilitating the teaching of sociological courses, encouraging participatory dialogue around timely social issues, and disseminating sociological discourse to broader audience. Moreover, a smaller but significant number of sociologists also became directly involved in various organizations that were set up to advocate and facilitate a variety of reforms. Table 6-4 lists a recent sample of sociologist that were involved in organized intervention on issues ranging from reform in juridical system, medical institutions, women's movements, deliberative democracy, the labour movement, environmental issues and the reconciliation of historical trauma. In Feb 2012, the Taiwan Higher Education Industrial Union was founded (as a counter-action to the penetration of

managerialism and academic globalism discussed in the next chapter) and there were eleven sociologists listed as its founding members¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociologist</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>PhD Year</th>
<th>Organization/Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chui, Hei-yuan</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>Indiana ’79</td>
<td>Judicial Reform Foundation&lt;br&gt;Death-penalty Abolishment Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Li-Yun</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>John Hopkins ’80</td>
<td>Medical Reform Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Mao-Kuei</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>Purdue ’84</td>
<td>Mainlander Taiwanese Association (Ethnical Reconciliation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku Chung-hua</td>
<td>National Cheng-Chi University</td>
<td>Heidelberg ’87</td>
<td>Citizen Congress Watch&lt;br&gt;Judicial Reform Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Jing-Fen</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>Ohio ’89</td>
<td>Awakening Foundation (Women Mvt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Dong-Shen</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Minnesota ’90&lt;br&gt;Yale ’97&lt;br&gt;Illinois ’97</td>
<td>Promoting Deliberative Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Kuo-Ming</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Heidelberg ’94</td>
<td>Judicial Reform Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Duan</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Florida ’97</td>
<td>Nanyang Sisters Association (Female Marriage Immigrant Right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia Hsiao-Chuan</td>
<td>Shi-Hsin University</td>
<td>Florida ’97</td>
<td>Nanyang Sisters Association (Female Marriage Immigrant Right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Yun</td>
<td>National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Yale ’00</td>
<td>Awakening Foundation (Women Mvt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dai Po-Fen</td>
<td>Fu Jen University</td>
<td>NTU ’00 (Urban Planning)</td>
<td>Higher Education Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Chin-Ju</td>
<td>Kaohsiung Medical University</td>
<td>Essex ’03</td>
<td>Nanyang Sisters Association (Migrant Right)&lt;br&gt;Southern Aboriginal Community Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shen Hsiu-Hua</td>
<td>Tsing-Hua Univ</td>
<td>Kansas ’03</td>
<td>Awakening Foundation (Women Mvt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke Chao-Ching</td>
<td>Chiao-Tung Univ</td>
<td>Tunghai ’07</td>
<td>Taiwan Association for Truth and Reconciliation (Transitional Justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang Shih-Hao</td>
<td>National Formosa University</td>
<td>Warwick ’08</td>
<td>Green Citizen Action Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai Pei-Hui</td>
<td>Shih-Hsin</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Taiwan Agricultural Frontline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu Hua-Mei</td>
<td>Nat Sun Yat-Sen Univ</td>
<td>Essex, ’10</td>
<td>Citizen of Earth, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu Yu-Bin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Essex,’10</td>
<td>Involvement in various labour unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-4 Cases of Organized Public Engagement of Taiwanese Sociologists

Many sociologists without routine engagement in certain NGOs were involved in

¹ See the Union website [http://thetu.blogspot.com/](http://thetu.blogspot.com/)
other confrontational initiatives (petitions, and occasional protest) as either initiators or supporters. Between 2010 and 2011 I received a number of petitions forwarded by other sociologists on issues related to labour rights, media reform, and higher education policy. A significant incident was the Wild Strawberry Movement (野草莓運動) initiated by the NTU sociologist Li Ming-Tsun (李明璁) on 6, Nov, 2008 to protest against the excessive use of police force during the visit of Chen Yun-Lin, a high ranking officer from China, and the controversial *Parade and Assembly Law* (集會遊行法) that legitimated such police action. The protest led to legal charges against Li MT because of his violation of what he was protesting against. This incident elicited the Taiwanese Sociological Association to issue an open statement on 19, Aug, 2009 to urge for revisions to the law and suspension of related trials of its members. A more recent incident was an open statement signed by the heads of all major sociology departments in Taiwan on 30 March 2012 to urge for a review of urban regeneration policies, as a response to a violent state operation that torn down a civilian property against the will of the owner and hundreds of supporting

---

1 The *Parade and Assembly Law* require prior application for staging parade and assembly in public space. Supporters appealed to the importance of social order. Critics indicated that the law restricted the freedom of expression.

protestors two days ago.

6.5 Comparative Analysis

A summary is presented in Table 7-4, with three different shadings indicating my subjective impression of the relative significance of activities (dark grey for strong, grey for moderate, light grey for a few, and white for barely existing) in each sector based on the material reviewed. Three points should be acknowledged. (1) The categories were sorted roughly in the sequence of “distance to the authority power.” So categories that are higher up on the table represent a closer affinity to government or corporate clients; lower represents the civil sphere, and even to the extent of being confrontational to the government. (2) The top or the bottom of the table both represent the more ‘organic’ modes of participation, while the central lines correspond to more ‘traditional’ modes that involve the dissemination of sociological knowledge. (3) The table is limited in that it cannot include the historical dimension; in other words, it can only present a ‘temporally-compressed’ picture.

1. http://www.coolloud.org.tw/node/67578 Yang You-Ren, a sociologist from Tunghai, even moved his lecture on “urban sociology” (along with all the students) to the site of the ruin.

2. The category ‘community service’ that appeared in the original sorting template was removed because of insufficient material collected on this sector to draw more substantial remark.

3. Readers can read the table as my personal response on a series of four-point Likert-scale questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>TAIWAN</th>
<th>HONG KONG</th>
<th>SINGAPORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service to Government or Public Bodies</td>
<td>A few notable senior scholars appointed.</td>
<td>None in colonial time. Lau, SK, Lee, MK appointed to CPU, 2002</td>
<td>Significant ratio of NUS faculty members (all SG national) involved in gov or public bodies. Gradually declined in the last decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Research</td>
<td>Limited. Roughly a hundred projects in 80s-90s, significant decrease afterward</td>
<td>Little. &quot;They prefer inviting foreign scholars&quot;</td>
<td>Extensive initially, declining since 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website by sociologists</td>
<td>Resource sites for teaching sociology courses. Topical sites on Gender, STS, SARS emerging in the past decade. Numerous personal sites.</td>
<td>Few, e.g. the personal site of Chan Kin-Man</td>
<td>Sociology blog Singapore since 2008 (rather inactive since '09). No personal site found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Commentary/Public Talk</td>
<td>'Liberal scholars' invited to contribute column on newspapers since 1970s. Press commentary a common practice to date. Frequent public talks by sociologists in events held by schools, bookshops, media, foundation</td>
<td>A few scholars form the second/third cohort wrote commentaries for press. HKSA public seminars since 2008. Some civil group (e.g. HK Reader bookstore) held small scale talks</td>
<td>Self-Censorship at work. Chua BH, Kwok KM, E Kwok do occasionally get interviewed/talk to public, on a delicate way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Group</td>
<td>Cases in groups advocating human right, immigrant right, medical-reform, media reform, gender issues (Table 7-5)</td>
<td>Chan KM on Democracy Network</td>
<td>AWARE (feminist group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation (Petition and Protest)</td>
<td>'Wild Lilly' to 'Wild Strawberry.' Frequent petition mobilization and occasional protest.</td>
<td>1990s, three HKBU Sociologist engaged in anti-WTO.</td>
<td>Not that I am aware of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>TAIWAN</th>
<th>HONG KONG</th>
<th>SINGAPORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely Exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-5 Public Engagement of Sociologists in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore
The overall picture can now be summarised as follows: Of the three places, only Taiwan had developed a strong tradition of public engagement amongst sociologists toward the civil side, in particular after political democratisation in the 1980s. The collaboration with the state, by contrast, was never strong, and sociologists were occasionally involved in confrontational activities against authority. Sociologists in Singapore, on the other hand, have historically closely associated themselves with the government as a way of contributing to the public. Engagement on the civil side is present, but was operated on a delicate basis because of “self-censorship” at work. Amongst the sociologists in Hong Kong are a few notable figures devoted to making sociological insight more accessible to the public. But there was neither the sort of activist tradition seen in Taiwan, nor the policy involvement in Singapore. The mode of public sociology remained largely within the ‘traditional’ scope. How are we to explain the patterns? Three contextual factors identified as relevant will be discussed: (1) the community size (critical mass), (2) institutional factors and (3) intellectual traditions. However, more research is needed to establish a convincing casual explanation.

6.5.1 Community Size: Critical Mass

Companionship is critical, especially when attempting something unconventional.
It provides courage and enables a division of labour. Various initiatives reviewed in previous Sections were completed by more than one individual. Conversely, when an existing team was disintegrated, those who remained often became less active (for example the short-lived activism in HKBU). The absence of public sociology of a more critical nature in Singapore, an informant (SG12) pointed out, was not because of the lack of critical people, but because of a lack of a “critical mass”— “They are minority. They couldn’t fit, and they left.” The slightly larger sociological community in Hong Kong allowed a few groups of scholars to emerge— such as the triad of Liu SK, Lee MK and Wong SL, the combination of Lui TL, Ng CH and Eric Ma, and the triad of radical sociologists in HKBU in the 1990s. However, such associations were too thin and fragile to form a tradition. The largest sociological community in Taiwan allowed greater diversity and a few viable circles of different orientations.

6.5.2 Institutional Factors

Logically, size can only explain the limited range of diversity (an issue of “deviation”) but not the actual balance of practices reached (an issue of “means”). To address the latter aspect, I will consider four factors that shaped the role of sociologists in relation to the state and the civil sphere: (1) state demand for
sociological expertise, (2) civil demand for sociological expertise, (3) state control and self-censorship of sociologists, and (4) massive movement and its moral legacy. The first two involve the functional demands that “pull” sociologist to engage beyond the academic, either on the state side or the civil side. The latter two involve the conflict between sociologists and state authority, which however will influence whether and how sociologists engage the civil public.

First, the state demand for sociological expertise is most visible in Singapore where sociologists have historically been involved in various policy research and consultancy in the compact Republic until the 1990s. On the other hand, both the Hong Kong administration and the Taiwanese government rely less on their sociological communities. The second aspect, the civil demand for sociological expertise, is more complicated to discuss. This aspect involves, first, the sociological literacy/consciousness of the citizens, second, the condition of an institutionalised platform for interaction (for example media, publishing industry, public forums, civil groups and networks), and third, the presence of public controversies. A satisfactory analysis would need more work. I will only make a point about media later in this section. Third, sociologists may have perceived pressure from the state when they thought of engaging the public. Such pressure could take two forms: a hard form deriving from possible political sanctions and
the associated self-censorship, as I've demonstrated in the cases of Singapore and pre-1987 Taiwan, and a milder form of the pre-empting effect (will be discussed in next chapter) of priorities set by the academic auditing system on other outputs regarded as more “professional”. Finally, sometimes, discontents with the state might evolve into massive confrontation. I've learned from many interviews about how such incidents could leave their psychological legacy in sociological communities. I shall now discuss three such historical incidents that were recalled by sociologists as definitive experiences in their career.

The three political confrontations are: (1) the 1990 Wild Lilly movement in Taipei, (2) the 1970s student movement (and the 1987 Operation Spectrum) in Singapore, and (3) the 1967 left-wing riots in Hong Kong. All informants who had living memories of these incidents described a similar sense of enhanced concern for social issues. Their varied consequence, as discussed below, left different psychological and moral legacy. The 1990 movement in Taipei (Wright, 2001: Ch5) was generally considered to be critical in triggering subsequent political reform. It was remembered as a successful attempt of the educated youth to lead political reform. The mid-1970s student movements in Singapore, by contrast, ended with the key leader, Tan Wah-Piow, convicted of “stirring riots” and the
state-led amendment in University Constitution to prevent further student activism (Haas, 1999: 24). The harsh memories was further exacerbated by the 1987 Operation Spectrum, in which 16 Singapore citizens associated with a Catholic Charity, including some former student activists, were detained without trial (some reported being tortured) for their alleged involvement in a Marxist conspiracy that is orchestrated by Tan Wah-Piow. This incident reminded Singaporean the “OB marker” in politics and led to conscious self-censorship (Barr 2008: 229). The 1967 Hong Kong left-wring riot, taking place on the year when HKU set up its sociology department, was well remembered by a few senior informants who were students at the time. The riot left more complicated legacies. On the one hand, the left-wing organizations that initiated the riot were systematically cracked down, and they even lost sympathies among Hong Kong inhabitants because of the violent measures employed (Cheung, GKW 2009:131). On the other hand, numerous issues criticized by the rioters, for example labour rights, housing, education, medicine and anti-corruption) and were subsequently addressed by the colonial administration in the coming decade (ibid: 132). The sense of progress and the sour memories of the riot seemed to have led to a
practical, conservative social climate unsupportive of social activism, and there were no major massive political conflicts for two decades.

Finally in this section, I will make a short note comparing the newspapers in the three locales since newspapers often serve as a major channel via which sociologists can reach a broader public. The degree to which sociologists engage in writing press commentaries for the public should be at least partially explained by the press ecology. I shall start with Taiwan, which sees the strongest current of public writing by sociologists on the press. The two longest-standing major newspapers in Taiwan, the United Daily and China Times, were both founded by a migrant Chinese cultural elite and inherited the Chinese press ideal that emphasised its social responsibility. The Western mode of modern press was brought to China during the turmoil of the late 19th century. The Chinese press, as a means of communication has, since its introduction “incorporated the ambition of social reform held by the traditional Chinese Shi

---

1 In 1989 a rally took place to support the students in Tianmen Square, but it was a protest against the Beijing instead of Hong Kong government. From 1997 onward, an annual protest was organized on 1 July to memorise the 1989 tragedy. This event started to draw larger public attention after 2003 because of the controversy surrounding Basic Law Article 23, which required the HKSAR to “prohibit any act of treason, secession, sedition, subversion against the Central People’s Government, or theft of state secrets” (Zheng, Y 2005). Several subsequent marches were organized with a central theme demanding universal suffrage.
class” (Sec 6.5.3)— an ideal best reflected in the slogan “Have newspapers managed by intellectuals. Save the nation with opinions” (文人辦報、言論救國) (2010:132). The moral ideal was somewhat suppressed in post-war Taiwan initially by the authoritarian regime, but made visible again in the 1970s when the two mainstream newspapers competed to invite “overseas scholars¹” (海外學人) to contribute to their ed-ops, which led to the “most significant... dissemination of ideas since the May Fourth Movement” (ibid. 132). An observer (HK21) from Hong Kong described both newspapers as “decently managed, willing to make offers and push authors (to write).” In particular he described China Times as “a publication for intellectuals. There’s nothing like this in Hong Kong”. To be fair, this Chinese press ideal can still be evidenced in a few Hong Kong press²—notably the intellectual oriented Mingpao (明報) founded by the famous novelist OBE Louis Cha Leung Yung (查良鏞). In particular, its associated Mingpao Monthly was a major platform for the few sociologists who do write for the public. However, their readership remain limited in a crowded Hong Kong

¹ The term refers to those nationals who had studied, and perhaps worked, overseas (particularly in United States). Taiwan in the 1970s was still isolated and few people can afford studying abroad; the few did therefore enjoyed high social status and their views were of significant authority and prestige. The Overseas scholars include but not restricted to the “liberal scholars” discussed earlier.

² Two other intellectual-oriented dailies Hong Kong Economic Times (信報) and Hong Kong Economic Journal (經濟日報)
press market that has fifteen dailies and many magazines spanning from left to right, elite to vulgar, and operating with a firm spirit of commercialism and competition. Singapore is known its strict control of the media (Seow, 1998). Davies (1999) traced how Singapore government had closed down domestic press by “intimidation” or by “legislative sanction,” as well as its “taming” of foreign media by lawsuits, circulation restriction and visa control. Now, the Singapore Press Holding (SPH) owns most dailies and MediaCorp controls the broadcasting media; both belong to the state (Gomez 2005).

Table 6-6 summarises the institutional aspects discussed so far. The last section in the chapter will move beyond the tangible institutions to evaluate a claim that relates the public commitment of sociologists to their cultural upbringing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Size (critical mass)</td>
<td>Larger, permit organized activism</td>
<td>Middle, formation of a few triads</td>
<td>Small, absence of critical mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Demand</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Intellectuals</td>
<td>Commercialism</td>
<td>State Monopoly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived State Control</td>
<td>High &gt; Low “White Terror”</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High “OB markers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Legacy</td>
<td>Social Responsibility Optimism</td>
<td>Social Responsibility Optimism</td>
<td>Social Responsibility Optimism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-6: Institutional Factors Relevant to Practice of Public Sociology
6.5.3 Intellectual Tradition

Numerous informants related their (or others) public commitment to exposure to Asian intellectual traditions; in particular (but not restricted to) the tradition of “Chinese intellectual” (中國知識分子) that derived from the Confucius doctrine about Shi (士). Shi refers to an educated elite class from which the ancient empire had systematically selected its officers by imperial examination (科舉 introduced in 605 A.D.) to form its meritocratic administration for more than two millennia. Literati or teachers who stay outside the administration still enjoy a degree of social esteem, in particular during times when politics seems corrupt. Central to the shi culture was the moral responsibility to ching-shih (經世), literally “setting the order of the world” (Chang, H 1996). The sense of moral duty was captured in the famous quote by Fan Zhong-yan (范仲淹 989-1052):

“Worry before the world worries; rejoice after the world rejoices.” This moral responsibility can be fulfilled as an officer in the regime, or as a teacher or writer

---

1 The discussion in this section is admittedly one-sided on the Asian intellectual tradition. The antithesis, an alternative intellectual culture associated with the professionalism developed under colonialism should be included to form a more symmetric analysis.
2 For instance, informant HK15, HK21, TW14, TW25 and SG10.
3 One particular informant in Singapore described the influence of a similar intellectual tradition in his country of birth, which however would be too specific to identify (Sec 2.5.2).
4 In the following passage, I may use two interrelated but distinguishable concepts: ‘intellectual tradition’ and ‘tradition of intellectual’. The first refers the holistic set of theoretical or practical traditions that is related to a particular philosophical stance, such as Confucianism. The latter is the part within the intellectual tradition that is related to the role, ethics, and philosophical ground of “man of knowledge.”
in the civil world. Therefore, as Shils (1996) pointed out, the Chinese Intellectual Tradition already contained an ideal of civil society and civility despite its association with service in the government. The Chinese encounter with the Western imperial powers in the late 19th century greatly impacted on the Shi class, drawing serious debate about ancient teaching in the face of the Western science and technology. The imperial examination system was abolished in 1905, shortly before the collapse of the last imperial dynasty, ending the default political role of Shi class (Elman 2000). But the introduction of the category “intellectual” provided a modern vessel of the moral bearing of the traditional teaching of “Shi”— mixed up with a nationalist sentiment deriving from the national agony under the late 19th C imperialism, an aspiration for modernization, and selected Western values. The hybrid spiritual baggage of the modern Chinese intellectuals was consolidated in the 1919 May Fourth Movement in which called for ‘science’ and ‘democracy’ as paths to modernization were made (Chow 1960).

This tradition of Chinese intellectual was brought to Taiwan and developed by two forces. First, the government systematically reproduced the Confucius tradition within its educational system— in particular in the 1966 “Chinese Cultural Renaissance” campaign as a response to the Cultural Revolution in
Chinese mainland. Second, the traditional intellectual morality was demonstrated by certain elite intellectuals, sometimes in ways openly oppositional to the authority. This prevented the state monopoly of the interpretation of the tradition. The imprint of this tradition can also be found in the writing of the “liberal scholars” (Sec 6.4.2) and in many sociologists educated in Taiwan— including some now working in Hong Kong or Singapore (e.g. Ambrose King and Eddie Kuo). By contrast, this tradition received less emphasis in school education in both Hong Kong and Singapore. In Hong Kong¹, the colonial authority systematically “de-sentimentised” Chinese history and heritage in its education curriculum to “denationalise” its subject pupil (Wong TH, 2008), presenting the “Chineseness” as connected to “neither contemporary China nor the local Hong Kong landscape” (Luk 1991). A study of the 1990s textbooks in Taiwan and Hong Kong found less material of Confucius ethics was included in Hong Kong (Tsang, LC 1996). The status of Confucius legacy in Singapore is more complicated. Once preserved in the Chinese ethnic vernacular schools, Confucianism was systematically suppressed in the post-independence national education system built to forge one nation out of four people. The authority made an attempt to

¹ Ironically, Hong Kong is also identified as a major site for the post-war development of New Confucianism (Makeham 2003). But the strand of intellectual development has largely been restricted to the scholarly network centring on the New Asia College.
reintroduce Confucian Ethics as one “option” in the Religious Knowledge (RK) scheme in 1982 but failed (Chua 1995; Kuo 1996; Tamney 1996). However, politicians continued to cite Confucian values in defence of the nation’s particularities, such as mode of governance or ministerial salary\(^1\).

A quick comparison between the educational reproductions of Confucian heritage with the pattern of public sociology seems to show an elective affinity that “confirm” the thesis from which this section started – where the intellectual was more stressed, namely Taiwan, the practice of public engagement is stronger. However, the logical link has a few weaknesses. First, the subjective account of this particular issue (compared with other more concrete questions) provides less adequate proof of the “cultural shaping” that took place without ones’ full awareness, and its evaluation always involves a degree of retrospective attribution that might easily be affected by ones scope of memory, political views, and the prevailing discursive framing. The covariance at the macro-level might be an artifact of numerous confounding factors, and can provide limited proof.

\(^{1}\) For instance, Lee Kuan Yew wrote in 1994 “The Confucianist \[sic\] view of order between subject and ruler helps in the rapid transformation of society. I believe that what a country needs to develop is discipline more than democracy. Democracy leads to undisciplined and disorderly condition.” (Rainey 2010: 195) In 2000, one minister justified a significant increase in ministerial salaries by appealing to ancient Confucian idea. (ibid: 237, n32)
Second, the subject in the thesis, “(the) tradition of Chinese intellectuals”, is just one element of a more elusive term of Confucianism\(^1\), and the concept itself is also a cultural historical construct constantly in the remaking. The May Fourth Movement, for instance, incorporated the virtue of science and democracy into this tradition. The “liberal scholars” in 1970s Taiwan further brought in a current of political liberalism. The extent to which the fusion ideal could still be described as “Chinese” is itself contested. To conclude this section, what I can argue for now is that Taiwan, compared with Hong Kong and Singapore, has developed an intellectual culture that has (1) a deeper root in the tradition of Chinese intellectual, and (2) a discursive climate that is more supportive to endeavours of the public engagement of sociologists. The casual association between the two was suggested, but not adequately established nor clarified by this project. The individual difference is evident and the cohort variation is plausible. Moreover, the multiple aspect of Confucian heritage might be interrelated with the different modes of public sociology. Both questions require further investigation.

\(^{1}\) Tu Wei-Ming, for instance, made the distinction between “political Confucianism” and “Confucian personal,” relating the former to a particular hierarchical power order and its associated ideology and the later to the norm that governs the everyday social life (Tu 1984). Thomas Gold also raised (Gold 1996) the question if Confucianism can “contain an elective affinity for both authoritarianism and the type of pluralist democracy”.
Summary

This chapter examined the public interface of the sociological community. Starting from an analytical critique of the scheme proposed by Burawoy, the chapter proposed a revised framework for analysing the various modes of public engagement of sociologists observed in the three locales. The framework was characterised by (1) an expanded definition of ‘public’ that include the engagement in government to better reflect the cultural bias in Asia, (2) the dissociation of the ‘type of extra-academic audience’ (state vs. civil public) and the ‘epistemological style’ (instrumental vs. reflexive), which acknowledge the possibility of working for government with critical capacity and serving the public with instrumental knowledge, and (3) an extension of the ‘traditional vs. organic’ division to engagement on the policy side. The various modes of public engagement of sociologists in the three places were surveyed with the new framework, and reported upon with attention paid to the historical dimension. Overall sociologists in Taiwan developed a strong tradition of public engagement on the civil side, including a level of activism, since the late 1970s, while their policy involvement remained limited. Their colleagues in Singapore, on the other hand, had historically been closely involved in consultancy and policy research,
while on the civil side, the mechanism of self-censorship was easily observable and the few who did engage the public were doing so with a delicate balance. There were a few sociologists committed to public engagement in Hong Kong, but their mode of participation remained more ‘traditional’ than ‘organic’, with the exception of the recent service of Lau SK and Lee MK in the Central Policy Unit and a short-lived current of activism in 1990s-2005 HKBU. The patterns were related to the presence of ‘critical mass’, various political-institutional factors (namely the political demand of sociological expertise, media-scape, perceived state control and self-censorship, moral legacy of major massive confrontation) and the selective inheritance of Asian intellectual tradition.
Higher education authorities in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore have made a series of reforms characterised by ‘managerialism’ and ‘academic globalism’ in the past two decades. Those reforms involve a new mode of research agenda-setting – one that does not indicate the preferred research topics or types in substantive terms, but spells out the desired outcome in technical terms such as publication performance. While not operating at the same level, both modes involve key agencies mobilizing resources to direct researchers’ effort, are prone to trigger debates and contentions, and potentially reshape the national scholarship.

This chapter focuses on the impacts on sociology. Three theoretical approaches to the contemporary higher education transitions are outlined and related to the historical trajectories of the reforms. Then how ‘managerialism’ and ‘academic globalism’ affected the intellectual life, and even the demography, of sociologists, are explored; the responses are compared, and impact on the outputs of the
professional communities is assessed. The analysis uses demographic and bibliographic datasets compiled from archival materials, semi-structured interviews with 55 sociologists stratified by seniority, institutional affiliation, country of PhD training and gender, and less formal talks during field studies.

7.1 Theoretical Approaches to Higher Education Transition

The higher education system in the industrialized world underwent great changes since the late-80s against the background of shrinking research funding (previously legitimized by Cold War), rising demand of higher education for industrial upgrading, and the prevailing neoliberal ideology. Three major theoretical perspectives can be outlined from the relevant literature. The first perspective, including the theses of entrepreneurialism (Clark 1998) and academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004), deals with the growing financial reliance of the universities on their links with the industrial and commercial sectors (e.g. tuition fee, funding for commissioned research, patent loyalties and endowment) and their implications on higher education. The second perspective, discussed mostly in the United Kingdom and some former Commonwealth countries, focuses on the penetration of managerialism (or new public management) in the public-funded universities.
Managerialism refers to the ideological stance that all organizations have certain similarities so that their performance could be enhanced by applying similar managerial concepts and practices—such as accountability, cost-effectiveness, centre of excellence, performance related funding, quality assurance, and institutional integration (Marshall 1992; Trow 1994; Deem 2001). The third perspective discusses the transition in higher education as part of the historical process of globalization (Currie and Newson 1998; Altbach 2001; Mok and James 2005; Marginson and Wende 2007). These literatures cover issues of four domains: the global flow of knowledge enabled by information and communication technology, the emergence of a global staff/student market, the proliferation of certain higher education discourse and policies at the global scale, and the global competition for university reputation (e.g. the impact of various world university ranking).

7.2 Higher Education Reforms in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore

Those three approaches have all been cited to explain, and sometimes to justify, the recent changes in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. But closer scrutiny reveals that each country had its own trajectory of change, reflecting its distinctive historical and political context.
7.2.1 Hong Kong

Hong Kong, a British colony, only granted higher education to a small elite through most of its history, which didn’t prevent it achieving impressive economic growth in the 1970s. But, facing the demand for industrial upgrading in the late 1980s, it found itself behind major Asian competitors in higher education. In 1989, the government decided to increase “first year, first degree” places from the 1980s average of 3% of the age cohort to 18% in 1994 (UGC, 1993). The rapid expansion soon caused concerns about the efficient use of the budget and the quality of staff and students. In response, the University Grant Committee (UGC) reviewed higher education, and initiated a series of managerial reforms—changing grant assessment methodology, designing a standard format for statistics from higher education institutions (HEIs), revising fund allocation procedures, and implementing assessment practices that included the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), Teaching and Learning Quality Process Review, and Management Review (UGC, 1993, 1995, 1996)\(^1\).

Parallel to the managerial reforms, Hong Kong policy-makers started to think about its higher education in relation to the rest of the world. The 1993 UGC report first articulated (Sec 25-27) the post-1997 scenario and the potential benefits of having a ‘world-class institution’ for its students and the host society. It was urged that Hong Kong should “adopt a much wider regional role in higher education” (UGC, 1996, Summary). In 2002, the first major UGC report after the handover argued (Sec 1.10) that Hong Kong universities also belonged to “larger communities outside the Hong Kong SAR,” and hence had a strategic position “envied by many other world cities”. The next year saw the first world university ranking published, and the China-.HKSAR Closer Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA) signed; the two soon made Hong Kong a popular destination for Chinese students seeking internationally-renowned higher education.

Standing between the student market from China and the new international reputation game, the UGC decided that Hong Kong's strategy was to become “the education hub for the region.” To pursue this vision, the UGC urged quite dominantly that each institution should “aspire to be top in the region at what it and the UGC agree on is its role” (UGC, 2004, Summary).
7.2.2 Singapore

Expansion, managerial reform, and globalist aspiration can all be found in the trajectory of higher education development in Singapore. The government increased its university enrolment from 5% in 1980 to 14% in 1989, and 21% in 2001 (Mok and Tan 2004, 73). A series of managerial measures were introduced in 2000 to make its universities internationally competitive. However, the state-university power relation was moving toward a different direction in the course of change. The key step seems to be the 1997 creation of the International Academic Advisory Panel (IAAP), consisting of leaders of prominent foreign higher education institutions and industrial corporations, to assist Singapore in making its universities “world-class.” Its composition and goal manifested how this entrepôt- turned city state was so conscious of its international presence.

The IAAP held six meetings in the first decade and made numerous recommendations— e.g. revising admission policies and undergraduate curriculum, attracting more international students and staff, encouraging interdisciplinary teaching and research.\(^1\)

One critical suggestion (made in the 2nd meeting in 1999) was to grant its universities more autonomy in recruitment, management and funding, as the prerequisite for their success. This was raised again by a special committee sent abroad to study university governance and funding in preparation for the Singaporean Management University. The committee urged that the universities should be granted more autonomy, provided that accountability was improved to ensure the efficient use of public funds. These recommendations were agreed, leading to restructuring internally and in relations to the government.

Universities were given more space within a new framework of governance. Internal quality reviews were institutionalized, to be validated by triennial external reviews commissioned by the Ministry. Budget allocation was made more flexible, but tied to departmental and faculty performance measured by various indicators (Lee, HHM and Gopinathan 2004, 120-122; Mok and Tan 2004). The major change for most academics was the new remuneration system, with a fixed basic salary and variable performance-related components, though staff could negotiate on the criteria by which their performance was evaluated.

7.2.3 Taiwan

Higher education in Taiwan also underwent tremendous changes in the 1990s;
these however were not initiated by the state, but by the scholarly community demanding self-government and academic freedom. These demands got their momentum from broader political democratization starting in the late 1980s, in which university staff and students played a critical role. The mounting pressure led to the 1993 amendment of the University Act, granting universities more autonomy, and the subsequent scholar-led educational reform aimed at loosening State control (Ku, Chung Hwa 2001). One reform objective was to further expand postsecondary education to grant wider access. The enrolment rate was lifted from 19.36% of the 18-21 age cohort in 1990 to 38.70% in 2000, and 64.98% in 2009 (Yang, Y 2010, 32). Taking responsibility for quality assurance, the Ministry of Education (MoE) no longer had the authoritative power; and had to attempt through the 1990s to develop a new, credible scheme for higher education evaluation. It was concluded that an independent professional body was needed, leading to the establishment of the Higher Education Evaluation & Accreditation Council (HEEAC) in 2005. In 2006 HEEAC carried out the first full-scale

---

1 The 1990 ‘Wild Lily Student Movement’, for instance, is considered to be a decisive incident in fostering a series of political reforms (Wright, 2001, Ch5).
2 The impressive rise in the past decade was partially due to the lower birth rate and shrinking size of the student cohort.
3 This included commissioning teams of senior academics to visit HEIs for evaluation, trials of commissioning professional academic association to do subject-specific evaluation in 1992-93, an extensive research into the evaluative indictors in 1997-98, and encouraging HEI self-administered evaluations in 2001-02 (Yang, Y 2010, 103-118).
university department evaluation, with the threat of forced closure of institutions.

Internal staff review (already introduced in a few elite universities) was made mandatory and tied to personnel decisions, and this drastically shaped intellectual life within the universities.

The discourse of higher education globalization also emerged in Taiwan around the late 1990s. It was soon absorbed in a series of proposals to strengthen national competitiveness in the globalized knowledge economy: a special grant for research with '(international) academic excellence', fostering international collaboration and English-taught courses, merging HEIs or launching trans-university research centres for effective resource allocation, and a fifty billion NTD grant to make a few research-intensive universities 'world class.'

These maneuvers attracted both enthusiasm and criticism. One critical controversy broke out in 2003, when the MoE mindlessly published a ‘university ranking’ based on statistics obtained from the Science Citation Index (SCI), Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and Engineering Index. The purpose was to show how Taiwanese universities ‘perform’ on those ‘leading’ journals covered. This was initially welcomed by some longing for more accountable higher education,
but it soon attracted massive criticism, arguing the ranking reduced the merits of HEIs to the *quantity* of one particular type of publication, and excluded consideration of teaching, social engagement, books, and Chinese writing. A conference, and its proceedings *Globalization and the Knowledge Production* (Taskforce for ‘Critical Reflection’ Conference, 2005), marked the beginning of contestation and negotiation among government, universities and the scholarly community on how academics should be governed\(^1\).

7.2.4 Managerialism and Academic Globalism

In these Asian countries, governments remain the major funders of higher education and hold firm control over the universities—despite attempts to attract more private funding, the popularity of ‘market’ as a metaphor, and the quasi-market mechanisms introduced in grant allocation and personnel policies. It was certainly perceived that market-rationality had infiltrated higher education, but much of the system still operates within a State-defined framework, in a scenario very different from that described by Slaughter or Clark. The notion of *managerialism* applies better to the measures aimed to ensure

\(^1\) At the time of writing, a petition "Against Prioritizing the SSCI and SCI Indicators, Reclaim the Spirit of University" was going on. See [http://bgo.tw/eyvsg](http://bgo.tw/eyvsg).
quality, efficiency, and accountability, following the expansion. However, the

*power relation* among the state, university and staffs varies. In Hong Kong the

UGC took a central role in imposing the policies, whereas in Singapore
government initiated reform by granting universities more autonomy. In Taiwan,
the reform unfolded in constant contestation and struggle between the state and
the scholarly community. Finally, the three governments all responded to the
discourse of *globalization* and knowledge economy with attempts to make their
top universities world-class for economic reasons. This reflects an ideological
conviction combining the neoliberal doctrine of competition, the alleged
economic role of universities (in the knowledge economy), and the tendency to
consider higher education on the global scale. I call this composite ideology

*Academic Globalism* and find it a better conceptual entry than globalization *per se*
for two reasons: First, ‘globalization’ tends to confound a wide range of issues as
one coherent structural change, and lacks analytical clarity. Second, describing
something as part of ‘globalization’ too easily delivers the impression that it is
caused by an external, objective, huge-scale structural change that is
irresistible—which conceals the critical role of local agents in *actively* embracing,
promoting, and actualizing such imagination. ‘Academic globalism’ fits the
managerial reform easily. The aspiration inspired by globalism provides the
rationale for managerial policies and practices, and various globalist values were easily absorbed into the design of the managerial regime.

7.3 Intellectual Life under Reform

7.3.1 Transition into the New Era

Every informant employed before the reforms acknowledged the significant change in the academic climate, tracing back to different events in the three places— in Hong Kong the 1994 RAE, in Singapore the 2000 institutional restructuring, and in Taiwan the controversial 2003 ‘ranking’ and subsequent full scale evaluation. The different state-university power relations also shaped how these reforms were experienced and responded to. Despite such variations, all three university staffs eventually found themselves entering a new era characterised by penetrating managerial measures with criteria reflecting academic globalism. They had to translate their ‘subjective’ efforts into ‘objective’ evidence defined by the evaluative indicators to justify their reward, or even existence, within the system. The degree to which one experienced the impact naturally depended on ones’ position. Tenured, middle-age staff had less immediate threat, but junior staff had to face unprecedented pressure, while
senior colleagues less active in publishing might find their contracts not extended as before (That also happened to a department head that resisted complying and was replaced) A Hong Kong informant (HK14) explained the changing scenario for the senior colleagues:

“...at 55, they can have another review to decide whether to terminate your tenure or not. If they are not impressed by your publication, they can lay you off. There were a few teachers in our department laid off like this. They still stay in the department but with a different status. The department hires them back with a new contract and much lower salary... things like this won't happen before.”

The shifting intellectual climate is also evident in subtler forms of discursive or actual practices in the everyday realm for academics. New procedure like “reporting recent publication and future plan” was introduced in regular meetings at some departments. Publication statistics were circulated in the university-wide newsletter. Informal chats among colleagues became saturated by discussion about publication and evaluation. Fundamentally, this was a process in which the standards by which one measured one’s achievements and value were swiftly redefined by external force in institutional terms.
7.3.2 Priorities in Roles and Publication Formats

The most salient effect was the pressure to reconsider priorities toward categories that counted more in evaluative practices—in both balancing professional roles between research, teaching and public engagement, and calculating the pros and cons of different publication formats. On the first, most universities claimed equal importance for the three sectors, but all informants saw that in practice research publications still counted more in personnel decisions because talent/efforts in teaching or service were hardly measurable with ‘objective’ indicators.

“... the indicators look good, seemly balancing between research, teaching and service. But in practice the latter two do not count as much. Those who contribute greatly in service would only earn a minor margin in the mark, say, 8 points rather than 6. So is teaching. The teaching review can’t produce terribly different result. Hence in the end the message from the system is to urge you focus on research.... By research it means publication. (TW10)”

---

1 The priorities of publication formats have a bearing on the production and access of knowledge, which, however, requires another article to elaborate.
There were stories of how acclaimed teachers and activists were disadvantaged because their publication records were considered under-performing. Some departments introduced teaching exemption for junior or ‘productive’ staff to give them more time for research.

On the second, more emphasis was placed on publication in internationally refereed journals, especially ‘top-tier’ ones. In Taiwan and Hong Kong, sometimes the journal ‘tier’ was signaled by its SSCI inclusion and impact factor. This preference could be delivered through the design of administrative forms, the statistics collected and circulated, financial rewards for publication of certain sorts, and sometimes clearly-stated criteria (e.g. number of papers on SSCI) for procedures of staff review or promotion. Supporters justified this by stressing the insufficient scale of domestic academia, the importance of dialogue with international colleagues, and the verified quality of journal articles by international standard. Skeptics added to this list (cynically) that the journal articles were more ‘countable’ and hence easier to translate into performance indicators—not to mention the fact that these statistics contributed heavily to the two influential world university rankings.
7.3.3 The Disadvantaged Forms of Publication

Relatively discouraged, on the other hand, are book-writing and publication in Asian languages. Books published by reputable publishers do have credit, but committing oneself to writing monographs is increasingly seen as riskier in the fixed assessment cycle. It has become popular to publish chapters as articles before putting them into a book, or to conceive a book as a collaborative project from the start. These strategies nonetheless limit how a book could be conceptually structured.

The reception of non-English publications differs. It was alleged that in Hong Kong and Singapore anything not written in English wouldn't be granted significant credit. To be sure, I have not seen any document explicitly excluding publications in Asian languages, but the sense of preference was repeatedly described as self-evident in the everyday practices within the institutional setting. A prominent professor in Hong Kong told me that he was once asked by the department secretary, pointing at the Chinese titles he included in the evaluation form, “Professor XX, don’t you get something better? (HK4)”. One of his colleagues explained the rationale of the practice.
“Chinese publication is not really disallowed, but when it comes to the review, the external reviewers are predominantly foreign experts who can’t read Chinese. The university claimed that Chinese publication are still acceptable, but department always remind us to be careful. Many people dare not include Chinese titles in the submission... (HK14)”

Taiwan, on the contrary, has a strong tradition of local publication in Chinese. Its larger academic community allows greater autonomy from the Anglophone world. In 2000, attempting to assess the quality of the domestic journals, the NSC created a Taiwanese SSCI that included 42 (expanded to 89 by 2009) domestic ‘core’ social science journals based on various formal criteria.¹ There was strong criticism of its instrumentalism, various side effects, and the potential risk of being used by the ‘main streamer’ to discredit academic rivals. Yet when university evaluation was implemented, the TSSCI ironically became a certificate of ‘proven quality’ that secured legitimate space for writing in Chinese for local readers.

¹ Such as frequency, number of paper, stability of publication, peer-review policy, transparency (Guan and Yu 2000).
7.4 Scholarly Demography

There were also indications that the reforms’ impact went beyond individual calculation to shape the demographic outlook of the sociological community—particularly in Hong Kong and Singapore. This took place by two mechanisms. On the one hand, scholars finding themselves hardly fit for the post-reform system might either choose, or are forced, to leave. While no statistics of resignation/retirement with the ‘true reasons’ specified were available, I continued to hear stories that someone left because of growing frustration in finding space for their research interest or professional commitment in the changing environment. On the other hand, the cohort recruited after the reform might reflect a different self-definition of the institution. I compiled the faculty database of four leading sociology departments\(^1\) in the three places and observed two particularly interesting cases, the NUS and the CUHK.

\(^1\) Data obtained from the *Annual Report*’70 of Univ. of Singapore, the *General Information*’81-’00 (with ’89, ’90 missing) and *Bulletin*’05 of (The) National University of Singapore, the *Prospectus*’74, *General Information*’75-’84 (with missing years), *Handbook*’86-’98 (with ’95-;97 missing) and the website (’06-) of its Sociology Dept, the Calendar of Hong Kong Univ.’67-’09, the *Handbook of the General Information*’64 and *Calendar*’65-’00 of Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong, and the *Staff Address Book* of the National Taiwan University’60-’08.
The new appointments made NUS sociology department has significant higher percentage of Western expatriate (4.4.4) The surge reflected the institution’s vision of making itself ‘world-class’ - but it should also be attributed to the debut of the Times Higher Education Supplement world university ranking which placed NUS nicely on top. The ranking actually attracted scepticism among many expatriates in NUS when it first came out in 2003. One veteran informant recalled how colleagues were teasing about the ranking and thought “there’s no way we were there!” But soon it became clear that the prestige constructed by the ranking had consequences—higher visibility of staff among international colleagues, enhanced profile among international job-seekers and prospective students, increased popularity as a collaboration partner; and higher resources from government and industries. All these in effect helped create the ‘international excellence’ the ranking was supposed to measure.

The CUHK host the largest sociology department in Hong Kong. The department made a batch recruitment of assistant professors in 2005-2008, which was demographically characterised by the dominance of scholar of China origin and the marginality of Hong Kong native. Departmental informants all agreed that
these junior colleagues were chosen primarily because of their publication in
(American) ‘main-stream’ journals. The demographic contrast with their senior
colleagues (mostly Hong Kong-born) stirred contested interpretations. One
informant saw this shifting pattern as inevitable given the “decline of Hong Kong
student going abroad (US) for PhD study”, and the “shift of interest to China in the
international academic community”. Another, native to Hong Kong, made similar
observations with a sense of deprivation. He suspected the high rate of
China-born recruits “reflects a strategic attempt to enhance the profile of the
department both in China Studies and Chinese student market,” which, however,
was making the university increasingly detached from Hong Kong society. He
attributed the alleged ‘decline in studying abroad for PhD’ to the expansion of
local postgraduate study, which attracted “some of my friends who want to do
local research, but now ended up finding a bleak job prospect because the
universities do not welcome local PhDs.” Even some senior staff expressed their
concern about the ‘inter-cohort gap’ and the lack of commitment to Hong Kong
society (studies) among junior colleagues.
7.5 Responses of Sociologists

How did practicing sociologists respond to these institutional innovations?

Whether active promotion, compliance, compromise or resistance, it was those activities that helped materialize any consequences framed by the institutional causes. The pattern of those responses also reflects the distinctive context of each place.

7.5.1 Singapore: Improvement Acknowledged

Only in Singapore did most informants seem content with the current system. Those NUS members who witnessed the reform expressed their general support, citing two major reasons. First, they acknowledged the improvement in administrative democracy and transparency—committees and standard procedures were introduced for decisions that once lay with the department head and the emphasis on the assessable performance reduced the room for under-table manipulation. They also enjoyed an acceptable degree of autonomy in negotiating the criteria by which they should be evaluated. Thus the ‘journal tier’ was settled at department level, so staff had leverage to include titles they considered important, whether or not they were included in the SSCI. Second, the goal of international excellence brought more research funding and postgraduate
applicants, creating an improved research climate. However, there are two other less-mentioned factors which I consider relevant. First is the radical restructuring of department staff. Of the 32 pre-reform faculty members employed in 1997, only 12 remained in 2009, working with more colleagues appointed after 1998. The majority of the junior cohort are (Western or Asian) expatriates, who are less bothered by the implications of academic globalism to the local community. Second, the department has never had strong engagement with the general public (except for services to the government) so the potential trade-off remains limited.

7.5.2 Hong Kong: Mixed Responses but Compliance

Responses from Hong Kong are more mixed. Those appointed in the 1990s can usually testify the numerous drawbacks of the reform, such as discrimination against certain types of publication/scholarship, the erosion of collegiality, and constraints on public engagement. Younger cohorts seem more polarised. Some, facing higher pressure driving them from other commitment, expressed stronger, but others identified themselves more as a ‘professional scholar,’ emphasized the virtues of focusing on top journal publication, and excelled in the game.
The greater discontent in Hong Kong than in Singapore can be imputed to at least three factors. First is the opposite direction of perceived change in their relations with the state. Sociologists in Singapore welcome greater freedom from state control, while their Hong Kong colleagues experienced a growing presence of the administration as the UGC introduced various measures. Second is the demographic factor. In Hong Kong, expatriate scholars are only a small fraction of the sociological community even today. In particular, the backbone cohort happens to be a generation with the strongest Hong Kong identity (compared to senior mainland immigrants and junior international-recruits); hence, the sense of losing the Hong Kong particularity is more acute from their perspective.

Despite discontent, all informants seemed compliant to the system. Few believed that they stood any chance to influence the governance framework. This prevailing view reflected the perceived penetration of administrative power in the academic community. On the one hand, the UGC played a dominant role in leading reform. In its 2002 report on Hong Kong higher education, for instance, two ideal-typical modes of university governance were compared and the more democratic and egalitarian was bluntly rejected as “risky for chronic indecision …
and the lack of clarity about the power to act and implement in uncharted
territory.” (UGC, 2002, Ch3) On the other hand, the possibility of collective action
was also hindered by the lack of solidarity among the Hong Kong sociologists.

7.5.3 Taiwan

Taiwan is sharply contrasted with the other two cases in the level of critical
reflection its scholarly community demonstrated on its institutional
circumstances. The 2004 conference marked a significant collective action
against the anticipated reform. On-going debates could be found not just in
professional and institutional bulletins but even in newspapers.

Sociologists had a significant presence in this process. The 2004 conference had
on its panel four sociologists, from three prestigious universities. The Taiwanese
Sociological Association’s (TSA) published several issues of its newsletter and
organized numerous panels in its annual conferences for critical discussion on
how academics should be governed. There were also a stream of scholarly works
produced from the perspective of ‘sociology of sociology’ to assess the condition
of the discipline within the current institutional setting. Yeh (2003) critically
examined the implication of US-trained scholars’ dominance in the ‘knowledge-power struggle’ among Taiwanese sociologists, Su (2004), using network analysis, demonstrated the citing patterns and the ‘invisible colleges’ within sociology’s professional community, Chang M.K. et al (2005) traced the path of sociology’s development in Taiwan, and Chang Y.H. et al (2010) explored how evaluation had been experienced by sociologists working in different institutional setting via extensive interviews.

The presence of such public dialogues, at least, provided the moral support for those who chose to pursue causes not rewarded by the system. There were even cases in which consensus was generated from the scholars’ side to feed into the making of future policies. The ‘local books,’ for instance, were not given proper credit in the earlier evaluative schemes because most domestic publishers had not established a rigorous peer-review mechanism, because of the limited market for academic titles. This systematic discrimination against books attracted severe criticism in the 2004 conference. Yet just a few months after the publication of Globalization and Knowledge Production (Taskforce for Critical Reflection Conference 2005), the National Science Council established a special
grant to encourage monograph writing, and came up with an innovative policy that commissioned the ‘editorial boards of established journals’ to review book manuscripts and sponsored the publication of the recommended ones. While these initiatives cannot reverse the disadvantaged status of books under the managerial regime, they did provide greater space for those interested in book-writing. Despite the significant presence of objection and attempted negotiations, it must still be admitted, most sociologists in Taiwan still rationally, no matter how reluctantly, fulfill the imposed requirements, and the sense of inevitable adaptation was prevailing.

The greater resistance among Taiwanese sociologists could be attributed to several factors. First, the Taiwanese sociology has the strongest tradition of indigenous scholarship, publishing in Chinese, and commitment to the public cause. The perceived stake when confronted by the academic globalism embedded in the managerial reform was higher. Second, the political democratization in Taiwan has left a distinctive political culture. The State did not have the same level of control over the universities as their counterparts in Hong Kong and Singapore, and many scholars who had joined the earlier student
movement (as either student or staff) also inherited the conviction that intellectuals should and could have political influence. Third, the long-established professional association and its newsletter served as a critical platform for inviting debates and cultivating consensus.

7.6 Impacts on Output

How have these reforms, coupled with the divergent responses of the sociologists, shaped the general patterns of the output from this professional community?

7.6.1 Sociology Journal on SSCI

Starting from the publication format most rewarded, internationally-refereed journals on SSCI, Fig. 1 shows the annual article counts on SSCI-listed journals categorised as 'sociology' written by authors from addresses that contain Taiwan, Hong Kong or Singapore' since 1980. One can see that publications from the three places remained at low visibility (<5 per year) in SSCI sociology journals till the mid-1990s, when the publication count from Hong Kong started to take off.

---

1 These counts do NOT represent all and only SSCI-publications by sociologists. Many of them published in journals sorted in other categories, and some of the articles counted here were submitted by scholars from neighboring disciplines. Nonetheless, the curve can still be read as an indicator of the more general trend. The demographic increase in sociologists was very minor compared with the sudden surge of the publication counts from Hong Kong and Taiwan in the critical years; hence its contribution should be limited.
around the when the RAE was implemented. The Singapore curve shows a gradual ascent since the late 1990s, when the discursive shifts suggested a foreseeable university reform. But the slope was not that dramatic—perhaps because the SSCI was not taken as a self-evident criterion of quality. Taiwan ranks third in this time sequence, with its publication count shooting up since 2006—the year the first full-scale university review was implemented.

Fig. 7-1 Counts of Articles Published on SSCI-listed Sociology Journals

7.6.2 Implications for the Broader Publication Pattern

The broader picture of impacts on other publication is difficult to assemble, due to the limited availability of relevant bibliography and the inconsistent criteria for inclusion. In general, the managerial reforms enhanced the overall research profile, with a lifted baseline of expected output (especially in the more
standardized, peer-refereed channels) from each member. In some cases it was associated with a shifting presentation of formats and languages, especially between different cohorts.

Taiwan is the only place that continues to have a strong current of non-English publication, though the output of English publication rises. The TSSCI provided a legitimate space for domestic journals publishing articles written in Chinese. The initiative of 'book manuscript review by journal editorial board' also provided a mechanism to endorse the quality of domestic books, solving the tricky task of fitting them into the evaluation scheme. The monograph writing and publishing grant further facilitated the production of a batch of books that were made with better quality. These initiatives can be seen as attempts to guard Taiwan’s indigenous scholarship against the erosion of academic globalism by reengineering the domestic journals to fit them better in the managerial regime.

While Chinese writing persisted, the major publication format changed.

1 A senior editor said the publication grant reduced the financial risk of academic titles and made sophisticated book-making possible. The writing grant has also in the first 4.5 years funded 218 (out of 474) applications, 38 in sociology (Wei 2010)
Comparing the staff profiles of the sociology department in National Taiwan University, there is a clear transition between the earlier sociologists and the cohort employed after 1995. In 1980-94, the staff of the department produced 177 ‘books’ but only 88 ‘journal articles.’ Their junior colleagues, in contrast, made a more impressive record on journal publication, but only two (out of twelve) ever published a monograph in Chinese¹. A quick glance at recent books by major sociology publishers suggests a growing trend of edited books published out of collaborative project.

A comparable shift was observed in the CUHK². The cohort appointed in the 1970s includes a few figures who published books that became quite influential in greater China—mainly on issues of Chinese modernization, Sinicization of social sciences, and sociological re-interpretations of Chinese classics. The cohort appointed in 1980-95 wrote more about Hong Kong for domestic academics or

¹ Source of data: the National Taiwan University Repository, at http://ntur.lib.ntu.edu.tw/. Categories defined by the database. At the time of retrieval, the category ‘book’ in sociology department was only updated to 1995. The post-1995 data on books were obtained by library catalogue search with the staff list. This strategy is less applicable to journal databases because the abbreviated form of many Chinese names (e.g. P. Chen) would match multiple authors.

² Data compiled from the ‘selected publication’ of each staff member on the department website. Demographic data, see note 10.
public readers. Despite the changed focus they all published bilingually, with a significant presence of books. The last, post-1995, cohort, appointed after the implementation of the RAE, published nicely in international journals but wrote significantly less in Chinese\(^1\), less about Hong Kong, and had so far made no attempt to write monographs like their senior colleagues.

The language was less an issue in Singapore as English had been adopted as the working language to balance its delicate multi-racial linguistic politics since the birth of the nation state. NUS sociologists faced no linguistic barrier to establishing their own publication platforms in international Anglophone academia (e.g. the *Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, the *Working Paper* series of the NUS sociology department). There was little tension between embracing academic globalism and granting their domestic publications proper credits. The Asian sociologists working there do occasionally publish in Asian languages (Chinese, Malay, Indian, and etc) and it seems a welcomed addition to their profiles, but these pieces were rarely given significant position in the staff review.

\(^1\) The growing dominance of English in the *Chinese* University of Hong Kong also attracted criticism from its alumni network (CUHK Alumni Concern Group 2007).
7.6.3 Withdraw from Teaching and Public Engagement?

The systematic bias toward publication in the managerial regime brought high

pressure upon sociologists devoted to teaching or public engagement— especially those in their lower ranks. Chang Y.H. et al observed that “the struggle balance between research and teaching had become a giant dilemma in [sociologists’] life”.

Meeting different ends together more often requires a sacrifice of personal life in private time. To my surprise, I have not yet observed an obvious systematic withdrawal of sociologists from the two professional roles. There were certainly impacts, but they were buffered by several mechanisms induced by the very pressure— the adaptive combination of research and teaching/activism, the enhanced moral support for activities less rewarded in institutional terms, and even some counter-action by the established cohort to balance the anticipated consequences. The long term impact, however, cannot be safely excluded.

In teaching, the majority of informants still expressed a strong commitment and continued to invest great efforts in the courses taught. It was described as a necessity in the intellectual life:
“...Teaching can refresh my passion for the academic field. Doing research is a lonely process, and you never know how much contribution your work can bring to the society...even whether it would be read. In the contrary, the postgraduate students can get closer to your field and have more dialogue with you...” (TW15)

Some informants shared how they adaptively combined the research and teaching agenda to make course preparation a constructive part of their research. Even the devoted teachers described as “victims” of the reform had at least the moral support from students and some colleagues. Teaching remained a core element that many sociologists were unwilling to compromise. Nonetheless, there is a possible greater impact on individual supervision and tutoring, as scholars, disciplined to be more efficiency self-aware, might find it inevitable to restrict his/her commitment on individual student affair. The sense of loss was strongest in a few institutions used to be proud of their tradition of collegiality and intimate teacher-student interactions.

The impacts on public engagement are even trickier to demonstrate, partly because of differences in the pre-reform pattern across the three cases (Ch6).
Taiwan had the strongest tradition of public engagement. The perceived threat from the managerial reform even made the discursive climate more supportive to such endeavours, giving the sociologists some inertia against the changing institutional environment. Complaints about the struggle between the public calling and research duty were often heard, but still there has been a vibrant stream of collective actions on a wide array of contemporary issues in the past few years\(^1\). Hong Kong has a weaker tradition of public engagement (Sec 6.3). Most of the junior informants admitted that they place public engagement as lower priority, at least in the early stage. Ironically, it was exactly under such circumstances that a few (more established) sociologists started to take initiatives to strengthen their link with the local public—such as the *HKSA sociology public seminar* and the *Hong Kong Society and Culture* conference series established as a platform for presentation in Cantonese, and a batch of books published in Chinese for general readers. The long-term consequence of the two-way effect is yet to be observed. Singapore has limited perceived space for engaging in civil public or activism (Sec 6.2). Generally sociologists feel that they are not expected to go beyond the academic boundary and comment on mass

\(^1\) Partly due to the emergence of various online platforms that made mobilization and coordination easier.
media as an academic. Those few who do engage with the press and the local civil
groups operate in a delicate way, often in a balance with their connection with
(and trust from) the authorities.

7.7 Toward a Critique of Managerialism and Academic Globalism

In the last section, I will move beyond the terrain of empirical inquiry to develop
critiques of both managerialism and academic globalism.

7.7.1 Managerialism on the Intellectual Life

The Managerialist doctrine applied in higher education systems, in effect,
requires the scholar to *dissemble* their intellectual labour into deliverable and
countable items in somewhat standardized formats, so that the “performance” of
individual scholars can be translated into objectified, quantifiable indicators that
are comparable, manageable and assessable. This approach has several
often-heard justifications: making the difference in effort visible, bringing more
transparency to the process of recruitment and promotion, motivating individual
scholars to work harder, enhancing the efficiency and fairness of resource
allocation and ensuring accountability in the use of public funds. Indeed, a
number of informants testified that managerialist measures exempted them from
the need to engage with academic politics based on traditional social ties, or
motivated some colleagues to be research-active again.

However, it should be stressed that the managerialist approach can only create
these instrumental benefits with some side effects and even a degree of
compromise at the very nature of intellectual activities. At the operational level,
managerialist doctrine often involves the creation of a centralized evaluative
mechanism responsible for ascribing the systematic exchange-value to the
products of the internal labour by scholar. A more democratic system is
conceivable, but its operation is often seen as contradictory to the central value
of managerialism—efficiency.

If a system is designed in a more rigid way, the acceptable output format might
be too narrowly defined to restrict the flexibility of scholarship. For instance,
privileging publication on international refereed journals disadvantages those
works that require longer treatise, such as theoretical works of a more
systematic nature, ethnography, or a comprehensive comparative-historical
inquiry. It is into these precise categories that many of the masterpieces in this
discipline fall within. There is still room for all that, certainly, but they are being
located in a more risky construct¹.

Moreover, any managerialist practice by its nature involves fitting the mental activities inspired by human curiosity into an external, mechanic scheme of institutional auditing and rewards. This process inevitably involves surrendering a degree of individual control of intellectual endeavour to a system operated by an embedded “institutional rationality,” a possible new “iron cage” (in Weber’s categories); in other words, it “alienates” (in Marx’s word) the process and value of knowledge work from its producer by imposing institutional definitions of working schedules and product values. In managerial schemes that took a more quantitative approach, the emphasis on a somewhat standardized “value” for sorts of knowledge product might lead to what I shall call the tokenization of knowledge. Each piece of writing was in this process ascribed certain publication categories with given credit values (e.g. impact factors and ranking). At its calculation, what is actually written was rendered less relevant than whether and

¹ The case of Dr. Ka, Chih-Ming (Researcher, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica) is telling. He earned the prestigious title of distinguished researcher for a groundbreaking book in historical sociology (Ka 2001). But before then he had to endure the pressure of being graded ‘B’ (less than 10% in the institution) in the annual institutional review for several consecutive years because of the lack of journal publications. Compared with Ka, who is already tenured, well-respected researcher, junior colleagues waiting for substantiation generally don’t believe that they have the luxury.
where the work got published. The effort put into this work is reduced into points or credits, a form of numerical token by which the value of scholars are measured.

Of course, many scholars still pursue research that answers their calling, not necessarily reduced to a lab rat blindly driven by incentives. But the discrepancy between the meaning-oriented intellectual pursuits and the token-oriented institutional rationality leads to compromises at various levels. The worst case scenario could be found in occasions where human judgment based on the actual reading of works is replaced by item-counting. With the reward system that gave each published article similar value, I have even heard tips on how to dissect research into “publishable units” or to rearrange materials to generate more publication counts based on the same set of material. Rational strategies like these lead to the trivialization of the published article and the fragmentation in the knowledge horizon.

7.7.2 Academic Globalism

Knowledge (or university) has multiple roles in the human world, but the pursuit of academic globalism often recognizes only a few. The academic globalists, with
their neoliberal spirit, tend to focus on the economic roles that include its contribution to the national innovative capability, the cultivation of human resource, and competition for the title of ‘world-class’ and international students. The hidden stakes here, then are its social and cultural roles that are often locally-bounded—such as the discursive framing of public affairs, the cultivation of citizenship and critical faculties, and the searching for or making up of cultural identity. The academic globalists presume a universalism stance on the property of knowledge that overlooks, in the social and humanistic fields, the importance of (1) linguistic boundaries in research and writing, (2) cultural particularity in adopting and innovating theories, and (3) epistemological locality. All the three aspects require further unpacking.

Linguistically, a globalist automatically prioritises English as the major, if not the only, acceptable academic language. In fields like science and technology there might be fewer problems, but in the field of social studies, the native language of the researcher, or the indigenous language that is actually used in the social context studied still has an edge that is not easily replaceable by translations¹.

¹ See, for instance, Feleppa (Feleppa 1988) for critical discussion of “translation” in social
The native language provides the researcher an *epistemological affinity* that is not otherwise available. The indigenous language provides a *phenomenological fitness* that requires less translation (observation still needs to be translated into theoretical categories). Being able to communicate the scholarly work with international readers is important, but the pursuit of this end should not deprive the development of scholarship in alternative languages.

Prioritizing publication on international refereed (mostly Anglo-American ones) journals further creates a pressure for scholars to follow the Western discursive fashion, and to conform to the research agenda set elsewhere. These borrowed theoretical frames and concepts, while often bringing new insights to the appraisal of domestic studies, do not always capture the empirical phenomenon that bears cultural particularities (Alatas, SF 1995; 2006; Connell 2007).

Moreover, many significant contributions to sociological theories were first cultivated in a cosier, somewhat isolated linguistic/cultural *enclave* before being translated for an international audience\(^1\). Such an intellectual enclave provides, anthropological studies.

---

\(^1\) One example was the Chinese sociology during the WWII. Developed almost isolated from the external academic network, these works nonetheless is considered full of original insights. Comparable examples would be the various currents of European thoughts that became
first, alternative discursive resources from which some critical leverage to the international mainstream may be generated, and second, a cosier network for more-focused dialogue around issues of cultural particularity. Both will be impossible if sociologists of one country were collectively driven to follow the agenda set for English journals, and this may eventually deprive the capacity of making significant innovation within this particular sociological community.

In terms of epistemological value, a lot of knowledge is worth pursuit simply because it has significant bearing in the local community, not because it has a potential to make contributions to global sociological discourse. Prioritizing publication in foreign journals reduces the chance of this type of knowledge being produced, marginalizing the needs of domestic knowledge users. The marginalization may take forms of (1) the choice of empirical site, (2) the ways in which research is framed, and (3) public access to sociological knowledge. First, taking Hong Kong as an example, the emphasis placed on international publication has already driven some academics to consider China as more marketable research subject than Hong Kong. Of course, it is possible to publish influential worldwide— note none of these works were originally written
studies of anywhere as long as significant insight can be distilled, but the
perception of geographical preference in the international research agenda still
persists. Second, international and local audiences have different demands. The
former tend to focus on the current research agenda set in the core countries and
they demand theoretical contributions that have generalizable implications,
while the latter demands knowledge that is responsive to local interests or
practical issues, contextualized with historical particularities properly
acknowledged. Texts prepared for different readership are naturally tailored to
meet their demand. Prioritizing one type of reader in effect discourages the
research framing for the other. Finally, if casting public influence is still
considered the end purpose of sociology, academic globalism has some serious
ethical issues. Sociologist channelled to the enterprise of global academic
reputation chasing face greater stress if they still intend to engage the local
public. Publishing mainly on international journals excludes access to
sociological knowledge for local readers who do not have adequate levels of
professional literacy and subscription. Moreover, a more competitive
environment also tends to erode the sense of collegiality, and therefore reduce
the chance of collective action.
7.7.3 Changing Geography of Knowledge Flow

To conclude the section, I will situate the scenario in the conceptual framework of “world system of knowledge network” to propose two implications of the changing geography of how sociological knowledge is produced and disseminated. The attempt to make a university “world-class” is to reposition it in a regional context beyond the administrative boundaries. Universities are to be staffed by “world-class experts” who do not need to have personal connections to the host society. They could take the department as their base to research the neighbouring, often less developed hinterland (e.g. China for Hong Kong, and South East Asia for Singapore), employing theoretical concepts developed in the West, writing in a language not known to their subject, and publishing in internationally refereed journals produced in the West. In this picture, these sociology departments in the Asian “world class” universities function as strategic nodes for transmitting knowledge generated from the less-developed peripheral, to the developed cores. Two implications could be derived:

First, the reproduction of imperial gaze: the transcontinental knowledge flow reproduces the geographical pattern of how earlier colonial scholarship was
generated and communicated under the imperial order. One significant
difference though is that this resurgent pattern is being created largely by actors
in Asia, not the imperial power; the “reproduction” was a consequence of
voluntary self-colonizing.

Second, the lifting out of academic sociology from the domestic society: the entire
process of sociological knowledge production and dissemination was gradually
channelled into an institutional space (conferences, journals and databases) that
is detached, or “lifted out\(^1\),” from the host society. The recruitment of
international staff often entails the deprivation of already limited institutional
vacancies for domestic sociologists. The prioritisation of international journal
further marginalises the domestic demand for sociological expertise and
knowledge through the various mechanisms. These trends, in the end, pose
serious question around what sociology is for.

**Summary**

This chapter sought to evaluate how sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and

---

\(^1\) Giddens (Giddens 1979) defined globalization as the “lifting out” of social relations from local context. I found this concept appropriate for describing the knowledge process under the higher education transformation pursued with a belief of “academic globalization.”
Singapore has been affected by the recent higher education reforms, characterised by managerialism and academic globalism. The thesis found that the institutionalised incentive structure swiftly redefined the reference scales against which sociologists evaluate their intellectual efforts. The systematic bias toward objective, measurable outcomes caused perceived pressure to invest more in publications, in particular in international refereed journals. The reforms were further associated with a shifting staff demography in some leading departments. The responses of sociologists in each place, however, showed a distinctive pattern that reflected their historical and social context. While sociologists in Singapore generally acknowledged the benefit of the reform, their Hong Kong colleagues expressed mixed feeling but remained rather compliant with the managerial system. Taiwanese sociologists, on the other hand, demonstrated a higher level of critical engagement. There was a temporal affinity between significant managerial measures and the rise of publications in SSCI sociology journals. An inter-cohort shift towards publishing more in journals and in English could be observed in some leading departments. The individual patterns in publication type reflected distinctive intellectual traditions and linguistic politics. While the publication-oriented reform imposed more pressure on those committed to teaching and public engagement, no clear evidence was
found that the sociologists were withdrawing from those fronts—partly because of some counter-action to neutralise the anticipated impacts. In the longer term, considering the changing scholarly demography, effects might vary. This chapter ended with a critique on managerialism and academic globalism. In particular, I argued that the uncritical adoption of both would lead to what I described as “the reproduction of Imperial Gaze” and “the lifting out of sociology from the local.”
Conclusion

In March 2009, the Council of National Associations of International Sociological Association (ISA) held a conference in Academia Sinica (Taipei) on the challenges of sociology today. The agenda included themes like ‘Facing Northern Hegemonies’, ‘Facing Political Pressures’, ‘Beyond Universalism and Particularism’, ‘Dilemmas of International Rating’, ‘Neoliberalism and the Academy’, and ‘Forging Alternative Sociologies’¹, reflecting the timely relevancy of these issues to the status and prospects of the discipline. The presentations covered a wide range of accounts on the particular trajectories or problems of sociology in specific nations (Burawoy, Chang et al. 2010). Some other collections also featured the reviews of sociology in different countries (Genov 1989; Patel 2010). However, there were very few studies that sought to compare sociology in multiple places in a more systematic way. The current study about the sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore presents an example. The analysis delivered in precedent chapters shows that the inclusion of three cases created much analytical leverage and some potential for theoretical synergy in opposition to focusing on one case.

¹ http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/cna/03program.php
The conclusion will first outline the major findings and arguments presented in the five empirical chapters, and then relate them back to two theoretical themes I started with: the “world system of knowledge network” conceptual frame and the thesis of “colonial modernity.” A discussion about how geopolitics, states and sociologists interact in framing the direction of sociology will follow, before I suggest a few directions for future work.

Outline of Arguments

I started this exploration by demonstrating how sociological expertise and knowledge were introduced into, and later institutionalised in the three places, in the ways shaped by their changing relations with the four imperial powers (China, UK, Japan, and the USA) in the region. Evidences for pre-WWII sociological investigations and teaching in the three colonies were first, but they were found to have limited influence on post-war scholarship for various reasons. Three currents of post-war scholarly migration were identified as relevant to the flow of sociological expertise in the region: the war-driven Chinese sociologists moving to Taiwan or Hong Kong, the British social anthropologists visiting Hong Kong and Singapore under the auspice of colonial administrations, and the American researchers driven by interest and funding that reflected a Cold War
geopolitical agenda. The Chinese sociologists played critical roles in the subsequent institutionalisation of sociology in Taiwan and Hong Kong. The other two groups contributed to the Western knowledge about Asia, but they left relatively limited legacy for the domestic sociology.

Chapter Four identifies two modes of institutionalisation of sociology. First, the Chinese migrant scholars, with aid from various American Foundations and Christian Organizations, founded a number of sociology departments in Taiwan and Hong Kong. Those sociologists in Hong Kong faced little intervention from the colonial administration, but their colleagues in Taiwan were initially discouraged by the State’s distrust on sociologists. Second, the two former British colonial universities (NUS and HKU) also set up sociology departments in the 1960s. Two factors were suggested as relevant: the rising status of sociology within the British and the Commonwealth universities, and the social unrest in both port cities. Despite a similar start, the two departments evolved in diverted path, reflecting the political contrast between the colonial Hong Kong and a newly-independent Singapore. I further traced institutional expansion in the 1980s and beyond, and provided a detailed portrait of the cohort structures of the sociological communities in the University of Singapore, the HKU and CUHK.
and Taiwan. Four broadly defined episodes of demographic transition were identified; the earlier migrant cohort, the subsequent recruitment of ethnic Chinese in the 1970s-1985, the various modes of localization in the 1980s-90s, and the most recent cohort under the impact of higher education reform.

Chapter Five characterises the local traditions of sociology based on a systematic review of four critical sorts of bibliographic outputs: domestic journals or paper series, writings about local history of sociology, normative-epistemological debates, and edited collections of domestic social studies. The term “domestic disciplinary identity” was coined as a heuristic devise for interpretation, and three types of subjectivities were distinguished by contrasting the observed patterns: (1) geo-disciplinary subjectivity, the degree to which sociologists of a particular locale were considered (or acted) as if they belonged to one bounded community (strong in Taiwan and Singapore), (2) geo-empirical subjectivity, the degree to which a geographical territory was seen as a legitimate epistemological subject (strong in Singapore, moderate in Hong Kong), and (3) civilizational subjectivity, the degree to which sociologists perceived that they belonged to a culture distinctive from the Western civilizational frame in sociology (strong in Taiwan). The patterns were related to their post-war identity politics.
Chapter Six examines the public interface of the sociological community. A frame for coding modes of public engagements was revised from Burawoy. The practices of public engagement of sociologists in the three places were surveyed with emphasis paid on historical transition. In brief, sociologists in Taiwan had developed a strong tradition of public engagement, including a level of activism, since the late 1970s, while their policy involvement had remained limited.

Sociologists in Singapore had historically been closely involved in consultancy and policy research, while on the civil side, the mechanism of self-censorship was observable and the few engaged in the public were doing so on a delicate balance.

A few Hong Kong sociologists were committed to public engagement, but, with few exceptions, their mode of participation remained more “traditional” than “organic”. The patterns were related to the presence of critical mass, various political-institutional factors and intellectual tradition.

The last chapter seeks to evaluate how sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore has been affected by the higher education reforms characterized by managerialism and academic globalism. The impacts on intellectual life, publication patterns (more emphasis on international journals), and even departmental demography (in the cases of Singapore and Hong Kong) were
noted. The responses of sociologists varied from place to place. Sociologists in Singapore generally acknowledged the benefits of the reform, while their Hong Kong colleagues expressed mixed feeling but remained rather compliant with the managerial system. Taiwanese sociologists, by comparison, demonstrated a higher level of criticism and resistance. While the publication-oriented reforms imposed more pressure on those committed to teaching and public engagement, no clear evidence was found that the sociologists were “withdrawing” from those fronts—partly because of some counter-action to neutralise the anticipated impacts. The long-term consequence is however hard to predict if the changing scholarly demography is considered.

**World System of Knowledge Network and Colonial Modernity**

Each of these empirical chapters can be related to two theoretical themes that I started with: a “world system of knowledge network” and “colonial modernity”. The conceptual edges of “world system of knowledge network” can be best demonstrated by the recent developments of Hong Kong and Singapore, which was characterised by the constant transgression of personnel or knowledge flows across their territory boundaries. There was a growing trend for sociologists in Hong Kong to get involved in China studies, and more scholars in
Singapore to be involved in studying their neighbouring countries. Both groups publish extensively in Western journals. The disciplinary formation has actually marked a return to the historical roles the two settlements played in the early production of Oriental knowledge—Singapore as a base for investigating the Malaya Peninsula and Hong Kong as a base for studying China. Most of the critical discourses that presumed a dualist image failed to reflect the contemporary role of the two cities as “knowledge trading hub”.

The empirical chapters of this dissertation enriched our knowledge about the “world system of knowledge network.” The beginning chapter on earlier colonial scholarship and post-war flow of Western researchers demonstrated how the three former colonies were subjected to the “colonial gaze.” The subsequent examination of the institutionalisation of sociology, on the other hand, showed the dispersion of a modern scientific discipline along the proliferation of modern knowledge incentive institutions (universities). It became evident that such dispersion did not go straightforwardly from the West to East, but could take various routes that are mediated by numerous intermediate parties (e.g., Japan for the introduction of sociology into China, and China for Taiwan/Hong Kong). Also, the entire process is deeply embedded in the broader historical and
political structure. The Chapters about the “domestic disciplinary identity” and “public sociology” can be seen as an examination of such network at a subnational level. The former involves the morphology of the local scholarly communities as it sought to examine how domestic scholars were interacting to each other; the later investigate whether or not sociological knowledge was being made accessible to extra academic knowledge users. These issues seemed domestic, but they were shaped by factors of larger scales (geopolitics and the consequential identity politics). Moreover, the findings in a later chapter suggested, both the domestic disciplinary identity and practice of public sociology of a sociological community could be tied up to how it is positioned in relation to the global academia. Managerialism and Academic Globalism, two ideological terms adopted to describe the recent higher education reform in the final chapter, mark a radical restructuring of the “world system of knowledge network,” as my concluding critiques pointed out, toward a “reproduction of colonial gaze” and the “lifting-out of sociological communities” from the local social fabrics.

Two sorts of flow traced so far should be distinguished: First the lower-hierarchical empirical knowledge generated from the peripheral for the
epistemological consumption at the core— for instance the colonialism-associated anthropological studies, the Cold War-inspired ‘Chinese’ studies in Taiwan and Hong Kong and the recent pressures to publish in Western journals for international ranking. The second was the higher-hierarchical disciplinary knowledge imported from the core to peripheral, overshadowing the indigenous discourse with the epistemological privilege associated with the level of ‘development’. This includes: the diverted post-war dispersion of Chinese sociologists to Taiwan and Hong Kong; the wave of American visiting teachers in the 1960-70s; the post-1979 flow of Hong Kong sociologists to China; and the sort of ’academic dependency’ described in Sec 1.3. The core concern behind the detailing of these flows was to pose questions about the disparity of the production and access of sociological knowledge and the relationship of dominance— a concern shared by many participants in the 2009 ISA CNA conference, a concern which marked the beginning of this inquiry.

I have concluded the theory chapter with a suggested link between Asian sociology and “colonial modernity”. The investigation presented so far at least has revealed four points about the resemblance between Asian sociology and colonial modernity: First, on the basic level, sociological scholarship, like most
other aspects of how modernity is understood in Asia, was introduced via a colonial link. Second, the ‘partial’ adoption was mediated by the colonial link and the particular geopolitical and political context. Colonial modernity cannot be viewed as mere reproduction of its Western counterpart. Similarly, the Asian transplantation of sociology was always partial. Theories could be easily introduced, but not the intellectual milieus instrumental to theoretical advancement. Specialised skill could be copied, but not the entire division of scholarly labour: Critical thoughts can be learned, but not necessarily the momentum of critical engagement. Third, consequently, the variety of formation: The variation of geopolitical and political circumstance, as we have seen, had led to the variation of disciplinary formation in terms of the publication pattern, sense of domestic disciplinary identity, modes of public engagement and even the responses to imposed institutional reform. Fourth, implanted western modernity has often induced a sense of identity crisis and the debate around what should be changed and what should be preserved. This, too, can be found in the agenda of “Sinicization” (Yang, KS and Wen 1981), “indigenisation” (Yeh, 2001) or “alternative discourse” (Alatas, SF 2006) surrounding the development of sociology.
Geopolitics, States and Sociologists: Structure and Agent

Throughout the thesis, every aspect of the domestic sociology examined was more or less framed by a broader geopolitical context—in particular, the contestation of KMT and CCP in Chinese Civil war and its aftermath; the decline of the British colonial power and its legacy; and the rising American dominance in the Cold War structure. The three factors not only intertwined with the process of introduction and institutionalisation of sociology, but also framed the external context against which the domestic identity politics was unfolding, and therefore indirectly influenced the formation of domestic disciplinary identity in the three places. The reproduction/suppression of tradition Chinese intellectual tradition and the particular mode of political governance, two factors considered critical to the varied level of public engagement of sociologists, were again associated with the varied strategies each state took in response to changing geopolitical configurations, for example, the forced independence of Singapore, the impact of the divided Chinese identity on Hong Kong, and the on-going competition with CCP for the KMT government in Taiwan. Even the recent dispersion of the managerialist and globalist discourses was itself part of the new round of geopolitical competition framed in terms of knowledge economy.
On the other hand, the histories detailed in the dissertation also illuminated the proactive role of the state in embracing, resisting, or coping with the given external or internal circumstances, and in mediating the local consequences of geopolitical factors. The state revised its higher education policy to meet the human resource for better competitive edge in regional economics (and in the case of CUHK, to reduce reliance on Taiwan or China). The state enforced a series of policies in forging the desired national identity (or discouraging the unwanted sense of identity) to balance itself among the various external forces. These measures all had the potential to reconstruct the geopolitical structure through shaping various transnational flows (e.g. consumption, migration, and educational attainment), and were the actual practices that had the acting influence in framing the lived reality of sociologists.

The link between the state and the sociologists was of varied nature in the three cases. In Singapore sociological expertise had been systematically absorbed into the state and sociologists could be seen as part of the institution, while in Taiwan the connection was characterised, first, by the lack of trust and integration, and latterly, by regular tension and confrontation with which sociologists “participated” in the civil reengineering of the regime. In Hong Kong, by contrast,
the connection between the state and sociologists remained minimal except for a few notable cases. The varied patterns, discussed in Chapter Six, were themselves a particular formation framed by various contextual factors, but they also became part of the context. Nonetheless, in each case we could always identify individual sociologists, who left an enduring legacy for the shaping of the discipline and beyond, such as in the case of Martin Yang, CK Yang, Hans Dieter-Ever (Ch4), Chui Hei-Yuan, Lui Tak-Lok, Chua Ben-Huat (Ch6) and many others. Sociology was framed by the geopolitics and the state agenda, but it also evolved, within the given space, through the initiative sociologists take. They made compromises, certainly, but they also bargained. The story of sociology told is not of a determinist version.

**Directions for Future Works**

The dissertation presented so far has achieved three tasks: (1) to empirically map a number of selected aspects of the trajectory of sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, (2) to propose a few theoretical frameworks or categories to sum up descriptions of the observed patterns, and (3) to suggest and evaluate numerous contextual themes that could be associated with the observed pattern. What has *not* been achieved is a closer scrutiny of the various suggested
contextual themes, and the verification of their causal links to the observed patterns to form an explanatory narrative. In the writing of each chapter, I have encountered numerous points at which I have to force myself not to get too absorbed into an intellectual detour. Behind each point, there lies a possible journey. In the last section, however, I will only discuss four directions that seem most promising. First, the idea of “disciplinary identity” and the suggested link with broader identity politics requires more unpacking. How exactly were the broad narratives on identity mediated at the psychological level of sociologists, or translated into institutional measures, that led to the framing of the disciplinary identity? Second, the chapter about public sociology invites further inquiries into how sociological knowledge is disseminated and accessed within the public sphere. This broad question involves studies on, for instance, the sociological literacy of ordinary people, on the media and publishing industry in disseminating sociological knowledge, and on the particular period (e.g. when major controversies took place) when sociological knowledge is most demanded. Third, the chapter on managerialism and academic globalism has revealed the decisive power of international rankings. The ranking operates by redistributing a constructed resource that I call “symbolic capital,” of which the growing importance should be attributed to the explosive information and the resulting
insufficiency of attention. Such observations call for more elaborate theorising
about the mechanisms of how symbolic capital is generated and distributed, and
even a critique of its distribution inequality and monopoly. Finally, any
comparative project invites more comparison. In particular, the issues discussed
in chapter six and seven seem to be relevant to many sociology colleagues
worldwide. Further comparison may clarify the similar and divergent trends. It
also serves as a basis for possible transnational collaboration of sociological
communities to steer the higher education discourse in the ways that allow
sociologists to fulfil their professional commitments.
Epilogue: The Personal Legacies

Originating from my personal confusions, this thesis which I have just concluded was, in retrospect, a 'by-product' of an intellectual journey that led to a greater sense of clarity about my profession, its Asian heritage and the area that I came from. These clarified pictures led to the formation of certain attitudes, series of actions, and a refined definition of the role I expect to take. This last section features a prose-style personal reflection of this journey.

Visions in the Journey

I have benefited from the project in four major ways: First, the project allowed me to think through numerous issues fundamental to the discipline of sociology and to formulate my view. Some were discussed in the thesis— for instance the various ontological, epistemological and ethical issues discussed in Ch2, the conceptual frame of ‘public sociology’ in Ch6, and the various contestations associated with the rise of managerialism and academic globalism in Ch7. There were perhaps more that were left out, ranging from the viability of an ‘alternative’ sociological paradigm grounded in Asian heritage, the ‘normative aspect’ of public sociology, the changing ground of the discipline's legitimacy in the
contemporary world (and in particular, in Taiwan), to many structural and practical challenges the domestic sociological community are facing.

Second, the interviews granted me the privilege to closely observe many established sociologists in terms of how they balanced between competitive ends and strived to meet their commitments in a variety of given circumstances. The sharply contested views they expressed, the intimate narrative they shared, and the implicit wisdom they showed all together constituted a thick yet thorny ground of reference against which I sketch my own stance by assimilating, debating and negotiating the elements within this horizon.

Third, the subject matter enabled me to acquire a degree of familiarity with Asian traditions of sociology that is otherwise not easily attainable. One common problem I observed of many Asian sociologists trained in the West was the (initial) lack of awareness of what their predecessors had done before. The rupture from earlier generations of sociologists impeded the formation of domestic scholarly tradition, reproducing the intellectual dependency on the West. I consider myself relatively lucky to be able to have a better historical sense from the start.
Finally, any traveller can attest that exposure to the exotic is a way to realise one’s own identity. This is more so when the exotic contains elements that seem familiar, and this was exactly what I experienced in my visit to Hong Kong and Singapore. The seven months I spent in the two city states not only enabled me to collect the data required to write this thesis, but more importantly, granted me fresh perspectives of looking back at Taiwan— and discerning certain subtle characteristics that were made visible only through comparison. Assembled together, the knowledge about the three locales further constitutes a broader picture of the region in which our national history should be anchored.

**Attitudes**

All the questions that motivated me into the project were eventually answered and a set of attitudes about this profession were formulated. I came to see sociology not as a discipline I was trained to follow, but as an intellectual enterprise that has evolved in ways that reflect the variant circumstances. I learned to place all professional wisdom and practices taken for granted into brackets and reconsider their necessity in different settings. It won’t be feasible to elaborate on these attitudes with proper justification, but I will make four points that have become central in my view:
First, sociology has its universal dimension, but many aspects of its domestic formulation, as demonstrated throughout this thesis, varied in ways that reflect the distinctive configuration of contextual factors in each locale (e.g. the professional identity, the patterns of output, the public roles of sociologist, and politics of evaluation). It is possible to think of these variations as imperfections from some “ideal” model alleged to be how sociology ought to be. In practice, American sociology was often seen as the incarnation of such a model as least in the three societies studied. But given the particular demand and constraints in many national settings (e.g. size and the possible degree of specialisation), I am inclined to see variation as inevitable and am sceptical about any claim to develop the discipline solely by following a foreign model alleged to be of universal merit. Instead, different local solutions need to be tailored for their distinctive settings.

Second, the ultimate purpose of sociology, I believe, was to help human kind to make sense of, and to cope with, the multiple challenges in modern society. The professional norm of producing peer-reviewed literature, refining models and making theoretical contributions are important instrumental objectives toward the end, but they should not be mistaken as the end itself. The modern division of
labour between knowledge production and its application is often cited to justify an individual focus on criteria associated with the above-mentioned objectives, but this rationale does not exempt the sociological community from the need to constantly review how much their collective efforts were making real impacts, beyond the accumulation of literature, on the public (extra-academic) spheres of human society.

The third point, particularly relevant to the semi-peripheral societies like those studied in this project, can be inferred by intersecting the universal/local and professional/public divides noted above: While the dialogues with international colleagues are certainly beneficial for facilitating empirical comparisons and exchanges of ideas, the pursuit for this goal should not lead to ignorance of domestic demand for sociological knowledge and expertise. Making sociological knowledge accessible to the public of where it was generated should be considered an important ethnical aspect for this profession. Nonetheless, there is an inevitable cost. Writing for the two audiences often involves not only different languages, but also different agenda and focus; sociologists willing to meet both ends need to make constant negotiations in balancing his/her effort.

Fourth, in smaller societies where the division of labour in the production and
circulation of sociological knowledge is more restricted, and there might not be a viable space for writers or journalists specialised in communicating sociological knowledge with broader public. Sociologists could be encouraged to take greater roles in making their expertise and insight more accessible.

**Engaging the Public**

These attitudes were soon reflected in my writings, actions, and how I allocated my efforts toward the end of PhD study. While continuing to communicate my research with a broader academic community with presentations in conferences and invited sessions in numerous countries, I spared considerable time for engaging in public affairs. On the one hand, I maintained a popular blog that features writing about sociology and its application to contemporary issues and wrote numerous commentaries for Taiwanese Press. On the other hand, I participated in a number of activities conceived to address public issues within the sociological circle — I had initiated a research workshop named ‘Seminar Synergy 2009’ to facilitate dialogue among Taiwanese junior social researchers during my visiting stay in Academia Sinica, joined a preparatory team for

---

1 The blog has gradually built up its readership through its synchronous publication on various social media (e.g. facebook, Google+, twitter). The eleven posts published in Jan-March 2012, for instance, has together attracted 25,000+ reader clicks up to 30, March.
launching a Public Sociology Study Group in BSA (which was discontinued later) in 2010, delivered talks on professional issues on special forums in two TSA annual conferences, and recently launched a online group named *Taiwanese Junior Sociologist* to connect the Taiwanese sociology doctoral students and new PhDs in different countries.

**Pyramid-builder, Intellectual Warrior and Bridge-Maker**

Through these engagements, I also came to develop a refined definition of my role. Over the past few years, three figurative metaphors, among others, emerged in my dialogue with friends and colleagues about sociologists' role: First, a *pyramid builder*, used to describe a scholar whose job was to lay on the giant pyramid (scientific literature) a stone carved with his/her name (e.g. journal article). To have your stone accepted for building the glorious pyramid, one needs to carve the stone to certain rigorous standards to be checked by senior builders (peer-review). The end purpose of the pyramid is not one of the builder's concern since the vast scale of the artefact and the sophisticated labour division prevents an ordinary builder from assessing the success of the overall project— one just needs to have faith in it.
Second, an *intellectual warrior*, inspired by Bourdieu’s depiction of sociology a ‘martial art’ (2010), denotes a sociologist who uses the critical capacity granted by sociology to challenge the suppressive, defend the disadvantaged, and mediate between the confrontational. The ‘intellectual martial art’ is the act performed, not the object produced. It involves the bodily presence of the sociologist within the social fabric of other agents (e.g. opponent, collaborators and the victims) in a timely fashion, while a pyramid stone could be carved in ways detached from the social fabric and over a longer time frame. A warrior is more committed to the ends. S/he can still serve as a pyramid builder when required, but is likely to find it more relevant to engage in the public.

Third, a *bridge-maker* sought to communicate between two shores — either between confrontational narratives, between groups of people, between theory and practice, or between the academic and the public. A bridge could be a text that bridges different views or an institutional hub that links people together. It could be located within the architecture of the giant pyramid, or on its way to the rest of the world. While warriors tend to distinguish between two sides and defend the weaker, a bridge maker sought to connect and foster cooperation.
Of the three, *pyramid builders* evoked an image symbolising what I was reluctant to become, and the other were used as depictions of my idealistic roles. The metaphor *intellectual warrior* often came to mind when I tried to articulate for the underrepresented and balance its power relation to the established. Sometimes I even felt that the way I balanced my criticism resembled certain “warrior ethics” described in some martial art novels, for example “exert proper strength for your opponent”, “avoid power abuse on the weak” or simply “serve the justice.” One ultimate ethic for martial arts was to “turn fierce confrontation into peace and cooperation.” This is the level where a warrior became a *bridge maker*. The art of bridge-making involves, in writing, the creation of a text platform that connects the separate; a “discursive space” that accommodates the oppositional. In social life, bridge-making involves the initiating of social or institutional platform where people of different stances could be connected for mutual gaze, for dialogue, and cooperation. This marks my vision as a sociologist.
Appendix A: Interview Guideline

Note: The interviews were aimed to be semi-structured, allowing new ideas/issues to emerge. This guideline (1) only served as a reminder of the key aspects and was not observed rigidly, and (2) was in the process of constant revision accommodating perspectives emerging from former interview. Presented here is a latter, more comprehensive version which was however adopted selectively in individual interview session.

1. Individual-Biographical
   1.1 Personal Career Trajectory
   - On Choice of becoming a scholar (sociologist), choice of field
   - On major career decisions (PhD education, employment)
   - Impressions of Significant Incidents
   - Influence of Particular Figure (Mentor, Model)?
   - Other Comments on Intellectual Upbringing

   1.2 Disciplinary Identity
   - Sense of disciplinary identity, its purpose
   - Personal epistemological/methodological leaning
   - Choice of audience and medium

   1.3 Negotiating with the Western Paradigm
   - The applicability of Western paradigm, how is it negotiated.
   - On alternative discourse e.g. ‘Sinicization’ or ‘Indigenization’ of sociology

   1.4 Professional Life
   - Time/attention/energy allocation: balance between role
   - Choice of Publication Target (Does SSCI, impact factor, prestige counts?)
   - How is your agenda supported/restricted by the department
2. Institutional

2.1 Collective Life
- Initial Impression of the Department
- Role of institution, its student/faculty body
- Employment/promotion decision making: What is valued?
- Evaluation Scheme (document)
- Politics with the Univ. admins or state authorities
- Collegiality: Competition, Cooperation, Isolation
- Special notes on institutional culture

2.2 Transition
- Any significant institutional change (structural, cultural, policy-wise)?
- Initiator, Politics, and Discourse
- Observable activities pattern shift (time allocation, publication, role, collaboration) and impact on Dept. solidarity/morale..

3. Domestic State-wise

3.1 Scholarly
- How to categorise the various institutions?
- Inter-institutional interaction

3.2 Public Interface
- The presence of state administrative power
- Involvement in Policy/government service
- Modes of Public Participation

3.3 Professional Community
- The Professional Association (TSA/HKSA),
- Major controversy/contestation

3.4 Transitional
- Higher education reform and associated Impact
- Impact of significant event (1987-89, 2000)

4. International
- Familiarity with other national sociological communities
- Impression and Interaction
- Sign of changing tendency
Appendix B: Informants List and Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution (^1)</th>
<th>Interview Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TW01</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>2008.4.1 14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW02</td>
<td>Tunghai</td>
<td>2008.4.16 10:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW03</td>
<td>Publisher editor</td>
<td>2008.4.22 16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW04</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>2008.4.23 14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW05</td>
<td>Nat Taipei</td>
<td>2008.5.6</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008.6.2 10:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW06</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>2008.5.8 15:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW07</td>
<td>Fujen</td>
<td>2008.5.9 11:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW08</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2008.5.14 16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008.6.2 16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW09</td>
<td>Fujen</td>
<td>2008.5.15 12:00</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW10</td>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>2008.5.22 14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW11</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2008.5.22 17:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW12</td>
<td>Nat Tsing-Hua</td>
<td>2008.5.26 16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW13</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>2008.5.27 14:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW14</td>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>2008.6.3 14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW15</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2008.6.11 13:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW16</td>
<td>NSYSU</td>
<td>2009.2.20 10:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW17</td>
<td>Fo-Gruan</td>
<td>2009.6.28</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW18</td>
<td>Nat Tsinghua</td>
<td>2009.6.29 15:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW19</td>
<td>Fujen</td>
<td>2009.6.30 14:30</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW21</td>
<td>Tunghai</td>
<td>2009.7.6</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW22</td>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>2009.7.2 14:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW23</td>
<td>Soochow</td>
<td>2009.7.9 09:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009.7.27 15:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW24</td>
<td>Nat Tsing-hua</td>
<td>2009.7.28</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW25</td>
<td>Academia Sinica</td>
<td>2010.3.10 15:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW26</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2010.3.19 14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK01</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
<td>2008.2.22 13:00</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008.2.16 10:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK02</td>
<td>HKSYU</td>
<td>2008.2.23 13:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) There were a number of senior informants who had moved to new institutions after long service in other institution. In such case, the coding was based on the institution the informant had been affiliated to for longest time instead of the current one. If the informant had moved to a different country, the institutional coding was based on the one that was of research interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date 1</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HK03</td>
<td>HKPU</td>
<td>2008.3.5</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK04</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
<td>2008.2.25</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK05</td>
<td>HKBU</td>
<td>2008.2.27</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK06</td>
<td>HKSYU</td>
<td>2009.12.16</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK07</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>2008.3.12</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK08</td>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>2008.3.17</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK09</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
<td>2008.3.20</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK10</td>
<td>HKPU</td>
<td>2008.3.22</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK11</td>
<td>CUHK (Edu expert)</td>
<td>2008.3.22</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK12</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>2009.12.22</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK13</td>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>2009.12.22</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK14</td>
<td>CUHK</td>
<td>2009.12.22</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK15</td>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>2009.12.22</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HK16</td>
<td>HKU</td>
<td>2010.3.17</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date 1</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG01</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2009.5.12</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG02</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.5.13</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG03</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2009.5.13</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG04</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.8.21</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG05</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>2009.8.26</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG06</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.8.27</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG07</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.8.28</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG08</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.9.2</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG09</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.9.11</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG10</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.9.17</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Class Rm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG11</td>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>2009.9.17</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background profile of sociologists interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taiwan 24</th>
<th>Hong Kong 21</th>
<th>Singapore 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male 18</td>
<td>Male 15</td>
<td>Male 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 6</td>
<td>Female 6</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Academia Sinica 5</td>
<td>CUHK 5</td>
<td>NUS 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTU 4</td>
<td>HKU 4</td>
<td>NTU(SG) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCCU 2</td>
<td>HKBU 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat Tsing-hua 3</td>
<td>HKSYY 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat Taipei 1</td>
<td>HKUST 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSYSU 1</td>
<td>HKPU 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunghai 2</td>
<td>CityU 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fu-jen 3</td>
<td>Lingnan 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soochow 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nan-hua 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fou-Guan 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Prof 14</td>
<td>Prof 12</td>
<td>Prof 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate 1</td>
<td>Associate 4</td>
<td>Associate 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist 9</td>
<td>Assist 4</td>
<td>Assist 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer 1</td>
<td>Lecturer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of PhD</td>
<td>US 13</td>
<td>US 11</td>
<td>US 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TW 5</td>
<td>UK 9</td>
<td>European 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE 3</td>
<td>HK 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>2 Westerners</td>
<td>3 Westerner</td>
<td>1 Southeast Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This table excluded TW3, SG5 and HK12, who were not sociologists.
Appendix C: List of Chinese and Japanese Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Name</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chan Hoi-Man</td>
<td>陈海文</td>
<td>翁忠华</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan Kin-Man</td>
<td>陈健民</td>
<td>楼明照</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan Kwok-Bun</td>
<td>陈国賁</td>
<td>李明辉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Chia-Ming</td>
<td>張家銘</td>
<td>吕明華</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ching-ye</td>
<td>張鏡予</td>
<td>陈沛良</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ly-Yun</td>
<td>張笠雲</td>
<td>李佩华</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang Ying-Hwa</td>
<td>張錫安</td>
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