

Going International: Double/Joint Degree Programs in a Taiwanese University

Sheng-Ju Chan*

Graduate Institute of Education, National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan

Abstract

In their pursuit of international competitiveness and reputation, many universities have been internationalizing their campuses through a wide range of initiatives. One popular cooperative platform is double/joint degree programs (DJDP), where providers in different countries collaborate to offer a program. Despite the increased popularity of such programs, few studies have concentrated on them in relation to internationalization. In this wider context the current article used a case study approach to examine DJDP at a private university in Taiwan. In addition to better understanding how these programs are run, some critical issues and challenges emerged, including student mobility, program design, quality assurance and academic alignment, language use and domination, organizational restructuring, professional capacity enhancement, and employment. These discussions deepen existing knowledge about DJDP.

Keywords: internationalization, higher education, double/joint degree

1 Introduction

When people begin to classify the different types of internationalization in higher education, numerous approaches can be used. Knight (2008a), who proposed one often used typology, regarded internationalization as a kind of cross-border educational activity that included four categories of mobility: people, programs, providers, and projects. The most common form of internationalization is related to the mobility of students, scholars, researchers, experts, and consultants. The mobility of programs usually refers to a situation in which a partnership arrangement between international and domestic providers is reached to provide courses for local or other countries' students. A new trend has emerged among educational providers in different locations at the national level -- namely, branch campuses and virtual universities, which have grown significantly since the 1990s in line with the intensification of globalization. In addition, a wide range of research

projects, curriculum, technical assistance programs, and educational services transcend the national jurisdiction and are provided as forms of development aid, academic linkages, and commercial trade.

The increasing popularity of mobility in people, programs, providers, and projects highlights the growing importance of internationalization in higher education. Compared to people and provider mobility, program mobility more commonly retains the advantages of relatively low costs with high customer orientation. Many universities regard program mobility as an effective instrument for greater internationalization. A large majority of both U.S. institutions and EU institutions (more than 85%) plan to develop more joint and double degrees in the future (Kuder & Obst, 2009). The key motivations for launching joint and double degree programs appear to revolve largely around advancing the internationalization of the campus and raising the institution's international visibility and prestige (Kuder & Obst, 2009). However, an in-depth examination of the program mobility indicates that various forms of cooperation are involved with similar or overlapping connotations.

Most studies on internationalization of higher education have focused on national policies, student movements, and intercultural learning and teaching. Very limited empirical literature exists on dual/joint degree programs (DJDP) despite their growing importance around the globe. The current study aims to address this literature gap by examining the DJDP at a private university in Taiwan. The selection of this non-elite institution, referred to herein as M University, can reflect typical responses of universities in Taiwan. In addition to better understanding how M University employs DJDP to internationalize its campus, some critical issues and challenges emerge during the investigation, including student mobility, program design, quality assurance and academic alignment, language use and domination, organizational restructuring, professional capacity enhancement, and employment.

This article is divided into the following sections. First, we conduct a literature review on program mobility in general and DJDP in particular. Second, we discuss the national context for internationalization policies

* Corresponding Author: Dr. Sheng-Ju Chan (ju1207@ccu.edu.tw)
Associate Professor, Graduate Institute of Education
National Chung Cheng University

and regulations, with special reference to DJDP. This is followed by a brief section on research design and methods. The fourth part of this article centers on the institutional profile of M University, detailing its commitment to internationalization. We then depict the overall picture of DJDP at this investigated university. Finally, we focus on the emerging issues and challenges drawn from the empirical data of document analyses and interviews.

2 Internationalized Higher Education: The Mobility of Degree Programs

Knight (2008a) proposed six types of program mobility at the international level: franchise, twinning, double/joint degree, articulation, validation, and virtual/distance. In the current article, we devote our attention to twinning, double/joint degree, and articulation, which are conceptually intertwined and related, in order to provide some clarity on the meaning and key issues involved (Knight, 2008b). In addition to the virtual/distance program aspects, other types of program mobility involve some sort of cooperation between foreign and local providers/institutions. In the case of franchises, foreign providers authorize a local collaborator, as a protector of quality assurance, to run the course/program/service and award the qualifications. As such, local collaborators only copy and implement the program exactly without having the right to provide academic credentials. The main essence of twinning refers to developing an articulation system by allowing students to take course credits at both foreign and local institutions. However, only one qualification is awarded by the initiator, implying that all arrangements for this twinning program usually comply with the national regulation of the initiator. In fact, this definition is similar to another type of program mobility: articulation. Under the framework of articulation, quite flexible measures and mechanisms can be designed among all participating institutions while enabling students to gain credits from all collaborators. Therefore, it seems that articulation, by definition, is broader and more flexible and can cover the meaning of twinning.

Double/Joint degree program have proved very popular, yet problematic in terms of how the course/program/service is provided. In general, double/joint degree program indicate that two institutions collaborate to offer a program for which a student can receive two degrees respectively from each institution or a joint qualification from all participating providers. In practice, such collaborative courses or programs can be run jointly or separately, resulting in different implications. When the program is organized by much joint effort in course design, forms of faculty involvement, mutual credit recognition, quality assurance and marketing, this collaboration can create

organic, systemic, and productive learning experiences for students. However, when the double/joint degree program is loosely established, the most extreme outcome may become rough articulation due to the fact that students simply study abroad and earn credits at foreign collaborators in order to receive their qualifications. Therefore, the degree of integration among collaborative partners in double/joint degree programs is decisive and has a profound impact upon the students' learning experiences and outcomes.

Furthermore, although these courses and programs seem to be internationally mobile in relation to national jurisdiction, many students usually need to physically move to another country to earn the credits. This highlights the fact that double/joint degree programs available to students are still largely confined within the national boundaries in terms of physical form, requiring extra cost or payment from students for this benefit. Nevertheless, considering the differentiated meanings and complicated forms of these different types of program mobility, the term *double/joint degree program* (DJDP) will be used throughout this article to cover the majority of transnational cooperative degree programs and will be applied to the Taiwanese context in general and to the case study university, M University, in particular.

Among the major regions, Europe is by far the most active in developing DJDPs, thanks to the European Commission's (EC) funding programs (Erasmus Mundus Programs, 2004-2008), followed by Asia and the U.S. (Knight, 2008b). The fundamental principle of the Erasmus Programs initiated by the EC lie in the spirit of encouraging student mobility within Europe in an attempt to broaden students' regional and international perspectives and strengthen the European identity for the next generation through double/joint degree courses. Student enrolled in such programs are required to take courses from at least two participating universities to undertake such transnational learning experience. In a transatlantic survey reported by Kuder and Obst (2009), among the 180 higher education institutions surveyed, only 13% of American institutions and 26% of European institutions offer joint degrees; the figures increase to 68% and 76%, respectively, for double degrees. Thus, double degrees are more common than joint degrees. A large majority of both American institutions (87%) and European ones (85%) plan to continue to offer more joint and double degrees (Kuder & Obst, 2009). These survey results provide direct evidence of the continuous growth and popularity of double degrees among universities. The EU respondents' major partners for double/joint degrees come from the U.S. or other European counterparts, such as France, Spain, Germany, and the U.K. American respondents' collaborators mainly originate from the EU, such as Germany, France, and Spain, and Asia,

such as China and South Korea. A strong connection exists between EU countries and the U.S. in establishing these cooperative programs. However, among those established joint programs, European and American universities are favored by their Asian counterparts, including Taiwan. This tendency indicates that Asian countries are inclined to choose advanced and industrialized countries for partnership.

The strong demand for establishing DJDPs across the globe results in benefits for participants. Based on his field experience at Georgetown University, Stearns (2009) summarized the twofold benefits for such joint ventures. Cooperative partners can integrate valuable faculty from both sides and provide better teaching fellows for students. Furthermore, implicit knowledge, such as operational culture, students' learning styles and attitudes, and marketing strategies can be easily transferred to partner institutions to better promote the program in the local market. For some natural sciences and engineering programs, double/joint degree programs can share expensive equipment and instruments and integrate physical resources so as to reduce operational costs. Individual students' primary benefits come from the presumed effects of earning two/joint degrees, acquiring international credentials, having access to expanded teaching faculty, and developing a better understanding of local knowledge for employment.

Building on similar experiences in North Carolina State University, Li (2010) explained why his university develops dual degree programs with foreign universities: to develop a "strategic approach for international collaboration in higher education" and "enhanced learning experiences and global competence" for students. He believed that such joint initiatives can build strong and long-lasting partnerships with foreign institutions, promote curriculum integration with global perspectives, and engage faculty in global exchanges and scholarship. In light of enhanced learning experiences, DJDP is able to produce more degree-seeking students than typical exchange programs, enhance academic learning with global content and competence, increase cross-cultural and international understanding, and improve students' employability in the globalized economy. For example, the University of Hong Kong's cooperation with Oxford University and Cambridge in the senior executive program shows that their courses are composed of intensive 5-day workshops using interactive lectures, case analyses, discussions, and group work by incorporating expertise both from the U.K. and Hong Kong (Fong & Postiglione, 2011). Such course design to some extent seems to be consistent with the expected benefits Li (2010) proposed.

Although international DJDPs have been rapidly expanding in recent years (Kuder & Obst, 2009), little academic literature has analyzed such initiatives, particularly in Asia. Two articles have dealt with cooperative cases from China and Russia as well as Hong Kong's collaboration with its counterparts in the U.S. and the U.K. Uroda (2010) examined the development of two sets of partnerships developed by four higher education institutions in Harbin, China, and Vladivostok, Russia. These were not traditional elite universities located in the big cities; indeed, one of the participating institutions does not bear the title of university. In these two cases, the Chinese institutions were more active, and both pairs of institutions focused their programs primarily on Chinese students. In one partnership, the flow of students is one way only: China to Russia (Uroda, 2010). Instruction is carried out in Russian and Chinese, with specialties in information science, civil engineering, food technology, and economics. According to Uroda (2010), the success of the joint dual degree programs can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Strict central control imposed on the institutions' curricula
- (2) Mutual recognition of educational certificates and degrees signed in 1999
- (3) Legal status of students during their course of study and amount of time they are expected to reside in the host country
- (4) Use of Russian and Chinese as medium of instruction

In another case, Fong and Postiglione (2011) aptly pointed out that the main driver for the University of Hong Kong (HKU) to run joint degrees with prestigious universities is to enhance its global branding. Meanwhile, the foreign universities wished to tap into a new unmet market demand in the Asia-Pacific region in addition to generating additional revenues. HKU is able to learn from the high-quality faculty and curriculum provided by leading universities' business schools. In turn these cooperative initiatives can promote Hong Kong as a leading international center for the study of economics and business in Asia and serve the development needs of Hong Kong as an international financial center. Therefore, the construction of a cooperative relationship through double/joint degree programs can be strategic with long-term vision, which is not only beneficial to students and participating institutions, but also to local economic development and social prosperity.

Despite the many claimed benefits, implementing DJDPs actually faces a wide range of major challenges, ranging from national policies and regulations to institutional differences and extra administrative work at the personal level. Li (2010) concisely presented these points as follows:

- (1) Different higher education systems/regulations and accreditation requirements
- (2) Difficulty in coordinating academic requirements, credits, and quality assurance
- (3) Different tuition and cost structures between participating universities
- (4) Difficulties related to the legal review, approval process, and administrative supports
- (5) Heavy workload during preparation and set-up that often produces very few students

Faced with the varied legal and administrative requirements of academic standards and quality assurance procedures, participating institutions have to struggle with these diverse conditions and attempt to co-design mutually agreed-upon programs to meet the needs of all providers.

Some have question whether the final outcome of these DJDPs is worth such efforts. A survey aiming to examine strengths and weaknesses of a sample of programs at the graduate level in engineering produced mixed results (Culver, Puri, Spinelli, DePauw, & Dooley, 2012). According to the survey, all stakeholders were positive about these dual programs, but gains were indicated in personal dimensions (e.g., self-reliance) rather than professional ones. Even worse, employers were unclear about what dual degree programs were and did not tend to view graduates as more marketable. In other words, the advantages originating from dual degree programs are not related to the hard knowledge and skills learned transnationally, but instead to personality or individual attributes. In addition, there seems to be no relative market strength for graduates from such cross-border programs compared to domestic ones. These preliminary findings would constitute major challenges or barriers for international double degree programs in the long term.

3 National Context for Internationalization and Double/Joint Degree Programs

By analyzing the development of higher education in Taiwan during the past two decades, it becomes evident that decision makers and university leaders have paid less attention to the issue of internationalizing the higher education sector despite the numerous scholars trained by the Western system. It was not until the 21st century that Taiwan's government became aware of the internationalization of higher education in relation to the increasing international competition and national competitiveness (Song & Tai, 2007). In 2001, the *White Paper on Higher Education* formally pointed out that "the degree of internationalization is insufficient (Ministry of Education, Taiwan, 2001, p. 54)." The

Ministry of Education in Taiwan (MOE Taiwan) subsequently accelerated the implementation of relevant internationalization measures through efforts such as Enhancing International Competitiveness of University Plan and Improving English Proficiency of Higher Education Students in 2002. In addition to these two projects, recruiting international students become one of the main objectives while achieving internationalization. Increasing the number of foreign students in Taiwan was classified as a key component of the National Development Key Plan by the Premier of the Executive Yuan in 2004 (Wu, 2008). In an attempt to improve the effectiveness of recruiting non-local students, the Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education of Taiwan (FICHET) was established in 2006 in order to coordinate joint efforts between universities and governments and provide extra funds for setting up Taiwan's Education Center to act as a platform for providing information on studies in Taiwan.

The MOE Taiwan issued its *Study in Taiwan Enhancement Program* in 2011 and encouraged higher education institutions to recruit more students from Southeast Asia. Two major strategies were identified (Ministry of Education, Taiwan, 2011): (1) providing a friendly environment to international students, such as by offering full English courses, a supportive administration system, relaxed requirements for admission, and the ability to remain in Taiwan after graduation; and (2) marketing the advantages of studying in Taiwan, such as a single service window, memorandums of understanding (MOUs) signed with other governments, enhanced international visibility, and the promotion of Chinese learning. The underlying aim of such administrative assistance was to export the higher education industry to Southeast Asia so as to enhance international competitiveness, secure diplomatic relationships, and broaden local students' global outlook. Moreover, the newly elected President Ma Ying-Jeou announced in 2011 that he expects to build Taiwan into a key center of higher education in Southeast Asia. It is against this wider national context that transnational double degree programs become a primary indicator for assessing university internationalization. MOE Taiwan calculated the number of double degree programs as a countable measurement for determining the degree of internationalization for each university from 2002 to 2009. The direct link among internationalization, foreign student recruitment, and double degree programs can be found under this grand policy discourse at the national level.

However, the very concept of a double or joint degree in Taiwan has not been so clearly defined. Before 1998, the regulation entitled *Running Joint Degree Program between Domestic and Foreign Institution* aimed to help overseas Chinese students articulate their university education from

the third year or above in Taiwanese higher education institutions. Thus, the initial motivation mainly targeted Chinese students in Southeastern Asia, although the design of degree programs are articulation in essence rather than offering joint courses or even double degrees. Given the rapid development of IHE (Internationalization of higher education) in Taiwan, a wide range of universities wish to expand the scopes and sources of their incoming foreign students in the form of DJDPs. The original regulation, principally based on the needs of overseas Chinese students in Southeast Asia, was outdated and needed to be revised in order to meet the greater needs of diversified non-local students. Two former Ministers of Education in Taiwan, Professor Chao-Hsiang Yang and Professor Wei-Fan Kuo, have urged that a new cooperation model be established to set up double degree programs with foreign university. Thus, the old regulation was abolished in 2004.

The subsequent Article 29 of *The University Law* became the major baseline regulating international DJDPs. *Regulation Regarding the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Academic Credentials for Institutions of Higher Education*, enacted as a result of Article 29, indicates that the enrollment periods at both local and foreign universities can be held concurrently for different degrees. At least 32 months of enrollment are required for a bachelor's degree while 12 months of enrollment are the minimum standards for a master's degree; 24 months of enrollment are required for doctoral degrees. In addition, course credits taken at either university shall be no less than one third of the total course credits. In other words, a local student seeking to earn two degrees from both universities has to complete at least one third of all course credits at both universities. International partners for DJDPs have to be universities accredited by the responsible authorities of their local governments or by foreign accreditation agencies and listed in the database of foreign universities coordinated by the MOE Taiwan. The requirements clearly state that quality assurance and official recognition are important considerations for choosing cooperative partners from the national policy perspective. However, the list of officially recognized foreign universities does not cover all countries, and only 41 universities in Mainland China have been recognized, which prevents Taiwanese universities from establishing cooperative programs with many Chinese institutions.

4 Research Design and Methods

A case study approach was used in this study to examine the DJDP at a private university. The focus of a case study is a case in its own right, taking its context into account (Robson, 2002). Stake (1995, p. xi) asserted that “a

case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important environment.” He did not emphasize the quantitative measurement by paying attention to “episodes of nuance, the sequentiality of happenings in context, the wholeness of the individual (p. xii).” Yin (2009) also indicated that a case study is an empirical inquiry that “investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (p. 18).”

The advantages of a case study allow us to include in-depth context analyses and holistic perspectives of an organization and its subunits to developed a deeper understanding of the dynamic relationship between the single case and its wider environment. The only case included in this current study is a private university in Taiwan. We explored how this university used double degree programs to purchase its own strategic mission and vision for greater internationalization. The focus of the investigation was the motivation, strategic positions, implementation strategies, difficulties, issues and challenges of the DJDP involved. In order to garner sufficient information to answer the identified questions, several data collection methods were used, including document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Materials collected for further analysis included promotion documents and flyers, meeting minutes, university regulation and guidelines, program documents, website information, the university's magazine, and *Newsweek*. Such documents contain abundant information and can provide relevant answers to the research questions.

Another major source of data was semi-structured interviews. The interviewees included two faculty members in administrative positions in charge of the double degree program, three full-time administrators responsible for running the double degree program, two academic faculty members teaching in the double degree programs, and five students (two are foreign) enrolled in the program. These 12 people were interviewed between February and early May 2012. Each interview lasted from 60 to 90 minutes. E-mails were also employed to communicate with students regarding their learning experiences in the international programs.

5 Institutional Profile: Commitment to Internationalization

This private university, called M University, was established in 1957 as a junior college. It is located in Taipei city. The mission of the institution, as detailed on its website, is to serve as a teaching-intensive university

supplemented by research in order to be an internationalized comprehensive institution. This mission statement demonstrates that it is not a traditional elite university, but rather is still in pursuit of international development and global outreach. Indeed, the seed of internationalization was deeply rooted in the belief of the institution's founder, who actively participated in unofficial diplomacy, international academic exchanges, cultural interactions, and women's soccer on the global stage. These pioneering activities in the early stages illustrate the fundamental characteristics of this internationally oriented organization. Along with advances in globalization and liberalization, M University realized that everyone has to engage this global village and immerse him-/herself into this new world economic and social network. From the perspective of the labor market, students should not be confined to the domestic vacancies but rather utilize their capacities on the global stage. Due to the worldwide competition for individual career and mobility, M University intends to educate students with international vision and outlook in a combination of theory and practice, helping them acquire better positions in the global labor market.

Against this wider institutional recognition and perception, M University pays special attention to strengthening international education. In line with this grand idea, recruiting international students and providing English courses have become essential measures in promoting educational exchanges and cooperation with foreign universities in the form of sister universities. Other relevant initiatives that M University is undertaking include hosting academic conferences, offering study abroad, hosting exchange students, and promoting academic and cultural exchanges. In order to provide institutional support, several administrative and academic units have been created to assist in the development of greater internationalization and double degree programs in particular. The International Education and Exchange Division was set up in 2001 with the function of handling relevant administrative affairs while the Office of International Student Service, established in 2002, aims to provide consultancy, discipline, visas, and health assurance. In order to enhance the capacity of providing courses and training fully taught in English, the International College (IC) -- with seven undergraduate programs and one graduate program¹ -- was created in 2004 and began to admit both local and foreign students. The double degree program students who participated in this study were enrolled in this college.

¹ These programs include applied computing program, travel and tourism program, international affairs and diplomacy program, international business and management program, journalism and mass communication program, international trade and management program, department of finance, and Graduate School of International Affairs.

Thanks to such efforts, the number of international students has gradually increased to 579 by 2011, making it the third largest in Taiwan after National Chengchi University and National Taiwan University. In addition, with the governmental funding support, M University established Taiwan Education Centers in Mongolia and South Korea to export its educational industry, offering Chinese courses and recruiting other countries' students. These two centers are effective administrative units for fostering greater internationalization for M University. In fact, in order to better comply with international standards, M University has consistently sought accreditation by an American higher education accreditation body since 2006, ultimately succeeding in 2010 when it was officially recognized by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in the U.S. After being officially accredited, the current president even declared they want to be an "American University in Asia" with the hopes of becoming an internationalized university (Lee, 2007, p. 201).

6 Double/Joint Degree Program as a Means of Internationalization

The establishment of double degree programs with foreign universities has been primarily inspired by the needs of greater internationalization, providing more study choices for domestic students and recruiting more foreign students (Interviewees 1, 2 & 5). However, available information reveals that earlier DJDPs at M University concentrated on Malaysian universities since 2001 (Ministry of Education, Taiwan, 2011) because these programs are customized for overseas Chinese students in Malaysia for their further study in Taiwan. These students transfer or articulate their studies to M University and do not finish their degree at the sending university in Malaysia. In other words, this double/joint degree arrangement usually does not result in two degrees for Malaysian students. Nevertheless, M University still retains a strong desire to internationalize its campus through DJDPs with other countries.

Since 2004, it has sought to diversify cooperative partners. This diversification approach is not just attempts to provide more mobile destinations for local students, but also expand international linkages at the institutional level (Interviewees 1 & 2). The interviewees in charge of DJDP believe that local students can benefit from cooperative programs as a consequence of receiving better teaching quality, expanded global outlook, and employment prospects in both countries. These beliefs inspire this university to take an active view in expanding such programs. Table 1 illustrates the rapid progress made

Table 1 Double/Joint Degree Programs with Foreign Universities until 2010

Date of Signing	Country	Institutions	Agreement
Oct. 19, 2001	Malaysia	Hanxing Academy of Journalism and Communication	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
Nov. 1, 2001	Malaysia	Han Chiang College	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
Dec. 31, 2001	Malaysia	Southern College	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
Jan. 15, 2002	Malaysia	Central Academy Art College	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
Feb. 1, 2002	Malaysia	Baruvi Academy of Communication	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
June 13, 2002	Malaysia	New Era College	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
Sept. 12, 2003	Malaysia	In-House Multimedia Academy	Joint Degree Cooperation Agreement
May 15, 2004	U.S.A.	Saginaw Valley State University	Statement of Articulation Principles
Sept. 1, 2004	U.K.	Northumbria University	Articulation Agreement for Advanced Entry
Sept. 26, 2006	U.S.A.	Park University	Interim International Academic Agreement
Sept. 29, 2006	Vietnam	Vietnam National University	Cooperation Agreement of Joint-Degree Program
May 23, 2007	U.K.	University of Bedfordshire	Dual Degree
June 1, 2007	Malaysia	Malaysian Institute of Art	Joint Degree Agreement
July 25, 2007	Mongolia	Otgontenger University	Joint Degree
Nov. 14, 2007	Vietnam	Hanoi University of Business and Technology	Cooperation Agreement on Joint-Degree Program
Jan. 25, 2008	South Korea	Suwon Science College	Cooperation Agreement on Joint-Degree Program
April 21, 2008	U.K.	Northumbria University	Articulation Agreement
Aug. 13, 2008	Vietnam	Foreign Trade University-Vietnam	Application for Joint-Training Program License
March 26, 2009	Latvia	School of Business Administration Turiba	Agreement for Realisation of Double Degree Programme
April 23, 2009	Malaysia	New Era College	Renewed agreement
April 23, 2009	Malaysia	Dasein Academy of Art	MOA Joint Degree
April 1, 2010	Vietnam	Dai Nam University	Cooperation Agreement on Joint-Degree Program
May 3, 2010	South Korea	Suwon Science College	Cooperation Agreement of Joint-Degree Program (renewed)
May 5, 2010	Vietnam	Hanoi University of Business and Technology	Cooperation Agreement on Joint-Degree Program (renewed)
June 14, 2010	Mongolia	Global Leadership University	Cooperation Agreement on Joint-Degree Program

Source: Ministry of Education, Taiwan (2011).

over the past decade. The countries included are the U.S., the U.K., Vietnam, Malaysia, Mongolia and South Korea, concentrating on English-speaking countries and Asian neighbors. Alumni of American and British universities at M University play major roles in helping to negotiate such programs in the early stages of collaboration while other DJDPs have evolved from solid cooperative relationships, such as sister universities. Moreover, the Taiwan Education Centers set up by M University in South Korea and Mongolia have also provided an effective platform for establishing DJDPs in the long term.

Among these programs, most are referred to as “joint” degrees while very few are called “double” or “articulation.” These titles of agreement seem to indicate

that “joint” is a more common arrangement in Taiwan. However, a deeper examination into these agreements reveals that “articulation” is only used with universities in the U.S. and the U.K. because students at M University wish to be transferred to these English-speaking countries for articulation. Interviewee 1 clearly expressed that this is a “one-way street,” with only out flowing students and no inflowing ones from these Western universities. Despite having signed so many programs, some are more active while others are dormant due to the lack of student participation. Some programs are not as popular among domestic students and thus lack stable student sources. The interviewees also indicated that undergraduate programs are more feasible than postgraduate ones. The major difficulties

faced by postgraduate students are time constraints and academic issues. Earning two degrees within two years requires two quality dissertations, including one in English (Interviewees 2, 3, 11 & 12). These would pose significant challenges to Taiwanese students. In contrast, there are a range variety of undergraduate double/joint programs with different combinations, such as 3 + 1 and 2 + 2. The former requires students to study in Taiwan for 3 years and spend their final year at foreign universities while the latter divides students' time into half at both campuses. Even with sufficient time to adapt to the European and American learning environments, students still suffer from problems of languages, curriculum articulation and recognition, and academic capacity, which will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of this paper. When asked which subjects are most popular among students participating in these cooperative degree programs, business and management, tourism, and language specializations stand out.

In terms of joint degree programs with Asian countries, usually no outflow students leave M University as no one is interested in studying in Vietnam, Malaysia, or Mongolia. The inflow students from Asia are allocated into different departments and grades of IC at M University according to their previous studies and application intention. In fact, these departments and programs are created as parallel systems so as to entirely serve the needs of double/joint degrees seekers, foreign learners, and local students interested in the courses taught in English. In other words, there are similar departments and programs exist with regard to organizational structure -- notably, business management or journalism. This design not only avoids the large-scale transformation of current operational structures, but also effectively provides essential support for greater internationalization with respect to admitting more foreign degree seekers. When it comes to the curriculum design of these DJDP, courses are provided separately at both universities, thus lacking co-teaching activities. When a student wants to earn a degree he/she has to get certain credits in compliance with regulations or requirements of both universities. This may create institutional barriers for mobile students to finish their study. Moreover, there seems to be no coherent or systemic synergies among collaborative partners in sharing issues of teaching load, management matter, academic regulations, marketing, websites, or registration. Students are required to move across national borders in order to finish their studies. The pattern of provision, therefore, is not nicely coordinated and planned by both sides. Despite coordinating so many double/joint degrees programs, M University has not enacted *Implementation Guidelines for Offshore Dual/Joint Degree Programs* for internal reference. This deficit is obvious, and additional effort is required.

7 Issues and Challenges Faced

The rapid emergence of DJDP at M University indicates that it has become one of the major channels for internationalization efforts. However, the strategies and practices used also cause a wide range of concerns. These concerns occur at different levels, ranging from systemic and institutional issues to individual levels that must be addressed. Some concerns arise as important issues and might need official assistance. Others might constitute lasting challenges for M University in particular and other institutions in general. In this section, we will focus on these concerns, issues, and challenges.

7.1 Patterns of Student Circulation: A Relay Model

In terms of DJDP at M University, cooperative universities cover industrialized countries and Asian counterparts. However, a deeper analysis reveals that the student mobility among these programs is uneven and imbalanced. Interviewees confirmed that no or a very limited number of students from English-speaking countries have enrolled at M University through such joint efforts, representing a unidirectional mobility. The literature review demonstrated that collaborative partnerships between China and Russia in joint degree were one way as well (i.e., from Harbin, China, to Russia). For these Western collaborators, they have net inbound students into their campuses and can generate extra income. The benefits for M University are to help their students gain "higher credential values as well as better employment prospects (Interviewees 6 & 7)." Through these institutional linkages, M University also enhances its branding and attractiveness in the competitive higher education market in Taiwan. Therefore, mutual benefits become the basis for both sides.

In the double/joint degrees programs with Malaysia, Vietnam, and Mongolia, there are net inflow students for M University as no local students move out for further study. Here, another type of uneven student mobility is taking place: University M -- similar to Western universities -- has become an attractive destination for these Asian students. The DJDPs play a role in articulating their studies in Taiwan. Such hierarchical or unidirectional relationships between M University and cooperative universities in Asia and the West are vertical in mobility with respect to student flow (Chan, 2012). Taking all these collaborative programs into account, M University seems to act as a relay station receiving inbound students from Asian countries and sending out local students to English-speaking ones. The mobility of students in this network is circulatory, where M University is increasingly internationalized due to the frequent involvement of learners across the national borders. What people do not discover is that, within this

circulation network, developing countries such as Vietnam and Malaysia are still likely to suffer from brain drain (Chiang, 2012).

7.2 Characteristics of Double/Joint Degree Programs

Few studies have discussed how DJDPs are implemented (Fong & Postiglione, 2011; Uroda, 2010). Previous analysis of such joint programs at M University indicates that most are joint or articulation in nature. Students are required to start their courses at domestic institutions and finish or complete part of the courses at cooperative institutions. They have to earn credits first from domestic and then foreign institutions. For students, the program can be divided, fragmented, and scattered if effective coordination is absent. The degree of integration of the DJDP in course design, forms of faculty involvement, mutual credit recognition, quality assurance, and marketing becomes very essential in helping students continue through these difficulties. Based on the interviews with five students, M University probably needs to make extra effort in harmonizing the different systems, such as rules or regulations for transfer credits. Students sometimes face difficulties in gaining sufficient credits for graduation. These technical issues relate to the consistence of curriculum articulation in mapping exercises, the total learning hours for each credit, and even physical education. Such concerns were voiced by the outflow students interviewed; more input from inflow students is needed in the future in order to understand how to design such mechanisms better.

7.3 Quality Assurance/Accreditation: Academic Alignment Issues

The previous literature review in this article indicated that different regulations, accreditations, and quality assurance can pose a serious challenge to international DJDPs. Our findings from fieldwork interviews and document analyses confirm this point. Some practical constraints and challenges emerge from the differences in national policies, institutions, and regulations among the participating universities. For example, the mutual recognition of universities and educational programs among different countries is essential for establishing DJDP (Hou, 2012). M University encountered difficulties in expanding its DJDP with universities in China and some Asian countries, such as India, due to accreditation issues. The minimum requirement of one third of credits being completed at both universities also dictates the behavior of M University and forms of DJDP undertaken. Interviewees also mentioned that more flexibility and support are needed to adjust to the differences of different systems while complying with national policies and practices. Therefore,

although educational authority in Taiwan is keen to encourage further internationalization in higher education, balancing quality assurance and institutional autonomy for internationalization remains a tough issue to consider.

7.4 Language Issues

The implementation of DJDPs is closely related to the medium of instruction. In promoting further internationalization, M University had to strategically use English as the official language for teaching at IC and all inflow students through DJDP. This raises concerns over the English proficiency of students and teachers at IC. As the mother tongues of most involved students and teachers is not English, the teaching and learning quality sometimes could be doubtful. Similar situations have occurred among outbound students studying in the Western countries, as their language proficiency was good enough to adapt to the learning environments and finish their degrees (Interviewee 7). This problem could be exacerbated if academic requirements are not met while students insist on undertaking DJDPs. Using English as a medium of instruction seems to be challenging for both students and staff at M University. This also provokes a debate as whether such a move would result in “Anglicisation” or “English imperialism (Knight, 2008b, p. 21).” In combating such developments and stressing the rise of China, the Department of Teaching Chinese as a Second Language was also created in 2006. Local learners and inflow students from Asian countries are encouraged to take Chinese courses, thereby enhancing their competitiveness. This diversion development along with the emphasis of English popularity has created a dual system where English dominates the scene while Chinese is gaining in importance.

7.5 Organizational Restructuring: A Parallel Development

To promote greater internationalization and more inflow students through DJDP, some organizational units have been added to existing structures since 2001, including the International Education and Exchange Division, the Office of International Student Service, and IC. As Li (2010) asserted, DJDPs tend to create a heavy workload in preparation and set-up, but often produce very few students. The three added units, therefore, intend to meet the challenges of inbound and outbound students. The appearance of IC and its departments and programs at M University indicate a parallel development for incorporating international dimensions and have multiple implications for higher education management. It is quite understandable that some faculty and staff resist accepting too many foreign students and in turn use English as the teaching language. Thus, IC can act as a conduit for accepting international

students and prevent the dramatic transformation of the university as a result of internationalization. Moreover, Chinese teaching can be reserved mainly for local students at the original departments and programs. This parallel development might indicate a new organizational trend for non-English-speaking universities around the world and be worth investigating further in terms of its function, operation, culture, and tension with other subunits within the organization, particularly similar departments that can be taught in Chinese.

7.6 Professional Learning and Employment Prospects

One of the prominent attractions for mobile students of DJDPs is related to the enhancement of professional knowledge, skills, and employability in the job market. The participants we interviewed confirmed that the main motivations and expected advantages for joining such programs relate to the previously mentioned capacities, such as broadening the international outlook, strengthening (English) language ability, transition to foreign postgraduate programs, and acquiring better employment prospects (Interviewees 8, 11, & 12). All interviewed students agreed that foreign credentials are more valuable than local ones, helping them occupy a better position in the labor market. One faculty member in charge of DJDPs at M University mentioned that their graduates scatter comprehensively in diverse occupations across the countries. This also implies that an international DJDP is able to provide better skills for transnational employment. Therefore, we can assume that DJDP is effective in raising professional capacity and improving employment opportunities at the global level. This assumption is based on a clear identification and higher value of DJDP from the perspective of employers. However, a recent survey rejected such a positive prediction by saying that employers do not regard such graduates as more marketable (Culver et al., 2012). These authors even asserted that the gains are not in professional growth or enhancement. Given the lack of solid data and systematic tracking of such graduates, we might need further information in order to determine the final outcome and effectiveness of the labor market.

8 Conclusions

For the past two decades, we have been witnessing more internationalized initiatives and programs across the globe. Knight (2008a) once classified these activities into four types of mobility: people, programs, providers, and projects. Within program mobility, DJDP has gained wide popularity as many universities in Europe and America are seeking to launch such initiatives in the future. M University, a non-elite private institution in Taiwan, has devoted itself

to greater internationalization since the late 1990s due to the increasingly globalized economy and transnational competition. DJDP, therefore, has been adopted by this emerging university for international aspiration and reputation enhancement. This special channel of cooperative relationship with foreign universities provides diverse benefits for both institutions and individuals involved.

However, a deeper examination into the strategies and practices of M University reveals that there are some issues and challenges to be addressed. In terms of internationalization, the patterns of student mobility seem to be uneven and imbalanced, representing a hierarchical relay model by receiving students from Asian countries while exporting Taiwanese ones to English-speaking countries. Moreover, the characteristics of DJDP in large part are organized in a form of loose articulation with foreign collaborators; thus, extra harmonization between institutions is needed. This problem becomes exacerbated due to the quality assurance regimes that national policies dictate and the lack of mutual recognition with some countries. Language issues plague DJDP further. In addition to the concerns over English proficiency among students and faculty, how to balance the English teaching for international competitiveness and Chinese learning for local needs becomes an emerging task for M University to tackle. The temporary solution has been a parallel system with the creation of IC, focusing on institutional dimensions and teaching. This organizational restructuring has diverse implications for higher education management and is worth studying in greater depth. Finally, does DJDP enhance professional skills and employability in the labor market? Our limited information seems to be positive, but comprehensive evidence is needed to verify these assumptions.

In addition, we understand that the experiences of this private university may not be inclusive and somehow differ from other institutions' in Taiwan. However, it is also clear that some of these issues and challenges identified from this only case can be common among non-English speaking countries in Asia while implementing internationalization. For example, the imbalanced student mobility and the use of dual language can be a serious concerns for Korea and China. Our findings based on Taiwanese university actually retains wider implications for other countries or universities and make up the literature gap as we indicated previously.

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude goes to Dr. Kuo-Pao Chang for his great help in carrying out fieldwork and interviews.

References

- Chan, S. J. (2012). Shifting patterns of student mobility in Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 25, 207-224.
- Chiang, L. C. (2012). Trading on the West's strength: The dilemmas of transnational higher education in East Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 25, 171-189.
- Culver, S. M., Puri, I. K., Spinelli, G., DePauw, K. P. K., & Dooley, J. E. (2012). Collaborative dual-degree programs and value added for students: Lessons learned through the evaluate-E project. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16, 40-61.
- Fong, P., & Postiglione, G. (2011). Making cross-border partnerships work: The case of China's Hong Kong system. In R. Sakamoto & D. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-Border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 169-190). New York: Routledge.
- Hou, A. Y. C. (2012). Mutual recognition of quality assurance decisions on higher education institutions in three regions: A lesson for Asia. *Higher Education*, 64, 911-926.
- Knight, J. (2008a). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Knight, J. (2008b). *Joint and double degree programmes: Vexing questions and issues*. London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Kuder, M., & Obst, D. (2009). *Joint and double degree programs in the transatlantic context: A survey report*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Lee, C. (2007). *Change and development in the university: Ming Chuan's journey from a women's college to a world class university*. Taipei, Taiwan: Wunan.
- Li, B. L. (2010, February). *Practices and challenges of international dual degrees: The perspective of state universities*. Paper presented at the 2010 AIEA Conference, Washington, DC.
- Ministry of Education, Taiwan. (2001). *White paper on higher education*. Taipei, Taiwan: Author.
- Ministry of Education, Taiwan. (2011). *Academic exchange and cooperation*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.tw/files/site_content/B0005/2011.5學術交流合作.xls
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Song, M. M., & Tai, H. H. (2007). Taiwan's responses to globalisation: Internationalisation and questing for world class universities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 27, 323-340.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stearns, P. N. (2009). *Educating global citizens in colleges and universities: Challenges and opportunities*. New York: Routledge.
- Uroda, A. (2010). Borders bridging degrees: Harbin and Vladivostok's dual-degree programs. In D. W. Chapman, W. K. Cummings, & G. A. Postiglione (Eds.), *Crossing borders in East Asian higher education* (pp. 231-261). Hong Kong, China: The University of Hong Kong.
- Wu, Y. C. (2008). Review and prospect of recruiting international students policy. Retrieved from <http://www.ced.ncnu.edu.tw/%E6%A0%A1%E5%85%A7%E6%BC%94%E8%AC%9B%E5%BA%A7%E8%AB%87ppt%E7%AD%89%E5%AD%98%E6%94%BE%E8%99%95/962/97.04.17%E5%90%B3%E4%BA%9E%E5%90%9B/%E5%A4%96%E7%94%9F%E6%94%BF%E7%AD%96%E5%9B%9E%E9%A1%A7%E8%88%87%E5%89%8D%E7%9E%BB041797.pdf>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

