

Missing Link among German *Verwaltungswissenschaft*,
International Public Governance Research, and
Japanese Public Administration Study:
Focusing on Governance of Network and
Insights of Prof. Dr. Dr. Klaus König

KUDO Hiroko*

Introduction

1. Public Governance and Network Governance
2. New Public Service and Citizen Participation
3. Citizen Participation under Public Governance
4. Findings, Implications, and Limitation

Introduction

German *Verwaltungswissenschaft* has developed some unique features compared to its international counterparts, as its Japanese equivalent has. The research thus focuses on these characteristics and tries to understand what distinguishes the German schools from the global trends and what Japan can learn from them. The first includes the relative weak attention on New Public Governance (NPG), which Japanese schools share, certain scepticism toward New Public Management (NPM), of which Japan is a fan, and the insights of Klaus König's research (see list), which have only partially been introduced in Japan (Harada, 2000, p. 199), however contain valuable elements for the latter. Since the analysis of the latter requires long exposition, the paper mainly explores the first.

* Professor, Faculty of Law, Chuo University

Although many Japanese researchers of public administration have studied in and about Germany, there are not so many literatures on development of German *Verwaltungswissenschaft* studies (Harada, 2000). Indeed, as Harada points out, its uniqueness might be limited to several authors, championed by Lorenz von Stein and Renate Mayntz. His work also mentions about more recent researches of Peter Eichhorn and Werner Jann, both internationally well-known scholars in public management study community. In his analysis, Harada argues that the disciplinary background of German schools, which deeply rooted in administrative law, has influenced their development.

It might be interesting to note that Peter Eichhorn is an economist by training, majoring business administration, and specialised in public and non-profit management, while Werner Jann is a political scientist by training, studied economics and mathematics, and specialised in public management. Indeed, both do not have any legal background. Other German top researches of the field, Christoph Reihard, Sabine Kuhlmann, Isabella Proeller, among others, share business administration and/or social science background and hold public management degree. It is understandable that these scholars share more international theoretical background, methodologies, and topics than domestic interests, although in some occasions, like the other two researchers cited in the work of Harada, have worked for the German government and thus dealing with domestic issues.

It might be also necessary to mention about the schools in terms of institutions. Most of the researchers above cited worked at the German University of Administrative Sciences or Deutsche Universität für Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer during their career, while landed at the University of Potsdam, except Peter Eichhorn, who taught at the University of Mannheim. Indeed the Speyer school has been the centre of

Verwaltungswissenschaft schools with strong legal background. The career path of these researches show that this traditional approach is still rooted in German public management study, while new approaches, represented by business administration turned public and non-profit management, have developed in new institutions. With the capital moving to Berlin following the reunification, the centre of public administration research also moved toward the new capital.

The paper thus first explores the issues less focused in Germany, even by those public management researchers above mentioned. Then it tries to identify those in Japan. Finally the paper draws some hypothesis to understand these differences from the insights of Klaus König.

1. Public Governance and Network Governance

What is network? In the era of Internet of Things, it seems that everything makes network and is in network. We encounter regularly surveillance cameras, which remind us to be under constant observation and in network; we do networking through various professional as well as personal settings, and many academics as well as practitioners have explained the increasing importance of network in recent years. The major theories of network governance, however, point out its potential as well as issues, including its difficulties in management practices, accountability, and trust.

Attentions on network, public service delivery, and the role of citizens and social sector lead traditional NPM to New Public Governance. According to Bovaird (2005), New Public Governance “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”. New Public Governance has adopted a citizen-centric approach and tries to guarantee participation of stakeholders (Pestoff, 2011). The role of citizen has been stressed also from trust issue raised by network governance theory. Because of the complexity caused by the participation of numerous stakeholders, building trust among these stakeholders and between them and the government and/or related institutions has become important and active participation of citizen in the process has been recognized as essential condition to achieve this.

Participation in New Public Governance, however, is usually stated as different from, or at least as a very specific version of, the notion in the traditional sense. The term “coproduction” is defined as “the provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalized service providers (in any sector) and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions” (Bovaird, 2007). Co-production differs from voice-based participation in the sense that it places the emphasis on cooperation through co-commissioning and co-delivery of services (Bovaird and Löffler, 2011). Under this framework, citizens are no longer considered as passive customers of public service since their experience and competences are fully recognized and mobilized (Bang, 2005). Citizen influence varies from case to case; co-production does not systematically share decision-making power with users and is sometimes restricted to co-implementation (Voorberg *et al.*, 2014).

There are wide differences among counties in terms of co-production and citizen participation. The paper also analyses Japanese cases, which are considered unique. Japanese society’s features appear to correspond to specific patterns of participation. Indeed, assuming Japanese citizens may not be made for discursive and conflictual forms of participation; Japanese society’s characteristics appear to fit co-production. That is, Japanese society

benefits from extremely strong social capital (Sorensen, 2012) and high civic engagement (Haddad, 2012). Sorensen (2012) argues that although social capital in Japan is strong, it focus on cooperation and assistance rather than on debate and initiative. The relationship between state and society is also conceived as integrated and cooperative and is characterized but a high level of mutual trust (Haddad, 2012). These statements echo some success criteria for co-production such as high social capital and citizenship (Taylor, 2003) and trust (Bovaird, 2007) for instance. Moreover, Avenell (2010) pointed out that civic engagement in Japan progressively took the form of “symbiotic relationships with the state and the market”. Finally, service provision has also been ensured by neighbourhoods associations within local communities for decades, working in more or less close collaboration with local governments (Kawato *et al.*, 2011). In addition, these associations still disseminate information and directives from the local and central government at the neighbourhood level. This may explain the relative weakness of public participation and calls for carefully examining co-production forms of citizen involvement while analysing Japanese cases.

Indeed, public administration researches in both countries have showed less attention on public governance discourse, especially network governance. The reason, however, could be different in the two countries: while in Germany, public governance has not enjoyed attention because there was general scepticism for the former NPM and thus there were no strong need to transform NPM into something different; public governance in Japan is not yet so popular, partially because NPM is still dominant, but also because the society traditionally has various New Public Governance oriented practices and thus there have been less interests in introducing new concept substituting NPM.

1.1. 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, started 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 uniqueness of German *Verwaltungswissenschaft* could partially be explained through this tradition as well as its similarity to Japan.

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 Centuries. 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 1980’s 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, hasn’t. 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.

Level of acceptance and introduction of NPM varies among countries and Germany and Japan are on opposite side. This influenced the NPM and post NPM influences in both countries.

1.2 Public Service Delivery 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, *et al.*, 1998). Customer-oriented and/or outcome-oriented thinking has been introduced in policy making and implementation processes (Hood, 1991; 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 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, *et al.*, 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 and 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 services 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.

1.3 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 and 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 of 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 PA until the late 1970s/early 1980s; 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; Osborne, 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 1990s 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 and 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).

The post NPM or NPG discourse is the most distinctive feature which divides German and Japanese public administration study from its international counterpart. This leads to another missing link, which is network governance, dividing German schools from global trends.

1.4 Network Governance and Democratic Network Governance

The concept of network governance emerged along with the New Public Governance and Bevir (2009) pointed out its nature as “ubiquity of network in governance”. He mentioned that the relationship between actors is based on exchange of resources and that the medium of exchange between actors is trust, while the means of resolving conflicts is diplomacy. According to him, culture of reciprocity is the key to the network governance. He also pointed out that the “explosion of networks has gone too far” and “can undermine democratic values, such as accountability” (Bever, 2009). The network governance seemed to be embedded into the public governance discourse; however the difficulty to guarantee some values and the need of trust were also pointed out. Indeed, trust has become a key concept to enable network governance as well as democratic network governance.

Democratic network governance was proposed by Sørensen and Torfing in 2007. In their edited volume entitled “Theories of Democratic Network Governance”, they wrote that three questions must be answered if governance networks are to become a positive contribution to democracy: 1. how can it be ensured that all affected are allowed the access to participate in governance networks?; 2. how can it be ensured that network actors participate in the networks allow for discursive contestation and openness between network actors and networks; and 3. how can publicity be promoted in and around governance networks in order to ensure democratic

accountability (Sørensen and Torfing, 2007). The importance of participation and accountability is pointed out again by these authors as well as other authors in the volume. Esmark stressed that challenges includes “finding the accountability holders and holdees”, “sufficient publicity”, and “adequate responsiveness” (Esmark, 2007), and Dryzek pointed out “if engagement (of multiple discourses in the presence of a network) proceeds according to principles of respect, reciprocity, and equality in the capacity to raise and challenge points, it can help contribute to discursive democracy” (Dryzek, 2007). According to Peters, thus, “the types of organizations that are involved in networks, the size of those networks, and the range of activities in which the networks are involved all affect the ability of networks to institutionalize effective internal interactions” (Peters, 2007). Network governance needs various conditions to be effective and those conditions are not easily realized. Thus the paper later analyses the issues of participation, in order to understand the validity of network governance.

Network theory, when it is adopted into the context of public administration or public governance, seems to suggest several significant elements. Keast *et al.* (2014) suggest the possibilities of collaborative networks in public settings as well as network management (Keast *et al.*, 2014) They stressed the “Theory of Collaborative Advantage” as the background of advantages in network in public sector, as well as its difficulties since it is based on multidimensional model. Network, in relation to public services and technologies which used for them, can play an important role. Pollitt (2012) expressed that “Changing technologies also have direct impacts on where public services can be sited. Certain kind of services (particularly the provision of information, the filling-in of forms, and the payment of taxes) can now be sited almost anywhere. Thanks to modern ICTs, the range of activities that are in this sense ‘mobile’ has increased, but it is still far from comprehensive, and is unlikely ever to

become so”, and “Functional logics increasingly combine with technological possibilities to enhance the political and managerial appeal of international cooperation to deal with increasing international flows. This goes far beyond the obvious cases of crime and terrorism to embrace education, health care, taxation, environmental regulation, and many other public functions”.

Negative aspects of network have been also discussed by some authors. Hood and Lodge argued that control, blame avoidance and cheating form public service provisions through their analysis on reward, competency, loyalty and blame in public service bargains.

The paper thus analyses the citizen participation, one of the key elements which enable network governance in the context of New Public Governance. The paper focuses on co-productive characteristics of Japanese participation practices as they suggest the possibilities of network governance under trust and developed social capital.

2. New Public Service and Citizen Participation

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).

3. Citizen Participation under Public Governance

This part tries to focus on the second issue, the characteristics of Japanese public administration study, which in part, have many common issues with Germany as well as international tendencies. Many Japanese local governments introduced New Public Management (NPM) in the late Nineties, 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, 2015).

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 realize 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 realize 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

literatures 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 literatures on NPM since the mid-nineties 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, 2015). 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 literatures?

3.1 New Public Governance in Local Governments

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 was 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 didn't 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 points 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 literatures among Japanese academic researches (Kudo, 2015). 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.

3.2 Participation and Capacity Development of Citizens

The last part explores theories of participation to see how it has gained more and more importance in policy-making as well as policy implementation and how it has been transformed under New Public Management (NPM) and later with the introduction of New Public Governance. Civic engagement or citizen involvement is considered to be one of the crucial issues for better public governance, however its concept and reality vary among countries and areas, thus it is not easy to draw general pictures.

Recent decades have been marked by an international trend towards increased citizen involvement in policy-making and growing interest in public participation issues from scholars (Blondiaux, 2008). Participation has been implemented in both local and national governments and in large array of areas (Rowe and Frewer, 2005). Participatory mechanisms allow citizens to take part in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policy. Since the landmark study conducted by Arnstein in 1969, many scholars have been tackling this issue and have elaborated classifications of public participation based on its purpose and degree (Blondiaux, 2008; Rowe and Frewer, 2005). For example, the representative typology proposed by the OECD draws a distinction between information, consultation and participation, in which the relationship between government and citizens is respectively one-way from the former to the latter, two-way with the latter simply invited to give their opinion, and two-way with citizens actively involved in the decision-making process and the management of the structure (Gramberger, 2001). It is generally considered that participation may provide numerous benefits such as democratic and legitimacy gains, public policy and service quality improvement, social inclusion, social justice as well

as contribution to the education and socialisation processes (Blondiaux, 2008).

In the framework of NPM, customer-oriented and outcome-oriented thinking have been introduced in policy-making and implementation (Hood, 1995). Introduction and use of ICT to improve managerial processes and to enhance communication to and with citizens is a key factor for a successful e-Government policy. Subsequently, attentions on public service delivery and the role of citizens in its process led to New Public Governance. According to Bovaird, New Public Governance “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” (Bovaird, 2007). New Public Governance has adopted a citizen-centric approach and tries to guarantee participation of stakeholders (Pestoff, 2011).

However, participation in New Public Governance is usually stated as different from, or at least as a very specific version of, the notion in the traditional sense. The term “co-production” is endorsed by scholars such as Bovaird who defines co-production as “the provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalized service providers (in any sector) and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions” (Bovaird, 2007). His paper’s title advocates to go “Beyond Engagement and Participation” and the same rationale is apparent in other definitions such as the New Economics Foundation’s one which states that “[co-production] is not about consultation or participation – except in the broadest sense. *The point is not to consult more, or involve people more in decisions*; it is to encourage them to use the human skills and experience they have to help deliver public or voluntary services” (New Economics Foundation, 2008). In other words, co-production differs from voice-based participation in the sense that it places

the emphasis on cooperation through co-commissioning and co-delivery of services (Bovaird and Löffler, 2011). Under this framework, citizens are no longer considered as passive customers of public service since their experience and competences are fully recognized and mobilized (Bang, 2005; Birchall and Simmons, 2004). Citizen influence varies from case to case; co-production does not systematically share decision-making power with users and is sometimes restricted to co-implementation (Bovaird and Löffler, 2011; Voorberg *et al.*, 2014).

3.3 Japanese Participation as Co-design and Co-production in Network

Japan is depicted as a highly specific country with peculiarities regarding civic engagement, citizen involvement, and citizen participation (Sugimoto, 2010; Nakane, 1967). As Haddad argues, Japanese democracy would be a “fusion of foreign liberal democratic values, institutions, and practices with indigenous Japanese political values, institutions, and practices” (Haddad, 2002). The peculiarities of Japanese democracy are of the utmost importance when it comes to analyse citizen involvement.

Indeed, some features of Japanese society seem to be inappropriate with the practice of citizen participation. For instance, Confucian values would have – among others, but mainly – shaped Japanese political tradition and remained to some extent even after the Second World War. Consequently, it is very often stated that Japanese people tend to prefer social order to individual freedom and an interventionist government to a small one; they would also be little suspicious about government intentions and pretty reluctant to protest publicly (Haddad, 2012). While Nakane pointed out a few decades ago the strength of hierarchy in social relations and the tendency to decide by consensus (Nakane, 1967), recent works affirm that decision by consensus still holds a prevalent place (Haddad, 2012). Thus, participation in

Japan would be little conflictual (Yamashita and Williams, 2002). According to Nakane, when attending an assembly, very often Japanese people do not dare to openly express their opinion because of hierarchical power relations and the vote consequently becomes undemocratic (Nakane, 1967). Matsuura shows that these characteristics do impede public participation since most participants remain silent or just nod their head, because they “can’t speak out in public” (Matsuura, 2006).

However, other narratives consider that public participation in Japan is not much different than that in western countries (Jain, 2011; Kikuchi, 2010). Indeed, all along the post-war era, not only have liberal democratic values unfolded in Japan, but also Confucian and other traditional values adjusted to these new values (Haddad, 2012). In the wake of the citizens and residents movements of the 1960s and 1970s, progressive local governments started to deal with social problems with citizen inputs, bringing to a “change in the relationship between citizens and local administrations [that] signalled the development of participatory democracy” (Kawato *et al.*, 2011).

Although individual citizens and citizen groups were rather passive and mostly reactive in their relation with government and towards policy-making until the 1990s, they became much more proactive starting from the late 1990s (Haddad, 2012). Furthermore, due to financial constraints, local governments need more to strengthen cooperation with citizens for policy-making and implementation (Kawato *et al.*, 2011). Public participation would now be institutionalized and widely practiced (Jain, 2011; Kikuchi, 2010), and most participatory mechanisms present in western countries are also frequently used in Japan. Public participation is particularly salient at the city level where *machizukuri* initiatives (“community-building” or “city-building”) are flourishing, especially since the 1990s (Sorensen, 2012).

Besides this debate about peculiarity of public participation in Japan,

it is appropriate to analyse and to expect substantial citizen involvement in Japanese cases. It is important to understand that Japanese society's features appear to correspond to specific patterns of public participation, which, far from being essentially Japanese, exist all around the world as well. This being said, it is of interest to return to the aforementioned distinction between participation and coproduction. Indeed, assuming Japanese citizens may not be made for discursive and conflictual forms of participation; Japanese society's characteristics appear to fit coproduction pretty well. That is, Japanese society benefits from extremely strong social capital (Sorensen, 2012) and high civic engagement (Haddad, 2012). Sorensen argues that although social capital in Japan is strong, it focuses on cooperation and assistance rather than on debate and initiative (Sorensen, 2012; Yamashita and Williams, 2002). The relationship between state and society is also conceived as integrated and cooperative and is characterized by a high level of mutual trust (Haddad, 2012). These statements echo some success criteria for coproduction such as high social capital and citizenship (Taylor, 2003) and trust (Bovaird, 2007) for instance.

Moreover, Avenell pointed out that civic engagement in Japan progressively took the form of "symbiotic relationships with the state and the market" (Avenell, 2010). Finally, service provision (public security and night watch, garbage collection, road and green spaces maintenance, for instance) has also been ensured by neighbourhood associations within local communities for decades, working in more or less close collaboration with local governments (Sorensen, 2012; Kawato *et al.*, 2011). In addition, these associations still disseminate information and directives from the local and central government at the neighbourhood level. This may explain the relative weakness of public participation and calls for carefully examining coproduction forms of citizen involvement while analysing Japanese cases.

Some scholars consider ICT to be a powerful means to promote and improve public participation (Ishikawa, 2002; Monnoyer-Smith, 2011). ICT may reduce participation costs by enabling citizens to participate through their mobile devices at any time and place (Marres, 2012). The modes of expression and communication provided by ICT also allow new publics to have interest and legitimacy in participating in public affairs (Monnoyer-Smith, 2011; Muhlberger *et al.*, 2011). Not only would ICT widen the public of participation; it also has the potential to enrich the content of citizens' input that would no longer be solely in a discursive form (Monnoyer-Smith, 2011). Collaborative tools such as citizen sensing and other interactive applications (Gutiérrez *et al.*, 2013) have the potential to enhance democratic debates, while information aggregators may facilitate citizen engagement (Kavanaugh *et al.*, 2014).

E-participation, which mobilises ICT for participatory process, aims to increase citizens' abilities to participate in the political process (Sanford and Rose, 2007). This can go beyond by not only supplying citizens with information on public policies, but also giving them an opportunity to co-create them. Interactions between governments and citizens consist of provision of information, consultation and active participation of citizens on political decision-making (Gramberger, 2001). ICT supports these interactions (Akrivopoulou, 2013), and is believed to renew the trust in government (Hague and Loader, 1999). In the electronic environment, citizens can interact with public officials in a more informal way and the nature of interactions would therefore become more horizontal and egalitarian, instead of vertical and bureaucratic (Macintosh, 2009).

Furthermore, it is worth noting that given the peculiarities of Japanese society, scholars argue that more than elsewhere, ICT could greatly boost citizen participation in Japan: for Ishikawa, "Internet is an ideal tool for jump-starting deliberative democracy in Japan" (Ishikawa, 2002). Moreover,

reflected by Sabouret who qualifies Japanese as “*homo technophilus*” (Sabouret, 2007), many scholars consider that Japanese people are keen to use new technology. However, the possibility of ICT to stimulate public participation is subject to criticisms. First, the promises of increased social inclusion may be counterbalanced by new forms of exclusion, regarding the elderly in particular (Millward, 2003). This caution is especially relevant with regard to Japanese society since in 2014, 26% of the population is over 65 years of age. Second, although ICT allows for new forms of expression and creativity, it also favours individualised patterns of participation at the expense of collective patterns based on open discussion.

4. Findings, Implications, and Limitation

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 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 vs. privacy, open and big data vs. data protection, and critics related to NPM; efficiency and/or effectiveness vs. participatory democracy, private sector driven management vs. 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 IT corporations in society. In this view, all stakeholders are related in public governance network.

Both scholars and practitioners stress that (smart) citizens play a crucial role, not only by their appropriate (smart) behaviour (Khansari *et al.*, 2013) but also by their participation in (smart) governance (Giffinger *et al.*, 2007; Meijer and Rodriguez Bolivar 2015; Mellouli *et al.*, 2014; Scholl and Scholl, 2014). Furthermore, Caragliu *et al.* (Caragliu *et al.*, 2009) highlight the need for participatory governance. However, despite the abundance of discourse about the key role of citizens, relatively little research has been produced so far. As Chourabi *et al.* put it, “addressing the topic of people and communities (as part of smart cities) is critical, and traditionally has been neglected” (Chourabi *et al.*, 2012). Furthermore, they also consider that most publications frame governance as a technical or managerial issue and note a lack of attention for the politics of technical choices since both sustainability and citizen participation are not analysed as issues of political struggle and debate but rather as desirables for a ‘good society’ (Mellouli *et al.*, 2014). For Mellouli *et al.*, “The concept of a smart community refers to the use of information and communication technologies by local governments and cities to better interact with their citizens, taking advantage of all available data to solve important problems” (Mellouli *et al.*, 2014). They add that “governments need not only to create new services to their citizens based on these technologies in order to improve their quality of life, but also to engage citizens in this new set of services” (Mellouli *et al.*, 2014).

In order to analyse network governance, especially democratic network governance in public sector setting, the case of citizen participation in

smart city, which heavily relies on ICT, thus network technology, could suggest interesting insights. Given the diversity of smart city governance cases, it is worthwhile using the analytical framework proposed by Meijer (Meijer, 2014). Indeed, Meijer indicates two ideal-type models of smart city governance, connected to “two distinctive waves of technological innovation [...]: technologies for concentrated intelligence and technologies for distributed intelligence”. In the former, new technologies (big data, etc.) would “enable central steering actors to strengthen their intelligence, provide more integrated services, develop better policies and steer other actors in the city more effectively”. On the contrary, in the latter, new technologies such as social media and open data would facilitate cooperation between various actors and “takes direct citizen involvement as its starting point” (Meijer, 2014). What some authors term “smart community” (Gurstein, 2014; Mellouli *et al.*, 2014) corresponds to smart cities whose governance resembles the latter ideal-type model. In this case, public participation is considered as an end in itself. By contrast, smart cities which mainly aim at improving public services provision and quality of life correspond to the former, in which public participation is more akin to a means. However, these are ideal-type models and actual smart city projects are obviously imbued with both rationalities, although with a different balance.

One ambition of this analysis is to highlight that it is better to be cautious with “citizen participation” claims when it comes to network governance. The fact that smart cities may mobilise ICT to steer citizens rather than to catalyse public participation calls for further research. Indeed, the Japanese case suggests an interlocking between the rise of smartness and the emergence of a “behaviour change agenda” (Jones *et al.*, 2013) based on the use of behavioural sciences and big data. In this regard, citizen involvement in smart cities may be considered as a disciplinary strategy

(Vanolo, 2014) and seen as a means rather than as an end in itself; in other words, as a policy instruments aiming at improving efficiency rather than deepening democracy. Although already underlined by the literature (Bovaird and Löffler, 2011), the ambiguous relation between co-production and governmental approaches to behaviour change would deserve further analysis when ICT and network are at stake.

The literature review and examples confirm the introduction of NPG in public service delivery and of network governance in public sector. 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 and they are forming networks. Considering the characteristics of the public service delivery processes, it is also possible to say that these are NPG-oriented governance and/or de facto network governance. More evidences are needed to generalise the recent situations, however the importance of citizen participation in public service delivery to build trust under NPG has been confirmed through theories and practices.

The paper explained the various missing elements among public governance in various countries, focusing on Germany and Japan, and re-evaluated them among these elements. So far, the research identified the common and unique features of the selected countries, however, failed to draw some lessons from the situation.

One of the possible answers to all these could be the works of Klaus König, professor emeritus of the German University of Administrative Sciences. His research covers many areas including both traditional German *Verwaltungswissenschaft* area as well as more recent public management field (König, 1996). His background is law and political science, but his work covers even public governance (a seminar of Bouckaert reminded him as major

alternative figure) as well as systemic governance, thus linking many issues and elements which were not clearly addressed by his co-nationals.

The paper lacks the whole analysis of the literatures of Klaus König, which would be explored at the next occasion. Despite these limitations, however, the paper has drawn several factors and issues, not often pointed out in the public administration community.

References

- Agranoff, R. and M. McGuire (2004), *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*, Georgetown University Press, Washington.
- Akrivopoulou C. M. (2013), *Digital Democracy and the Impact of Technology on Governance and Politics: New Globalized Practices*, IGI Global.
- Avenell, S. A. (2010), *Japanese Citizens: Civil Society and the Mythology of the Shimin in Postwar Japan*, University of California Press.
- Bang, H. P. (2005), Among Everyday Makers and Expert Citizens, in: Newman, J. ed., *Remaking Governance: Peoples, Politics and the Public Sphere*, Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 159–78.
- Bardach, E. (1998), *Getting agencies to work together. The practice and theory of managerial craftsmanship*, Brookings, Washington.
- Bevir, M. (2009), *Key Concepts in Governance*, Sage Publications.
- Birchall, J. and R. Simmons (2004), *User Power: The Participation of Users in Public Services*, National Consumer Council, London, URL: http://www.ncc.org.uk/nccpdf/poldocs/NCC071ft_user_power.pdf
- Blondiaux, L. (2008), *Le Nouvel esprit de la démocratie, Actualité de la démocratie participative*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris.
- Bouckaert, G. (2012), Trust and Public Administration, in: *Administration*, Vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 91–115.
- Bovaird, T. (2005), Public governance: balancing stakeholder power in a network society, in: *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 217–228.
- Bovaird, T. (2007), Beyond Engagement & Participation: User & Community Co-Production of Public Services, in: *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 846–860.
- Bovaird, T. and E. 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.
- Bovaird, T. and E. Löffler (2011), “From Engagement to Co-production: How Users and Communities Contribute to Public Services”, in: Brandsen, T. and V. Pestoff, eds. *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production*, Routledge, London.
- Caragliu, A., Del Bo. C., and P. Nijkamp (2009), Smart Cities in Europe, in: *Proceedings to the 3rd Central European Conference on Regional Science*, Košice, Slovak Republic.
- Chourabi, H., Nam, T., Walker, S., Gil-Garcia, R. J., Mellouli, S., Nahon, K., Pardo, T. A., and H. J., Scholl (2012), Understanding Smart Cities: An Integrative Framework, in: 2012 *Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pp. 2289–2287.
- Christensen, J. G. (2000). The Dynamics of Decentralisation and Recentralisation, in: *Public Administration*, Vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 389–407.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., and J. Tinkler (2006), *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, The State, and E-Government*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fedele, P., and E. 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, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L., and A. Pettinngrew (1996), *New Public Management in Action*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gramberger, M. (2001), *Citizens as partners: OECD handbook on information, consultation and public participation in policy-making*, OECD.
- Grossi, G., and R. 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.
- Gurstein, M. (2014), Smart Cities vs. Smart Communities: Empowering Citizens not Market Economics, *The Journal of Community Informatics* 10 (3).
- Gutiérrez, V., Galache, J. A., Sánchez, L., Muñoz, L., Hernandez-Muñoz, J. M., Fernandes, J., and M. Presser (2013), SmartSantander: Internet of Things Research and Innovation through Citizen Participation, in: Galis, A. and A. Gavras, eds. *The Future Internet: Future Internet Assembly 2013: Validated Results and New Horizons*, Springer Open, pp. 173–186.
- Haddad, M. A. (2012), *Building Democracy in Japan*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hague, B. M. and B. Loader (1999), *Digital democracy: Discourse and decision making*

in the information age, Routledge.

- Harada, H. (2002), *Shakai Seigyo no Gyousei-gaku: Mayntz Gyousei Syakaigaku no Shiza (Public Administration of Social Control: Perspective of Mayntz's Administrative Sociology)*, Shinzansha Publisher.
- Hartley, J. (2005), Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present, in: *Public Money and Management*, Vol.25, no. 1, pp. 27–34.
- Hood, C. (1991), A Public Management for All Seasons?, in: *Public Administration*, Vol. 69, Issue 1, pp. 3–19.
- Hood, C. (1995), The 'New Public Management' in the 1980s: variations on a theme, in: *Accounting Organisation and Society*, Vol. 20, no. 2/3, pp. 93–109.
- Hood, C. and M. Lodge (2006), *The Politics of Public Service Bargains: Reward, Competency, Loyalty and Blame*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hutchcroft, P. 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, T. (2002), Kokyo Kukan no Saihen (Restructure of Public Domain), in: *Imamura, Tsunao, ed. Nihon no Seifu Taikei: Kaikaku no Katei to Houkou (Japanese Government System: Process and Direction of Reforms)*, Seibundou.
- Ishikawa, Y. (2002), Calls for deliberative democracy in Japan, *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 5 (2), 331–345.
- Jain, P. (2011), Japan's subnational government: toward great decentralization and participatory democracy, in: Inoguchi, T. and P. Jain, eds. *Japanese Politics Today: From Karaoke to Kabuki Democracy*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 163–181.
- Jones, R., Pykett, J., and M. Whitehead (2013), *Changing Behaviours. On the Rise of the Psychological State*, Edward Elgar.
- Kavanaugh, A., S. Krishnan, M. Pérez-Quñones, J. Tedesco, K. Madondo and A. Ahju (2014), Encouraging civic participation through local news aggregation, *Information Polity* 19 (1–2), 35–56.
- Kawato, Y., Pekkanen, R., and H. Yamamoto (2011), State and civil society in Japan, in: Gaunter, A. ed., *The Routledge Handbook of Japanese Politics*, Routledge, pp. 117–129.
- Keast, R., Mandell, M. and R. Arganoff, eds. (2014), *Network Theory in the Public Sector: Building New Theoretical Frameworks*, Reutledge.
- Khansari, N., Mostashari, A., and M. Mansouri (2013), Impacting Sustainable Behaviour and Planning in Smart City, *International Journal of Sustainable Land*

- use and Urban Planning*, 1 (2), 46–61.
- Kickert, W. J. M., Klijn, E. H., and J. F. M. Koppenjan, eds. (1997), *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*, Sage Publications, London.
- Kikuchi, M. (2010), Public Policy Processes and Citizen Participation in Japan, in: Berman, E. M., Moon, M. J., and H. Choi, eds., *Public Administration in East Asia*, CRC Press, 2010, pp. 213–232.
- Kudo, H. (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, H. (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, H. (2015), “Bridging the Gap between Reform Practices and Literatures: New public service delivery of Japanese local governments”, in *International Public Management Review*, 16 (1): 147–164.
- Macintosh, A., Coleman, S., and A. Schneeberger (2009), eParticipation: The research gaps, *Electronic participation* 5694, 1–11.
- Marres, N. (2012), *Material Participation: Technology, The Environment and Everyday Publics*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Matsuura, M. (2006), Localizing Public Dispute Resolution in Japan: Lessons from experiments with deliberative policy-making, Doctoral thesis of Philosophy in Urban and Regional Planning, MIT.
- Meijer, A. (2014), Smart City Governance: A Local Emergent Perspective, in: J. R. Gil-Garcia, T. A. Pardo and T. Nam, eds., *Smarter as the New Urban Agenda: A Comprehensive View of the 21st Century City*, Springer, New York, pp. 73–85.
- Meijer, A. and M. P. Rodriguez Bolivar (2015), Governing the Smart City. A Review of the Literature on Smart Urban Governance, *International Review of Administrative Science*.
- Mellouli, S., Luna-Reyes, L. F., and J. Zhang (2014), Smart government, citizen participation and open data, *Information Polity* 19 (1–2), 1–4.
- Millward, P. (2003), The “grey digital divide”: Perception, exclusion and barrier of access to the Internet for Older People, *First Monday* 8 (7) (2003).
- 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: 03.12.2014).

- Monnoyer-Smith, L. (2011), *Communication et délibération. Enjeux technologiques et mutations citoyennes*, Hermès, Paris, 2011.
- Muhlberger, P., Stromer-Galley, J., and N. Webb (2011), Public policy and obstacles to the virtual agora: Insights from the deliberative e-rulemaking project, *Information Polity* 16 (3), 197–214.
- Mussari, R. (2005), *Le performance dell'azienda pubblica locale*, Cedam, Padova.
- Nakane, C. (1967), *Tate Shakai no Ningen Kankei (Human Relationship in Vertical Society)*, Kodansha, translation in English (1970), *Japanese society*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- New Economics Foundation (2008), *Co-production: A manifesto for growing the core economy*, URL: http://b3cdn.net/nefoundation/5abec531b2a775dc8d_qjm6bqzpt.pdf
- OECD (2003), *Managing Decentralisation: A New Role for Labour Market Policy*, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD Publishing.
- Olson, O., Guthrie, J., and C. Humphrey (1998), *Global Warning! Debating International Developments in New Public Financial Management*, Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- Ongaro, E. (2006), The dynamics of devolution processes in legalistic countries: organisational change in the Italian public sector, *Public Administration*, Vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 737–770.
- Oosumi, S. (1999), *New Public Management: Idea, Vision, and Strategy*, Nihon Hyoron Sha.
- Osborne, S. P. (2006), The New Public Governance?, in: *Public Management Review*, Vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 377–387.
- Osborne, S. P. ed. (2010), *The New Public Governance*, Routledge, London & New York.
- Osborne, S. P. and A. Ball, eds. (2010), *Social Accounting and Public Management: Accountability for the Public Good*, Routledge, London & New York.
- Pestoff, V. (2011) New Public Governance and Accountability: Some Jewels in a Treasure Chest, *CIES* N. 91.
- Peters, B. Guy and David J. Savoie, eds. (2000), *Governance in the Twenty-first Century – Revitalizing the Public Service*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Canada.
- Pollitt, C., Birchall, J. and K. Putman (1998), *Decentralising Public Service Management*, Macmillan, London.
- Pollitt, C. (2012), *New Perspectives on Public Services: Place and Technology*, Oxford

- University Press, Oxford.
- Pollitt, C. (2014), Managerialism Redux?, Keynote Speech at 8th International EIASM Public Sector Conference, University of Edinburgh, September 2014.
- Rowe, G. and L. J. Frewer (2005), A typology of public engagement mechanisms, *Science, Technology & Human Values* 30 (2), 251–290.
- Sabouret, J.-F. (2007), *L'Empire de l'intelligence. Politiques scientifiques et technologiques du Japon depuis 1945*, CNRS Editions, 2007.
- Sancton, A. (2000), *Merger Mania. The Assault on Local Government*, McGill-Queen's, London.
- Sanford, C. and J. Rose (2007), Characterizing eParticipation, *International Journal of Information Management*, 27 (6), 406–421.
- Scholl, H. J. and M. C. Scholl (2014), Smart Governance: A Roadmap for Research and Practice, *iConference 2014 Proceedings*, pp. 163–176. URL: https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/47408/060_ready.pdf?sequence=2
- Sorensen, A. (2012), The State and social capital in Japan, in: Daniere, A. and H. V. Van Luong, eds., *The Dynamics of Social Capital and Civic Engagement in Asia*, Routledge, New York, 163–181.
- Sørensen, E. and J. Torfing (2007), *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*, Palgrave.
- Sugimoto, Y. (2010), *An Introduction to Japanese Society*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, third edition.
- Taylor, M. (2011), *Public Policy in the Community*, 2nd edition, Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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.
- Vanolo A. (2014), Smartmentality: The Smart City as Disciplinary Strategy, *Urban Studies* 51 (5), 883–998.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., and L. G. Tummers (2015), A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the Social Innovation Journey”, *Public Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 9, pp. 1333–1357.
- Yamamoto, H. (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, K. (2008), Sekai to Nihon no NPM (NPM in the World and in Japan), in: Muramatsu M. ed. *Koumu Kaikaku no Toppakou: Seisaku Hyoka to Jinji Gyosei (Breakthrough for the Public Service Reform: Policy Evaluation and Human Resource Administration)*, Toyo Keizai Sinpo Sha.
- Yamashita, H. and C. Williams (2002), A Vote for Consensus: Democracy and difference in Japan, in: *Comparative Education*, 38 (3). pp. 277–289.

List of works of Klaus König related to the topic

- Zum Standort der Verwaltungswissenschaft, in: *Die Öffentliche Verwaltung* 1990, S. 305 ff.
- Unternehmerisches oder exekutives Management - die Perspektive der klassischen öffentlichen Verwaltung, in: *Verwaltungsarchiv* 1/1996, S. 19 ff.
- Öffentliche Verwaltung - postindustriell, postmodern, postbürokratisch, in: Merten/Schmidt/Stettner (Hrsg.), *Der Verwaltungsstaat im Wandel, Festschrift für Franz Knöpfle zum 70. Geburtstag*, München 1996, S.141 ff.
- Öffentliche Verwaltung im vereinigten Deutschland, in: König/Siedentopf (Hrsg.), *Öffentliche Verwaltung in Deutschland*, Baden-Baden 1996/97, S. 13 ff.
- Der Verwaltungsstaat in Deutschland, in: *Verwaltungsarchiv* 4/1997, S. 545 ff.
- Gute Gouvernanz als Steuerungs- und Wertkonzept des modernen Verwaltungsstaates, in: Jann/König/Landfried/Wordelmann (Hrsg.), *Politik und Verwaltung auf dem Weg in die transindustrielle Gesellschaft, Festschrift für Carl Böhret zum 65. Geburtstag*, Baden-Baden 1998, S. 227 ff.
- Verwaltungsstaat im Übergang. Transformation, Entwicklung, Modernisierung*, Baden-Baden 1999
- Verwaltung und Verwaltungsforschung - Deutsche Verwaltung an der Wende zum 21. Jahrhundert* (Hrsg.) , Speyerer Forschungsberichte 211, Speyer 2000
- Governance als Steuerungskonzept, in: König/Adam/Speer/Theobald, *Governance als entwicklungs- und transformationspolitisches Konzept*, Berlin 2002, S. 9 ff.
- Governance-Werte, politische Konditionalität und Globalisierung, in: König/Adam/Speer/Theobald, *Governance als entwicklungs- und transformationspolitisches Konzept*, Berlin 2002, S. 319 ff.
- Regieren als politisches Management und als öffentliche Governance, in: Sommermann/Ziekow (Hrsg.), *Perspektiven der Verwaltungsforschung, Beiträge zur Wissenschaftlichen Arbeitstagung aus Anlass des 25-jährigen Bestehens des*

- Forschungsinstituts für öffentliche Verwaltung*, Berlin 2002, S. 201 ff.
- Theorien öffentlicher Verwaltung, in: Jan Ziekow (Hrsg.) *Verwaltungswissenschaften und Verwaltungswissenschaft*, Berlin 2003, S. 153 ff.
- Verwaltungskulturen und Verwaltungswissenschaften, in: König/Reichard (Hrsg.), *Theoretische Aspekte einer managerialistischen Verwaltungskultur*, Speyerer Forschungsberichte 254, Speyer 2007, S. 1 ff.
- Verwaltungswissenschaft im Zeichen der Globalisierung und Europäisierung, in: Magiera u.a. (Hrsg.), *Verwaltungswissenschaft und Verwaltungspraxis in nationaler und transnationaler Perspektive*, Berlin 2008, S. 793 ff.
- Regieren als Management-Problem, in: Jann/König (Hrsg.), *Regieren zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen 2008, S. 29 ff.
- Governance- und Managementkonzepte des Regierens, in: Holtmann/Patzelt (Hrsg.), *Führen Regierungen tatsächlich?*, Wiesbaden 2008, S. 21 ff.
- Verwaltete Regierung - Studien zur Regierungslehre*, Köln/Berlin/Bonn/München 2002
- Regieren zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts* (hrsg. zusammen mit Werner Jann), Tübingen 2008
- Moderne öffentliche Verwaltung - Studium der Verwaltungswissenschaft*, Berlin 2008
- Zivilgesellschaftliche Verwaltung als Verwaltungstypus, in: König/Kropp (Hrsg.), *Theoretische Aspekte einer zivilgesellschaftlichen Verwaltungskultur*, Speyerer Forschungsberichte 263, Speyer 2009, S. 1 ff.
- German PA (Public Administration) and PA in German, in Bouckaert/van de Donk (Hrsg.) *The European Group for Public Administration (1975–2010), Perspectives for the Future*, Bruxelles 2010, S. 140 ff.