

Kiyoshi Yamamoto

Management for public governance – The case of childcare services in Japan

childcare; governance; NPM; public management; public service

The trend of public sector management seems to have moved from new public management (NPM) to public governance (PG) or post-NPM around the world. However, the trajectory of public sector management reform might not be identical and differ from country to country owing to a layering process of public sector reform. This paper shows that by adopting a theory of hybrid strategy, Japan's nursery services management has relied on a mixed system of traditional public administration, NPM and some of PG, in contrast to a more general international classification as a late adopter of the NPM model.

I. Introduction

There are varied types of models for providing public services. Today, the trend of public service is shifting from the new public management (NPM) model to the public governance (PG) or post-NPM model (Emery/Gauque 2014). Some commentators (Thomas 2013) insist that the focus of NPM is on competition, customer orientation and devolution or autonomy, while PG centers on cooperation, co-production and flexibility. However, both principles are not always mutually exclusive: the results and quality of services are considered in two approaches. Practically, old public administration (OPA), NPM and PG currently coexist in Japan's public service. Nursery care in Japanese municipalities provides a good case, allowing an examination of how the services are appropriately provided and controlled in a mixed system. Demands for the services have recently soared owing to the growth in dual-income families, and to the increase of female population returning to work after childbirth. Other relevant factors include the deterioration in community support, despite the decreasing number of births.

Municipalities are now facing the social needs for rapidly increasing the capacity of nursery schools, whether public or private (non-profit or profit). However, the services are regulated by law (OPA): the fees and subsidies from the national government and prefectures are standardised, along with the quality of services. In other words, guardians pay the same fees depending on their income whether for using public or private nursery schools. Private nursery schools, by type, also receive grants from municipalities. Therefore, to meet the demands, municipalities first ensure the budget, and if necessary they increase the school's capacity (outputs) by establishing new schools or by encouraging the private sector to establish the schools. Then, applications are reconciled to the capacity in accordance with the selection criteria, considering the need for daycare and the practical applicants assigned to the schools providing services. Evi-

dently there are three principal measures for municipalities to cope with budget constraints: first, is the construction of new public nursery schools (OPA); second, is the recruitment of private providers (PG); and third, is the privatisation of public nursery schools (NPM). Indeed, this means that the second and third measures are modified into being placed under a municipality's indirect control using PG or NPM while the service costs might be saved, by contrast the first measure is under the municipality's direct control in OPA.

This paper explores how the Japanese municipalities have developed nursery services management system in response to changing demands for childcare and new government policies regarding childhood. The second section of the paper explains the theoretical framework to analyse the development. The third section indicates policy and management issues for nursery services. The fourth section is a case study on nursery services in an urban district. The fifth section presents a discussion and the final section presents a conclusion.

II. Theoretical framework

1. Literature review

Public management is intrinsically associated with PG, since management is considered as an instrument and a system for governance which “can be defined as the tradition, institutions, and processes” (Denhardt/Denhardt 2007 p. 86). In the early 1980s, the NPM movement appeared in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand before promptly diffusing around the world (Boston et al. 1996; OECD 2005; Hood 1995; Pollitt/Bouckaert 2011). NPM adopts the principles of result and customer orientation, devolution, and market mechanisms, while OPA adopts the principles of input control, beneficiaries of public services, centralisation, collective decision-making, and bureaucracy. NPM is a mixed approach of “making managers manage” and “letting managers manage” (Schick 1996). In other words, more autonomy in operations is given to managers in exchange for holding them more accountable for the results.

However, NPM's disciplines caused vertical and horizontal problems in the government sector. From a vertical perspective, the process of devolution, such as agencification (Pollitt/Talbot 2004), deteriorated central and political control. Terrorist attacks such as the 9/11 tragedy, natural disasters and the global financial crisis strengthened and re-concentrated political and central control. From a horizontal perspective, individual goal seeking by departments or agencies, produced departmentalism, which is not harmonious with national aims. Thus, effective public governance needs to coordinate between national policies and departmental management. Re-considering NPM, a post-NPM movement emerged in Australia and New Zealand in the late 1990s (Christensen/Laegreid 2011). The new movement has been discussed in several terms by other scholars: Post-bureaucracy (Olsen 2006), Neo-Weberian State (Lynn 2008), New Public Service (Denhardt/Denhardt 2004), New Public Governance (Osborne 2006). These models commonly stress the need for more coordination, networking and cooperation among stakeholders. However, the models will unlikely replace NPM or OPA as shown in Japan's case; in-

stead, the new models will likely exhibit some characteristics of a hybrid or mixture of OPA and NPM.

2. Theoretical framework

Japan is often considered a late adopter of public management reform, especially of NPM. For example, Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011, p. 15) analysed that Japan “borrowed from the NPM toolkit cautiously and selectively.” However, the reality might differ from the observations and comparative studies focusing on tools and instruments of NPM. First of all, as some commentators indicated, Japan is not a mere imitator but rather an innovator in developing new elements and even in introducing entire systems or institution from foreign countries. For instance, as Westney (1987) showed, Japan’s government modeled new governmental initiatives on western prototypes in the late-nineteenth century (the early Meiji Era), and modified or adopted them in an innovative way. Also, in the post-war period, quality control or total quality management in the United States were introduced in Japan’s industry, then these were developed into Kaizen and Just-in-time (Kanban) systems in the automobile companies (Monden 1995). In addition, Japan relies significantly on the non-government sector to deliver public services directly to households, although the total government outsourcing is the average level in OECD member countries. More than 65 % in public health care, daycare, childcare and other social services are provided by private and non-profit sectors in terms of “social transfers in kind via market producers” (OECD 2011).

Therefore, it is not accurate to determine that Japan has been reluctant to adopt NPM tools. Rather, when we consider Japan’s traditions in adopting other nations’ systems and tools since its modernisation, it is presumed that the government will use a hybrid strategy in its reform of public sector management. Japan’s management and governance system are unlikely to reflect a linear development from NPM to PG or Post-NPM, through the changing process of OPA to NPM. Probably, the Japanese system resembles the layering process in archeology (Thelen 2009), because many social welfare services including nursery schools have been delivered not only by government but also by non-government sectors in a kind of internal market where the prices paid by users are fixed by the government for private or public providers.

Accordingly, the reform strategy adopting PG in Japan will inevitably be added on the present system, which has already adopted some features of NPM and OPA. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011) also acknowledge that NPM is a mixture of hierarchies and markets and that some management tools, like contracting out are associated with NPM and PG.

III. Policy and management for Japan's nursery services

1. Japan's nursery school system

For a long time in Japan, child care services were provided by the family or community. Then, during the Meiji Era (1868-1912), industrialisation caused mothers to be employed, thus requiring services outside the family for child care. The first nursery school was established in 1890 as a private daycare facility. In Taisyo Era (1912-1926) after the First World War, a new global education movement centered on children appeared in Japan. Social services also grew, including maternity and childcare for women working in factories. In 1919, the first public nursery school opened in Osaka. In 1947 after Japan's defeat at the Second World War, the nursery school was defined as a child care facility by the Child Welfare Act. The target for nursery services was children aged 0 to 5 years, before they entered into elementary school. However, according to the Child Welfare Act, the services were limited to eligible children "lack(ing) in daycare," (Article 24(1) of the Act) that is, it was limited to children without daytime guardians. Therefore, children aged 3 to 5 years were eligible for either entering kindergarten or for using childcare services at nursery schools, depending on their family situations. Kindergarten is a preschool and an early education institution prescribed in the School Education Act of 1947. This means that childhood services fall under both the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare (MHLW), and the Ministry of Education, Sports, Science, Technology and Culture (MEXT).

Owing to social and cultural changes in the postwar era, especially to the increased employment in women, the demand for childcare services was greater than its capacity or supply. One of the most important issues in urban elections included childcare or daycare due to the long waiting lists for entering nursery school. At times, younger generations moved to municipalities with shorter waiting lists. However, the separated system for children, depending on their attributes and different definitions despite similar functions, finally caused the government to consider a harmonisation of childcare and early education services. In 2006, integrated services in daycare and early education started through the enactment of the Act on Advancement of Comprehensive Service Related to Education, Child Care for Preschool Children, falling under the purview of both MEXT and MHLW. The facility is called Approved Preschool although the number of these facilities is still small (approximately 1100 in 2012), compared to the number of nursery schools amounting to 23,000.

Table 1 shows the characteristics of nursery schools, childcare centers, kindergartens and preschools for children. The different functions and roles of facilities cause some differences in services and charges, while every service can be provided by the private sector other than the public sector. The ministries responsible for nursery services and early education are, respectively, MHLW and MEXT. Therefore, the preschool program is jointly controlled by MEXT and MHLW.

| Item | Nursery school | Childcare center | Kindergarten | Preschool |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Target | 0-5 years old lacking in daycare | 0-5 years old lacking in daycare | 3-5 years old | 0-5 years old |
| Content | childcare | childcare | early education | childcare and early education |
| Provider | public/private | public/private | public/private | public/private |
| Charge/Fee | part of cost | part of cost | differ by type and municipality | differ by type |
| Public support | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Standards for facilities | Yes | Yes (relaxed) | Yes | Yes |
| Assessment of eligibility | Municipality | Center | - | Municipality |
| Responsible ministry | MHLW | MHLW | MEXT | MHLW/MEXT |

Table 1: Types of services for children aged from 0 to 5

Source: Author's compilation

2. Nursery services management

The Child Welfare Act stipulates that municipal government shall provide daycare services to the children in a nursery facility when the guardian applies for using the service in accordance with the standards lacking in daycare like working or illness, or any other reasons. The municipality assesses the eligibility and coordinates the applications. Even though the applicants meet the standards, the capacity provided does not always satisfy the specified demands. According to the Cabinet Office (2013 a), in 2011, 23 % of children aged 0 to 2 years were provided services in nurseries in contrast to 66 % of women aged 25 to 44 years who were working. This suggests that a significant amount of guardians do not use child care services in accordance with the Act. Especially in urban areas, applications by guardians have grown significantly despite a stable or decreasing childhood population aged 0 to 5 years, in addition to the increased capacity of municipalities.

While childcare is basically supplied by authorised providers meeting the national standards, which comprised public and private nursery schools, there are also non-authorised nursery schools or childcare centers for children who do not enter into authorised nursery schools. The number of unauthorised facilities amounts to half of authorised schools; however, due to their small sizes, this represents a capacity of just 11 % of authorised facilities caring more than 20 children.

The municipality, therefore, receives applications for entering the authorised nursery schools from guardians and then assesses the applicants in accordance with the criteria of those lacking in daycare. Then the municipality assigns the applicants to schools considering the demands of guardians and the capacity of facilities. In using services by the nursery school, the guardians shall contract with the municipality in case of either public or private nursery schools. The guardians have to pay the municipality for the user charge depending on their situations. Public

nursery schools are operated by municipalities whose expenses are paid under operating and personnel budget items, while some public nursery schools are contracted out to private corporations that adopt the designated administrator system or a comprehensive outsourcing system. On the other hand, private nursery schools provide nursery services by receiving subsidies or operating municipal grants. The grant is ordinarily financed by charging the guardians, the national government, the prefecture, and the municipality. By contrast, guardians use non-authorised nursery services when applications do not meet the criteria of need. In this case, the services are a contract between the guardian and the school, although the municipality might subsidise the school or the guardian.

3. Reform for early child and nursery care system

Enacting the new law, the Children and Support for Child Raising Act of 2012 will transform child care services into a new stage which will be implemented in 2015. The Act stipulates that “all constituents in families, schools, communities, work place and elsewhere have to play their roles and cooperate with each other” (Article 2(1)) to raise children. Practically, the responsibilities of municipalities, employers and the public are prescribed in the Articles 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Therefore, the Act clearly shows that government adopts a public governance principle to cope with the problem of childcare. Significant policy changes are found in transforming the target population for childcare from children lacking in daycare to all children before they enter elementary school. Under the new system, children in need of daycare services are eligible to enter nursery schools or preschools or kindergarten, while under the current system just those lacking in daycare are eligible to use nursery schools and preschools. The policy change asks municipalities to estimate the demands for childcare services and plan on child rearing. Discussions will be held at the Committees for Children and Child Raising in municipalities, prefectures and at the national level. Indeed, the plan includes childcare services in facilities such as nursery schools and community-based institutions. Accordingly, each municipality will set up the child raising supporting plan in consultation with prefectures and in accordance with the national guidelines set by the central government. Also, prefectures will establish prefecture-level plans, coordinating services with a regional perspective and issuing permits for establishing preschools or nurseries by the private sector including profit companies. Under the existing circumstances, nursery- and preschool services are exclusively limited to school corporations, and social welfare corporations for non-profit.

These drastic changes emerged as a policy response to Japan’s decreasing population and ageing society, in tandem with a higher demand for childcare. The shortage of nursery schools reduced the motivation of women to give birth and deterred them from returning to work, which arguably led to slower economic growth. Thus, a comprehensive program was developed not only for childcare and employment but also for economic growth strategy. For a long time it has been advocated that childcare services should be integrated into early childhood education and be useful for improving working conditions. The background was the demographic and social change in the 1990s resulting in unbalanced services for childhood: the decreasing child-birth caused failing below capacity in kindergarten, by contrast to the long waiting lists for en-

tering in nursery schools. The government took some initial steps in this direction. In 2003, the Act on Advancement of Measures to Support Raising Next-Generation Children was enacted, which encouraged corporations to improve employer-provided childcare system services. Following the law, in 2006, as mentioned earlier, a preschool system was established to implement both childcare and early education for children aged 0 to 5 years. Accordingly, the new reform is regarded as a development of previous policies. In fact, childhood services before the reform already exhibited three different governance models composed of OPA, NPM and Post-NPM (see table 2).

| Type | OPA feature | NPM feature | Post-NPM feature |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| Nursery school | regulation by Child Welfare Act | designated administrator system for childcare (outsourcing) | |
| Childcare center | monitoring standards by revising Child Welfare Act in 2001 | deregulation for childcare services | employer-provided childcare services by Act on Advancement of Measures to Support Raising Next-Generation Children in 2003 |
| Kindergarten | regulation by School Education Act | | |
| Homecare | | | public support to community or homecare |
| Preschool | enacting new law in 2006 | service contract between guardians and providers | expanding new preschool |

Note: Blank shows that there is no visible feature of any management principle.

Table 2: Policy change in childhood before the reform

Source: Author’s compilation

IV. Case study on nursery services in an urban district

Child care is one of the most crucial issues for young generations in an urban area. One particularly important political issue in metropolitan areas remains the waiting lists for entering the nursery schools. Despite a much lower birth rate in Tokyo than in other regions, the population of children aged 0 to 5 years has recently grown slightly, owing to increasing transfers of young families to Tokyo. Therefore, municipality A located in a metropolitan area whose population is approximately five hundred thousand people is considered a good case in studying the policy and management practices for nursery services. We collected and analysed the related data and documents, in addition to interviewing the director for nursery services. The municipality has progressively improved child care services in response to higher demands for nursery services. It increased the capacity by establishing more nursery schools and by subsidising nursery schools and child care centers (see table 3). The capacity for nursery services including child-

care centers increased 5,038 in 2003 to 6,870 in 2011, while the population of children increased only marginally in this period. In fact, the waiting list decreased from 173 in 2003 to 52 in 2012, though the number was not straightly decreased by increasing the capacity. In response to an increase in capacity from 5,038 to 5,461, the waiting list decreased from 173 in 2003 to 13 in 2007. However, from 2007 to 2009 the list became longer and reached 137 in 2009, then becoming 23, 71 and 52 respectively for the years 2010, 2011 and 2012. Here, it is noteworthy that MHLW defines waiting children as those who do not enter the nursery school despite their guardians applying for entering nursery services and meeting the criteria for those needing daycare. This means that the lack of a waiting list is not identical to fully meeting the demand for childcare. However, citizens and politicians have used the waiting list as a key performance indicator in assessing the quality of child care services for municipalities. The number of waiting children also plays a symbolic role when Yokohama, the largest city around Tokyo, in April 2013, succeeded in realising a waiting list of zero for child care services, under its political leadership and by using innovative way: a bus-transfer system from the living zones to the locations in the nursery schools which have available capacity is provided for children in lack of daycare. Municipality A was also unable to disregard this movement, although it understands that increases in services or capacity would cause more demand, as suggested above. Applications for entering nursery schools in 2013 amounted to 3,000; however, the first assessment on applications caused half of applicants to be denied entrance to schools. An urgent plan for reducing the waiting list was declared in March of 2013: by 2014 the waiting list will be zero.

In response to the new scheme of the Children and Support for Child Raising, the municipality also is developing a support plan for child raising. As mentioned before, the plan will cover all children aged 0 to 5 years in contrast to the current childcare services solely focusing on children lacking in daycare. This means that the target population will be expanded and that the measure will shift focus from waiting lists to determining the demands for services. This policy change has caused municipalities some difficulty in forecasting the needs for childcare services, which directly affects the budgeting and planning. In case of municipality A, the national guideline generally leads to a larger than expected demand in necessity, especially in infants less than one year old: although approximately 80 % of guardians having babies under the age of one have taken a nursing leave in 2014, the demand forecasted reaches 61.6 %.

A more complicated issue relates to budgeting. The budgets for child care services are included in several items other than the child care program comprising operating public nursery schools, contracting-out of public nursery schools, and subsidies for private nursery schools and daycare service centers. However, to grasp the whole budget figure, it is important to consolidate the personnel costs for public employees working at public nursery schools as well as to consider public investment in facilities for childcare services whose budgets appear in different items.

| Type | Number of children | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Public nursery school | 4,051 | 18.6 |
| Private nursery school | 1,324 | 6.1 |
| Childcare center | 1,163 | 5.3 |
| Home care | 8,862 | 40.7 |
| Public kindergarten | 547 | 2.5 |
| Private kindergarten | 5,470 | 25.1 |
| Preschool | 372 | 1.7 |
| Total | 21,789 | 100.0 |

Table 3: *Childcare in early childhood (0-5 years of age in 2011)*

Source: *Statistical Data from Municipality A*

V. Discussion

Childcare and early education are now integrated into a comprehensive child raising support services system by the new law which will start in 2015. The separated policies and services for childcare and early education will become part of the comprehensive childhood services based on child raising plan as developed by municipalities. The plan covers all children as the target population. From this perspective, new reform presumes that there is cooperation among different governments, and governments play a networking role between providers. In addition, all related actors comprising governments, employers, employees, guardians, providers and experts shall be involved in the child raising support plan. These features correspond to the concept of coordination and cooperation in the Post-NPM model.

On the other hand, the government sector still holds great power in controlling service provisions. Although the target for nursery services could be changed from children with a lack of daycare to those in necessity of services in accordance with national guidelines, the necessity is assessed by municipalities, as in the current system. Prefectures will also coordinate the regional plan covering several municipalities. Accordingly, the reform has some OPA features in its centralised system.

Furthermore, the new scheme is influenced by NPM features in delivering services. In preschool and public nursery schools, guardians shall enter into a contract with providers and pay the charge in contrast to contracting with the municipalities, even in case of using public nursery schools. The new scheme also loosens regulations on enterprising companies that enter into nursery services.

Consequently, the reform aims to build a hybrid system for childhood services with OPA, NPM and post-NPM features. This supports the presumed framework. It seems that Japan has realised public governance by adopting a different trajectory from western countries. The findings suggest that Japan's specific context led to a different changing process in the public sector reform partly in respond to the research proposal by Kuipers et al. (2014). However, the success of Japan's model remains uncertain due to some possible problems. Firstly, childhood policy will be linked to other related policies, as policymakers acknowledged in enacting new law.

Especially employment policies and growth strategies are to be closely associated with childhood policies, because improving working conditions such as work and life balance are necessary to encourage women to return to work and to reduce their housework, in cooperation with their partners. Also, family income has to be increased. As a survey research (Cabinet Office 2013 b) indicates, the major concerns for adults having a child, in order of importance, are the increasing economic burden (70.9 %); the balancing between work and life (45.9 %); unstable employment (42.2 %); and a shortage in childcare services (35.3 %). This means economic and labor conditions might become more influential in increasing children than improving capacity for childcare, by contrast to the comments from sociology and anthropology (Kingston 2004). However, the support plan for raising children mainly focuses on childcare and early education. The cooperation with employment policies regarding work and life balance is a non-mandatory matter in the plan; in addition, there is no specific item in the plan addressing economic growth. Secondly, there is an equity issue in providing childhood services among guardians or children and municipalities. For example, many guardians having children apply to enter authorised nursery schools. However, owing to assessment and capacity constraints, some of the applicants are obliged to enter childcare centers and some children have not been allowed to use childcare services as those listed in waiting. The quality of services and the charges differ from nursery schools to childcare centers. Also, the actual percentage of guardians using nursery services varies among family income levels. In the case of municipality A, children from the highest income family account for the largest share (12.2%) of those entering nursery schools. Also, compared to the City of Yokohama, where 15.0 % of infant children entered nursery schools, 21.1 % of infant living in municipality A entered into nursery schools. This shows that accessibility to the service differ in the same metropolitan area. The new system will start in 2015 in which each municipality will assess the necessity in daycare, in contrast to the current system providing childcare services for children in lack of daycare. Therefore, the figure might change slightly under the new system; however, it is evident that the level of nursery services will differ across municipalities, even though family situations including income remain identical.

Thirdly, the costs for childhood services are largely financed with public funds or taxes: guardians only pay about 10 % of the costs. Accordingly, the government sector, especially the municipalities responsible for services are accountable to the public. The information on cost structures, budgeting, beneficiaries or guardians, has to be disclosed in a standardised and comparable form across municipalities. Also, to accomplish the intended outcomes such as increasing the younger population, and revitalising the economy, performance goals will be established and actual performance has to be evaluated. However, in the current system, as described in the earlier section, the budget for childhood spreads over several items of the current budget. In addition, there are capital budget items for constructing and improving facilities for childcare, further personnel costs for staff in public nursery schools are separated from childcare services. These costs shall be consolidated into the childhood program and then evaluated in terms of performance, from the perspective of efficiency and effectiveness.

VI. Conclusion

The public sector management seems to have moved in a direction away from NPM and toward public governance or post-NPM. This transition is caused by the shortcomings of NPM in terms of departmentalism, outputs orientation, and competition in the provision of public services. More cooperation, coordination, and engagement with all stakeholders are stressed in the PG model. However, the trajectory is not identical and might differ from country to country. The study of Japan's nursery services shows that current service relies on a mixed system of OPA, NPM and some of PG, in contrast to a more general international classification as lagging behind in public sector reform. Eligibility for services is assessed and the applicants are assigned places for children by the municipality receiving applications from guardians (OPA). On the other hand, the services are provided by the public and private sector (NPM) in nursery schools, daycare centers, and newly established preschools which provide childcare and early education services (PG).

Reforms beginning in 2015 include the advancement of the current system and the development of more coordination with related programs and actors (PG). The new reforms aim to integrate public services in childhood by municipality. For a long time, two separate services have been provided by different facilities, i.e., by nursery schools and kindergartens whose responsible departments were, respectively, welfare division and education commission. Besides, government regulation for nursery services will be relaxed to make providers for profit enterprises easy to enter into the services.

However, there are some hurdles in implementing these reforms. First, there is the need for harmonisation of centralisation and decentralisation in planning and execution of the services through coordination. Under the new system, the municipality is responsible for determining the necessity of care and coordinating the demand and supply with providers that include preschools and kindergartens. Second, the reforms need to balance the autonomy of providers and with accountability for the results through performance measurement. Third, the reforms should achieve a high level of efficiency and equity in providing services by using national guidelines. The quality of services and the capacity for nursery schools in practice differ across municipalities. Thus, it is necessary to ensure the opportunity and quality of public services to all citizens irrespective of their location.

Future studies should examine whether the hybrid model of childhood policy and services can work as intended. The new system requires the municipality to play an integrating role of planner and coordinator in childhood services, while the current system still operates with different types of services such as childcare, home care, and early education. Coordination in complex system, however, might increase transaction costs; as a result, this could result in an unintended decline in efficiency and effectiveness. Indeed, transaction costs are significantly influenced by the national culture and the overall design of the system. Consequently, we have to carry out comparative studies on other public services, including elderly care in Japan and the childhood services of other nations.

Zusammenfassung

Kiyoshi Yamamoto; Management für Public Governance – Der Fall der Kinderbetreuung in Japan

Governance; Kinderbetreuung; NPM; öffentlicher Dienst; Public Management

Es scheint so, als ob sich weltweit der Trend der Verwaltung des öffentlichen Sektors vom New Public Management zum Public Governance oder Post-NPM weiterentwickelt hat. Allerdings sind die Entwicklungen der Verwaltungsreform in den einzelnen Ländern nicht identisch. Sie unterscheiden sich von Land zu Land aufgrund unterschiedlicher Prozesse des jeweiligen öffentlichen Managementsystems und der Institution. Dieses Papier zeigt, dass durch die Annahme einer Hybridstrategie am Fall eines Kindergarten- Service-Managements in Japan, sich ein gemischtes System der traditionellen öffentlichen Verwaltung, des NPM und einige Elemente des Public Governance Ansatzes herausgebildet hat, im Gegensatz zu einer allgemeinen internationalen Zuordnung als Late Adopter des NPM-Modell.

References

- Boston, Jonathan et al. (1996), Public Management: The New Zealand Model, Auckland.
- Cabinet Office (2013 a), Briefing on New Law of Children and Supporting for Child Raising, Tokyo.
- Cabinet Office (2013 b), Survey on Indicators for Checking and Assessment of Vision about Children and Child Raising Support, Research Report, Tokyo.
- Christensen, Tom and Per Laegreid (2011), Complexity and Hybrid Public Administration - Theoretical and Empirical Challenges, in: Public Organization Review, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 407-423.
- Denhardt, Janet Vinzant and Robert B. Denhardt (2004), The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering, Armonk.
- Denhardt, Janet Vinzant and Robert B. Denhardt (2014), The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering, Expanded edition, Armonk.
- Emery, Yves and David Gauque (2014), The Hybrid Universe of Public Administration in the 21st Century, in: International Review of Administrative Sciences, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 23-32.
- Hood, Christopher (1995), The 'New Public Management' in the Eighties, in: Accounting, Organization and Society, vol. 20, no. 2/3, pp. 93-109.
- Kingston, Jeff (2004), Japan's Quiet Transformation, London.
- Kuipers et al. (2014), The Management of Change in Public Organizations: A Literature Review, in: Public Administration, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 1-20.
- Lynn, Laurence (2008), What is a Neo-Weberian State? Reflections on a Concept and its Implication, in: NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy, Special Issue: 'A distinctive European model? The Neo-Weberian State', vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 17-30.
- Monden, Yasuhiro (1995), Cost Reduction Systems: Target costing and kaizen costing, Portland.
- OECD (2005), Modernising Government: The Way Forward, Paris.
- OECD (2011), Government at a Glance 2011, Paris.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2006), Maybe It is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy, in: Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Osborne, Stephen (2010), The New Public Governance?, London.
- Pollitt, Christopher and Colin Talbot (2004), Unbundled Government: A critical analysis of the global trend to agencies, quangos and contractualisation, London.
- Pollitt, Christopher and Geert Bouckaert (2011), Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis, 3rd edition, Oxford.
- Schick, Allen (1996), The Spirit of Reform, edited by: The State Services Commission Wellington.
- Westney, D. Eleanor (1987), Imitation and Innovation: The Transfer of Western Organizational Patterns to Meiji Japan, Cambridge.

Management for public governance – The case of childcare services in Japan

Thelen, Kathleen (2009), Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies, in: *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 471-498.

Thomas, John Clayton (2013), Citizen, Customer, Partner: Rethinking the Place of the Public in Public Management, in: *Public Administrative Review*, vol. 73, no. 6, pp. 786-796.