

**University-community partnership in the transformation of local development:
From market-oriented to local-based development**

Muyi Chou*

Dung-Sheng Chen**

DRAFT- PLEASE DONOT CITE

Abstract

Taiwan has democratized since late 1980s. However, political democratization does not necessarily lead to the democratization of economy. Local societal development is usually subordinate to the principle of continuous national economic growth and local actors are not able to deliberate their own economic models. In this context, how do local communities gradually liberate from domination of top-down political and market power and develop alternative ways of life and economy? The aim of this paper is to illustrate how universities form partnership with local communities to respond to local needs and develop local-based economic institutions. Through such collaboration, some universities have gradually integrated into local societies by working with local actors and try to translate theoretical knowledge into local one and also to enrich their own teaching and research by learning local experiences. It is not a unilateral way of delivering services but rather multi-lateral interactions among various stakeholders from different parties in creating collective knowledge and a sense of “belongingness.” Unlike expert-oriented policy-making, this collaboration emphasizes on cross-disciplinary and cross-community partnership to investigate important local socioeconomic problems and find feasible solutions at the same time. Universities play a significant role in activating and reshuffling local human and natural resources in creative ways and encourage local actors actively engage into resolving these problems. Thus, local development can be redefined and envisioned by university-community partnerships. In this paper, we will use case studies to elaborate how university-community coalitions reframe local development by the concept of “social economy” and how it initiates, develops and sustains. Although these alternative economic experimental projects are in their early stage, they are very heuristic cases for investigating hypothesis of liability of newness in exercising alternative economic models. This paper will contribute to elaborate dynamic processes of university-local community collaboration in local social economy.

Key words: social economy, local development, university-community partnership

* Postdoctoral Fellow. Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University. Email: muyichou@gmail.com

**Professor. Department of Sociology, National Taiwan University. Email: dschen@ntu.edu.tw

1. Introduction: Envisioning Alternative Economies and Models of Local Development

Economic development in post-war Taiwan was characterized as a model of developmental state, that is, the state- or bureaucracy-led economic policies led into an export-oriented economic development fully integrated into the world capitalist system. The state-civil society relations in economic development were shown as state-centered. After democratization, although policies of economic development are no longer totally controlled by state bureaucrats, capitalism still serves as a guiding principle of the Taiwan economic institution. In this context, strategies of economic development are still dominated by state bureaucrats. Political democratization does not necessarily lead to the democratization of economic policy decision making. Local development is usually subordinate to continuous national economic growth and local actors are not able to develop their own economic models.

Moreover, capitalism brings us both advantages and disadvantages. Although modern technologies and global market to some extent promote the living standards of many people, it also causes the huge gap between the rich and the poor. The expansion of socio-economic inequality may easily lead to the political inequality, which makes the inequality problem negatively influence economic-disadvantaged and marginalized groups (Merkel 2014). According to Wright (2010: 37, 33-85), there are eleven central criticisms of capitalist economic system. We think the most decisive one is “capitalism corrodes community” (Wright 2010: 37, 79-81). Since the competitive logic of capitalism is very different from the cooperative logic of community. Without community, some important or idiosyncratic values based on culture are difficult to maintain or sustain. The mainstream trend of economic development tends to overestimate modernized procedure of production and economic growth without taking environmental issues and community solidarity into consideration. As a result, many rural areas face the degeneration and pollution of the land and water resource, which damages villagers’ daily life. Local culture is difficult to sustain its autonomy when global market forces penetrate into every dimension of local communities. Is this vicious circle the only way to develop local economy? If not, how do rural communities get rid of such dis-embedded and aggressive way of development?

With this in mind, this paper follows the abovementioned concern and seeks to explore alternative possibilities of local development. The aim of this paper is to illustrate how universities form partnership with local communities to respond to local needs and develop local-based economic institutions. Through such cooperation,

some universities have gradually embedded into local societies by working with local actors and try to translate theoretical knowledge into local understanding and also to enrich their teaching and research by learning local experiences. It is not a unilateral way of delivering services but rather multi-lateral interactions among stakeholders from different parties in creating collective knowledge and a sense of “belongingness.” Previously, it seems that knowledge-building belongs to academic community. However, we usually overestimate experts’ advice in policies to shape society rather than include people’s experiential knowledge into policy-making process. Moreover, social problems are complex and therefore, they cannot be solved by any single discipline. With this in mind, we need cross-disciplinary and cross-community coalitions to investigate important local economic problems and find feasible solutions together. Universities play a significant role in activating and reshuffling local human and nature resources in creative ways and encourage local actors actively engage into resolving these problems. In line with it, local development can be redefined and envisioned by university-community collaboration. This demonstrates a different model of university-community partnerships.

In this paper, we will use a case study to elaborate how university-community coalitions reframe local development based on “social economy” and how it initiates, develops and sustains. Although these alternative economic experimental projects are in their early stage, they are very heuristic cases for investigating hypothesis of liability of newness in exercising alternative economic models. This paper will contribute to elaborate dynamic processes of university-local community collaboration in local social economy.

The content of this paper is structured as the following. First, we briefly review literatures on alternative economies and social economy is employed as an applicable concept for us to envision and reframe an alternative model of local development. In practice, we suggest alternative model of local development can be carried out by university-community partnerships implementing process-oriented projects. Different from goal-oriented project implementation, the process-oriented projects are practiced by trial and error and modify their goals according to the dynamic of local communities and the involvement of stakeholders. Then, we will use a case study to illustrate how one university builds partnership with an indigenous community and how they co-construct a new vision by transforming mainstream economic development model into one based on social economy logic, namely taking community-based and cultural elements into consideration. With this case, we show how the idea of social economy is translated into indigenous understanding and linked to their cultural practice. Besides, the network-building of local development will be analyzed and see how diverse participants no matter from outside or from within

contribute to community development. Finally, we will discuss the implication of social innovation in this case as well as challenges of university-community collaborative initiatives in the future.

2. Theoretical Approach: Bottom-up, Local, Open, and Reassembling (BLOR) Actor (Community) Network

Reframe the Understanding of the Economy and Local Development

The aims of this section are twofold. One is to reframe the understanding of the economy and then envision the alternatives of local development. The other one is to introduce an analytical framework for understanding how the action research conducts and modifies according to the dynamics of changing participants and diverse demands.

In Taiwan, with dominant Han(Chinese)-culture and capitalist development approach reinforcing by state policies, compulsory education and mass media, minority ethnic groups and cultures are often underestimated and excluded. Rural areas are gradually marginalized by the trend of rapid urbanization. Job opportunities are concentrated in cities, which discourages young people to live and work in rural areas. As a result, the devitalization of rural communities and their cultures becomes the common challenge in Taiwan. Moreover, capitalist market economy overly emphasizes on competition and utility, which damages the solidarity of community and leads to the negative effects on environment, ecology and social equality (Wright 2010: 37). Profit-oriented way of production simplifies value as money. As a result, profit maximization becomes the key principle to make an economic decision and excludes diverse alternatives. If economic behavior separates itself from local and cultural context, it is difficult to defend “value.” Bring the culture back is the key to create value and preserve social and cultural diversity (Clammer 2016: 10).

Local development shall not be reduced to urbanization. Rural areas shall be treated as autonomous entities rather than peripheral parts of cities. Although capitalist economy benefits corporations, especially transnational ones and contributes to economic growth, it causes a lot of negative impacts on environment and ecology. Besides, it worsens the exploitation of local workers and discourages the practices of indigenous cultures and knowledge (Pun, Ku, Yan, and Koo 2016: xiii). “Socioeconomic inequality” becomes larger and larger and results in “political inequality”, which may systematically exclude the interests of marginalized groups and erode social diversity (Merkel 2014: 117-123). Rural areas in this sense serves as the pool to provide human and nature resources but capitalist production does not

feedback to local areas but rather takes all profits out of these areas. This predatory capitalist model is incompatible with local sustainability and dis-embeds in local context of development. Thus, the local development should be a “situated practice” in response to local needs and take ethical consideration of culture, community and environment when making economic decisions (Amin 2009: 11-14; Borowiak 2016: 29-34; Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy 2013: xviii-xix).

Theories and practices of social economy provide us alternative possibilities to respond social problems out of capitalist development. Among them, “reframing” is a key to imagine an alternative economy, namely viewing something familiar in new ways by giving new meanings (Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy 2013: 7-10). In line with it, Noya and Clarence (2007: 15) argue that “social economy reframes the investment in business into investment to people and environment.” Moreover, in terms of economic behaviors, Borzaga and Tortia (2007: 23) reframe “self-seeking individual” into “reciprocal preferences” that benefit involved members and they further reframe the conception of firm from “production organizations” into “governance structures.” Thus, the economic results are not simplified as the maximum of profit but rather viewed as “economic sustainability.” In this sense, local development in the logic of social economy can be reframed as a “locally embedded” economy that takes local community members, environment, and cultural and historical context into consideration (Borzaga and Tortia 2007: 23).

What is so-called local-based here? Conventional discussion of local development strategies can be categorized into two main approaches. One is from exogenous perspective or needs-based community development strategy (Gibson-Graham 2006: 145). This strategy is “problem-centered” and it diagnoses the lack of community and finds solutions from external assistances (Gibson-Graham 2006: 145-146; Pun et al. 2016: xv). The other one is from endogenous perspective or asset-based community development strategy (Gibson-Graham 2006: 145; Kretzmann and McKnight 1993). Such strategy focuses on “the change of production mode” on the basis of local resources, assets and capacities in response to common needs. It is usually carried out by cooperation, mutual help, and democratic participation (Gibson-Graham 2006: 145-146; Pun et al. 2016: xv). In this paper, we argue that community development can be beneficial by both approaches. The key is whether a community can exert its autonomy and solidarity toward external influences. Thus, in practice, before working on economic alternatives, we think it is more important to (re)build social ties and facilitate the solidarity of local community first.

Inspired by theoretical and practical practices of sharing economy, cooperative economy, social economy and solidarity economy around the world, we seek to explore their implications and what we can do in Taiwan’s context. In fact, alternative

economies are not entirely new in Taiwan. According to Chen (2017: 557), there are three main phases for alternative economies happening in Taiwan as follows. The first phase was in 1960s and it was about the establishment of credit union league¹ for the purpose of emergent loan for the demands of living or initiating a business. However, this was not a bottom-up movement but rather a special permission authorized by the authoritarian government (Chen 2017: 557).

The second phase was in 1990s during the period of democratization. In this period, there were lots of grassroots organizations emerging and they devoted themselves to local development (Chen 2017: 549). Among them, some worked on the history and literature of local communities and the others focused on community development. The latter one was beneficial from the government's policy on "community empowerment" (Chen 2017: 549-550). However, government's funding sometimes do more harm than good to local development. In order to fit the government's criteria, many local communities became more and more similar and resulted in even more dependent on the government's resources, which was contrary to the original purpose of local autonomy and community empowerment (Chiou and Chen 2001; Chen 2000; Ho 2010). Nevertheless, there were some successful cases of developing community economy based on local specialties. Most of them successfully linked their business to local history and culture, which emphasized their business embedded in local community and the profits returned to social services or public use (Chen 2017: 549-554). Some of values, such as share, reciprocity, and mutual help, were originated in their cultures but were underestimated in capitalist market economy. However, they were conducive to the solidarity of local community. Beyond economic development, the implication of successful cases is facilitating solidarity of local communities. In this period, the role of government was to nurture or foster the potential of local development (Chen 2017: 558).

The third phase has started in 2008 when global financial crisis impacted the whole world till now (Chen 2017: 554). The introduction of sharing economy and social enterprises facilitated the energy of social innovation, namely using or synthesizing new technologies, thoughts, and business models to solve social problems (Chen 2017: 554-557). In this stage, the role of government turns to a supplementary one and focuses on providing compatible institutional and financial support to make social innovation organizations sustain and develop (Chen 2017: 558). This is an ongoing stage and newly emerged organizations or social enterprises still strive for sustaining.

However, it seems that there are gaps between the second and the third phase. In rural areas, how do they also benefit from the new technology, thoughts or means of

¹ <http://www.culroc.org.tw/english/index.html>

crowdfunding to pursue alternative ways of development without being even more marginalized by the unbalanced development between the urban and rural communities? This paper seeks to fill this gap and explore the possibilities of initiating an alternative model of development at community level especially in rural areas.

With the development of capitalism and globalization, the asymmetric development between the core and periphery area causes lots of tensions. Confronted by this challenge of mainstream development, Reid and Taylor (2002: 20) suggest that the role of university can be decisive in the way of economic development. Universities can follow the global capitalist trend that influences the local society from above. Or alternatively, they can facilitate “grassroots globalization” that reconstructs involved community and environment for a sustainable existence to resist or counterbalance uncertain side effect of globalization (Reid and Taylor 2002: 20).

With regard to the role of universities we think it is an important mediator for local communities except local government especially concerning empowerment and knowledge transfer. Universities form partnership with communities and respond to social problems and needs together especially those are neglected by the government and the market. The gap that is ignored by both the state and market is exactly the starting point that university-community partnership can work together. The working process of university-community collaboration tends to be experimental and malleable according to the dynamic of the community demands. In recent years, more and more universities included social responsibility as one of their important tasks. Here we refer to Wright’s (2010: 10-29) argument in “the task of emancipatory social science” in *Envisioning Real Utopia*. He proposes the concept of “desirability, viability, and achievability” to envision economic alternatives of capitalism (Wright 2010: 20-25). We apply these three concepts to elaborate how universities establish partnership with local communities. University research team is composed by diverse disciplines and invites local communities to work together. The collaboration between the two parts is characterized as bilateral or multilateral and the collaborative communities are those who have some ideas and are willing to act. When it goes into practice, the research team has to identify the problem with community partners and confirms the willingness of collaboration. The “desirability” is twofold here. One is the principle is logically desirable and the other one is the willingness of participants and stakeholders to join the process of discussion and co-working for the desirable purposes. At the same time, the research team has to provide theoretically and institutionally “viable ideas” to respond to social problems and communicates these strategies with community partners. At this stage, the asymmetry of knowledge power between university and community is inevitable. However, it provides space for

university team to bring new ideas in and stimulates collective creativity to reframe things that we take for granted into different visions and understanding.

When it turns into action, it is about the operationalization of the conceptual ideas, turning it from theoretical understanding into applicable practices. This “achievable” stage relies on local or experiential knowledge contributed by community partners. Their knowledge and skills are the keys to localize and transform theoretical ideas into a real practice embedded in local context (Chou, Xiong, and Chen 2015). The operationalization part is the core of whole collaborative project since the operational mechanism is created at this stage and relies on whether professional and local knowledge can be well translated and communicated by involved participants and it will influence whether such mechanism sustainable or not.

In this case, revitalizing indigenous culture and language to reframe value is the key concern for university-community collaborative project. It aims to counterbalance the domination of Han-culture and market-oriented approach of local development. Thus, we wonder if it is possible to carry out an alternative economy. Moreover, social pluralism, local autonomous governance and diverse development shall be theoretically and institutionally guaranteed in a democratic regime. However, it is not necessarily so in reality. If rural area is always served as a periphery of mainstream economy, it hardly gets rid of the dependence on external resources and such dependence is not sustainable in a long run. As a result, local autonomy is in name only. Furthermore, practices of social economy “make economic alternatives visible”, which takes local community, environment, and cultural context into consideration (Borowiak 2016: 29-34). By this way of local development, we can envision an embedded economy that enriches community resilience and empowers its capacity and switches its marginalized position into a better one to link to global network accordingly (Klein and Tremblay 2013: 232). In line with it, we try to fill the gap that the government and the market ignore and find alternative way of seeing and defining problems and development.

Regarding the definition of social economy, we adopt the social economy defined in Quebec since it does not only respond to social problems ignored by the government and market but also pursues alternative models of functioning economy. In other words, it challenges problematic institutions or norms and seeks to find alternative ways and orders, which is based on social movement perspective (Bouchard 2013: 4). We think it is applicable to Taiwan context since a serious of social movement emerging after democratization, many NGOs strives for challenging misgovernment or inappropriate rules. However, it seems that we need a bottom-up “counter-institution” to respond to social movement issues continuously and foster social change in a long run (Roussopoulos and Benello 2005: 9). Thus, what Quebec

has experienced can inspire Taiwan academic communities, especially including and activating academic research energy into developing and spreading social economy. In this sense, social economy is defined as follows:

The concept of “social economy” combines two often-opposing terms:

“economy” refers to the concrete production of goods and services - the enterprise as an organizational structure - that contributes to a net increase in collective wealth

“social” refers to the social (as opposed by and not just the economic) benefits of these activities. Social benefits are measured in terms of their contribution to democratic development, their support of an active citizenry, and their promotion of values and initiatives that further individual and collective empowerment. Social benefits therefore contribute to enhancing the quality of life and well-being of the population, particularly by providing a greater number of services. As with the traditional public and private sectors, social benefits can also be evaluated in terms of the number of jobs created. In its entirety, the social economy field covers all activities and organizations built on community-based entrepreneurship and operating on the following principles and rules:

1. the primary purpose is to serve its members or the community, rather than simply to make profits and focus on financial performance;
2. it is not government-controlled;
3. it incorporates in its bylaws and operating procedures a process of democratic decision-making that includes users and workers;
4. it places people and work above the pursuit of capital when distributing profits and revenues;
5. its activities are based on the principles of participation, empowerment, and the accountability of individuals and communities.

Source: Excerpted from the report of the Task Force on the Social Economy, Taking on the Challenge of Solidarity! (TT), from the Summit Conference, October 1996. This is also cited by Bouchard (2013: 5).

Social economy in Taiwan's is in an embryo stage and inspired by worldwide experiences. In this paper, we focus on how to localize these ideas and put into practice. A social economy initiative is a way of finding solutions in response to social needs and functions as a counter institution that extends social movement and propels social change in an aggregative way (Bouchard 2013: 8; Roussopoulos and Benello 2005: 9).

Sustainable Community Networking: BLOR Actor-Network

We adopt Chou, Xiong and Chen’s (2015) “bottom-up, local, open and reassembling (BLOR) actor network” analytical framework in illustrating the interaction of involved members in initiating social economy project in an indigenous community. Social economy project serves as a counter-institution of facilitating alternative community economy. It starts from small experimental project and is accessible to grassroots community to initiate and conduct. Such experimental project recognizes local consciousness and is designed according to community needs and their particularities. However, local is by no means parochial but something beyond the community scope. Open refers to twofold meanings. One refers to the boundary of such localized initiative is open to link external communities and resources. The other refers to open to the public participation. With the openness, the community network of such collaborative project resembles itself according to the changing conditions and participants (Chou, Xiong, and Chen 2015). BLOR actor network is characterized as resilient and flexible to the social dynamics, which is useful for us to explain the process of a social economy initiative at the community level.

Moreover, reframing economy here not only refers to the way of seeing and understanding economy but also includes the mixed use of diverse economy as table 1. In the next section, we will use a case study to explain it. The logic of starting social economy project is to reduce the reliance on currency for fulfilling the demands.

Table 1: The diverse economy

Labor	Enterprise	Transactions	Property	Finance
Wage	Capitalist	Market	Private	Mainstream Market
Alternative Paid	Alternative Capitalist	Alternative Market	Alternative Private	Alternative Market
Unpaid	Noncapitalist	Nonmarket	Open Access	Nonmarket

Source: Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy (2013: 13)

In sum, this paper seeks to answer this question by a case study conducted by university-community partnership. It focuses on how to initiate a social economy project in an indigenous community. We will illustrate how we link indigenous culture with the ideas of social economy to carry out a series of community-based projects. We admit the asymmetry between local a community and a university especially in professional knowledge and resources. Such asymmetry is not necessarily an obstacle to pursue alternative development. The key is how to reshuffle these elements and how to link to the chain of mainstream development.

3. A Case study on Bunch of Millet Bunun Independent Publishing Studio (Millet Studio hereafter) in Nakahila

Nakahila is an indigenous community of Taiping village in southern Hualien of eastern Taiwan.² There are about 40 households living there. More than 90% of residents are Bunun people. Local organizations around there include a community development association (CDS hereafter), a Catholic church, and a Christian church. Local economy relies on agriculture, which is mainly maintained by the aging residents. Most young people have no choice but move to cities for job opportunities. Thus, Nakahila is confronted by demographic decline and the loss of Bunun culture and language. With this in mind, the preservation of Bunun culture and language is the main task for the local development in this university-community collaborative project. This study is mainly conducted by in-depth interviews with involved participants and participatory observation. The writers are also collaborative members of the research team and visit the field every month and stay there about two to four days each time.

3.1 Building Relationship: Initiating a Multi-Function Co-Working Space from the Bottom-up Based on Local Asset

In order to facilitate social responsibility of universities and strengthen the links between universities and local society, the Humanity Innovation and Social Practice (HISP) Project began in 2013. It is sponsored by the Department of Humanity and Social Sciences, Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan. There are four universities in different regions of Taiwan carrying out this project. They form respective research teams and build partnership with local communities to identify problems and find solution together. Since the partnership can only work well under bilateral interaction and reciprocity, the willingness of community partners is very important. The cooperation can be realized only under bilateral commitment to this experimental project. The research team selected accessible communities and it was also selected and evaluated by communities. The latter one is usually more decisive to whether cooperation can make it.

In the case of Nakahila, in the beginning, the university research team³ visited CDS and worked with them. However, the director lost the following election of the CDS and replaced by his competitor who had no willingness to continue former

² Taiping village includes three indigenous communities, including Tavila, Nakahila, and Valau. Most residents are Bunun People. In Taiping village, there is a CDA shared by three communities and an elementary school.

³ This project is mainly conducted by the HISP team of National Dong Hwa University.

projects. Thus, they continued to work with the former director for finishing the projects at hand but at the same time they wanted to find other community partners to initiate different projects that do not directly overlapped with the CDS' work. They heard a Bunun young poet planned to return home so they contacted him. This Bunun young poet, Salizan, is from Nakahila. He perceived that where he lived and received education was dominated by Han(Chinese)-culture, which made him gradually distance himself from Bunun essentials. He was afraid of the loss of Bunun language. Thus, he delivered his love and nostalgia to his tribe by writing poems. Later on, he came out an idea of publishing them in order to make Bunun People more accessible to Bunun books and invoke their concern about Bunun culture and language. In 2015, he went back to Nakahila and prepared to initiate "Bunch of Millet Bunun Independent Publishing Studio (Millet Studio hereafter)." With this opportunity, Salizan became the key person to work with and served as the bridge between university and Nakahila. Culture was the common concern for them. Salizan possessed the knowledge and ability to investigate and collect Bunun culture while university had various methods of displaying culture. In other words, Salizan and Bunun people traced back and recorded Bunun culture from within and then introduced to and discussed with the research team for other possibilities of showing or advancing these materials. The research team invited relevant university partners from different disciplines and they applied various methods (e.g., open street map, films, photos, records, words, paintings, co-learning or co-working projects, etc.) to display Bunun knowledge and culture to the public. The culture is the foundation for university-community cooperation in Nakahila. For both of them, culture-based activities were important to strengthen the solidarity of the community and it is also a process for participants to find their positions and ways to work with each other.

The realization of the Millet Studio relied on collective efforts, including community people, Bunun intellectuals, the research team and university students. University-community partnership was built by designing practical courses based on community needs. In this stage, university and community knew each other and built trust by some co-working projects. By practical courses, professors and students contributed to art intervention into space renovation, collecting indigenous books for the Millet Studio as community library, wall paintings, and creative design of small products to promote Bunun culture. These activities were not entirely well planned in advance. Instead, many ideas were created during the working process according to different composition of participants.

Salizan and the research team mobilized several resources from within and outside. They were as the following. First, they renovated an unused building together. By working together, it created the tie and the sense of "us" and "belongingness" among

participants. This was realized by several practical courses conducted by the college of art and the college of indigenous studies of the university. Practical courses were designed by community partners, the research team and related professors in order to ensure the practices were consistent with community needs. Community partners introduced the community history, environment, and Bunun culture to students and in exchange for students' labor and creativity to renovate and decorate the space. The research team and students worked with community partners to ensure the implementing process and outcome was compatible with local context.

Second, in order to make more people know about Millet Studio and use this place, Salizan came up with the idea of having a community library. The inner decoration of the Millet Studio thus followed this idea and Salizan and the research team invited people to donate books related to indigenous studies to the Millet Studio. By book donation activity, many scholars and cultural intellectuals around Taiwan knew the Millet Studio. The more important aim was to let children have a library to read and learn more knowledge about indigenous culture. However, Salizan found that not so many people came to read. In order to encourage community people to use the place, Salizan and the research team planned extracurricular activity for children during summer vacation. The Millet Studio became a place for children to do activities and homework. Several university students who had taken practical courses volunteered to keep children company and assist their homework. By this activity, community people gradually knew more about the Millet Studio and its work. Ultimately, the renovation of this studio was completed in October 2015 and celebrated by Bunun traditional ceremony known as "sharing pork and feast."

During co-working process, the research team sought to translate academic knowledge into indigenous understanding and investigate experiential knowledge in a systematic way. However, translation and knowledge exchange is not an easy task especially at the early stage of cooperation. Cultivating cultural sensitivity is the key for outsiders who want to work with an indigenous community. Inspired by the Bunun traditional ceremony of sharing pork and feast to show the host's thanks, the research team revised the way of cooperation and sought different means to work with community partners. Experiential knowledge embedded in their daily life could enrich the means and prospects of university-community collaboration. Then, cultural learning course was designed according to abovementioned modification.

The way of conducting courses was different from routine courses. It had flexibility in schedule and in content. Community partners were teachers as well. The way of conducting the course was learning from indigenous community. Culture is derived from daily life. For example, millet is a staple food in Bunun culture. Many traditional Bunun ceremonies go along with the cultivation of millets, such as the

ceremony of reclaiming land, throwing rocks, seeding, collecting tools, repelling birds, harvest, ear-shooting, and hunting gun. These ceremonies are taken place in line with four seasons, which shows the Bunun's humble attitude and respect to spirits and Nature. Nowadays, only a few people remain to grow millet because it is quite labor-intensive. In order to revive such cultural food and ceremonies, cultural learning course was introduced to join the process of planting millet and learn the skills and cultural practices from the Bunun elderly. University students used their labor in exchange for learning Bunun culture. They also helped to record the process by words, photos and films as supplements to the elderly's customary way of delivering knowledge by telling and doing.

To sum up, in the beginning stage, the interaction of university and community focused on building relations and let community people know university partners by working together. The next stage stepped into the core of cooperation, namely promoting Bunun culture and responding to community needs. But the needs were not out of the lack of something but rather based on local asset or particularities. Thus, it was local-based issue and implemented by collective efforts. The design and implementation of the collaborative project is open to participation. It is a problem-solving process rather than goal-oriented task. The former one emphasizes on process and the goal is amendable according to reality and experiences whereas the latter one usually overestimates the result and tends to be ossified and insensitive to social dynamics. Thus, resilience to change and is very important to make cooperation among different groups sustainable.

After completing the renovation of the Millet Studio, Salizan kept working on interviewing the elderly and recording Bunun history, tales, cultural practices, and language. These precious materials were collected and edited to become books which were conducive to the preservation of Bunun culture. As for the research team and participatory students, they discussed with Salizan about the ideas of promotion and book launch party and assisted him to realize it. Students from the college of art contributed to typesetting, cover design, postcard making, and marketing. The related artwork of the Millet Studio no matter for the space or for books was mainly designed by Bunun cultural elements. Students tried to visualize their understanding of Bunun culture and turned it into products. A group of students planned an indigenous literature tour in Nakahila, which attracted people from different places to visit Nakahila and the Millet Studio. Salizan invited his friend, an Atayal poet, to talk about their poems and the inspiration to write. Several community people joined to arrange this tour and were responsible for guiding and hosting tourists. It was a two-day and in-depth tour for tourists to know Nakahila and experience Bunun culture. This trip was a test to see if it is possible for community to organize a trip and if it is

workable to use trip to promote Bunun culture. The answer is uncertain due to the lack of human resources. It can be supplemented by students temporarily but its sustainability in a long run is still a challenge.

3.2 Sustainable Networking: Open to the Public and Reassembling Collaborative Partners from Different Disciplines for Different Projects

Not only community and university partners participated in activities of the Millet Studio, a group of young people who worked and lived in Southern Hualien were also very supportive to the Millet Studio. One of young partners helped practical course in Nakahila before and then stayed in Southern Hualien to work. She initiated a dinner party at the Millet Studio. People who joined the dinner were welcome to bring friends. It was an informal gathering and important for young people could have a place to make friends and exchange ideas. After that, they decided to hold dinner party every two or three months. There were some new friends each time. People exchanged what they do for job and what they are good at with each other. It gradually became a small talent pool for future cooperation. Some of them helped to do the editing and proofreading of book manuscripts. One of them designed the book cover and posters for the Millet Studio. The others served as volunteers to organize book launch parties. Their participation enriched activities of the Millet Studio a lot.

People from different places knew each other in the Millet Studio by causal gathering. They came up with some interesting ideas and carried out together. This is the driving force for participants to visit and contribute to the Millet Studio continuously. The way of running the Millet Studio is very different from formal organizations. It is neither goal-oriented nor profit-oriented. Instead, its work and activities are “culture-based” and “community-based.” People with different cultural backgrounds and abilities gather in this studio and create fruitful outcomes. The flexible way of working encourages participants to contribute creative ideas and make an effort to realize it. For them all, it is a process learned by trial and error. However, the good thing is people are not alone to face the challenge. They believe that working together makes “us” stronger. Through co-working process, participants create a sense of trust and belongingness among them. The particularities of Nakahila are based on its culture and diverse participants use different ways in enriching Bunun culture.

Through collective efforts, the Millet Studio has published six books in Bunun language since 2015. Two of them are portable dictionaries of two Bunun dialects which are very important to the preservation of Bunun language diversity.⁴ In order

⁴ There are five dialects remained in Bunun language, including Isbukun, Takbanuaz, Takivatan, Takibakha, Takitudu.

to encourage more Bunun teenagers and children to learn Bunun language, the Millet Studio plans to build on-line dictionaries with pronunciations. It has a primary framework of the webpage and is still going on.

With several book launch parties in different Bunun communities, more and more Bunun people knew about the Millet Studio. When throwing book launch parties, local political figures, Bunun chief, the elderly, and the director of CDA would join and gave their blessings. The Millet Studio also became a place for schools nearby to learn Bunun culture. Moreover, some Bunun teachers and writers were willing to let the Millet Studio to publish their works. It implies that many Bunun people think it is important to preserve culture and language and many of them have done it in their own ways for a long time. However, their works rarely have chance to be published by general market-oriented press. Thus, the Millet Studio serves as an amplifier to make more people know about Bunun history and culture and it also encourages more Bunun people to write their stories.

In 2016, the Millet Studio is registered as a limited company. It is an expedient choice at the moment because the requirement of such registration is easier to achieve. A formal organization is important for what the Millet Studio and its partners have contributed can be aggregated there. In the long run, the task of the Millet Studio is to preserve Bunun culture and language and provide voices from the Bunun perspective.

In sum, the aim of a series of university-community collaborative projects in Nakahila was is to explore local particularities and utilize these assets to pursue a local-based development. Some projects were related to community needs, such as space renovation and extracurricular activities. The others were related to “asset-based development” which activated community resources and capacities and expanded the network of promoting Bunun culture, such as publishing books and organizing literature tour (Gibson-Graham 2006: 145). Even the community needs in this case were also for the cultural purposes. These projects were conducted collectively rather than unilaterally delivered by university. During the co-working process, the research team has found that social economy and Bunun culture have something in common. For example, the reciprocity, community-based, and diverse economy based on nonmonetary exchange in social economy are similar to “labor exchange” during harvest time and “sharing meat” in Bunun hunting culture (Takisvilainan 2017: 185-187). Moreover, Bunun People’s humble attitude toward nature and how they keep balance between people and nature are especially inspiring to carry out sustainable development. For example, another ongoing project is about indigenous crops and plants and their use and meanings to the daily life. With these cultural materials out of daily life and experiential knowledge, the research team may find some clues about how to construct a different model of aging in place in Bunun

community. The research team learns from Bunun elderly about how to interact with people and nature in a harmonious way, which makes the idea of taking social and environmental well-being into consideration when doing economic activities more concrete.

Taking diverse economy into consideration, most projects relied on collective efforts and diverse resources internally and externally. Take book publishing for example, it is very difficult for a publishing studio to sustain especially if it only publishes Bunun books since the market is very limited from the capitalist perspective. However, in the logic of social economy, it is achievable because the Millet Studio works with a university and they can utilize the combination of diverse economies. Among them, labor exchange is an important means to build social ties among diverse groups by working together. In this case, the Millet Studio relied on “labor exchange”, “volunteers”, “university partners”, and “friendship” to minimize the monetary exchange during the publishing process. For students, their designs have a chance to be published. For the elderly, their wisdom and knowledge can be recognized and inherited in different forms. For the Millet Studio, every book it publishes brings some new friends to join and more Bunun knowledge and culture is accumulated little by little. Some parts of the published books are gifts to community people who participated in the book launch parties. And the rest of them are for sale. The Millet Studio reframes the publishing industry from a business into an interactive cultural course to aggregate and inherit Bunun culture and language by different ways of exploring it in-depth. The books are the gifts to deliver Bunun culture and the joy to share with co-workers and people concerned about it. The publishing is reframed as a means of preserving Bunun culture by facilitating cross-disciplinary and cross-group cooperation. The Millet Studio has applied for diverse grants from the government or foundations especially for the use of publishing books. Although it is not financially stable now, the Millet Studio tries different ways to link and mobilize internal and external resources. The flexible and open-minded attitude of the Millet Studio makes people joyful and willing to work with it.

4. Tentative Conclusion

University-community cooperation in Nakhila has brought some changes in local development from the perspectives of “relations of production”, “relations of consumption”, “relationships between enterprise”, and “spatial configuration of social relations” (Bouchard 2013: 8-10). They provided new services such as extracurricular activities and the new products such as literature tour and Bunun books. They also provided new opportunity for community people to reframe the way of practicing

economy, redefine value based on culture. In line with it, they reactivated non-monetary exchange and reciprocity out of tradition and culture, such as sharing meat, labor exchange, gift, and so on. With these activities to assemble people and the trust among them to strengthen social ties within and beyond the community, university-community partnership served as a platform and a supportive network to assist young people to stay in rural areas and find alternative possibilities together. They paved a possible way for young people to return to or stay in rural areas and make the living by collective entrepreneurship.

BLOR actor network is a useful framework for us to understand the process of this experimental project and how it sustains. It is a problem-solving process. In this case, it was launched at community level. The initiated project was the idea of a young poet who wanted to have a place to work on reviving Bunun culture and language. It started from a small-scale project to renovate an unused house and the process relied on bottom-up forces from community people and university partners. By introducing practical courses, the process of renovating house became a series of Bunun cultural learning classes and at the end students used their creativity and talent to feedback the Millet Studio. Students from different ethnic groups learned from Bunun elderly and worked with each other. This experience encouraged them to think in a situated position and even reconsider their position and their own culture and identity in current context. Some of them found their interests during practical courses and continued to participate in other activities organized by the Millet Studio.

Bottom-up initiative and small-scale project embedded in local context is a start. Small-scale project is easily to achieve and can strengthen participants' confidence to continue and encourage observers or interested people to join. These experimental projects are local-based but by no means parochial. It thinks locally and emphasizes on the solidarity of involved community but it can acts and mobilize resources beyond the border and even cross-region. Thus, open the border and open to participation is important to sustain local-based development. By public participation, social empowerment can be fulfilled step by step. According to Gonzales (2007: 143-146), civic empowerment can be facilitated by including involved participants to participate in decision-making. By promoting the inclusion of involved participants in decision-making, they also share the risk and consequence of the result. The leadership is flattered and thus it to some extent avoids the concentration of power. Moreover, such flattered decision-making mechanism is conducive to facilitating the organization to work beyond only filling the gaps left by the government or market and can encourage participants' democratic engagement and exercise or even fight for their rights (Gonzales 2007: 133-137; Noya and Clarence 2007: 14-15).

The Millet Studio publishes Bunun books, which makes marginalized language

have chance to be recognized and spread. It has a significant meaning in the preservation of Bunun culture. Thus, its influence and networking is beyond Nakahila and expands to other Bunun communities and to people who are interested in Bunun culture. Moreover, each project recruits some new members from university or Bunun communities, which shows it functions as an open network and keeps networking from different disciplines according to different projects or books. One of workable mechanisms to sustain such continuous networking is through practical courses conducted by university-community collaboration. Community and university partners design and carry out practical courses together. Through co-learning and co-working process, university and community learn from each other and strengthen trust between them for further cooperation. The operation of the Millet Studio is not as efficient as formal organizations. However, its flexibility and open-minded attitude provides participants space and freedom to exert creativity, which makes the Millet Studio and its work so unique and humane. This is the key that the Millet Studio sustains and continues to try new things and different ways of doing things.

The aim of university-community collaboration in this case is to activate local particularities out of culture and take them as the foundation of community development. We argue that university-community partnership can be the facilitator to initiate social economy project to respond to social problems based on local assets and pursue an alternative model of local development accordingly.

In our case, the realization of the Millet Studio depended on collective contribution, including community people, university partners, and people who are interested in Bunun culture. Various ways of contribution included alternative or non-capitalist economic activities, such as donation, volunteer, labor exchange, gift, and government grants. Moreover, there were several interactions and translations worth mentioning. Regarding labor exchange, it was displayed between Salizan and the Bunun elderly. Salizan recorded the elderly's knowledge and skills and turned them into books for the preservation of culture and language. In order to make more Bunun children learn Bunun language, Salizan plans to build an on-line dictionary for younger generation to access it easier. It is a reciprocal process by building linkage across generations based on culture. Besides, labor exchange was also shown in practical courses. Students worked with community people for cultivation and learned Bunun cultural practices from doing. Through multiple works done by the Millet Studio, it encouraged the elderly to deliver knowledge and made young people have multiple channels to learn it. In addition to social practices, the bureaucratic manner is also a challenge for many newly established organizations. In this case, the research team assisted the Millet Studio translates community needs into funding agency's understanding to get grants. Community people learned from university partners

about how to apply for grants and dealt with bureaucracy and funding agencies.

In sum, the Millet Studio has shown its flexibility and inclusion to work with different people by diverse ways and its capacity to mobilize resources internally and externally. Although it organized diverse activities, all of them were for the same purpose, namely creating more interactions between Bunun culture and people. This kind of alternative way of local development may be viewed as inefficient and lax. However, we think these gaps are important for cultivating culture and reframing the narratives of local development. In this case, the sharing and labor exchange embedded in Bunun culture makes the introduction of social economy possible. However, financial instability and understaffed situation are main challenges for sustaining. Although students and young people nearby are supportive and helpful, it remains uncertain. Furthermore, the organizational form of the Millet Studio also needs to be reconsidered. It operates as an organization beyond profit. Current status as a limited company is an expedient choice since the requirement of this type is easier to achieve. However, the status of company does not fit what the Millet Studio exactly does and may weaken its publicity. Finally, regarding university-community partnership, the different working culture and working pace between university and community still needs more patience and communication to narrow down the gaps.

References

- Amin, Ash. 2009. "Locating the Social Economy." In *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*, ed. Ash Amin. London & New York: Zed Books. pp. 3-21.
- Borowiak, Craig. 2016. "Mapping Social and Solidarity Economy: The Local and Translocal Evolution of a Concept." In *Social Economy in China and the World*, eds. Ngai Pun, Ben Hok-bun Ku, Hairong Yan and Anita Koo. New York: Routledge. pp. 17-40.
- Borzaga, Carlo, and Ermanno Tortia. 2007. "Social Economy Organizations in the Theory of the Firm." In *The Social Economy: Building Inclusive Economies*, eds. Antonella Noya and Emma Clarence. Paris: OECD publishing. pp. 23-60.
- Bouchard, Marie. J. 2013. "Introduction: The Social Economy in Quebec: A Laboratory of Social Innovation." In *Innovation and the Social Economy: The Quebec Experience*, ed. Marie J. Bouchard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. pp. 3-24.
- Chen, Dung-Sheng. 2017. "Comparative Analysis of Different Alternative Economic Models: Taiwan's Experiences" In *Unfinished Miracles: Taiwan's Economy and Society in Transition*, eds. Zong-Rong Lee and Thung-Hong Lin. Taipei: Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica. Forthcoming. pp. 532-565.
- Chen, Liang-quan. 2000. "Recent Progress of Comprehensive Community Empowerment in Taiwan." *Journal of Housing Studies* 9(1): 61-77.
- Chiou, Chang-Tay, and Chin-Chun Chen. 2001. "Pitfalls and Vision of Practicing Communitarianism in Taiwan: From 'Powerless' to 'Empowerment' Community." *The Journal of Public Administration & Policy* 3: 1-44.
- Chou, Muiyi, Huei-Lan Xiong, and Dung-Sheng Chen. 2015 "Social Innovation Network in Practice : A Case Study on The Humanity Innovation and Social Practice Project." Paper presented at Social Science in Action: Innovative Practices of University Outreach in Taiwan. Taipei: National Chengchi University.
- Clammer, John. 2016. "Social Economies and Economic Anthropology: Challenging Conventional Economic Thinking and Practice." In *Social Economy in China and the World*, eds. Ngai Pun, Ben Hok-bun Ku, Hairong Yan and Anita Koo. New York: Routledge. pp. 3-16.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K., Jenny Cameron, and Stephen Healy. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: an Ethical Guide for Transforming our Communities*. Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.

- Gonzales, Vanna. 2007. "Social Enterprises, Institutional Capacity and Social Inclusion." In *The Social Economy: Building Inclusive Economies*, eds. Antonella Noya and Emma Clarence. Paris: OECD publishing. pp. 119-153.
- Ho, Ming-Sho. 2010. "Whose Community? Which Future Vision? Taiwan's Community Movement under the Shadow of Developmentalism." *Taiwan Democracy Quarterly* 7 (1): 1-30.
- Klein, Juan-Luis and Pierre-Andre Tremblay. 2013. "The Social Economy: A Springboard for Local Development Project?" In *Innovation and the Social Economy: The Quebec Experience*, ed. Marie J. Bouchard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. pp. 229-254.
- Kretzmann, John, and John McKnight. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Evanston, Ill.: Asset-Based Community Development Institute, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.
- Merkel, Wolfgang. 2014. "Is Capitalism Compatible with Democracy?" *Journal of Comparative Governance and Politics* 8 (2): 109-128.
- Noya, Antonella, and Emma Clarence eds. 2007. *The Social Economy: Building Inclusive Economies*. Paris: OECD publishing.
- Pun, Ngai, Ben Hok-bun Ku, Hairong Yan and Anita Koo eds. 2016. *Social Economy in China and the World*. New York: Routledge.
- Reid, Herbert, and Betsy Taylor. 2002. "Appalachia as a Global Region: Toward Critical Regionalism and Civic Professionalism." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 8(1): 9-32.
- Roussopoulos, Dimitrios I. and C. George Benello. 2005. "Introduction." In *Participatory Democracy: Prospects for Democratizing Democracy*, eds. Dimitrios I. Roussopoulos and C. George Benello. Montréal; New York: Black Rose Books.
- Takisvilainan, Savi. 2017. *Becoming a Bunun: Bunun Childhood and Education*. Hualien: Bunch of Millet Bunun Independent Publishing Studio.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London; New York: Verso.