

Central Management of Local Performance: A Comparison of England and Korea

Submitted by Dong-Ok Lee, to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Public Administration, January 2009.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(signature)

Abstract

Since the 1980s, New Public Management (NPM) has deeply influenced the public sector across the world, and thus measuring or managing performance has become a principal element of government reform. In terms of borrowing models and techniques from the private sector, performance measurement has been significantly extended into government, but differences between the two sectors have led to difficulties and criticism of this practice with a wide inconsistent variety of different theoretical explanations about it. In this context, this thesis investigates the effectiveness of performance measurement and theoretical explanations of conditions for its success in the public sector. It focuses through a comparative methodology on Comprehensive Performance Assessment and Joint Performance Assessment that have recently been introduced between the levels of government in England and Korea for the improvement of local government performance and accountability.

Extensive analysis of literature and case studies have allowed the thesis to find firstly, that the introduction of such unique assessment systems, by which the centre assesses localities, was deeply affected by the environmental commonalities of both countries such as centralisation in inter-governmental relations and enthusiasm for NPM. Second, the empirical evaluation of both tools shows that they have in practice been valid for accurate assessment, and directly functional for improvement and indirectly for accountability to the public. Their high validity and functionality proved to be mainly attributable to two characteristics. One was institutionally that both frameworks were based on a balanced approach to performance and the disclosure of assessment results to the public for facilitating competition between localities. The other was that both had impacted on internal management of local government which led to change in organisational culture with more focus on performance. However, it identified a necessity for local authorities to participate in the development process of those tools to ensure legitimacy of central management of local performance since they enjoy their own electorally based political support. The research has also found the importance of assessors' expertise for accurate assessment and a possibility that performance measurement can contribute to the resolution of political tension and cooperation between central and local government when it focuses more on outcomes than input and process. A deeper theoretical and practical understanding of these successful experiences and important policy elements in contemporary public management contributes significantly to knowledge in the three settings of evaluation of policy instruments, comparison between countries and central-local relations. Finally, the study assists each country and others to draw lessons from each other.

List of Contents

Abstract	2
List of Tables	8
List of Figures	8
Acknowledgement	9
List of Abbreviations	10

Chapter 1. Introduction

1. The background of the research	12
2. The purpose, questions, theoretical basis and scope of the research.....	17
3. The methodology of the study and research design.....	21
4. The structure of the research.....	28

Chapter 2. Performance Measurement in the Public Sector

1. The development of performance measurement in the public sector.....	30
1.1. The origin and history of performance measurement in the public sector	30
1.2. The demand on performance measurement in the public sector and New Public Management	37
2. Performance and performance measurement in the public sector.....	39
2.1. Performance measurement.....	39
2.2. Performance in the public sector.....	44
2.3. The purposes and uses of performance measurement in the public sector	48
2.4. The perverse effects of performance measurement.....	51
3. Performance measurement in the public and private sector.....	54
3.1. The criticism and scepticism of performance measurement in the public sector.....	54
3.2. The distinction of performance measurement between the private and public sector.....	56
3.3. The blurring difference of performance measurement between the two sectors.....	60

Chapter 3. Developing Good Performance Measurement Systems

1. Developing performance measurement systems in the public sector.....	65
---	----

2. Different stakeholders and performance measurement in the public sector...	69
3. The difficulties of performance measurement in the public sector.....	72
4. Overcoming difficulties and perverse effects.....	76
5. An emphasis on the bottom-up approach to performance measurement.....	81
6. Some examples of tools and models for performance measurement.....	85
6.1. A basic logic model for performance measurement.....	85
6.2. Benchmarking.....	87
6.3. Quality Awards.....	88
6.4. Charter Mark.....	89
6.5. ISO 9000: Quality management systems and total quality management..	90
6.6. The Balanced Scorecard.....	91
6.7. EFQM Excellence Model	93
6.8. Cautious use of generic models in the public sector	93
7. The conditions of good performance measurement systems in the public sector.....	94

Chapter 4. Local Governments and Accountability in England and Korea

1. Local government in England.....	100
1.1. Legal status and structure	100
1.2. Power and function	103
1.3. Finance.....	104
1.4. The relations between central and local government.....	106
2. Local government in Korea.....	110
2.1. Legal status and structures.....	110
2.2. Power and function.....	113
2.3. Finance	115
2.4. The relations between central and local government.....	116
3. The characteristics of local government systems in England and Korea.....	120
4. The accountability of local government and logical basis of central management of local government performance.....	123
4.1. Theoretical explanations of the relations between central and local government.....	123
4.2. Accountability of local government and performance measurement.....	125
4.3. Accountability of local government and the logical basis of CPA and JPA.....	127

Chapter 5. The Comprehensive Performance Assessment in England

1. Genesis and history.....	130
2. Aims and objectivities.....	140
3. Assessment of local government by CPA.....	143
4. Methodology.....	147
4.1. The CPA framework for single and upper tier councils.....	147
4.1.1. Corporate Assessment (CA).....	149
4.1.2. Use of Resources (UOR).....	152
4.1.3. Service Assessment (SA) by the AC.....	153
4.1.4. Service Assessment (SA) by other inspectorates	155
4.1.5. Direction of Travel Assessment (DOT).....	157
4.1.6. Reporting and re-categorisation	158
4.2. The CPA framework for district councils.....	160
4.3. CPA as a vehicle for reward and punishment.....	162
4.4. Conclusion.....	163

Chapter 6. Experience in England: Case Studies of CPA

1. The framework for the case studies of CPA and JPA.....	167
2. The case studies of CPA in England	171
2.1. General information of Bristol City and Devon County Council.....	171
2.2. The validity of CPA.....	175
2.3. The legitimacy of CPA.....	179
2.4. The functionality of CPA.....	183
3. Conclusion – a comprehensive evaluation of CPA.....	190
3.1. Regarding the aims and objectives of CPA.....	190
3.2. Regarding the AC and CPA results.....	192
3.3. Regarding the validity, legitimacy and functionality of CPA.....	194
3.4. Conclusion	197

Chapter 7. The Joint Performance Assessment in Korea

1. Introduction and development of JPA.....	198
2. Aims and objectives of JPA.....	206
3. Assessment of local government by JPA.....	209
4. Methodology.....	215
4.1. The assessment section of local government activities and achievement	

(AA).....	216
4.1.1. The assessment of local administration in AA.....	218
4.1.2. Other assessments in AA.....	220
4.2. The assessment section of national priority targets (ANT).....	222
4.3. Individual assessments of local government combined into JPA.....	223
4.4. Process	224
4.5. Rating and incentives.....	226
4.6. Conclusion.....	229

Chapter 8. Experience in Korea: Case Studies of JPA

1. General information of Daegu Metropolitan City and Chungbuk Province...	232
2. The validity of JPA.....	235
3. The legitimacy of JPA.....	238
4. The functionality of JPA.....	241
5. Conclusion – a comprehensive evaluation of JPA.....	247
5.1. Regarding the aims and objectives of JPA.....	247
5.2. Regarding MOPAS and JPA results.....	248
5.3. Regarding the validity, legitimacy and functionality of JPA.....	249
5.4. Conclusion	252

Chapter 9. Anglo-Korean Comparisons and Lesson-Drawing

1. Similar performance measurement systems in different countries.....	254
2. Successful performance measurement systems in the public sector	258
3. Resolution of conflict, and cooperation for better service delivery between central and local government.....	261
4. The growing necessity for professional expertise in performance assessors...	265
5. Drawing lessons from methodological similarities and differences between CPA and JPA	267
5.1. A balanced and comprehensive approach to local government Performance.....	268
5.2. Different performance measures, data collection, ranking and incentives.	270
5.3. Feedback for improvement, perverse effects and cost.....	273

Chapter 10. Conclusion

1. Central management of local performance	277
--	-----

2. Distinctive contribution to knowledge and review of the research.....	280
3. Suggestions for each country and for future research.....	283
3.1. Recent developments and suggestions in the short term.....	283
3.2. Desirable reforms in a long term perspective.....	288
3.3. Suggestions for further research.....	290
Appendix.....	292
Bibliography.....	311

List of Tables

1-1. The framework of comparison between CPA and JPA in the research.....	24
2-1. Eight purposes that public managers have for measuring performance.....	49
2-2. Immanent values in the public and the private domains.....	57
2-3. Measurement logics.....	62
4-1. Composition of tax revenue in some OECD countries in 2002.....	122
5-1. The overall CPA categorisation since 2005.....	159
5-2. The number of single tier and county councils subject to review.....	160
5-3. Freedom and flexibilities for local government by the CPA category.....	162
6-1. The CPA results of Bristol.....	172
6-2. Star rating by council types in 2007 CPA published in 2008.....	173
6-3 The CPA results of Devon.....	174
7-1. The assessors of JPA in its process.....	212
7-2. The AA in the 2006 JPA	216
7-3. Individual evaluations of local government to be combined in JPA.....	224
7.4. The rating of local authorities in the 2006 JPA.....	227
8-1. The JPA results of Daegu for 2005-2007.....	233
8-2. The JPA results of Chungbuk for 2005-2007.....	235
9-1. The comparison of frameworks between CPA and JPA.....	275

List of Figures

3-1. Inputs, outputs and outcomes, and the three Es.....	86
3-2. The three dimensions of performance measurement systems.....	98
4-1. Funding gap between the central and local governments in the UK.....	106
5-1. The CPA framework for 2005 - 2008 single tier and county councils and overall categorisation.....	148
5-2. CPA district council framework for 2006 to 2009	161
6-1. Star categories from 2005 to 2007.....	184
6-2. Direction of Travel result from 2005 to 2007.....	184
7-1. The system of government activity assessment	210
9-1. The levels of capacity.....	269

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Stephen Wilks for his precious advice, support and encouragement. In fact, he helped not only my study but also his wife, Philippa was a kind help to my family in settling in England.

I would also like to give great thanks to two English tutors, Dr. Patrick Jehu and Mr. Michael Hind in the INTO University of Exeter for their help in improving my writing skills, as well as to two examiners, Prof. Mark Evans in the University of York and Prof. Andrew Massey in the University of Exeter for their reading.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to all the interviewees in this research for their assistance and to the Korean Government and the British Council for their considerable help in funding it.

I have been very fortunate to have such a wonderful mentor, Dr. Jeong-Sik Kim who has always advised and supported me in anything regarding my life and study.

Most of all, I gratefully have to acknowledge the full support and warm encouragement of my family - my father, Byoung-Ha Lee, mother, Ok-Youn Hong and mother in law, Pung-Won Jang; my wife, Joo-Young Sung and two daughters, Eun-Jie and Eun-Soo; and my siblings particularly Myoung-Sook Lee.

List of Abbreviations

AA	Assessment section of Activities and achievement
AC	Audit Commission
ACT	Assessment of Culture and Tourism
AE	Assessment of Environment management
AHW	Assessment of Health and social Welfare
ALA	Assessment of: Local Administration
ALE	Assessment of Local Economy
ANT	Assessment section of National-priority control Targets
APW	Assessment of Policy on Women
ARD	Assessment of Regional Development
AS	Assessment of Security for Life and Property
ASC	Assessment Section of Capacity
BSC	Balanced Scored Card
BV	Best Value
BVPI	Best Value Performance Indicators
BVPP	Best Value Performance Plan
BVR	Best Value Review
CA	Corporate Assessment
CAF	Common Assessment Framework
CCR	Current Capability Review
CCT	Compulsory Competitive Tendering
CGA	Committee for Government Activity Assessment
CIPFA	Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy
CPA	Comprehensive Performance Assessment
CSCI	Commission for Social Care Inspection
CYPP	Children and Young People Plan
DCLG	Department of Community and Local government
DOT	Direction of Travel
EFQM	European Foundations for Quality Management
GPE	Government Performance Evaluation
GPRA	Government Performance and Result Act
IDeA	Improvement and Development Agency
IGR	Inter-Governmental Relation

IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
JPA	Joint Performance Assessment
KFDA	Korea Food and Drug Administration
KLOA	Key Lines of Assessment
KLOE	Key Lines of Enquiry
Krila	Korea Research Institute for Local Administration
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LGA	Local Government Association
LGA 1999	Local Government Act 1999
LGA 2000	Local Government Act 2000
LGA 2003	Local Government Act 2003
LGMA	Local Government Modernisation Agenda
LPSA	Local Public Service Agreement
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
MCST	Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism
MKE	Ministry of Knowledge Economy
MLTM	Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs
MOGAHA	Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs
MOGE	Ministry of Gender Equity
MOPAS	Ministry of Public Administration and Security
MOSF	Ministry of Strategy and Finance
MW	Ministry of Health and welfare
NAO	National Audit Office
NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
NPM	New Public Management
ODPM	Office of Deputy Prime Minister
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education
PI	Performance Indicator
PM	Performance Measure
PSA	Public Service Agreement
SA	Service Assessment
TQM	Total Quality Management
UOR	Use of Resource