Hiroko Kudo

Still convinced by New Public Management or introducing somehow New Public Governance? How Japanese local governments are coping with these changes to deliver public services

local government; New Public Governance (NPG); New Public Service; participation; public service; stakeholder

Many Japanese local governments introduced New Public Management (NPM) in the late 90 s. After a decade of experiences, some municipalities have begun to distance themselves from the NPM-driven managerial style. There is, indeed, evidence of a shift from NPM to New Public Governance (NPG). So far, the examples are small in number, and do not necessarily confirm the theoretical framework of NPG, since the reasons of these shifts vary; however NPG is already a reality among local governments. The paper analyses the characteristics of Japanese public governance in the case of public service delivery in local governments and in the academic literature.

I. Introduction

Many Japanese local governments introduced New Public Management (NPM) in the late 90 s, prior to the national government and to its academic introduction. Most of them introduced performance measurement, programme evaluation, citizen-customer and employee satisfaction survey, outcome orientation, outsourcing and/or contracting out to private sector and/or social sector, revision of public service delivery, Private Finance Initiative (PFI), and Public and Private Partnership (PPP), following the Anglo-Saxon examples (Oosumi 1999).

Public services, especially childcare, elderly care, and culture, sports and leisure related services have been mostly outsourced to private and social sectors (Yamamoto 2008). However, after a decade of these experiences, some local governments are starting to take distances from the NPM-driven managerial style. Some decided not to renew contracts to the private sector, after evaluating the performance and considering customer satisfaction, but to bring back the service again into the hand of public administration, or to introduce new forms of collaboration between public and private sectors, mainly based on proposals from the private sector. Some empirical cases show that there are evidences that a significant number of local governments have already shifted from NPM-driven management to post NPM orientation. Especially in case of childcare and elderly care, some local governments re-started to hire experts in order to develop internal personnel as managers and policy makers in the future. Culture, sports and

leisure related services are still outsourced in many local governments; however some are revising their relationship with contractors and are starting to impose their policies and strategies much more clearly on them (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications 2013). So far, the examples are small in number, and do not necessary confirm the theoretical frameworks of public governance, since the reasons of these shifts vary among local governments and also because there is almost no academic attention in Japan on New Public Governance (NPG) (Kudo 2014).

II. Public Service under NPM and NPG

1. From traditional public administration to NPM

With the introduction of NPM, the science of public administration has introduced managerial techniques and instruments of private sector and other disciplines, including economics and finance, which were new to the science of public administration. It introduced markets, managers and measurement (Ferlie et al. 1996).

The science of public administration, per se, had been traditionally interdisciplinary, starting as kingcraft, and then developed in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as technique to govern country and/or territory, in order to train monarchs and their bureaucrats, which was known as Kameralismus. This already included public finance, administration, law, and economic policy to serve the monarchs and their bureaucrats. The tradition of Kameralismus, however, did not develop into the modern science of public administration, which had influenced by many other disciplines, mostly by administrative law. Indeed, in most of the Continental European countries, administrative and constitutional law tradition has been strong, while in Anglo-Saxon countries, political science influence has been decisive. Japan has historically developed similar characteristics to the former ones.

The modern science of public administration was separated from political science and was given birth through division of implementation from policy making in late nineteenth century. With the welfare state, the policy areas which public administration dealt were widened, thus its study and practice started to involve many related disciplines. While Kameralismus tradition had to deal only with defence, police, justice, taxation, and limited public works, the modernisation brought commercial, agricultural, and industrial promotion as well as many other social issues as main objectives of the political leaders. Indeed, modern science of public administration has been dealing with many issues, from infrastructure, housing, energy, transportation, to education and social security.

Despite the introduction of "small government" in the 80s and then dominating NPM, the areas which science of public administration dealt with had never become smaller; they rather became wider. The way the public administration is involved in service delivery might have changed and became efficient; however the background involved in, has not. Governments have been involved in law making, institutional organisation, infrastructure construction, industry building and promotion, commercial activities protection and regulation, education delivery,

science and culture promotion, economic and financial policy, and welfare policy. All these areas need particular knowledge and expertise, along with professional law making and managerial skill.

2. Public Service Delivery and Decentralisation under NPM

Renewal of public management and public service delivery has become an important trend in recent public sector reform.

NPM was introduced into the traditional form of public administration and changed its managerial style through a series of techniques imported from business management (Olson/Guthrie/Humphrey 1998). Customer-oriented and/or outcome-oriented thinking has been introduced in policy making and implementation processes (Hood 1991 and 1995). Reform in public service delivery, influenced by these orientations, forced public sector organisations to outsource some functions, privatise enterprises, and revise the role of government in accordance with the role of private sector and civil society. PFI, PPP, and other forms of collaborations became alternatives to traditional government restructuring. This trend is now evolving into the "governance model", with greater emphasis on integrating politics and management rather than relying merely on the introduction of new management techniques. These trends of NPM show that NPM deals with a wide range of policy areas. It introduced private sector managerial techniques, instruments, and theories.

Decentralisation is considered as one of the characteristics of NPM, along with management by objectives, contracting out, competition within government, and customer orientation (OECD 2003). Changing the decision-making structure as well as service delivery system is an important element of NPM. Decentralisation is also associated with multi-level-governance, another characteristic of NPM as well as policy strategy of modern states.

Many authors have analysed decentralisation and devolution processes, following the public governance approach. This shows that the decentralisation, which is one of the characteristics of NPM, has studied in interdisciplinary way. Many researches, indeed, focused on devolving activities and responsibilities from central to local governments and the relational features existing between and within the different institutional levels (Ongaro 2006; Mussari 2005, Hutchcroft 2001; Christensen 2000; Pollitt/Birchall/Putman 1998). The completion of the devolution process and the increasing use of the public governance approach and the network theory have led to renewed interest on the part of scholars and practitioners in agglomeration processes, especially those carried out by local governments (Agranoff/McGuire 2004; Sancton, 2000; Bardach 1998), in order to improve and/or rationalise public service delivery to the residents.

It is important to highlight the impact of the decentralisation on public service delivery and especially, on public administrations at the local level (Fedele/Ongaro 2008; Grossi/Mussari 2008), because of several reasons. First, the number of public services provided by local governments has increased. Second, the decentralisation process has had an impact on the system of funding local governments, which has changed from an indirect to a direct system. Local governments are increasingly financed directly by their citizens, thus, as a consequence, many local governments do not have sufficient financial resources to fund the provision of the ser-

vices needed. These changes are accompanied by a demand for increasingly complex public services, which are often difficult for a single local government to provide. These single administrations therefore need to manage their public services in various ways, including outsourcing and/or contracting out to private sector and/or social sector, PFI, and PPP, to collaborate with other administrations, or to resort to agglomeration processes in order to exploit their financial, material and human resources more efficiently, with the aim of satisfying citizens' demand for increasingly complex services.

3. NPM to post NPM or NPG

Attentions on public service delivery and the role of citizens and social sector in its process lead to NPG. It was also proposed as critiques to NPM, which merely stressed efficiency, effectiveness and managerial techniques.

Some authors started to point out issues of NPM and propose modifications to NPM. They have discussed that because NPM emphasised too much the viewpoint of private management techniques in public sector, elements, such as citizen participation and other forms of democratic decision-making, have been undermined. The contents and characteristics of accountability have, indeed, changed from the initial period of NPM and social audit and accounting have been necessary to consider (Osborne/Ball 2011). Some pointed out that since NPM concentrated on performance measurement and evaluation, monitoring, and auditing, it has considered little the viewpoint of public policy in general and decision-making, thus has strengthened the short-term political interest, not the outcome of long-term and strategic policy and plans, creating situations contrary to what NPM originally aimed.

These authors have tried to modify the concept of NPM, which stressed the viewpoint of private management in public administration, emphasised the importance of citizen participation and role of social sector in public service delivery, and focused on much broader public governance, which includes public and private partnership. They have focused on co-production between the citizen and the public and social sector as service agent and stressed the importance to co-produce the services.

While NPM is based on neo-classical economics and particularly on rational/public choice theory and has an emphasis on implementation by independent service units, ideally in competition with each other and a focus on economy and efficiency, NPG is rooted within organisational sociology and network theory and it acknowledges the increasingly fragmented and uncertain nature of public management (Pestoff 2011).

Osborne ironically argues that NPM has actually been "a transitory stage in the evolution (from traditional public administration) towards New Public Governance" (Osborne 2006, p. 337). He agrees that public administration and management has gone through three dominant stages or modes: a longer pre-eminent one of public administration until the late 70s/early 80 s; a second mode of NPM, until the start of the 21st century; and an emergent third one, NPG since then. The time of NPM has thus been a relatively brief and transitory one between the statist and bureaucratic tradition of PA and the embryonic one of NPG (Osborne 2006; 2010).

Bovaird argues that the emergence of governance as a key concept in the public domain is relatively recent, and he traces the evolution of the concept in public administration. He suggests that "governance provides a set of balancing mechanisms in a network society, although it is still a contested concept, both in theory and in practice" (Bovaird 2005, p. 217). By the end of the 90 s various concerns about corporate governance, local governance and network society had crystallised into a wider focus on "public governance", which he defines as " […] the ways in which stakeholders interact with each other in order to influence the outcomes of public policies" (Bovaird/Löffler 2003, p. 316). Co-production becomes a key concept and the importance attributed to it by Public Governance has two major implications for public administration. First, it "seriously questions the relevance of the basic assumptions of NPM that service delivery can be separated from service design, since service users now play key roles in both service design and delivery". Second, "service users and professionals develop a mutual and interdependent relationship in which both parties take risks and need to trust each other" (Bovaird 2005, p. 222). Trust has thus become an important issue under NPG.

Bovaird also argues that there has been "radical reinterpretation of the role of policy making and service delivery in the public domain resulting in Public Governance". Policy making is "no longer seen as a purely top-down process but rather as negotiation among many interacting policy systems". Similarly, "services are no longer simply delivered by professional and managerial staff in public agencies, but they are co-produced by users and communities" (Bovaird 2007, p. 846). He presents a conceptual framework for understanding the emerging role of user and community co-production. Traditional conceptions of service planning and management are, therefore, outdated and need to be revised to account for co-production as an integrating mechanism and an incentive for resource mobilisation – a potential that is still greatly underestimated (Bovaird 2007).

NPG, which was proposed first as critiques to NPM, then, has introduced some new concepts and actors into public governance: its attention on citizen participation and its leadership lead to "citizen-centric" governance; it guarantees active participation of stakeholders in decision-making as well as public service delivery through "joined-up governance"; that is based on democratic decision-making; its strong emphasis on public service delivery resulted in the concept of New Public Service (NPS); its stress on partnership in delivering public service lead to "co-production"; it is based on network governance; gives important role not only to private sector but also to social sector; and it introduced new issues such as public value and/or trust.

Pestoff pointed out that under NPG, "central role attributed to citizen co-production and third sector provision of public services" (Pestoff 2011, p. 3), while Osborne defined NPG as "it posits both a plural state where multiple interdependent actors contribute to the delivery of public services and a pluralist state, where multiple processes inform the public policy making system" (Osborne 2006, p. 384).

Examining public service delivery models, many recent models show characteristics of NPG; emphasis on "citizen-centric" governance and democratic decision-making; participation of stakeholders; "co-production"; emphasis on social sector; and introduction of public value and/or trust. Since NPG had to introduce some new principles in order to contrast NPM and its efficiency, effectiveness, and value for money, many authors started to investigate into public

value (Hartley 2005) and trust (Bouckaert 2012). There are also critics to NPG, mainly pointing out its lack in instruments/tools similar to NPM (Pollitt 2014).

III. Public service delivery under Public Governance framework

At national level, NPM has been introduced from its Anglo-Saxon experiences and implemented in Japan in its own unique manner since late Nineties. The critical situation of public finance, urgent need for public sector reform, and political instability lead to two extreme options; one was the self-reforming effort of bureaucracy, and the other was the citizen empowerment and its pressure on bureaucracy. Meanwhile the second has been struggling to get public consensus, expertise for practice, and institutionalisation, the first managed to result in reorganisation and restructure of administrative institutions to a certain extent, and in establishment of legal framework and operational system for performance measurement and policy evaluation (Kudo 2003). Academic attentions on NPM followed the practices, becoming a fashionable topic to argue. Many authors became enthusiastic with NPM and the tendency has continued until today.

Meanwhile, some interesting efforts can be found out at local level. Almost all of the prefectures and major part of the municipalities have introduced performance measurement systems by the end of Nineties. Some of these show ideas to realise co-governance. Some have introduced policy evaluation and/or programme evaluation. Some enacted special charters or regulations, most issued guidelines in introducing their system. Those charters showed, in fact, efforts to introduce a kind of citizen's charter and are one of the most interesting experiments among the local governments to realise NPM in its original sense, as they tried to guarantee the control of stakeholders and thus enabling the advocacy of the citizen (Tsujiyama 2002).

Many Japanese local governments introduced NPM in the late Nineties. Most of them introduced performance measurement, programme evaluation, citizen-customer and employee satisfaction survey, outcome orientation, outsourcing and/or contracting out to private sector and/or social sector, revision of public service delivery, PFI, and PPP. Public services, especially childcare, elderly care, and culture, sports and leisure related services have been mostly outsourced to private and social sectors. Some local governments have introduced new forms of collaboration between public and private sectors, mainly based on proposals from the private sector. The literaturs on NPM, especially academic researches and publications have followed these practices, however soon became a trendy topic, making most of the public administration researchers enthusiastic with NPM. There have been numerous literaturs on NPM since the mid-90 s until today.

Some empirical cases show that there are evidences that a significant number of local governments have already shifted from NPM-driven management to NPG orientation (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications 2013). So far, the examples are small in number, and do not necessary confirm the theoretical frameworks of public governance, since the reasons of these shifts vary among local governments. Furthermore, compared to the enthusiasm showed for the NPM, there is almost no attention toward NPG in the academia (Kudo 2014). Are there any

specific reasons for this? Will it follow the practical cases of NPG, like in the case of NPM, which was first introduced in practice, then among literature?

1. New Public Governance in local government?

The nation-wide movement of experimenting performance measurement and/or policy evaluation by local governments was rather independent from the national effort to establish legal framework for evaluation system. It were these local government movements that actually led the nation's trend of NPM. Both national and local efforts for better governance in their different manners produced interesting results, not always positive though, on their reforms and also on governance in general.

One of these interesting experiments was that of introducing governance model, or so-called "Atarashii Kokyo" (literary means "new public", but did not have reference to New Public Governance), in a Japanese municipality (Imamura 2002; Yamamoto 2002; Tsujiyama 2002). The case represented governance model in local governments, trying to introduce concept of public governance, redesigning the public domain and trying to establish a partnership in providing public services (Kudo 2003). The system, which was implemented in Setagaya Ward (municipality level local government) in Tokyo Metropolitan Government (provincial level), can be considered as one of the Japanese examples of public governance. It focused on reviewing the role of public sector and seeking its partnership with private sector, NPOs, and civil society in local public service delivery.

The system introduced the concept of public governance, or so-called "new public" in measuring performances. Its indicators consider the possibility of outsourcing, citizen participation, and different forms of partnership between public and private/social sectors. Projects are classified, according to these criteria, into those: 1) which need strong and direct public sector involvement also in the future; 2) which might be outsourced or need partnership; and 3) which have to be passed completely to private sector as soon as possible. This classification is in accordance with the patterns of human resource management, financial resource management, long-term public sector reform plan of the municipality, their characteristics, cost analysis, and market competitiveness. This experiment was thus analysed from the point of view of public governance model and that of public service delivery reform.

The municipality introduced this model, after implementing several projects of collaboration among public sector, citizen, local business, and NPOs in providing its public services of specific fields. The concept of governance was: 1) to rationalise public sector performance; 2) to reduce cost; and 3) to empower citizen, local business, and NPOs. The concept referred to the introduction of new patterns of partnership in public domain, including the reviewing of the public domain itself. In fact, the concept of governance delivered from the reviewing of public domain.

As governance model was introduced in order to implement public sector reform, the performance information of this performance measurement system is expected to become important resource to classify performances using criteria like "partnership" and "governance". All projects were classified for the reform of the municipality.

The experience was clearly one of the very first attempts of NPG in Japan, although it has not been recognised as NPG. Rather, it has been considered as an original version of NPM (Imamura 2002). The late introduction of Japanese NPM in its unique characteristics resulted in this interesting phenomena. NPM became one of the most important instruments to promote their public sector reform and at the same time, as learning and self-reforming process of public servants/public sector (Kudo 2003). The system, thus, was not, and has not been considered as NPG, but as NPM in practice as well as in academic debates. The former can be explained through the fact that NPM was already widely accepted as reform instrument, while the latter, because there is almost no citation of NPG literature among Japanese academic researches (Kudo 2014). NPM has been dominant as public sector management techniques and is still the major concept.

Customer oriented and/or outcome oriented management has then introduced in policy-making and implementation process. Reform in public service delivery, affected by these orientations, forced public sector organisations to outsource some of its functions, privatise its enterprise, and revise the role of government in accordance with the role of private sector and civil society. PFI, PPP, and other forms of collaborations implemented became alternatives to traditional government restructuring. This trend evolved into the new public governance driven reforms, without being noticed and/or classified as NPG.

2. Survey among local governments on their reform and its results

Research group (Research on impact of public administration reform and development of Post-NPM, JSPS Funding 2013-2016), in which the author takes part, conducted extended survey among Japanese municipalities. The questionaires were sent to mayors in January 2014, obtaining 1,129 answers (out of 1,720 municipalities in total). Since the research group had done similar surveys in the past ("Research on governance and system reform of local public finance", JSPS Funding 2007-2010, and "International comparison on diversification of public service delivery under financial reform", JSPS Funding 2004-2006), asking the motivations of public administration reform and methods of public service delivery during and after the implementation of municipality merger, the last survey focused on the impact of public and finance reform, especially that of municipality merger on public service delivery.

28.0 % of the respondents answered that the sound financial situation has the major priority in their local government, followed by the revitalisation of local economy (21.3 %), and counter measure for declining population (17.9 %). Among the second priorities, revitalisation of local economy was considered most important (21.6 %), followed by welfare policy for aged and disabled (16.7 %), and counter measure for declining population (18.6 %). Austerity, growth strategy, and welfare spending can be contradictory among them, but enjoy same importance. 37.8 % agree to the principle of subsidiarity, while 31.3 % think that the state has to decide and delivery on behalf of local governments. 67.7 % think that it is better to increase their own financial resources from local tax revenue, which has never succeeded, despite various attempts, including "trinity reform", or "three-in-one reform".

Regarding the evaluation of the impact of municipality merger, 66.5 % declare that it saved their expenditures; 45.5 % think that enabled administration of wider area; 33.0 % noticed that their policy-making capacity has improved; 27.6 % believed that their service standard has improved; 15.9 % think their service standard has worsened; and 13.4 % declared that their expenses have increased. The evaluations are divided, especially in terms of service delivery. This might be the reason why many local governments have been concentrating their reforms on service delivery.

77.5 % think that citizens should collaborate with public administration to resolve problems; while 9.8 % think that issues should be resolved mainly by public administration. This is the sign that the Japanese local governments have followed already somehow NPG driven reforms and many believe in the importance of cooperation. 80.8 % of the mayors observe that the citizen behave as beneficiary of public services, 63.5 % as contributor, 49.0 % as clients, and 73.9 % as partners of collaboration, while 16.2 % do not think they behave as clients. When they were asked how they see the citizen in carrying out their policy, 84.0 % as beneficiary of public services, 77.1 % as contributor, 58.8 % as clients, and 92.3 % as partners, while 15.3 % see the citizen not as clients. The role of citizen as clients gained the most divided view. The cooperation and partnership are recognised as important concepts by most mayors, confirming that the NPM has deeply rooted in these municipalities.

The survey shows that the concepts of NPM are widely recognised by most of the mayors, although their perceptions vary, and cooperation and partnership are their policy priorities, although they do not realise yet the concept of NPG.

IV. Analysis and findings

NPM had introduced collaborative government and co-production in public service delivery. New Public Governance concepts explain the conditions of the stakeholders involved in these processes.

In case of decentralisation policy, that is strongly connected to public service delivery and is a typical NPM strategy, traditional values like territory are strongly concerned, while many stakeholders are involved in crucial decision making.

In case of e-Government policy and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) policy, they are also typical NPM strategies, although they have several unique characteristics as public policy (Kudo 2010). Strong privacy concern, security issues, and data protection, along with open data, big data, and network/ubiquitous, remind us of the importance of finding the right equilibrium/balance among these. Recently recognised issues of ICT; security and/or safety versus privacy, open and big data versus data protection, and critics related to NPM; efficiency and/or effectiveness versus participatory democracy, private sector driven management versus network governance in big society, seem to confirm the NPG. Even e-Government, then e-Governance has been challenged with “digital era governance”, which goes beyond the NPM (Dunleavy et al. 2006) and stresses the active role of taxpayers as well as information technology (IT) corporations in society. In this view, all stakeholders are related in public governance network.

The examples and the results of the survey confirm the introduction of NPG in public service delivery among Japanese local governments. Citizens and communities are invited to participate not only in the decision-making process, but also the service delivery process. They are redesigning the structure of local service delivery.

Despite the practice, there are few researches and literature in Japan for the NPG, probably because of: 1) late introduction of NPM; 2) introduction of NPM sometimes mixed up with NPG, which was already dominant in Anglo-Saxon countries; 3) too strong and still dominant attention on NPM; and 4) less attention on NPG, since NPM was self-reform process by the Japanese public servants, especially at the local level (Kudo 2014).

There is evidence that some local governments are starting to take distances from the NPM-driven managerial style. Some decided not to renew contracts to the private sector, after evaluating the performance and considering customer satisfaction, but to bring back the service again into the hand of public administration, or to introduce new forms of collaboration between public and private sectors, mainly based on proposals from the private sector. In case of childcare and elderly care, some local governments re-started to hire experts in order to develop internal personnel as managers and policy makers in the future. The latter is an evidence of re-evaluation of professionals in public services. Some are revising their relationship with contractors and are starting to impose their policies and strategies much more clearly on them.

It is not yet clear if public service delivery in Japanese local governments can be classified as NPM type of management or that of NPG. Given the late introduction of NPM in practice, it is possible to interpret these public service delivery cases as NPM type of management arrived late. However, considering the characteristics of the public service delivery processes, it is also possible to say that these are NPG-oriented governance. More evidence is needed to generalise the recent situations.

Zusammenfassung

Hiroko Kudo; New Public Management oder New Public Governance? Wie gehen japanische Kommunen im Kontext von Dienstleistungserbringung damit um?

Kommunen; New Public Service; New Public Governance (NPG); Stakeholder; Teilhabe

Viele japanische Kommunen haben in den späten neunziger Jahren New Public Management (NPM) eingeführt. Nach einem Jahrzehnt der Erfahrungen, gibt es Anzeichen für eine Entwicklung weg von Wechsel von NPM zu NPG. Bisher gab es noch sehr wenige Beispiele. Da die Gründe dieser Verschiebungen variieren, war es bisher nicht möglich, zu analysieren, ob der theoretische Rahmen von NPG bestätigt werden kann; in den lokalen Regierungen ist NPG jedoch bereits angekommen. Der Beitrag untersucht die Beschaffenheit der japanischen Public Govnernance im Fall der Erbringung öffentlicher Dienstleistungen in lokalen Regierungen und in der Literatur.

References

Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire (2004), Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments, Washington.

Bardach, Eugene (1998), Getting agencies to work together. The practice and theory of managerial craftsmanship, Washington.

Bouckaert, Geert (2012), Trust and Public Administration, in: Administration, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 91-115.

Bovaird, Tony (2005), Public governance: balancing stakeholder power in a network society, in: International Review of Administrative Sciences, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 217-228.

Bovaird, Tony (2007), Beyond Engagement & Participation: User & Community Co-Production of Public Services, in: Public Administration Review, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 846-860.

Bovaird, Tony and Elke Löffler (2003), Evaluating the Quality of Public Governance: Indicators, Models and Methodologies, in: International Review of Administrative Sciences, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 313-328.

Christensen, JØrgen G. (2000), The Dynamics of Decentralisation and Recentralisation, in: Public Administration, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 389-407.

Dunleavy, Patrick et al. (2006), Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, The State, and E-Government, Oxford.

Fedele, Paolo and Edoardo Ongaro (2008), A Common Trend, Different Houses: Devolution in Italy, Spain and the UK, in: Public Money and Management, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 85-92.

Ferlie, Ewan et al. (1996), New Public Management in Action, Oxford.

Grossi, Giuseppe and Riccardo Mussari (2008), Effects of Outsourcing on Performance Measurement and Reporting: The Experience of Italian Local Governments, in: Public Budgeting and Finance, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 22-38.

Hartley, Jean (2005), Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present, in: Public Money and Management, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 27-34.

Hood, Christopher (1991), A Public Management for All Seasons?, in: Public Administration, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 3-19.

Hood, Christopher (1995), The 'New Public Management' in the 1980 s: variations on a theme, in: Accounting Organisation and Society, vol. 20, no. 2/3, pp. 93-109.

Hutchcroft, Paul D. (2001), Centralisation and Decentralisation in Administration and Politics: Assessing Territorial Dimensions of Authority and Power, in: Governance, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 23-53.

Imamura, Tsunao (2002), Kokyo Kukan no Saihen (Restructure of Public Domain), in: Nihon no Seifu Taikei (Japanese Government System), edited by Tsunao Imamura, Tokyo.

Kudo, Hiroko (2003), Between the 'Governance' Model and the Policy Evaluation Act: New Public Management in Japan, in: International Review of Administrative Sciences, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 483-504.

Kudo, Hiroko (2010), E-Governance as Strategy of Public Sector Reform: Peculiarity of Japanese IT Policy and its Institutional Origin, in: Financial Accountability & Management, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 65-84.

Kudo, Hiroko (2014), NPG in okeru Seisaku: Post NPM Jidai no Seijiteki Ishikettei to Governance Model (Public Policy under NPG: Political Decision-making and Governance Model in post NPM era), paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Japanese Society for Public Administration, Tokai University, May 2014, Tokyo.

Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (2013), Materials of the research group on the changing management of local governments and the future reform of local government system: http://www.soumu.go.jp/main_content/000283778.pdf (access: 3.12.2014).

Mussari, Riccardo (2005), Le performance dell'azienda pubblica locale, Padova.

OECD (2003), Managing Decentralisation: A New Role for Labour Market Policy, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Olson, Mancur Jr. (1969), The Principle of "Fiscal Equivalence": The Division of Responsibilities among Different Levels of Government, in: The American Economic Review, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 479-487.

Olson, Olov, James Guthrie and Christopher Humphrey (1998), Global Warning! Debating International Developments, in: New Public Financial Management, Cappelen Akademisk Forlag, Kristiansand.

Ongaro, Edoardo (2006), The dynamics of devolution processes in legalistic countries: organisational change in the Italian public sector, in: Public Administration, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 737-770.

Oosumi, Soshiro (1999), New Public Management: Idea, Vision, and Strategy, Nihon Hyoron Sha, Tokyo.

Osborne, Stephen P. (2006), The New Public Governance?, in: Public Management Review, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 377-387.

Osborne, Stephen P. (2010), The New Public Governance, London and New York.

Osborne, Stephen P. and Amanda Ball (2010), Social Accounting and Public Management: Accountability for the Public Good, London and New York.

Pestoff, Victor (2011), New Public Governance and Accountability: Some Jewels in a Treasure Chest, CIES no. 91 Atlanta, Giorgia.

Pollitt, Christopher (2014), Managerialism Redux?, Keynote Speech at 8th International EIASM Public Sector Conference, University of Edinburgh, September 2014, Edingurgh.

Pollitt, Christopher, Johnston Birchall and Keith Putman (1998), Decentralising Public Service Management, London.

Sancton, Andrew (2000), Merger Mania. The Assault on Local Government, London.

Tsujiyama, Takanobu (2002), Jichi Kihon Jorei no Kousou (Perception of Local Government Charter), in: Jichitai no Kousou (4) Kikou (Perception of Local Government, vol. 4, Institution), edited by Matsushita, Keiichi, Nishio, Masaru, and Muneyuki Shindo, Tokyo.

Yamamoto, Hiraku (2002), 'Atarashii Kokyo' to Shimin no Governance ('New Governance' and Governance of the Citizen), in: Gekkan Jichiken (Monthly of the Research Institute for Autonomy), vol. 44. no. 517, pp. 34-43.

Yamamoto, Kiyoshi (2008), Sekai to Nihon no NPM (NPM in the World and in Japan), in Koumu Kaikaku no Toppakou: Seisaku Hyoka to Jinji Gyosei (Breakthrough for the Public Service Reform: Policy Evaluation and Human Resource Administration), edited by Michio Muramatsu, Toyo Keizai Sinpo Sha, Tokyo.