

# TABLES

Table 2.1. Dimensions and degrees of organisational autonomy versus political control in public administration . . . . .	25
Table 3.1. Possible mapping of formal structures to different key principles . . . . .	66
Table 3.2. Possible complementary and more informal processes . . . .	67
Table 4.1. List of institutions before and after the reform . . . . .	83
Table 4.2. Taiwan's performance in the IMD rankings . . . . .	86
Table 4.3. Taiwan's performance in the WEF rankings . . . . .	87
Table 7.1. The impact of 'distributed governance' . . . . .	155
Table 7.2. Mapping the Flumian model to Australian practice . . . . .	158
Table 7.3. Authority, powers and accountability arrangements of a selection of integrity agencies . . . . .	162
Table 8.1. Four social service networks in Hong Kong and Taiwan and their network roles as measured by degree centrality . . . . .	176
Table 8.2. Network roles and associated organisational characteristics in Hong Kong and Taiwan . . . . .	177
Table 8.3. Differences in the engagement channels utilised by CBOs in Hong Kong and Taiwan . . . . .	181
Table 8.4. Differences between CBOs in Hong Kong and Taiwan in their adoption of advocacy methods . . . . .	182
Table 9.1. Key tasks in vertical management . . . . .	202

Table 9.2. Variable calibration and sources . . . . .	208
Table 9.3. Truth table . . . . .	210
Table 9.4. Truth table final solutions . . . . .	211

This text is taken from *Designing Governance Structures for Performance and Accountability: Developments in Australia and Greater China*, edited by Andrew Podger, Tsai-tsu Su, John Wanna, Hon S. Chan and Meili Niu, published 2020 by ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.