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Abstract: The administrator of a city park must respond to various needs pertaining to parks as a provider of social and ecological services for city sustainability, through both profitable and non-profitable services. Especially for a large city park, it is difficult to cover all requirements through a single administrative party. Thus, a joint venture (JV) constituting multiple parties is one promising way to administer a large city park. This study aims to clarify the effectiveness and tasks of a JV in the designated administration of city parks. The results of questionnaires received from 69 designated administrators of large city parks (43.7% cover rate in study targets) indicated that JVs tended to actively seek new relationships with parties that have never interacted before to realize better park administration. The merits of constituting a JV included complementing limited know-how of park administration and accumulating new know-how in constituent parties. On the other hand, some disadvantages were highlighted, such as an insufficient number of new projects created through collaboration and vertically divided administration due to role sharing. To cope with these problems, better communication among constituent parties and the establishment of a collaborative environment are necessary.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Designated Administrator System for City Parks

Aiming at effectively and efficiently responding to diversified user needs and saving costs in public facilities (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC), 2010), the foundation of the Designated Administrator System (hereafter DAS) was intended to leverage the power of the private sector through a partial amendment of the Local Autonomy Law (1947) in September 2003. In 2004, the City Park Act (1956) was partly amended and DAS was introduced to city parks. In the DAS, an administrator of a public facility can be assigned through the decision of the local government assembly. Through this amendment, the administration of public facilities, which was limited to a juristic person or public body in which local government invested before the foundation of the DAS, was extended to private businesses and other parties as well. By implementing the DAS in city parks, a designated administrator (hereafter DA) has various
administrative powers defined in the city park ordinance of the local government (e.g., permission of action, reception of usage fee, event scheduling, maintenance of facilities and planting, patrolling, advertising, and reporting) (Japan Research Institute for Local Government (JRILG), 2008a). However, permission of exclusive use and supervisory order remain enforceable only by local government under the City Park Law (Japan Research Institute for Local Government (JRILG), 2008a).

By March 2011, 11,639 of 101,111 city parks (ca. 11.5%) had introduced the DAS according to a survey by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (hereafter MLIT) (MLIT, 2014). The introduction rate of the DAS was higher for larger parks (MLIT, 2014). About 60% of DAs were public service corporations and the other 40% private companies and non-profit organizations. The proportion of private companies as DAs is gradually increasing (MLIT, 2014).

1.2 Literature Review

In park and recreation management, Crompton (1998) identified four factors stimulating the growing interest in privatization: a shortage of tax funds, political thinking in conservative and liberal ideologies, a recognition of the inefficiencies associated with monopolistic service delivery, and an awareness of the distinction between facilitators and service providers. In this context, privatization is expected to promote efficiency and responsiveness to changing public preference by the introduction of competition into the marketplace (Johnston & Seidenstat, 2007; LeRoy, 2005). However, there has been criticism of privatization due to preferential treatment of special interest parties and uncertainty in non-profit functions, such as the provision of equitable services and environmental conservation, because private contractors require profit (More, 2005; Wade, 2005). When privatization such as DAS is introduced, it is essential to recognize the importance of public of parks as efficiency, flexibility, and profitability are enhanced.

Through the introduction of DAS, various private companies entered city park administration (Li et al., 2014). Public service corporations have a lot of park management experience, relative to private companies that are assumed to be more profit-oriented and tend to recognize park administration as a new business, especially if they have little prior experience of park management. Because a joint venture (hereafter JV), in which multiple parties cooperate as a DA, enables cooperative administration of city parks between the public and private sectors, it may be a promising way for new parties to enter city park administration while both non-profitable and profitable functions of parks are secured.

The DA of a city park must respond to various needs pertaining to parks as a provider of social and ecological services for city sustainability (Chiesura, 2004; Nielsen et al., 2014). Especially for a large park, it is difficult for a single party to conduct all affairs; thus, cooperation with specialized companies for aspects such as cleaning, patrolling, and the maintenance of facilities is necessary (Katsura, 2006). JVs can mitigate the inherent shortcomings of public and private administration (Tanaka, 2006). By complementing each other, new knowledge is accumulated in constituent parties through the sharing of information and interaction (Saito, 2007). Thus, JVs should be evaluated not only from the perspective of park administration but also from the perspective of developing the ability of constituent parties.
Thus far, some general reports on DA through a JV have been published (Japan Research Institute for Local Government (JRILG), 2008b; Saito, 2007), however, these are not specific to city parks. Additionally, although several aspects of the DAS of city parks have been studied, including the DA selection process (Masuda, 2008), the evaluation method of user satisfaction (Maeda, 2008, 2009), vegetation management (Li et al., 2014), collaboration with citizen groups and park communities (Ohtaki & Miyake, 2007; Urata & Hirata, 2006), and the feedback process (Imanishi & Nakamura, 2016), there are no previous studies focusing on JVs. Therefore, JVs in DAS as a promising approach in the privatization of city park administration must be investigated in more detail.

1.3 Study Objective

This study aims to clarify the effectiveness and tasks of designated administration through a JV for city parks by investigating the background of JV establishment, the advantages and disadvantages of its establishment for city park administration, and constituent parties.

2. METHODS

2.1 Study Target

For this study, a JV is defined as an administrative organization composed of multiple juristic persons and/or other parties. However, a single cooperative society is not treated as a JV. This study targets DAs as JVs in large city parks, where the collaboration of various parties is necessary, specifically large parks (recreation cities and wide-area parks) and parks in cities (general parks and athletic parks) in accordance with the definition by the MLIT. By analysing the data of MLIT, as of March 2014, the total number of large-sized parks and parks in cities was 1,223 across the country; the number of DAs for those parks was 993. Among these, the number of parks administered by a JV was 190 (15.6 %), and 158 (15.9 %) were administered by JV DAs.

2.2 Questionnaire Survey

In August 2015, 132 of the 158 JV DAs for large city parks were identified as DAs that had continued working after the MLIT’s survey in March 2014. If a DA administered multiple parks, one park was randomly selected for this survey. From October to November 2015, participation in the questionnaire survey was requested by telephone, and responses were obtained by email or fax from a person responsible at each DA. Questionnaires were distributed to 110 DAs, and responses were received from 69 (62.7% response rate). The cover rate in study targets was 43.7 % (69 of 158 DAs), which was deemed substantial for the analysis.

The questions were set by referring to the reports on designated administration through a JV in general (Japan Research Institute for Local Government (JRILG), 2008b; Saito, 2007), and by conducting interviews with three JV DAs in September 2015. The main questions other than to obtain basic information about a DA were as follows and summarized in Figure 1:
Q5–Q7. Background of becoming a DA by constituting a JV

Q5. Reasons for becoming a DA by constituting a JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) to achieve better administration
(2) to make constituent parties eligible to be a DA
(3) to avoid scrambling for one seat in the DA
(4) to follow the instructions of local government

Q6. The appeal of constituting a JV in the DA selection process (multiple answers allowed)
(1) stability of the organization (size of organization, financial condition)
(2) stability of administration (financial flexibility, administration feasibility)
(3) facility and planting maintenance
(4) event planning
(5) crisis management

Q7. Relationship of a representative party with constituent parties of a JV
before constituting the JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) accepting and ordering relationship
(2) subsidiary or group companies
(3) members of cooperative society
(4) no relationship

Q10–Q12. Effects of constituting a JV for designated administration

Q10. Advantages of designated administration by constituting a JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) complement limited know-how
(2) reduce operating risks
(3) reduce administration costs by sharing specialized areas of each constituent party
(4) utilize the links with other groups of each constituent party
(5) interchange of ideas from objective viewpoints
(6) increase motivation of constituent parties

Q11. Disadvantages of designated administration by constituting a JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) difficult to manage confidential information of a constituent party
(2) takes more time to make decisions
(3) sharing of roles tends to result in vertically divided administration
(4) increased administrative cost to provide profits
(5) differences in the motivation of each constituent party

Q12. Creation of a new event by collaborating with constituent parties in a JV by utilizing the strength of each party (yes or no option)
Q12.1. Details of the new project if Q12 was answered “yes”

Q13–Q14. Effects of constituting a JV on constituent parties

Q13. Advantages for constituent parties of constituting a JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) accumulate new know-how
(2) increase social status
(3) secure income
(4) human resources development
(5) can be a DA even if a constituent party does not have total park administration ability
(6) can be a DA even if the financial flexibility of a constituent party is poor
Q14. Disadvantages for constituent parties of constituting a JV (multiple answers allowed)
(1) requires same working conditions as other constituent parties
(2) different responsibility from trustee of commissioned business
(3) decreased profit
(4) require continuous presence of workers in a park

Figure 1. Relationships among questionnaire items

2.3 Analysis of Response Pattern

A cluster analysis of responses to Q5–Q7, Q10–Q12, and Q13–Q14 was conducted using the Ward method and Euclidian distance with SPSS Statistics ver.22 (IBM, Corp.) in order to classify JVs having different response patterns. JVs that did not respond to all questions were excluded from this analysis. Then, Chi-squared tests were conducted for each question to investigate trends in the responses of each cluster. If the expected frequencies in the Chi-squared tests included a cell of less than five, Fisher’s exact test was applied instead of the Chi-squared test. To analyse the relationship between the response pattern and organizational characteristics of JVs, Fisher’s exact test and Welch’s t-test were applied to the proportion of representative parties that were specialized in park management, and to years of experience as a DA before constituting a JV, respectively. The level of significance was set at \( p < 0.05 \) in the statistical tests.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Basic Information of DAs as JVs

The number of constituent parties in a JV was 2.8 ± 1.0 parties, ranging from 2 to 6 parties (n = 66). Regarding the organization types of the constituent parties of the JVs, 28 were public service organizations (15.0%), 140 private companies (77%), and 13 non-profit organizations (7.2%) (n = 181 (constituent parties of 66 JVs)).

The areas of specialization of constituent parties were landscape construction (60 parties, 27.6%), park management (39 parties, 18.0%), sports (33 parties, 15.2%), building maintenance (29 parties, 13.4%), and others (n = 181 (constituent parties of 66 JVs), multiple answers allowed, Figure 2). Areas of specialization of representative parties in JVs were park
management (30 parties, 35.3%), landscape construction (23 parties, 27.1%),
sports (10 parties, 11.8%), and others (n=62, multiple answers allowed,
Figure 3).
Years of experience as a DA before constituting a JV of constituent
parties were widely distributed (5.5 ± 3.6 years) (Mean ± S.D., n= 120
constituent parties of 53 JVs), ranging from 0 to 12 years. Years after
constituting the JV were also widely distributed (5.3 ± 2.9 years) (Mean ±
S.D., n= 67), ranging from 1 to 12 years.

![Specialized Areas of Constituent Parties](image)

**Figure 2.** Specialized areas of constituent parties (n=66 JVs, multiple answers allowed)

![Specialized Areas of Representative Parties](image)

**Figure 3.** Specialized areas of representative parties (n=62 JVs, multiple answers allowed)
3.2 Background of Becoming a DA by Constituting a JV

Regarding the reasons for becoming a DA by constituting a JV (Q5), 91.0% of JVs chose “(1) to achieve better administration,” indicating that most were established to ensure effective park administration (Figure 4). In addition, 29.9% of JVs chose “(2) to make constituent parties eligible to be a DA,” indicating that a single party was sometimes not enough to conduct park administration.

Regarding the appeal of constituting a JV in the DA selection process (Q6), practical aspects of park administration such as “(3) facility and planting maintenance” (71.2%) and “(4) event planning” (63.6%) were more emphasized than organizational aspects such as the “(1) stability of the organization” (39.4%) and “(2) stability of administration” (28.8%) (Figure 5).

Regarding the relationship of a representative party with constituent parties of a JV before its constitution (Q7), more responses were received for “(4) no relationship before composing the JV” (57.8%) than cases with some relationships such as “(1) accepting and ordering relationship” (35.9%) or “(2) subsidiary or group companies” (14.1%) (Figure 6).

![Figure 4. Reasons for becoming a DA by constituting a JV (Q5, n=67)](image)

![Figure 5. Appeal of constituting a JV in the DA selection process (Q6, n=66)](image)
3.3 Effects of Constituting a JV on Designated Administration

Regarding the advantages for designated administration by constituting a JV (Q10), 81.5% agreed with “(1) complement limited know-how”, indicating that constituent parties in a JV often lack some know-how of park administration and that a JV can supplement the gap (Figure 7). As for financial aspects, the score for “(3) reduce administration costs by sharing specialized areas of each constituent party” was relatively high (58.5%) (Figure 7).

Regarding the disadvantages of constituting a JV for designated administration (Q11), most responses noted “(3) sharing roles tends to vertically divide administration” (42.1%) as the greatest demerit (Figure 8). Regarding financial aspects, 21.1% of JVs chose “(4) increase administrative cost to provide profits” (Figure 8).

Regarding the creation of a new event through collaboration with constituent parties (Q12), 56.3% responded “yes” (Figure 9). Furthermore, 34 examples of new projects were provided (Q12.1) including sports classes, sports competitions, field music festivals, and seasonal festival events.

Figure 7. Advantages of constituting a JV for designated administration (Q10, n=65)

Figure 6. Relationship with constituent parties of a JV before its constitution (Q7, n=64)
Figure 8. Disadvantages of constituting a JV for designated administration (Q11, n=57)

Figure 9. Creation of a new event by collaborating with constituent parties (Q12, n=64)

3.4 Effects of Composing a JV on Constituent Parties

Regarding the advantages for constituent parties of constituting a JV (Q13), the most responses were received for “(1) accumulate new know-how” (79.4%) (Figure 10). In addition, more responses indicated “(5) can be a DA even if a constituent party does not have total park administration ability” (27.0%) than “(6) can be a DA even if the financial flexibility of a constituent party is poor” (4.8%), indicating that administrative ability was more important than financial ability to become a DA (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Advantages for constituent parties of constituting a JV (Q13, n=63)
Regarding disadvantages of constituting a JV for constituent parties (Q14), most chose “(2) different responsibility from trustee of commissioned business” (37.3%) and “(3) decreased profit” (37.3%) (Figure 11).

![Figure 11. Disadvantages for constituent parties of constituting a JV (Q14, n=51)](image)

### 3.5 Characteristics of the Response Pattern

From the cluster analysis of responses to Q5–Q7 (Background of becoming a DA by constituting a JV), Q10–Q12 (Effects of constituting a JV on designated administration), and Q13–Q14 (Effects of constituting a JV on constituent parties), two clusters, namely Group A (21 JVs) and Group B (26 JVs), were identified by considering the interpretability of the characteristics of each cluster (Figure 12). Group B contains significantly more JVs that have a representative party specialized in park management (16 of 26 JVs) than Group A (4 of 21 JVs) (Fisher’s exact test, \( p = 0.007 \)). Years of experience as a DA before constituting a JV were not significantly different between the two groups (Welch’s t-test, \( p = 0.159 \)); however, Group B had a tendency to contain JVs with longer experience as a DA than Group A did (Group A: 4.0 ± 4.0 years, Group B: 5.7 ± 2.7 years, Mean ± S.D.). The statistically significant response trend of the two groups is summarized in Table 1.

![Figure 12. Results of the cluster analysis of JVs (n=47)](image)
Table 1. Question items in which statistically significant differences were found between Group A and Group B

| Question Items                                   | Group A | Group B | p value* |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|
| Q5 (1) to achieve better administration         | ○       |         | 0.013    |
| Q6 (2) stability of administration              | ○       |         | 0.002    |
| Q6 (5) crisis management                        | ○       |         | 0.049    |
| Q7 (1) accepting and ordering relationship      | ○       |         | 0.036    |
| Q7 (4) no relationship                          | ○       |         | 0.000    |
| Q11 (4) increased administrative costs to provide profits | ○       |         | 0.014    |
| Q12 creation of a new event by collaborating    | ○       |         | 0.000    |
| Q13 (1) accumulate new know-how                 | ○       |         | 0.036    |
| Q13 (2) increase social status                  | ○       |         | 0.039    |

○ indicates that the option was more frequently chosen in that group
*: Chi-squared test, or Fisher’s exact test when expected frequencies in the Chi-squared test included a cell of less than five

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Background of Becoming a DA by Constituting a JV

When constituting a JV, DAs considered more practical aspects of park administration than financial aspects (Figure 5). Furthermore, the results for Q7 (Figure 6) indicate that constituent parties actively searched for cooperation with new parties they had never interacted with before to constitute the JV to achieve better park administration (Figure 4). In general, undesirable aspects of privatization, being the pursuit of too much profit, were not observed.

4.2 Effects of Constituting a JV on Designated Administration

Overall, the choice rates of advantages (Figure 7) tended to be higher than those of disadvantages (Figure 8), indicating that the advantages of constituting a JV exceed the disadvantages for the designated administration of city parks. However, the creation of a new event by collaborating with constituent parties was 56.3% (Figure 9), indicating that not enough JVs demonstrate a synergistic effect among constituent parties.

The most selected disadvantage of constituting a JV for designated administration was that it vertically divided administration through sharing roles (Figure 8), indicating that differences in areas of specialization sometimes cause vertically divided administration. Effective administration can be ensured by promoting communication among constituent parties (Japan Research Institute for Local Government (JRILG), 2008a). Setting a place to confirm the direction of park administration and regularly discussing how each party can contribute seems important in avoiding vertically divided administration.

Regarding financial aspects, while a relatively high number (58.5%) selected the reduction of administration costs by sharing the specialized areas of each constituent party as an advantage (Figure 7), increasing administrative costs to provide profits (21.1%) was also a notable disadvantage (Figure 8). This indicates that in many cases, decreasing
administration costs can be achieved by constituting a JV, although administration costs may increase to secure profits for each constituent party.

4.3 Effects of Constituting a JV on Constituent Parties

Regarding the effects of constituting a JV on constituent parties, accumulating new know-how was indicated most (79.4%) (Figure 10). This trend was similar to the advantages of the designated administration of city parks (Figure 7) and a previous report on the designated administration of public facilities in general by Saito (2007). The accumulation of know-how in constituent parties seems important to privatized park administration in the long term, because private companies can learn how to provide non-profitable public services to parks, and public service corporations can learn how to make a profit while improving user satisfaction.

4.4 Characteristics of the Two Groups Identified in the Cluster Analysis

For Q11, the JVs in Group A more frequently selected “(4) increase administrative cost to provide profits” and for Q13, “(2) increase social status.” For Q5, this group less frequently responded “(1) to achieve better administration” than Group B (Table 1). Although 75% of the JVs in Group A chose “(1) to achieve better administration” for Q5, this group seemed more sensitive to securing profits and increasing social status with the aim of survival and the development of constituent parties. Because Group A indicated that they less frequently created a new event through collaboration (Q12) (Table 1), a longer time is needed to accumulate know-how to realize survival and the development of constituent parties, as well as effective park administration.

Group B contained significantly more JVs with a representative party specialized in park management ($p = 0.007$), and had a tendency to contain JVs with longer experience as a DA ($p = 0.159$) than Group A did. For Q5, Group B more frequently responded “(1) to achieve better administration” (Table 1). Group B contained more JVs with a representative party specialized in park management and more JVs that had accepted and ordered relationships before constituting the JV (Q7 (1)) (Table 1). JVs in Group B tended to more frequently create a new event by collaborating (Q12) and accumulate new know-how (Q13 (1)) (Table 1), possibly because representative parties specialized in park management supported constituent parties by utilizing their rich experience in park administration.

JVs that do not have enough experience in park administration need to be supported by local government departments through consultation and confirmation of administration work with the DA (Imanishi & Nakamura, 2016). In addition, constituting a JV with a representative party with rich experience in park management promotes the accumulation of know-how of city park administration and provides an environment in which they can easily collaborate on new projects.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This was the first study clarifying the effectiveness and tasks of the designated administration of city parks by JVs by clarifying the motivation
and background for constituting JVs and their advantages and disadvantages for city park administration and the constituent parties.

It was found that JVs tended to be constituted by actively seeking a new relationship with parties that have never interacted before to realize better park administration. Furthermore, constituting a JV often had advantages in terms of complementing limited know-how on park administration and accumulating new know-how through constituent parties.

On the other hand, some disadvantages were pointed out, such as insufficient creation of new projects through collaboration and vertically divided administration through role sharing. To cope with these problems, better communication among constituent parties seems necessary. In addition, the park administration costs as a whole are not always reduced by constituting a JV, because of the necessity of securing profits in each party. The response pattern indicated that a responsible department needs to support JVs with less experience in park administration.

Overall, because the advantages were more frequently selected than disadvantages, it is considered that this study demonstrated the effectiveness of constituting a JV for city park designated administration. In the future, improving administrative aspects such as avoiding vertically divided administration and establishing a collaborative environment to achieve effective park administration from both practical and economic perspectives is expected.
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