

ขนาดของคณะรัฐมนตรีนั้นสำคัญไฉน

Cabinet Size Does Matter

โกสิทธิ์ เฟื่องสวัสดิ์*

Kosit Fuangwasdi*

* นิตินิตหลักสุตรัฐประศาสนศาสตร์ดุสิตบัณฑิต นานาชาติ ภาควิชารัฐศาสตร์ คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยมหาจุฬาลงกรณราชวิทยาลัย

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของโครงการวิจัยเพื่อการพัฒนาขีดความสามารถในการแข่งขันของประเทศไทยแบบยั่งยืน ขีดความสามารถของประเทศไทยจัดอยู่ในระดับกลางของโลกโดยสถาบันชั้นนำต่างๆ อุปสรรคหนึ่งที่สำคัญคือประสิทธิภาพและประสิทธิผลของรัฐบาลอยู่ในระดับต่ำและไม่มีแนวโน้มที่จะขยับขึ้นไปเทียบกับประเทศชั้นนำ ทั้งที่รัฐบาลไทยหลายชุดที่ผ่านมาได้ปรับเปลี่ยนทั้งตัวบทกฎหมาย กฎเกณฑ์ ระเบียบปฏิบัติต่างๆ มากมาย ส่วนภาคเอกชนได้มีการปรับโครงสร้างขององค์กรซึ่งเป็นรากฐานของการตัดสินใจขององค์กรเพื่อประสิทธิภาพและประสิทธิผลที่สูงสุด โครงสร้างของรัฐบาลเริ่มจากคณะรัฐมนตรี ขนาดของคณะรัฐมนตรีเป็นหนึ่งในปัจจัยที่รัฐบาลที่ผ่านมาไม่เห็นความสำคัญ ในขณะที่กลุ่มประเทศชั้นนำได้ปรับเปลี่ยนขนาดให้มีความคล่องตัวเพื่อเผชิญกับความท้าทายของการเปลี่ยนแปลงของอนาคตที่รวดเร็ว ผันผวน ไม่แน่นอน ซับซ้อนและสับสน ถึงเวลาแล้วที่รัฐบาลไทยควรให้ความสำคัญต่อรากฐานของโครงสร้างของคณะรัฐมนตรีและปรับเปลี่ยนให้เหมาะสมที่จะต่อสู้กับอนาคตอันท้าทายเพื่อเสริมสร้างประสิทธิภาพและประสิทธิผลที่สูงสุด

คำสำคัญ: ประสิทธิภาพ ประสิทธิผล โครงสร้างคณะรัฐมนตรี ความคล่องตัว

Abstract

This paper is part of the research project to develop Thailand's sustainable competitiveness. The competitiveness of Thailand assessed by several international institutions has been ranked in the middle group with no chance to rise into the upper group due to many factors, one of which is the relatively low government efficiency and effectiveness. Many attempts by previous Thai governments including promulgation of laws, rules and regulatory procedures were made but to no avail. Private sectors made similar attempts aim to increase efficiency and effectiveness including the review of their organizations and restructure. Cabinet is the heart of the Thai government structure. Size of the cabinet has been overlooked by governments in the past. This is opposite to those governments of the advanced economies as they see that size of the cabinet really matters to the optimization of efficiency and effectiveness of all decision-making processes and outcomes. The future is obviously getting more volatile, uncertainty, complex and ambiguous. It is now the time for the Thai government to become more agile by looking at the optimal size of the cabinet to strive for maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

Keywords: Efficiency, Effectiveness, Cabinet Structure, Agility

Introduction

The national competitiveness of all countries is annually assessed and published by three well-known institutions, the International Institute for Management Development (IMD), the World Economic Forum (WEF), and the World Bank (WB). These annual competitiveness reports are direct indicators of where the global investments and fund flows would take place, leading to where new development and growths, as well as the well-being of people will be. Using the IMD, WEF and WB global government efficiency and effectiveness ranking, the Thai government has been ranked around the middle of the emerging economic group with no sight to move into the world's leading group. All the past attempts have been failed partly due to a lack of understanding the simple fact related to the government or cabinet structure. Considering an option proposed by Richards Leblanc and James Gillies recommended for the private businesses to optimize efficiency and effectiveness of the organization (LeBlanc & Gilles, 2005), an insightful recommendation could possibly increase efficiency and effectiveness of the government significantly.

Research Objectives

1. To understand the definitions of government efficiency and government effectiveness.
2. To learn where Thailand is in the world's ranking of government efficiency and effectiveness.
3. To visualize what the future government structure should look like.
4. To recommend the size of Thai cabinet.

Research Hypotheses

Two hypotheses formed the basis of this research; government efficiency and government effectiveness define national competitiveness, and cabinet size is a factor affecting government efficiency and effectiveness.

Scope of the Study

As a desk-based research, all data are secondary in nature. They are from texts, web-based journals and reports, mostly from IMD, WEF, WB, and global consulting firms. The scope of content focuses on efficiency and effectiveness of the government and their relationships to the size of the cabinet. A 5-year period ending 2019 is the scope of time of data and this research is completed in the 2nd and 3rd quarter of 2019.

Research Methodology

An analytical induction desk-based is the research methodology. The research was prepared in 4 stages. The first step was to define clearly what the government efficiency and effectiveness mean in the world's standard measurement. The second step was to identify the Thailand's ranking compared to the world scale. The third step was to visualize what the future looks like. The Big Four's researches and megatrend studies from McKinsey and BCG can be alluded and collaborated as a general forecast. At this stage, the future government structure with highest efficiency and effectiveness can be visualized. The last step was to review the selected government structures of the world's leading countries and emerging economies, purposed to confirm the hypotheses and outcome, which is the recommendation of the best possible size of the Thai cabinet.

Research Results

Government efficiency and effectiveness and Thailand's ranking: Graham T. Allison and Charles Goodsell define Public Management as an approach to government administration and non-profit administration aim to maximize efficiency and effectiveness (Walker, 2012). In a layman term, the citizens can feel secure and assured that their future will be rosy if the government manage the public with high efficiency and high effectiveness.

The World Bank Group publishes annual report compiled by the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) Project (Georgieva, 2018). The WGI Project reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for over 200 countries and territories over the period 1996-2017, for 6 dimensions of governance including; (1) voice and accountability, (2) political stability and absence of violence, (3) government effectiveness, (4) regulatory quality, (5) rule of law, and (6) control of corruption.

GovData360 is a database comprising all data for the World Bank Group to collaborate for the publication of annual global competitiveness report. The government effectiveness is defined as 'perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies'. Reconciled data during the period of 1996-2017 indicates that Thailand's government effectiveness has been moving within the global middle range of 60-69 (the higher the number, the higher the government effectiveness and country's competitiveness). In ASEAN, Thailand is ranked in the middle.

Singapore is at the very top, ranked with the highest score not only in ASEAN region but in the world. Malaysia is the only other country outpace Thailand while the remaining fall below Thailand (Bris, 2018).

The World Economic Forum (WEF) produces the Global Competitiveness Index demonstrating the government efficiency in interacting among all 12 components including institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, health and primary education, higher education and training, goods market efficiency, labor market efficiency, financial market development, technological readiness, market size, business sophistication and innovation (Schwab, 2017). Government efficiency is about doing more for less; the ability to maximize outputs with minimum inputs. Reconciled data during the period of 2007-2017 indicates that Thailand's government efficiency has been moving within the global middle range of 75-116 (the higher the number, the higher the government efficiency and country's competitiveness).

In ASEAN, Thailand is again ranked in the middle. Singapore's efficiency rose sharply since 2007, but probably second to Vietnam. Vietnam's efficiency took a great jump in 2010 to outpace all of ASEAN members including Singapore but dropped sharply in 2015 and bounced back a year later. Malaysia and Indonesia performed poorly in terms of government efficiency within this group.

The IMD demonstrates government efficiency in five different aspects; (1) public finance, (2) fiscal policy, (3) institutional framework, (4) business legislation, and (5) societal framework. There are 73 criteria totally under these 5 aspects assessed annually by the IMD to determine if the government policies of each country are conducive to competitiveness or efficient. Two out of 15 criteria under the institutional

framework can be brought up for close consideration; government decisions and adaptability of government policy. These criteria are direct outcome of the government structural architecture; a reflection of how efficient the government makes right and timely decisions and adapts the policies to cope with the changing environment. Over the past 5 years, Thailand's ranking on government efficiency has been moving within the range of 20-28 and the institutional framework has rolled around 30-35. This illustration demonstrates no or very little improvement because the structural architecture of the Thai Government has never been improved.

The world has evolved continuously at faster and faster pace. Structural reform of the government should evolve to maintain or increase its governance capability to cope with the future challenges. Founded in 2007 by the philanthropic arm of the Dubai-based investment firm the Legatum Group and other 40 donors, the London-based independent educational charity Legatum Institute publishes annual world's best-governed countries with the 'Global Prosperity Index' (Stroud, 2018). The index is assessed by 9 major parameters namely economic quality, business environment, governance, education, health, safety & security, personal freedom, social capital, and natural environment. The governance parameter is broken down into three categories; effective governance, democracy and political participation, and the rule of law. The top ten in ranking are Norway, New Zealand, Finland, Switzerland, Sweden, Netherlands, Denmark, Canada, Australia and United Kingdom. Singapore is ranked at 17th, while Japan's position is 23rd. Among ASEAN member countries, Singapore is ranked the best while Thailand and Vietnam are ranked the worst.

The Doing Business 2019 Report published and released by the World Bank Group in late October 2018 reveals the world's top ten best countries including in order; New Zealand, Singapore, Denmark, Hong Kong, South Korea, Georgia, Norway, United States, United Kingdom, and Macedonia, FYR.

Future government structure: Megatrend studies from world-renown business consultants are certainly the best sources of information with reasons that most state and private agencies worldwide use as guidelines for national policy and planning.

PricewaterhouseCoopers' latest megatrend research in late 2016 pointed to the world's largest megatrends; rapid urbanization, demographic and social change, climate change and resource scarcity, shift in global economic power, and technological breakthroughs (Modley, 2017). With the rapid urbanization, 50% of global GDP will be generated by 300 largest metropolitan areas. Spreading national budgets fairly throughout the country seems to flow against the forecast. Developing the nation with an economic growth migration seems to better fit the future, the model which turned People's Republic of China from poverty to the world's 2nd economic superpower in less than 3 decades. The size of the middle class in Asia Pacific is expected to overtake Europe and North America combined. In a global scale, 1.5 million people are added to the global urban population every week. Come with the middle-class group are state efficiency and effectiveness, freedom and less regulatory controls. The sizeable government structure with low efficiency and non-performing effectiveness is definitely not the answer. More than 35% increase in food demand is expected worldwide. Food and necessary resources will become scarcer. Less but more

efficient regulatory controls will be needed, and these cannot come from highly sophisticated and cumbersome government structures. PwC predicts that seven out of the world's biggest 12 economies in 2030 will come from emerging markets and named as the "E7". Countries in the emerging market (EM) group therefore compete rigorously to produce highest possible GDP for economic growth and the well-being of their people. The public administration strategy should therefore be an offensive nature, rather than a defensive for stability. A small and lean organization is likely to run faster than a large and complex one.

Deloitte Consulting GmbH is another giant consulting conglomerate publishing the world's megatrend research, widely used by European state governments. Deloitte foresees that technologies will fundamentally reshape how work gets done (Briggs, 2017). All organizations, public and private, need to embrace fast-changing technologies. The emerging technology trends in the immediate future will not come in pieces but in unison. Coping with these future technologies in either vertical (focusing online of business or isolated industries) or horizontal (focusing on processes or enabling technologies) transformation will likely fail. Future works will be completed efficiently and effectively by vertical and horizontal integration and hence, the coordination and cooperation within and among organizations are critically crucial, a symphonic enterprise model. For the public administration organization, several governments of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) especially those in the EU have been adjusting their organizational architecture to optimize the effectiveness through organizational structure, organizational leaders and organizational process. The erosion of governance will take place in

modern societies. Citizens will demand for direct democracy expanding from Western Europe to all other parts of the world. Referendum will become a new norm as people demand to exercise their voting rights in all matters. Local administration and decentralization will dictate the rural governance and development. Because of resource scarcity, disputes among people both domestically and internationally will escalate. As the gap between rich and poor gets bigger and bigger, support for free market ideologies has started to grow as societies begin to get tired of a series of public policies that are thought to benefit only the rich. As political tensions increase, countries become more nationalistic, and socioeconomic inequities continue to divide nation states, the old models of global governance will not work. People, especially those increasing middle-class will seek for alternative governments including non-state institutions, coalitions, activist movements, transnational professional networks. To cope with the future, governments are in need of reform. Only those efficient and effective governments can survive and take their respective nations to prosperity.

KPMG, another member of the world's Big-Four, conducted a joint research on future 2030 world public policy with Mowat Centre, an independent public policy research center at the School of Public Policy & Governance at the University of Toronto. The future world is to meet 9 major challenges in 3 changing areas (Chism, 2017). Higher life expectancy and falling birth rates are increasing the proportion of elderly people across the world, challenging the solvency of social welfare systems, including pensions and healthcare. Some regions are also facing the challenge of integrating large youth populations into saturated labor

markets. The change of demographics will be phenomenal. Advances in global education, health and technology have helped empower individuals like never before, leading to increased demands for transparency and participation in government and public decision-making. The rise of the individual will continue. The population of the middle class will outpace the poor by 2022. The world has experienced an incredible transformation in the last three decades from information and communication technology. A new wave of technological advances will impose threats to governments worldwide on how to formulate public policies for the benefits of their people. The interconnected global economy will see a continual increase in the levels of international trade and capital flows. Coordination and cooperation among trading partners are the only solution to the new world, that requires the level of government agility no one has seen. Public debt will become the most important constraint on fiscal and monetary policies. Only effective and efficient governments can develop capability to bring debt under control and find new ways of delivering satisfiable public services to respond to major social, economic and environmental challenges. Emerging economies are lifting millions out of poverty while also exerting more influence in the global economy. With a rebalancing of global power, both international institutions and national governments will need a greater focus on maintaining their transparency and inclusiveness. On the physical environment issues, rising greenhouse gas emissions are causing climate change and driving a complex mix of unpredictable changes to the environment. Formulating the right combination of adaptation and mitigation policies will be more and more difficult for all governments. Water, food, arable land and energy will

become more scarce generating more pressure to population growth, economic growth and climate change. These issues will place sustainable resource management at the center of government agendas. By 2030, Mowat Research Centre predicts that two-thirds of the world's population will reside in cities. Urbanization is creating significant opportunities for social and economic development and more sustainable living. Higher pressure will inevitably exert on infrastructure and resources, particularly energy. Geopolitical challenges will dominate international arena. To cope with all these gigantic challenges, governments need to change; structural changes, strategy changes and new skills are keys to success. The government structure dictates how processes and decision-making are efficient and effective. The strategies must fit with rapid changes defined in the mega-trends. Public administrators will need to be reskilled and equipped with new tools to become adequately capable.

EY Global issued the 2018 megatrend report early this year (Schreiber, 2018). Ten megatrends will dominate the world in 3-10 years driven by three primary forces and leading to three new rules. Technological advancement, demographic change and globalization are the three primary forces. These forces drive changes in 10 megatrends including new definition of industry, new way of work between humans and machines, consuming behavioral change, behavioral design to reflect the interface between humans and new technologies, adaptive regulations officiated by efficient and effective governments, urbanization remapping, innovating communities, health reimaged, disruptive food industry, and molecular economy driven by disruptive nanotechnologies. The three new rules or future way of working will become new norms.

The world will become a multipolar and hyper-connected coordination is how and where the world's power congregates. Reform and revolution of all social contracts will be significantly demanded. Governments will play a key role in realigning the interests of private sector actors with the long-term inclusive needs of society. Specifically, new policy measures will bridge gaps and address market failures. Many of these policies will incorporate behavioral economics. Markets of goods, services, information, labor and other assets of value will advance from viscous to fluid to superfluid. New technologies will significantly erase inefficiency and frictions from market mechanism. Only efficient and effective governments can cope with these new norms; capable coordinator in a multipolar connected world, skilled reformer of social contracts, and highly advanced technological enabler to manage superfluid markets. Adaptability and agility are crucial specification of new governments.

The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) published the Twelve Forces That Will Radically Change How Organizations Work in March 2017 (Bhalla, et al. 2017). The research has been widely adopted by various state governments to develop future policies and strategic plans for their respective countries. BCG foresaw 4 major shifts in the new world revolution; (1) Technological and digital productivity demands abrupt changes in automation for manufacturing, the use of big data and advanced analytics for production efficiency and effectiveness, and rapid access to information and ideas for strategic competitive advantage development. (2) Shifts in ways of generating business value will prevail the high-cost-low-return models in the past. This will require simplicity in complexity, agility and innovation, and new customer strategies. The

future organization needs to be lean and simple, agile but very innovative, and capable to provide unlimited experiences and value to customers. (3) Shifts in resource distribution becomes inevitable due to resource scarcity and demographic shift. The year 2019 will be the year in history when 5 generations of workforce work together. These shifts include a new demographic mix, skill imbalances, and shifting of geopolitical and economic power. Many emerging economies have been vying to capture special skills and talents to develop high-value competency and produce phenomenal growth and become economic powers. (4) Changing workforce cultures and values come with demographic shift and alteration of social framework. Diversity and inclusion become new norm of future organizations. Workforce is more individualistic and driven by entrepreneurship. State governments are among the largest organizations in the world. For the purposes of efficiency, effectiveness and survival, the government structures shall be lean and small, equipped with technological advancement systems, agile and innovative, loaded with highly competent and skill workforce, and capable to provide well-being and high-value successes to the people.

McKinsey & Company, another world's leading consulting firm publishes their annual megatrend review in late 2017 (Dobbs, 2017). McKinsey reiterates 4 megatrends shaping the new way of working; the age of urbanization will dominate the new world economic migration throughout the world, people will experience the acceleration of technological changes at the speed never recorded, aging society will seriously demand new responses not only from efficiency and effective governments but also from the highly diversified societies, and advancement of globalization that greater interconnections between

trade, people, finance and data become highly sophisticated. Like megatrend researches by other consulting firms, McKinsey believes the global rotation will be much faster at the speed no one has realized.

All these studies by world's largest consulting firms may differ in detail but inevitably share the similar conclusions, i.e. volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity; an acronym of VUCA, a term first used in 1987 by the U.S. Army War College developed from the leadership theories of Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). With the introduction of World Wide Web in 1989 by Tim Berners-Lee at CERN or European Organization for Nuclear Research, leading to the birth of Internet in August 1991 and the world of technology has evolved at a bullet speed. Within only 2 decades, the world is now in the age of Internet of Things, Artificial Intelligence, and Machine Learning, a clear sign pointing to a faster evolving technology. The degree of VUCA will definitely be higher into the future. One of the most common strategic management terms searched in 2018 is 'strategic agility', following many studies by Harvard Business School suggesting as a tool to cope with high-degree VUCA. Harvard studies found that annual planning cycles and formal strategic planning have been proven to not benefiting in that they take too long for decision making (Kennedy, 2017). The ultimate keys of success to cope with the future world are agility and speed of good quality decision making.

Cabinet sizes of selected countries: The last step is to compare with the current Thai government structure. After staging a coup and becoming the prime minister, Gen. Prayut Chan-o-cha and his administration had decided to exercise the use of special order under Section 44 to bypass all the existing legal and regulatory hurdles. The

Section 44 was promulgated by the National Council for Peace and Order (NCPO) on July 22, 2014 under the Interim Constitution. The main concept of Section 44 is that in any case deemed necessary by the Head of the NCPO, with the approval of the NCPO, the Head of the NCPO can issue an order, restrain or perform any act regardless of whether such act enters into legislative, executive or judicial force. In this regard, all orders, acts as well as performance in compliance with such orders shall be deemed lawful and constitutional. Gen. Prayut defended the use of this Section many times citing the justification to break deadlocks in administration where no other solutions could be exercised with efficiency and effectiveness (The Nation, March 8, 2017). As of November 26, 2018, Gen. Prayut had exercised the use of this special article 200 times which can be grouped into 8 categories; (1) judicial matters, (2) educational reform, (3) illegal unreported and unregulated fishing and illegal immigrant workforce, (4) establishment of special economic zones, (5) efforts on media control, (6) efforts to control independent organizations, (7) efforts to control electoral system, and (8) miscellaneous issues including police reform, energy reform and others.

Even with the use of special article and bypassing of conventional cabinet's decision making and approval, the public perceived that not only these special orders were not effective and that issues were not resolved, but some of the orders were full of mistakes and some were issued to merely correct the previous ones. Let alone the conventional decision making and approval processes by the cabinet and the fact that Section 44 is certainly not the sustainable solution as it is dictatorial in nature and not democratic. Moreover, the use of Section 44 is a process to bypass solution and not designed to cope with

the rapidly changing future. At this stage, it is worrisome if the Thai Cabinet would not restructure to cope with higher degree of VUCA in the future.

There are, of course, many approaches to improve the Cabinet's decision-making process efficiency and effectiveness. One of considerable ways to optimize effectiveness of the board or the Cabinet is to understand how the quality decision making process works in a holistic approach suggested by Leblanc and Gillies (Leblanc and Gillies, 2005). Leblanc and Gillies described that the effectiveness comes from 3 major attributes; structure, membership and process. There are 4 components of the structure; size, composition, committee and leader. Either undersized or oversized cabinet would not yield an optimal effectiveness. Composition and committee of the cabinet member are external factors defining critical issues at hand the cabinet needs to counter. Good example is the development of technology ministry in nearly all governments at present. No matter how good the cabinet structure is, the leader is always the most critical key to success. Diversity, development and retirement form major components of the membership attribute. The process attribute involves data and information, meeting process, and decision making. In short, the decision making could only be optimized by sufficiently available, correct and good quality data and information and the appropriate meeting process.

In short, the cabinet size does matter. A comparison between the Thai cabinet and those of leading countries assessed by international institutions could help shed light on improvement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Thai cabinet.

Table 1: Comparison of cabinet size of various countries in 2019.

Country	Deputy PM	No. Ministry	No. Ministers
Advanced Economies			
New Zealand	1	18	19
Netherlands	3	13	17
Norway	0	15	20
Denmark	0	17	22
Japan	1	18	19
South Korea	2	18	19
Singapore	2	16	21
Emerging Economies			
Thailand	5	20	32
Cambodia	10	26	32
Laos	3	20	23
Myanmar	0	24	39
Vietnam	5	20	20

Most of the members of the advanced economy group are ranked as leaders in the IMD's government efficiency, the WEF GCI on efficiency and effectiveness and the WB's government efficiency and effectiveness. On the other hand, all countries under emerging economy group are ranked below the average and closer to the bottom. The size of cabinet of countries in the emerging economy group is obviously larger than those of countries in the advanced economy group. This oversized cabinet prohibits optimal group decision making and tends to cause more problems. When it comes to critical decision-making issues such as economy, the government has to create another separate cabinet known as economic cabinet; an indication of need for smaller decisive group of

the same ministers. This practice is very uncommon in the advanced economy group. Worse for the case of the previous government of Thailand governed by the military junta, the use of Section 44 to bypass all the team decision making both within the cabinet and the parliamentary system fails to solve all the critical problems, either in short or long term.

Many researchers including Shiela Margolis of the Institute of Workplace Culture (Goodman, 2017) conducted empirical studies to search for a magic number for optimal group decision making, realizing working in teams is a key paradigm for most management and operational processes. Most researchers found out that the ‘c factor’ or group’s collective intelligence is not strongly correlated with the average or maximum individual intelligence of group members but is correlated with the average ‘social sensitivity of group members’, that is ‘diversity’. In other words, good quality decision making comes from a team with high diversity more than size. The cabinet size does matter, but not too small or too big. With the same number of ministries between any country in the advanced economy group and any country of the emerging economy group, the emerging economy countries have a greater number of ministers. This oversized cabinet is perceived as a barrier to optimal efficiency and effectiveness. Superpower countries like the U.S. and Germany, have only one vice president or one vice chancellor whose duty is to act as the president or chancellor in case of emergency. Another superpower like People’s Republic of China where population exceeds a billion, there are only 2 vice presidents. The world’s largest democratic country, India, does not have a position of deputy prime minister. All these countries do not have any ‘deputy’ position in any ministry.

Research Discussion

Size is one of critical component of the government structure, others are composition, workforce committee and leader. These components are independent but interrelated. Size is considered the most, depending upon the situation of each country at that time. However, size directly relates to efficiency and effectiveness of the team or the cabinet. Affected by VUCA and megatrends, the cabinet size shall support high-quality and timely decision-making, and development of agility and rapid responses to the public needs.

Research Conclusions

1. Government efficiency is defined as public services with minimum inputs for maximum outputs. Government effectiveness is defined as the quality of public services, policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitments.

2. Thailand's government efficiency and effectiveness have been ranked by international institutions including IMD, WEF, and WB in the global middle range without foreseeable sight to rise to the leading group.

3. The future government structure should cope with situation at the time, but certainly be agile, equipped with capability to cope with the rapid changes driven by VUCA and megatrends.

4. With agility, the Thai cabinet size should be small and mobile, with ability to respond to the public needs rapidly with quality defined by efficiency and effectiveness, as well as good governance.

Research Recommendations

For optimum efficiency and effectiveness, the Thai cabinet should be structured with maximum agility with capability to respond to the public needs. Nearly all advanced economies and leading global nations do not have sizeable government structure. Their cabinets generally have only 1 deputy prime minister and 1 minister for each ministry. This lean structure directly supports best possible decision-making and composition of agile government, the ideal government to cope with VUCA and megatrends.

For good governance, the government should structure itself with an external perspective from the public viewpoint, which demands rapid responses. With 20 ministries, the Thai cabinet should be structured with only 22 ministers; 20 ministers-in-charge and 1 deputy prime minister.

References

- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. 1985. “Leaders’ Strategies for Taking Charge”
New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.
- Bhalla, V.; Dyrchs, S. and Strack, R. 2017. “Twelve Forces That Will
Radically Change How Organizations Work” Massachusetts: The
Boston Consulting Group.
- Briggs, B. and Hodgetts, C. 2017. “Tech Trends 2018 – The Symphonic
Enterprise” New York: Deloitte Insights.
- Bris, A. (2018). “Methodology and Principles of Analysis” IMD World
Competitiveness Yearbook. Lausanne: IMD World
Competitiveness Center.
- Chism, N. (2017). “Future State 2030: The Global Megatrends Shaping
Governments” Toronto: School of Public Policy & Governance,
University of Toronto.
- Dobbs, R.; Manyika, J. and Woetzel, J. 2017. “The Four Global Forces
Breaking all the Trends” New York: McKinsey & Company.
- Georgieva, K. 2018. “Doing Business 2018” A World Bank Group Flagship
Report. New York: World Bank Group.
- Goodman, L. 2017. “What is the Optimal Group Size for Decision
Making” Kampala: MetaOps MagEzine.
- Kennedy, M. 2017. “3 Steps to Develop Strategic Agility and Deliver
Innovation” New York: Workzone.
- Leblanc, R. and Gillies, J. 2005. “Inside the Boardroom: How Boards
Really Work” New York: Wiley.
- Modly, T. 2017. “Five Megatrends and Their Implications for Global
Defense & Security” London: PricewaterhouseCoopers.

วารสารรัฐศาสตร์ปริทรรศน์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์
ปีที่ 6 ฉบับที่ 2 (กรกฎาคม – ธันวาคม 2562)

- Schreiber, U. 2018. “What’s after what’s next? The upside of disruption. Megatrends shaping 2018 and beyond” London: Ernst & Young Global.
- Schwab, K. 2017. “The Global Competitiveness Report 2017-2018” Davos: World Economic Forum.
- Stroud, B. P. (ed.) 2018. “The Legatum Prosperity Index 2018” London: Legatum Institute.
- Walker, R. et al. (ed.) 2012. “Public Management and Performance: Research Directions” Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.