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Introduction
The modern form of public administration (PA) studies began in America (Mosher 1975). Although there were also a few early studies in Europe and England (Lynn 2005: 38) that influenced the establishment of the profession of public administration in the US, the American influence on the development of public administration in developing countries was dominant. However, the practice of public administration and policy exists in various forms in each country, since the social characteristics and political contexts of each nation define the way government works (Riggs 1964). This chapter deals with the developments of governmental policy phases and practices in China, South Korea and Hong Kong. It describes the historical developments of each jurisdiction and its unique administrative and policy characteristics.

China

General introduction
China has a long history of civilization and administration. It has a territory of 960 million square kilometres and the mainland population reached 1.35 billion by the end of 2012. Since the second half of the 20th century, China has accelerated its industrialization and modernization. It successfully changed from a planned to a market economy. Its national GDP became the second largest in the world in 2010. As the world’s biggest and fastest-developing society, China’s public policy and administration are facing unprecedented opportunities and challenges.

The historical development of public administration and policy in China

1978–1991: introducing public administration
Post-1978 reform brought China’s long administrative history into its public administration stage (Jing 2010). Along with the shift of the ruling Chinese Communist Party (CCP) from a revolutionary to a pragmatic strategy, the government’s top priorities changed to performance, especially economic performance. Economic growth, investment, employment and international
trade became the government’s major goals. Scientific management and regular PA institutions were introduced. Beginning in the 1980s, normal procedures for the recruitment, training, promotion and retirement of civil servants were established. In 1988, the Ministry of Personnel was established. The State Civil Servant Examination gradually replaced a labor allocation system for staffing government agencies. Local governments gained increasing autonomy to deal with local economic and social issues.


In 1992 the CCP’s 14th National Congress formally decided to build China’s socialist market economy. This led to China’s entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001. Administrative reforms during this period focused on the government’s adaptation to and facilitation of an emerging market economy. Most state-owned enterprises (SOEs) were privatized, while large SOEs were incorporated. The government continued to shed its micro-economic management functions and regulations, endeavouring to establish new markets, market rules and property rights protection. Macro-economic fiscal management was strengthened: for example, the 1994 tax-assignment and the 1998 Central Bank reforms tried to build a national market. In 1993, the Provisional Regulations for State Civil Servants were enacted as a milestone for China’s building a modern civil service.

2002–2011: further globalization and social protection

China’s entry into the WTO forced further domestic reforms. Administrative reforms, rule changes, and adjustments to industrial policies and economic regulations all deepened China’s economic engagement with the world system. Nominal GDP and fiscal revenues grew at annual rates of 16 per cent and 21 per cent during these ten years. China became the world’s second largest economy and trading country. Structural reforms, such as super-ministry reforms, were introduced to facilitate policy coordination. Meanwhile, cumulated problems in social, environmental and other areas attracted policy attention and resource inputs. Harmonious society, inclusive development, and balanced development were officially proposed. Since 2002, social welfare, social insurance and public service systems were developed. Government social expenditures increased quickly. In 2005, a Civil Service Law was enacted, signalling a dual emphasis on rational management of the bureaucracy and its political loyalty to the Party (Chan 2007).

2012–: modernization of state governance system and capacities

The turnover of leadership in 2012 created new momentum for China’s public administration. At this stage, incremental reform, or the philosophy of “touch the stone to cross the river” faced increasing difficulties. Pragmatic and trial-and-error methods of handling problems were not sufficient. Systematic institutional reforms and the comprehensive enhancement of public sector management were expected. In 2013 the CCP had an important conference in Beijing and decided to push forward the modernization of state governance system and capacities, setting institutional foundations for effective responses to challenging issues like corruption, social polarization, rural poverty, environmental degradation and the middle-income trap. The unprecedented anti-corruption movement led by President Jinping Xi was intended to bring the self-seeking and economy-driven bureaucracy back into law-abidance and fairer public services.
The characteristics of public policy and administration in China

Government structure
Historically, China had a centralized administrative regime and has maintained a unitary system of government. The command-and-control chain links five levels of government: central, provincial, municipal, county, and finally rural township and urban street governments. Below that, mass autonomous organizations – Villagers’ Committees and Urban Residents’ Committees – implement government policies. By the end of 2013, the numbers of the four levels of local governments and the mass autonomous organizations were 34 provinces, 333 municipalities, 2,853 counties, 40,497 local governments and 683,000 mass organizations. Since the late 1970s, reforms decentralized intergovernmental relations, delegating and devolving functions downward.

The organizational system of Chinese public administration has three parts. The core comprises governmental agencies like the Ministries of Finance and Education. In 2008, the State Council directed 27 ministries and commissions, 16 bureaus, four offices and 14 public service units. Beyond that are the administrative agencies of the Court, the People’s Congress, the People’s Political Consultative Conference, the CCP and eight Democratic Parties, the Youth League, the trade unions, the Women’s Union and a few other organizations. Employees of these agencies are civil servants subject to civil service laws. The periphery of the public administration system is composed of public service units that are sponsored and led by the first two kinds of agencies. In 2011, the latter employed 7.02 million and 880,000 civil servants, while public service units had 25–30 million employees.

Reform path
Reform became orthodox rhetoric in the late 1970s and its strong symbolic values have been deeply incorporated into the political culture. Announcing a major reform helps the government display legitimacy and effective leadership. Major administrative reforms were launched in 1982, 1988, 1993, 1998, 2003, 2008 and 2013, years when new governments were elected. Reorganization, downsizing and market facilitation were major themes of these reforms (Ngok and Zhu 2007).

Reforms are incremental in nature. Least resistance and Pareto improvement were expected when designing reform packages. Reforms often start tentatively from local areas, and may become formal and national policies after successful experiences are summarized and recognized by the central government. The vitality of incremental reform in China has largely been due to the fast-growing economy, which created new opportunities and solutions and thus avoided zero-sum games. However, continuous reliance on incremental reforms is getting more difficult. Further reforms have to touch on issues of redistribution, as economic polarization reaches unprecedented levels and causes a social backlash. As President Xi said in an interview, “China’s reforms have got into deep-water areas, easy and win-win reforms were done, and the reforms before us are all bones instead of meat.”

State–market–society relations
Marketization has been a major tool for the Chinese government to reshape state–market relation. Reforms in the 1980s and 1990s aimed at building basic market institutions and introducing real market players. Governments gradually reduced direct economic participation and intervention by shrinking SOEs and through deregulation. Foreign-funded enterprises and private enterprises prospered. While the non-state economy accounted for the majority of China’s urban employment and industrial outputs, China’s economic dependence on
international markets also rose dramatically. Nonetheless, the government still plays a much stronger and wider role in economic management compared to many other transitional and developing countries. State-owned enterprises, fiscal and financial policies and industrial policies, as well as direct administrative interventions, are major instruments to manage a state-steered market economy. In theory and in practice, a laissez-faire market economy is not an appropriate model for China.

State–society relations have experienced vast changes as economic marketization has brought about fundamental changes to the social structure. Major changes include expanding social freedoms, citizen rights, and social services and welfare. Meanwhile, civil association attained legitimation. China’s social organization policy has been shifting from a control focus to an empowerment focus, albeit not decisively (Jing 2015). The state has realized it needs social organizations for service delivery and collaborative governance purposes. As China has been in a major process of transition, state–society relations will be hybrid and complex, encompassing the full spectrum of rivalry, supplementary and complementary relationships (Young 2000).

Policy system

Policy-making in China has been adapting to vast socioeconomic and technical changes. An increasingly modernized and diverse society makes public policies more important as their consequences are getting more difficult to predict, evaluate and control. Although the CCP continues to be the political centre of the country’s political, ideological and organizational leadership, policy-making and implementation have been getting more rational, evidence-based, participative, and transparent. Governments have made serious efforts to improve due process, collective decision-making, policy analysis, implementation, performance measurement, and accountability. New policy instruments such as contracts, grants and subsidies, vouchers, loan guarantees, tax expenditures, and public–private partnerships are widely used. The adoption of these policy instruments led to the engagement of various non-state actors in the process of policy implementation. While policy-making and implementation still suffer from inadequate intergovernmental and interagency coordination, ICT, big data techniques, and new decision-support instruments create a potential for scientific decision-making advocated for by the Chinese government. Besides an obvious pursuit of efficiency and effectiveness, the policy process in China is fundamentally conditioned by its political system and values.

South Korea

General introduction

Established on August 15, 1948, the Republic of Korea (ROK) is located at the southern part of the Korean Peninsula and neighboured by China to the west and Japan to the east. With an area of approximately ten thousand square kilometres and a population of 51.14 million in 2013, South Korea ranks 109th in the world in terms of land area and is the 14th most populated country. The national GDP of South Korea is the 13th largest in the world. In this free democratic polity, the President is elected by the direct vote of the people for a five-year term. The country has 17 regional local governments and 227 basic local governments. As an open-market capitalist economy, the country has turned from being impoverished to an economic powerhouse that aims to be the financial hub of northeast Asia.
The historical development of public administration and policy in South Korea

The 1950s and 1960s: the foundation of the Republic and the establishment of economic infrastructure

The UN recognized the ROK as the only legitimate government on the Korean Peninsula. On the northern part of the Peninsula, however, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) was established as a Communist country under the auspices of the Soviet Union. The ideological confrontation between the two entities led to the Korean War. After the all-out three-year long war ended in 1953, the peninsula was divided and left with few natural resources and destroyed industrial facilities. South Korea was among the world’s poorest countries until the 1960s.

The first President, Rhee Syngman, was forced out of office by popular pressure in 1960 after rigging an election, and the political situation became unstable. General Park Chung-hee carried out a coup d’état that eventually led him to become President in 1963. Park established a five-year economic development plan to modernize the country. As reflected by the phrase “the Miracle on the Han River,” the country’s economy grew tremendously based on an export-oriented policy. The Saemaeul Undong (New Community Movement) greatly contributed to the improvement of living conditions in general.

The 1970s and 1980s: continued economic growth despite political turmoil

President Park extended his term by declaring martial law and announcing the Yusin (Revitalization Reform) in 1972. The 18 years of his dictatorship finally came to an end when Park was assassinated in 1979. However, Singunbu, a group of army officers led by General Chun Doo-hwan, seized power and delayed the onset of democracy. The country made steady economic growth throughout this period. From 1962 to 1981, the average growth rate was 8.45 per cent (Kang, Lee, and Choi 2008: 181). Roh Tae-woo, the successor to President Chun, announced direct elections for the position of President. The Roh administration improved diplomatic relations with Communist countries such as China and the Soviet Union.

The 1990s and 2000s: the beginning of the democratic state

Two life-long fighters for democracy were elected to presidential office in the 1990s. Kim Young-sam fought against corruption and increased transparency. High-ranking public officials were required to register all their assets. The use of false names was banned from all financial transactions. The newly enacted local autonomy system allowed residents to elect their administrative leaders.

Kim Dae-jung’s administration had to deal with the foreign exchange crisis inherited from the Kim Yong-sam government. The economic downturn hit the country hard. Kim Dae-jung is best remembered by the “Sunshine policy” toward North Korea, in which the two Koreas established a collaborative economic partnership led by the private sector.

Roh Moo-hyun, the political successor to Kim Dae-jung, was inaugurated as President in 2003. The Roh administration concentrated on three objectives: the realization of democracy with the participation of the people, balanced social development, and the construction of peaceful and prosperous relationships with Northeast Asian countries (Korean Culture and Information Service 2015: 220). Kim and Roh’s terms were criticized due to economic slowdown. Although the nation was governed democratically, a variety of social conflicts began to emerge.
New developments since the late 2000s: governmental reform to serve people better

The administration of Lee Myung-bak attempted to make the government work more efficiently by reforming administrative regulations, targeting public enterprises, and reducing its size through privatization. Massive development projects started under the name of a “Green Growth policy,” but received more criticism than praise since it focused narrowly on economic growth (Lah 2013). The GDP growth rate during Lee’s term was a record low 3 per cent.

In 2012, Park Geun-hye was inaugurated as the country’s first female president. The Park government has had to deal with a variety of hardships, including the sour relationship with North Korea, an ongoing economic depression, and conflicts between ideologically polarized social groups. The Park administration is currently pursuing governmental reform, namely “Government 3.0.” The goal is to regain the public’s trust by achieving transparent, competent and service-oriented government through more openness. The reform aims to provide customized services for individual citizens and support for job creation and a creative economy by opening and sharing public information as well as removing barriers from government operations (MSPA 2014).

The characteristics of public policy and administration in South Korea

A strong administration system and delayed democratization

South Korea is the only country that has transformed from an Overseas Development Aid recipient to a donor. The country made great economic strides in a relatively short time period, and many developing countries see its development path as a model. Two strengths, well-educated human resources and a government-led development system, help explain the country’s extraordinary success. Scarcity of natural resources has caused the nation to focus on developing its human resources and emphasize the importance of education. The compulsory education system requires all Koreans to finish middle school. The government supports all families with infants by providing allowances until children are five years old. Almost 80 per cent of high school graduates go to college. This strategy has helped South Korea achieve rapid economic growth.

The country also needed a strong government system to remove the legacies of the Japanese colonial period and quickly improve the economy. Since public positions are traditionally regarded as prestigious, and since most public jobs guarantee life-long employment, competent elite groups have wanted to fill these positions, and they have become even more popular in the unstable job market. South Korea relied heavily on a powerful government filled with elite bureaucrats. This model created hugely successful economic development (Ahn and Jung 2007), but came at the cost of an undemocratic policy-making framework (Ha et al. 2009). Government traditionally possesses relatively stronger decision-making power than other social sectors. The checks and balances of the legislature, the media, and the public have been relatively weak in South Korea. This may have come from the dictatorial years, but it can also be attributed to the close connection between social elite groups. The lack of a consensus-building process let the government freely push forward its agenda as it wanted. This government domination of the public policy-making process continued at least until the late 1980s. Economic success was only possible based on a secretive, top-down-style policy-making process (Lah 2010). However, rapid development resulted in neglect of democratic values such as human rights, equity and fairness, transparency, and most of all public trust and respect for government.

With ten years’ experiences of two progressive presidents, however, society gained momentum for more democratic development. Since the 2000s, many kinds of public participation have been
used, including citizen referendums, citizen recall, citizen litigation, a citizen budget system, and citizen participation in the trial system (Lah 2010). The democracy in Korea, however, came at the cost of social conflicts. NGOs strengthened their activities and the media freely criticized governmental policies. It became very hard to find a consensus-based solution to national projects such as the Sapaesan Tunnel Project, naval base construction in Jeju, a Free Trade Agreement with the US, and the Four Rivers restoration project. The Park Geun-hye government created the Presidential Committee for National Cohesion to deal with social conflicts. South Korea needs more experience in order to balance democracy and social stability.

**New Public Management and Performance Management**

Following the global trend called New Public Management (NPM), a performance management system was introduced in the early 2000s to create a mission-driven, incentive-based, decentralized senior civil service and top-down budgeting system. Performance management in South Korea has four different managerial dimensions: organization, human resources, finance, and evaluation (Lee and Moon 2010). The team-based structure and executive agency system are examples of organizational reforms. Human Resource Management (HRM) reforms include a more open and competitive civil service, performance agreements, performance-based pay, individual performance evaluation, and decentralization. A top-down budgeting system and total wage system characterize financial management. Programs are evaluated annually and the results are directly linked to the increase or decrease of the programs’ budget allocation the next year. The government may have become more competitive through performance management, but its emphasis on competition makes collaboration between actors and organizations difficult. The success of performance management in South Korea depends on how to effectively overcome this conflict.

**The use of IT and e-government**

South Korea is well known for its cutting-edge information technology and top-notch e-government (see Chapter 33 in this volume for an in-depth analysis). Comprehensiveness, fragmentation, and orientation toward citizen services and operational efficiency, as well as building new systems rather than changing existing ones, characterize Korean e-government (Choi 2010). It has fundamentally changed the way government works (Kim 2005). In the mid-1990s, with the advance of information technology (IT) and the democratization of society, a networked system was created. With the Framework Act on Informatization Promotion, the government started to devise ways to use IT for improving the efficiency of public administration, including estate registration processes, patent filing, military services operations, and so on. E-government also increased transparency and helped decrease corruption. In the 2000s, the government began to provide citizen-oriented services online and accept ideas from the public. The relationship between e-government and democracy is already a virtuous circle. More IT has brought more transparency and vice versa. The current e-government represents the overall policy orientation of South Korea. The Park administration claims to be a more open government by sharing information publicly, breaking down barriers between ministries and setting up a “creative economy” by sharing previously confidential governmental data with the public. The government plans to collect public opinions on major policies and projects and seek cooperation with the private sector through online, direct democracy (MSPA 2014).
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Hong Kong

General introduction

After 155 years of British colonialism, Hong Kong was established as a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the People’s Republic of China in July 1997. The SAR operates separate economic, political, administrative and legal systems under the Basic Law and the policy of “One Country, Two Systems” laid down by Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping. With only 1,104 square kilometers, Hong Kong is home to more than seven million people, among the highest population density in the world. Benefiting from China’s reform and opening up since 1978, Hong Kong has transformed itself from a manufacturing into a service economy. Already a global financial and business center, Hong Kong is not only the world’s eighth largest trading economy and sixth largest stock market, but also a premier gateway for trade and investment in Mainland China (HKSAR Government 2013).

Historical development of public policy and administration in Hong Kong

The colonial era

Public administration in colonial Hong Kong was characterized by the building of a meritocratic bureaucracy under the rule of law and the British administrative tradition (Lee 2011). The colonial bureaucracy was established mainly to maintain law and order and hence to facilitate British business interests, rather than to serve the local people, so the public sector in Hong Kong remained small before the end of World War II. Only after the 1967 riots instigated by leftists did the highly authoritarian colonial regime launch more social policies to alleviate massive social discontent. During the 1970s, the philosophy of the colonial government moved from laissez-faire to a more proactive “positive non-interventionism” (Cheung 2010), so it could intervene selectively, especially in education and housing. Through the “administrative absorption of politics,” appointing businesspeople and professionals to advisory and statutory bodies, the colonial government co-opted the emerging middle class and local business elites. The highly centralized structure of the bureaucracy was reorganized and policy functions were delegated to six policy branches and two resource branches in the Government Secretariat, according to the recommendations of the 1973 McKinsey Report. This division into policy-making branches (later called bureaus) and departments for execution has remained the framework of the Hong Kong government ever since. Public administration was considered “administratively pragmatic, economically conservative and fiscally limited” (Cheung 2010).

The transition to Chinese rule from the mid-1980s

The 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration was overshadowed by a confidence crisis about Hong Kong’s future. Full democratization did not happen during this transition but, beginning in the mid-1980s, direct elections at the district level were introduced to incorporate community views. More social programs were also launched. Concerns about the cost and quality of services in the public sector prompted the introduction of NPM reforms. Nonetheless, the 1989 political crisis in Mainland China shook the confidence of Hong Kong citizens during the transition to Chinese sovereignty.
The post-1997 period

Under the Basic Law, the political system kept the key elements of the colonial government intact, but the political and policy contexts have experienced profound changes since 1997. The Chief Executive (CE) replaced the Governor as the head of government. The Accountability System for Principal Officials was introduced in 2002 to enhance the CE’s power over the bureaucracy and to recruit non-civil servants into the top echelons. Each bureau would be headed by a politically appointed Secretary accountable to the CE. The number of bureaus dropped from 16 to 11 to facilitate better allocation of resources and closer coordination of policy portfolios. A further reorganization of the Government Secretariat in 2007 increased the number of bureaus to 12. Nonetheless, since 2002, about half of these ministers have still come from the civil service. The need for economic restructuring after the 1997 Asian financial crisis compelled further administrative changes. For instance, Hong Kong witnessed a downsizing of the civil service from 184,639 in 1997 to 153,477 in 2008 and 170,404 in early 2014 through efficiency drives, voluntary retirement, and an open recruitment freeze (Scott 2010; Civil Service Bureau 2014).

Growing social inequality, ageing population, and popular demands expedited the modification of the government’s non-interventionist stance. Public expenditure increased from HK$194.4 billion in 1997–1998 to HK$421.0 billion in 2014–2015, representing a growth of 4.7 per cent per annum. Education, social welfare, and health are the key expenditures, contributing about 57 per cent of total recurring expenditures in 2014–2015. Revenue increased from HK$281 billion in 1997–1998 to HK$430 billion in 2014–2015, representing a growth of 2.5 per cent per annum (Working Group on Long-Term Fiscal Planning 2014).

NPM measures such as corporatization, outsourcing, and privatization expanded after 1997. The Asian financial crisis and the ensuing economic depression led to unprecedented budgetary deficits and the acceleration of private sector involvement in delivering public service. Increasing challenges from opposition groups and social expectations, coupled with external economic pressures, have compelled the government to take a more assertive role in socioeconomic development, even though its capacity to command public trust and deliver service eroded after 1997.

Key challenges of public policy and administration in Hong Kong since 1997

The political executive and executive–legislative relations

The formal powers of the executive are extensive. The CE, however, lacks a clear popular mandate, as he was elected by an election committee composed of 1,200 from the elites. Without political party support under the current system, he has to rely upon pro-establishment legislators to pass laws, but such support cannot be taken for granted. After 1997, the Legislative Council (LegCo) has evolved into the main opposition to the executive. The Basic Law constrains the power of LegCo to propose policy alternatives or amendments that challenge the government’s policy agenda, and the separate vote-counting mechanism requires separate majorities in both the geographical and functional constituencies for passing any motion, bill, or amendment introduced by individual legislators. Pro-government forces regularly constitute the majority in the functional constituencies, but not in the geographic constituency of LegCo. The government cannot assume unanimous support from pro-establishment parties for unpopular proposals when they find it politically expedient to oppose the government. The prospect of reaching a broad-based agreement is often difficult, and tortuous bargaining between the government and the LegCo is routine. The legislature, which is constituted by a proportional representation electoral system, cannot serve as
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an effective mechanism in aggregating societal interests. Policy agenda setting has also been increasingly shaped by politics outside the legislature, as social movements have often mobilized strong opposition to challenge the government.

The bureaucracy and the public sector

The policy secretaries are accountable to the CE but they dictate priorities within their portfolios, so coordination between them has weakened, in sharp contrast to the pre-2002 system dominated by the administrative elites with a stronger esprit de corps. In the absence of a popular mandate and effective leadership, amid a period of economic fluctuation, growing social demands increasingly expose the legitimacy deficit of the government. The politically appointed secretaries have been noted for their lacklustre performance, further weakening the morale of the civil service and the performance legitimacy of the regime. In short, the policy capacity of the post-1997 government has weakened in a highly turbulent economic and political environment.

The role of citizen participation

In order to legitimize policies in a quasi-democratic polity, mechanisms for public participation established in the colonial period, such as district and advisory bodies and public consultation exercises, were retained after 1997. However, they have been challenged by an increasingly vocal civil society, especially since 2003 when it mobilized against the national security legislation. The government was compelled to adopt more participatory public engagement mechanisms in areas such as heritage preservation and urban planning, but the utilization of such mechanisms varied widely across policy areas (Cheung 2011). Judicial review has been regularly used by critics to delay the policy process, and filibustering tactics have also been employed by opposition legislators.

A wave of new social movements, featuring youth participation and digital activism using social media for mobilization, has emerged, as reflected most aptly in the Occupy protests fighting for universal suffrage in late 2014. Increasing protests and demonstrations revealed the inadequacy of existing participatory channels, the rise of local identity and the legitimacy deficit of the quasi-democratic regime amidst closer socioeconomic interactions between Hong Kong and Mainland China. To conclude, public administration in Hong Kong has been facing important challenges since 1997 because the existing regime lacks sufficient popular support to drive policy consensus and to deliver better public service to satisfy a demanding population.

Conclusion

In pursuit of better public administration and policy, more commonalities than differences are found in the three unique jurisdictions China, South Korea, and Hong Kong. All three governments underwent a period of modernization, characterized by rapid economic development and a struggle for democracy. A similar path was found in the introduction of modern public administration structure and policy procedures, which can be summarized as a more efficient government. In particular, China and South Korea are remarkable in their rapid economic development in the late 20th century. Large-scale governmental policy developments were seen as essentially instrumental to the repositioning of the state to be more market-oriented.

The pursuit of efficiency and better performance was echoed by the government reforms in all three jurisdictions. The reform efforts were not always fully successful but nevertheless made meaningful improvements. The reforms often took the form of administrative restructuring.
Privatization, outsourcing, downsizing, and reorganization proposed by the NPM movement were manifested in the three jurisdictions and even fueled by the financial crisis in the late 1990s. The new reform efforts also emphasized the role of the non-governmental sector by empowering civil society and encouraging public involvement in the policy-making process. Although government still has a very strong power and capacity, it has become more responsive to the demands of civil society. Governments in the three jurisdictions have become keen to be perceived as more democratic, especially on matters such as transparency and public collaboration.

Globalization, which first affected and was brought about through the market, has also affected public administration. As such, the reforms to public administration in the three jurisdictions over the past couple of decades conform to the global norms such as NPM and the new emphasis on the collaboration of diverse social players. As such, these three jurisdictions follow many of the themes outlined in the preceding three chapters: the increased complexity of public administration and the ascent of new means to include more stakeholders. Of course, the particular path of reforms balanced domestic circumstances with broader global trends. Challenges still remain for each government. China is calling for more systematic coordination between government entities. Civil unrest within an omnipresent democracy is one of the most significant challenges for Korea. In Hong Kong, the performance and accountability of the government is currently in question due to the absence of effective political leadership and fully developed democracy.

Notes

1 Data from www.mca.gov.cn/article/zwgk/mzyw/201406/20140600654488.shtml. Local governments have very different forms: for example, the 34 provinces include four Directly-Supervised Municipalities, 23 Provinces (including Taiwan), five Minority Autonomous Regions, and two Special Administrative Districts (Hong Kong and Macao).
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