

Decision-Making in the Public Sector: Miaoli County Dapu Farmland Expropriation Case Study*

Edward K. Hwang**

** Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration, Chung Hua University, President, Taiwan
Public Opinion Study Association

Abstract

Decision-making is the study of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values and preferences of the decision-maker. Decision-making is also the process of sufficiently reducing uncertainty and doubt about alternatives to allow a reasonable choice to be made **Research methods used** *in this study include naturalistic (unobtrusive) observation and case study.*

The Miaoli County Government (MCG) carried out an urban planning which intended to expand the Jhunan base of Hsinchu Science Park and designated areas on the periphery of the Jhunan base; hence, they needed to confiscate the land by zone expropriation. The Innolux Corporation requested the MCG to expand 4.98 hectares of land allocation at March 13, 2008, therefore, MCG formulated the "Hsinchu Science Park Chunan base area around a specific area expand plan". However, Taichung High Administrative Court (THAC) issues a judgment that the demolition of 4 houses by the MCG on July 17, 2013 is illegal. Therefore, THAC sentenced the 4 house owners won and their land expropriation must be revoked; other 20 house owners' appeal was dismissed. But the Chang pharmacy and 22 householders delegated a lawyer to appeal at January 29, 2014. This appeal causes the Dapu land expropriation case undetermined yet and the judicial process must go through all over again.

*Comparing the decision-making theories and the Miaoli Dapu farmland expropriation case shows that the organization process model and bureaucratic politics model by Alison (1971) explain largely the decision-making in the Dapu farmland expropriation. The organizational SOPs and power **do** matter, and most decisions in Dapu farmland expropriation are made based on organizational process and political power rather than rationality.*

Key Words: decision-making, Taiwan, organizational process model, governmental politics model, political decision model

I. Introduction

A decision is an act of making up one's mind to decide or settle a dispute or question. It can be defined by the acts or options among which one must choose, the possible outcomes or consequences of these acts, and the contingencies or conditional probabilities that relate outcomes to acts. A decision involves choosing one alternative amongst a set of alternatives. The decision process involves both thought and action culminating in **the** act of **choosing**, and there are two basic dimensions of decision-making: uncertainty registration and

commitment to action (Bass, 1983: 3; Buelens & Hooland, 1987: 102). Therefore, decisions are the results of applying judgmental criteria to a set of alternatives for the purpose of choosing (a single course of action). People have to make decisions all the time. Some we make on our own, some in small groups, and others in large agglomerations of people. Sometimes the costs of these decisions, in terms of information gathered and thought given to weighing alternatives and choosing among them, can be very high. Politics is expensive because the costs of decision are high (Munger, 2000: 163-4).

Public decision-making behavior is the authoritative allocation of responsibility and resources between actors and levels in the political-administrative system. Public decisions can be defined as those where my choices affect your welfare; private decisions are then choices that affect only my welfare; individual decisions are those where I can choose on my own, while collective decisions are made by a group, using some choice rule, and are binding on all (Munger, 2000: 47-8).

Decision-makers, whether individuals or organizational units, have problems of capacity and with coping with large quantities of information and varieties of premises (Christensen, 2003: 110). Therefore, decision-making is the study of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values and preferences of the decision-maker. Decision-making is also the process of sufficiently reducing uncertainty and doubt about alternatives to allow a reasonable choice to be made from among them. There are several basic kinds of decisions: decisions whether, decisions which, and contingent decisions (Harris, 1998).

The decision environment is defined as the collection of information, alternatives, values, and preferences available at the time of the decision. Since decisions must be made within the constrained environment, the major challenge of decision-making is uncertainty, and a major goal of decision analysis is to reduce uncertainty (Harris, 1998). The decision situation often involves uncontrollable factors and many consequences. So, decision theory is a body of knowledge concerned with the nature and process of decision-making. Decision theory abstracts given situations into a structured problem, which calls for the decision-maker to make an objective judgment. McKenna (1980: 61-2) argued that decision theory provides a method for rational decision-making when the consequences are not fully known. Decision-makers apply various criteria to decision situations. For specific criteria, decision theory identifies the best alternative. When the criteria are vaguely defined, or not unanimously held in group situations, decision theory provides a framework for evaluating alternatives. The role of decision theory in decision-making is two-fold: first, it provides a framework for better understanding the decision situation, and second, it can furnish a way to evaluate alternatives in light of the uncertainty.

As Simon *et al.* (1986:1) argued that the work of managers, of scientists, of engineers—the work that steers the course of society and its economic and governmental organizations—is largely work of making decisions and solving problems. It is work of choosing issues that require attention, setting goals, finding or designing suitable courses of action, and evaluating and choosing among alternative actions. The first three of these activities—fixing agendas, setting goals, and designing actions—are usually called “problem solving”; the last, evaluating and choosing, is usually called “decision-making.” Nothing is more important for the well-being of society than that this work be performed effectively.

What is the decision-making function? On one level, we all use decision-making daily in confronting a myriad of personal choices, such as when to get up in the morning and what clothes to wear. On the larger and more complicated level of public administration, the decisional process involves vital community or

societal choices-where to build a new school, when to negotiate an arms limitation treaty, or how to organize a new federal program for poverty relief. The process of choice runs the length and breadth of public administration and involves 4, 40, 400, or 4000 steps, depending on the complexity and range of variables presented by the problem at hand (Stillman, 1996: 234).

Kraan (1996) argued there must be decision rule, which determines how collective decisions are taken in a collective household in budgetary decision process. In order to coordinate its members, a collective household needs decision rule that specify how binding collective decisions are to be made. For this purpose, these rules not only indicate how collective decisions are to be derived from sets of individual decisions, but also whose individual decisions have to be taken into account to begin with.

In term of power and conflict within organizations, Lawton and Rose (1991) argue we can approach decision-making from three dimensions as Lukes (1974) suggested:

(1) Pluralist view as Dahl (1961) focused upon the making of decisions over which there was an observable conflict of opinion. Power is fragmented between the different groups involved in the decision-making process since different groups got their way on different issues.

(2) Bachrach and Baratz (1962) argued that some groups could consciously or unconsciously put up barriers to the public discussion of issues. We need to be aware of the power of the group or individual who decides what is discussed in the first place.

(3) Lukes (1974) argued a person or group may have power by shaping beliefs, values and desires. The power of advertising is such that we believe that our lives will be unbearable unless we possess the latest dishwasher, video recorder or television set. This is the most insidious form of power in that we can be manipulated into a course of action or believing in a set of values without realizing it.

II. Literature review

The mainstream theories of decision-making include rationalism, incrementalism, governmental politics, political decision, and contingency. They will be discussed as following respectively:

1. Rational model

Decision-making is a critical feature of public administration. Traditionally, of central concern to decision-making in public administration is the degree to which the tenets of rationality can be applied, given the dynamic character of the public administrative environment. These tenets, derived from rational theory, embrace the notion of economic motivation as a centerpiece to both describe human actions and decisions as well as to predict such actions (Meek, 2007: 349). Rationalism is the practice of accepting reason as the only authority in determining one's opinion or a course of action. But what is rationality? Ordeshook (1986) stated completely in "Positive Political Theory". On one hand, rationality is the origin of human civilizations; on the other hand, it also makes us puzzle. If men are rational, why are there so many conflicts and endless wars? Or are wars another type of rationality?

Rational behavior is to arrange its preferences in some logical pattern; it is a goal-directed behavior, which entails an attempt to gain a benefit. Rationality assumption asserts that there is something about people that make them behave (usually) in a regular way. In social science, it is the fundamental element for generalization.

Most models of decision-making under comprehensive rationality are based on three fundamental

assumptions. First, all possible states of the world facing decision-makers can be ranked in regard to desirability. Second, decision-makers know the connection between the strategies they may choose from and desired goals, or evaluated states, of the world. Third, decision-makers optimize. That is, they choose the strategy that brings about the largest total amount of satisfaction to them (Jones, 1994: 37-38).

The actor in a rational decision model goes through a sequence of steps: (1) defining goals; (2) imagining alternative means for attaining them; (3) evaluating the consequences of taking each course of action; and (4) choosing the alternative most likely to attain the goal (Stone, 2002: 233). Marshall and Oliver (1995) argue that the term **decision-making** is very broad, encompassing a wide range of possible topics, from a simple choice between two alternatives, each with known certain outcomes, to an axiomatic mathematical logic found in texts on statistical decision theory.

Clemen (1996: 607-8) argues that decision analysis can help with such **difficult** decisions. The cycle of structuring the decision, modeling uncertainty and preferences, analyzing and then performing sensitivity analysis can lead a decision-maker systematically through the issues that make the decision complicated and toward a requisite decision model, one that captures all of the essential elements of the problem. What considerations do managers feel important when they analyze decisions? Rowe and Boulgarides (1992: 23) provide 10 important factors to make good decisions: Perception, Tolerance, Rationality, Integrity, Commitment, Innovation, Compulsive, Openness, Leadership, and Risk-taking.

The decision analysis process could be set as five steps (Murger, 2000: 310-1):

- (1) Convert from “uncertainty” to “risk” by assigning probabilities to outcomes, or to the results from intermediate steps between choices and outcomes.
- (2) Identify a set of outcomes that (a) are mutually exclusive, (b) exhaust the set of possibilities, and (c) correspond to the model of cause and effect to be employed in the decision analysis.
- (3) For the policy being evaluated, or the decision being considered, estimate the value of the outcome if it came to pass.
- (4) Assign probabilities to each of the mutually exclusive outcomes, using the appropriate “intersection” or “union” of events to specify the sequence of intermediate steps which lead to that outcome.
- (5) Multiply the estimated values of each outcome by the probabilities of the sequence of events which could lead to that outcome to obtain an “expected value” for each feasible course of action.

Harris (1998) provides four **decision-making** strategies:

- (1) Optimizing. Choosing the best possible solution to the problem, discovering as many alternatives as possible and choosing the very best.
- (2) Satisfying. The first satisfactory alternative is chosen rather than the best alternative.
- (3) Maximax. Focusing on evaluating and then choosing the alternatives based on their maximum possible payoff.
- (4) Maximin. The worst possible outcome of each decision is considered and the decision with the highest minimum is chosen.

How to test the goals and consistency of rationality? Because posited goals reveal transitive orderings and posited transitivity reveals preference. We must measure the rational behavior back and forth between these two approaches.

Golub (1997: 8-12) provides ten cyclical steps of the rational model: set agenda: prior to performing any

decision analysis, define problem: the difference between a current and some preferred situation, identify objectives: identifying the underlying reason(s) for addressing the problem, identify alternatives: identifying a group of reasonable responses to the problem, forecast: the choice among alternatives must be guided by a vision, compare: the analyst has enough information to compare the forecast for each alternative, select: the transition between the decision analysis and administrative phase of the rational model, implement: a process of converting a variety of inputs into the solution of a problem, monitor: the oversight employed to ensure that a decision has the greatest possible chance of achieving its desired effect by making sure it is correctly implemented, and evaluate: to identify the extent to which the original problem was resolved.

In brief, [decision-making](#) procedure includes: (1) identify the decision to be made together with the goals it should achieve; (2) get the facts; (3) develop alternatives; (4) rate each alternative; (5) rate the risk of each alternative; and (6) make the decision. However, [decision-making](#) is a nonlinear, recursive process. That is, most decisions are made by moving back and forth between the choice of criteria and the identification of alternatives (Harris, 1998).

The rational model had its shortcomings; there was a lack of adequate information of policy options, there were competing values to maximize, there was the avoidance of values in developing decision options, there was the intertwining of means and ends, and there was the lack of time for proper data gathering and scrutiny of decision options (Meek, 2007:349). Some scholars criticize the rational model. Two main criticisms are Simon's ([1986](#)) "Satisfying model" and Lindblom's ([1979](#)) "Incremental model". Yes, men are not God, they could not be comprehensive rational. But everybody has [multiple](#) goals. It is also rational to achieve his main goal at the cost of abandoning other sub-goals.

Prescriptive theories of choice such as SEU (subjective expected utility) are complemented by empirical research that shows how people actually make decisions. What chiefly distinguishes the empirical research on [decision-making](#) and problem-solving from the prescriptive approaches derived from SEU theory is the attention that the former gives to the limits on human rationality. These limits are imposed by the complexity of the world in which we live, the incompleteness and inadequacy of human knowledge, the inconsistencies of individual preference and belief, the conflicts of value among people and groups of people, and the inadequacy of the computations we can carry out, even with the aid of the most powerful computers. The real world of human decisions is not a world of ideal gases, frictionless planes, or vacuums. In a world of limited rationality, economics and other decision sciences must closely examine the actual limits on rationality in order to make accurate predictions and to provide sound advice on public policy (Simon [et. al.](#), 1986).

2. Lindblom's incrementalism model

Lindblom (1959) describes a decision-making process in which policies typically emerge from a process of mutual adjustment between organized interests, with limited analysis of alternatives and frequent mixing of means and ends. Articulation of clear and well-ordered goals was the exception rather than the rule. Lindblom offers what he saw as a more realistic model of most public policy making than his contemporary "rational-comprehensive" theorists. Lindblom's focus was mainly on [decision-making](#) itself rather than outputs or outcomes.

Lately, Lindblom (1979) advances to distinguish between three elements:

(1) incremental politics: the process of changing outputs and outcomes cautiously, in small steps;(2)

incremental analysis: the process of analyzing policy problems one at a time, in an ad hoc manner, rather than attempting grandiose, synoptic or comprehensive reviews; and (3) partisan mutual adjustment (PMA): a process of political [decision-making](#) which is fragmented and/or decentralized, and the resultant “policies” are the amalgam of attempts at mutual persuasion by the main stakeholders, rather than the decision of a single, unitary body.

3. Allison’s governmental politics model

Allison (1971) explained the Cuban missile crisis by comparing three models to find out [the](#) essence of decisions. He offered three competing models of [decision-making](#): rational actor, organizational process, and governmental (bureaucratic) politics. Each model pointed to different perspectives that could explain [decision-making](#) and policy choice during the Cuban missile crisis. In the rational actor model, analysts can explain and predict the behavior of national governments in terms of value-maximizing behavior, and governmental action is the choice with regard to objectives. In the organizational process model, the decisions are limited as a result of the existing organizational routines and physical capabilities that constitute the effective options open to address any particular problem and governmental action is in short run largely determined by present SOPs and programs, in longer run, importantly affected by organizational goals, SOPs, etc. Among the questions posed by the organizational process paradigm are:

- (1) Of what organizations (and organizational components) does the government consist?
- (2) Which organizations traditionally act on a problem of this sort and with what relative influence?
- (3) What repertoires, programs, and SOPs do these organizations have for making information about the problem available at various decision points in the government?
- (4) What repertoires, programs, and SOPs do these organizations have for generating alternatives about a problem of this sort?
- (5) What repertoires, programs, and SOPs do these organizations have for implementing alternative courses of action?

The bureaucratic politics model points to decision options that are shaped by the leaders who sit [at the](#) top of organizations, who in their own right are players in a central, competitive game, and governmental behavior is understood as outcomes of [the](#) bargaining games.

In fact, the governmental politics model poses five questions:

- (1) What are the existing action channels for producing actions on this kind of problem?
- (2) Which players in what positions are centrally involved?
- (3) How do pressures of job, past stances, and personality affect the central players on the issue?
- (4) What deadlines will force the issue to resolution?
- (5) Where are foul-ups likely?

Therefore, the contributions of rational actor and organizational process to our analyses, explanations, and predictions of public affairs are considerable. But after Allison checked Robert Kennedy’s last account of the Cuban crisis (Thirteen Days: A Memoir of the Cuban Crisis), he averred that the governmental politics model can explain thoroughly the realistic Cuban crisis. On the other hand, Li and Wang (2009) conduct an empirical test on the votes in U.S. congress’ decision on whether to grant China the PNTR status in 2000, under a framework of political economy of trade policy. It analyzes which factors affecting the

congressional members voting behavior and to find out [the](#) magnitudes of these factors influences and also finds that the voting results [are](#) the equilibrated outcome of interactions between the government and interest groups.

Besides, Steinbruner (1974), one of Allison's colleagues in the Bureaucracy Research Seminar, presented the fourth conceptual mode—The Cybernetic Paradigm, it emphasized [decision-makers](#) respond automatically to the environment. Steinbruner categorized decision-making into: (1). [analytic](#) paradigm and (2). [cybernetic](#) paradigm, just as Christopher Alexander [\(1964\)](#) mentioned “self-conscious” and “unself-conscious”.

Analytic paradigm, like rational model, is highly self-conscious, highly calculated. Cybernetic paradigm is just like organizational process model submitted by Allison, organizations will develop the standard operating procedures (organizational routine) to respond to the environmental varieties, and it must get the abilities of controlling uncertainty, reducing varieties, simplifying the environment, and fragmenting complex decisions into simpler components treated separately by way of the cognitive processes and instrumental learning processes.

As Steinbruner (1974) argued, the tension between adaptive capacity and internal simplicity is in fact a drama of cybernetic analysis. Because cybernetic paradigm combines organizations and their environments, organizations interact with their environments very frequently, they can respond simply, unself-consciously, and directly to their environments by marginal adjustments.

Wiarda (1996: 13-4) examines some of the problems and dilemmas in US foreign policy-making. He provides also some models of American foreign policy-making:

- (1) Rational actor model [implies](#) a single actor, presumably the president in the American system, making a rational choice on the basis of complete information and clear options.
- (2) Bureaucratic politics model: the decision result is frequent conflicts between some of the main agencies of the US government.
- (3) Organizational model: not only do the agencies of the US- government have different bureaucratic interests but they also have different “cultures” within the organization; their differing and sometimes clashing SOPs make the carrying out of foreign policy very difficult.
- (4) Political process model refers to all the vote trading, the logrolling, and the political payoffs that are involved in foreign policy decisions.
- (5) Self-aggrandizement model refers to the all-consuming efforts by many legislators, and perhaps by all politicians, to advance their own political careers and self-interests above all other considerations.

4. Stone's Political Decision Model

Stone (2002) provides a political [decision-making](#) model. In the polis, authority on issues of any significance is usually dispersed, shared, negotiated, and constantly contested. Most policy issues involve questions of who has the power to decide. Statements of goals are not only wishes and intentions; they are means of gathering political support. Being ambiguous about one's intentions leaves a policymaker wiggle room in the future. The inescapable ambiguity of political goals means that they are more like moving targets than fixed standards.

The second step of the decision model, selecting alternative actions for consideration, is no less complicated

in the polis. Controlling the number and kinds of alternatives considered is the essence of the political game. In the polis, the way language affects people is undeniably a valid part of human experience. Symbols can combine and reconcile seemingly contradictory alternatives and thereby make possible a new range of options. The deliberated ambiguous actions are a staple of the political world, because ambiguity permits a leader to escape difficult tradeoffs.

Moving to the third step in the decision model, evaluating the consequences of actions, we encounter another disjunction between the model and the polis. What the rational model conceives as abstract costs and benefits are in politics losses and gains to real people. The distribution of consequences plays a critical role in step 4 of the model, the choice among alternatives. The politician pretends to be responsive to everyone, but is more responsive to organized constituencies. For better or for worse, most of the policy choices are made by logrolling among powerful groups who trade support for policies that benefit the few at the expense of the many. Political actors are dedicated to showing that a favored course of action benefits the society as a whole and imposes costs on no one in particular.

5. The Contingency Approach

Smith and May (1997: 172) discuss incrementalist and rationalist models as well as attempts to provide a 'third' alternative. They imply a commitment to an adequate explanatory account of decision-making practices in the policy process as a precursor to prescriptions about how decisions ought to be made. They imply too the need for empirical studies of what decision-makers mean by decision-making and how that varies in the varied contexts in which policy arises and gains practical effect.

Decisions are made in a context of ambiguity and uncertainty wherein "this is not to be just a process by which the institution adapts to its environment, but a process by which the institution and the environment adapt to each other". It is decision-making by what is termed "loose coupling," meaning that "To deal with complex, confusing, inconsistent and ambiguous environments, complex organizations decentralize, delegate, and contract out" (Frederickson & Smith, 2003:175-77).

In rationalism's final vocabulary, no idea is more deeply entrenched than that of decision. The selection of the decisions as the primary unit of organizational analysis presupposes a particular set of beliefs about the purpose of and relation between thought and action (Harmon, 1995: 174-5). The types of problems in decision-making situations often determine how a problem is treated, and then the types of decision should reflect the characteristics of the problem. Some problems are straightforward: the goal of the decision-maker is clear, the problem familiar, and information about this problem easily defined and complete. They are called well-structured problems. However, many decision situations are ill-structured problems, since they are new or unusual, and the information about such problems is ambiguous or incomplete.

Just as problems can be divided into two categories, decisions can also be divided into programmed or non-programmed. Programmed decision, a repetitive decision that can be handled by a routine approach, is the most efficient way to handle well-structured problems. It is relatively simple and tends to rely heavily on previous solutions. While non-programmed decision that must be custom-made to solve unique and nonrecurring problems, is required when a manager confronts an ill-structured problem.

In addition, every decision-maker brings a unique set of personal characteristics to his or her problem-solving efforts. Robbins (1995) has sought to identify different decision-making styles. The basic

premise for Robbins' model is the realization that individuals differ along two dimensions. The first is the way they think, logically (rationally) or creatively (intuitively), and the second dimension focuses on individuals' tolerance for ambiguity. If someone has a high need for consistency and order in making decisions, then the ambiguity is minimized. Therefore, four decision-making styles could be formed: directive, analytic, conceptual, and behavioral.

The directive style represents a decision-making style characterized by low tolerance for ambiguity and a rational way of thinking. These [decision-makers](#) are logical, efficient, and make fast decisions, which focus on the short run. The analytical style is famous for their high tolerance for ambiguity combined with a rational way of thinking. They prefer complete information before making decision and carefully consider many alternatives. The conceptual style of decision-making tends to be very broad in outlook and typically will look at many alternatives, and then they tend to focus on the long run and often look for creative solutions. The behavioral style reflects those who think intuitively but have a low tolerance for uncertainty. They work well with others, are open to suggestions, and concern about the individuals who work for them.

Oettinger and Price (1978) argued policy-making in the United States is not a tidy matter. Few issues are decided by fiat. In some democracies, such as those with parliamentary structures, the leader of the government has prior assurance that the legislators will back his or her policies. In the United States, the President must persuade the Congress that a position is correct, whether or not a majority of the Congress is of the same political party as the President. Because of the Constitution's system of checks and balances- its divisions of power- policy is often a reconciliation of differences, a distillation of compromise. In most matters, public policies reflect a consensus of views. Hua (2009) based on analysis of questionnaires concerning the public policy decision in Tianjin government and public organizations and concludes that in the public policy making process, public servants are influenced by many factors both from inside and outside, which result in different decision-making behaviors and the performance of the public policy.

III. Case study: the decision-making process of Dapu farmland expropriation in Miaoli County

Miaoli is in the pivotal position of the Asia-Pacific region. Miaoli County (MC) is located in the mid-northern coast of western Taiwan. She faces Taiwan Strait in the west and her coastlines are about 54 kilometers. The revised development plan of MC focuses on four dimensions: production, ecology, life, and transportation. Miaoli County Government (hereafter as MCG) comes up with three major enterprises in the two dimensions of production and ecology. Transportation takes into account of both the whole county perspective and living perimeters to build a matrix road network. MCG also plans to build extensive transportation network for convenient commuting and daily shopping need. Her future goal is to find out her own niche and protect environment simultaneously.

The MCG carried out an urban planning which intended to expand the Jhunan base of Hsinchu Science Park and designated areas on the periphery of the Jhunan base; hence, they needed to confiscate the land by zone expropriation. After 98 percent of the landowners agreed on the zone expropriation and applied for compensation on land expropriation, the MCG conducted the land preparation on June 9, 2010. In the meanwhile, whether the rest of Dapu farmers agreed or not, the MCG forcibly expropriated their farmland to

build the construction of public facilities. What makes matters worse is that some of the farmland was nearly ripe rice for harvest; nevertheless, it was bulldozed and destroyed by excavators. In addition, the government damaged the rice field in the range of expropriation, which eventually resulted in opposition by the people. After the mass media reported and criticized the incident, their reports provoked a series of civil organizations' protest, and the public also expressed support for the residents of Dapu. Most important of all, they demanded Taiwan authorities revised the Land Expropriation Act.

In response to the base land requirements saturation for the Hsinchu Science-based industrial park Chu-Nan industrial land base and for the urban development of Toufen Areas, MCG applied for new urban plan in 2001. This plan had been passed by the Ministry of the Interior in 2004 and had been publicly exhibited on November, 2014. Liu Zhengong continued to promote it after his inauguration as magistrate on December 20, 2005. The Hsinchu Science Park Chunan site and the surrounding area-specific urban plan, which includes industrial park, public facilities districts as well as residential areas, commercial purposes, had been passed by the Community Commission in 2003, the county urban plan committee 10 times during 2004 to 2012, the Ministry of the Interior urban plan committee 12 times, and by the land acquisition committee.

The Innolux Corporation requested the MCG to expand 4.98 hectares of land allocation at March 13, 2008, therefore, MCG formulated the "Hsinchu Science Park Chunan base area around a specific area expand plan". This expand had been approved by the county urban plan committee at January 3, 2007, the Ministry of the Interior urban plan committee at December 11, 2007 and at April 1, 2008. Then the Miaoli Dapu urban plan was approved as a new urban project.

The Urban Plan Commission of Ministry of Interior approved the development scope and asked MCG to handle sections according to the article 4, Land Acquisition Ordinance Provisions. The Ministry of Interior approved Miaoli Dapu land expropriation, then MCG made public and notify the land owners to expropriate land at April 14, 2009. Local residents set up the Chunan Dananpu Self-help Association for this land expropriation at June 3, 2009. The Miaoli County Council asked the MCG should coordinate with the residents before the land expropriation procedure in May, 2010. But the MCG destroyed the harvest of paddy fields by the police and the mob ay June 8-9, 2010, and it provoked the Taiwanese people to amaze.

In terms of disposing the urban plan committee action appealed by the 32 land owners, Taipei High Administrative Court dismissed 32 expropriated land owners sued at November 25, 2010. The Supreme Administrative Court also dismissed 32 land owners' appeal at November 24, 2011. In terms of disposing the expropriation action appealed by the 32 land owners, Taichung High Administrative Court dismissed 32 expropriated land owners sued at January 19, 2012. The Supreme Administrative Court also dismissed 32 land owners' appeal at June 28, 2012. In terms of disposing the pull down action appealed by the 4 house owners in Dapu, Taipei High Administrative Court dismissed 4 removed house owners sued at December 20, 2012. The Supreme Administrative Court also dismissed 4 house owners' appeal at July 25, 2013.

On the other hand, In terms of disposing the zone expropriation action appealed by the 32 land owners in Dapu, Taichung High Administrative Court dismissed 32 expropriated land owners sued at June 30, 2011. The Supreme Administrative Court returned to the Taichung high administrative court to reexamine at November 8, 2012. Taichung High Administrative Court resentenced at January 3, 2014: "the administrative procedure of Miaoli County Dapu zone expropriation is partially illegal since the Minister of Interior does not substantially review the public interest and necessity indeed but just only seemingly review". Taichung

High Administrative Court (THAC) stated that land owners were only given 2 options during the negotiation process, there was no discussion of the price offered for the properties, constituting a violation of the Land Expropriation Act and the MOI does not thoroughly consider the public interest. Therefore, THAC issues a judgment that the demolition of 4 houses by the MCG on July 17, 2013 is illegal. Therefore, THAC sentenced the 4 house owners won and their land expropriation must be revoked; other 20 house owners' appeal was dismissed. The Chang Pharmacy owner Peng Xinchun demanded an apology from Magistrate Liu Zhenghong, the return of her land, and build her house back. Taiwan Rural Front and Miaoli Dapu Self-help Association held a press conference to petition the Ministry of Interior to give up appeal and reconstruct the 4 houses back at January 13, 2014. The Ministry of the Interior had declared not to appeal, but the Chang pharmacy and 22 householders delegated a lawyer to appeal at January 29, 2014. They required to sentence the Dapu land expropriation by MOI illegal and rebuild their houses on the same place. Therefore, this appeal causes the Dapu land expropriation case undetermined yet and the judicial process must go through all over again. The Supreme Administrative Court rejected THAC sentence- "the 4 house owners won and their land expropriation must be revoked" and returned to the Taichung high administrative court to reexamine at May 13, 2015. At April 22, 2016 THAC ruled that the MCG was only a participant in the civil groups' original lawsuit against the MOI and was not subject to a direct ruling, therefore rejected the appeal to return Dapu farmland to original owners and rebuild their houses on the same place

IV. Conclusion

While in judging the quality of a decision, in addition to the concerns of logic, use of information and alternatives, three other considerations come into play: (1) the decision must meet the stated objectives most thoroughly and completely; (2) the decision must meet the stated objectives most efficiently, with concern over cost, energy, side effects; and (3) the decision must take into account valuable byproducts or indirect advantages (Harris, 1998).

So the principles of good decision-making include: (1) compliance with the law; (2) appropriate use of powers exercised by those properly authorized; (3) provision of reasons to explain and justify decisions, ensuring fairness, transparency, consistency and accountability; and (4) "fair and reasonable" approaches to decisions, and "natural justice" or "procedural fairness" for anyone impacted by a decision (Podger, 2002).

The study of decision making has attracted much attention throughout most of the 20th century. By the end of World War II, a powerful prescriptive theory of rationality, the theory of subjective expected utility had taken form; it was followed by the theory of games. Game theory had seen widespread applications of these theories in economics, operations research, and statistics, and, through these disciplines, to [decision-making](#) in business and government during 1940s to 1980s.

Innes and Booher (2004) shows that collaborative participation can solve complex, contentious problems such as budget [decision-making](#) and create an improved climate for future action when bitter disputes divide a community. Authentic dialogue, networks and institutional capacity are the key elements. They propose that participation should be understood as a multi-way set of interactions among citizens and other players who together produce outcomes.

What are the consequences of changes in the partisan behavior among elected officials on public policymaking? Given that increases in partisanship lead to less civility within Congress, and the public's

disdain for conflict surrounding the policymaking process (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 1995). Partisan divisions in American politics have been increasing since the 1970s, and the polarization is observed most frequently within the debates and deliberation across issues within Congress. The majority of conflict within Congress is partisan, partisan conflict should be a factor that influences both the long-term equilibrium movement of congressional approval and the short-term fluctuations around that equilibrium. Ramirez (2009) also indicates that over-time changes in partisan conflict within Congress have a direct and lasting effect on how citizens think about Congress.

People make decisions about anything anywhere, anytime. But how do we make decisions? It depends! Every event has its special essence and environment. We must choose suitable methods to make decisions. But first we must decide to choose what models of decision-making to analyze the issue and its environment. As Nicholas Nicholaidis surveys 332 high rank officers and finds that decision-making in the public sector is based on political factors rather than rationality (Adair, 2009). Allison (1971) also averred that the governmental politics model can explain thoroughly the realistic Cuban crisis. Comparing the decision-making theories and the Miaoli Dapu farmland expropriation case shows that the organization process model and bureaucratic politics model by Alison (1971) explain largely the decision-making in the Dapu farmland expropriation. The organizational SOPs and power **do** matter, and most decisions in Dapu farmland expropriation are made based on organizational process and political power rather than rationality.

References

- [Adair, J. \(2009\). *Effective Decision Making: The Essential Guide to Thinking for Management Success*. London: Pan Macmillan.](#)
- Allison, G. (1971). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little Brown.
- [Bachrach P. & Baratz, M. \(1962\). Two Faces of Power. *The American Political Science Review*, 56\(4\), 947-952.](#)
- Bass, B. M. (1983). *Organizational Decision making*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.
- Buelens, M. & Hooland, B.(19887). The Public Manager as Decision-maker. In J. Kooiman &K. A. Eliassen (eds.),*Managing Public Organizations: Lessons from Contemporary European Experience* (pp.102-113). CA: Sage.
- [Christensen, C. \(2003\). *The Innovator's Solution: Creating and Sustaining Successful Growth Hardcover*. Harvard Business School Press.](#)
- [Christopher, A. \(1964\). *Notes on the Synthesis of Form*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.](#)
- Clemen, R. T. (1996). *Making Hard Decisions: An Introduction to Decision Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Duxbury Press.
- [Dahl, R. \(1961\). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. Yale University Press.](#)
- [Frederickson H. & Smith, K. \(2003\). *The Public Administration Primer*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.](#)
- Golub, A. L. (1997). *Decision Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Harmon, M. M. (1995). *Responsibility as Paradox: A Critique of Rational Discourse on Government*. CA: Sage.
- Harris, R. (1998). *Introduction to Decision-making*. www.virtualsalt.com

- Hibbing, J. & ~~E.~~Theiss-Morse, E.(1995). *Congress as Public Enemy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hua, T. (2009). The Research on the Decision-making Constraints and Decision-making Behaviors in Public Policy. *Journal of Tianjin Normal University (Social Science)*, **202**, 27-30.
- Innes, J. & ~~D.~~Booher, D.(2004). Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21th century. *Planning Theory and Practice*,**54**, 419-437.
- Jones, B. D. (1994). *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics*. IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kraan, D. (1996). *Budgetary Decisions: A Public Choice Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawton, A. & ~~A.~~Rose, A.(1991). *Organization and Management in the Public Sector*. London: Pitman.
- Li, K. & ~~X.~~Wang, X.(2009). The Determining Factors of U.S. Trade Policy toward China: A Political Economy Analysis Illustrated by the PNTR Bill.*Economy Quarterly*,**8**(2), 375-396.
- Lindblom, C. (1959). The Science of Muddling through.*Public Administration Review*,**19**(3), 79-88.
- Lindblom, C. (1979). Still Muddling, yet through.*Public Administration Review*,**39**(6), 517-526.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*.NY: Macmillan.
- Marshall, K. T. & Oliver, R. M. (1995). *Decision-making and Forecast: with Emphasis on Model Building and Policy Analysis*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- McKenna, C. K. (1980). *Quantitative Methods for Public Decision-making*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Meek, J. (2007). Political Decision-making within Metropolitan Areas. In Morcol, G. (ed.), *Handbook of Decision-making*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Munger, M. (2000). *Analyzing Policy: Choices, Conflicts, and Practices*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Oettinger, M. & ~~A.~~Price, A.(1978).*Steering the Course: Policymaking in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: International Communication Agency.
- Ordeshook, P. C. (1986). *Game Theory and Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramirez, M. (2009). The Dynamics of Partisan Conflict on Congressional Approval. *American Journal of Political Science*,**53**(3), 681-694.
- Robbins, S. P. (1995). *Supervision Today*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rowe, A. J. & ~~J.-D.~~Boulgarides, J. D. (1992). *Managerial Decision-making: A Guide to Successful Decisions*. New York: Macmillan.
- Simon, H.(1986). *Decision-making and Problem Solving*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press
- Smith, G. & May, D.(1997). The Artificial Debate between Rationalist and Incrementalist Models of Decision-making. In M. Hill (ed.), *The Policy Process: A Reader* (2nd ed.) (pp.163-174). Prentice Hall: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Steinbruner, J. D. (1974). *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stillman, R. J. (1996). *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Stone, D. (2002). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision* (revised ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.
Wiarda, H. J. (1996). *American Foreign Policy: Actors & Processes*. New York: Harper Collins.

公部門的決策分析：臺灣立法委員選舉制度改革－

「單一選區兩票制」與「席次減半」個案研究*

黃國敏**

摘要

決策乃是基於決策者的價值與偏好來設計與選擇方案的研究。決策同時也是設法減少相關方案的不確定性和疑惑以從中作合理選擇的過程。本文研究方法主要為自然無干擾觀察法與個案分析法。臺灣立法院於 2004 年 8 月 23 日三讀通過劃時代的憲法修正案，將立法委員席次從 225 席減為 113 席，三年任期改為四年，改採單一選區兩票制，保障婦女在全國不分區的席次過半，賦予選民公投權並廢除國民大會。此意謂著區域立委由各選區選出一位，全國不分區和海外委員則由得票率超過 5% 的政黨所列名單分配之，而各政黨所提婦女名額須過半。

經由決策理論與苗栗縣大埔農地徵收案例比較發現，組織過程模式與官僚政治模式(或稱為政治的決策模式)較可以解釋的競技場。權力才是重點，國會多數的決策是基於「黨派鬥爭」而非民眾所期待的「理性問政」。

關鍵字：決策、立委選制改革、臺灣、政府政治模型、政治決策模型

* 本文曾發表於 the 67th MPSA Annual Conference, April 2-5, 2009, Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago.

**中華大學行政管理學系副教授兼民意調查研究中心執行長，台灣民意學會理事長，