

**Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy**  
**[Accepted]**  
Paper Series

---

**Teaching Public Policy in East Asia:  
Aspirations, Potentials and Challenges**

**Wu Xun**

Associate Professor  
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy  
National University of Singapore  
Email: [sppwuxun@nus.edu.sg](mailto:sppwuxun@nus.edu.sg)

**Allen Yu-Hung Lai**

PhD Candidate  
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy  
National University of Singapore  
Email: [allen@nus.edu.sg](mailto:allen@nus.edu.sg)

**Do Lim Choi**

Associate Professor  
Department of Public Administration  
Chungnam National University  
Email: [dmchoi@cnu.ac.kr](mailto:dmchoi@cnu.ac.kr)

Date: 27 November 2012

Paper No.: LKYSPP 12-20

This article should be of interest to scholars in collaborative public management, nonprofit research, and network management.

Please cite this paper as the following form:

Xun Wu , Allen Yu-Hung Lai & Do Lim Choi (2012): Teaching Public Policy in East Asia: Aspirations, Potentials and Challenges, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 14:5, 376-390

## **Teaching Public Policy in East Asia: Aspirations, Potentials and Challenges**

### *Abstract*

Public policy courses have increasingly become an indispensable part in professional training programs in public affairs in East Asia in response to rapid changes in political, social and economic environment in the region. In this paper, we examine the current trends in public policy education in East Asia through the lens of syllabi of public policy courses offered in graduate programs in leading universities in mainland China, Taiwan, South Korea and Japan. Our comparative analysis points to three main challenges in teaching public policy in East Asia: insufficient attention to policy knowledge rooted in the local context, inadequate teaching capacity and under-representation of policy analysis.

Key words: public policy training, East Asia, and course syllabus

## Introduction

Although public policy as a field of study was introduced to East Asia as early as 1960s (Kim and Kang 1992, Jan 2003), the mainstreaming of public policy training in the development of educational programs and professional practices in public affairs has been a recent phenomenon, stimulated by rapid changes in political, social and economic environment in many East Asian countries as well as the proliferation of professional training programs, such as Master in Public Administration (MPA), in the region. In Korea and Taiwan, the transition towards democratic systems has broadened the scope of participation in policy process and thus boosted demand for policy specialists and analysts with professional training in public policy (Lee 2007, Mok 2007). In mainland China, where there were only a handful of universities offering courses on public policy in the mid 1990s, under the guidelines stipulated by National MPA Steering Committee, public policy analysis has become one of the nine compulsory courses for MPA programs, which are now offered in more than 100 universities across the country (Wu and He 2009). In addition, public policy has been included as a key subject in civil service entrance exams in a number of countries (Jan 2003, Xu 2005, Park 2009, Watanabe 2009).

The increased emphasis on public policy training should provide not only tremendous impetus to the development of the field of public policy in East Asia, but also unprecedented opportunities to strengthen policy capacity among government agencies, NGOs, and civil society. While East Asian countries made great strides towards economic and social development in the last century, each of them has been confronted with a set of daunting challenges, such as global warming, terrorism, and aging population. Policy capacity in dealing with these challenges in these countries may be the decisive factor in determining their success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and public policy training can be the catalyst.

On the other hand, however, the rapidly growing demand for public policy training in East Asia may present serious challenges. Due to the limited number of graduate programs in public policy in East Asia, very few scholars have been trained in the field of public policy. In mainland China, for example, the public policy analysis courses required for MPA programs are often taught by faculty members with neither training nor professional experience in the field of public policy (Ren 2002, Gao 2004, Qian 2007). In Taiwan, Korea and Japan, although generations of scholars have pursued their studies in Western countries where there is a longer history in public policy education..

More important, the development of learning materials may not keep pace with the fast growing demand for public policy training. Although the origin of field of public policy can be traced to the emergence of policy science in Western countries, particularly the US, the study of public policy is rooted deeply in political systems, cultural norms, and historical contexts that are considerably different from one country to another, and therefore discerning efforts are critical in assessing the applicability of theories and practices developed in other contexts. However, the fast growing demand for public policy training may leave little time for the development of learning materials based on local contexts, forcing instructors/scholars to rely on learning materials from Western countries.

This paper focuses on various tensions in the development of public policy training in East Asia and their potential impacts to the development of the field in the long run. In particular, we examine teaching capacity, coverage, and learning materials for public policy training in East Asia through the analysis of 62 syllabi used in graduate programs in top universities in

mainland China, Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. Our analysis allows us to uncover some salient features in the development of public policy training in East Asia and to gain insight into potentials and challenges in such development.

### Research Methodology

Course syllabi have been used to analyze trends in the development in public policy training (Romero 2001, Rethemeyer and Helbig 2005). Straussman (2008) has concluded that reviewing syllabi in public affairs programs is an important means for exploring the level of agreement in the profession about what comprises core content in professional training curricula. However, course syllabi have rarely been used to study curriculum development in East Asia due perhaps to the fact that the use of syllabi was not a standard practice in many universities in the region until recently.

The main data sources for our analysis are syllabi used in public policy courses in graduate programs from 2008 to 2011 in top universities in mainland China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan<sup>1</sup>. For countries where there are few universities offering public policy courses, efforts were made to collect syllabi from all of them. Most course syllabi were collected through internet, but e-mail communications and telephone requests were also extensively used when syllabi were not available through the public domain. However, while it is infeasible to check all courses offered in the sampled departments (or programs), we've made efforts to examine the titles of core courses to rule out the possibility of other similar courses on the subject of

---

<sup>1</sup> While there is a long history of public policy training in Hong Kong and Macau, there are in general too few programs in Hong Kong and Macau that offer graduate programs in public administration or public policy to generate statistical results for comparison purpose. Therefore, public policy courses taught in programs in Hong Kong and Macau are not included in the sample of our analysis.

public policy or policy analysis. Therefore we are confident that the courses included are the only core courses in public policy/policy analysis in their respective programs.

To avoid oversampling of a particular university or program, we selected one syllabus from each university targeted. For consistency, we excluded four types of courses from our sample: courses offered as electives, courses only focusing on policy research, courses devoted to a specific step in policy process such as evaluation, formulation, and decision-making, and courses focusing on specific sectoral policy such as education policy and technology policy.

Although efforts were made to ensure the comparability of syllabi across programs and countries, there are two limitations of our study. First, syllabi may not accurately delineate what the instructors would be teaching as some instructors may prefer to use extremely concise syllabi while others may have more detailed syllabi. Second, the omission of certain topics from syllabi might be due to the design of curriculum in having them offered in other courses included in the curriculum.

Our final sample consists of 62 syllabi in total, 23 from mainland China, 15 from Taiwan, 14 from Korea and 10 from Japan, as presented in Table 1. The small number of courses for Japan is due to the fact only a limited number of Japanese universities currently offer courses in public policy. In Japan, the number of public policy schools remains small with only eight schools as of January 2012 (Watanabe 2009). However, there are about 30 plus universities offering courses in public policy or policy analysis, mainly conducted in the graduate schools of public administration and policy science (Ministry of Education, Japan 2012). In our analysis, we have included the majority of first-batch-universities accredited by Japan's Ministry of Education that conducted programs in public policy.

[Table 1 about here]

Based on Romero's synthesized model for public policy courses (Romero 2001), we coded the contents of course syllabi by four categories according to four main pedagogical foci typically expected in public policy courses, they are, namely, *fundamentals of public policy, policy process, policy context, and policy analysis*, and each category is represented by several key topics. The details on the rationale of such categorization as well as the selection of topics for each category will be explained in details in next section.

While building on earlier studies based on analysis of course syllabi, two innovations were introduced in our research. First, due to the tremendous growth in the demand for training in the public policy, efforts were made to collect the profiles of course instructors so that analysis can be conducted on teaching capacity for public policy training in East Asia. Through internet search and direct inquiries, we were able to construct the profiles of instructors, which include information on their highest educational credentials, field of study, and places (countries and educational institutions) where they obtained their highest educational credentials. Second, based on information obtained from syllabi in our sample, we identified and collected most frequently used public policy textbooks that were written by local scholars. Lists of references in these textbooks were coded and analyzed to gauge the extent to which learning materials reflect theories and practices generated in local contexts, a critical aspect for training in public policy.

## Findings and Discussion

### *Profile of Course Instructors*



Table 2 presents the profiles of course instructors in terms of their training background. While the majority of instructors (82.3%) are doctorate degree holders, there are sizable differences across East Asia, ranging from less than two thirds in mainland China to 100% in Korea. It is striking that, in mainland China, more than one fifth of instructors for graduate courses on public policy only possess bachelor's degrees themselves, an indication of daunting challenges for many Chinese universities to cope with fast growing demand for public policy courses. Aside from Japan, where scholars trained in economics and law seem to play an significant role in public policy training, the majority of instructors (about three quarters) received training in the field of public administration/public policy for their highest educational credentials.

[Table 2 about here]

Although the majority of course instructors obtained their highest academic credentials from universities in their own countries, there are considerable disparities across East Asia, ranging from 91.3% in China and only about a third in Taiwan where roughly two thirds pursued their graduate study in the US. The United States is the top destination for scholars to pursue their study outside their own countries as around 30% of course instructors in our sample are graduates of various degree programs from educational institutions in the US.

It would be wrong to assume that the Western influence to public policy training in China would be less extensive because 91.3% of course instructors obtained their highest educational credentials in China. Universities across China have made tremendous efforts in recent years to strengthen capacity building and many faculty members have been sent to Western countries for short training programs or joint research projects, and as a result, it is rare that a scholar from a top university in China didn't have any experience abroad. More important, sustained efforts have been made to translate books written by Western scholars so

that language barriers have had smaller impacts. Table 3 shows the selected list of public policy books that have been translated into Chinese, and the list has been expanding quickly.

[Table 3 about here]

*Pedagogical Focus 1: Fundamentals of Public Policy*

Although there is no consensus on what consist of fundamentals in the field of public policy, we include the following topics in this category: *concepts of public policy*, *evolution of policy sciences* and *approaches to public policy*, based on the list of topics typically appear in leading public policy textbooks, such as Howlett, Ramesh, and Perl (2009) and Lester and Stewart (2000). The coverage of these topics in our sampled courses is reported in Table 4. There seems to be a strong tendency among courses instructors in East Asia to include topics categorized as “*fundamentals of public policy*”. Given that the introductory nature of many courses selected, the emphasis on these topics is well placed.

[Table 4 about here]

One finding may not be obvious from the coverage statistics in Table 4 is the dominant influence of Western literature. A glimpse through leading public policy textbooks used in courses in mainland China, Taiwan and Korea would quickly come to the revelation that definitions of public policy in the classics of public policy written by Western scholars such as Dye (2002) and Dror (1996) and Jenkins (1978), the history and evolution of policy science in the US, and various approaches such as public choice, positivism, institutionalism are often upheld as the fundamentals of public policy by East Asian scholars.

*Pedagogical Focus 2: Policy Process*

Although the prominence of stage model as a policy science theory has gradually declined among public policy scholars, the use of various stages in policy process in sequencing and organizing contents in public policy courses seems to continue to hold its appeal. In our analysis, we used the five steps outlined in Howlett, Ramesh, and Perl (2009)—*agenda setting, policy formulation, decision-making, policy implementation* and *policy evaluation*—as the basis, and added two more steps featured in other classics of public policy (Jones, 1984; Lester and Stewart, 2000; Sabatier, 1999)—*policy legitimization* and *policy termination*—into the category of policy process.

Table 4 shows that policy process receives high level of coverage among public policy courses in East Asia, especially in mainland China and Taiwan. A close examination of textbooks used in courses in mainland China and Taiwan reveals that both policy process and individual stages are covered extensively in these textbooks.

The underrepresentation of some topics, such as policy legitimization in Japan and Korea and policy formulation in Korea, can be explained by differences in definition or merely translation of terminologies—for instance, policy formulation and legitimization may be considered as a part of decision-making in some countries. However, there are still considerable disparities both across countries and across topics. For example, topics related to policy process were covered much less extensive in courses in Japan and Korea than those in mainland China and Taiwan, and in Japan, policy implementation was only covered by three out of ten courses included.

### *Pedagogical Focus 3: Policy Context*

In *policy context* category, we included topics concerning policy actors, policy environment, the interaction between policy actors and policy environment, and the interaction among policy actors.

In particular, we included two types of topics in this category to gauge the coverage on policy context. The first type of topics focuses on policy actors and environment for policy development, including *policy actors*, *political systems* and *societal structures*. The second type of topics deals with how policy actors interact with each other, including *policy network*, *public opinion*, *policy discourse* and *policy marketing*. Due to differences in political systems and societal relationship, policy context can be expected to differ considerably from one country to another.

While the majority of courses (72.6%) covered “policy actors”, the rest of topics in this category received less attention than those in “fundamentals of public policy” and “policy process”, and substantial variations are found for both across topics and across countries. For example, two thirds of courses in mainland China did not include “political systems”, and “societal structures” is not covered in six sevens of courses. In comparison, instructors from Taiwan and Korea have paid much greater attention to topics related to policy context, such as policy network, public opinion, and policy discourse.

One plausible explanation for more extensive coverage of these topics in Taiwan and Korea might be the change in political systems. For example, the transition towards democracy has increased the scope of public participation in public affairs, and thus topics such as *public opinion* and *policy discourse* might be gaining more prominence in public policy education. Another interpretation is that, because in both Taiwan and Korea, a significant number of course instructors were trained in the US, they might be more receptive to the influence of new trends in policy research in Western countries, such as the emergence of post-positivism approaches to public policy.

#### *Pedagogical Orientation 4: Policy Analysis*

Defined specifically, policy analysis is “determining which of various alternative policies will most achieve a given set of goals in light of the relations between the policies and the goals” (Nagel, 1994). Policy analysis differs from other pedagogical foci in that it emphasizes more on prescriptive as supposed to analytical and descriptive aspects of public policy, and thus has a strong practical orientation. The topics we chose to assess the coverage on policy analysis include key steps in conducting policy analysis (Bardach, 1999; MacRae and Whittington, 2000)—*identifying policy problems, determination of decision criteria, alternative formulation, and forecasting policy outcome.*

While each of these steps is indispensable in conducting policy analysis, their coverage in public policy courses differs considerably from one step to the other. For example, in general, “constructing policy problems” received much more attention than “formulating policy options” and “forecasting policy outcomes”. Such imbalance in coverage may undermine the potentials of public policy training in improving the quality of policy making through better policy analysis. One explanation is that technical aspects of some steps in policy analysis, such as “forecasting policy outcomes” present significant challenges for many instructors who were trained in disciplines in which technical analysis is not emphasized.

Given the practical orientation in the study of public policy, the development of skills and craft in conducting policy analysis is an essential component of public policy education. However, limited attention has been directed to this aspect. The fact that policy analysis received greater attention among courses in mainland China does not mean that sufficient attentions are paid to the development of necessary skills and craft. Close examination of course syllabi and leading textbooks used in these courses reveals that the subject of policy analysis is only covered in one chapter in textbooks, and instructors rarely spent more than one session to the whole subject. In addition, based on course requirements stated in syllabi, it is rare (two of 23 courses in mainland China) that students are required to conduct policy analysis for a real policy issue. While it is true that policy analysis is often a part of masters’

theses or capstone projects in graduate programs in public administration and policy, our analysis suggests that the students are often asked to conduct policy analysis before they receive any formal training on the subject in their course work.

The challenges in better integrating policy analysis in public policy courses may also reflect the institutional realities in many East Asian countries. For example, policy analysis is not required and routinely practiced in most government agencies in these countries, and the development of the profession of policy analysts is still in its early stage. On the other hand, however, the weakness in policy analysis in public policy training may undermine the future progress towards more extensive use of policy analysis in government agencies.

#### *Learning Materials: Textbooks*

Learning materials from Western countries have been used extensively in public policy courses in East Asia as nearly half of courses required at least one book authored by foreign scholars as a part of textbooks for the courses (Table 5). While it might be reasonable to assume that instructors with overseas training experience might have a bias towards textbooks authored by foreign scholars, there is no evidence to support it based on our analysis. For example, although of the majority of Chinese instructors for courses in our sample (91.3%) obtained their highest academic credentials from domestic universities, two thirds of them required textbooks written by foreign scholars; in contrast, although most Korean instructors (about two thirds) were trained abroad, the vast majority of them (85%) only assigned textbooks written by Korean scholars.

[Table 5 about here]

While course instructors may typically assign a range of reading materials, such as journal articles, government reports, and unpublished manuscripts, to supplement the textbooks, the

uses of such materials were not systematically documented in the majority of the syllabi in our sample, thus our comparison is based on the textbooks specified in the syllabi. As in other fields in social sciences at the graduate level, textbooks should not only cover the classics of readings in the discipline, but also introduce new theories and practices.

It is also a mistaken belief, however, that textbooks written by East Asian scholars would necessarily differ substantially from those by their Western counterparts in their emphasis on theories and practices generated in the context of their own countries. In order to gauge the extent of such focus, we conducted an in-depth analysis on the references reported in nine leading textbooks written by local scholars, three from Taiwan (Chiu, Wu, and Chang), three from mainland China (Chen, Xie, and Yan), and three from Korea (Ro, Jung, and Kang).

[Table 6 about here]

It is clear that, books, especially books by foreign scholars, are heavily weighted in comparison to journal articles, which are often considered the main sources for cutting-edge research and new practices. There are also considerable differences across textbooks in the number of books referenced as the percentage of total number of references, ranging from 44% in Jung, Jung and Gil (2005) to 99% Chen et al (2009). In addition, the majority of journal articles referenced were written by foreign scholars and published in journals abroad, and articles published in local journals only accounted for very small share in the references. As a result, many textbooks by East Asian scholars can be seen as variants of textbooks from Western countries.

The neglect of local scholarship in references reported in textbooks may in part reflect the status of public policy research in East Asia. While greater efforts have been made to introduce public policy theories and practices from the Western countries, insufficient attentions have been paid to generate policy knowledge rooted from individual country

contexts. In the long run, an over-reliance on learning materials imported from abroad may inadvertently undermine the appealing of the study of public policy in providing practical solutions to major policy challenges in East Asia.

#### Concluding remarks

The demand for public policy education has increased dramatically. In China, courses on public policy analysis have been offered in over one hundred universities across the country as a result of fast growing professional training programs in public administration. In Korea, there are about 20 universities that offer Master's degrees in public policy. Similar developments are also observed in other East Asian countries. There is shared optimism that the greater emphasis on public policy education can contribute to the quality of policy-making and governance in East Asia.

Our paper examines the current trends in public policy training in East Asia through the lens of syllabi of public policy courses offered in graduate programs in leading universities in mainland China, Taiwan, South Korea and Japan. Our analysis reveals several salient features. First of all, public policy education in East Asia has been heavily influenced by the theories, practices, learning materials from Western countries. Textbooks written by Western scholars are often assigned as required textbooks in public policy courses, and the textbooks written by local scholars are also largely dominated by theories and practices from Western countries. Although local cases are indeed included in the textbooks, our in-depth analysis of such cases included in selected textbooks suggests that they are often used to vindicate theories or approaches generated by Western scholars. The under-representation of work by local scholars in leading textbooks demonstrates that public policy research in East Asia has not kept pace with the demand for public policy education. We believe that the scholars/educators in East Asia can do more in generating policy knowledge. That is, to



conceptualize and theorize based on individual country contexts, instead of merely introducing and verifying policy knowledge generated in the Western countries.

Second, the fast growing demand for public policy education has posed significant challenges in the area of teaching capacity. While the scholars trained in various disciplines may bring fresh perspectives into public policy teaching and research, there is a danger of undermining core values and approaches of the field.

Third, there is an imbalance of attention paid to descriptive, analytical and prescriptive aspects in the study of public policy, as seen from the under-representation of policy analysis in public policy courses. Insufficient attention has been paid to the development of skills and craft in conducting policy analysis. The lack of emphasis on policy analysis may potentially undermine the potential of public policy education in improving the quality of policy-making through better policy analysis.

While one might rightly argue that the above problems might be temporary or transitional in nature, the trends imbedded in these problems may have detrimental and potentially irreversible impacts to the development of the field in the long run. For example, uncritically upholding theories and practices generated in Western countries as general truths may divert scholarship attention away from essential questions with regard to their applicability in specific contexts. More important, the failure of public policy education in response to key policy challenges may gradually vanquish tremendous enthusiasm and optimism placed on it and resources allocated to public policy education may be diverted elsewhere. It is our hope that the analysis in the paper can help to raise the awareness of these possibilities and that individual and collective efforts can be made to elevate public policy education in East Asia to the next level.

Acknowledgment: the authors are grateful of Dr Jesse Lan, Dr. Jose Chen, David Yu, Takaaki Oiwa, Kuniko Fuls, Kubo Yoshichika, Naoto Hamada, Seon Joo Kang for their assistance in collecting syllabi from Taiwan, Japan and Korea. The authors also pay their gratitude to insightful feedback received in 6<sup>th</sup> ICPA-Forum, Taipei in June 2009 that enriched our argument in this paper.

Table 1: List of Course Included in the Sample (n = 62)

Country	University	Course Title
China (23)	Wuhan Institute of Technology	Public Policy Analysis
	Tianjin University of Science & Technology	Public Policy Analysis
	Shanghai Jiao Tong University	Public Policy Analysis
	Renmin University of China	Public Policy Analysis
	China Central Radio and TV University	Public Policy
	Huazhong University of Science and Technology	Public Policy Analysis
	Jilin University	Public Policy Analysis
	Shandong University	Public Policy
	Sichuan University	Public Policy Analysis
	Guangxi University	Public Policy
	Hunan University	Public Policy Studies
	Xi'an Jiaotong University	Public Policy Analysis
	Nanjing university	Public Policy Analysis
	Xiamen University	Policy Science
	Fudan University	Public Policy Analysis
	Southwest Jiaotong University	Public Policy Analysis
	Beijing Normal University	Public Policy Analysis
	Tong Ji University	Public Policy
	Peking University	Public Policy Analysis
	Tsinghua University	Public Policy Analysis
	Sun Yat-sen University	Public Policy Analysis
	Nankai University	Public Policy Analysis
	Zhejiang University	Public Policy Analysis
Taiwan (15)	National Chengchi University	Public Policy Analysis
	National Taipei University	Public Policy Studies
	National Sun Yat-Sen University	Public Policy Analysis
	Shih Hsin University	Public Policy
	National Taiwan University	Seminar on Public Policy
	National Chung Hsin University	Public Policy
	National Chung Cheng University	Policy Science
	Kainan University	Policy Analysis
	National University of Tainan	Public Policy Analysis
	I-Shou University	Public Policy Analysis
	National Hsin Chu University of Education	Public Policy
	National Open University	Policy Analysis
	National University of Kaohsiung	Public Policy
	Soochow University	Public Policy
	Tung Hai University	Public Policy
Korea (14)	Seoul National University	Theories of Public Policy
	Korea University	Public Policy Analysis
	Yonsei University	Introduction to Policy Studies
	Inha University	Introduction to Policy Sciences
	Sejong University	Public Policy
	Ehwa Womans University	Policy Making and Implementation

	Chungnam National University	Introduction to Policy Science
	Pusan National University	Policy Analysis
	Kyungpook National University	Policy Analysis and Evaluation
	Kongju National University	Policy Analysis
	Pukyung National University	Policy Making and Implementation
	Yeungnam University	Policy Science
	KDI School	Analysis of Policy Process
	Dong-A University	Policy-Making Theory
Japan (10)	University of Tokyo	Policy Analysis
	Meiji University	Public Policy
	Ritsumei University	Policy Science
	Hokkaido University	Public Policy
	International Christian University	Public Policy
	Keio University	Public Policy
	Osaka University	Public Policy
	Chuo University	Frontier of Public Policy
	Kyoto University	Public Policy
	Hitotsubashi University	Public Policy

Table 2: Profiles of Course Instructors (n = 62)

Content	China (23)	Taiwan (15)	Japan (10)	Korea (14)	Total
<b>Course instructor background</b>					
PhD	16(69.6%)	14(93.3%)	7(70%)	14 (100%)	51 (82.3%)
Master	2(8.7%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (10%)	0	4 (6.5%)
Undergraduate	5 (21.7%)	0	2(20%)	0	7 (11.3%)
<b>Highest degrees from (local universities: 64.3%, overseas universities: 35.7%)</b>					
China	21 (91.3%)	0	0	0	
US	1 (4.3%)	9 (60%)	1 (10%)	7 (50%)	18 (29.0%)
Taiwan	0	5(33.3%)	0	0	
Japan	0	0	9(90%)	0	
Korea	0	0	0	5 (35.7%)	
UK	1 (4.3%)	1 (6.7%)	0	0	
Others	0	0	0	2 (14.3%)	
<b>Field of study of the course instructor</b>					
Public admin/policy/analysis	15 (65.2%)	13 (86.7%)	4 (40%)	12 (85.7%)	44 (71.0%)
Economics	1 (4.3%)	0	2 (20%)	1 (7.1%)	4 (6.5%)
Political science	2 (8.7%)	1 (6.7%)	0	1 (7.1%)	4 (6.5%)
Law	1 (4.3%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (30%)	0	5 (8.1%)
Others	5 (21.7%)	0	2 (20%)	0	7 (11.3%)

Table 3 List of Public Policy Textbooks Translated into Chinese (Selected)

Title	Author(s)	Year of publication
<i>New Science of Management Decision</i>	Simon, Herbert A.	1982
<i>Systems analysis and policy science</i>	Klawns, R.M.	1987
<i>The Policy-Making Process</i>	Lindblom, Charles E.	1988
<i>Public Policy-Making</i>	Anderson, James E.	1990
<i>Making Public Policy</i>	Kelman, Steven	1990
<i>Encyclopedia of Policy Studies</i>	Nagel, Sturt S.	1994
<i>The Public Policy Dictionary</i>	Kruschke, Earl R.	1992
<i>Policy Making in the Crisis</i>	Dror, Yehezkel	1996
<i>Theoretical foundations of public policy</i>	Bromley, Dannel	1996
<i>Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning (2nd Edition)</i>	Patton, C & D. Sawicki	2001
<i>Public Policy Making: Process and Principles</i>	Gerston, Larry N.	2001
<i>Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice (2nd Edition)</i>	Weimer, D. & A. Vining	2002
<i>Public Policy Analysis (2nd edition)</i>	Dunn, William	2002
<i>Understanding Public Policy</i>	Dye, Thomoas R.	2002
<i>Top-Down Policymaking</i>	Dye, Thomoas R.	2002
<i>Evaluation of Public Policy</i>	Fischer, Frank	2003
<i>Post-modern Public Policy</i>	Cobb, John B.	2003
<i>Agenda, Alternative and Public Policies</i>	Kingdon, John W.	2004
<i>New Public Policy: Public Policy for Democracy</i>	Ingram & Schneider	2005
<i>Policy Paradox</i>	Stone, Deborah	2006
<i>Studying Public Policy: Policy cycle and Policy subsystem</i>	Howlett, Michael et al	2006
<i>Theories of the Policy Process</i>	Sabatier, Paul A.	2006
<i>Public Policy Instruments: Evaluating the Tools of Public Administration</i>	Peters, Guy B.	2007

Table 4: Coverage Based on Course Contents (n = 62)

Content	China (23)	Taiwan (15)	Japan (10)	Korea (14)	Total
<b>Fundamentals of Public Policy</b>					
Concepts of Public Policy	23 (100%)	14(93.3%)	7 (70%)	9 (64.3%)	53 (85.5%)
Evolution of Policy science	19 (82.7%)	10 (66.7%)	6(60%)	10 (71.4%)	45 (72.6%)
Approaches to public policy	14 (60.9%)	10 (66.7%)	6 (60%)	9 (64.3%)	39 (62.9%)
<b>Policy Process</b>					
Agenda setting	18 (78.3%)	8 (53.3%)	5 (50%)	7 (50%)	38 (61.3%)
Policy formulation	15 (65.2%)	11 (73.3%)	9 (90%)	5 (35.7%)	40 (64.5%)
Decision-making	16 (61.9%)	12 (80%)	6 (60%)	7 (50%)	41 (66.1%)
Policy legitimization	15 (65.2%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (10%)	4 (28.6%)	24 (38.7%)
Policy implementation	18 (78.3%)	13 (86.7%)	3 (30%)	6 (42.9%)	40 (64.5%)
Policy evaluation	20 (87.0%)	14 (93.3%)	5 (50%)	6 (42.9%)	45 (72.6%)
Policy termination	12 (52.2%)	7 (46.7%)	2 (20%)	5 (35.7%)	26 (41.9%)
<b>Policy Context</b>					
Policy actors	17 (73.9%)	11(73.3%)	9 (90%)	8 (57.1%)	45 (72.6%)
Political systems	9 (39.1%)	8 (53.3%)	7 (70%)	6 (42.9%)	30 (48.4%)
Society structures	4 (17.4%)	4 (26.7%)	7 (70%)	7 (50%)	22 (35.5%)
Policy network	4 (17.4%)	6 (40%)	2 (20%)	5 (35.7%)	17 (27.4%)
Public opinion	4 (17.4%)	9(60%)	5 (50%)	7 (50%)	25 (40.3%)
Policy discourse	0(0)	8 (53.3%)	0	6 (42.9%)	14 (22.6%)
Policy instrument	12 (52.2%)	9 (60%)	3 (30%)	4 (28.6%)	28 (45.2%)
Policy marketing	2 (8.7%)	4 (26.7%)	0	1 (7.1%)	7 (11.3%)
<b>Policy Analysis</b>					
Constructing policy problems	21 (91.3%)	12 (80%)	2 (20%)	8 (57.1%)	43 (69.4%)
Determination of policy objectives and criteria	16 (69.6%)	3 (20%)	1 (10%)	7 (50%)	27 (43.5%)
Formulating policy options	12 (52.2%)	6 (40%)	1 (10%)	5 (35.7%)	24 (38.7%)
Forecasting policy outcome	15(65.2%)	6 (40%)	0	5 (35.7%)	24 (38.7%)
Average number of topics covered in each syllabus	12.4	12.6	6.8	9.7	

Table 5: Coverage Based on Course Contents (n = 62)

	China	Taiwan	Japan	Korea	Total
Required textbook					
Foreign only	1 (4.3%)	6 (40%)	2(20%)	1 (7.1%)	10 (16.1%)
Local only	8(34.8%)	4 (26.7%)	5(50%)	12 (85.8%)	29 (46.8%)
Both Foreign and local	12(52.2%)	5 (33.3%)	1(10%)	1 (7.1%)	19 (30.6%)
Unknown	2(8.7%)	0	2 (20%)	0	4 (6.5%)



Table 6: Analysis of Local Textbooks in Public Policy

	Taiwan			China			Korea		
Textbook title	Public Policy	Public Policy	Public Policy Analysis	Public Policy Analysis	Introduction to Public Policy	Public Policy Science	Introduction to Public Policy	Introduction to Public Policy	Public Policy Analysis
Author (year)	Chiu (2008)	Wu (2008)	Chang et al. (2004)	Chen et al. (2009)	Xie et al. (2009)	Yan et al. (2008)	Ro, Wha Joon	Jung, Jung Gil et al.	Kang, Keun Bok
Highest degree	PhD in public policy	PhD in public policy	PhD in public affairs	PhD in public policy	Master	Undergraduate	PhD in public policy	PhD in public policy	PhD in public policy
Reference (total)	309	77	131	261	38	139	412	513	155
<b>In the form of books</b>									
Total	241 (78%)	59 (77%)	100 (76%)	259 (99%)	35 (92%)	114 (82%)	297 (72%)	223 (43.5%)	113 (73%)
	Average: 77%			Average: 91%			Average: 62.8%		
Foreign books	228	46	75	184	25	87	251	190	71
Local books	13	13	25	75	10	27	46	33	42
Local textbooks	8 (2.6%)	6 (7.8%)	17 (13%)	11 (4.2%)	8 (21%)	13 (9.3%)	29 (7.9%)	19 (3.7%)	28 (18%)
	Average: 7.8%			Average: 11.5%			Average: 9.8%		
<b>In the form of Journal articles</b>									
Total	68 (22%)	18 (23%)	31 (24%)	2 (1%)	3 (8%)	25 (18%)	115 (28%)	290 (56.5%)	42 (27%)
	Average: 23%			Average: 9%			Average: 37.2%		
Foreign articles	57	10	25	2	2	15	91	223	19
Local articles	11 (3.5%)	8 (10.3%)	6 (4.5%)	0	1 (2.6%)	10 (7.1%)	24 (6.5%)	67 (13%)	23 (15%)
	Average: 6.1%			Average: 3.2%			Average: 11.5%		

## References

- Bardach, Eugene, 1999, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving* (Los Angeles: CQ Press).
- Birkland, Thomas A., 2001, *An Introduction to the Policy Process; Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe).
- Brunner, Ronald D., 1997, Teaching the Policy Sciences: Reflections on a Graduate Seminar. *Policy Sciences*, 30, 217-231
- Chang, S.S., 2004, *Public Policy Analysis*. (Taipei: Wu Nan Press).
- Chen, C.M., 2009,. *Public Policy Analysis*, (Beijing: Renmin University Press).
- Chiu, C.T., 2008, *Public Policy* (Taipei: Ju Liu Press).
- Dye, Thomas R., 2002, *Understanding Public Policy* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall).
- Gao, S., 2004, On Public Policy Research: Localism and Empiricism. *Chinese Public Administration*, 6, 93.
- Howlett, Michael, Ramesh, M., and Perl, Anthony, 2009, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press).
- Jan, C.Y., 2003,. *New Public Policy – History, Philosophy, Globalization* (Taipei, Hua Tai Press).
- Jones, Charles O., 1984, *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy* (Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole).
- Kim, J.H., and Kang, M.G, 1992, A Study of Public Policy Education in Korea, *Korean Policy Studies Review*, 1,42-62.
- Lester, James P., and Stewart, Joseph, 2000, *Public Policy: An Evolutional Approach* (Canada: Wadsworth Thomson Learning)
- Lee, H.Y., 2007, A Preview on the History of Korean Policy Sciences Prior to the Foundation of the Korean Association for Policy Studies in 1992. *Korean Policy Studies Review*, 16(2), 1-29.
- Lindblom, Charles E., 1968, *The Policy-Making Process*. Englewood Cliffs (NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- MacRae, Duncan, and Whittington, Dale, 2000, *Expert Advice for Policy Choice: Analysis and Discourse* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press).
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan. [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/koutou/senmonshoku/08060508.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/senmonshoku/08060508.htm), accessed on 30 Jan, 2012.
- Mok, J.H, 2007,. Suggestions for Analyzing and Developing Korean Public Policy Education. *Korean Policy Studies Review*, 16(4), 97-118.

- Nagel, Stuart S., 1994, *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies* (New York: M. Dekker)
- Park, Y., 2009, *Korean Public Policy Programs: Past, Present, and Future*, in: *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum Workshop*, Taipei, Taiwan, pp.(7) 1-21.
- Qian, B., 2007, *On Localization of Public Administration: A Review of the Book – Public Administration in China*. *Education and Research*, (3), 41-48.
- Ren, S., 2002, *Public Management toward Localized Research: Limitation, Logic, and Relationship*. *China Public Administration*, 10, 12-20.
- Rethemeyer, R. Karl, and Helbig, Natalie C., 2005, *By the Numbers: Assessing the Nature of Quantitative Preparation in Public Policy, Public Administration, and Public Affairs Doctoral Education*. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(1), 179-191.
- Romero, Francine S., 2001, *The Policy Analysis Course: Toward A Discipline Consensus*. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(4), 771-779.
- Sabatier, Paul A., 1999, *Theories of the policy process* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press).
- Straussman, Jeffrey D., 2008, *Public management, politics, and the policy process in the public affairs curriculum*. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(3), 624-635.
- Watanabe, S.P., 2009, *Where Do They Belong in the Job Markets? A Comparative Analysis of Public Policy Program Graduates in the United States and Japan*, in: *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum Workshop*, Taipei, Taiwan, pp. (5) 1-18.
- Wu, X., and He, J., (2009, *Paradigm Shift in Public Administration: Implications for Teaching in Professional Training Programs*. *Public Administration Review*, 69, s21-s28.
- Xie, M., 2009, *Introduction to Public Policy* (Beijing: Renmin University Press).
- Yan, Q., 2008, *Public Policy Science* (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press).
- Xu, L., 2005, *Localization of Material on Public Policy Analysis*. *China Science and Technology Information*, 13, 232.