

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AS TOOLKIT ON GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS IN EAST ASIA: THE CASES OF JAPAN, SOUTH KOREA AND TAIWAN

Jun Yi Hsieh

## ABSTRACT

*This article reviews the role of development management on global competitiveness in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. Development management has emerged in response to improvement in public service delivery, public institution building, and human resource development in the service of the internationally accepted development goals, as the stated by the United Nations Division for Public Administration and Development Management. However, most papers employing this approach seem to stay in the theoretical discussions, and rarely apply empirical evidence to specific projects, programs, or areas.*

*Employing the competitiveness index developed by World Economic Forum (WEF) and the International Institute for Management Development (IMD), this research connects the toolkit approach to competitiveness in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. This research finds that all of these countries have adopted a series of toolkit strategies to promote their global competitiveness. These toolkits can maintain consistent growth. In terms of theory and practice, this research employs cases-comparison strategies to reveal the theoretical components of development management, and thus advance the knowledge in this field.*

**Keywords** - Development Management, East Asia, Global Competitiveness, Japan, Korea, New Public Management, Taiwan, World Competitiveness

## INTRODUCTION

In the face of global economic downturn, rising food and energy prices and demographic and other socioeconomic changes, policymakers need to reinvent governance machines to promote development and international competitiveness (Schwab & Porter, 2009). In this situation, the United Nations Division for Public Administration and Development Management claims that development management (DM) provides an alternative approach to integrate and use resources. In addition, globalization through economic and financial, technological, environmental, and socio-political forces has led to

**Copyright:** © 2012 Jun Yi Hsieh. Copyright for this article is retained by the authors, with first publication rights granted to the International Public Management Review (IPMR). All journal content, except where otherwise noted, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. By virtue of their appearance in this open-access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings.

**Corresponding Author:** jh04e@tmue.edu.tw

closer integration between industrialized and developing countries. This integration also means that DM is applicable to economic growth, poverty alleviation, and national development in both the industrialized and developing worlds (Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999). Extending the set of international and comparative public administration theory and practice, DM concentrates upon organizational and managerial problems, issues, and practices around the world (Brinkerhoff, 2008; Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999). The role of DM offers perspectives on rebuilding the state, focusing on the governance issues associated with core state functions based on issues of effectiveness, legitimacy, and security (Brinkerhoff, 2008). But much of this research is done primarily on US-based evidence (Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff, 2010). Scholars have warned that this risks bias regardless of efforts to ensure objectivity and accommodation of other points of view. Abouassi (2010) extrapolates what a Southern NGO perspective might add to our current understanding of DM. The study maintains that only when Western and the Eastern studies communicate with each other and find venues to learn and accumulate more evidence to increment the project's theoretical validity, can the knowledge of this field can be advanced.

The infrastructures of DM based on Brinkerhoff's and Coston's (1999) inductive arguments are a means to foreign assistance: a toolkit, values, and process. This research will review DM for its applicability to critical management problems on national competitiveness in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, with a special emphasis on a toolkit. The toolkit approach views DM as the application of a range of management and analytical tools adapted from disciplines including strategic management, public policy, public administration, organizational development, psychology, and political science (Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999). Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have created a regional economic miracle. Some activists refer to "the East Asian miracle" and "Asian tigers" as examples of DM through technological innovation, national support, and economic development (Brinkerhoff 2008; Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999; Leipziger & Thomas, 1993).

This article will begin with a theoretical discussion regarding DM as toolkit as well as global competitiveness. Supporting evidence will be collected from official reports, academic research, and the websites of international organizations. Following that, comparative methods will be used to identify similarities and differences among Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, following with discussion of implications of the results. Finally, this article will comment on DM theory, practice and future research.

## **LINKING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS**

### **Development Management as Toolkit**

The United Nations General Assembly, which met in 1996 in a special session to discuss the theme of "Public Administration and Development", promoted a concept of development administration that incorporated the values of the traditional model of public administration (Bertucci, 2008). The Division for Public Administration and Development Management of the United Nations assists Member States, through the practices of good governance and DM, in transforming public institutions into ones that are more

citizen-oriented, efficient, effective and accountable through transparent, participatory and innovative measures<sup>1</sup>.

Despite a variety of alternative definitions, any definition of development management will have both analytic and practical components (Abouassi, 2010). For example, Thomas (1996) distinguished DM from the efficient management of resources for rational organizational ends (management of development), and from the adaptation of international 'good practice' management models to local contexts (management in development). Brinkerhoff and Coston (1999), as well as Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2002) describe four dimensions of development management: values, process, tools and means to institutional agendas. The value dimension is informed by politics and emphasizes citizens' empowerment and self-determination and an equitable distribution of benefits among beneficiaries. The process and tools dimensions allow development management to intervene using the right analysis and management to address development processes in balanced ways and ensure more equitable outcomes. Finally, development management is a means to achieve certain institutional goals in alignment with policy agendas and organizational missions of actors involved, especially government (Abouassi, 2010).

This article uses the toolkit approach as a theoretical lens to inform this case study. DM tools merge policy and program analytics with the ability to implement or not implement public policy that United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific defines as the concept of "governance"<sup>2</sup>. On the analytic side, it consists of the tools that both explore the institutional and organizational incentive aspects of achieving results, and examine the psychology of change efforts, focusing on individual incentives and motivation. On the action side this consists of tools and approaches that focus on appraisal, design and planning, and action-learning and experimentation (Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999).

In the 1980s and up to the late 1990s, the New Public Management (NPM) emerged. DM has maintained focus on public sector efficiency and effectiveness in fulfilling basic public governance and on the performance agenda introduced by New Public Management (NPM), as well as its attention to politics and process. Developing countries imported NPM from industrialized countries, seeing it as the solution to the state-as-problem; then added strategic management, results-based management and performance measurement (McCourt, 2008; McCourt and Gulrajani, 2010), administrative devolution, competition and contracting, downsizing, and decentralization, measures to induce customer orientation, performance contracts and indicators, and improved management of human resources and information, which are reflected in the taxonomy of DM as toolkits.

### **Development Management as a Catalyst**

The determinants of the wealth of nations have ranged from specialization and the division of labor, investment in physical capital and infrastructure, education and training, technological progress, macroeconomic stability, good governance, DM, the rule of law, transparent and well-functioning institutions, and many others. Each of these suppositions rests on solid theoretical foundations. But they are not mutually exclusive, and so

that they can be simultaneously true (Schwab & Porter, 2009). Good governance has become a defining metric for the developmental state in which the International Monetary Fund (IMF) or World Bank, are basing their aid and loans on the condition of good governance, DM has paid more attention to the relationship between public governance and reforms. Although the growing consensus that economic growth centers around markets and can be measured in terms of increases in gross national product (GNP) is indispensable, it is not sufficient to bring about improvements in the human condition in a way that is conducive to human development (Graham, 2003). Two alternative indexes for measuring national growth—The Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) of the World Economic Forum, and the World Competitiveness Index (WCI) of the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) in Switzerland—capture the microeconomic and macroeconomic foundations of national competitiveness. Schwab and Porter (2009) define competitiveness “as the set of institutions, policies, and factors that determine the level of productivity of a country. In turn, the level of productivity sets the sustainable level of prosperity that can be earned by an economy” (p.3). Therefore, a country with a more competitive economy tends to be able to produce greater wealth for its citizens.

Calling for development management (management reform) is necessary for administration. For example, the *PA Times* (November, 2008 issue) cautioned that the health of the USA federal government is eroding and unless the President moves past piecemeal reforms there will be serious consequences for the nation. Federal managers therefore leverage their inside knowledge to provide specific recommendations on how the next administration can improve<sup>3</sup>. The most important points to be made about development issues in public administration are the convergence of economic growth, the accumulation of social capital, and sustainable conditions of life, which we call the components of competitiveness. Development management is expected to play a vital role in coordinating the government’s operations, strengthening its performance and competitiveness.

### CASE SELECTION AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research employs comparative case methods to review how DM works in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. Our objective is to create an understanding of their DM’s status. These three countries are similar in culture, institutions, economy, and society. But the ways in which each country responded to DM are notably different.

Typology, one of the comparative methods (Peters, 1998), is used to compare three areas and reveal something about the internal operations of each DM system in a deductive way. We employ the same evaluation characteristics to compare three cases<sup>4</sup>, in order to validate and achieve consistency for case-comparisons. As indicated above, the theoretical framework is that global competitiveness is the result of DM, which is a function of New Public Management. In examining its effect on global competitiveness, we will analyze six typologies: leading agency in government management and innovation, downsizing, e-government, citizen participation, and evaluation. In light of the typology-driven classification, we have utilized data from think tanks such as the Global Competitiveness Report (GCR) of the World Economic Forum<sup>5</sup> and World Competi-

tiveness Yearbook of International Institute for Management Development (IMD) in Switzerland<sup>6</sup>, as well as the government websites and related research of Japan<sup>7</sup>, Korea<sup>8</sup>, and Taiwan<sup>9</sup>.

## COMPARATIVE FINDINGS

### Development Management as Toolkit in Japan, Korea and Taiwan

This section will discuss the toolkit approach for development in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan in the six typologies as shown in table 1.

#### Leading Agency

- a. Japan: Administrative Management Bureau (AMB), Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication in Japan make administrative agencies and services efficient and allow citizens to express themselves to the administration. In addition, the AMB promotes the streamlining of the administration and uses information technology to promote e-government. Moreover, the AMB discloses information in administrative agencies and protects private information, thereby applying laws to ensure citizens' confidence in the administration.
- b. Korea: The goals of Korea Ministry of Public Administration and Security (MOPAS) are 1) to establish a capable government; 2) to develop trustworthy civil servants; 3) to ensure a safe and secure society; 4) to establish a leading e-government system; 5) to grant greater autonomy to local governments; 6) to strengthen an accountable local finance system; 7) to promote vibrant local economies; and 8) to enhance the government's organizational capacity.
- c. Taiwan: The Research, Development and Evaluation Commission (RDEC) has four strategic goals: 1) re-vitalizing public information and knowledge to upgrade government's strategic thinking; 2) enhancing policy coordination and implementing reorganization to make government a more integrated organization; 3) promoting transparency to help citizens to participate more fully in public affairs, and 4) advancing results-oriented performance management to achieve government accountability.

#### Government Management and Innovation

- a. Japan: The central government tackles reforms in personnel expenses, reviews of incorporated administrative agencies, and other reforms according to the "Law Concerning Promotion of Administrative Reforms for a Simple and Efficient Government" and other regulations, thereby simplifying its organization, promoting administrative reforms targeting zero waste, and making a simple and efficient government.
- b. Korea: 1) to promote service values: Transition to "a Government Serving the People" in line with the new administration's emphasis on a market-oriented small government. 2) To foster the culture of pragmatism: Delivering effective and timely solutions to on-site problems. 3) To delegate authority: projects re-

- lated to areas such as the development of regional communities, small and medium-sized business administration, and environmental policy will be delegated to local governments. 4) To deregulation and enhance service delivery: providing citizens with faster and easier access to administrative services, and supporting more prompt and precise services through improvements in work procedures.
- c. Taiwan: 1) Flexibility: flexibility in adjustment of administrative departments shall be manifested chiefly in diversify organizational structures to improve administrative effectiveness under legal regulations. 2) To enhance cross-ministry/council coordination and clarify agency responsibilities and minimize agency function overlaps. 3) To introduce corporate management to establish the system of keeping the good and eliminating the bad in government departments. 4) Strategy planning: All agencies must formulate an "annual administrative plan" and submit it to the Executive Yuan for approval. Administrative plans are forwarded, together with the Central Government budget, to the Legislative Yuan for deliberation. 5) Quality of government services: To enable the government to offer better public services to the people, the RDEC formulated the "Total Service Quality Promotion Plan". The RDEC also organizes the annual "Executive Yuan Quality Service Award", which aims to set up quality service benchmarks and encourage agencies to follow the benchmarks. 6) Inter-Governmental Cooperation: A system of power sharing and cooperation has been constructed so the government can possess global competitiveness and vitality.

### **Downsizing**

- a. Japan: 1) the AMB implements a series of downsizing management, and conducts bold and structural reviews regarding specific office operations and projects, thereby creating a simple and efficient administrative organization and optimizing its numbers of workforce. It strives to achieve cuts of at least 5.7% (at least 19,000 employees) in the five years from fiscal 2006. 2) Reviewing independent administrative agencies: Independent administrative agencies are incorporated with a corporate personality, independently from central government, in order to separate the planning and drafting function for policies from the implementation function and to make the implementing departments more efficient and better in quality. By fiscal 2006, the review of 23 corporations is projected to achieve cost cuts by about 190 billion yen throughout the next mid-term target period.
- b. Korea: 1) Reorganizing central government bodies and downsizing: numbers of government bodies reduced from 56 to 45. 2) Downsizing numbers of staff: Numbers of public employees reduced by 3,427 as of February 25, 2008 (from 607,717 to 604,290). 3) Privatization of Government Functions: Tasks and services which can be more effectively managed or delivered by the private sector.

- c. Taiwan: 1) Streamlining: to trim the number of ministries and councils from 37 to 29. 2) To reevaluate government functions, allocate government human resources, and impose limits on staff numbers. 3) Thoroughly assess the necessity of illegitimate offices in accordance with legal regulations.

### **E-Government**

- a. Japan: 1) the central government's "Program for Promoting e-Government" in 2006 was intended to increase citizen convenience for public service delivery and to make administrative management simpler and more efficient. About 14,000 (about 95%) of all the administrative procedures to the central government have gone online since March 2007. 2) The central government set up an "Action Plans for Promoting On-line Use" for 165 procedures which were most frequently applied for during the year in order to promote online use. 3) The government is also focused on its efforts to promote online use by its citizens by means such as advertising and broad deploying of e-government, monitoring opinions and requests, and realizing one-stop service based on the comprehensive contact of the e-government.
- b. Korea: 1) The vision of Korea's e-Government is for the program to become the world's best digital government for the people. MOPAS provides convenient services to citizens and strengthens the competitive edge of business. Korea has ranked at the top of the Digital Opportunity Index survey conducted by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) for three years (2005-2007). In addition, Korea ranked second in the UN Global e-Participation Index and 6th in the Global e-Government Readiness Index among 198 countries. 2) "Integrated resident service system" provides efficient e-government services to residents of areas served by local governments including public health, welfare, employment, and lifetime education.
- c. Taiwan: 1) Vision: To enhance public values and establish a trusting and connected society. 2) Goals: To provide active services to the public and to enrich citizens' quality of life. To develop customer-oriented; active and easily accessed services with cross-agency, with one-stop-shop functionalities that provide greater convenience to citizens and businesses alike. 3) Strategies: IT transformation for efficient resource utilisation, integration of government service workflows, legislation for advanced e-government, provision of on-demand services to citizens, and enhanced e-government marketing and greater citizen satisfaction.

### **Citizen Participation**

- a. Japan: 1) Citizen complaints about the checking system: Citizens may have a complaint or opinion about the national government but not know whom to consult. 2) To promote information disclosure, the "Act on Access to Information Held by Administrative Organs" in 2001 and the "Act on Access to Information Held by Independent Administrative Agencies" in 2002 stipulate the right of access to documents owned by administrative agencies, independent

- administrative agencies, and other establishments in order to make the central government fully accountable to the citizens.
- b. Korea: 1) To promote citizen participation: supporting greater participation by citizens in the policy making process. Adopting an "Incubation procedure", which allows an idea to become a policy through discussions, and implement a reward system for proposals which are successfully developed into policies. 2) Promotion of active participation by local residents: Local residents have the legal right to request recall votes, so that they can remove elected officials from office. 3) Citizen lawsuits: Local residents have the right to file a lawsuit for irregularities in financial affairs, reimbursement, property acquisition, contracts, local tax levies.
  - c. Taiwan: 1) Public Opinion Survey: the RDEC shall utilize the resources of public opinion surveys effectively, expand the capacity of national public surveys, and assist policy formulation for all agencies to increase the quality of government policy implementation. 2) The Executive Yuan Gazette: The public need sufficient information to participate in the formation of public policies, supervise the government actions and take part in various economic activities. The RDEC schemes a new Gazette system when reviewing the draft bill of "Freedom of Information" during the cabinet meeting.

### **Evaluation**

- a. Japan: Aiming to realize an effective and efficient citizen-oriented administration, the AEB uses a nationwide investigation network consisting of Regional Administrative Evaluation Bureaus and District Administrative Evaluation Offices and performs work related to policy evaluation, evaluation of incorporated administrative agencies, administrative evaluation and inspection, and administrative counseling.
- c. Taiwan: 1) Constructing and Promoting a Government Performance Management System: the Executive Yuan has established an up-to-date and forward-looking performance management framework. RDEC wrote a handbook for assessment of the administrative performance of agencies subordinate to the Executive Yuan. The new administrative performance assessment system requires all agencies to set their own performance targets and evaluation indicators for "services", "manpower", and "funding" when drafting their mid-term administrative plans. The resulting targets and indicators shall provide strategic guidance for administrative policies. At the same time, all agencies must submit an annual administrative plan and annual performance report in order to provide the Executive Yuan a basis for assessing administrative performance and issuing rewards.

**Table 1: Development Management as Toolkit in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan**

<b>Toolkit</b>	<b>Japan</b>	<b>Korea</b>	<b>Taiwan</b>
1. Leading Agency	Administrative Management Bureau(AMB), Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication	Ministry of Public Administration and Security(MOPAS)	The Research, Development and Evaluation Commission (RDEC)
2. Government Management and Innovation	a. Law concerning Promotion of Administrative Reforms for a Simple and Efficient Government	a. Government Serving the People b. To foster the culture of pragmatism c. Delegation of authority d. Deregulation and enhanced service delivery	a. Flexibility b. Enhance cross-ministry/council coordination and minimize agency function overlaps c. Strategy planning d. Quality of government services e. Inter-Governmental Cooperation
3. Downsizing	a. Implements a series of strict head count management b. Reviewing independent administrative agencies	a. Reorganizing central government bodies and downsizing. b. Downsizing numbers of staff c. Privatization of Government Functions	a. Streamlining: Trim the number of ministries and councils. b. Reevaluate government functions, allocate government human resources, and impose limits on staff numbers. c. Thoroughly assess the necessity of illegitimate offices
4. E-Government	a. Program for Promoting e-Government b. Action Plans for Promoting On-line Use c. To promote online use by its citizens	a. To achieve the goal of the world's best digital government for the people b. "Integrated resident service system"	a. Vision: To enhance public values and establish a trusting and connected society. b. The goals: To provide active services to the public and to enrich citizens' quality of life. c. Strategies: IT transformation for efficient resource utilization, enhanced e-government marketing and greater citizen satisfaction.
5. Citizen Participation	a. Citizen complains checking system b. To promote information disclosure	a. To promote citizen Participation. b. Promotion of active participation by local residents c. Citizen lawsuits	a. Public Opinion Survey: b. the Executive Yuan Gazette
6. Evaluation	a. Policy Evaluation, b. Evaluation of Incorporated Administrative Agencies, c. Administrative Evaluation and Inspection, and d. Administrative Counseling.		a. Constructing and Promoting a Government Performance Management System

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND COMPETITIVENESS

Early definitions underlined this desire to improve both the administration of donor and foundation-sponsored development programmes as well as national administrative capabilities (Riggs, 1970). In the contemporary period, DM has also focused on enhancing performance, often defined by the twin goals of efficacy and efficiency. Altering the tools, values, processes and means of DM is an implicit concern for scholars identifying with a reformist perspective (Thomas, 2007; Brinkerhoff et al., 1999; Brinkerhoff, 2008; Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff, 2010).

Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have implemented DM in order to improve national competitiveness. This approach uses strategies and instruments to manage government operations in a series of NPM reforms that affects other policies and leads to improvements in government performance. Its characteristics as public policy are different from those of other policies, especially in relation to NPM advances result-oriented performance rather than output. As the cases of Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have shown, DM as toolkit can play a role in public sector reform. How much impact does it have on global competitiveness? Table 2 shows that three areas rank fair to good around the world for global competitiveness as reported by World Economic Forum (WEF), and International Institute for Management Development (IMD). All of them have adopted a series of toolkit strategies to promote their competitiveness. It is too early to make the conclusion using statistical significance that DM can explain the variance of global competitiveness. But the time data of global competitiveness for WEF and IMD have shown that they have a moderate level of national competitiveness. These previous discussions along with Table 1 have shown that Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have adopted different reforming strategies. Thus, there may be an implied relationship between DM and global competitiveness. The toolkits may allow a country to maintain its competitiveness.

**Table 2: Global Competitiveness (WEF) and World Competitiveness (IMD) Index rankings and 2004-2008 Comparisons in Japan, Korea, and Japan**

	2004		2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
	WEF	IMD														
Japan	9	23	10	21	7	17	8	24	9	22	8	26	6	27	9	26
Korea	29	35	19	27	24	32	11	29	13	31	19	27	22	23	24	22
Taiwan	4	12	8	11	13	18	14	18	17	23	12	23	13	8	13	6
Samples	104	60	117	51	125	53	131	55	134	55	133	57	139	58	142	59

Some scholars have complained that the Anglo-American versions of NPM have failed to take effect in East Asia because of its unique institutions, culture, and society. For example, Norton (2007) found that the Anglo-American versions of NPM may not be appropriate for Japan's public sector reform. The need for Japan's public sector reformers to evolve a form of NPM which accommodates the cultural and historical traditions of the country instead of mimicking occidental approaches (e.g., NPM) has been identified. But previous research has validated that the management reform in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan has claimed its promised effects on e-government (Chen, Huang, & Hsiao, 2006; Choi, 2007; Kim & Lee, 2006; Kudo, 2008; Lim & Tang, 2008), performance

management (Yang, 2009; Yang & Hsieh, 2007), and citizen participation (Chen, Huang, & Hsiao, 2006; Choi, 2007).

To improve their competitiveness, countries around the world are making every effort to increase efficiency in their policy implementation according to the principles of DM, which cannot be realized without a comprehensive performance management system. Countries may have the problems of coordination, conflict, and appropriateness when they apply the toolkit of DM. But this research has identified some reliable evidence for three countries concerning DM as toolkit and global competitiveness.

## CONCLUSIONS

Development management is an analytical and applied field. But there are inherent barriers to sharing experience and accumulating knowledge, because the literature tends to define development management rather than analyze how or why DM takes effect in different settings. Thus there are some problems in developing information flows and dialogue which can cross-fertilize, penetrate, and advance this field. Increasing the power of analysis across a range of settings and circumstances is critical for this field. (Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999). This research has revealed the implications of applying the knowledge and practice DM global competitiveness to Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. Through making comparisons, this analysis provides convincing support for the status of DM. As globalization pressures public managers to reform their governments, scholars and practitioners are calling for more comparative investigation (Heady, 1998; Riggs, 1998). At the same time, we are able to eliminate alternative explanations in order to achieve internal validity<sup>10</sup> (de Vaus, 2001). As case studies are used to generalize to a theory rather than to a population, we test the theoretical framework to ensure external validity<sup>11</sup> (i.e. linking DM and global competitiveness in this research). In addition, turning to the comparison between public governance capacity and national economic growth (e.g., GDP per capita) is still strong in macroeconomic research; however, a potentially close significance exists in the relationship between DM as toolkit approach and global competitiveness. Although this study has sought to contribute a broader and more comprehensive view on the study of three countries, it remains an incomplete picture of the global challenges and prospects for DM. It tells a story which might be different (or in some instances not) from what debates on DM in the North focus (Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff, 2006) or the South Center (Abouassi, 2010). This study will hopefully fuel future thinking and open the door for further comparative research across the world.

Development management may suffer a constant identity crisis, because this term covers some heterogeneous approaches (i.e., institutional agenda, tools, process interventions, and values), which in statistics lack discriminatory validity for their relationship, and factor construct validity for their convergence. The Division for Public Administration and Development Management, United Nations had been promoting the transfor-

**Jun Yi Hsieh**, Ph. D., is Associate Professor, Department of Social and Public Affairs, Taipei Municipal University of Education, Taiwan. E-mail: jh04e@tmue.edu.tw

mation of public institutions into ones that are more citizen-oriented, efficient, effective and accountable through transparent, participatory and innovative measures, including the adaptive use of information and communication, environmental problems and unsustainable resource utilization rates, increased incidence of resource shortages, and global warming. This practical advocate may nurture the growth of DM. But this does not mean developing the theoretical framework without evidence. In the future, more efforts are expected to develop the appropriate framework to explain general lessons; then describe, analyze, and advance the usable knowledge under the umbrella of development management.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> UN Public Administration Programme (2009). Mission Statement. Retrieved July 22, 2009 from <http://www.unpan.org/DPADM/AboutUs/tabid/420/Default.aspx>.
- <sup>2</sup> UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2009). Good Governance. Retrieved July 29, 2009 from <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/ProjectActivities/Ongoing/gg/governance.asp>.
- <sup>3</sup> The headline of *PA Times* (November, 2008) published an article “Financial Bailout Package Just Beginning of Reform Effort Report Lays Out Critical Government Management Reform Recommendations for the Next President and Transition Teams”.
- <sup>4</sup> Cases are used for theoretical rather than statistical generation, as the purpose of case studies is not to generalize to a wider sample of cases. Rather, it is to find cases that will provide valid data in order to test a theory. A significant factor in determining the number of cases will be the rigor with which the propositions are to be tested (de Vaus, 2001).
- <sup>5</sup> The fundamental objective of the Global Competitiveness Report (GCR) is to evaluate economic competitiveness of a large sample of countries. The index combines available hard data and data from the Executive Opinion Survey conducted annually by the World Economic Forum for additional analysis of Survey results and methodology. (Schwab and Porter, 2009: xi). World Economic Forum (WEF) defines all the determinants into 12 pillars of economic competitiveness: 1. Institutions. 2. Infrastructure. 3. Macroeconomic stability. 4. Health and primary education. 5. Higher education and training. 6. Goods market efficiency. 7. Labor market efficiency. 8. Financial market sophistication. 9. Technological readiness. 10. Market size. 11. Business sophistication. 12. Innovation (Schwab and Porter, 2009).
- <sup>6</sup> Competitiveness factors and criteria for International Institute for Management Development (IMD) are measured with the following factors and their sub-factors: 1. Economic Performance: Domestic economy, International trade, International investment, Employment, and Prices. 2. Government efficiency: Public finance, Fiscal policy, Institutional framework, Business legislation, and Societal Framework. 3. Business efficiency: Productivity, Labor market, Finance Management practices, and

- attitudes and values. 4. Infrastructure: basic infrastructure, technological infrastructure, scientific infrastructure and both Health and Environment Education.
- <sup>7</sup> The development management as toolkit information for Japan is from the official website of Administrative Management Bureau (AMB), Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication, Japan. <http://www.soumu.go.jp/english/amb/index.html> (accessed July 30, 2009).
- <sup>8</sup> The development management as toolkit information for Korea is from the official website of Korea Public Administration Disclosure System. [http://www.open.go.kr/pa/html/eng\\_main.htm](http://www.open.go.kr/pa/html/eng_main.htm) (accessed July 30, 2009).
- <sup>9</sup> The development management as toolkit information for Taiwan is from the official website of Research, Development and Evaluation Commission (RDEC), Executive Yuan. <http://www.rdec.gov.tw/mp110.htm> (accessed July 30, 2009).
- <sup>10</sup> Threats to internal validity stem from the danger that other factors other than our key factors are producing any change we observe (de Vaus, 2001:233). One of the advantages of case studies is that they attempt to understand the significance of particular factors within the context of the whole cases rather than by screening out this context. As such case studies have the potential for good internal validity based on a more thorough understanding of the meaning of particular behavior and events than the other designs (de Vaus, 2001:247).
- <sup>11</sup> The external validity of case studies is based on the logic of replication rather than on sampling logic (de Vaus, 2001:247).

## REFERENCES

- Abouassi, Khaldoun (2010). International Development Management through a Southern Lens. *Public Administration Development* 30, 116–123.
- Bertucci, G. (2008). The State and International Development Management: Commentary from International Development Management Practitioners. *Public Administration Review*. 68(6): 1002-1003.
- Brett, E. A. (2003). Participation and Accountability in Development Management. *Journal of Development Studies*. 40(2):1-29.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W. and Coston, J. M. (1999). International Development Management in a Globalized World. *Public Administration Review*. 59(4): 346-361.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2008). The State and International Development Management: Shifting Tides, Changing Boundaries, and Future Directions. *Public Administration Review*. 68(6): 985-10001.
- Brinkerhoff, J. M. and Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2002). Government-Nonprofit Relations in Comparative Perspective: Evolution, Themes and New Directions. *Public Administration and Development*. 22(1): 3-18.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer and Brinkerhoff, Derick W. (2010). International Development Management: A Northern Perspective. *Public Administration and Development*. 30, 102–115.

- Chen, D., Huang, T. and Hsiao, N. (2006). Reinventing Government through On-Line Citizen Involvement In The Developing World: A Case Study of Taipei City Mayor's E-Mail Box in Taiwan. *Public Administration and Development*. 26(5): 409-423.
- Choi, J. (2007). Governance Structure and Administrative Corruption in Japan: An Organizational Network Approach. *Public Administration Review*. 67(5): 930-942.
- Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research Design in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Graham, Lawrence S. (2003). Development Policy. In Jack Rabin (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Policy*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker Inc.
- Kim, S. and Lee, H. (2006). The Impact of Organizational Context and Information Technology on Employee Knowledge-Sharing Capabilities. *Public Administration Review*. 66(3): 370-385.
- Kudo, H. (2008). Does E-Government Guarantee Accountability In Public Sector? Experiences in Italy and Japan. *Public Administration Quarterly*. 32(1): 93-120.
- Leipzig, D. M. and Thomas. V. (1993). *The Lessons of East Asia: An Overview of Country Experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank .
- Lim, J. and Tang, S. (2008). Urban E-Government Initiatives and Environmental Decision Performance in Korea. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 18(1): 109-138.
- McCourt, W. (2008). Public Management in Developing Countries. *Public Management Review*,10(4):467 – 479.
- McCourt, Willy and Gulrajani, Nilima (2010). The Future of Development Management: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Public Administration and Development*. 30, 81–90
- Norton, S. (2007). Lost in translation: The inappropriateness of occidental new public management to reform of the public sector bureaucracy in Japan. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 20(7): 674-693.
- Peters, B. G. (1998). *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Riggs FW. 1970. Introduction. In *Frontiers of Development Administration*, F Riggs (ed.). Duke University Press: Durham; 3–37.
- Schwab, K. and Porter, M. E. (2009). *The Global Competitiveness Report 2008–2009*. Geneva: the World Economic Forum.
- Thomas A. (1996). What is development management? *Journal of International Development* 8(1): 95–110.

- Turner, M. (2006) From Commitment to Consequences: Comparative Experiences of Decentralization in the Philippines, Indonesia and Cambodia, *Public Management Review*. 8 (2): 253–72.
- World Economic Forum (2007). *The Global Information Technology Report 2007-2008*. Hampshire, England: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Yang, K. (2009) Examining Perceived Honest Performance Reporting by Public Organizations: Bureaucratic Politics and Organizational Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 19(1): 81-105.
- Yang, K. and Hsieh, J. (2007). Managerial Effectiveness of Government Performance Measurement: Testing a Middle-Range Model. *Public Administration Review*. 67(5): 861-879.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills and London: Sage.

#### About IPMR

**IPMR** The International Public Management Review (IPMR) is the electronic journal of the International Public Management Network (IPMN). All work published in IPMR is double blind reviewed according to standard academic journal procedures.

The purpose of the International Public Management Review is to publish manuscripts reporting original, creative research in the field of public management. Theoretical, empirical and applied work including case studies of individual nations and governments, and comparative studies are given equal weight for publication consideration.

**IPMN** The mission of the International Public Management Network is to provide a forum for sharing ideas, concepts and results of research and practice in the field of public management, and to stimulate critical thinking about alternative approaches to problem solving and decision making in the public sector.

IPMN includes over 1300 members representing about one hundred different countries, both practitioners and scholars, working in all aspects of public management. IPMN is a voluntary non-profit network and membership is free.

**ISSN** 1662-1387