

# What Evaluation for Sport Management?

## Japanese Governmental Evaluation for Elite Sport

KUDO Hiroko \*

### Introduction

1. Japanese Sport Policy
2. Elite Sports Strategy in Japan
3. Literature Review on Sport Policy
4. Policy Evaluation of Japanese Government under NPM Reform
5. Performance Measurement and Policy Evaluation of Elite Sports
6. Discussion

## **Introduction**

In 2012, a scandal threatened Japanese elite sports; All Japan Taekwondo Association (AJTA), one of the two federations of Tae Kwon Do in Japan illicitly received financial support from Japan Sport Council (JSC), a public institution in charge of sports promotion under The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). The financial support in question was given up to three forth by the JSC, while one forth has to be self-financed by the federations which ask for the support. Since many minor sports federation do not have enough financial resources, one of the main figure of AJTA, who were also a board member of Japanese Olympic Committee (JOC), suggested and instructed the federation that after receiving public support to pay coaches and personnel, they could have

---

\* Professor, Faculty of Law, Chuo University

“donated” a part of their salary to the federation, in order to compensate the initial “payment” by the federation to obtain the financial support.

This episode put light for two things: on one hand, the poor financial condition of many elite, but minor sports; on the other hand, the lack of control towards these financial supports by the authorities. The first is a structural problem, which cannot be solved easily; however the latter is an institutional problem, which should not have occurred, if the evaluation system could have applied regularly.

Evaluation of sport policy is not easy and many governments have been struggling to establish valid key performance indicators and reasonable evaluation system. The paper first describes these general conditions surrounding sport policy in Japan. Then, the case of Japan Sport Council (JSC, formally known as National Agency for the Advancement of Sports and Health, NAASH); a public agency in charge of basic research, promotion of sport activities, education for future generation, and training for elite athletes, is analyzed. The institute in question is an agency under Ministry of Education, which also is in charge of culture, sport, and science and technology promotion. As a public agency, the organization has to be evaluated every year under Government Policy Evaluation Act above mentioned. However, the performance indicators used for this institute have peculiarities similar to those used for cultural organizations.

The paper then reviews the literature on sport policy, in order to understand what issues should be considered in promoting sport and in sport policy. The literature review shows that sport policy is connected to well-being and health issues, thus physical education, school sport, and community sport. Thus the sport promotion could be legitimized through the importance of the health and welfare issues. Since there is almost no significant literature on evaluation of sport policy, the paper reviews on

general performance evaluation in public sector and then the Japanese situation, before analyzing the evaluation of Japanese sport policy. The case study analyses how elite sport promotion is evaluated through which performance indicators, pointing out the issues and suggesting possible solutions. The paper concludes with findings and discussions on the management of elite sport related policy.

## **1. Japanese Sport Policy**

MEXT is in charge of the overall administration of sports such as preparation of environment where people can familiarize with sports, improvement of international competitiveness by raising Olympic athletes, improvement of physical strength of children and enhancement of physical education in school. In order to promote the sports, "Sports Promotion Act" was first enacted in 1961. "Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports base on the Sports Promotion Act" should have been the basic implementation instrument to realize the Act, but has never formulated until recently, because of the lack of financial resources. Finally it was formulated in 2000 for the period of 2001-2010, since the new financial instrument, namely the sports betting, was about to start in 2001. The Plan was modified after five years of implementation in 2006.

In 2010, MEXT worked to formulate the national physical activity strategy to define the basic direction of the nation's sports policy in the future, reviewing the current "Sports Promotion Act" and replacing it with a newly formulated "Basic Sports Act", which was enacted in June 2011.

### **I-1. Policies for Improving Regional Sports Environments to Achieve Lifelong Participation in Sport**

“Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports base on the Sports Promotion Act” promotes this policy. The goals are: (1) Achieving a society that is active in sports throughout life by giving everybody the opportunity to engage in sport anywhere, anytime and forever, regardless of physical strength, age, capability, interest and purpose; and (2) The target is to achieve at the earliest possible time a level of engagement in sports whereby half of adult population engages in sports activities at least once a week.

In order to achieve this goal, the Plan considered the nationwide deployment of “Comprehensive Community Sports Clubs”. The goals to be achieved by 2010 were: (1) to create at least one Comprehensive Community Sports Club in each municipality; and (2) to create at least one Sports Center Covering a Wide Area in each prefecture. For the development of the Comprehensive Community Sports Club infrastructure, the development of the human resources and the creation of the lifelong sports society, awareness building and education activities are to be carried out and the efforts of the local public entities in creating the Comprehensive Community Sports Clubs will be encouraged and promoted.

Another instrument is “Training and Securing of Sports Instructors”. The goal is to train and secure highly capable and qualified sports instructors in accordance with the needs, and to this end the system of MEXT for the development of sports instructors is to be reviewed in an effort to upgrade the training measures and an environment favoring the activities of instructors, including their vigorous activities in sports facilities, is to be created.

Furthermore, expansion of sports facilities was included as one of the policy goal. A commitment must be made to ensure the effective upgrading

of the public sports facilities and the efficient management and operation. Thus, for example, efforts should be made to turf outdoor exercise grounds. The schools' physical education facilities should be utilized and serve jointly as the premises for the Comprehensive Community Sports Clubs.

Besides constructing new facilities, it is also important to provide accurate sports information to local communities. A system for providing sports related information adapted to particular conditions of the region and the needs of the local communities should be developed. This may involve the presentation of models of a system capable of providing information that is meaningful to all members of the local public. Finally, in order to promote sports at local level, review of regional sports administration was scheduled in accordance with the needs of local communities. A shift of emphasis in local sports administration should take place toward supporting personal sports activities by the members of the local communities such as the development of Comprehensive Community Sports Clubs.

## **1-2. Measures to Promote a Closer Link between Lifelong and Competitive Sports and School Education and School Sports**

Japanese sports policy had been strongly related and promoted through school education and school sports as physical education. This tradition is one of the characteristics of the Japanese sports, and has been influencing strongly even the elite sports. The policy goal is to foster a closer link between lifelong sports and competitive sports on the one hand and school education and school sports on the other in order to bring about a fulfilled lifelong sports life and upgrade international competitiveness.

It is important to enrich children's sports activities both in and out of school by creating a regional sports environment marked by a closer bond between the schools and the local community, including cooperation toward

the development of the Comprehensive Community Sports Clubs. It is important to raise the level of competitiveness particularly of pupils with a high level of athletic ability by fostering environment conducive to boosting international competitiveness, with the optimal training programs for upgrading competitiveness closely coupled with school education and sports, including the use of programs for the development of athletes.

In order to achieve these policy targets, some measures have been introduced. First, efforts are required to upgrade instruction in physical education in order to improve stamina for a strong and healthy life and to foster the talents and abilities to enjoy sports activities. The schools should be encouraged in their efforts to enhance physical ability not only through physical education, but through the educational activities of the schools as a whole. Second, efforts are required to develop and upgrade the instructing ability of the teaching staff and to develop and secure superior instructors. Furthermore, in order to create an environment for school children to enjoy the fun of sports activities in safety, it is necessary to promote efforts to turf outside exercise grounds in accordance with the conditions of the schools and to provide and upgrade the schools' sports facilities with a possibility of their being shared with the local community, including the creation of training rooms. Third, in order to meet the diverse needs of school children for sports, efforts should be made to upgrade the instructors of the school sports clubs activities, including the use of local instructors at the schools. Efforts should also be made to ensure a greater measure of flexibility for the school sports club activities by several schools joining together in accordance with the existing school conditions.

MEXT is working on fostering comprehensive community sports clubs where everyone from children to the aged can participate according to their interests and goals in order to achieve a lifelong sports society, in which

anyone can practice sports at anytime, anywhere, and at any stage of their lives. It is also working on measures to improve the physical fitness of children.

MEXT also works to enhance the performance of the top level athletes through support such as equipping national training centers, supporting sports science, medical science, and relevant information, and assisting sport organizations.

## **2. Elite Sports Strategy in Japan**

The Basic Plan for the Promotion of Sports declares the Olympic medal award rates of over 3.5%. MEXT supports strengthening of athletes through the utilization of the Japan Institute of Sports Sciences and National Training Center and through advanced athlete support utilizing sports medicine/science research output.

### **2-1. Measures aimed at an Overall Improvement in Japan's International Competitiveness**

These policy goals are as follows:

(1) The goal is to positively promote the development and reinforcement of athletes capable of competing at major events, seeing that the performance of the nation's top level athletes at international competitions, notably the Olympic Games, fills the hearts and minds of the nation with a vision and with great emotional excitement and thus contributes to the development of a happy and vigorous society; and

(2) Given, in particular, that Japan's Olympic medal award rate at the 1996 Olympic Games dropped to 1.7%, the goal is to double this medal award rate, in other words, raise it to 3.5% by promoting in a general and planned

manner a range of measures designed to develop and reinforce Japan's top level athletes.

In order to promote this policy, the Plan establishes Optimal Training Programs. The target is to establish optimal training programs for the development of top level athletes in an organized and planned manner. Specifically, this means the establishment of programs for the development of athletes indicating the concept and nature of the training for the Athletics Association's rearing top level athletes and of a system for instructing the athletes in accordance with this program.

One of the concrete objects of the Plan is to develop Training Centers. In order to engage in the development and reinforcement of athletes in accordance with the fully integrated system effectively it will be important to provide centers at which top level athletes and eminently talented athletes from the regions can assemble for intensive, general training. For the reinforcement of top level athletes, in particular, it is essential to create within the earliest possible time, full scale training centers at the national level equipped with a complete spectrum of functions both in terms of equipment and support capabilities. Besides the facilities, development of instructors is considered. In order to develop and secure instructors capable of underpinning the optimal training programs is necessary to review and upgrade the training system for sports instructors and encourage the use of fulltime instructors for top level athletes. It is equally important to promote the establishment of a National Coach Academy and reinforce the cooperative links among the instructors at the National Federations, schools and local sports clubs.

It is necessary to identify the directions in which the development of the future athletic sports environment should take place, with the creation of a system in which top level athletes can exclusively and safely concentrate



on sports in order to rise to the world's top level. Efforts are needed to upgrade the incentive measures that will facilitate the support of sports by companies and the use of top level athletes as instructors.

One of the other measures related to this policy is the smooth organization of sports events on international and nationwide scale. Efforts are required to support the convening, preparation and running of international athletics and sports events with a view to the smooth organization of sports contests on a national and international scale. Efforts are also needed to foster the more effective running of competitive events, including the simplification of the operation of public sports events.

Since Japanese domestic sports are scheduled according to its school and academic year, which starts in April and ends in March, the whole national events are not necessary corresponding to various important international meetings. This fact has been causing difficulty in preparing international competitions, while participating in domestic meetings, which are sometimes necessary to qualify for the international ones. Given the geographical distance to both continents, athletes have to organize their travel abroad in order to participate in the international competitions and trainings. The fiscal year, which also starts at April, is also a handicap for the Japanese federations to decide their strategy and especially their budget.

## **2-2. Japan Sport Council (JSC) and Japan Institute of Sports Sciences (JISS)**

Japan Sport Council (JSC, until 2012 known as National Agency for the Advancement of Sports and Health, NAASH) is an independent administrative institution, which is responsible for the elite sports among its many functions, including that of the school physical education. There are two organizations which promote elite sports through various

instruments. One of these is Japan Institute of Sports Sciences and the other is the National Training Centre. Both collaborate with Japanese Olympic Committee, the MEXT, and sports federations. JSC, besides supporting elite sports through scientific research and training facilities, gives financial support to athletes and federations, using sport betting, that is Sports Promotion Lottery.

JSC has numerous internal organizations and facilities, corresponding to its wide range of functions. Among them, there is the Japan Institute of Sports Sciences (JISS), whose goal is to strengthening sports in Japan.

JISS utilizes the most up-to-date facilities and equipment, all developed on the basis of leading-edge research in the fields of Sports Sciences, Sports Medicine, and Sports Intelligence, and conducts support activities for the enhancement of international competitiveness in Japanese sports in collaborative cooperation with highly qualified specialists and researchers in a wide variety of fields. JISS has four departments, namely, Department of Sports Science, Department of Sports Medicine, Department of Sports Information, and Department of Sports Administration. With these four departments, JISS implements six programs; Support Program for Sports Medicine/Science, Sports Medicine/Science Research Program, Sports Clinic Program, Sports Intelligence Program, Sports Academic Program, and Service Program. These include Athletic Check-ups, in which JISS provides data and advice through various measurements and tests.

Athletic Check-ups are conducted from the perspective of Sports Medicine and Sciences to provide useful information known to have an important influence on competitive performance and which contribute essential information to the creation and revision of training plans and the enhancement of policies at individual sports associations. Specifically, check-ups are classified into four categories: Medical Check-ups, Fitness Check-ups,

Psychological Check-ups, and Nutrition Check-ups. JISS chooses the most essential measurement items for individual sports after close consultation with the various sports association in advance.

In order to support athletes, JISS has Medical/Scientific Support, though which it supports athletes and coaches from a medical and scientific perspective to identify and resolve problems with the goal of strengthening the abilities of individual athletes. It provides scientific support for sports associations, athletes and coaches to resolve problems in Olympic sports. JISS provides testing, measurement, and seminars utilizing scientific methods and findings and gives individual consultations and guidance for each athlete. It also provides practical suggestions based on the analysis of the data obtained.

One of these supports is Fitness Support, in which JISS tests and measures physical conditions and reactions to physical movements. For Guidance for Training, JISS provides guidance for safe and effective training in addition to creating highly effective programs. Nutrition Support is also provided by the organization, in which it conducts dietary surveys in order to help athletes organize their nutritional environment and provide the kind of guidance that helps them to increase muscle mass and control weight. The JISS Nutritional Guidance Restaurant also provides advice to assist athletes in achieving optimal eating patterns. Psychological Support is another support, through which JISS provides mental training guidance and sports counseling to support the competitive careers of individual athletes. In Motion Analyses, the organization records physical movement during competition to measure and analyze impact on the body. In Analyses of Races and Games, JISS measures and analyzes the speed, pitch, and stroke of athletes competing in racing sports to understand the physical movement and formations of individuals and teams. And as Image Technology Support,

JISS utilizes the SMART-system, an image data base that it developed. The institute also provides advice and seminars on camera technique, image editing and data storage specific to each sport for the technical staff of sports associations. Finally, Information Technology Support is a service, in which technical guidance for data collection and analysis of competitive sports is provided.

Besides programs such as, Sports Medicine/Science Research Program and Sports Clinic Program, there is Sports Intelligence Program. JISS carries out various projects designed to strengthen Japan's sports intelligence, including the maintenance and expansion of collaborative networks among related institutions both at home and abroad to contribute to the improvement of international competitiveness in Japanese sports. It designs, implements, and supports projects designed to provide solutions to problems related to the improvement of international competitiveness in Japanese sports, such as the promotion and dissemination of sports intelligence activities, and the evaluation of programs designed to discover and cultivate talented athletes. This program consists of two ongoing projects (Intelligence and Network Programs) and several temporary projects.

JISS supports the enhancement of international competitiveness in Japanese sports from the perspective of sports intelligence through the collection and analysis of various information related to sports activities and the provision of such data throughout the JISS network, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, the JOC, national federations, local governments, and overseas sports institutions, etc.

Another important institution under JSC is the National Training Centre. Situated next to JISS, the center provides various facilities for many disciplines. It functions as retreat preparation center for competitions.

### **3. Literature Review on Sport Policy**

Policy, politics and practice around elite sport, physical education and the links to community sports development have long since been a contested space (Fleming, Talbot and Tomlison, 1995; Green, 2007). Internationally there is a considerable diversity of approaches to the development of school and community links and associated fields of practice. In particular, the current financial climate of fiscal austerity is further driving the public sector rationalisation of sports development provision (Devine, 2012; King, 2012; Mackintosh and Liddle, 2013). This is a dynamic example of a case study in public sector sports policy and programme analysis aimed at addressing youth sports participation levels in Japan. Nicholson et al (2011) suggest there has been a growing interest in sports development but that many studies have yet to examine in detail policies focused on sports participation. This 'significant gap in the research literature' (Nicholson et al, 2011; 1) sits alongside the more established interest in elite sport policy (Bloyce and Smith, 2010a; Green, 2007; Houlihan and Green, 2008). Internationally, this pressing concern with mass participation in sport is closely linked to the interest in its instrumental use as a vehicle for building social capital (Nicholson and Hoye, 2008; Devine, 2012; Karaktas, 2012) and also potentially addressing obesity (Nicholson et al, 2011). Van Bottenburg (2011) has discussed the turbulent evolution of Dutch sports policy as a complex interplay and governmental pull between elite and 'sport for all' resources in the Netherland. Likewise, Petry and Schulze (2011) map a detailed examination of sports participation policies in Germany where there is a largely autonomous 90,000 strong sports clubs at the heart of the sport sector where they argue 'the state interprets its role as that of sponsor

who merely creates the framework that facilitates autonomous sport' (p.52). Thus in a European setting individual countries have considerably different sports development systems between school, local government and community.

Whether Japan takes this approach or takes its own path will only be seen as policy and programmes evolve in the lead up to Tokyo 2020 bidding process and the policies developed after its win. Finally, it can also be seen that lessons can be learnt from this study for those that aim to build upon existing understanding of policy and programme design in sport policy in Australia (Hoye and Nicholson, 2011), New Zealand (Collins, 2008; Sam, 2011) and Canada (Thibault and Kikulis, 2011). This paper sets this analysis within this international context of school sport policy and existing understanding of programmes established to develop mass participation through school-community linkages, club development and enhanced provision linked to school PE curriculum. It will also consider the implications and areas for policy learning that arise from this case study of policy change in Japan and for other international policy makers.

#### **4. Policy Evaluation of Japanese Government under NPM Reform**

At national level, NPM in Japan has been introduced from its Anglo-Saxon experiences and implemented in its own unique manner since late 90's. The critical situation of public finance, urgent need for public sector reform, and political instability lead to two extreme options; one was the self-reforming effort of bureaucracy, and the other was the citizen empowerment and its pressure on bureaucracy. Meanwhile the second has been struggling to get public consensus, expertise for practice, and institutionalization, the

first managed to result in reorganization and restructure of administrative institutions to a certain extent, and in establishment of legal framework and operational system for performance measurement and policy evaluation.

Renewal of public management and public service delivery has become an important trend in public sector reform recently. NPM was introduced into the traditional type of public administration and changed its managerial style with its series of techniques delivering from business management. Customer oriented and/or outcome oriented thinking has been introduced in policy-making and implementation process. Reform in public service delivery, affected by these orientations, forced public sector organizations to outsource some of its functions, privatize its enterprise, and revise the role of government in accordance with the role of private sector and civil society. Public-Private Partnership (PPP), Private Finance Initiative (PFI), other forms of collaborations implemented became alternatives to traditional government re-structuring. This trend is now evolving into the “governance” model of government.

Since the 1980s, there have been considerable changes in management and control of public sector organizations, and those changes have been classified as a “New Public Management (NPM)” (Olson et al., 1998). NPM is characterized by the following aspects: the idea of a shift in emphasis from policy making to management skills, from a stress on process to output, from orderly hierarchies to an intentionally more competitive basis for providing public services, from fixed to variable pay, and from uniform and inclusive public service to a variant structure with more emphasis on contract provision. An increasingly notable element of the NPM is the seemingly endless list of accounting-based techniques that are being drawn on in the pursuit of reform. Specifically, it is pointed out that there are at least five different categories within that referred as “new public financial

management (NPFM)” reforms (Hood, 1995).

The first involves changes to financial reporting systems, including the promotion of accrual-based financial statements across government departments and sectors and a reliance on professionally set accounting standards. The second concerns the development of commercially minded, market oriented management systems and structures to deal with the pricing and provision of public services. The third comprises the development of a performance measurement approach, including techniques such as financial (and non-financial) performance indicators, league tables, citizens’ charters and program evaluations. The fourth concerns the development or delegation of budgets, coupled with the attempted integration of both financial and management accounting systems and also economic-based information sets. Reforms have especially tried to link budgets as predetermined plans with the reporting of results (in financial and non-financial terms). The final category of NPFM reform involves changes to internal and external public sector audits, notably in terms of monitoring service delivery functions and providing reviews of the efficiency and effectiveness (VFM, or ‘value-for-money’) of public services.

In summary, NPM represents an increased use of business and/or commercial management tools and strategies in the public sector. In particular, increasing use of the commercial (accrual) accounting model in the public sector is advocated, without comparing this accounting model with the cameral accounting model, which for centuries has been used in the public sector in many countries, particularly in continental European countries (Eichhorn, 2001).

In Japan, establishment of legal framework was one of the results of national efforts for policy evaluation, which is considered to be one of the most important aspects and instruments to realize NPM. The Japanese



Policy Evaluation Act was enacted on June 2001 and was put into force on April 2002. In accordance with the Policy Evaluation Act, the Cabinet issued “Basic Guideline for the Policy Evaluation” on December 2001. This guideline was approved by the cabinet meeting after hearing opinions of various policy evaluation committees of Ministries and Agencies, those of Independent Administrative Institutions (IAIs, e.g., agencies) and covers wide range of issues, such as: 1) guideline for basic plans of Ministries and Agencies; 2) guideline for improving policy evaluation system; 3) guideline for implementing policy evaluation system.

The national legal framework for policy evaluation and its operational system are designed to be completed within bureaucracy, and manage to get rid of any control from outside. The system offers neither clear separation between performance measurement by bureaucrats and policy evaluation by political authority, or control from the third party, especially from the citizen. In fact, final evaluation and expression of judgement are the competence of the Ministry of International Affairs and Communication (MIC)<sup>1)</sup>, which is an internal organization and one of the government institutions. The decision to make the MIC the final evaluation organ of performance of Ministries and Agencies characterizes the authoritarian Japanese evaluation system. The national legal framework, despite its efforts for establishing performance measurement and policy evaluation, lacks any guarantee of co-governance with the citizen and thus denies the role of stakeholders in policy process.<sup>2)</sup> The current system shows that at

---

1) When the national performance measurement system was established, the Ministry in question was called Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs and Post and Telecommunications, MPMHAPT, since it was just created through the merger of three institutions, former Management and Coordination Agency, former Ministry of Home Affairs, and former Ministry of Post and Telecommunication.

the national level, the Japanese public management reform lacks the citizen empowerment and its advocacy, thus resulting in an uncompleted NPM, focusing only on managerial techniques.

Meanwhile, some interesting efforts can be found out at sub-national level. Almost all of the prefectures and major part of the municipalities have already introduced or now are going to introduce performance measurement systems. Some of these show ideas to realize co-governance. Although most of those deal only with performance measurement, some have already introduced policy evaluation and/or programme evaluation. Some advanced municipalities enacted special charters or regulations, most issued guidelines in introducing their system. Those charters show, in fact, efforts to introduce a kind of citizen's charter and are one of the most interesting experiments among the local governments to realize NPM in its original sense, as they try to guarantee the control of stakeholders and thus enabling the advocacy of the citizen (Tsujiyama, 2002).

This nation-wide movement of experimenting performance measurement and/or policy evaluation by local governments is rather independent from the national effort to establish legal framework for policy evaluation system. It is these local government movements that are actually leading the nation's trend in this field. Both national and local efforts for better governance in their different manners are now producing interesting results, not always positive though, on their reforms and also on governance

- 
- 2) Yamamoto, H., 2002 quotes, for example, Barnett, A., "Towards a Stakeholder Democracy", in Kelly, G., Kelly, D., and Gamble, A., (eds.), *Stakeholder Capitalism*, Macmillan, 1997, and Freeman, R.E., *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Pitman, 1984, among many. He also refers to Box, R.C., *Citizen Governance: Leading American Communities into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Sage, 1998, and Clark, W., *Activism in the Public Sphere: Exploring the Discourse of Political Participation*, Ashgate, 2000.

techniques in general.

#### **4-1. Policy Evaluation Act**

“Japanese Policy Evaluation Act” was enacted on June 2001, following the "Standard Guidelines for Policy Evaluation", and was put into force on April 2002. The Act serves as framework and regulation of performance measurement and policy evaluation among Japanese governmental institutions. The Cabinet issued “Basic Guideline for the Policy Evaluation” on December 2001 in accordance with this Policy Evaluation Act. This guideline<sup>3)</sup> was decided by the cabinet meeting, after hearing opinions of different policy evaluation committees of Ministries and Agencies, those of Independent Administrative Institutions (IAIs) and covers wide range of issues.

From April 2002, all Ministries and Agencies, as well as Independent Administrative Institutions (IAIs) started to introduce the policy evaluation system. Each Ministry and Agency nominated Director General for Policy Planning, who is in charge of coordination of policies, development of performance management strategy, and implementation of policy evaluation system.

Each Director General for Policy Planning heads department in charge of this task. These departments are in charge of developing ministry-wide system of performance management under the concept of “management by objectives (MBO)”, establishing the "policy management cycle" in every policy area, reviewing ministerial programmes in accordance with the Ministry’s missions and goals, and evaluating outcomes of policies and

---

3) The guideline covers wide range of issues, such as; 1) guideline for basic plans of Ministries and Agencies; 2) guideline for improving policy evaluation system, 3) guideline for implementing policy evaluation system.

programmes. All Ministries and Agencies, as well as IAIs appointed groups consisted of external experts on policy evaluation, as policy evaluation committees of Ministries, Agencies, and IAIs, and these are working together with the director generals and the departments on performance management.

All central governmental institutions are required to establish their own performance management system and conduct policy evaluation of all policies and programmes. The results need to be published and guarantee accountability of institutions, with free access from the public. Meanwhile the performance information should be utilized for policy management cycle to achieve "management by objections", and for the budgeting process. Efforts to introduce performance based programme budgeting can be seen in many organizations.

#### **4-2. Public Sector Reform and Policy Evaluation**

Independent Administrative Institutions were established after the public administration reform of January 2001, which focused on central governmental organizations restructuring. Various Ministries and Agencies were merged among themselves, after revising their functions and missions. In accordance with these changes, IAIs were created and separated from the original organizations and became independent institutions. Thus, they were asked to revise and define their own mission, goal, and business plan by themselves and conduct their performance management. Now, each IAI has committee to evaluate their policy and performance.

However, the independence of IAIs is still merely a description on documents and need to be accomplished in order to be agencies. IAIs are still depending institutions under the responsibilities of respective Ministries. Although they have to implement their evaluation and report to

the Ministries, there is no independence in terms financial resources, human resources, and policy management.

For the IAIs, the policy evaluation has led to a structural reform of their institutions. Like the other public organizations, IAIs introduced their performance measurement system in 2001. While performance measurement in Ministries and local governments mainly aimed to rationalize costs and to review polities, that of IAIs led to abolish some of them, to merge among themselves, and to reorganize completely many. In fact, structural review process has been in action, coordinated by the MIC, but implemented by each Ministry, responsible for their corresponding IAIs.

The IAI system is a framework to implement public projects that the government needs not do directly, but that are unlikely to be carried out by the private sector so that the government can provide efficient administrative services that respond to the public needs.

The Commission on Policy Evaluation and Evaluation of IAIs raises opinions about whether to revise or abolish main clerical procedures and enterprises when reviewing the organizations and tasks in general at the end of the mid-term target period (three to five years) of each agency, in order to ensure efficiency and properly revise or even abolish enterprises that are no longer necessary. With regard to the results of a task result evaluation conducted by the Commission on IAI Evaluation of each Ministry every fiscal year, the MIC conducts a strict secondary evaluation from a cross-ministerial perspective.

The number of IAIs is in decrease, those, which were in charge of research and developments, have been merged, and those, which had similar target or used similar methodology, have been rationalized. Among many IAIs under MEXT, there are various organizations, which operate in the field of sports and education. Thus there are plans to reorganize institutions

and rationalize their functions, personnel, and costs. Especially in the field of higher education, various institutions would be merged into one and would be completely reorganized.

With the Policy Evaluation Act, all Ministries and Agencies are struggling with their performance measurement and/or policy evaluation every year. As the MIC introduced series of guidelines, there are more common characteristics among those systems than uniqueness that remains in previously developed system like that of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT), which has continued to develop the previous evaluation system of the Ministry of Public Work (Construction), after the merger among the Ministry of Public Work, Ministry of Transportation, National Land Agency, and the Hokkaido Development Agency. Furthermore, the MIC got special status as coordinating body of policy evaluation systems of Ministries and Agencies.

Meanwhile, almost 80 % of the 47 prefectures (provinces) and major part of the 1,800 municipalities introduced or are now going to introduce performance measurement and/or policy evaluation system. Most of those still deal only with performance measurement but some have already introduced policy evaluation and/or programme evaluation.

Some municipalities enacted special charters or regulations, most issued guidelines in introducing their system. This nation-wide movement of local governments is rather independent from the national effort to establish legal framework for policy evaluation system, although the impact of Policy Evaluation Act cannot be ignored.

## **5. Performance Measurement and Policy Evaluation of Elite Sports**

Although the performance measurement and policy evaluation system was introduced in 2001 and all public institutions are evaluated by third parties every year, institutions of some fields, mostly related to research and development, culture, and education, have issues and problems for implementing their evaluation, because of their nature and characteristics of their field of activities.

It is not easy to evaluate, for example, the outcome of research related investment incentive. It is not easy to measure short-term results of, for example, new curricula for elementary school, since the real outcome could have measured only after several years. The impact of culture related expenses is often measured through number of visitors to exhibitions, and/or number of spectators of performances, etc., but the real outcome of these investments could not be simply measured with these numbers.

Given the fields of difficulties are strongly connected to the main policy fields of MEXT, the performance measurement and policy evaluation of the Ministry have been difficult to implement. In fact, the past performance reports<sup>4)</sup> show that the elaboration and analysis of the Ministry are naïve compared to those of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism (MLIT). When it comes to IAIs under MLIT, many performance reports<sup>5)</sup> of these institutions are rather descriptive and not analytical, leaving many simple questions not answered. During these ten years of experiences, performance indicators and evaluation criteria have been

---

4) All information can be obtained at [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/hyouka/index.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/hyouka/index.htm).

5) See: [http://www.mext.go.jp/a\\_menu/hyouka/d\\_kekka/main10\\_all.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/hyouka/d_kekka/main10_all.htm)

modified several times by the MIC, which is responsible for performance measurement system of all Ministries and related institutions, making easier to implement performance measurement and policy evaluation for them.

In fact, following these modifications, the performance reports of IAIs under MEXT in recent years have improved a lot, although still many indicators are chosen in dubious way and some analysis are not objective. Many performance reports lack logical choice of performance indicators to measure policies and projects, analysis of performance information, and recommendation for the future.

Meanwhile in 2009, the newly elected Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) introduced a new system to evaluate policies in order to formulate the 2010 budget. The system is called Jigyo-Shiwake, or Project and policy classification, and led by politicians, mass media and citizen. The whole question-and-answer session is disclosed to public through direct participation, TV, and web. The main reason to introduce an almost parallel system was strengthen political leadership and transparency, first because, the DPJ wanted to show some differences to its predecessor, latter because many suspected the ministry-led performance measurement system to be “gentle” to their own performances.

The impact of this new classification system seemed very strong. Many policies and projects were judged useless, many institutions got sever evaluation. The mass media was enthusiastic about the event and citizen was excited with the idea. However, in reality, even many policies and projects were judged negatively, those received originally requested budget, sometimes in quite satisfactory level, only few had received small budget, since the new classification system has no juridical background and has not been structured as an instrument for budget formulation. There is no legal or institutional obligation to follow the results of this classification.



Regarding the sports, the new classification took even activities of JOC into considerations and attacked on its expenses for elite sports. They judged that the related expenses need cut, especially for athletes of minor sports. In reality, the Japanese expenses related to Vancouver Olympic Games was about 40 Million Dollar, winning only 5 medals without any gold medal, while that of South Korea was about 5970 Million Dollar to win 14 medals, including 6 gold medals. Many consider that the Japanese sport related expenses are still small, compared to the major countries, while serious situation in finance makes it difficult to expand general budget. There are ideas to concentrate the budget to those sports which could win medals, while stopping financial support to sports with less possibility.

The new classification has had small impact on budget formulation and had been implemented only three times. The third version was low profile and had gained small attention from the media as well as the formal evaluation process. In fact, in terms of sports policy, Japanese government finally enacted "Basic Sports Act" in 2011. This is considered a new milestone for the Japanese sports policy.

However the big question of how to evaluate elite sports has not yet resolved. Partially the number of medals at the Olympic Games would be the answer, but it is of course not enough for an accurate analysis. Given the complexity of sports policy, which includes promotion of physical education among school children, promotion of lifelong sports activities, and promotion of health in general, the impact of elite sports could be wide-ranged. Thus, the development and improvement of performance measurement and policy evaluation system of this field is needed and would be crucial to the development of the sports of the Nation.

## 6. Discussion

The complexity of sport policy has made it difficult to evaluate properly. Thus the policy itself has been considered from various angles, including life-long promotion of wellbeing, thus physical education, schools sport, and community sport. However, this actually made the evaluation further more difficult, since the measurement of outcome became more complex. Physical education in schools has clear set of goals and thus it rather easy to measure, however the promotion of life-long wellbeing through community sport is not easy to measure, and the elite sport policy is much more difficult to legitimate as well as evaluate.

The case confirms the theoretical difficulties to evaluate sport policy explored in the literature, but also confirms various efforts to evaluate the policy from various angles as well as with different methods. As literature review shows, an international comparison could be useful to explore some possible solutions for the evaluation methods through various approaches to understand sport policy itself. This international comparison could be a next step, thus would be the possible future research.

### References

- Collins, M. (2010) From 'sport for good' to sport for sport's sake' – not a good move for sports development in England? *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 2(3), 367–379.
- Devine, C. (2012) London 2012 Olympics: a big sporting society? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 1–23, iFirst article.
- Eichhorn, P., Öffentliche Betriebswirtschaftslehre: Public und Nonprofit Management zur wirtschaftlichen Erfüllung öffentlicher Aufgaben, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Montag, 23. April 2001, nr. 94, Seite 33.
- Fleming, S., Talbot, M. and Tomlinson, A. (eds.) (1995) *Policy and Politics in Sport, Physical Education and Leisure*, Brighton, LSA

- Green, M. (2007) Governing under advanced liberalism: sport policy and the social investment state, *Policy Science*, 40, 55–71.
- Houlihan, B. (2000) Sporting excellence, schools and sports development: The politics of crowded policy spaces, *European Physical Education Review*, 6(2), 171–193.
- Hood, C.,(1995) The “New Public Management” in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol 20, N. 2/3, 93–109.
- Imamura, T., Kokyo Kukan no Saihen (Restructure of Public Domain),(2002) in Imamura, T., (ed.), *Nihon no Seifu Taikei (Japanese Government System)*, Seibundo Publisher.
- Iwasaki, M., Sagawa, Y., and Tanaka, N., (eds.),(2003) *Seisaku to Governance (Public Policies and Governance)*, Tokai University Press.
- Kudo, H.,(2003) Between the ‘Governance’ Model and the Policy Evaluation Act: New Public Management in Japan, in *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol.69, 483–504.
- Mackintosh, C. and Liddle, J. (2013) School sport development policy and governance in England: Big Society, autonomy and decentralisation, *World Leisure Journal* unpublished.
- Miyakawa, T., and Yamamoto, K.,(eds.),(2002) *Public Governance: Kaikaku to Senryaku (Public Governance: Reform and Strategy)*, Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha.
- Olson, O. Guthrie, J. and Humphrey, C.,(1998) *Global Warming! Debating International Developments in New Public Financial Management*, Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- Tsujiyama, T.,(2002) Jichi Kihon Jorei no Kousou (Perception of Local Government Charter), in Matsushita, K., Nishio, M., and Shindo, M., (eds.), *Jichitai no Kousou (4) Kikou (Perception of Local Government, vol.4, Institution)*, Iwanami Publisher.
- Yamamoto, H.,(2002) “Atarashii Kokyo” to Shimin no Governance (“New Governance” and Governance of the Citizen), *Gekkan Jichiken*, Vol.44. No.517.
- Materials for the Committee on Performance Management System in the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport.
- Materials for the Committee on Performance Measurement of Independent Administrative Institutions of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Science and Technology