

THE IMPACT OF KOREAN PERFORMANCE BUDGETING ON BUDGETARY PROGRAMMES

By INCHEUL CHO

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Institute of Local Government Studies
School of Government and Society
The University of Birmingham
November 2010

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of the Korean system of performance budgeting on government spending programmes. It sets out to examine the associations between a programme's future budget and its past performance and also the impact of performance budgeting on managerial practices.

Much of the study uses quantitative techniques – particularly regression analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Regression analysis is used to examine the links between budget decisions and performance, by analysing the impact on budget changes of SABP (Self-Assessment of Budgetary Programmes) scores (or grades) of programmes which the SABP assessed from 2005 to 2007. Secondly, ANOVA is used to examine changes in seven managerial practices: goal clarity, goal difficulty, budget adequacy, budget flexibility, budget participation, procedure formalization, and support from higher management, using perceptual data of 807 administrators in the Korean central government.

This thesis found evidence of two main effects of Korean performance budgeting on government operations. Firstly, budget decisions have a statistically significant correlation with the performance of programmes or SABP scores (or grades). Secondly, Korean performance budgeting tends to initiate changes in programme-managerial practices within spending organizations, and to improve programme performance.

DEDICATION

TO MY PARENTS

TO MY WIFE, HYANG SOON PARK

and MY TWO DAUGHTERS, HYO JIN and KOUNG ME

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has benefited greatly from the help and guidance of my supervisors, Reader Peter A. Watt and Professor Tony Bovaird. Their comments and support have given me strong encouragement throughout the process of writing my thesis. I thank them for those hours of patient consultations and thoughtful queries that inspired me.

I am very grateful to all the staff and fellow PhD students in the Institute of Local Government Studies, particularly John W. Raine, Phillip Whiteman and Adrian Campbell for their insightful suggestions and comments on my thesis. Also, I am very thankful to Professor Sheila Ellwood, my external examiner, for considerate consultations.

I am highly indebted to my sponsor, the Korean central government, who provided me with generous financial and other assistance. Without their sponsorship, my study in the UK would not have been possible.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to those who, despite their busy schedules, responded to my questionnaires. Without their kind support, my research could not have been completed. I am especially grateful to my Korean colleagues for giving me all kinds of help throughout my PhD courses.

Finally, my strongest appreciation goes to my family, for the sacrifices they unselfishly made so that I could complete my studies. In particular, I owe my wife, Hyang Soon, an enormous debt of gratitude.

Only for the weaknesses in this thesis do I take all the responsibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Objectives	1
1.2 The Scope of the Research	6
1.3 The Structure of the Thesis.....	9
CHAPTER 2 DISCUSSIONS OF PERFORMANCE BUDGETING..	13
2.1 Overview	13
2.2 Performance in the Public Sector	16
2.2.1 Definition of Performance.....	16
2.2.2 Determinants of Performance.....	19
2.2.3 Measurement of Performance	32
2.2.4 Conclusion.....	40
2.3 Performance Budgeting in the Public Sector	41
2.3.1 Introduction	41
2.3.2 Definitions of Performance Budgeting	43
2.3.3 Types of Performance Budgeting	46
2.3.4 Recent Trends	52
2.4 Impacts of Performance Budgeting in the Public Sector	55
2.4.1 Introduction	55
2.4.2 Impact on the Public Sector	58
2.5 Conclusion.....	60
CHAPTER 3 KOREAN PERFORMANCE BUDGETING	63
3.1 History.....	63
3.2 A Framework for Korean Performance Budgeting	67
3.2.1 Underlying Laws	67

3.2.2 Measuring Programme Performance	69
3.2.3 Integrating Performance Information into the Budget Process	74
3.2.4 Roles Played by Individual Organizations	76
3.2.5 Limitations	78
3.3 Self-Assessment of Budgetary Programme (SABP)	83
3.3.1 Background	83
3.3.2 Institutional Overview	84
3.3.3 Programmes Assessed with SABP in Korean public finance.....	94
3.3.4 SABP Operating Mechanisms	96
3.3.5 Checklists as a Means of Assessing Performance	100
3.3.6 Use of SABP Results	105
3.3.7 Limitations	107
3.4 Impacts of Korean Performance Budgeting	111
3.4.1 Overall Impacts on the Korean Central Government	112
3.4.2 Impacts on Budget Allocations.....	115
3.4.3 Impacts on Managerial Practices.....	116
3.5 Conclusion.....	118

CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....121

4.1 Introduction	121
4.2 Developing Research Questions	122
4.2.1 Earlier Studies	122
4.2.2 Research Questions.....	127
4.3 Methods of Analysis	133
4.3.1 Analysis Framework	133
4.3.2 Analysis of Budget Allocation Changes	136
4.3.3 Analysis of Managerial Practice Changes.....	145
4.4 Conclusion.....	162

CHAPTER 5 A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SABP RESULTS165

5.1 Introduction	165
5.2 Statistical Characteristics	166
5.2.1 Overall Review.....	166
5.2.2 Characteristics of Questions.....	168
5.2.3 Characteristics of Sections	170

5.2.4 Characteristics of Programme Types	172
5.2.5 Characteristics of Organizational Groups	176
5.3 Conclusions	179

CHAPTER 6 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF BUDGET ALLOCATION CHANGES 181

6.1 Introduction	181
6.2 Data Descriptions.....	183
6.3 The Results of the Analysis	195
6.3.1 Introduction	195
6.3.2 Relationships between SABP Assessments and Budget Allocations by the MPB.....	197
6.3.3 Relationships between SABP Assessments and Budget Requests by Spending Ministries and Agencies.....	211
6.3.4 Relationships between SABP Assessments and Budget Appropriations by the National Assembly	219
6.4 Conclusion.....	226

CHAPTER 7 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF VARIATIONS IN MANAGERIAL PRACTICE 231

7.1 Introduction	231
7.2 Data Descriptions.....	233
7.2.1 Quality of the Data.....	233
7.2.2 General Characteristics of the Data	238
7.3 Impacts on Managerial Practices	241
7.3.1 Introduction	241
7.3.2 Impacts on Programme Goal Setting	244
7.3.3 Impacts on Budget-Managerial Practices	254
7.3.4 Impacts on Other Programme-Managerial Practices	266
7.3.5 Conclusion.....	275
7.4 Impacts on Programme Performance.....	278
7.4.1 Impacts on Programme Performance.....	278
7.4.2 Differences in the Impact of Managerial Practices on Programme Performance	284
7.5 Conclusion.....	289

CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSION 293

8.1 Summary of the Thesis.....	293
8.2 Policy Implications	297
8.3 Future Research Areas	302

BIBLIOGRAPHY 305**APENDICES..... 323**

APENDIX 1 A QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)	323
APPENDIX 2 A QUESTIONNAIRE (KOREAN)	329

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Characteristics of performance indicators for different purposes	39
Table 3-1 Extension of the numbers of PMS participants.....	72
Table 3-2 GPA vs. NFA regarding the performance management of Korean government	81
Table 3-3 Relations between grades and numeric scores.....	85
Table 3-4 Ratings by the PART	90
Table 3-5 Differences between SABP and the PART	93
Table 3-6 A standard for answering a question (example).....	97
Table 3-7 Checklists for SABP.....	102
Table 3-8 Relationship between the four levels of answer and scores in Questions 3-2 and 3-3.....	105
Table 3-9 Means and Standard Deviations of SABP scores (2005-2007)	110
Table 4-1 Summary of existing studies on public performance budgeting.....	125
Table 4-2 Estimated results for the models in the budget proposal (three-year pooled data).....	144
Table 4-3 Managerial practice variables and grounds	146
Table 4-4 Items and their sources, depending on variables.....	152
Table 4-5 Composition of questionnaire	155
Table 4-6 Response rates of ministries and agencies.....	156
Table 4-7 Demographic features of respondents	156
Table 4-8 Summaries of Analysis Methods.....	164
Table 5-1 Frequency distributions of grades	167
Table 5-2 Yes/No distribution between the questions	167
Table 5-3 Proportion of ‘Yes’ answers to questions related to a performance plan	169
Table 5-4 Distribution of scores between sections	172
Table 5-5 Distributions of scores between programme types	173
Table 5-6 Differences in average scores between Economy- and Welfare-related programmes	174
Table 5-7 Differences in average scores according to budget size	176
Table 5-8 Distributions of scores between organizational groups.....	178

Table 6-1 Descriptive statistics for individual budget stages	184
Table 6-2 Programmes excluded from this analysis	184
Table 6-3 Budget change differences at the presidential budget stage	187
Table 6-4 Distribution of scores set by the MPB.....	190
Table 6-5 Distribution of grades set by the MPB for the truncated sample	192
Table 6-6 Pearson correlation coefficients between proposed budgets and SABP scores by the MPB.....	192
Table 6-7 Differences between programme budgets at different budget stages in Korea	196
Table 6-8 Relationship of SABP scores to changes made to budget proposals by the MPB	201
Table 6-9 Differences in the impact of the different grades on changes made to budget proposals by MPB	203
Table 6-10 Relationship of programme components' SABP scores to changes made to budget proposals by MPB	205
Table 6-11 Interaction effects between SABP scores and programme groups at the MPB stage	209
Table 6-12 Relationships between SABP scores and changes to budget requests in spending ministries and agencies.....	214
Table 6-13 Differences between grades in their impact on changes to budget requests in spending ministries and agencies.....	215
Table 6-14 Relationships between programme components' SABP scores and changes to budget requests in spending ministries and agencies.....	217
Table 6-15 Interaction effects between SABP scores and programme groups in spending ministries and agencies	218
Table 6-16 Relationship of SABP scores to final budget changes at the National Assembly stage	221
Table 6-17 Differences between grades in their impact on changes to budget request in the National Assembly	222
Table 6-19 Interaction effects between SABP scores and programme groups in the National Assembly	225

