

I. THE CONCEPTS OF ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

1. WHAT IS ADMINISTRATION ?

When the question, “What is administration?” is asked, there will be a number of different answers. An individual responding to such a question will either try to give one of the definitions of the concept or will try to explain its meaning in view of his/her perception of it. For a better understanding of the concept of administration, we will first give several definitions and then discuss the basic components of each definition for identifying the common elements among them.

According to Simon, **“Administration can be defined as the activities of groups cooperating to accomplish common goals”** (Simon, Smithburg, Thompson, 1950). As can be seen, administration is defined as cooperative human action or cooperative group behavior. The word, “cooperative”, is the first key element in this definition. Human activity is cooperative if it has the effects that would be absent if the cooperation did not take place. For example, for a moment let us suppose our common goal is to educate a group of individuals in the field of public administration. Having the specific goal in mind, a number of individuals who are specialists in the field of public administration have been brought together. Then we have told the specialists that they are going to educate this group of individuals in the field of public administration and that they better start the business of educating people. If each one of the experts acts in his/her way without consulting the others, there will be chaos in the group. Each one of the specialists may ask the group to meet in a specific place where he/she will give a lecture; one of them may ask the group to meet at 10.00 AM in the morning at a specific location in the city for a lecture in comparative public administration, another one may ask the same group to meet at 10.30 AM at a different location in the city for a lecture in personnel administration and yet another one may ask the group to meet for a lecture in local government at the same time. As can be seen, if each specialist acts independently without consulting or cooperating with the others, they will not be able to accomplish their goal. But if they cooperate with each other they will hold a meeting and discuss how they can accomplish the given objective. Probably they will prepare a time schedule regarding the lecture hours, decide on a certain location for the meetings of the students and determine priorities, in short, they will prepare an order of tasks necessary for the accomplishment of the common goal. As can be seen easily, cooperative human activity has the effects that would be absent if the cooperation did not take place. The word, “cooperative” is here defined in terms of the results of the human activity. If we take a frequently used illustration, when two men together roll a stone which neither of them could roll alone they are cooperating. Thus the essence of administration is the utilization of cooperative action for the accomplishment of common goals.

The second key element of the above definition is the goal or purpose. The idea of a goal is central to the concept of administration in the sense that if there was not a goal,

the members of the group would not come together and cooperate with each other. When you bring together a number of individuals at a certain location, the first thing they will ask is why they have been brought together, what the objective of the group is. Without the formulation of an objective or goal, no one within the group would know what to do and they would not get involved in any activity. When someone determines the objective, and the group is informed about that, then the group members will start to think about what they can do for the accomplishment of that objective and they will start to cooperate with each other. As can be seen easily, without a specific objective or goal, it is impossible to get people to cooperate with each other. In that sense, the concept of goal is the second key element of the concept of administration.

In another definition, administration is defined as **“an activity or process mainly concerned with the means for carrying out prescribed ends.”** (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967). In this definition the concept of goal accomplishment again plays an important role. As the definition clearly indicates, administration is mainly concerned with the means that are necessary for the accomplishment of pre-determined goals. In this it seems that a new element is introduced, that is the concept of means. The means is the way by which something is done or obtained. When a group of individuals are working for the accomplishment of a common goal, a division of labor is necessary, so that each individual will know what to do. Or there is the need for an authority structure to control and coordinate the activities of the individuals involved. Division of labor and authority structure are means – there are many others- for carrying out prescribed ends. In this sense, administration is an activity mainly concerned with the means. For that matter cooperation and any other method which will insure cooperative activity is a means as well.

It is possible to come up with a number of other definitions which, in general, would be similar to the ones discussed above. They may introduce some other elements or concepts but in essence they would be concerned with cooperative activity in the accomplishment of desired goals. For example according to Waldo **“administration is a type of cooperative human effort that has a high degree of rationality.”** (Waldo, 1955). As you can see cooperative human activity is again emphasized and a new concept of “rational action” is introduced. Rational action is here defined as action correctly calculated to realize given desired goals with minimum loss to the realization of other desired goals.

When the above definitions are studied, it is obvious that the concept of administration is closely related to cooperative human activity in the accomplishment of pre-determined goals. Thus, referring to the first definition, we will define administration in its broadest sense as **“the activities of groups cooperating to accomplish pre-determined goals”**.

2. WHAT IS ORGANISATION ?

According to one of the prominent scholars, **“organizations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals”**. (Etzioni, 1964). In this definition organizations are seen as social units or human groupings, which implies that the basic elements of organizations are individuals. Thus the first key element of this definition is the fact that organizations

are groupings of individuals. Another basic element is deliberate construction that is, organizations are deliberately constructed for accomplishing specific objectives. The third element is of course the concept of goals, organizations are established for the accomplishment of certain goals.

In another definition organizations are defined as **“collectivities that have been established for the pursuit of relatively specific objectives on a more or less continuous basis.”** (Scott, 1964). Again in this definition organizations are defined as social units composed of individuals, and they are specifically created for the pursuit of certain objectives.

According to Pfiffner and Presthus **“organization is the structuring of individuals and functions into productive relationship”**. Again as it can be seen the basic element of organizations is individuals, an organization is a grouping of individuals. In this definition organization is not only a grouping of individuals but also a number of functions are brought together alongside individuals. The concept of goal is another basic element of this definition; the term, “productive relationship”, simply implies that the individuals and functions are brought together for the objective of producing something, goods or services.

When the above definitions are evaluated carefully, it is obvious that there are certain common elements in the definitions of different scholars regarding the concept of organization. These common elements are a grouping of individuals, deliberate establishment or construction, and the accomplishment of specific goals. By referring to the above common elements, we will define organizations as **“social units or human groupings deliberately established for the accomplishment of specific objectives.”** Ministries, corporations, universities, hospitals, schools, political parties, prisons, associations etc. are organizations in this sense.

One of the major problems in discussing or thinking about organizations is that the very term is so similar to the broader term of “social organization”. Social organization refers to the ways in which human conduct becomes socially organized. (Blau and Scott, 1962) This statement simply indicates that the observed regularities in the behavior of people are due to the social conditions in which they find themselves rather than to their physiological or psychological characteristics as individuals. That is, social conditions influence the conduct of people. Social conditions which influence the behavior of people can be divided into two main types: (a). The structure of social relations in a group., (b). The shared beliefs and orientations that unite the members of the group or collectivity and guide their conduct. These two main types of social conditions constitute the two basic aspects or characteristics of social organizations.

The conception of structure implies that in a social organization individuals stand in some relation to one another. Thus, there is a certain network of relations which is one of the dimensions of social organization. The second dimension of social organization is the system of shared beliefs and orientations which serve as standards for human conduct. In the course of social interaction, common notions arise as to how people should act that is, common expectations concerning how people ought to behave. In short social norms develop, and social sanctions are used to discourage the violations of these norms. By taking the above discussions into consideration, we can define social organizations as **“networks of social relations and shared orientations”**. Society is a social organization of which municipalities, associations,

ministries, political parties, corporations as organizations are parts. In this sense, the concept of social organization indicates the broader set of relationships and processes. Organizations as we are using the term here are parts of the more general concept of social organization, being affected by it and, reciprocally, affecting it in turn. In this sense, society itself, ethnic groups, friendship groups, families, tribes etc. are social organizations.

When the term “organization” is used in this text, reference is made to what has been called by many as **formal organization**. That is, the terms “formal organization” and “organization” mean the very same set of relationship for our purposes. From now on, whenever the term “organization” is used in this text, we are referring to what has been called, “formal organization”.

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMAL ORGANISATION

Having in mind the definition made previously, the most prominent characteristic of organizations (formal organization) is the conscious deliberate human efforts to establish and operate them for the accomplishment of pre-determined goals. In other words, organizations are deliberately created by human decisions for the purpose of accomplishing pre-determined goals. The goals may vary from one organization to another. The important point here is the fact that goal accomplishment is important (basic, vital) and that is why the organization is created in the first place.

Another important feature of formal organizations is the structured relations among its members. As has been mentioned before, organizations are established for accomplishing specific objectives, and these objectives are going to be accomplished through the efforts and contributions of a number of people who are members of that organization. Since hundreds or thousands of people are going to contribute their mental or physical efforts for the accomplishment of the same goal, the relations among the individuals have to be structured or planned in a way which will facilitate goal accomplishment. When you have a group of individuals working for the accomplishment of a common goal, you have to relate the individuals to each other and coordinate their activities. Without relating the members of the group to each other without planning their activities, it is not possible to accomplish the common objective. Because each member of the group will behave and take action in his/her own way, there will be chaos within the group. In this sense, in formal organizations, the relations among the members are structured, their activities as members of the organization are ordered. In short, the relations among the members are orderly, and they perform their activities according to pre-determined rules and regulations in view of the goals to be accomplished.

One of the important characteristics of formal organization is the fact that their members are selected on the basis of their individual qualifications. Since each organization has pre-determined, specific goals to accomplish, and the accomplishment of goals requires a variety of activities, the individuals who are going to contribute their mental and/or physical activities have to be selected in view of the activities necessary for goal accomplishment. This selection has to be based on the qualifications of the individuals in view of the goals to be accomplished. According to the kind of activities necessary for accomplishing the goal, the members will be selected by the organization.

The formal organisations, in their efforts to accomplish their objectives, will use money and other material resources. Another characteristic of formal organizations is the fact that money and other material resources to be used by the organization are determined with reference to its goals.

A final characteristic of formal organizations is that the interactions of the organization with its environment is regulated to the extent required by the nature of its goals.

4. ORGANISATION AS SYSTEM

In its broadest and most abstract sense, the concept of “organization” is almost synonymous with that of system. In this understanding, the concept of organization refers to any situation where there are a number of elements which are bound together or stand in some relation to one another and represent the order or structure, and that structure as a whole fulfills some sort of a function. In this sense we can talk about the organization of a building, of a machine, of a book, of an ethnic group, of a market, of a galaxy, of a planet etc. They all have some kind of organization or some ordered relationship among a number of elements.

Organization as a system has the following characteristics: (a). There are a number of elements; (b). The elements of a system are interrelated among themselves in an orderly or ordered manner. This means that their relationship is not chaotic or completely random. There is some kind of pattern in these relationships so that a change in one element of the system leads to predictable changes in other elements. (c). A system may be related to some other systems or be a part of some larger systems.

5. COMMENTS ON THE TERMS OF “ORGANISATION” AND “ADMINISTRATION”

The concepts of administration and organization are closely related to each other; in a sense the object of both organization and administration is the control of human and other resources in the accomplishment of pre-determined objectives. Organization and administration exist together, and they are not separable. If organization is regarded as structure, then administration becomes a process; it can be argued that if organization is concerned with the formal aspects of administration, administration is a directing process carried on within the organizational setting. It is claimed that such a conceptualisation, to a certain extent, exaggerates the static properties of organizations. The fact is that organizations are subject to change and they are always changing. When the definition of organization is taken into consideration, it is obvious that it implies a certain stability.

The term “administration” is sometimes used in the meaning of “organization” as shown in the following examples in Turkish and English language,

--Every action of the **administration** is subject to judicial review.

--**Idarenin** kurulus ve görevleri , merkezden yönetim ve yerinden yönetim esaslarına dayanır.

--Food and Drug Administration.

--Kamu Ortakligi Idaresi.

The terms “administration” and “management”, are generally used synonymously, and meaning the same thing. But the term “management” is generally identified with private sector organizations and used with reference to such organizations. The term, “administration” on the other hand, is used with reference to public organizations. Such a usage should not give one the impression that managing a private organization is completely different from administering a public organization. Public or private organizations are social units established for accomplishing pre-determined objectives, and in accomplishing their objectives, they both employ the very same techniques and processes. In this sense, administration is a universal phenomenon. But this does not necessarily mean that there are no differences between public and private organizations with regard to their administration.

II. THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN ORGANIZATION

1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AN ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

Organisations do not exist in a vacuum and, thus, each one has an environment. By “environment” everything outside the organization is meant: other organizations; people with their values, demands and expectations; technology; climatic conditions; topography and its characteristics; political, economic and social structures etc. are all included in the environment of an organization. The environment of an organization is a critical factor in understanding what goes in an organization, because organizations have to interact with their environments continuously to be able to survive and accomplish their objectives. Every organization has to get inputs (technology, manpower, raw materials etc.) from its environment and, then, to transform these inputs into either goods or services, which we will call the outputs of an organization. The outputs of the organizations are given back to the environment for the use of other organizations and individuals and/or for some other purposes.



As shown in the figure above, the interaction between the organization and its environment is a vital process for every organization. Organizations have to have such an interaction with their environments for perpetuating their existence. Organizations are established for accomplishing pre-determined objectives, and in accomplishing their goals, organizations have to have manpower, raw materials, technology, energy and information related to the accomplishment of their goals. All of the above mentioned commodities can be obtained from the environment of the organization.

One of the basic characteristics of the environment is the fact that it is dynamic, there are changes taking place continuously. The environment is not static. Since, as described above, there is a continuous and vital interaction between the organization and its environment, the prevailing conditions of the environment are going to affect the organizations. Organizations, to be able to survive in this dynamic and ever

changing environment, have to adapt themselves to the changing conditions of their environment.

Technological Conditions.

Technology is advancing, and technological changes will eventually reach the organizations related to them. Organizations in their effort to accomplish their goals cannot avoid technological changes taking place within their fields of speciality. New ideas, new techniques of production, and new techniques developed in the administration and management of organizations may come into circulation and become a part of the environment. In their efforts to accomplish their goals and survive in this dynamic and changing environment, organizations cannot ignore such developments. Organizations do not respond to technological change by absorption. Instead, the organization's political process operates. Organizations have their own radicals and reactionaries in terms of their responses to the developments in technology and other environmental conditions (Hall, 1977). That is, there is the need for a specific policy decision for adapting a new technology or a method to be employed by the organization. For example, banking machines, one of the latest products of computer technology are on the market. Your competitors are employing the machines in their services and attracting many new customers. What are you going to do? Stick to your traditional practices and methods, and lose your clients, or import the new technology and improve your services? You have to make a policy decision whether to use the new technology or not. The important point is that if you do not adapt to the changing conditions of the environment you will have to bear the negative consequences this will bring in the future.

Legal conditions.

Organizations must live with laws. There are several laws regulating and maintaining order in the society, and laws that are directly related to the functioning of the organization itself. In addition, there is a value system at work in every society, and there are bad or good things. Through laws, individuals, their rights, lives and properties are protected. Since laws regulate the social order and activities of organizations, it is inevitable that they are going to affect their functioning. An organization that operates a 5 star hotel and a casino has to take into consideration the mandates of the laws which regulate the gambling activities in that country. In our country, as well as many others, there is the widespread belief that gambling may be hazardous to youngsters. In line with such a value judgement, the laws will bring age limitations regarding access to the casinos, and the relevant organizations have to take that into consideration. According to our Constitution Article 42 "No one shall be deprived of the right of learning and education. ... Primary education is compulsory for all citizens of both sexes and is free of charge in State schools." This is the mandate of the law, and the Ministry of National Education has to take that into consideration in planning its educational activities and providing facilities for insuring that every citizen gets primary education.

Political conditions.

Generally, laws are not passed without there being pressures for their enactment. The political situation that brings about a new law has its effects on organizations. For example political pressures brought to bear by various conservation groups concerned about pollution may end up in the prevention of the establishment of

nuclear power plants, which may contribute to a shortage of electrical power. The strong political pressures brought to bear to reduce military spending may result in creating a crisis for organizations operating in this field.

Economic conditions.

The state of economy in which the organization is operating will affect the functioning of that organization. For most businessmen, this is one of the crucial variables. Changing economic conditions serve as an important constraint on any organization, and this becomes evident especially in the process of preparing their budget. In periods of economic crisis, an organization is likely to cut back those programs it feels are less important. A good example of this is the policy of reducing public spending, which has frequently been practiced by the Turkish governments during the last decade. When the tax revenues are not sufficient, and the governments do not have the necessary financial means with which to provide public services, there will be measures taken to decrease public spending, which will affect the proper functioning of public organizations.

Demographic conditions.

Demographic conditions, the variations in the composition of the population, are another important factor in the operations of organizations. The number of people served and their age and sex distribution make a great deal of difference to all organizations. Organizations produce either goods or services, and it can be argued that they can predict their probable "market" for the future by obtaining information from census data. Thus the variations in the composition of population are taken into consideration by organizations, and changing demographic conditions will affect their operations. For example when the number of children who are going to attend primary school increases, the Ministry of National Education has to adjust its operations to accommodate the additional students. In addition to the variation in the composition of the population, population shifts (such as migration from rural to urban areas) will affect the operations of related organizations. Since population shifts are less predictable, they make the organizations more vulnerable. As a result of sudden mass migrations to metropolitan areas the local governments located in these areas may experience problems in providing their services to people.

Ecological conditions.

The number of other organizations with which an organization has contacts and relationships and the environment in which it is located are components of its social ecological system. Organizations which are located in urban areas are much more likely to have contacts with a large number of other organizations than ones located in rural areas. The outputs of certain organizations may be the inputs for some others, and in this relationship, the demands and expectations of certain organizations will affect the operations of the others. The Ankara Metropolitan Municipality provides public transportation within the metropolitan area. If the service is not provided properly, and people in general are not able to get to their work on time, there will be pressures coming from several organizations on the municipality to improve the service. When we turn our attention from social ecology to the physical environment, the relationships between organizations and ecological conditions become more evident. For example, an electrical power producing plant using coal in its production process and polluting the air will receive criticism from other organizations that fight

pollution.

2. CONSIDERATION OF GOALS

“An organisational goal is a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize”.(Etzioni,1964) According to this definition, an organisational goal is closely related to the present and future activities of an organisation, because “desired state of affairs” simply implies the future, and realising the intended state of affairs necessitates that the organisation undertake action which will insure the realization of the future state of affairs. The action taken today will play an important role in the realization of the desired state of affairs. In this sense, the organisational goal is closely related to the present and future activities of the organization. When the above considerations are taken into account, it is clear that an evaluation of organizational goals plays an important role in the administration of an organization.

A consideration of organizational goals is important from the point of view of organisational design. By “organisational design”, we are referring to the organizational arrangements, such as personnel to be employed, procedures and technology to be used, materials needed, the physical location of the organization and its activities etc., necessary for the accomplishment of the goals. Organizational arrangements are going to be determined to a great extent by the goals set for an organization. That is, the basic characteristics of the organization are going to be determined by the goals of the organization. The General Directorate of Highways (Karayolları Genel Müdürlüğü) and the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East (Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü) are two public organizations, but they have different organizational arrangements, because of the fact that each one of them was established for the accomplishment of a different goal. The General Directorate of Highways was established for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, repairing and operating highways and bridges etc, and because of that, it basically employs technical personnel like engineers and has its field units throughout Turkey. The latter, the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East was established to perform activities which contribute to the development of public administration in accordance with modern concepts and to train personnel in the field of administration, and thus, this organisation basically employs academics and does not have an extensive field organization as is the case for the General Directorate of Highways.

The consideration of organisational goals is also important from the point of view of evaluating, appraising, reforming, reorganizing, and criticizing an organization. In evaluating the performance of an organization, the first thing to do is to review the goals of the organization and then review the actual performance of the organization in order to find out its accomplishments on its way to reaching its goals. Without having some knowledge about its goals, we can not evaluate the performance of an organization. In this sense, the appraising, criticizing, reorganizing of an organization inevitably necessitate some knowledge about its goals.

At first glance, the idea of goal seems simple, but in reality the notion of goal is always complex, because in many cases it is difficult to find a single, simple, clear goal without looking beyond it. Actually there is not one but several goals. A seemingly single goal, in most cases, may be a link in a means-ends chain for accomplishing a higher level goal. Or in a large organization, members may perceive

its goals differently, top executives may see the organization as seeking one kind of a goal, while those in the middle and lower echelons may have drastically different goals for the organization. Even in an organization in which there is a high participation in decision making and strong membership commitment, it is unlikely that there will be a total consensus on what the organization should attempt to do.

Organisational goals are formulated by the decisions of individuals, singly or collectively. At the same time, the determination of a goal for collective action becomes a standard by which the collective action is evaluated and judged. Goals of an organization seldom remain constant over time, because new considerations imposed from within or outside the organization may result in the modification of the goals. When the relationship between the organization and its environment is taken into consideration, it is clear that organizations are affected by the changes taking place in their environment, and they have to adapt themselves to the changing conditions. In the process of adaptation they may also have to modify their goals as well.

“Official” and “Operative” goals.

In discussing organizational goals we can distinguish between the “official” and “operative” goals of organizations.(Perrow, 1961). Official goals are “the general purposes of the organization as put forth in the charter, annual reports, public statements by key executives and other authoritative pronouncements.” Operative goals, on the other hand, “designate the end sought through the actual operating policies of the organization; they tell us what the organization actually is trying to do regardless of what the official goals say are the aims.” Official goals reflect the desired state of affairs, and in that sense they may be called the “ideal goals” of the organization which are difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish. The operative goals, on the other hand, can be seen as the means by which the official goals are going to be accomplished.(Hall, 1977). But since the official goals are either too general, vague or of high abstraction, the “means“ (operative goals) may become ends in themselves, when the organization is the object of analysis. For example, according to its Organic Law (Law No:2287,1933) the official goal of the Ministry of National Education is “ to develop the Turkish Nation in knowledge, art, science and prosperity to the standards of western civilization in an atmosphere of freedom; to develop the national moral, and human values that the Turkish nation possesses; to make the nation a constructive, creative and distinguished member of the western civilization.” As can be seen clearly, the official goals of the Ministry simply indicate the general purposes of the organization, it is a statement describing the desired state of affairs, and to a certain extent it is vague and abstract. The operative goals of the Ministry, on the other hand, are the establishment and operations of the primary, secondary, technical and vocational schools, and the activities related to higher education. Officials of the ministry, in their daily activities, are concerned with the quality of education, curriculum development, teacher shortage, establishing new schools etc. As can be seen, operative goals provide the specific content of official goals and they are the means by which the official goals are to be established. The focus of attention of the officials of the Ministry is the accomplishment of the operative goals, such as solving the problem of teacher shortage or the establishing of new schools for accommodating the increase in the number of students, and in this sense, the operative goals become ends in themselves.

In this understanding, operative goals become the standards by which the Ministry's actions are judged and according to which decisions are made. The performance of the Ministry is evaluated on the basis of its operative goals. But it should never be forgotten that the operative goals reflect the official goals; it can be argued that operative goals are abstractions made more concrete.

Multiplicity of goals.

Organisations have several goals, and the goals of organizations may not be compatible, they may be logically inconsistent. It has been argued that modern or complex organizations are trying to achieve several goals simultaneously and that the compatibility or relations between these are controversial. For example, one of the goals of the General Directorate of Security (Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü) is to maintain law and order and protect the lives and properties of citizens. Another goal of the very same organization is to respect and protect the legal security of citizens. These two goals are not compatible in the sense that the police can function much more effectively if they are not asked to respect the legal security of the citizens. In apprehending criminals the police are asked to obtain a search warrant from the court before entering the residences of citizens, but trying to get a search warrant may slow down the functioning of the police and prevent their effective action.

The goal or purpose is the basis for organizational activities. In many cases it is true that the means can come to be emphasized more heavily than the goal itself; the members of the organization may have no idea of why they are doing what they are doing, they may not be aware of their contribution to the organization's accomplishments, but without the presence of a goal, they would not be doing whatever they are doing. The goal is the basis for the organization, even if it is forgotten or ignored by its members. The organization would not exist if it were not some common goal or purpose. When organizations are studied, it is found that most organizations have more than one goal. These multiple goals may be in conflict with one another, but even then, they are still the basis for organizational action.

3. ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

In every organisation there are formally and clearly defined departments with specific tasks, and within each department, there are units and sub-units. Individuals are placed in specific positions, and their formal relations with each other are predetermined in view of the goals to be accomplished. Every organization has such an explicit framework which is called its **formal structure**. The structure of an organization indicates how the activities necessary for the accomplishment of goals are divided among the members of the organization, and how the people and units of the organization are related to each other in view of the goals to be accomplished. The organizational structure serves two basic functions: (a) The structure is designed to minimize, or at least to regulate, the influence of individual variations on the functioning of the organization. In that sense, the structure is predetermined and imposed to insure that individuals conform to the requirements of the organization. (b) The structure is the setting in which authority is exercised, decisions are made, and the organization's activities are carried out. Organizations accomplish their objectives with the contribution of hundreds or thousands of individuals. In the process of accomplishing the objectives, decisions have to be made regarding the

necessary activities, the flow of information needed by the decision makers has to be insured, and the activities of the individuals have to be directed toward the goals. The above necessitates the structuring of the relations among the individuals, the distributing of authority to influence the behavior of individuals, and the determining of the channels of communication for the flow of information etc., all of which is to be regulated by the structure.

In designing the structure of an organization, the basic question to be answered is: "What departments should we have, and on what basis should these departments be established?" Several factors (political, legal, emotional, sociological and administrative) will be in effect in answering the above question. The point of departure in designing an organizational structure is the elaboration of operative goals. By analyzing the organizational goals, we will know which functions or operations should be performed in achieving the goals. Without having a clear idea about the goals to be accomplished, we cannot be sure of the kind of activities necessary for the organized action. The second step in the effort to design an organization is to decide on a pattern of division of labor, because the goal or goals are to be achieved with the contribution of hundreds of individuals, and we have to be able to divide the overall work into small components and assign it to individuals. In this sense, the work that is going to be accomplished by organizational effort must be analyzed and divided into its component parts, and each part should be assigned to a unit in the organization. The nature of organizations inevitably leads to a division of work.

In dividing the work of an organization to its component parts, the need for specialization and coordination has to be taken into consideration. The overall work to be accomplished by the organization must first be divided into its most economic parts on the basis of some kind of specialization, and then each part must be assigned to a specific unit. Division of work (or division of labor) helps to reduce the number of objects to which attention must be directed, and thus increases the efficiency of the individual and the organization. Let us take a closer look at the relationship between division of labor and the performance of individuals, for the purpose of having a better understanding of the effects of division of work. An individual has a variety of abilities, and when employed by organizations, is going to use his/her abilities in an effort to contribute to the -goal accomplishment. As a result of the division of labor, the individual is asked to direct his/her attention to a limited sphere of activity and employ only a few of his/her abilities in undertaking the organizationally assigned tasks. The individual, as a consequence of using a few of his/her abilities, doing the very same job in a repetitive manner, will be able to develop those skills and specialize in what he/she is doing. Because of this, division of labor is recognized as the best means of making use of individuals and groups of people in organizations. When division of labor is in effect in an organization the need for effective coordination becomes a vital need. The overall work of the organization is divided into its small components, each component is assigned to an individual or a unit. Now it is necessary to establish meaningful relationships among the components for accomplishing the goal. That is, there is a need to coordinate the activities of different units and individuals doing related work. The division of labor put into effect should facilitate such a need of coordination.

The above discussion clearly indicates the inevitability of division of labor for organizations. The division of labor is a must and begins at the most general level of an organization and then goes down to the individual jobs.

Departmentalisation.

Dividing an organisation at the most general level into large and then into smaller units is usually called departmentalization. Departmentalization is the process through which departments, divisions, units and sub-units are established in the organization. As has been indicated above, goal accomplishment with the contribution of hundreds of individuals requires a division of labour among the individuals. When the overall work is divided into small components and each component is assigned to individuals and groups, then there arises the need to establish meaningful relations among the components. That is, the components that are related to each other have to be brought together and placed under a common authority for facilitating goal accomplishment. Departmentalization refers to the process of grouping the components and relating them to each other. At this point, the question to be answered is: how can we divide the organization into departments, and according to what kind of criteria we can accomplish this? Is there a single principle of effective departmentalisation? According to one of the prominent scholars (Gullick,1947) there are several criteria to be employed in departmentalization, such as;

- ◆ The major purpose to be served.
- ◆ The processes to be used.
- ◆ The persons or things served or dealt with.
- ◆ The place where the activities will take place

The basic idea is to combine homogenous activities and units and separate heterogeneous ones. Each one of the above criteria has its advantages and disadvantages, and it is not possible to single out one of them and then say this is the single principle of effective departmentalization. Each one of the above mentioned system of organization is intimately related with the others, because in any organization, all four elements are present in the work of an individual or unit. Each member and unit of the organization is working for some major purpose, uses some process, deals with some persons, and serves or works at some place. If an organization is structured on the basis of the one of the above, it becomes immediately necessary to recognize the others in constructing the secondary and other divisions of the work.

Job Specification.

In an organization, it is not sufficient to determine only the departments and their subdivisions with specific tasks and responsibilities, this process should go down to individual jobs. What kind of individual jobs there will be in each unit has to be determined. Job specification refers to the specification and standardization of manual work in organizations. Job specification was first studied by Frederic Taylor. In his “Scientific Management” approach, Taylor claimed that work had to be scientifically analyzed in order to give the workers exactly defined tasks, and make management’s authority and directions unquestionable. According to Taylor, it was possible to find out a one-best-way of doing a job, through employing time and

motion studies for manual works in the organisation (George, Jr., 1968). It was the one-best-way because it had been found out through scientific investigations by the experts. Job specification describes how the job is going to be performed in the best way possible and also indicates the qualifications necessary for the individual to have. Job specification, in this sense, is the division of labor at the individual level, and is used with reference to manual work in organizations.

Job description.

Job description is a parallel technique of analysis of individual positions developed for office work. In this case all categories of jobs are analysed, classified, and related to overall operational goals. Each specific job is described in terms of the duties of the task to be performed, the responsibilities of the incumbent, and the authority delegated to the position. In addition to the above, the qualifications of the individual who is going to perform that job are determined in terms of the field of education, level of education, experience necessary, and any other special abilities. Job descriptions are designed for the purposes of recruitment, placement, training and wage setting.

Structural levels.

When an organisation is structured, that is, its main departments, subdivisions of the departments and individual posts are determined, it takes a pyramidal form. In every organization structured in the form of a pyramid, there are several **levels** or **echelons**. The number of levels changes from one organization to another and it affects the functioning of the organization, thus the question of how many levels we shall have in an organization is an important question to be answered. The number of levels is important from the points of view of upward and downward communication, coordination, the speed in the performance of duties and red-tape. In general, if the number of levels increases, it will have negative effects on upward and downward communication. In general, as a rule, communication follows hierarchical levels without bypassing any level, and if there are too many levels, communications will take too much time and, thus, will slow down. A slowing down in the information flow will negatively affect the decision making process, in the sense that there will be delays in decision making and the organization will not be able to respond to the problems on time. As can be seen easily, if the number of levels increases, this will slow down the performance of duties and contribute to the creation of bottlenecks and red-tape. Thus, it is recommended to have as few levels as possible.

The numbers of levels is closely related to the concept of span of control. **Span of control** is the number of personnel directly supervised by an administrator. If the span of control is narrow, the number of hierarchical levels increases; if it is broad, the number of levels decreases, that is, there is an inverse relationship between span of control and the number of organisational levels. Which form is preferable, wide or narrow span? According to some scholars, classical advocates, the span of control should be restricted, thus narrow. They are of the opinion that a restricted span of control can improve executive effectiveness, produce better employee cooperation and build morale and a sense of unity within the organisation. The concept of span of control is widely discussed among scholars, and no one knows what the magic number is, because such factors as the personality of the executive, the nature of work (whether routine or complex), the need for immediate decisions, and the degree of geographic dispersion are factors defining the supervisory relationship. Since these

factors are subject to change from one organisation to another, it is not possible to suggest an optimum number for the span of control, thus, it is subject to change.

For the sake of administrative and organisational efficiency, it is desirable to restrict the number of structural levels as much as possible. Any level which is not vitally needed should be eliminated. But in determining the number of levels, prime consideration should be given to the span of control, because forcing managers to exceed their feasible span of control for the objective of reducing the number of structural levels will increase the administrative and social distance between executives and subordinates. As a result, executives will no longer have sufficient time to interact with their subordinates and find out what is going on in the organisation.

Line and staff.

In organisations there may be a single individual at the top of the organisation who is responsible for the organisation as a whole. But, usually, the man at the top is not alone, because there is a group of individuals to assist him in his administrative functions. This group is usually called, the “**staff**”. Originally the concept of staff comes from military organisations; commanding officers of large units are provided with a group of specialised officers to assist them in planning and appraising important decisions. The same idea has been transferred to civilian organisations, and in complex, large scale organisations chief executives are aided by staff. In this sense, the staff is identified as a group of individuals giving advice to the executive. The staff generally is concerned with two types of work:(1) Overall long-range developmental problems of the organisation; developing new products, or more efficient methods of production; improving the services rendered; making projections and forecasts for the future. (2) Assisting the manager in complex, non-routine, or emergency situations which require specialised knowledge and careful analysis for decisions.

As opposed to staff, line services or functions are those that are direct in their contribution to the objectives of the organisation. That means the line has direct responsibility for accomplishing the objectives of the organisation (Urwick, 1947). In other words, only line functions have the power and authority to initiate and carry the primary activities, which are necessary to accomplish the stated objectives of the organisation. To give an example, let us consider a police organisation: the police organisation is responsible for the maintenance of law and order, and for the protection of the lives and property of citizens. The policeman patrolling the street or regulating the traffic flow is undertaking a line function, because what he is doing is directly contributing to goal accomplishment. But, on the other hand, the legal adviser to the chief of police is indirect in his contribution to the goal accomplishment, when he gives advice to his boss. Since the line is directly responsible for accomplishing the organisation’s objectives it follows that the line elements of organisation can be identified most accurately in terms of these objectives.

4.AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIP (AUTHORITY STRUCTURE).

Organisations are defined as “social units or human groupings deliberately established for the accomplishment of specific objectives”. This definition clearly indicates that, in an organization, goal accomplishment is possible through the contribution of a number of individuals. If this is so, then there is need for a means that will direct and coordinate the activities of members for realizing the given objectives of the organization. Some members of the organization should be able to influence the behavior of the others so that each member undertakes his/her organizationally assigned activities at the right time and place for facilitating goal accomplishment. In short, there is need for an authority structure.

Authority can be defined as “ **the power or right to give order, enforce obedience, take action or make final decision**”. Formal authority is associated with a given position in the organization. Such authority may be defined as the influence and sanctions available to any position in the organization, regardless of the personal characteristics of the individual who is occupying that position (Hall,1977). In an organization, theoretically authority is concentrated at the top, but alongside departmentalization, it is distributed throughout the organization through the process called “**delegation of authority**”. Organizational structure shows the authority distribution and authority relationships in the organization in the sense that those individuals occupying higher positions in the organizational hierarchy will have more authority compared with the ones who are occupying lower positions.

A discussion on the concept of authority necessarily brings into consideration the concept of power. Power is related to the relationship between two or more persons, in which the behavior of one affects that of the other(s). Power is the possibility of imposing one’s will upon the behavior of other persons. In other words, “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something B would not otherwise do” (Dahl,1957). This simple definition contains the essence of the power concept; one of the individuals is able to impose his/her will upon the behavior of others. The above definition also implies an important point that is often neglected: power is meaningless unless it is exercised. The concept of power refers to the relationship between individuals, in which the behavior of one or more is affected by the other. A person or group cannot have power in isolation; it has to be in relationship to some other individual or group.

Power involves force or coercion and is not an important factor as an internal process in organizations. Authority is a form of power that does not imply force. It involves a “suspension of judgment” on the part of the individual who is the recipient of an order. In an organization, subordinates obey the order given by their supervisor because they believe that they ought to obey. In the case of the authority relationship, compliance is voluntary, but this requires a common value system among the organizational members. In other words, authority involves the acceptance of a power system as one enters the organization; in this power system, those who are in supervisory positions are entitled to give orders, and those who are in subordinate positions are expected to comply with the orders. In this sense, compliance is voluntary in an authority relationship. But the subordinate is aware of the fact that if he does not comply with a specific order, there is always the possibility of a certain sanction being used by the supervisor against such a behavior. In the case of power

relationship, the decision to accept the influence of the other is made at the particular moment when the power appeal is sent by the power holder.

Organisations have a pyramidal structure, and this structure consists of several hierarchical levels which represent superior – subordinate, and therefore authority, relationships. Authority is distributed on the basis of this hierarchical structure; the individuals who are placed at higher positions in this hierarchical structure will have more authority compared to the others. There are certain principles which should be in effect in the design of this authority structure of the organization:

Scalar Principle.

According to this principle, authority should follow hierarchical levels in an unbroken manner, and officials at each level should have authority over those who are positioned at the immediately lower level. Thus a line of authority, from the top manager to the employee at the lowest level, develops. This unbroken line of authority is called a “**chain of command**”. Orders and directives have to follow this chain of command, and thus hierarchical levels, without bypassing any level. In designing an organization, formal authority relations should be clearly indicated. If there is a necessity for a specific deviation from the hierarchical chain of command, it should have sound justification and be made explicit.

Unity of Command.

According to this principle, no member of an organization should receive orders from more than one superior. The basic idea is to prevent subordinates receiving conflicting orders coming from more than one supervisor (Gulick, 1937). In this sense it is essentially a logical principle but it is not possible to fully apply this principle in practice, especially in large scale organizations. In the application of this principle, the following has to be taken into consideration: (a) No employee should formally report to more than one supervisor on any single function. (b) A single supervisor should be designated who will be ultimately obeyed under all circumstances, and especially in the cases of conflicting orders.

5. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Planning.

Planning is an activity that concerns itself with proposals for the future, with the evaluation of alternative proposals, and with the methods by which these proposals may be achieved. From an organizational viewpoint, planning is concerned with setting organizational goals or objectives and determining the approach by which the goals are to be established. In this sense planning determines where the organization is going and the general approaches it will use to get there. Planning coordinates the activities of the organization toward defined and agreed objectives. Within this understanding, planning is concerned with the future and helps the manager shape the future of the organisation. Planning is related to the future activities, but preparation of the plan or planning the future activities of organisation necessitates a thorough evaluation of the present conditions, the state of affairs and the capabilities of the organisation at the moment.

The implementation of a plan commits an organization to a specific course of action, therefore, plans should cover a time period long enough to foresee the fulfillment of

commitments made in the plan. In addition to above mentioned, the dynamic nature of planning requires that it should be flexible, because one never knows exactly what the future holds. Planning to a certain extent is based on the forecasts or predictions of the state of future conditions, and the planners may not be so precise in their forecasting or predictions. Thus, there may arise the need to adapt the planned activities to the conditions which are different from those predicted. In this sense plans should be flexible enough to facilitate such adaptations.

Organizing.

Every administrator works within an organizational framework. The successful administrator must have a solid understanding of the principles of organization and must realize that the structure of an organization plays a vital role that cannot be overlooked. As a function, organizing is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which departments, divisions and subdivisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for the accomplishment of the defined objectives. Organizing is a continuous activity of every administration; once the formal structure of the organization is established, this does not necessarily mean that the very same structure will be in effect in the future indefinitely. Organizations have to adapt themselves to the changing conditions of the environment to perpetuate their existence and in this process of adaptation their formal structure may be subject to change as well. As indicated earlier, the interaction between the organization and its environment is a vital one, and thus the organization has to take into consideration the changing conditions of the environment, if it wants to accomplish its objectives and increase its efficiency. The changing conditions of the environment may necessitate and/or may force the organization to modify its formal structure. In this sense, organizing is one of the functions to which the administrator has to pay continuous attention.

Staffing.

Staffing is the whole personnel function, of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work. One of the essential needs of every organization is to have qualified manpower for undertaking activities related to its goal accomplishment. Staffing principally deals with the recruitment of employees for organization positions, with the separation of employees from the organization through retirement, dismissal, or resignation, with the training of employees, with their salaries and wages, and with their health, safety and welfare. In addition to the above mentioned promotions and transfers from one position to another, the techniques to be used in the selection of the employees etc. are activities which can be listed under staffing. Staffing is directly related to the manpower needs of an organization which changes in line with the changing environmental conditions. Thus, forecasting the future and trying to predict the possible changes which will affect the manpower needs of the organization is a vital aspect of staffing. As can be seen, staffing is simply the personnel administration, which plays a vital role in the overall picture of organization.

Directing.

Directing is the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions, and serving as the leader of the enterprise. Directing involves insuring cooperation among the employees, making sure that each employee contributes his/her mental or physical efforts for accomplishing the objectives of the organization. In this sense some of the individuals have to direct the others for insuring their contribution to goal accomplishment, and such an activity requires lots of decisions. One of the most critical activities of administrators is to engage in the decision making process. As a matter of fact, almost every position in an organization involves some decision making, such a simple matter as the size of the piece of paper to insert in a printer involves a decision.

Decision making is the act of reaching a judgment or conclusion regarding an issue. Decision making is usually regarded as an intellectual process, the product of an individual mind. However, it must be emphasized that organizational decision-making is an institutionalized process. Any ultimate decision in the organization is the end product of the combined efforts of many individuals at several different levels in the organizational hierarchy. Thus, an organizational decision is a collective product rather than the result of any individual's choice. What really happens is that, in the first place, every decision is based on information, and secondly, the decision maker (administrator) is given information regarding the possible alternatives involved. The alternatives are developed, and the possible consequences of each one studied thoroughly by several individuals, and then the related information is given to the decision maker for consideration. The ultimate decision made is simply the selection made from amongst the alternatives submitted to the decision maker. As can be seen clearly, there are several individuals and several of their contributions in organizational decision making, thus as indicated earlier, organizational decision making is an institutionalized process.

As a function, directing is closely related to leading and leadership style. In general, leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in its efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation. This definition of leadership clearly indicates that leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational variables. In essence, leadership involves accomplishing goals with and through people. Therefore, a leader must be concerned about the tasks which are necessary for goal accomplishment and the relationship among the people who are going to perform the tasks. In elaborating the function of the leader, classical theory emphasizes a concern for the task, but neo-classical theory stresses a concern for relationships. The recognition of these two concerns characterizes the writings on leadership and identifies two basic styles of leadership. When the leader emphasizes the task aspect of his job, he/she is concerned with setting up and enforcing performance criteria to meet organizational goals, and his/her main focus is on the needs of the organization not on the needs of the individual. Such leader behavior is called **authoritarian**. When the leader emphasizes the relationship aspect of his/her job he/she is concerned with facilitating cooperative goal attainment among followers while providing opportunities for their personal growth and development, and his/her main focus is on the needs of the individuals, not on the needs of the organization. Such leader behavior is called **democratic**. The differences in the two

styles of leader behavior are based on the assumptions leader makes about the source of his/her power or authority and human nature.

The **authoritarian** style of leader behavior is often based on the assumption that the leader's power is derived from the position he/she occupies in the organization and that man is lazy and unreliable by nature. As a result, in the authoritarian style, all policies are determined and all vital decisions are made by the leader and then communicated to the others. The **democratic** style of leader behavior is based on the assumption that the leader's power is granted by the group he is to lead and that the average man is basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. In this style of leadership, the leader shares his/her leadership responsibilities with the others, policies are open to group discussion, and thus there is joint decision making in the group.

Coordinating.

Coordinating is the task of interrelating the various parts of the work. Coordinating is an important activity of the administrator, because in the functioning of an organization, there exists a detailed division of labor, and goal accomplishment is possible through the contributions of several individuals. As a result of division of labor, the overall work is divided into its components, and each component is placed under the responsibility of an individual or group, and goal accomplishment necessitates the establishment of specific relations among various parts of the work. The need for coordination is taken into consideration in the process of designing organizational structure; the units which do related work are brought together and placed under the authority of a common superior. The normal method of coordination is hierarchical in its operation, that is, if trouble or a problem develops between two individuals or units, the matter is handled by the common higher authority. In addition to structural arrangements, when needed, special committees are established for purposes of coordination.

Controlling.

Organisations are established to achieve specific goals and the goals are expected to be attained as specified in terms of place, time, quantity, and quality. Once an organization formulates its objectives and prepares an action plan, which prescribes the course of action to be followed, and starts its operation, then it is necessary to check or verify whether things are going as planned, to exercise authority over those who are responsible for the various functions, and to curb or restrain those who deviate from the determined course of action. In this sense, control is a continuous activity, and one of the basic components of administration related to the operations. The need for control should be taken into consideration in the design of an organization, in other words, an effective control system should be developed and built into the organizational structure and operational arrangements. Hierarchical structure, departmentalization, specification of the jobs, classification of positions, span of control, and unity of command are all directly or indirectly related to control function.

There are four elements common to all control systems:

(1).Determining measurable and controllable characteristics. The first step in designing a sound control system is to specify measurable performance standards. Specification of measurable standards is not something easy ; in many instances it may not be possible to determine such standards. Duties determined in a job description, determining standards for quality, and allocations made in the budgets etc. may serve as standards.

(2).Verification and measurement. The second step in a control system is the inspection and measurement of the performance of the employee. At this stage, the basic objective is to evaluate the actual performance of the employee and reach a judgment regarding his accomplishments.

(3).Comparing the actual results of the performance with the standards determined and evaluating the difference. This is an important step in the control process, because the comparison made will show to what extent the actual performance is in conformity with the pre-determined standards.

(4).Effecting changes if necessary. If there are important differences between the actual performance and the standards determined, it may be necessary to take corrective action to insure the accomplishment of the pre-determined standard.

As can be seen from the above description, control is the examination of the results of performance. To control is to make sure that all operations at all times are carried out in accordance with the plan adopted, with the orders given and with the principles laid down.

Communicating.

Communication, simply defined as “the exchange of information and the transmission of meaning”, plays a vital role in the functioning of organizations. As has been already indicated, organizations are deliberately established for the accomplishment of specific goals. In their effort to accomplish the goals, the organisations have to get inputs (manpower, technology, and raw materials etc.) from their environments and then transform these either into goods or services (outputs) and give them back to the environment. This interaction between the organization and the environment is vital for the organization, and organizations have to adapt themselves to the changing conditions of the environment in order to perpetuate their existence. That being so, organizations have to try to regulate their relations with their environment, and for that reason they have to communicate and exchange information with their environment. Before receiving their inputs, organizations have to get information regarding the variety and quality of the inputs for making a rational decision in the selection of their inputs. They have to obtain information regarding the changing conditions of the environment to make decisions in relation to the adaptation process. The outputs of the organization are given to the environment, and the outputs of one organization may be the input of some other organization or may be consumed by individuals or organizations in the environment. The implication of this is clear: since the output is going to be used in the environment, its characteristics should be in line with the expectations of its probable consumers. Thus the organization has to have information regarding the kind of effects its outputs are creating in the environment, so that necessary changes can be made in the characteristics of the outputs, to meet the expectations of the consumers. As can be

seen, the organization has to exchange information (communicate) with its environment regarding its outputs as well. In short, organizations have to communicate externally with their environment for reasons of survival.

Communication also plays a very important role internally within the transformation process in which inputs are transformed into goods or services. In the process of producing their outputs (goods or services), organizations have to make lots of decisions. Decisions made are communicated to the related units or individuals for implementation. If there occurs any problem in the process of implementing the decision, the problem has to be communicated to the decision center for consideration and the necessary adjustments. As can be seen in the functioning of an organization, there will be a continuous flow of information and information exchange between its hierarchical levels. Researchers have identified three basic types of internal organizational communication:

I. Downward Communication. This is the most common type of communication used in every organization. In this type, the communication is initiated by the higher levels and destined for the lower levels, that is communication flows from a supervisor to a subordinate. The following types of information are transmitted to the lower levels in downward communication (Katz and Kahn, 1967): (1). Specific task directives: job instructions describing the best way to complete a task. (2) Job rationale: information defining a job and relating it to other jobs, organizational goals and objectives. (3). Organizational policies and objectives: information about organizational procedures and practices. (4).Performance feedback: feedback to the subordinate about his performance. (5). Information of an ideological nature: explaining organizational goals to the subordinates (indoctrination of goals).

II. Upward Communication. Upward communication is the communication initiated by the subordinate and addressed to the supervisor. Upward communication provides administration with feedback about organizational practices and policies, current issues and problems. Since this type of communication is initiated by the subordinates, the subordinates are expected to give information about their performance and the problems they are facing in undertaking their organizational tasks, and their feelings and evaluations about organizational procedures and practices (Katz and Kahn, 1967). Upward communication plays an important role in developing and improving organizational performance, but there are obstacles on the way to effective upward communication. The basic problem faced in upward communication is the nature of the hierarchical administrative structure. People are related to each other as supervisors and subordinates within this structure. The role given to people in executive and supervisory positions is to direct, coordinate, and control the activities of the people below them. The supervisors do not have the habit of listening to their subordinates, instead they prefer to tell them what to do. The subordinates also fall into this role pattern and expect to listen to their superiors rather than be listened to. In addition to the above, information transmitted up the line is generally utilized for control purposes, and because of that, there are great constraints on free upward communication. The supervisors are not likely to be given information by the subordinates which will lead to decisions affecting them adversely. Members of the organization want to get certain information up the line, but generally they are afraid of presenting it to the most relevant person or in the most objective form. Full and objective reporting might be penalized by the supervisor or regarded as espionage by peers.

III. Horizontal communication. Communication between people at the same hierarchical level is called “horizontal communication”. This type of communication is less formal when compared with the two previous vertical types. Horizontal communication usually involves problem solving and the coordination of work flow between peers or groups. This type of communication in addition to providing task coordination and problem solving also furnishes emotional and social support for the individual.

Budgeting.

Budgeting, or budgetary process, is central to the administration of any organisation, because through budgeting an effective control is exercised over the financial resources at the disposal of the organisation. Dimock claims that budgeting is at the heart of the administrative processes, because “Without money work would come to a stop or never would be undertaken in the first place” (Dimock and Dimock, 1964). A similar evaluation is made by Pfiffner and Presthus when they state “ The budgetary process is central to administration because the control of the purse is perhaps the most effective tool of coordination” (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967). Budgeting is an important element of financial administration, which includes those operations designed to make funds available to officials and to ensure their efficient use within the framework of laws.

Financial administration includes the following: the determination of financial policies; preparation of the budget; collecting revenues and allocating them for the various activities in view of the goals to be accomplished; supervision of expenditures; the control of the accounting and reporting system; and treasury management and audit. The analysis of fiscal organisation and procedures throws light on other aspects of administration. In this sense, finance and administration are inseparable. Almost every administrative action has its financial implications, either getting something out of the treasury or making a contribution to it.

5. SOME KEY CONCEPTS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF ORGANISATIONS

There are certain concepts which are frequently used in studying, analyzing and evaluating the functioning of organizations. Concepts like rationality, effectiveness and efficiency are used in relation to the activities of organizations. In this section, the meaning of these frequently used concepts and their implication for organizations and their administration will be discussed .

Rationality.

Rationality is one of the most frequently-used key concepts in the study, evaluation and analysis of organizations and their administration. In general, rationality is related to decision-making and choice. According to Pfiffner, “rationality is one of the vital theoretical aspects of decision making”. Rationality is defined as “the capacity of man to make choices based upon conscious deliberation about the means selected to achieve specified ends” (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967). The above definition clearly indicates that rationality and being rational are taken as a human ability and generally, it is related to decision making. Decisions and actions of the individuals will be considered as rational to the extent they have the following characteristics: 1) Decision

or action should be taken deliberately and consciously, that is, the individual should be aware of what he/she is doing and intending to accomplish. (2) Since there are usually various alternatives and means to accomplish the very same objective, there should be an effort to identify the set of alternatives and various means to achieve them. (3) The decision should be directed to the search of finding the best available means, and this search must be based on logical reasoning and scientific knowledge. (4) There should be a deliberate attempt to recognize or find out to what extent emotions, habits, beliefs and interest enter into the process of choice. The above description is an idealized conception of rationality, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to be fully rational in this sense.

When the above mentioned characteristics are taken into consideration, it seems that being deliberate and conscious seems to be the dominant peculiarity (feature) of rationality. In such a conception, rationality is identified with deliberateness and consciousness. Then the question to be asked is this: is not the action of an individual who instinctively withdraws a finger that is burned rational? Of course, the answer to such a question will be: yes, it is rational. Or take the example of a typist who trains himself/herself to strike a particular key in response to the stimulus of a particular letter. Once trained, the typist is able to type a document at very high speed by using ten fingers of both hands, but not making a conscious decision with each stroke. The behavior of the typist is rational, but certain characteristics which are identified with rationality are not there. One last consideration in relation to rationality is the question of in terms of what objectives and whose values rationality be judged. Consider the example of two soldiers sitting in a trench opposite a machine-gun nest. One of them stays under cover. The other, at the cost of his life, destroys the machine-gun nest with a grenade. Which action is rational? As can easily be seen, there are complexities involved in the use of the term. As one of the prominent scholars, Simon, suggests, perhaps the only way to avoid such complexities is to use the term "rational" in conjunction with appropriate adverbs. Then a decision is "objectively" rational if in fact it is the correct behavior for maximizing given values in a given situation. It is "consciously" rational to the degree that the adjustment of means to the ends is a conscious process. A decision is "organizationally" rational if it is oriented to the organization's goals; it is "personally" rational if it is oriented to the individual's goals.

What is the relevance of rationality for organizations? Organizations are deliberately established to achieve specific goals. The definition of organization implies that they are at least planned to be rational. Because an organization is expected to accomplish its goals with the contribution of several (hundreds or thousands of) individuals, and for that matter they have to plan their activities, they have to set up a specific order. In short, deliberateness and consciousness are in effect in the decisions made to establishing the organization and the measures introduced for achieving rationality in its design and operations. But complete rationality is almost impossible in an organization. Organizations employ individuals, and individuals take decisions and engage in a variety of actions, and they are expected to be rational. But this is not so easy, there are rational and irrational elements in their behavior. Emotional factors like fear, love, friendship, affection, anger, jealousy, beliefs, and loyalties are obstacles to rationality in individuals. Thus, complete rationality is almost an unattainable ideal in organisations. Since complete rationality is seen as an unattainable ideal, a modified conception of rationality, which is called "limited

rationality” has been developed. Perfect rationality can be achieved very rarely, in very limited situations. Thus, generally rational efforts are directed to obtaining satisfactory solutions rather than optimal or optimum solutions.

Effectiveness.

Effectiveness is defined as “ the degree to which (an organization) realizes its goals.” (Etzioni,1964) Since organizations are established to accomplish specific goals and most of the activities that take place in organizations are carried for conscious specific aims, the concept of effectiveness is important for organizations. Within this understanding organizational effectiveness is the extent to which an organization fulfills its objectives. Effectiveness is not a simple issue, because organizations in general do not have a single goal. The basic difficulty in analyzing effectiveness is the fact of multiple and often conflicting goals in many organizations. Effectiveness in one set of goals may lead to ineffectiveness in another.

Efficiency.

The concept of efficiency is generally used as a synonym for rationality and it is used in the meaning of economy, reducing the expenditures. Efficiency is defined as “ the amount of resources used to produce a unit of output”. In this sense, efficiency is directly related to how an organization uses its resources in the production of goods or services. If we can measure an organization’s inputs and outputs, such a concept of efficiency is both very useful and relevant in the operation and evaluation of organizations. In many cases, it is difficult to measure the inputs and outputs of an organization, but this situation should not prevent us from paying attention to the concept of efficiency in evaluating the performance of an organization. Since the resources at the disposal of an organization are limited, how they are used in the accomplishment of goals should be the concern of everyone involved. A useful approach in this sense is to identify waste and unused inputs. If there are inputs which are not used, if there is a large amount of idle manpower or machinery, this would indicate inefficiency in that organization.

Rationality, effectiveness and efficiency are important concepts related to the performance of organizations. In general, it can be argued that organizations have to be rational in order to be effective and efficient. But rationality is not the only determinant of efficiency and effectiveness, there are some other factors involved. In this sense the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness are related to each other, but an organization can be efficient without being effective, or can be effective but not efficient.

III. THEORIES OF ORGANISATION

Theories of organization are derived from the study of organizations as social units that have been established deliberately for attaining specific goals. The first theory, the Classical Theory of Organization, arose at the turn of the twentieth century in what may be considered the industrialized countries of that time. The industrial revolution and the developments in production technology had affected and changed the size of organizations, and large scale organizations started to emerge. New production technology, the need to produce in larger quantities, meant the recruitment of new individuals. Bringing new individuals introduced new patterns of relations and changed old ones, and new functions appeared in organizations. All of these developments brought the efficiency of organization as a problem to the attention of the scholars and practitioners. The studies focusing on how to increase the efficiency of organizations led to the emergence and development of theories of organizations.

Organization theories are classified according to several criteria by the students of organization. The classification adopted in this study is: classical, neoclassical, and modern theories. It may be argued that the desire to achieve greater efficiency in the functioning and administration of organizations is the objective of organization theories.

1. CLASSICAL ORGANISATION THEORY

Classical organisation theory basically deals with the anatomy of organizations. The structure is important, and the attentions of the scholars are focused on the design of the formal structure. Classical organization theory is built around four key pillars. These are the division of labor, scalar and functional processes, structure, and span of control (Scott, 1963).

Division of labor. Division of labor is the cornerstone of the four elements. Adam Smith's description of modern manufacturing of pins, in his "Wealth of Nations", has become a classic illustration of the significance of the division of labor. Smith indicated that a worker by himself might produce 20 pins a day. But by breaking down the task of making pins into many small operations, it is possible to produce more. He estimated that there were about 18 different jobs involved in the production of pins. By assigning different jobs to different workers, 10 workers could produce 48,000 pins a day. This represents 4,800 pins per worker a day. The division of labor that Smith indicated was to become the basis of a theory of organizational efficiency. In this sense, division of labor is the central tenet of classical theory. The classical theory firmly rests on the assumption that the more a particular job can be broken down into its simple component parts, the more specialized and the more skilled a worker can become in carrying out his/her part of the job. The more skilled the worker becomes in fulfilling his/her particular job, the more efficient the whole production system will be.

The scalar and functional processes. The scalar and functional processes deal with the vertical and horizontal growth of an organization. The scalar process refers to the growth of the chain of command, the delegation of authority and responsibility, and unity of command. The functional process refers to the division of the organization into specialized parts and the regrouping of the parts into compatible units.

Structure. Structure is the logical relationship between functions in an organization, arranged to accomplish the objectives of the organization efficiently. Classical organization theory usually deals with two basic structures, line and staff. Line functions are those which have direct responsibility in the accomplishment of the objectives of the organization. Only line functions have the power or authority to initiate and carry through the primary activities that are necessary to reach the stated goals of the organization. Staff has no authority over other parts of the organization. Staff does not direct, it advises and serves. It is available to, and can be used by, all units of the organization within the limits of organization policy or practice. Thus, staff is a reservoir of special knowledge, skills, and experiences which the entire organization can use (Urwick, 1937)

Span of control. Span of control refers to the number of subordinates a manager can effectively supervise. Classical theorists basically defend the notion of “a limited span of control”. According to them, no supervisor can directly supervise the work of more than five or at the most six subordinates.

Among these elements, the division of labor is the cornerstone, and the other elements flow from it as corollaries. For example scalar and functional growth (vertical and horizontal) growth require specialization and departmentalization of functions. Organization structure depends upon the specialization of functions.

As indicated earlier, classical theory basically pays attention to the formal structure of an organization and has developed the above mentioned principles with regard to the formal structure. Classical theorists have adopted the notion of the economic man of the Classic Economic Theory. According to this notion, man is rational and seeks the immediate material needs of himself. As a result of this viewpoint, they emphasize the material rewards to motivate the employees. They also assume that average man is lazy and unreliable. Assuming that the employees are lazy and unreliable in work, the managers have to strictly define and control the work process. Frederick W. Taylor in his Scientific Management approach defended the idea of “one best way of doing a job”, determining it scientifically through “time and motion” studies and giving the workers well-defined tasks. Taylor did not permit workers to take any initiative at work. The management’s control had to be “undivided”. Ignorance of the “human factor” is another important characteristic of the classical theory and this ignorance has made their theories mechanical. The classics subscribe to the idea that if they can develop the formal structure of the organization to the best possible form and order, they will be able to increase organizational efficiency. Thus, they have placed the emphasis on the structure of the organization and ignored the human factor.

2. NEOCLASSICAL THEORY OF ORGANISATION

The neoclassical theory of organization is commonly identified with the human relations movement. The underlying propositions of the human relations school of thought can be traced to the Hawthorne studies of 1927-1932. The Hawthorne works was the largest manufacturing plant of the Western Electric Company, employing 40,000 people. The primary purpose of the study was to test the effects of particular alterations in the physical environment on the resulting output. Prior to the study, it was believed that the physical conditions in the plant produced monotony and fatigue among the workers, and that experimental situations could be created to test such variables as temperature, hours of sleep, and humidity. It was also assumed that the selection of a small group of workers would make testing easier and would promote a cooperative attitude.

The first experiment was designed to test five women in the “relay assembly room”. From this initial experiment, an interview program was established throughout the plant to determine what employees liked and disliked about their working environment. The Hawthorne study revealed there was no relationship between productivity and the lighting system, and that productivity increased not because varying work schedules, rest periods, and other conditions, but because the social situation had been altered in a way that helped foster friendlier relations among the women. Thus, the ideals, personalities, beliefs, habits, and traditions of the work group constituted a social system, and the output was dependent on these factors as well as on physical conditions. The Hawthorne study concluded that worker satisfaction leads to increased output, while dissatisfaction fosters absenteeism and increased turnover of employees. This study clearly showed that informal as opposed to formal activities had some effect on the efficiency and productivity of organizations. This finding led to further studies of workers in the Hawthorne plant, and other human relation studies elsewhere. As a result of such studies, a new theory, the Neoclassical Theory of Organization emerged.

The main contribution of the neoclassical school is the introduction of behavioral sciences (psychology, sociology, and social-psychology) into the study of organizations. Through the use of behavioral sciences, neoclassical theorists have been able to demonstrate how the pillars of the classical theory are affected by the impact of human actions. Another important contribution of the neoclassical school is the introduction of the concept of “ **informal organization**”. The neoclassical school studies the informal organization and shows its influence on the formal organization.

The neoclassical approach to organization theory does not reject the principles developed by the classical theory, in this sense it has not emerged as a reaction to the classical theory. The neoclassical school accepts the classical theory, but criticizes its principles and superimposes on them modifications resulting from individual behavior, and the influence of the informal group. The following is an evaluation and criticism by the neoclassical school of the principles of classical theory: (1). Division of labor, one of the basic principles of the classical school, has been the subject of discussion for a long time. In the field of industrial psychology, studies of industrial fatigue and monotony caused by the specialization of work have been conducted. Division of labor, by limiting the sphere of activity of the individuals, facilitates specialization, but at the same time, doing a simple activity in a repetitive

manner creates boredom and monotony, which affects the efficiency of the individual negatively, and motivation becomes a serious problem. As an organization expands, motivation and the coordination of the activities of the officials become important. Thus, the neoclassical school has developed a large body of theory relating to motivation, coordination, and leadership. (2). Scalar and functional processes. The neoclassical school argues that the scalar and functional processes are theoretically valid but tend to deteriorate in practice. The classical school assumes something of perfection in the delegation process. But the neoclassical school points out that human problems are caused by imperfections in the way this process is handled. For example, too much or insufficient delegation of authority may make an administrator incapable of action. The failure to delegate authority and responsibility equally may result in frustration in the subordinate. (3). Structure. According to the neoclassical school, human behavior disrupts the best laid organizational plans. As criticism of structure focuses on the frictions that appear internally among people performing different functions. Line and staff relations appear to be a serious problem area. Line and staff are expected to cooperate with each other for the sake of organizational efficiency. But many organizations experience the difficulty of keeping line and staff working harmoniously. The neoclassical school has conducted research to discover the causes of such frictions and has suggested remedies such as the recognition of human dignity, and better communication, and participation. (4). Span of control. According to the neoclassical school, span of control is a function of human determinants, and the reduction of the span to a precise, universally applicable ratio is silly. If the span is short or narrow, there will be a tall structure resulting in tight supervision. If the span is wide, there will be a flat structure requiring a good deal of delegation with looser controls. Which is better? There is no precise answer, because of individual and organizational differences, sometimes one is better than the other.

An important contribution of the neoclassical school to the study of organization is the concept of informal organization. Informal organization is the natural grouping of people in the work situation. According to the neoclassical school, it is not possible to prevent the formation of informal groups, because they appear in response to the social need- the need of people to associate with others. When informal organizations came into being, they assume certain characteristics, and they influence the behavior of their members. Since an understanding of these characteristics is important for management practice, the neoclassical school has conducted studies to find out the internal dynamics of informal groups.

The primary distinction between the classical and neoclassical approaches to the study of organizations is the classical emphasis on the rational, formal organization and the neoclassical emphasis on the informal organization and social relationships among the workers. In response to the differences between the two schools of thought, modern interpretations attempt to bring the formal and informal aspects together to provide a more complete view of organisations.

3. MODERN THEORIES OF ORGANISATION

Modern theories of organization are seen by many as attempts to synthesize the classical and neoclassical schools of thoughts. To a certain extent, such an interpretation is correct, but modern theories should not be seen as a simple synthesis of the previous theories, because they are more than that. Modern theorists see an organization as a complex unit, in which various types of social groups interact (these groups may or may not share common values, they may or may not cooperate, and they may not be in agreement all the time). According to the modern theorists, there are conflicts between the management and workers, and between the necessities of a formal structure and the needs of the individuals. The modern school further examines the nature of the interrelationship of the organization and its environment. The modern approach, therefore, sees the organization in broader terms than either the classical or neoclassical approaches, by considering the human element, the formal structure, the environment of the organization, and the nature of the relationship as some of these several elements in the functioning of organization. According to the modern school, the only meaningful way to study organization is to study it as a system.

A system can be defined broadly as “any entity (conceptual or physical) which consists of interdependent parts“ (Ackof, 1961). In this sense a system is any entity consisting of more than one elements, but the important characteristic of the system is the fact that the parts or elements of the system are interdependent. Being interdependent implies that a change in one of the elements is going to affect the others. Modern theory treats the organization as an “open system”. An open system is any system which exchanges materials, energy and information with its environment, and this exchange is vital for the survival of the system. Most organic systems are open systems. A system is closed if there is no exchange of energy in any of its forms with its environment. By “environment” we mean everything outside the system. Since modern organization theory studies organizations as open systems, it will be useful to consider some basic features of open systems that are relevant to the functioning of organizations: (1) Open systems receive material, energy and information from their environment. The cells receive oxygen from the blood, the human body receives oxygen and food from the environment. Organizations, likewise, receive raw materials, manpower and technology from their environment. The things received from environment may be called “INPUT”. (2) Open systems transform the inputs they receive from their environment. The human body transforms the starch and sugar received from the environment into heat and action. Organizations transform the input they receive into new products. (3) Systems also deliver something to their environment, which in turn is the input of some other system. For example, biological organisms produce carbon dioxide and export it into the environment. Organizations also export their products (goods or services) into the environment. (4) The exchange of material, energy and information (input-transformation-output) is a cyclical process. In other words, when the system exports output to the environment, its activity does not stop or end. The survival of the system necessitates the intake of new inputs, their transformation into outputs and their exportation to the environment. Thus, the transaction between the system and its environment is vital for the survival of the system.

The implications of the above characteristics of an open system for organizations are as follows : (1) As open system organizations consist of interdependent elements or

parts, and because of these characteristics, a change in one of the elements will create or cause changes in the other elements. (2) Organizations have to exchange materials, energy and information with their environment (input-transformation-output) and this exchange plays a vital role in the survival of the organization. (3) Because of the nature of the relationships with their environment organizations have to adapt themselves to the changing conditions of the environment to perpetuate their existence.

Modern theorists, in their effort to study organizations as a system, are trying to answer the following questions: What are the parts or elements of the system? What is the nature of the relationship among the elements? What kinds of processes link or bring the parts together? In answering the above questions, each scholar has a unique way of interpreting an organization as a system and has his own special emphasis in applying the systems idea to the study of organizations. Thus, it is not possible to claim that modern organization theory is a unified body of thought (Scott, 1961). But the above statement should not give the impression that there is nothing common with regard to the modern theories of organization and the approaches of the modern scholars. All of the researchers and theorists, in their efforts to study, are approaching organizations in their totality and they are employing the systems idea in their analysis of the organization. What follows is a system analysis of an organization by a modern scholar, namely William G. Scott.

According to Scott an organization consists of the following interdependent elements:

1. Individuals and the personality structures they bring to the organisation.
2. Formal organisation (a formal arrangement of functions).
3. Informal organizations (natural grouping of individuals in an organization).
4. Status and role patterns.
5. The physical setting in which the job is performed.

Since the above elements are interdependent, a change in one of them will cause changes in the others. For example, if the Ministry of National Education (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı) decides to abolish the General Directorate of Primary Education (İlk Öğretim Genel Müdürlüğü) and establish a new division in line with the new policy to provide eight years of continuous basic education, this change introduced to the formal organization is going to affect the other elements. It is going to affect individuals, because with the establishment of a new division, they will be displaced and they may be separated from the individuals with whom they used to work, they may be asked to play new roles. It is going to affect the informal organizations, because the members may be separated, and they may not be able to interact with each other to perpetuate their membership of the group. Status and role patterns are going to be affected, because with the creation of a new division, there may be new role patterns and a new status system introduced, and individuals may not feel satisfied with the new arrangements. As can be seen easily, a small change in one of the elements will have its repercussions in the others. Thus, for having a better understanding of the functioning and problems of organizations, we have to be aware of the elements of organization and their mutual dependency and take such characteristics into consideration in analyzing organizational problems.

In answering the question, “what are the processes linking the parts of the system?”, Scott suggests three linking processes: communication, balance, and decision-making. Communication is seen as the method by which action is induced from the parts of the system. Communication is not only seen as stimuli resulting in action, but also as a control and coordination mechanism linking the decision centers in the system into a synchronized pattern (Scott, 1961).

The concept of balance as a linking process refers to an equilibrating mechanism whereby the various parts of the system are maintained in a harmoniously structured relationship to each other (Scott, 1961). A system cannot function if there is not an ordered relationship among the parts or elements. In this sense, stability is an important concept in the functioning of systems. A system is stable with respect to certain of its variables if these variables tend to remain within defined limits. Such stability, the necessary balance among the elements, is a must if the system is going to function properly. This balance is subject to disruption caused by environmental factors, because for their survival, organizations have to interact with the environment, and during this interaction, change is imported into the organization. Once the balance is disrupted, a new balance, in accordance with the change needed, has to be established for the proper functioning of the system. In this sense, balance is an equilibrating mechanism, which brings the parts of the organization together for insuring a harmoniously structured relationship among them.

According to Scott, decision-making is the third linking process. There are two types of decisions: 1. decisions to produce, and 2. decisions to participate. Decisions to produce are largely a result of an interaction between individual attitudes and the demands of the organization. Individual decisions to participate in the organization reflect such issues as the relationship between organizational rewards versus the demands made by the organization.

IV. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Modern society is an administered society, and it is a society of organizations. Our survival in this world necessitates many goods and services, which are the outputs of several organizations. Societal order is maintained through the arrangements and rules that are the outputs of certain organizations. In any society, resources must be distributed and allocated among its members. In deciding how the resources are going to be distributed or allocated, the market mechanism plays an important role. How many automobiles, or refrigerators will be made is easily determined by the market. As long as multiple suppliers provide a commodity, such as automobiles or refrigerators, for a specific price, the market system dictates that there will be an appropriate distribution of financial, human and material resources for the production of automobiles or refrigerators. Consumers may benefit from competition among the manufacturers by getting quality goods at a fair price. If all commodities and services could be provided by the market in the ways described above, there would be no need for a central mechanism called government which extracts resources from citizens in the form of taxes and allocates them. However not all necessary goods and services are provided by the market system. People in any nation want protection against the dangers which may come from outside, therefore national defense as a service must be provided. Protecting the lives, property and rights of the citizens is another important service needed in any society. Arrangements have to be made for providing police and fire protection. Public health and disease control are another important concern in every society, and there is need for the provision of certain basic services in this field. Protection of the natural environment requires the provision of such services as wildlife protection, pollution control, and the conservation of soil and water resources. The market plays an important role in the provision of certain services, thus the conditions within which the market operates is important. Necessary arrangements have to be made for insuring fair competition among the firms for protecting both the consumers and the producers.

The services described above are needed in every society, and once produced, they are collectively consumed by everyone. It is difficult to determine prices for individual consumption. National defense is a service needed in every society, but it is difficult to determine the extent of individual consumption, and you cannot say that those who are not going to benefit should not pay the cost of the service. Protection of the lives and property of the citizens is another similar field, the service is needed but once produced, everyone is going to use it; you cannot have an exception. Then it is obvious that in the interest of the public, such services should be produced. But once produced, it is difficult to determine the extent of individual consumption. Private organizations, firms will produce goods or services for the objective of making a profit, that is, they should be able to sell their products on the market. Since the above-mentioned services cannot be marketed, who is going to produce them? You cannot have different organizations producing and marketing national defense in accordance with fair competition laws. Therefore, we have to have organizations

which would produce such goods or services collectively used by the public. Such organizations, organizations which are producing goods or services which are collectively consumed by everyone, are called public organizations. Public organizations are needed in every society for producing goods or services which are collectively used by people.

1. WHAT IS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ?

For the objective of having a better understanding of this concept, it will be useful to give several definitions and then identify the common elements in these definitions.

“Public administration is the practical or business end of government because its objective is to get the public business done as efficiently and as much in accord with the people’s tastes and desires as possible” (Wilson, 1887). “Defined in broadest terms, public administration consists of all those operations having for their purpose the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy” (White, 1949). “Public administration as a field is mainly concerned with the means for implementing political values.” (Pfiffner & Presthus 1967). “Public administration involves the implementation of public policy which is outlined by representative political bodies.” “Public administration is the coordination of individual and group efforts to carry out public policy.” “Public administration: (a) is a cooperative group effort in a public setting; (b) covers all three branches (executive, legislative, and judicial) and their interrelationships; (c) has an important role in the formulation of public policy, and is thus part of the political process; (d) is different in significant ways from private administration; and (e) is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals” (Nigro, 1989). “By public administration is meant the activities of executive branches of national and local governments and all those organizations which are affiliates of above mentioned” (Simon, 1950). “Public administration is the organization and management of men and materials to achieve the purposes of government.” When the above definitions are taken into consideration, it can be easily seen that, public administration is related to the implementation of public policy and public organizations. Then we may define public administration as .. **the administration of public organizations in the implementation of public policy.**

Are there any differences between the administration of public and private organizations? Organizations whether public or private are social units deliberately established for the accomplishment of specific objectives. In their efforts to accomplish the objectives, both types, public and private organizations, are going to employ the very same administrative techniques and methods. For getting the best available manpower, you have to conduct an open competitive examination, this method is going to be used by both. Every organization, whether public or private, has to have a hierarchical authority structure where such principles as unity of command and chain of command are in effect. In short, administration is a universal phenomenon, in the administration of organizations, the same techniques are going to be used. Although the concept of administration is a universal phenomenon, public administration differs in several ways from private administration: (1) Public policy, formulated by political bodies and supplemented by law, provides the framework within which public administration functions. As a result, the activities of public organizations and official are circumscribed by legal implications. Everything that a bureaucrat does must be authorized by law. (2) Government is susceptible to public

criticism which complicates public administration. Everything that is undertaken by a public organization concerns people, because public organizations are using tax money and every citizen has the right to know how it is spent. The difficulty of government work is that not only has it to be well done, but the public has to be convinced that it is being well done. In other words the quality, and convincing the public about that quality, are important. Because of that, decision-making takes more time in public organizations. The objectives of protecting the public interest and the rational use of tax money lead to the development of complicated methods, which increase red-tape in public organizations and affect their efficiency. (3) Another important difference between public and private administration centers on the profit motive. Maximization of profit is important for private organizations, but for the public, profit is not an important element. (4) There are differences in working conditions between public and private administrations. For instance, wages are comparatively higher in private sector.

Scope of public administration. The discussion over the scope of any discipline should start with a detailed evaluation of the definition of the field of study, so that its boundaries which distinguish it from other disciplines will be determined. But, as the above discussion indicates, public administration, like many human endeavours, is difficult to define. Up to now, unfortunately, no one has come up with a simple definition of the study of public administration that is acceptable to most of the scholars and practitioners. And as Stillman argues “Attempting to define the core values and focus of twentieth-century public administration provides lively debates and even deep divisions among the students of the field” (Stillman, 1992).

When the several definitions are taken into consideration, it is possible to identify public administration as having the following characteristics: (1) It can be identified with the executive branch of government, but this does not rule out the fact that public administration is also related in important ways to the legislative and judicial branches; (2) It is identified with the formulation and implementation of public policies, and thus, it is closely associated with private groups and individuals. In this sense, public administration is concerned with the major goals of the society and with the development of resources for achieving those goals within the context of a rapidly changing political environment; (3) It is identified with human behaviour and cooperative group effort; (4) It is identified with the production of public goods or services; (5) It is a field of study that can be differentiated in several ways from private administration. The review and analysis of several definitions clearly indicates that public administration covers a very large area of activity. In the words of Rosenbloom “Public administrative jobs range from the exploration of outer space to sweeping streets. Some public administrators are highly educated professionals, who may be at the forefront of their field of specialisation; others possess few skills that differentiate them from the mass of citizenry. Some public administrators make policies that have a nationwide impact and may benefit millions of people; others have virtually no responsibility for policy-making at all and may simply carry out the mundane governmental tasks of word processing, filing and record keeping. Public administrators are doctors, lawyers, scientists, engineers, accountants, budgeters, personnel officers, managers, clerks, key-boarders, manual labourers, and individuals engaged in a host of other occupations and functions. But knowing what public administrators do, does not resolve the problem of defining what public administration is (Rosenbloom, 1993).

Because of the above mentioned diversity of activities, public administrators may use methods and techniques developed and used by a variety of disciplines. Public administration theory is contributed to by social scientists engaged in research activities in other social sciences, particularly political science, sociology, psychology, social-psychology, anthropology, and business administration. This diversity in the study of public administration often means that the field lacks a sense of identity. According to Denhardt, "Public administration theory draws its greatest strength and its most serious limitation from this diversity. On the one hand, public administration theorists are required to understand a broad range of perspectives relevant to their theory building tasks. There is tremendous richness and complexity built into public administration theory. On the other hand, the diversity of public administration often means that the field lacks a sense of identity. Many even question whether it is possible to speak of building a coherent and integrated public administration theory"(Denhardt, 1990).

Taking all of the above discussions into consideration, we can conclude that public administration is an extremely complex endeavour. Public administration involves activity at organisational and individual levels, it is concerned with public policy-making and politics, its focus of attention is the executive branch of government and implementation of public policies, and finally, it is different from private administration. Because of the variety of activities and fields of interest, it is difficult to draw the precise boundaries of public administration, and in this sense one may speak of an "identity crisis".

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DISCIPLINE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The history of public administration can be traced back to the first formation of human societies. As soon as primitive people began to act jointly with their fellows, they had to plan, organize, assign roles, and coordinate, which literally makes administration the oldest of professions (or almost) (Dimock and Dimock 1964). As an aspect of political philosophy and statecraft, public administration has a long history. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle all had much to say about administration, although they did not sharply differentiate it from political philosophy and substantive fields such as science, education, or ethics. They were concerned with the city-state and the good life, as well as with the practical means by which the good may be attained, and administration was one of the means to be employed for that objective. As a matter of fact, in his Academy, Plato trained administrators, although he did not call them administrators. At about the same time (fifth century B.C.), in another part of the world, Confucius also trained administrators. Confucius was known as a teacher of ethics, and at that time, ethics related primarily to rule and rulers. According to the teachings of Confucius, the main rules of public administration were: First, a ruler should know his country well and try to remove the causes of its troubles. Second, in decision-making, an official should hold the mean, that is, be objective, fair, moderate, practical, and ethical. Third, an official should try to serve the public interest, avoiding favoritism and partisanship. Fourth, it is government's duty to promote the economic welfare of the people. Fifth, the accomplishment of all these objectives depends upon a high quality of public personnel, officials who are honest, unselfish, and able.(Dimock and Dimock 1964). As the rulers gained centralized

authority, the practice and problems of public administration expanded and administration developed as a practical art. Later, formal schools of administration were established. One of the first of such schools in the Western world, created in the latter part of the fifteenth century, was the Enderun (a training school) training officials for the Ottoman Empire, which at the time extended around most of the Mediterranean and into Europe. Early in the eighteenth century, administrative colleges were set up in Russia. Later on, there were similar formal schools of administration established for training officials in several countries.

But the study and teaching of public administration as a separate field, as a discipline, is fairly new. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, in 1887, Woodrow Wilson published an article in which he defended the necessity for an independent study of the administrative aspect of government. Wilson's essay titled "The Study of Administration" is considered by many scholars to be the first publication in the field of study which is now called Public Administration. Wilson's essay "The Study of Administration" is used as the starting point in the development of the field. Because administration has a long history, and because in theory and practice it has assumed many forms and approaches, it is necessary to make a certain categorization which distinguishes different approaches in studying the development of the field.

Traditional Approaches to the Study of Public Administration

The principal interest of the early students in public administration was reform; the objective was to strengthen the executive, so that responsibility for the conduct of government could be specifically placed, and to eliminate patronage and establish a neutral and competent civil service, because the professional politicians and their machines controlled the governments, and the standard of political morality was in many instances very low. Patronage criteria governed the selection of public employees. Efficiency and effectiveness in taking public services were important values. There were two distinct trends in traditional approach:

1. Constitutional-Legal-Historical Approach (Political).

The Constitutional-Legal-Historical Approach is based on a framework of legal rights and obligations of government. Under this approach, public administration was considered as a component of public law rather than as the dynamic specialty it has become today. Advocates of this approach are mainly interested in the roles of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, their relations vis-a'-vis one another, and the effect that their policies and actions will have upon the administration of government policy. The political orientation treats administration as an aspect of the political process and governmental executive agencies as a part of the total government system. Its objective is to characterize the role of the administration in relation to other institutions of government and society and in terms of the basic values which underlie the political system as a whole.

Woodrow Wilson. Wilson tried to show the difference between politics and administration. Wilson insisted that administration and politics were two separate elements within the governmental system, and according to him administration should be separated from politics and studied separately. This is something necessary because administration should be removed from the strife of politics and should concern itself with the detailed execution of plans laid down in law. This way politics, especially political influence, will be kept out of administration. To properly and efficiently

execute the tasks set for administration, a large measure of discretion is necessary for the civil servant, who should not be hampered in his work. At the same time, Wilson indicated, administrators must be responsive to public opinion and public opinion within the democratic framework, and play the role of “authoritative critic.”

Frank J. Goodnow. Several years after Wilson, Goodnow published his well known book titled “Politics and Administration”. Goodnow suggested that the function of politics should be conceived of differently from administration. According to him, the two basic functions of government may be characterized as politics and administration: politics is the expression of the will of the State; administration is the execution of that will. Goodnow does not equate the functions, politics and administration, with particular organs of government, because “...although the differentiation of two functions of government is clear, the assignment of such functions to separate authorities is impossible.”

2. Structural -Descriptive Approach (General Administration).

This approach focuses upon organizational forms and structures and administrative techniques, for the purpose of solving operating problems according to some criteria of efficiency. The traditional emphasis on public administration, especially in the early 1900s, stressed in both theory and practice a rationalized view of administration. A central tenet of the rationalized view was the achievement of both economy and efficiency in government. Achieving greater efficiency was thought to be the main task of administration, and it was the concept of efficiency that drew the attention of many students of public administration in the early decades of the twentieth century.

Frederick W. Taylor “Scientific Management”.

The traditional emphasis in public administration has also been characterized by the “scientific management” school of thought, which emerged in the early 1900s. Frederick W. Taylor, who is often called the “Father of Scientific Management”, stressed the importance of physiological factors in achieving greater efficiency. Taylor’s dominant concern was efficiency, and he sought the best and cheapest way of accomplishing routine work. Taylor’s emphasis on the mechanics of work led him to attempt to discover the “one best way” of performing a function. Taylor was also concerned with four basic principles. They were the development of a true science (not precisely defined by Taylor), the scientific selection of workers, the scientific training and development of workers, and an intimate and friendly cooperation between management and workers. Taylor was accused of neglecting the human element by treating men as adjuncts to machines, because, the human values of workmen, the relationships he encountered in his work, his attitudes toward morale and related factors involved in an organizational unit were of little consequence to Taylor and his methodology.

Henry Fayol.

Henry Fayol was a French industrialist who headed one of his country’s largest coal and iron combines. His writing was not based on scholarly research but on his personal experience as a manager. Fayol developed principles for effective administration which were mainly addressed to the top administrator. According to Fayol, administration is one of the six operations of business along with technical, commercial, financial, security, and accounting activities. And he indicated that “All undertakings require planning, organization, command, co-ordination and control,

and in order to function properly, all must observe the same general principles. We are no longer confronted with several administrative sciences but with one alone, which can be applied equally well to public and to private affairs and whose principal elements are today summarized in what we term the Administrative Theory.” The above statement clearly indicates that according to Fayol, administration has five main aspects: to plan, to organize, to command, to coordinate, and to control. It also indicates his view on the universality of the concept of administration. Fayol also describes the administrative tools that can be used in the execution of administrative function, these tools are: 1.General survey, 2. Plan of operations, 3. Reports or proceedings, 4.Minutes of conferences between heads of departments, 5.Organization charts.

Max Weber.

Weber is another scholar who significantly contributed to the traditional approach. Weber’s contribution was his “ideal-typical” model of a form of organization he identified as bureaucracy. Bureaucracy has certain characteristics such as established norms of conduct and adherence to rules, hierarchy, separation of office and incumbent, and specialization of tasks and selection by merit. Weber’s contribution is important in the sense that the theoretical foundation for much of the thinking in the field of Public Personnel Administration is found in his writings. Weber was concerned with the characteristics, growth and consequences of bureaucratic organization.

Luther Gullick.

L.Gullick , in his paper titled “On the Theory of Organization”, elaborates the organizational structure and the principles in effect in the design of organizational structure. Gullick asks the question, “What is the work of the chief executive? What does he do?” His answer is POSDCORB. POSDCORB is, of course, a made up word designed to call attention to the various elements of the work of a chief executive. POSDCORB is made up of + initials and stands for the following activities:

Planning, that is, working out in broad outline the things that need to be done, and the methods for doing them, to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;

Organizing, that is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for the defined objective.

Staffing, that is, the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;

Directing, that is, the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;

Co-ordinating, that is, the all important duty of interrelating the various parts of the work;

Reporting, that is, keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research and inspection;

Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control.

James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reilly. In 1930 another classic of the traditional approach, bearing the title “Onward Industry”, appeared. The authors were Mooney and Reilly, both executives at General Motors, whose experience and studies convinced them that coordination is the first principle of organization. According to them, “Coordination, therefore, is the orderly arrangement of group effort, to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose....as coordination contains all the principles of organization, it likewise expresses all the purposes of organization, in so far as these purposes relate to its internal structure”. Other principles advocated by Mooney and Reilly were the scalar (relating to hierarchical form and vertical growth of the organization), functional processes (relating to differentiation as to kinds of duties and specialized departments), and staff (relating to advice as distinguished from authority or command).

In evaluating the traditional approach to the study of public administration mention should be made of an important book titled “Papers on the Science of Administration” edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick and published in 1937. This book is today considered by many to be most representative work of the “classical“, “traditional”, or “orthodox” approach to administration.

As can be seen from evaluations made above, the gap between the political science and general administration approaches was not extremely wide. Although the political writers confined themselves to government operations and focused on institutions (especially the institutions of the U.S.), their search for an administration that did not depend on politics, but on proper means of control, and efficiency was close to the general administration concern with universally applicable ideas on organizing and managing. Both trends emphasized the structural aspects of administration and organization and looked for a science of principles. In developing their principles related to structuring and functioning of administration, they did not call and look for empirical research, lessons from practical experience and history were thought to be adequate guides.

Behavioral Approaches to the Study of Public Administration

The origin of the behavioral emphasis in public administration may be traced back to the experiments conducted at the Hawthorne works of the General Electric Company in the late 1920s and early 1930s. The Hawthorne studies were designed to test the influence of changes in lighting and other physical variables on worker productivity. The actual findings of the Hawthorne, however, were interpreted as evidence of something quite different; that employees respond to non-physical variables more than to physical ones. The behavioral emphasis focuses on the way people behave in organizations. Methodologically, the advocates of the behavioral approach criticise the traditionalists for attempting to generalize without the accumulation of sufficient evidence. The behavioralists argue that to study administrative organizations one must employ the scientific method, where verifiable phenomena serve as the basis for principles, knowledge, or findings. The behavioralists view organizations as social systems containing conflict, cohesion, and interactions, which may be studied to comprehend how organizations function. Administration must consider the totality of

factors relating to human behavior. Thus, administration is conceived as a study embracing many disciplines including psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology, and other sciences.

Herbert A. Simon. Herbert Simon is one of the best known students of administration and his sophisticated, **Administrative Behavior**, is one the most frequently cited books in the discipline of Public Administration. Simon introduced logical positivism to the literature of public administration. Simon criticized the traditional approaches by elaborating on their administrative principles, their understanding of rationality and the concept of economic man.

Simon labeled the “principles” of the traditionalists as proverbs, because for every principle one can find an equally plausible and acceptable contradictory principle. For example, the principle of span of control, “Administrative efficiency is enhanced by limiting the number of subordinates who report directly to any one administrator to a small number”, is contradictory to the principle of limited levels in hierarchy “Administrative efficiency is enhanced by keeping to a minimum the number of organizational levels through which a matter must pass before it is acted upon”. The contradiction is obvious, because the two principles mentioned above will lead to opposite organizational recommendations; if you keep the span of control narrow you will end up with many organizational levels, and if you keep the number of organizational levels to a minimum you will end up with a broad span of control. Clearly, these two principles, as defined above, are contradictory, and there is nothing in the theory to indicate which is the proper one to apply. According to Simon, the difficulty with the traditional administrative theory is that it treats as “principles of administration” what are really “criteria” for describing and diagnosing administrative situations. To make them useful, some way must be found of weighing the advantages associated with one criterion with the incompatible advantages associated with the competing ones. To choose between the advantages of a narrow span of control on the one hand those of a small number of levels of organization on the other, it is necessary to measure all advantages against the single criterion of efficiency. This, according to Simon, is a matter for empirical research. The real shortcoming of the traditional theorists, then, is that they have not gone on to do empirical research which would reveal the concrete circumstances in which the various criteria appropriately apply.

Simon viewed decision making as the central act of organization, and instrumental rationality as the basis for decision making. By “instrumental rationality”, he meant that the individual is rational and responsible only within the environment of a particular organization. He argued that anyone who observes behavior in organizations will not be able to find “global omniscience that is attributed to economic man”. Thus, he introduced the concept of “administrative man” and indicated that, “While economic man maximizes -select the best alternative from among all those available to him; his cousin, whom we shall call administrative man, satisfices -looks for a course action that is satisfactory or good enough“. According to Simon, “Economic man deals with the ‘real world‘ in all its complexity. Administrative man recognizes that the world he perceives is a drastically simplified model of buzzing, blooming confusion that constitutes the real world“. Administrative man makes his choices using a simple picture of the situation that takes into account just a few of the factors that he regards as most relevant and crucial.

Chester Barnard. Barnard contributed to the development of public administration through his logical analysis of organisation structure and his application of sociological concepts to management. He is best known for his book **The Functions of the Executive**. Barnard described a formal organisation, as “that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, and purposeful.” He defined formal organisation further as “a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons“. Then he indicated that the executive or executive capacity is the most important and strategic factor in organised or cooperative systems. Being highly sociological in his approach to management, Barnard repeatedly emphasised the individual and his importance as a strategic factor in the functioning of organisations. To him, an organisation was a system of interactions whose continuance depended on the balance between the individual member’s contributions and the satisfaction they derived. Barnard is also known for his recognition that authority rests upon the acceptance or consent of the individuals towards whom “commands” are directed.

Mary Parker Follet. A discussion of the behavioral approach to public administration should also include the ideas of Mary P. Follet, who is another behavioral pioneer of comparable significance to Barnard. Follet is remembered today for her ideas concerning democratic leadership, voluntary cooperation, and “the law of the situation.” According to Follet, authority as an act of subordination was offensive to man’s emotions and therefore could not serve as a good foundation for cooperative organisation. Instead, she proposed an authority of function, whereby an individual has authority over his own job area. Speaking about leadership, Follet stated that it was not a matter of a dominating personality, but rather the ability of one who was able to secure an interpretation from within a group of the best concepts of the leader and the led. She emphasised education and the fact that leaders are not born only, but could be made through education in understanding group dynamics and human behavior.

Modern Approaches

The modern study of public administration closely parallels the rise of data processing technology and the “information revolution.” The introduction of the “system” idea to the study of organisations and evaluating organisations as “open systems” have greatly affected the modern approaches to the study of public administration. The concept of “open system” and studying organisations as open systems have emphasised and shown the importance of environment over the functioning of organisations and their administration. According to systems theory, living systems, whether biological organisms or social organisations, are acutely dependent upon their external environment, so they must be conceived of as open systems. Open systems import some form of energy from their external environment, transform this energy and create a new product within the system and then export it back to the environment. This transaction and interaction between the system and its environment has a vital importance for the system, because the survival of the system depends upon that transaction. Thus, the study of public organisations and implementation of public policy requires that environmental factors, and/or the nature of the relationship between the public organisations and their environment, have to be taken into consideration. Being different from the previous approaches, modern

approaches are not only interested in the internal dynamics but have taken into consideration the external factors as well. Although there are attempts to categorise the modern approaches as decision-making approaches, ecological approaches etc., there will be no attempt made here to make such a classification. Instead, it will be sufficient to pinpoint the common characteristics of modern approaches because their starting points may be different, but they all employ the systems idea in their analysis of public organisations and execution of public policies. The modern approaches are not only interested in studying the structure, the legal framework, and are not only concerned with how to increase efficiency and effectiveness, but they also examine the individuals, the relationships between the individuals and administrative structure, the environment within which administration takes action, and the relationship between the environment and organisation. In other words, they attempt to study public administration in its totality, instead of paying attention to certain components of it. For example, Lindblom's work is a good representative of the modern approaches. Charles Lindblom, in his brief but popular essay "The Science of Muddling Through" analysed the conditions within which the average public administrator functions. According to Lindblom, the public administrator is no longer a "doer" governed by "principles" or separated from politics and he is no longer the "optimal rationaliser" of "efficiency and effectiveness". Rather, the public administrator practises the art of the possible in a complex, pluralistic world of competitive interest groups (Stillman II, 1982). The public administrator tries to produce an agreeable compromise among conflicting interest by using the tools of negotiation and strategy. In this sense the administrator "muddles" not "manages", and to Lindblom, this incremental decision-making is in the best interest of the society.

Among the scholars who have contributed to the modern approaches the names of Herbert A. Simon, Alvin W. Gouldner, John M. Pfifner, Robert Presthus, Fritz Morstein Marx, Dwight Waldo, Harold Stein, Charles Lindblom, Paul Aplebby, James Fesler, Samuel P. Huntington, George H. Frederickson, Frank Marini, David H. Rosenbloom, and Vincent Ostrom should be mentioned.

The late 1960s witnessed an important conference held at the Minnowbrook Conference Center at Syracuse University. The conference was organised by young scholars, and its objective was to explore the emerging theories of public administration. The organisers' intention was to place the emphasis particularly on views that were anti-hierarchical, but they have never achieved their goal of finding an alternative to hierarchy. These young scholars, in their efforts to explore the emerging theories, were also interested in placing the emphasis on views that were "people-oriented", in the sense that they were concerned with both workers and clients. That is, the scholars were not only interested in the development of administrative structures, or increasing administrative efficiency, as was the case for previous approaches, but were trying to answer the question of efficiency for whom. Such concepts as "minority groups", "social inequality", "social equity", and "segments of the society lacking economic and political resources", were frequently being used in the analysis of these scholars. "There was a renewed emphasis on the importance of bureaucratic decision-making in policy making and in the lives of citizens"(Cox, Buck, and Morgan 1994). That is why they were seeking to find an alternative to hierarchy, because they were aware of the limitations of bureaucratic structures and were of the opinion that by replacing hierarchy, government agencies

would achieve the desired flexibility of organisation and sensitivity to citizens' needs to accomplish their goals. As indicated above, the Minnowbrook participants never achieved their goal of finding an alternative to hierarchy, but their views regarding management practices have been highly influential.

As can easily be seen, modern approaches are studying public administration from a different perspective, a perspective which is not only concerned with increasing the efficiency of administration, but also concerned with results of the policies implemented to the extent that they are in compliance with the expectations of the people. In other words, modern theories, employing a systems approach in their study of public administration, are not only concerned with the public organisations and their administration, but also with the relationship between the public organisations and their environment, especially the effects their output creates on the environment. That necessitates scrutinising the environmental conditions, the expectations of the people and other organisations, and the internal dynamics of the organisations. The above-mentioned concern can be found in Huntington's work; Samuel P. Huntington argues that the 1970s witnessed a "democratic surge", a general challenge to the existing system of authority in both public and private spheres. People no longer felt the necessity to obey those whom they have previously considered superior to themselves in different accounts. Also there was increased public interest and concern about government, but a sharp decline in public trust and confidence toward government. Thus, people wanted to participate in decision-making which affected themselves, and the authority based on hierarchy, expertise and wealth was not in line with this democratic and egalitarian temper of the times.

Huntington is not alone in his arguments in favour of the participation of people. Vincent Ostrom, in his controversial book, "The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration", has introduced a new paradigm, which he calls democratic administration. Ostrom is in favour of democratising administration, and he argues

against "single-centered administrative power", "hierarchical administration", and the "separation of politics from administration". He defends the necessity of having "diverse democratic decision making centres", and "popular participation in administration".

One of the striking characteristics of the study of public administration since the 1980s is the extensive attention given to ethical concerns. The ethics of public service is discussed more and more, but it is difficult to claim that there exists a consensus among scholars regarding the subject. According to John A. Rohr, the precise nature of the ethic problem is the responsible use of administrative discretion. "Through administrative discretion, a career civil servant participates in governing a democratic society without being directly accountable to the electorate.(Rohr,1990). Accountability lies with the political decision maker, but the civil servant, although not accountable to the electorate, plays an important role in the implementation of the public policies. In this sense, responsible use of administrative discretion is the central ethical problem in the career civil service.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN TURKEY

The teaching of public administration, in the modern sense, started in the 1950s, but its history can be traced back to the Fifteenth Century, to the Ottoman times, when Fatih Sultan Mehmet established a special school, called the **Enderun**, for the purpose of training military and civil administrators (Ergun, Polatoğlu, 1992). The Enderun was a special school, because it was a different type of school from the ones existing in the Ottoman society and called “medrese”. The Medrese was basically a religious school, teaching religious principles, but the Enderun had a unique curriculum. Its curriculum included such language courses as Turkish, Arabic, and Persian; Turkish and Persian literature; the Koran and its interpretation and Moslem religion; law; Turkish history; and mathematics. The objective was to train military and civilian administrators, and in this sense the Enderun was a formal school of administration. The Enderun is also seen as one of the first formal schools of administration in the Western world (Dimock & Dimock, 1964).

When the modernisation and westernisation movement started in the Ottoman Empire during the Nineteenth Century, it was felt that the country needed able and talented people equipped with information and knowledge about the modern techniques and methods in administration. Thus, the Mülkiye Mektebi was founded for the purpose of training civilian administrators in the modern sense. This school, established in 1859, is today known as the “Political Science Faculty of Ankara University”. Until the 1950s, the teaching of public administration was under the heavy influence of continental Europe, where public administration was considered as a part of public law. Because of that, in the teaching of public administration, legal aspects were emphasised, and in the curriculum of the school, there were a variety of courses on law.

A landmark in the teaching and study of public administration in Turkey is the establishment of the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East in the 1950s. It may be claimed that the study and teaching of public administration as an independent discipline, separate from law started with the establishment of the above mentioned Institute (Ergun & Polatoğlu, 1992). The Institute, founded in 1953 in collaboration with the United Nations, intended to serve Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries. During the first few years of its establishment, the Institute worked in close cooperation with United Nations and New York University. Through this close cooperation, scholars who are well known in the field of public administration visited Turkey and gave lectures in their field of specialisation. Later on, towards the end of 1950s, the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East became a national institution but has kept its name as it is. The Institute is a multi-purpose organisation, which is responsible for the provision of training facilities for public officials, the conducting of research and studies, and the assembly and dissemination of published and other information concerning public administration in all its aspects (Cem, 1974). The Institute publishes the following periodicals : Amme İdaresi Dergisi; Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler ; Turkish Public Administration Annual; Turkish Yearbook of Human Rights; and İnsan Hakları Yıllığı. In addition to these periodicals, the Institute has published several hundred books since its establishment in 1953.

The end of the 1950s also witnessed the establishment of another organisation, which contributed to the development of the study of public administration, that is the Middle East Technical University and the Department of Political Science and Public Administration. The Department of Political Science and Public Administration is the first to teach public administration as an independent discipline, separate from law at university level in Turkey. The number of higher education institutions teaching public administration started to increase in 1960s and is still increasing.

Another important factor contributing to the development of public administration in Turkey is the use of Five-Year Development Plans for accomplishing the goals of national development. In the First Five-Year Development Plan it was indicated that “In order to be successful in the realisation of the goals of plan, it is absolutely necessary to make public administration capable of fulfilling what is expected of it, as it is the most important instrument in the implementation of the plans. The administration will be reorganised in order to accomplish this.” The same approach have been adopted by the following five-year development plans; almost all of them established a direct relationship between development plans and effective and efficient administration, and pointed out to the need to reorganise the public administration. In line with this kind of considerations, several studies have been undertaken by the State Planning Organisation, regarding how to reorganise the public organisation, which have contributed to the development of the field.

There have been a number of national symposiums organised by several institutions, which have contributed to the development of the field of public administration in Turkey; among them the following are worthy of mention:

The Colloquium on Administrative Sociology (Yönetim Sosyolojisi Kollokyumu) October 14-15 ,1976., Ankara ,(Organised by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East).

The First National Symposium on Administrative Psychology (Yönetim Psikolojisi I. Ulusal Sempozyumu), December 7-9,1977., Ankara ,(Organised by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East).

The Second National Symposium on Administrative Psychology (Yönetim Psikolojisi II. Ulusal Sempozyumu), November 16-19, 1981, Ankara, (Organised by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East).

The Symposium on “Privatization in the World and Turkey” (“Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Özelleştirme” konulu sempozyum), November14-16, 1990., Ankara, (Organised by the Department of Political science and Public Administration, Middle East Technical University).

The Symposium on the Discipline of Public Administration (Kamu Yönetimi Disiplini Sempozyumu), October 13-14, 1994., Ankara, (Organised by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East).

The First National Congress on the Quality in Public Administration (Kamu Yönetiminde Kalite I. Ulusal Kongresi), May 26-27, 1998, Ankara., (Organised by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East).

4. COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The study of public administration has often been comparative, showing the differences and similarities between the systems of different countries. The aim of the comparative public administration is to make comparative studies of the local and national administrative systems (bureaucratic systems) of different countries and, then, to try to make generalisations. But it should be mentioned that in a substantial part of the literature of public administration, comparative studies has not received much attention. Some scholars in the field, in their efforts to understand their country's administrative system better and to develop it, have studied the administrative systems of other countries. For example, Woodrow Wilson studied the administrative systems and experiences of European countries for the purpose of developing and better understanding of American system. But some others have concentrated their efforts on their own national administrative systems, and only on very rare occasions have they directed their attentions to other countries. It may be argued that public administration has the tendency to be ethnocentric, but it should not be forgotten that the process of governing is universal. “..while the political and theoretical foundations of governments play a key role in understanding the bureaucratic activities that we associate with public administration, the act of governing suggests a set of common processes that must be understood in a social and cultural setting no less than in a political setting” (Cox, Buck, Morgan, 1994). As the above quotation clearly indicates, public administration is quite similar throughout the world in the sense of using hierarchies, rule-enforcing mechanisms and management practices, which can be found all over the world. But the social and cultural environments that support government actions in different countries suggest differences of style and practice, which radically change the nature of governmental decision making and other actions.

What are the benefits of the comparative approach to public administration? There are persuasive reasons for conducting comparative studies in public administration. In the first place, those who are advocating the construction of a science of administration recognise that this depends, among other things, on success in establishing propositions about administrative behaviour that transcend national boundaries (Heady, 1991). In other words, if there are to be public administration principles having a universal validity there is need for comparative studies. Secondly, aside from the demands of scientific inquiry, there are other advantages to be gained from a better understanding of public administration in other countries. The administrative devices, methods or techniques, developed in a particular country may prove worthy of consideration for adoption or adaptation at a different country. The influence of Western patterns of administration over the newly independent and/or less developed countries of world is well known. Thus, the probability of the administrative system of a country, or certain administrative methods being adopted is rather high, and as a matter of fact this is a widespread tendency. The adoption of the administrative system or some administrative methods of other countries may end up with positive or negative results. When there is such a situation of adopting the administrative system of another country, or adopting an administrative method, there should be a thorough

evaluation of the situation. That is, there should be an elaborate comparative study of the characteristics of the two countries, in order to reach a rational decision as to whether to adopt it or not. The development of comparative public administration as a sub-field of public administration can be considered under two sub-headings as “traditional” and “modern”.

Traditional Comparative Public Administration.

Traditional comparative public administration was interested in studying and analysing the administrative structure and functions in Western European countries. The traditional approach is basically descriptive and employs historical and legalistic approaches. (The historical approach centers on the study of origins and growth of certain institutions. The legalistic approach focuses on the legality of administrative actions, whether they are in conformity with the constitution and other laws or not.). Both approaches study administrative systems in a very narrow frame, thus it can be argued that Traditional Comparative Public Administration basically has a narrow angle of vision.

The majority of the studies have been addressed to the examination of the administrative systems of Western developed nations such as the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, etc. There was sufficient justification for the selection of Western developed countries: accessibility of the countries studied; relative ease of overcoming language barriers; availability of official documents and other materials; and finally, cultural ties. Concentration on Western systems cannot be exclusively attributed only to the above mentioned ; an even more important factor was the belief, shared widely by the scholars of the time, that democracy was the normal and durable form of government, and it was destined to spread throughout the world. Thus, the interest of the scholars was limited to the democratic systems. Other countries were considered only for the purpose of identifying democratic institutions and forms. Also, it should be pointed out that, in these studies, no systematic effort has been made to identify the similarities and the differences between these countries.

As can be seen clearly, traditional comparative public administration was interested in studying Western democratic systems, and thus, underdeveloped and non-western countries were not taken into consideration. In addition to this narrow angle of vision, the traditional approach ignored the dynamic factors that account for growth and change. In other words, the traditional approach was interested in administrative structure or anatomy, and ignored the dynamic factors which affect the growth and development of this structure. One last characteristic of traditional comparative public administration is that it is essentially monographic. That is, most of the studies have taken the form of the monographs that have concentrated on the study of administrative institutions of a single system, or a particular institution in one system.

Modern Comparative Public Administration.

Before World War II, the term, “comparative public administration”, had a rather narrow connotation, referring to the public administration system in a country without much concern for its social context. After the war, on the one hand the United States of America, and on the other hand such international organisations as the United Nations have prepared technical assistance programs for underdeveloped countries,

and for those countries that suffered as a result of the war. These technical assistance programs were aiming to help underdeveloped countries in their economic development and those countries that had deteriorated as a result of the war. Involvement with non-Western nations through these aid programs, revealed the great gap in knowledge about their social structures, cultural patterns and value systems. These revealed facts played an important role in the development of comparative public administration, because within the framework of technical assistance programs, attempts were made to put into effect or impose the technology and administrative methods developed in Western countries on the Eastern countries, which had completely different cultural values. But the results were not satisfactory: the Western methods did not prove successful in different cultural settings. Then it became clear that an administrative system is in a close relationship with its society, there is a close interaction between the administrative system and the society within which it exists, and administration is affected by the values prevailing in the environment. The outcome was clear, introducing or imposing an administrative method without studying the cultural patterns and social values will not give positive results. Because of the above-mentioned foregoing, the search for new research methods and techniques to fill this gap enlarged the scope of comparative public administration.

Within this context, modern comparative public administration studies Eastern and less developed countries as well as Western countries. The modern approach is not only interested in the study of administrative structure, but also in the relationship between the system and its environment. In addition, instead of studying just one country, more than one country is being studied. But it should be pointed out that the enlargement of the scope of comparative public administration had brought out certain problems: in studying the administrative systems of different countries, one has to study their political systems as well, because one cannot separate an administrative system from a political system or setting, they affect each other. Thus, comparative politics is closely related with comparative administration, and the fact that there are so many independent countries with different political structures conducting comparative studies poses a serious problem. In addition to the above, there are differences between countries concerning the composition of population, the level of economic development, historical evolution, and the nature of social institutions etc., and it is not easy to find a framework that will deal with all this complexity. A second problem, faced by the modern comparative public administration, is the lack of dependable and sufficient data. In the case of Western developed nations, it is possible to find statistical data for almost every basic subject. But in the case of underdeveloped countries, it is difficult to find sufficient data in such basic subjects as production, employment, capital formation, public health, and agricultural production etc.

Anyone who studies comparative public administration literature can easily notice that there are so many different studies. This variety reflects the different view points scholars have concerning comparative public administration; almost every scholar has a unique framework for his comparative analysis. Because of this variety, there are attempts to classify the literature of comparative public administration, for example Ferrel Heady classifies the literature by subject matter and identifies four groups as (1) Modified traditional, (2) Development-oriented, (3) General system model-building, and (4) Middle range theory formulation (Heady, 1991).

1. Modified Traditional. The studies included in this category show a continuity with earlier traditional studies, the difference being that instead of studying individual administrative systems, they have focused on more than one system for the purposes of comparison between them, and also they have utilised more advanced research tools and incorporated findings from a variety of social science disciplines.

2. Development –oriented. The studies in this category have focused on the administrative requisites for national development. They were especially interested in underdeveloped countries where the effective implementation of such public policies, and the accomplishing of such national goals, require substantial political, economic, and social transformations. Among the studies in this category, Edward W. Weidner, “Development Administration: A New Focus for Research”; and Milton J. Easmen, “The Politics of Development Administration” can be mentioned.

3. General System Model-building. These are the studies concerned with the construction of typologies or models for comparative purposes, and their intention is to keep these value-free or value-neutral (Heady,1991). In this category the studies by Fred W. Riggs, “Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society”, and John T. Dorsey, “An Information-Energy Model” should be mentioned.

4. Middle-Range Theory Formulation. “Middle-range” theory tries to explain a limited set of relationships, as opposed to a theory that attempts to comprehend an entire social system. In other words, a middle-range theory attempts to abstract from the whole social context some limited but meaningful part for analysis, for example, the relationship between a given economic system and its public administration system. The most prominent and promising middle-range model for comparative studies in administration is the “bureaucratic” model, based on the ideal type model of bureaucracy formulated by Max Weber. Among the studies in this category mention should be made of Morroe Berger, “Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt”, and Joseph LaPalombara(ed), “Bureaucracy and Political Development”.

REFERENCES FOR PART ONE

- Ackoff, Russell L., "Systems, Organisations, and Interdisciplinary Research", in Joseph A. Litterer(ed) Organisations: Systems, Control and Adaptation, (New York: John Wiley & Sons. Inc., 1969)
- Barnard, Chester., The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938)
- Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard., Formal Organisations, (San Fransisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962).
- Cem, Cemil, "The role and activities of the Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East", Turkish Public Administration Annual, No.1, 1974.
- Cox III, Raymond W., Buck, Susan J., and Morgan Betty N., Public Administration In Theory and Practice, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: PrenticeHall, Inc., 1994)
- Dahl, Robert., "The Concept of Power", Behavioral Science, 2 (July 1957)
- Denhardt, Robert B., "Public Administration Theory: The State of the Discipline", In Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Widavsky (eds) Public Administration: The State of the Discipline, (Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990)
- Dimock, Marshall Edward and Dimock, Gladys Ogden., Public Administration, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964)
- Ergun, Turgay., Polatoğlu, Aykut., Kamu Yönetimine Giriş, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayinlari, 1992).
- Etzioni, Amitai., Modern Organisations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).
- Etzioni, Amitai., A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organisations, (New York: The Free Press, 1961)
- George, Jr., Claude S., The History of Management Thought, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968)

- Gulick, Luther., “Notes on the Theory of Organization”, in Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds) Papers on the Science of Administration , (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937)
- Hall, Richard H., Organisations: Structure and Process, (Englewood Cliffs, N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977)
- Heady, Ferrel., Public Administration: A comparative Perspective, (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1991)
- Henry, Nicholas., Public Administration & Public Affairs, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1992)
- Henry, Nicholas., “Root and Branch: Public Administration’s Travail Toward the Future”, in Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky (eds) Public Administration: The State of the Discipline. (Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990)
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L., The Social Psychology of Organisations, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967)
- LaPalombara, Joseph (ed), Bureaucracy and Development, (Princeton, New Jersey; Princeton University Press, 1967)
- Lindblom, Charles E., “The Science of ‘Muddling Through’ “, Public Administration Review , 19 (Spring 1959)
- Lynn, Naomi B. and Wildavsky, Aaron., (eds) Public Administration: The State of the Discipline, (Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, 1990)
- Nigro, Felix A., and Nigro, Lloyd G., Modern Public Administration , (Seventh Edition, 1989).
- Perrow, Charles., “The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organisations”, American Sociological Review , 26, No.6 (December 1961)
- Pfiffner, John. M., and Presthus, Robert., Public Administration, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967)
- Polatoğlu, Aykut., “Örgüt Kuramları ve İletişim”, Amme İdaresi Dergisi , Cilt: 17 , No: 4 , Aralık 1984.
- Rainey, Hal G., “Public Management: Recent Developments and Current Prospects”, In Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky Public Administration:

- The State of the Discipline ,(Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990)
- Riggs, Fred W., Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society. (Boston;Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964)
- Rohr, John A., “Ethics in Public Administration: A State-of-the-Discipline Report”,
In Naomi B. Lynn and Aaron Wildavsky (eds) Public Administration The State of the Discipline (Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990)
- Rosenbloom, David H.; Goldman, Deborah D., and Ingraham, Patricia w.,(eds)
Contemporary Public Administration, (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994)
- Rosenbloom, David H., Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector, (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.,1993)
- Scott, Richard W., “Theory of Organisations”, in Robert E.L.Faris (ed) Handbook Of Modern Sociology, (Chicago: Paul McNally and Corp.,1964)
- Scott, William G., “Organisation Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal”,
In Joseph A. Litterer(ed) Organisations: Structure & Behavior, (New York: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.,1966)
- Simon, Herbert A., Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes In Administrative Organisation, (New York: The Free Press,1966)
- Simon, Herbert A., Smithborg, Donald W., and Thompson, Victor A., Public Administration, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950)
- Stillman II, Richard J., Public Administration: Concepts and Cases, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1993)
- Taylor, Frederick W., The Principles of Scientific Management, (New York: Harper And Row, 1911)
- Urwick, L., “Organisation as a Technical Problem”, in Luther Gulick and L . Urwick (eds) Papers on the Science of Administration, (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937)
- Waldo, Dwight., The Study of Public Administration, (New York: Random House, 1968)
- White, Leonard D., Introduction to the Study of Public Administration , (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949)

VI. THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING OF TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

1. FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC

The basic characteristic of the Turkish Republic is indicated in article 2 of the Constitution which reads as follows: “**The Republic of Turkey is a democratic, secular and social State governed by the rule of law ; bearing in mind the concepts of public peace, national solidarity and justice, respecting human rights; loyal to the nationalism of Atatürk, and based on the fundamental tenets set for in the Preamble”**

The underlined concepts, in the above-mentioned article of the Constitution, have their effects on the structuring and functioning of Turkish State. The article above clearly indicates that the Republic of Turkey is a **democratic state**, ..is a **secular state**, ..is a **social state**, and is a **state governed by the rule of law**. Since the above-mentioned characteristics are adopted by the Constitution they have to be taken into consideration in the structuring and functioning of the Turkish Public Administration. Thus, it is necessary critically to evaluate each of the above-mentioned concepts to find out to what extent they are reflected in the structure and functioning of the Turkish State. Such an evaluation will be helpful in drawing the general framework within which the Turkish public administration functions or should function.

a. Democratic State

The essential features of a democratic system are free elections and representation; universal suffrage; the rule of the majority; and protection of the minorities. The principle of universal suffrage gives every citizen a chance to affect the administration, but the citizens cannot accomplish this effectively as individual citizens. Then, there is a need for organizations that bring together the individual judgments of citizens, formulate them into meaningful policies and lead and direct the citizens. That is, there is a need for the establishment of political parties. Then, the existence of freely organized political parties is one of the indispensable elements of a democratic state alongside the above-mentioned essential features. Through political parties, the citizens will be able to affect the administration.

Freedom of political organization and activity is not without limits under the Turkish Constitution. According to the Constitution, political parties have to conform to the principles of a democratic and secular republic based on human rights and liberties and the principle of the national and territorial integrity of the state.

A criticism that may be directed at political parties in Turkey is related to the administration and decision-making processes within the parties themselves. Political parties are seen as indispensable elements of a democratic system, and their administration should be based on democratic principles as well. The Turkish Constitution Article 69 states that “The activities, internal regulations and operation of political parties shall be in line with democratic principles”. But it is difficult to claim that Turkish political parties have democratic administration and decision-making processes in effect in their internal functioning. In general, the leaders are playing a dominant role in the decision-making process, and thus, the decisions made by the party do not reflect a consensus among the members of the party but the choices of the leader. For example, there are no primaries held before the elections in the determination of the candidates and, thus, the views of the members are not taken into consideration. In this sense, in general, the leaders of the political parties are dominating the affairs of their parties, and thus such an attitude is damaging the democracy within the party.

b. Secular State

A secular state is a state in which religious and state affairs are completely separated. In the West, secularism has meant complete separation of religion and state, and although the church is a powerful hierarchical organization, it is possible to separate religious and state services, because Christianity tries to prepare individuals for the other world, and in that sense, state and religious affairs are different from each other. But in the case of Muslim religion and the Turkish Republic, the conditions and requirements of secularism are different.

In the establishment of the Turkish Republic, the Kemalist conception of secularism has allowed for some measure of state control over religion, because of the nature of Islamic religion. Islam is not only a system of faith but also a system of law, a social and political ideology, and a total way of life. Because of the above-mentioned characteristics of Islam, it was feared that total non-interference would result in the interference of the religion in governmental affairs. According to this view, if religious affairs were left entirely in the hands of community organizations, without any governmental supervision, it could easily form into a powerful organization and struggle for power and try to retain its hold over the society, over its laws, politics and economics. According to this view, the establishment of the Department of Religious Affairs (Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı) should be evaluated within this perspective. Through the control exercised by this organization, the state wants to make sure that religious organizations deal with religious affairs only and that they do not try to interfere with governmental affairs (Soysal,1986).

For protecting the secular character of the State there is a constitutional provision bringing a ban on the use of religion for political purposes. Article 24 of the Constitution reads as follows: **No one shall be allowed to exploit or abuse religion or religious feelings, or things held sacred by religion, in any manner whatsoever, for the purpose of personal or political influence, or for even partially basing the fundamental, social, economic, political, and legal order of the State on religious tenets.** Freedom of religion is guaranteed, provided that the exercise of this right does not threaten the “the indivisible integrity of the state”. No one is to be compelled to worship or to participate in religious ceremonies or rites.

c. Social State

The term “social state” is used by the Constitution to refer to what is more commonly known as the “welfare state” in the west. “Welfare state” is a term comprising social rights, social security and social justice. A social state is not a socialist state, where the means of production are socialized to prevent the exploitation of the masses by a group and where workers control the power. In a social state, it is not necessary to socialize the means of production, and political power does not have to be controlled by the workers. As indicated above a social state comprises social rights, social security and social justice.

Social rights include the right to unionize, to strike, the right to collective bargaining, to housing, to vacation with pay etc. The state has to take measures and make the necessary arrangements for the realization of the above-mentioned rights. The Constitution charges the state with the responsibility of establishing social security and social welfare organization for all citizens. The Emekli Sandığı, Sosyal Sigortalar Kurumu, and BAĞKUR are social security organizations established by the state. But these organizations are not able to offer social security to all citizens; especially in the agriculture sector and rural areas, millions of citizens are not covered by social security organizations. Social justice implies measures to reduce inequalities in wealth and income. That is, the state has to take necessary measures to reduce the inequalities among its citizens. One group of such measures is progressive taxation and various taxes on wealth. Another more specific one is land reform. It is difficult to claim that Turkish governments are taking sufficient measures to insure social justice in the country, in spite of the fact that this is a constitutional mandate.

d. Rule of law (State of law)

The rule of law, or state of law, refers to a system where governmental agencies operating within the framework of laws and their actions are subject to review by independent judicial authorities. A state of law is a system whereby the legal security and rights of the individuals are assured. There are three basic elements that are absolutely essential in implementing the rule of law in a country, and these are as follows:

1. Judicial review of the legality of administrative actions. According to Article 123 of the Turkish Constitution, “Recourse to judicial review shall be open against all actions and acts of the administration.” The Constitution clearly states that all actions of the administration is subject to judicial review. In other words, access to the courts on account of administrative acts and actions cannot be banned. But the same article brings an exception to the above by indicating, “The acts of the President of Republic in his own competence, and the decisions of the Supreme Military Council (Yüksek Askeri Şura) are outside the scope of judicial review.” Such exceptions, of course, damage the principle of the rule of law. In Turkey, as is the case for most of the European countries, the judicial control of the legality of administrative acts and actions is performed by administrative courts, not by general courts. Such a practice (the dual judicial structure) does not impair the principle of rule of law, so long as the administrative courts are independent.
2. Judicial review of the constitutionality of laws. While judicial review of administrative actions is necessary in the implementation of the rule of law, if

judicial review of the constitutionality of laws is not insured, the legislative branch would be legally free to restrict the basic rights and liberties of the individuals at will. As long as such restrictions are imposed by laws, the courts can not provide protection to the individual. Thus, the existence of such a court, for reviewing the laws as to their constitutionality, is a must for a state of law. In this sense, the establishment of a Constitutional Court was a significant step on the way to implementing the principle of the rule of law in Turkey.

3. Independence of the judiciary. Another requisite of the rule of law is the independence of the judiciary. If the judiciary remains under the influence of other branches (legislative and executive), if judges give their decisions under the influence of certain authorities, judicial review will lose much of its significance. Thus, it is necessary to take measures for insuring the independence of the judiciary, if the principle of the rule of law is to be in effect in a country. The Turkish Constitution introduces several measures for insuring the independence of the judiciary. Article 138 states that “Judges shall be independent in the discharge of their duties; they shall give judgment in accordance with the Constitution, the law; and their personal conviction conforming with the law. No organ, authority, office or individual may give orders or instructions to the courts or judges relating to the exercise of judicial power, or send them circulars, make recommendations or suggestions.” With this article, the Constitution prohibits the authorities and individuals from trying to influence the judges. To insure the independence of the judiciary, the Constitution brings additional measures and guarantees a security of tenure for judges and public prosecutors. Article, 139 and 140 clearly state that judges and public prosecutors shall exercise their duties until they complete the age of 65, which is the retirement age; they shall not be dismissed, or retired before the age of 65; nor shall they be deprived of their salaries, allowances or other rights relating to their status, even as a result of the abolition of their court or post.

According to the Constitution, “Judicial power is limited to the verification of the conformity of the actions and acts of the administration with the law. No judicial ruling shall be passed which restricts the exercise of the executive function in accordance with the forms and principles prescribed by law, which has the quality of an administrative action and act, or which removes discretionary powers”.

2. CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES WITH REGARDS TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANISATION

The Constitution in the section with the title of Fundamentals of Administration introduces certain principles with regard to the structuring and functioning of public administration. Article 123 of the Constitution reads as follows: “The administration forms a whole (indivisible) with regard to its structure and functions, and shall be regulated by law. The organization and functions of the administration are based on the principles of centralization and decentralization.” In Article 126, with reference to the field units of the central administration, it is indicated that “The administration of the provinces is based on the principle of deconcentration.” The Constitution introduces the concepts of **centralization, decentralization, and deconcentration** with reference to the structuring of public administration. These

are the basic principles of organization. Authority for making decisions in an organization is usually distributed among various departments and levels, and in distributing authority between the field and center there are two basic solutions: (1) Concentrate all the authority at the center -**centralization** ; (2) Delegate it completely to the local units -**decentralization**. There is a third solution, which is a softened form of centralization, called **deconcentration**, in which the center delegates parts of its authority to its hierarchically controlled field units.

a. Centralisation and deconcentration.

These are two related principles which are in effect in the structuring and functioning of the central administration and its field units. In the case of centralization, the authority for making decisions concerning public services is concentrated at the top of the organization or at the center. Public services are brought to the people by the organizations, which are placed under hierarchical control of the center. In other words, decisions are taken by the center and executed by the officials of the center. In a centralized administration, the financial means are also centralized; that is revenues and expenditures are controlled by the center.

Having the principle of centralization in effect, or having a centralized administration, has certain advantages: In the first place, it insures uniformity in administration, that is, administrative practices will be the same all over the country, because decisions are made by one center. The cost of services is decreased, because the scale of operations is large, and services are produced in large quantities. The necessary specialization and financial means for the execution of public services can be obtained easily. Public officials are freed from local pressures, because decisions are made at the center.

There are also certain disadvantages involved in having a centralized administration: The most important disadvantage of centralization is red-tape, that is centralization increases red-tape. Since authority to make decisions is concentrated at the center, the centre and field have to communicate a lot. It is difficult to pinpoint the needs of localities from the center, and even if this is done, it will not be in accord with the local realities. Local officials will not be sensitive to the needs of the locality, because they are under the hierarchical control of the center, and the requirements of the center will take precedence over local necessities.

In the organization of the Turkish central administration, the principle of centralization is in effect. But in the organization of the field units of the central administration, the principle of deconcentration is in effect. Deconcentration is a different form (a softened form) of centralization, in which center delegates parts of its authority to the field units. That is to increase efficiency in the provision of public services, the center delegates parts of its authority to its field units. The basic decision-making authority is still concentrated at the center, but there is a partial delegation for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the administration.

b. Decentralisation.

In the case of decentralization, the authority to make decisions regarding public services is devolved completely to local units. Decentralized units are autonomous, that is, they have administrative and financial autonomy. Having autonomy does not

necessarily mean that they are completely independent of the center. To insure uniformity in the provision of public services, they have to operate within the framework of their respective laws. Decentralized units have their own public legal personality. In this sense they are the subject of rights; they can enter into transactions with others, own property, and have their own name and legal residence. Decentralized units have their own budget and execute their functions through their own administrative organs. They are under the administrative tutelage of the center, tutelage is not a hierarchical control power, but it gives the center a chance to exercise a limited degree of control over the activities of the local units as to its legality. Tutelage and autonomy are inversely related, that is if tutelage increases, the autonomy of local units decrease.

There are certain advantages to decentralization: Citizens can participate in the administration, and in this sense it is more democratic. The disadvantages of centralization are lessened or decreased through the application of decentralization; red-tape is decreased, decisions are made by local officials and thus, reflect the local necessities; the speed of the responses of the administration to local problems and issues is increased.

Decentralization has certain disadvantages, these are: it is difficult to insure uniformity in bringing public services to the people; decentralized units generally have limited resources and financial means, and since the scale of operations is small, there is a lack of technical experts or specialized public officials.

The principle of decentralization is in effect in Turkish public administration, with regard to the structuring and functioning of local governments. Turkish local governments such as municipalities, provincial local administrations, and villages are established and function on the basis of the principle of decentralization.

c. Indivisibility of administration.

According to Article 123 of the Constitution, “in terms of organization and functions, the administration is a whole”, that is the administration is indivisible. Turkey is a unitary state, therefore there can be no political or administrative entity with “reserved powers” in the sense of federalism within the boundaries of Turkish Republic. The departments and units of public administration may take diversified forms with regard to their organization and functions, but they all constitute the same body of administration. The harmony among the various parts of the administration is regulated by laws. As already discussed, the constitution recognizes the principle of decentralization as a basis for the organization and functioning of local administrations, in addition to the principle of centralization, which is in effect in the organization of central government. Since central government organizations are placed under the hierarchical control of the center, insuring harmony among the central units is easily accomplished. The local governments are decentralized units, and in that sense, they are autonomous. Harmony among the local governments is insured through the concept of tutelage. The local governments are subject to the control of central administration exercised through the power of tutelage. Tutelage, in this sense, is the means through which the indivisibility of administration is guaranteed.

d. Separation of powers.

The concept of separation of power is mentioned in the Preamble of the Constitution, and it is seen as a division of labor. The Constitution indicates the following: "...separation of powers does not imply an order of precedence among the organs of state, but reflects a civilized division of labor and mode of cooperation restricted to the exercise of specific state powers, and that supremacy is vested solely in the Constitution and the laws". It is not possible to talk about a real separation of powers in the Turkish system, because the executive power is vested in the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers, and the Prime Minister is the leader of the majority party, and the ministers also are the members of the same party. Thus, the executive and legislative branches are controlled by the same party. Within this framework, there is an integrated executive and legislative branch, thus it is not possible to talk about a separation of powers. But the judiciary is independent of the other branches of government.

3. LEGISLATURE

The Constitution vests legislative authority in the unicameral Grand National Assembly, and this authority cannot be delegated. The Grand National Assembly is composed of 550 members directly elected by the people for a term of five years. Every Turkish citizen over the age of thirty is eligible to be a deputy, on the condition that he or she has completed primary education and has not been convicted of a serious crime. Members of higher judicial and educational institutions, civil servants and members of the armed forces must resign from office before standing for election. According to the Constitution, deputies represent the whole nation, not only their own constituencies. Deputies are granted parliamentary immunities, such as freedom of speech and, with some qualifications, freedom from arrest. Freedom of speech simply implies that deputies shall not be held responsible for the speeches they made and the opinions expressed in the course of legislative debates, or repeating and revealing those activities outside the Grand National Assembly. Freedom from arrest is designed to protect the legislators from what may be arbitrary or politically-motivated arrests or detentions. There is growing criticism directed at the practice of freedom from arrest, in the sense that it should not protect those deputies who are involved with criminal activities. The members of the Grand National Assembly can be deprived of their membership of the Assembly by the decision of an absolute majority of its members.

The Grand National Assembly elects the President; it has the power to enact, amend, and repeal laws; it debates and approves the budget; it approves the ratification of international treaties and has the power to authorise a declaration of war; and it exercises control over the executive in the form of written and oral questions, investigations and interpellation. The control power of the Grand National Assembly is not exercised properly because of partisan politics and strict party discipline over the party membership. The political party (or parties) in power is in control of the majority of the seats in the Grand National Assembly, and any action initiated by the opposition to activate one of the control mechanisms is rejected by that majority.

4. JUDICIARY

As indicated earlier in the Republic of Turkey, the concept of separation of powers is not in effect, but the judiciary is independent of the other branches of government. That is, there is a separation in effect between the judiciary and other branches. The independence of judiciary is protected by the Constitution, according to which “No organ, authority, office or individuals may give orders or instructions to courts or judges relating to the exercise of judicial power, or send them circulars, make recommendations or suggestions”. Even the Grand National Assembly may not discuss or make statements concerning a case under trial, because the above-mentioned article of the Constitution states that; “No question shall be asked, debates held, or statements made in the legislative assembly relating to the exercises of judicial power concerning a case under trial.” Furthermore, the very same article of the Constitution states that “The legislative and executive organs and the administration shall comply with court decisions; these organs and the administration shall neither alter them in any respect, nor delay their execution.” The Constitution not only tries to insure the independence of the Judiciary but at the same time seeks to guarantee that the decisions of the courts are respected and implemented by the other branches and the administration. As indicated before, to insure the independence of judges, the Constitution states that all judges may hold their office until the age of 65, which is the retirement age indicated in the Constitution. Judges and public prosecutors cannot be expelled (dismissed) and be forced to retire before that age unless they want to. The principle body responsible for ensuring judicial integrity is the Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors. This council is charged with the personnel matters of judges and public prosecutors such as appointments, transfers, promotions, disciplinary action and dismissal. The Council is composed of seven members; five of them are appointed by the President of the Republic from among the candidates nominated by the High Court of Appeals and Council of State; the remaining two are ex-officio members, one of them being the Minister of Justice and the other is the Undersecretary of the same ministry. The composition of the Council, specifically the existence of the ex-officio members has received a lot of criticism focusing on the damage given to the independence of judiciary.

Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court is the highest court and reviews the constitutionality of the laws. Members of the court are appointed by the President of the Republic from among candidates nominated by high courts and councils. The Court elects its chairman from among the members. Principal proceedings can be instituted by the President of the Republic, the party in power, the largest opposition party and one-fifth of the members of the Grand National Assembly, that is, they may appeal to the Court to review the constitutionality of laws and decrees having the force of law. The Constitutional Court also functions as a Supreme Court where the President of the Republic, members of the Council of Ministers, presidents and members of the higher courts and their Chief Public Prosecutors are tried for offenses relating to their functions.

High Court of Appeals

High Court of Appeals (Yargıtay) is the last instance for reviewing the decisions and judgments of lower civil and criminal courts and may also exercise original and final jurisdiction in cases prescribed by law. Its members are elected by senior judges and

public prosecutors by secret ballot and by absolute majority of the total number of members. The chairman is elected by the members from among the members of the court.

Council of State

The Council of State (Danıştay) is the last instance for reviewing the decisions and judgments given by administrative courts. It is also the first and last instance for dealing with specific cases prescribed by law. The Council of State tries administrative cases, gives its opinion on draft legislation submitted by the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers, examines draft regulations and the conditions and contracts under which concessions are granted, settles administrative disputes and discharges other duties prescribed by law. Three-fourths of the members of the Council of State are appointed by the Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors from among the first category of administrative judges and public prosecutors, and the remaining one-fourth of the members by the President of the Republic from among officials meeting the requirements designated by law.

Court of Jurisdictional Conflicts

The Jurisdictional Conflict Court (Uyuşmazlık Mahkemesi) is empowered to deliver final judgments in disputes between courts of justice and administrative and military courts concerning their jurisdiction and decisions.

Audit Court

The Audit Court (Sayıştay) is charged with auditing on behalf of the Grand National Assembly all the accounts relating to the revenue, expenditure and property of government departments financed by the general and subsidiary budget and with taking final decisions on the acts and accounts of the responsible officials.

In addition to above, there are State Security Courts (Devlet Güvenlik Mahkemeleri) handling cases related to the security of the State. Military justice is exercised by military courts, which have jurisdiction over military personnel.

5. EXECUTIVE

At the top of the executive branch, there is the President of the Republic, who is designated as “Head of the State”, the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister. The executive branch has a dual structure: on the one hand there are politically active and responsible Council of Ministers and Prime Minister, on the other there is a largely ceremonial and apolitical President. The President at the top of the executive branch symbolizes the continuity of the state and unity of the nation, and in this sense the role of the President in the Turkish constitutional system is a ceremonial one. The real executive power is vested in the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers.

President

The President is elected for a term of seven years by the Grand National Assembly from among its own members who are over forty years of age and who have completed their higher education or from among Turkish citizens who fulfill these requirements and are eligible to be deputies. The nomination of a candidate for the

Presidency of the Republic from outside the Grand National Assembly requires a written proposal by at least one-fifth of the total number of members of the assembly. In the election of the President a two-thirds majority is needed; if a two-thirds majority of the total number of members cannot be obtained in the first two ballots, a third ballot is held, and the candidate who receives the absolute majority of the votes of the total number of members shall be elected as the President. If the President of the Republic cannot be elected by an absolute majority of the total number of members in the fourth ballot, new general elections for the Turkish Grand National Assembly are held immediately. The president-elect has to terminate relations with political parties and may not be re-elected.

The President has a variety of duties regarding three branches of government; the duties of the President are listed in the Constitution in relation to each branch. The 1982 Constitution gives the President a stronger and more extensive role than did the previous one, but this did not change the ceremonial characteristics of the presidential office. Additional duties placed under the responsibility of the president are generally related to the appointment of high level officials, but the president is not fully in control of the appointment process, because nominations are made by several other authorities and the president makes the appointment from among a limited number of nominees.

Duties related to the legislative: To summon the Grand National Assembly to meet when necessary; to promulgate laws; to return laws to the Grand National Assembly for reconsideration; to submit to referendum legislation regarding the amendment of the Constitution; to appeal to the Constitutional Court for the annulment of laws or decrees with the force of law; and to call new elections for the Grand National Assembly in the existence of the conditions indicated in the Constitution. (For example, according to the constitution, “In cases where the Council of Ministers fails to receive a vote of confidence or is compelled to resign by a vote of no-confidence, and if a new Council of Ministers cannot be formed within forty-five days or the new Council of Ministers fail to receive a vote of confidence the President of the Republic may call new elections”).

Duties related to the executive: To appoint the Prime Minister and accept his resignation; to appoint and dismiss Ministers on the proposal of the Prime Minister; to preside over the Council of Ministers or to call the Council to meet under his chairmanship whenever he deems it necessary; to ratify and promulgate international treaties; to call the National Security Board to meet and to preside over its meetings; to accredit representatives of the Turkish State to foreign states and to receive the representatives of foreign states to the Republic of Turkey; to appoint the Chief of the General Staff; to proclaim martial law or state of emergency, and to issue decrees having force of law; to appoint the members of State Control Board (Devlet Denetleme Kurulu) and to instruct the Board to carry out inquiries, investigations and inspections; to appoint the members of Higher Education Board (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu) and to appoint the rectors of the universities.

Duties related to the judiciary: To appoint the members of the Constitutional Court, one-fourth of the members of the Council of State, and members of the Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors. Members of the Military High Court of Appeals and the members of the Supreme Military Administrative Court are also appointed by the President.

According to the Constitution, the President is not accountable for his actions related to the discharge of presidential duties. Article 105 of the Constitution indicates that “All presidential decrees except those which the President of the Republic is empowered to enact by himself without the signatures of the Prime Minister and the Minister concerned, in accordance with the provisions of the constitution and other laws, shall be signed by the Prime Minister and the Minister concerned the Prime Minister and the Ministers concerned shall be accountable for these decrees.” The continuation of the Article states that “No appeal shall be made to any legal authority, including the Constitutional Court, against the decisions and orders signed by the President of the Republic on his own initiative.” As can be seen clearly, the President is not accountable for his actions, and so long as there are other officials jointly signing the decrees or decisions and held accountable for that action, the non-accountability of the President is understandable, and it does not impair the principle of the rule of law. But the non-accountability of the President when acting alone, by himself, is not in line with the principle of the state of law.

The President of the Republic may be impeached for high treason upon the proposal of at least one-third of the total number of members of the Grand National Assembly and by the decision of at least three-quarters of the total number of members.

According to the Constitution, in the event of a temporary absence of the President of the Republic on account of illness, travel abroad or similar circumstances, the President of the Turkish Grand National Assembly shall serve as Acting President of the Republic and exercise the powers of the President of the Republic until he resumes his function.

Supreme Councils and Boards

There are a number of high level boards or councils established within the body of central government, giving advice to the government or making final decisions with regard to certain executive activities. The members of these boards are usually composed of the president, the prime minister, ministers, and other high level civilian and military officials; depending upon the nature of activities of the specific board there will be a different composition of the above mentioned officials. Some of these supreme council or boards are: the National Security Board, the High Planning Board, the High Board of Science and Technology, the Supreme Military Council, the High Control Board of the Prime Ministry, the High Board of Privatization, the High Board of South-eastern Anatolia Project. Among these high level boards the National Security Board is an important one, worthy of mention.

National Security Board. The National Security Board is an advisory board giving advice to the Council of Ministers regarding national security issues. The members of the board are the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, Assistant Prime Ministers, the Chief of the General Staff, the Minister of National Defence, the Minister of Interior, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Commanders of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the General Commander of Gendarme. The board is presided over by the President of the Republic or, in his absence, by the Prime Minister. The agenda of the board is prepared by the President. The National Security Board submits to the Council of Ministers its views on taking decisions and ensuring the necessary coordination with regard to the formulation, establishment, and

implementation of the national security policy of the state. The decisions of the Board are simply advices to the Council of Ministers; if the Council of Ministers agrees with the Board, such advices are taken into consideration and reflected to its decisions regarding national security issues and implemented.

The composition and functioning of the National Security Board had been changed through amending the Constitution on October 3, 2001, and adopted the present formation. Previously the Assistant Prime Ministers were not entitled to attend the meetings of the board, thus the Board was meeting with the participation of 5 military and 4 civilian members outside the President. In addition to its different composition, it was the mandate of the Constitution that the Council of Ministers had to give "priority consideration" to the advices of the Board. There were heavy criticisms directed to the board because of its composition in favor of military members and the fact that Council of Ministers had to give priority consideration to its decisions. Such critics, especially international organizations, were claiming that military was playing an active role in Turkish political arena through the Board. Because of the pressures brought on Turkish governments, within the process of integration to the European Union, above mentioned changes were introduced with an amendment of the Constitution and the National Security Board wore a different make up, had a civilian appearance..

The National Security Board is a board where the highest civilian and military officials come together and discuss national security issues, and it is the most powerful and influential of the supreme boards. The issues of national security are taken into consideration from two different perspectives: internal and external, and the consideration of internal issues of national security gives a chance to the military to express its views on the domestic policies of the governments. In this sense, the National Security Board from time to time becomes a place whereby the military pronounces its criticism or wishes regarding the policies of the government and makes sure that its voice is heard by the public.

Council of Ministers and Prime Minister

The Council of Ministers consists of the Prime Minister and Ministers and is headed by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is appointed by the President from among the members of the Grand National Assembly. The President is not so free in appointing the Prime Minister, because the Prime Minister should be able to form a government, and that government should receive a vote of confidence in the Grand National Assembly. That is, the Prime Minister has to be someone who is able to gain the support of the majority of the members of the GNA. Thus, in appointing the Prime Minister, the President to a certain extent, has to appoint the leader of the majority party in the GNA.

After being appointed, the Prime Minister nominates ministers for appointment by the President. Ministers may be nominated from among the members of the Grand National Assembly, or from among those eligible for election as deputies. With the appointment of the Ministers, the new government prepares its program and submits it to the GNA for a "vote of confidence". Each new cabinet has to be presented to the GNA for a vote of confidence and is dependent on the support of a majority of the GNA. If at any time an absolute majority of the GNA supports a motion of no

confidence, the Council of Ministers must resign. If a new government is not formed within 45 days, the President has the power to dissolve the GNA and call for new elections.

The Prime Minister supervises the implementation of government policy. The members of the Council of Ministers are jointly and equally responsible for the implementation of this policy. The Prime Minister, as chairman of the Council of Ministers, insures cooperation among the Ministers, and supervises the implementation of government's general policy. In the functioning of the Council of Ministers, decisions have to be taken unanimously, that is, all of the Ministers have to be in complete agreement on every decision, otherwise there will be no decision. Ministers are collectively responsible for the general policy of the government, shared jointly and equally by all Ministers. If the Council of Ministers fall, as a result of a vote of confidence, no individual minister can stay in office claiming that he has not personally approved of, or participated in, the government policy. Although the Council of Ministers would under normal circumstances be expected to discharge its functions in group meetings, there are many cases where the decrees of the Council of Ministers are individually signed by its members without any deliberation in formal Council meetings. There are no formal requirements for the operation of the Council of Ministers, that is, its internal activities are not regulated by a by-law. Traditions play an important role in the functioning of the Council.

The Prime Minister is the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and in this sense the Head of the Government, but he is not a hierarchical superior of the ministers. That is, he cannot give orders to the Ministers regarding the discharge of their duties, the Ministers take action in line with the decisions of the Council of Ministers and implement the policy of the government. Thus, there is no hierarchical superior-subordinate relationship between the Prime Minister and the Ministers. But in practice, things are different, and the Ministers are subservient to the Prime Minister. There are two basic reasons for that submissive behavior of Ministers: In the first place, the Prime Minister is the leader of the party and, thus, a powerful and influential individual in the decision-making process of the party. The political future of the ministers to a certain extent depends upon their relationship with that influential politician. Secondly, he is the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and according to the Constitution, he has the right to dismiss the Ministers with the approval of the President. This right, recognised by the 1982 Constitution, increases the Prime Minister's power and correspondingly decreases the power of the Ministers. The probability of dismissal upon the suggestion of the Prime Minister, and thus, the possibility of giving up the prestigious ministerial post, simply places the ministers in a submissive position in their relationship with the Prime Minister. Another development which took place in the 1980s, and strengthened the position of Prime Minister, is the increase in the number of organisations attached directly to the Prime Minister's office. The Undersecretariat of the Treasury, The Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade, The Undersecretariat of Customs, The General Directorate of Village Services, etc., are the kind of organisations separated from the ministries and placed under the direct authority of the Prime Minister, and thus increasing the power of the Prime Minister.

Organisations Attached to the Prime Ministry

There are a number of organisations placed under the authority of, and/or are related to the Prime Ministry; some of these organisations are placed under the direct authority of Prime Minister, some of them, although they have their own public legal personality, because of the nature of their activities are tied (related) to the Prime Ministry. The Chief of General Staff (Genelkurmay Başkanlığı); the Prime Ministry Mass Housing Administration (Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı); the South-eastern Anatolia Project Regional Development Administration (Güneydoğu Anadolu Projesi Bölge Kalkınma İdaresi Başkanlığı); the National Intelligence Organisation (Milli İstihbarat Teşkilatı); the State Planning Organisation (Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı); the Undersecretariat of the Treasury (Hazine Müsteşarlığı); the Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade (Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı); the Undersecretariat of Customs (Gümrük Müsteşarlığı); the General Directorate of Village Services (Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü); and the State Statistic Institute (Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü), etc. are some of these organisations. Among the above-mentioned organisations, the State Planning Organisation requires special attention, because it is in charge of preparing national development plans.

State Planning Organisation. National planning is not a new endeavour for Turkey, five-year plans were first introduced in the 1930s as a part of the etatist industrialisation policies. The planning activities, which started in 1930s, were interrupted during the Second World War, and after the War, during the 1950s, the Democrat Party governments did not favour economic planning. But the 1961 Constitution made social and economic planning a duty of the state and the same attitude was adopted by the 1982 Constitution as well. According to the constitution “The planning of economic, social and cultural development, in particular rapid, balanced and harmonious development of industry and agriculture throughout the country, and the efficient use of national resources and the establishment of the necessary organisation for this purpose are the duty of the state.” In accordance with the above-mentioned clause of the Constitution, the State Planning Organisation was established and was given the responsibility for preparing long-term and annual plans, following up on the implementation of plans, and advising the government on current economic policy. The State Planning Organisation (SPO) is placed under the Prime Minister’s office and receives policy direction from the Council of Ministers who are given advice by the High Planning Council (Yüksek Planlama Kurulu). The High Planning Council is composed of the Prime Minister (chairman of the Council), ministers selected by the Prime Minister, and the department heads of the SPO.

Five-Year National Development Plans are prepared within a perspective of fifteen years. In preparing the plans, the SPO cooperates with the ministries and other central agencies, especially organisations like the State Institute of Statistics (Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü). This close cooperation between the SPO and the central agencies is significant from the point of accuracy and efficiency of plans. The SPO prepares the plans on the basis of policy decisions made by the Council of Ministers, who are given advice by the High Planning Council. Based on sophisticated economic models, five-year development plans include -in addition to investment levels-macroeconomic targets, social goals and policy recommendations for individual sub-sectors of the economy. Plan targets are binding on the public sector but only indicative for the private sector. The plan prepared by SPO is simply advice for the government; after consideration by the High Planning Council, Council of Ministers, and Grand National Assembly plans are ready for implementation.

Ministries

The central administration is organized in the form of ministries and each ministry is headed by a minister. According to the Constitution the formation, abolition, functions, powers and organization of the Ministries shall be regulated by law. That is, the establishment and abolition of a ministry can be accomplished only through legislative action.

Ministers are not merely politicians but also public officials. As public officials, they are the head of their ministries, and in that sense, they supervise the administrative activities within the ministry. There are basically two types of ministers: (1) Ministers with portfolio (regular minister), and (2) Ministers without portfolio (minister of state) (devlet bakanı). The word “portfolio” means a portable case for carrying loose sheets of paper such as official documents. Ministers without portfolio are ministers without a ministry, and in that sense, they do not need to have a portfolio for carrying documents. The Ministers of State (devlet bakanları) do not have a ministerial organization and, thus, substantial administrative duties to perform. If that is the case, then the question to be asked is “Why there is need for such ministers ?“ The Prime Minister, in forming a new Cabinet, appoints influential politicians as ministers, because as the leader of the party, he has to take into consideration the power structure of the party in distributing such prestigious positions. To be able to protect his position as the leader, the Prime Minister has to get the support of the influential politicians within the echelons of the party. When there are more influential politicians than the number of ministries, some of the politicians are appointed as State Ministers. State Ministers enjoy the same privileges as the other regular ministers enjoy, the only difference is the fact that their ministry does not have a ministerial organization and substantial functions.

The organizational structure of the ministries are similar to each other. The minister is the highest but a temporary official. Other officials of the ministry are permanent civil servants, among them the Undersecretary (Müsteşar) is the highest bureaucrat in a ministry. The ministries are divided into General Directorates (Genel Müdürlük) and Divisions (Daire Başkanlığı) and then into smaller units. In the Turkish tradition, every new minister tries to change the top level officials of the ministry, but the ministers do not have wide powers regarding the changing of top officials. They have to have sound and legal reasons when they attempt to change such officials, otherwise their decisions may be annulled by the administrative courts.

The central administration is organized on the basis of ministries, high level boards and councils, and general directorates, and other institutions attached to the ministries. Some of the central agencies have their field units established on the basis either of provinces or of areas covering more than one province. As the party in power changes, there are changes in the number of ministries in line with the policies to be implemented.

6. FIELD UNITS OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

According to the Turkish Constitution Article 126 “In terms of central administrative structure, Turkey is divided into provinces on the basis of geographical situation and

economic conditions, and public service requirements; provinces are further divided into lower steps of administrative districts. The administration of provinces is based on the principle of deconcentration. Central administrative organizations comprising several provinces may be established to ensure the efficiency and coordination of public services". The article above draws the framework of the organization and functioning of the field units in the central administration .

Ministries and other central agencies establish their branches or field units on the basis of this provincial division of the country. Central agencies establish their field units based on such criteria and conditions as the performance of activities on the spot or bringing public services to the locality.-representation, decentralization, and geographical, economic, and social requirements. Generally the organic laws of the ministries constitute the basis for the establishment of their field units. But it has been observed that sometimes this feature is either not specified in organic laws or even not mentioned at all. In the latter cases, where organic laws do not define powers and responsibilities of field units, they are determined and regulated by by-laws, circulars and general orders.

As a result of the above-mentioned, there are diversified local units stemming from the service necessities of the ministries and other central agencies. Some ministries establish their field units according to the provincial division of the central administrative organization, in which case the responsibilities and powers of the field units are coterminous with provincial boundaries. Other central organizations establish regional field organizations which have powers and responsibilities over a larger area, comprising more than one province. At this point, it should be indicated that not all of the ministries and central agencies have to establish such field units distributed through out the country. Depending upon their service requirements, they may not have field units established apart from their central organization, or they may have their field units outside the country, as is the case with Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

A. Provincial Units

Administrative Organization of Province. The main administrative unit for central government activities is the province. Provinces are further divided into sub-provinces (İlçe), and sub-provinces into districts (Bucak). Sub-provinces and districts are hierarchical subordinate units of provinces. Sub-provinces are headed by the Sub-Governor (Kaymakam) and districts are headed by the District Director (Bucak Müdürü). The Sub-Governor and District Director are hierarchical subordinates of the Provincial Governor.

Different technical services operate over common areas within the province, and the ministries and other central agencies have their representatives, who are not local employees, but appointed by, and placed under hierarchical authority of, the center. The provincial governor, appointed by the Council of Ministers after nomination by the Ministry of Interior and upon the approval of the President of the Republic, is the chief administrative and political officer in the province. According to the Provincial Administration Act, the provincial governor is the representative of the state and the government in the province. He is not only the representative of the Ministry of Interior but also of each ministry. Although he is considered an official of the

Ministry of Interior, he is the hierarchical superior of the officials of other ministries employed in the province. In this capacity, the provincial governor is responsible for directing and coordinating the work of the field units of the ministries and other central agencies in the province with the exception of judges, public prosecutors of the Republic, military units, plants and institutions.

Although each field unit or provincial branch has direct contacts with its ministry, all requests for technical and accounting information must go through the governor, who in turn decides what the technical and accounting matters are. In addition, all budget requests to the government must go through the governor first. Another supervisory power of the provincial governor is the preparation of efficiency reports on provincial employees of the central government agencies. Finally, the provincial governor supervises the work of all sub-governors (**Kaymakam**) who head the sub-provinces in his territory.

Within this administrative organization the position of provincial governor is very important. He is the chief executive of the provincial administration and has responsibility of coordinating and controlling the operations of different field agencies of the central government. The powers and functions of governors are defined in the Provincial Administration Act and a vast number of different laws, circulars, and general orders. The Provincial Administration Act, when enacted in 1949, described a definite form of administration as well as the functions and responsibilities of governors and lower-level administrative authorities within the provincial organization. However, it must be pointed out at once that the limits of functions and responsibilities of governors are not definite in regard to certain organizational units. Regional units, which have been founded at an increasing rate after 1950s, can be cited as examples.

Because of technological and rapid economic progress, the technical services of the government are increasing and becoming much more specialized. Since the governor is the area generalist within the boundaries of the province, he is faced with controlling and coordinating all these new services. Because the communications between the field units and central agencies go through the office of governor, new and additional services increase the administrative burden on governors.

In countries like Turkey, where there is a lack of delegation of authority in the administration of organizations, the all important authority to sign documents and to make operational decisions is concentrated in the top administrative officials of the government. In the case of provincial governors, not only are important decisions automatically referred to the governor but virtually all decisions must be made by the governor. The provincial governors are overwhelmed with routine and trivial obligations which impair their capacity to give administrative direction and leadership to their provinces. The Provincial Administration Act states: "Ministries and General Directorates, with a corporate status, shall directly communicate with the governors on all matters related to the general administrative organization of provinces. Governors directly communicate with ministries and general directorates with a corporate status on matters related to provinces".(Article 9/B). In accordance with the above article of the law, all communications coming into, and going out of, the province have to go through the governor's office and must have the signature of either the governor or the assistant governor. The continuation of article 9/B of the Provincial Administration Act reads as follows: "Governors can delegate authority to

the directors of provincial units to sign documents which are related to accounting and technical matters”. In spite of the above clause of the law, it seems that governors are hesitant about delegating authority to the directors of provincial units, because, according to the findings of a research conducted, they do not trust their subordinates and they do not find them qualified enough for the delegating such authority to them (Polatoğlu, 1975) .

Provincial governor. As indicated earlier, the provincial governor, appointed by the Council of Ministers, is the most powerful figure in the provincial administration. He is both the representative of the national government in the province, and the head of the provincial local government, which will be discussed later.

Duties and responsibilities of governors: As the representative of the national government, a governor is the subordinate of all the ministers of the national government. He is responsible for seeing that all laws, decrees and central instructions are put into operation. The provincial governor also has direct authority over the sub-provincial governors and over all other provincial officials, organizations, and activities of the national government, which take place in his province. Additionally, the provincial governor’s recommendations are critical in the advancement of the subordinates. In accordance with the articles of the Provincial Administration Act it is possible to classify the functions assigned to governors in five groups: (1) administration of the provincial programs, (2) inspection and audit of the field offices of central government, which are organized according to provincial division, (3) coordination and planning of the operations of the central government agencies in the province, (4) maintenance of public order and safety, and (5) representation of the state and the central government.

Political responsibilities of governors: The Provincial Administration Act, Article 9, states that “....Governor.....is the administrative and political executive of each minister individually.” According to the above statement of the law, governors have political responsibilities as well as administrative ones. The law about the Central Organization and Functions of the Ministry of Interior charges the governors with the responsibility of relaying information, “about the domestic policies of the government and the general and particular state of the province”, to central authorities. Considering the above clause of the law, it can safely be said that the political role of the governor is one of being a medium of political communication which may be justified on the following ground: governors have the responsibility to administer policies and “they consequently come to know about the public reactions to those policies, how successful the policies are, and where they might be modified”. But the role of the governor, as a medium of political communication, has declined as the political system has become more complex and other avenues of access, influence and pressure opened up. In contemporary Turkey, the function of political communication is partially performed by the political parties, trade associations and other organizations of the civil society, hence, the governor is being replaced as a means of transmitting information and political values and of assessing the needs of the people. Political parties with extensive field organizations reach to the most remote villages; and the modern communications media are increasingly performing the function of political communication in the country. But in the appointment of provincial governors political considerations still play an important role.

Appointment and removal of provincial governors: As has been mentioned earlier, governors are appointed by the Council of Ministers, after nomination by the Ministry of Interior and with the approval of the President of the Republic. There are no specific requirements for appointing someone as governor; generally the central government can appoint anyone as governor so long as he is qualified to be a civil servant at the lowest level of the service. According to the explanatory resolution of the Turkish National Assembly, governorship is not considered a post which requires specialization in any subject, and a governor is not considered a professional civil servant. Thus, the appointment of governors has been exempted from the provisions of laws which regulate the Turkish Civil Service. The reason for this exemption may be found in Article 9 of the Provincial Administration Act which states a “Governor is the representative of Government and state in the province, he is the delegate and administrative and political executive of each Minister individually”. The above article of the law clearly indicates that the post of governor is considered political, and by exempting his appointment from legal restrictions, the central Government has been left broad freedom of choice. The reasoning is as follows: since a governor is the one who is going to implement the policies of the central Government and represent every Minister and central Government in the province, he must be a person whose political thought is compatible with the above mentioned authorities. To insure this, the central Government should be free of any restriction in appointing governors. Thus, there is no rational method of selection, and no specific requirements of educational background stated in the laws concerning the appointment of governors. Anyone who is qualified to be a civil servant at the lowest level of the service may be appointed as governor. In short, it may be safely said that governorship is considered as a strategic, political post or a post of confidence, and there are no strings attached to the power of central government concerning the appointment of individuals to this post. But in practice, one can see a different picture. Although the laws do not impose any restriction on the central Government in relation to the appointment of governors, in practice governments tacitly consider governorship as a career, and appointments are made almost entirely from within the service. That is, provincial governors are appointed from among the assistant governors, sub-provincial governors and administrative inspectors of the Ministry of Interior. (Assistant governors and administrative inspectors are appointed from among the sub-provincial governors.). But there are occasions when persons from outside the above mentioned groups have been appointed as provincial governors.

According to the Article 6 of the Provincial Administration Act, governors, when circumstances necessitate, may be removed from office and may be employed in another post chosen by the Ministry of Interior. The removal process may be made through the same method as appointment; that is the same authorities who appoint the governor may remove him from office. This process is called “being taken to the center”, and the governors who are removed from office and employed at the center are called a “governors of center”. The post of “governor of the center” is one with almost no duty or power. The governors who are so transferred do not have any substantial duties and responsibilities: From time to time they are given some unimportant assignments. According to regulations, some duties assigned to a “governor of the center” include: (i) To study the annual reports submitted by the provincial governors to the Ministry of Interior and relay the information which they consider important to the related ministries and other central agencies. (ii) To study

the reports and notes of Ministers, Members of the Parliament, and governors who have been on an observation tour in the country, and inform the Minister of the Interior of important matters mentioned in these reports. In addition to inconsequential duties and responsibilities, these governors lack proper office facilities and clerical facilities. Although they do get the same salary as provincial governors, they do not have a gubernatorial residence or official car as are assigned to active provincial governors. In short, a governor of the center does not enjoy the same privileges as provincial governors, reflecting the kind of punishment given to governors of center. It is important to note that no explanation is given to the governors as to why they have been taken to the center, nor they been given any chance to defend themselves.

The sizes of provinces. According to articles 1 and 2 of the Provincial Administration Act, provinces can be established by law based on the principles stated in the Constitution. It cannot be said that the present provincial division of the country is in conformity with the factors mentioned in the Constitution. As is known, the establishment of most of the provinces is based on the traditions and historical evolution of the country. The principles of provincial administration were laid down in the Ottoman Constitution of 1876 and in the Provincial Administration Act of 1913. In the year 1920 there were fifteen provinces and fifty-three sub-provinces. The Constitution of 1921 made alterations and acknowledged that the new Republic of Turkey was only a fraction of the size of the pre-war Ottoman-Empire, and it abolished the large provinces and gave that title to the old sub-provinces. Thus the 1921 Constitution set the present division as province, sub-province, district and village. By that time, the country was divided into seventy-four provinces, and the 1924 Constitution reaffirmed the above document.

After the founding of the Turkish Republic, there were no significant changes in the number of provinces. The number of provinces decreased until 1933 and from that year on gradually increased until 1957, remained unchanged for about a decade after 1957, but then the number of provinces again started to increase. The current trend indicates that the increase in the number of provinces will continue in the years ahead. The changes that have been made in the number of provinces since 1925 were not in line with the changing conditions of the country, as might have been expected, but were purely political in character. Changing conditions (especially the rapid economic and social developments and the progress in transportation systems with their shortening of geographical distances) have had various effects on the factors which the provincial division of the country was based. But over the years, this has not been taken into consideration, and the changes which have been made in provincial boundaries have not reflected the new conditions, and as has been mentioned above, they have been politically oriented. The 1980s and 1990s have again witnessed increases in the number of provinces, and political considerations have again played an important role in the establishment of new provinces. At the moment, there are pressures coming from rapidly progressing sub-provincial center cities to become provincial centers, and taking the political circumstances into consideration, one can easily come to the conclusion that the increase in the number of provinces will continue in the future.

At this point, the question of why sub-provincial centers are so anxious to become provincial centers should be answered. In the Turkish provincial system, traditionally the largest and most populous city is the provincial center. But over the years, some center cities of sub-provinces have progressed rapidly and outgrown the provincial

center cities, and because of this, they would like either to be the center city of their provinces, or to form another province with themselves being the center city of the new province. There are basically two reasons why sub-provincial center cities are so anxious to become provincial centers: (1) Economic reasons. When a city becomes a provincial center, the volume of economic activity tends to increase because, on the one hand, the central government sets up its provincial headquarters, and thus, new offices are constructed with additional personnel being employed and coming to the city. On the other hand, people who live in nearby sub-provinces start coming into the city to take care of their business with several government organizations, and thus the city becomes much more active. (2) Legal reasons. When a sub-province is transformed into a province it will have a corporate status because with the establishment of each new province there is a new provincial local government established automatically and new revenues are allocated. This additional revenue, of course, will be committed to their services. As can be seen easily, the expectation of new revenues and increased economic activity are the basic reasons behind the pressures brought upon the governments for the establishment of new provinces. Central governments or parties in power take such pressures into serious consideration in order to increase their influence over the local population.

When studied closely, there are vast differences among provinces in their capacity for economic activity, rendering of public services and the making available of the means and resources, and the income level of their inhabitants, as well as differences in the areal size and populations. Since 1945, there have been several studies conducted to evaluate the problems arising from provincial division. Almost all of the above mentioned studies have come to the conclusion that most of the provinces are small administrative units, and in order to have an efficient provincial administration, changes have to be made to this structure. But, since the existing administrative division is based on historical evolution and tradition, it is feared that a reorganization movement would face a strong public reaction against it. The only kind of change effected in the provincial division of the country is the establishment of new provinces, and thus creating smaller administrative units.

B. Regional Units

After the foundation of the Turkish Republic, in accordance with the Constitution of 1924 and Provincial Administration Act, central government agencies had to organize their field units within the provincial or lesser-level administrative divisions. However, over the years, on the one hand, some technical legal necessities and, on the other hand the ongoing inclination of central agencies to escape the provincial and thus the authority of the governors, have caused the establishment of regional units as branches of central agencies. The first regional units appeared on the Turkish scene in 1950s and these regional units did not conform to the provincial units and comprised more than one province. Thus, their establishment was not in conformity with the constitutional principles. The 1961 Constitution (being different from the 1924) stated that “..Regional organizations, comprising several provinces and having deconcentrated powers may be established for the purpose of carrying out specific public services.” The above-mentioned clause of the Constitution has encouraged the central agencies to establish more and more regional units.

Today, there are hundreds of different regions established by the Ministries or other central agencies throughout Turkey. (Twenty-four Ministries and/or other central agencies have 348 regional directorates). There are wide differences among regional organizations. Some of them cover the whole country, such as the General Directorate of Highways. Some other central agencies have established regional organizations which do not cover the whole country but only parts of it, the Ministry of Labor and General Directorate of Foundations can be cited as examples (T.C. Devlet Teşkilatı Rehberi,1998). Regional boundaries usually coincide with provincial boundaries, but in some regional organizations (the ones established by General Directorates of Forestry, and Foundations), it has been observed that the regional boundaries cut across provincial boundaries. That is, they include one or two sub-provinces from one province and exclude the rest of the province. Boundaries of regional units do not coincide with one other; every Ministry and central agency has set up its own system of regions. Thus the country is divided into hundreds of regions with regional boundaries cutting across one other..

The cause of this complexity is very simple. First of all, these various types of organizations have not come into being in accordance with definite and similar criteria and have a diversity of purpose and motivation. As a matter of fact, as indicated earlier, until 1961 they were not in accord with the principles set forth in the Turkish Constitution. Generally the organic laws of the Ministries and central agencies constitute the basis for the establishment of these units, but sometimes this feature is not included in the laws, and there are no provisions defining local branches. In such cases where the organic laws omit the powers and responsibilities of local units, these are determined and regulated by by-laws, circulars and general orders. Most of the organic laws give the central agencies the authority for establishing regional units. However, these laws do not specify how the sizes, boundaries and centers of the regions will be determined. Thus, each agency has been left to determine for itself such specifications. In research conducted for the purpose of determining what kind of criteria had been used in defining and determining the area sizes, boundaries and centers of regions, it was not possible to get any sound or sufficient information.

In establishing regional units and determining their boundaries and centers, there has not been any cooperation or any kind of consultation among the different central agencies. Even within the same Ministry, which has more than one regional set up, there has been no such effort. It is found that central agencies establish their field units without collaborating with each other and without considering any coordination that might be necessary due to the nature of their services. Thus, every Ministry and central agency that has regional units has set its own standards and has produced the variety that exists among regional units.

C. Relations between regional units and provinces.

Provincial units and regional units execute their functions over the same area, the only difference being that the powers of regional units overrun the provincial boundaries and comprise more than one province. Since they do operate in the same geographical area and they do perform different but related functions, for the sake of regional and national development and efficiency and effectiveness of central administration, their activities should be coordinated.

There are problems involved in the coordination of these two different administrative divisions. Provincial units report directly to the provincial governor and they are under

his/her authority and control. But the regional units report directly to the Ministry or central agency to which they belong. Although regional units operate within the boundaries of provinces the authority of governors over them is not clear. The Provincial Administration Act indicates that "Governors have authority to observe and control the provincial operations of the agencies which cover more than one province." The above clause of the law is not clear: it does not specify what kind of control or power governors have, and what is meant by "observe" is not defined.

In 1963, Provincial Coordination Boards were established for the purpose of insuring coordination in realizing the objectives of the National Development Plans. The Provincial Coordination Boards under the chairmanship of provincial governors consist of directors of provincial units and of the representatives of departments undertaking investments in the province concerned. The development plan explained why there was need for such a board at the provincial level: "Since the investments included in the program are distributed over the country in the form of projects, and since implementation takes place specifically away from the center, any supervision from the center only would not be sufficient to ascertain developments actually taking place, and would not permit of any timely interventions. The need exists for an organization at province level able to eliminate any implementation difficulties encountered through decisions taken on the spot and able to ensure the necessary cooperation and coordination among various provincial departments." The Provincial Coordination Boards proved not to be successful, and some of the problems encountered by the Boards were directly related to the regional organizations. The provincial governors do not face any problems in regulating the relations between provincial units and the Provincial Coordination Board, because they been given sufficient authority over provincial units by the Provincial Administration Act. Since regional units cannot be considered under the same authority, it has been difficult for governors to have officials of regional organizations participate in board meetings. Friendly relations between the governors and representatives of regional organizations are not always sufficient to solve participation problems. In addition to the above, relations between regional organizations and their parent organization at the center adversely affect the coordination efforts at the level of the province. In fact, most of the time, regional organizations must have the consent of the central agency to which they belong for matters that necessitate cooperation and coordination with other organizations. Some regional and provincial organizations must have their programs approved by the parent agency and, since the approval process take time, the information needed for cooperation with other organizations can be delayed and this affects the coordination efforts negatively.

D. Shortcomings of the field-administration system.

The Turkish field administration system was developed in a simpler era "when revenue collection, maintenance of law and order, and appraisal of local opinion were the principal responsibilities assigned to field agents". Administrative division of the country was based on certain factors, which were directly related to the technology of the times. Areas were kept small, so that every community in the province would be at a reasonable distance easily reached from provincial centers by the means available under the technology of the times. Rapid economic and social

developments and the progress in transportation systems with their shortening of travel times affected the system used in the establishment of the provinces. The system is not functioning effectively, and it is possible to identify three problem areas: (1) Variations in administrative areas. As the country has progressed technologically, economically, and socially, the governmental functions has become more specialized, and grown in complexity, and operation costs have increased. New central agencies with the purpose of performing these new functions have begun to appear on the Turkish scene. But instead of conforming their field units to the existing provincial division, because of the reasons explained previously, these central agencies have chosen to set up their own administrative divisions and, thus, several single function regional organizations have been established without regard to provincial boundaries. Because of the variety of service conditions, the geographical areas chosen by various agencies in the establishment of regional organizations are not identical. It is not only the variety of service conditions, but the absence of cooperation and coordination in the establishment of regions between the central agencies, which causes variations.

(2) Absence of coordination. Insufficient coordination is one of the major shortcomings of the system. As is widely known, governmental functions are often so much integral parts of an overall strategy or plan that their coordination in both planning and execution stages is a major need. In the case of Turkish field administration, the increasing numbers of single function regional organizations and the variation existing among the several field organizations make coordination much more important. This is because each of the newly established regional organizations divides the work of the bureaucracy, and as is known, "The more the work of a bureaucracy is subdivided, the more important it is that the components be assembled in a unified relationship". Thus, it is imperative that, especially at the provincial level, these divided governmental functions be brought together into a meaningful relationship toward the achievement of common goals. Provincial Coordination Boards have not been an answer to the coordination problems encountered at the provincial level.

(3) Excessive central interference. Although provincial and regional organizations have deconcentrated powers, the central government continuously interferes with their activities and almost every decision is taken to the central agencies. The principle of deconcentration is in effect, but there is little delegation of authority accompanying it. The fates of two Provincial Administration Acts (the first dated 1929 and numbered 1426, and the second dated 1949 and numbered 5442) were the same; that is, both documents brought in the principles of deconcentration and appropriate delegation, which were then taken away by additional legislation in subsequent years.

The need for reorganization. After studying the field units of central administration and, thus, the administrative division of the country, it is obvious that provinces as multiple-function administrative areas are too small for the efficient execution of many governmental functions. The establishment of regional organizations as their field units by several central agencies is a clear indication of that need. Since the increased scope of state activity has made the use of a large number of specialist staff groups indispensable, and the establishment of increasing numbers of single-function regional units creates complexity and confusion in coordinating several governmental functions, Turkey is faced with redesigning her provincial administrative division by creating larger administrative regions better suited to the

exigencies of modern government. But unfortunately, the current trend is to establish new and smaller provinces by dividing existing ones.

VI. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Today, in Turkey, there are basically three types of local government, namely; Provincial Local Government (İl Özel İdaresi), Municipality (Belediye), and Village Administration (Köy). In addition to these basic types, in 1983 a new type of local government, although confined strictly to the most populated urban centers, came into existence; the Metropolitan Municipality (Büyükşehir Belediyesi). One of the unique characteristics of the Turkish public administration system is that, the above mentioned local governments exist side by side with field units of central government.

General characteristics of local governments:

According to the Turkish Constitution of 1982, local governments are “public corporate entities established to meet the common local needs of the inhabitants of provinces, municipal districts and villages, whose decision making organs are elected by the electorate, described in law, and whose principles of structure are also determined by law.” “The formation, duties and powers of the local administrations shall be regulated by law in accordance with the principle of decentralization.” “Local governments will be provided with revenues in proportion to their duties.”

The clause of the Constitution above generally draws the framework within which the local governments operate and also describes the general, common characteristics of Turkish local governments, which are:

1. Local governments are autonomous organizations based on the principle of decentralization. Thus, each one has its own public legal personality or corporate status.
2. Their decision-making organs are directly elected by the people.
3. Their powers and duties are determined and specified with laws. (Provincial Administration Act, Municipal Law, and Village Law).
4. Local governments are subject to the control of the central administration exercised through the power of tutelage. This insures the indivisibility of administration and protects public interest. (Tutelage is not a hierarchical form of control, it is a special kind of control exercised by central

administration over the actions and decisions of local governments as to their legality.)

5. Jurisdiction over the acquisition or loss of status by popularly elected administrative organs may be exercised only by the courts. However, the Ministry of Interior may remove from office those organs of local governments or their members against whom investigation has been initiated on grounds of offenses related to their duties pending judgement.
6. Local governments may form unions to perform their legally assigned functions through collective action. Approval or the permission of the Council of Ministers is required for the formation of such unions.

1. PROVINCIAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As indicated previously, the Turkish province has a dual status; on the one hand it is a field unit of central government and central agencies (Ministries and other central agencies) have their field units established on the basis of provincial division, on the other, it serves as a unit of local government.). Provincial local governments are established through legislation as provinces; when a new province is established there is a new provincial government instituted in the new province. Provincial Local Government is the least developed and the most disputed of all the local governments. As a unit of local government, until the year 2005 the province had been governed by a law, The Temporary Law on the General Administration of Provinces, which was enacted in 1913 (İdare-i Umumiye-i Vilayat Kanunu Muvakkatı).

Duties of Provincial Local Government.

Duties that are given to provincial local government are manifold in a variety of different fields such as education, construction, agriculture, health and social assistance. The duties of the provincial local governments and their relations with the central government are regulated by the 1913 law. This law assigns broad powers and substantial duties to the provincial local governments, thus, allowing them to function in a large field of activity. But over the years, most of the functions that were given to provincial local governments have been put under the responsibility of newly established or existing central government agencies. The basic reason or the justification of the above action of the central administration was that the provincial local governments did not have sufficient revenues for taking such services, so it would be much better to place them under the authority of the central agencies. But, since they have not been taken away from the provincial local governments, in practice there are two different public organizations charged with the same kind of duties and this creates a duality in bringing certain public services to the people. For example, construction of provincial roads was originally placed under the authority of

provincial local government, but with the establishment of General Directorate of State Highways, the very same duty was also placed under its authority, thus causing the above mentioned duplication. Realistic analysis of the situation, including the evaluations done by the Ministry of Interior, have not advocated a complete transfer of the function of public works back to the provincial local government. The most that could be done in many cases was to distinguish between construction and maintenance and make the provincial local government responsible for the latter. Such a distinction between construction and maintenance has in fact been made in the field of education; the Law on Primary Education and Training, enacted in 1961, charged the provincial local government mainly with the duty of maintaining and repairing primary school buildings. Because of such duplication the duties given to the responsibility of provincial governments are taken care of by the central agencies. In the field of agriculture all the functions of land and cattle improvement, extension services etc., which are the duties of provincial local governments, are exercised by the Ministry of Agriculture and only a few provincial local governments have model plantations and improvement centers. In short, the Temporary Law on the General Administration of Provinces assigns a variety of functions to provincial local governments but these local governments have neither the resources nor the specialized personnel to enable them to undertake such functions.

Organs of Provincial Local Government.

Provincial General Assembly (İl Genel Meclisi). The Provincial General Assembly is the basic decision making organ of the provincial local government. The members of the general assembly are popularly elected from each sub-province according to their population, thus, each sub-province is represented by a varying number of representatives determined by their population. The Provincial General Assembly normally meets once a year and examines and approves the provincial budget and makes decisions regarding those public services performed by the provincial local government. Decisions of the assembly, as a measure of tutelage, are subject to approval by the provincial governor. If the governor does not approve a decision of the assembly, he is asked to register his objections and take the case to the administrative court. The decision of the court will be binding of the parties involved. In certain cases the decision of the assembly becomes operative only after the approval of the Ministry of Interior or Council of Ministers, such as a decision to raise a very large loan.

Disapproval of a decision of the assembly by the governor arises very seldom in reality, because, the provincial governor, being the chief executive of the provincial local government, is the official who prepares the decision proposals for consideration in the assembly. Decision proposals are usually accepted by the assembly. Conflict between a provincial governor and a general assembly does not and cannot materialize because of the powerful position of the governor. Since provincial local governments do not have sufficient revenues and specialized personnel, they have to rely on the field units of central administration located at the province for taking public services to the people. The Provincial governor, being the highest official of the center, can use the resources and personnel of the field units of the center for bringing the public services placed under the responsibility of the provincial local governments. Being

aware of the powerful position of the governor the members of the assembly will not easily object to the decision proposals prepared by the governor.

The existence of the Provincial General Assembly is subject to administrative tutelage exercised by the Council of State (Danıştay), and under the following conditions Council of State may decide to dissolve the general assembly: (1) If the general holds a meeting other than the ones which are specified in the law. (2) If the general assembly holds a meeting in a place different from the one indicated in the law. (3) If the general assembly considers political matters and expresses its opinion. (4) If the general assembly is hesitant to execute the functions, which are specified in the law, on time.

Provincial Standing Committee (İl Daimi Encümeni). Provincial Standing Committee consists of members elected by the provincial general assembly from among its members. Depending upon the size of the general assembly, the standing committee is composed of either two or four members elected for a duration of one year. The chairman of the standing committee is the provincial governor. The standing committee examines the monthly accounts and controls the implementation of the provincial budget. The committee also makes decisions on behalf of the general assembly when the assembly is not in session, on the condition that such decisions be submitted to the general assembly in its first meeting for approval.

Chief Executive. The Provincial governor, who is appointed by the central government for supervising its field units within the province, is also the chief executive of the provincial local government. As the chief executive of the provincial local government, the provincial governor has the following duties: to prepare all proposals for the decisions that are to be taken by the provincial local government; to execute the decisions taken by the general assembly; to represent legally the provincial local government. (In the case of a conflict between the provincial local government and the State, the provincial governor represents the State and co-chairman of the general assembly represents the provincial local government).

The Provincial General Assembly is able to exercise a limited control over the governor. Every year the provincial governor, as the chief executive of the provincial government, submits an annual report to the general assembly on the activities of the provincial local government. The General assembly reviews this report, and if the achievements of governor are found unsatisfactory, the Ministry of Interior is notified of this decision. Then, it is up to the Ministry of Interior to take any action against the governor. For such a decision a two thirds majority is required after the debate in the general assembly. At this point, it should be indicated that up to now, there has been no case of such a decision.

The dual status of the provincial governor and the fact that the provincial general assembly's decisions are subject to approval by the provincial governor is not in line with the concept of democratic local self government and impairs the autonomy of provincial local government.

Revenues of provincial local government.

The basic revenues of provincial local governments are their shares from property tax, their shares of the taxes collected by the central government, and grants-in-aid

provided from the national budget. Provincial local governments do not have sufficient financial means and human resources. Although the Constitution states that local governments shall be allocated financial resources in proportion to their functions, revenues legally granted to provincial local governments are very small and limited in view of the duties and tasks given to them. Because of the above, they are bound to be helpless and dependent upon the central government. It is because of this inadequate financial, technical and human resources that these units have to borrow heavily from the central Government. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the personnel working for these units are the civil servants employed by the field units of central Government. Such a practice is possible because the provincial governor as indicated above has the dual status of being the chief executive of the provincial local government and the head of the field units of central Government.

2. MUNICIPALITIES

The municipalities are the most autonomous type of local government. They are the ones able to bring substantial services to the people, and large or small every community which has a population of more than 2,000 has a municipal administration. Because of the above mentioned characteristics, it will be appropriate to pay more attention to their functioning and to the problems encountered by the municipalities.

According to the Municipal Law communities with a population of more than 2,000 are entitled to establish a municipal administration and give up their village status. The passage from the village status to that of municipality is not automatic when the population reaches 2,000. The action of establishing a new municipal administration can be initiated either by the people living in the community or by the government. In either case, there will be a local referendum conducted for the purpose of getting the views of local population as to whether or not they would like to have a municipal administration operating in their community. If there is a consensus, that is, if the majority of the local populace is in favor of a municipal administration, the decision of the inhabitants of the community will be forwarded to the Provincial General Assembly of the province, in which that community is located. The Provincial General Assembly will study the potential revenues and make a decision as to whether or not revenues will be sufficient for taking the municipal services in that community. The decision of the Provincial General Assembly is first forwarded to the Ministry of Interior and then to the Council of State for their evaluations. After all of these reviews, if there is no objection or any sound reason against the application, with the approval of the President of the Republic, a new municipality will be established.

According to the Municipal Law, in addition to above, there will be a municipality established at the center cities of provinces and sub-provinces irrespective of their

populations. The implication of the above clause of the law is clear, sub-provincial centers, even if their populations are less than 2,000, are entitled to establish a municipal administration, and as matter of fact, there are, a number of municipalities whose populations are less than 2,000.

Duties of municipalities.

Article 15 of the Municipal Law, dated 1930 and numbered 1580, under the title of “Duties of the municipality” lists 76 items describing the duties assigned to the municipalities. This list is a detailed description of municipal services. Article 16 of the law, groups these duties and explicitly indicates that some of these duties are obligatory for every municipality, while some of them are optional duties depending upon the annual revenue of the municipality. Some of the obligatory duties of municipalities are the following: to ensure the order and cleanliness of public places; to inspect food and beverages, including their storage, with respect to sanitary conditions and conformity with regulations; to combat epidemics and contagious human and animal diseases and to take necessary measures; to remove obstacles which inhibit traffic, cause accidents or litter public places, to issue permits for construction; to designate the locality and conditions for manufacturing plants, installations, market-places and depots which may affect the public health; to collect and dispose of trash and garbage; and to issue technical inspection reports on construction and installations. The above-mentioned duties are obligatory for municipalities having an annual income of less than 50,000 TL. Municipal law assigns additional obligatory duties to those municipalities having more than 50,000 TL of annual income.

Additional obligatory duties for municipalities with an income of 50,000 and more: to set up and operate hygienic and sanitary catgut-houses which are considered as the complements of slaughter-houses; to establish and administer market-halls for retail and wholesale products such as meat, margarine, fish, olive oil, vegetables, pickles and saltedfish, which require sanitary protection at definite places and under supervision of the municipality. These duties are in addition to the ones listed as general obligatory duties.

Additional obligatory duties for municipalities with an annual income of 200,000 and more: In addition to the above listed duties, large municipalities are required to establish dormitories for the orphans and poor and to provide free birth and childcare homes; to establish mental institutions, free or free-charging municipal hospitals, and veterinary hospitals for domestic animals, provided that their plans are approved by the Ministry of Public Health.

Additional obligatory duties for municipalities with an income of 500,000 TL and more: In addition to the duties listed above, the largest municipalities are required to build and manage race tracks, stadiums for the youth according to local requirements, and municipal recreation centers.

Optional duties for all municipalities: To build municipal theatres, cinemas, hotels, casinos, museums, zoos and botanical gardens; to set up grain markets and warehouses; to arrange fairs and exhibitions; to open and operate auction rooms; to set up courses and schools to train personnel required by the municipal administration and municipal area.

The system introduced by the Municipal Law in determining the obligatory and optional duties of the municipalities is a logical and sound one. Because the system establishes a correlation between the nature of duties and the level of annual income of the municipalities, first obligatory duties for all municipalities are listed and, then, additional obligatory duties are stated for those municipalities having an annual income over certain determined levels. But such limits were determined in 1930, the year when the Municipal Law was enacted, reflecting the economic conditions of the times. Over the years, such limits determined by the 1930 law were not updated and, thus, they lost their significance. For example, establishing and operating race tracks is an obligatory duty of those municipalities which have more than 500.000 TL of annual revenue (Municipal Law Article 6-4, and 46). The above mentioned figure was a large amount of money back in 1930, but due to the high rate of inflation and the devaluation of Turkish Lira in present day Turkey, this amount is not even the daily wage of an unskilled worker. Since such limits determined by the law lost their significance, theoretically, interpreting the law to the letter, it can be argued that all of the duties listed in the law are obligatory for all municipalities no matter what their income is. The above mentioned condition is a clear indication of the urgent need to update the municipal law (Polatoğlu, 1999)

Organs of Municipalities

Municipal Council.(Belediye Meclisi). The Municipal council is the general policy and decision making organ of the municipality. The council is comprised of people directly elected for a term of five years by citizens who are legally qualified to vote. The number of municipal council members changes from one to the next depending upon the population of the community or the city but cannot be less than twelve. The council holds three regular sessions annually. The length of sessions is 15 days with the exception of budget sessions, which last up to 30 days.

Matters on which the Council may decide are: the budget, final accounts, city plans, reconstruction programs; the classification of streets and the assignment of names and numbers to them; budget changes, transfer of budgeted funds; rates and rations of taxes, dues and charges etc,. Some of the Municipal Council decisions are final; some are put into effect after the approval of the highest administrative agent of the central government in the locality, provincial or sub-provincial governor. For example those decisions regarding the municipal budget and loans are subject to the approval of the provincial or sub-provincial governor. The Municipal Council may be dissolved if the council holds a meeting other than the ones indicated in the law, or if the council considers political matters and expresses its opinion. The authority to dissolve the Municipal Council is vested in the Council of State.

Municipal Standing Committee (Belediye Encümeni). The Municipal Standing Committee is an organ of decisions for daily operations of the municipality. The basic duties of the committee are: to study budget drafts prepared by the mayor; to control monthly account summaries; to study and approve bidding specifications, contract and bargaining decisions; to submit opinions on final accounts; to decide on expropriations; to prepare rates for public transportation facilities and determine maximum prices; to proclaim municipal fines and warnings; to decide on

appointments, promotions, penalties and rewards of municipality personnel; and to discharge the functions of the municipal council when the council is not in session.

The Municipal Standing Committee consists of appointed and elected members; appointed members are the department heads of the municipality who are selected by the mayor; elected members are the ones who are elected by the municipal council from among its members. The number of the elected members cannot be less than two, but should not exceed half the number of appointed members.

The chairman of the Municipal Standing Committee is the mayor. The Committee decides its own meeting schedule. The mayor has the right of objection to the decisions of the committee. The objection of the mayor goes to the highest local representative of the central government which, in turn, brings the matter before administrative court. The decision of the administrative court regarding the conflict is final.

Mayor (Belediye Başkanı) The mayor is the chief executive of the municipal administration, and he/she is entitled to represent the public legal personality of the municipality. The mayor is directly elected by the people for a term of five years. But according to the law, although it is not practiced, the central government possesses the right to “appoint” mayors.

The mayor prepares the municipal budget, enforces municipal ordinances and regulations, executes the decisions of the municipal council, manages public properties and carries other duties assigned to him by the Municipal Council.

The Municipal Council exercises a strong control over the mayor through a practice called the “vote of confidence”. The mayor submits an annual activities report to the municipal council, in which the financial state of the municipality and to what extent the mayor has been able to execute the decisions of the Municipal Council, is elaborated. The Municipal Council reviews this report, and if by a two third majority, it finds the performance of the mayor insufficient, then the provincial governor is informed of the situation. In such a situation, the annual report of the mayor, together with the proceedings of the debate at the Municipal Council, are forwarded to the Council of State by the provincial governor. The final decision regarding the fall of mayor is taken by the Council of State.

In addition to the vote of confidence, the mayor can also be removed from office although temporarily, under some explicitly defined situations. This practice is possible if and when mayor is alleged to have been involved in illegal wrong doings and an investigation is in progress regarding the said illegal activity. The mayor will be removed from his office by the Ministry of Interior until the end of the investigation. The final decision, however, rests with the authorized administrative court.

Budget and revenues.

The municipal budget is prepared by the mayor as the chief executive of the municipality. The mayor, in preparing the budget, will take the mandates of the Municipal Law and policy decisions made in the Municipal Council into consideration. The budget proposal will first go to the municipal standing committee, and after being evaluated and accepted by the committee, it will be forwarded to the

Municipal Council. The budget will be reviewed by the council and then submitted to the highest administrative agent of the central administration in the locality, the provincial governor or sub-provincial governor, for approval. The municipal budget can be implemented only after the approval of either the provincial governor or sub-provincial governor depending upon the locality of the municipality. The approval of the budget is a clear example of tutelage exercised by the central administration over municipalities.

Revenues. Municipalities have a variety of revenues coming from different sources. Their basic source of income is their share from centrally collected taxes. Every year a certain percentage of nationally collected taxes is allocated to the municipalities, and it is distributed in proportion to the populations of the municipalities.

The second major source of revenue is the property tax collected by the municipality. A certain percentage of the property tax is given to provincial local governments, but it is an important source of revenue for the municipalities. Other revenues are the income obtained from municipal charges and fines, grants from the central government, and loans obtained from financial institutions.

The problems faced by municipalities.

Size. One of the major problems faced by the municipalities is related to the concept of size and scale of operations. There are approximately 3,000 municipalities in the country, and the majority of them are small in size. Table 1 indicates the sizes and number of municipalities in terms of population. As can be seen from the above table, 80.7% of the municipalities have a population of less than 10,000, indicating the fact that these are small municipalities. Out of 2,187 municipalities 1,017 have a population of less than 5,000, which means almost half of these small municipalities have a population of less than 5,000. In another words 37.5% of Turkish municipalities have a population of less than 5,000, and the number of small municipalities will continue to increase in the future because of the following. According to the Municipal Law, the communities which have a population of more than 2,000 are entitled to establish a municipal administration and with the establishment of a municipality they will give up village status. Giving up village

Table 1
Number of Municipalities According to Their Population

Population Group	Number of Municipalities
Less than 10,000	2,187
10,001 - 25,000	257
25,001 - 50,000	97
50,001 - 100,000	69
100,001- 200,000	43

200,001- 300,000	27
400,001- 500,000	18
500,001- +	12

Source: Ziya Çoker, Yönetimde Yeniden Yapılanma, Ankara, 1995.

status will bring two major benefits to the community: on the one hand, with the establishment of a municipality, the community will be entitled to receive a certain share from centrally collected taxes, on the other hand the people living in the community will be freed from the “collective work obligation” of the village administration. Because of the above-mentioned advantages, as soon as a community reaches the required population of 2,000 there will be action initiated for the establishment of a municipal administration. The desire to establish a municipal administration among the villages whose populations are close to 2,000, is so strong that prior to the census day, there will be an organized action of inviting those friends and relatives, who have migrated to the cities, for a short stay in the village so that they will be officially counted as residents of the village. Thus the population of the village being officially determined as over 2,000, the village will be registered as entitled to establish a municipal administration. As a result of such practices there are hundreds of municipalities whose populations are less than 2,000. In addition to the above practice, according to the law, all sub-provincial centers, no matter what their populations are, are entitled to establish a municipal administration, and there are a number (20 according to the 1990 census) of such sub-provincial centers. The number of such small sub-provincial center municipalities will tend to increase in the future because of the practice of establishing new provinces by dividing the existing ones. Any increase in the number of small municipalities decreases the municipalities’ share of the nationally collected taxes (Falay, 1997), because every year a certain portion of the nationally collected taxes is allocated to municipalities and distributed on the basis of the population of the municipalities.

Why is size so important for the functioning of local governments? What are the disadvantages of having small size municipalities? The most important disadvantage is the fact that when the scale of operations is small, the cost of services is greater. That is, the municipal services, if they are rendered properly, will be more expensive. Secondly, it is difficult to obtain the necessary financial means and specialized manpower for the operations. Even if the financial resources are found, the employment of specialized personnel will not be a rational move, since the scale of operations is small, it will not be possible to benefit from them at their full capacity, and this will be an important factor in increasing the cost of services.

A survey has been conducted to examine the budgets of small municipalities in order to find out the nature of expenditures and their ratio to overall revenues of the municipality. According to the findings of this research, 107 municipalities out of 200, which is about 53% of the total number of municipalities studied, are spending more than 70% of their budget on operational expenditures. When the wages of the municipal personnel and their share in the budget are taken into consideration, the findings indicate that 51% of the municipalities studied are spending more than 50% of their budget on paying the salaries of the personnel they employ (Polatoğlu, 1999). A study conducted earlier, and studied the budgets of 10 municipalities, reported similar findings, according to which small municipalities (those municipalities whose

population is less than 5,000) were spending more than 70% of their budget on operational expenditures.(Ziya Coker, 1995).

The findings of the above-mentioned surveys clearly indicate that small municipalities spend the money allocated to them on paying the wages of the personnel they employ and purchasing the material needed for providing the existing municipal services, the services they are able to take to the people. They are not in a position to make new investments to improve the quality of the services or introduce new municipal services to the public. What is more striking is the finding that in the studies of the budgets it was not possible to find figures in relation to certain traditional municipal services such as garbage-collection and cleaning the streets. Eighty-six municipalities out of 200 (which is about 43%) do not report any spending on such a service. According to municipal law, municipalities are given the obligatory function of ensuring the cleanness of public places, inspecting food and beverages including their storage with respect to sanitary conditions and conformity with the regulations, combating epidemic and contagious human and animal diseases and taking other necessary measures. In spite of the mandates of the above mentioned law, during the studies of the budgets, it was not possible to find an item regarding health services in the budgets of 141 municipalities, which make up 70% of the total studied (Polatoğlu, 1999). That is, these municipalities did not report any spending on health services which is one of their obligatory functions.

These examinations of the budgets of small municipalities clearly show that they are not able to provide municipal services properly, and in many cases even the traditional municipal services are ignored. The money allocated to them from the centrally collected taxes is basically spent on paying the wages of municipal employees and on the operational costs of the services they can provide with the kind of material resources and personnel under their disposal.

The biggest item in the budgets of municipalities studied is the money paid to their employees. According to municipal law, in line with the obligatory duties given by the law, municipalities have to employ specialized or technical personnel in the fields of construction, health, and fire fighting etc. But it is difficult to find such personnel within the cadres of small municipalities. The basic reason for the lack of qualified personnel is the lack of financial means, and as indicated earlier, even if small municipalities have sufficient money, it is not rational to employ such specialized personnel because of the scale of their operations and high cost. A study conducted earlier indicated that 52 % of the employees of small municipalities are primary school graduates, and they do not have any professional training. (Ziya Coker,1995). Thus, it is not possible to say that small municipalities have qualified personnel.

Bringing together the above-mentioned evaluations, it is fair to state that small municipalities are spending more than 50% of their revenues on paying the wages of their personnel who are insufficiently qualified. The study of the budgets of small municipalities and the above-mentioned evaluations clearly show, that small municipalities are not able to provide municipal services because of a lack of qualified personnel and sufficient financial means. The money allocated to them from the centrally-collected taxes basically goes to the payment of the wages of the personnel. Therefore it is possible to claim that in Turkey, where there is a high rate of unemployment, small municipalities serve the purpose of offering employment opportunities to the unemployed rather than providing services to the people. Thus, the question to be asked is simple: should Turkey continue to have such small scale municipalities and allocate part of the centrally-collected taxes to them? It is difficult

to give an affirmative answer to the above question, because providing job opportunities for the unemployed is one of the duties of the state, but this should not be done at the expense of local government and municipal services.

The need for grouping. A second problem in relation to the size of municipalities stems from the fact that all of the municipalities, no matter what their size is, are subject to the mandates of the same law with regard to their duties and responsibilities. There is a great variation among the municipalities with regard to population, the size of the area within which they are supposed to take their services, the nature of economic activity dominant in the region and several other differences which affect their functioning. Such differences reflected in the function of the municipalities, and thus they face different problems; the solutions to such problems require different approaches and settings. But, in the case of Turkish municipalities, there is a single municipal law treating all municipalities as if they were operating under the same conditions, as if there were no differences among them in terms of their sizes, and as if they all faced the same kinds of problems on the same scale. The needs and operating problems of a municipality consisting of 5,000 inhabitants will of course be different from those of a municipality which has 100,000 or 300,000 inhabitants. Municipalities that have substantial differences from others should be subject to different rules and regulations, in line with their characteristics. In this sense, there is a need to group the municipalities and creating different classes or types of them and then design rules and regulations for each class or type.

Another problem which justifies the need for grouping is the municipalities' share of centrally collected taxes. This is the basic source of revenue for all of the municipalities, and it is distributed on the basis of the population of the locality. In Turkish practice, a census is usually conducted in November, the time of the year when everyone is present at their official residence. According to the results of the census, municipalities are allocated money in proportion to their population from the centrally collected taxes. This is not a fair practice for those municipalities located in the tourism regions of the country. A municipality located on the Mediterranean coast can be counted as having a population of 5,000 on the census day, but the same municipality may provide accommodation and municipal services to 15,000 people for six months a year during the tourist season. This is not a fair practice; the above characteristics of such municipalities ought to be taken into consideration.

The need for updating the Municipal Law. The Municipal Law, which is in effect today, was enacted in 1930, and thus it reflects the conditions of the 1930s. The prevailing conditions of contemporary Turkish society, the problems to which municipalities have to pay attention, the expectations of people regarding municipal services, are very different from those of the 1930s. Thus, there is need either to enact a new Municipal Law or to update the law in effect. One of the reasons for a need to update the present municipal law is that: the municipal law lists the duties of municipalities in two different groups: obligatory and optional duties. In listing the obligatory duties, priority is given to the kind of duties which every municipality has to undertake; these are the major municipal services, and thus every municipality has to provide such services. There is a second group of obligatory duties for those municipalities which have annual revenues of over a certain determined limit. For example, establishing and operating horse race tracks is an obligatory duty of those municipalities that receive more than 500,000 TL of annual revenue (Municipal Law

Article 16-4, and 46). The above mentioned figure was a large amount of money in 1930, but due to the high rate of inflation and the devaluation of Turkish Lira in present day Turkey, this amount does not even amount to the daily wage of an unskilled worker. Over the years, such limits determined by the 1930 law have not been updated and thus, they lost their significance. Theoretically, interpreting the law to the letter, it can be argued that all of the obligatory duties listed in the law are obligatory for all of the municipalities, no matter what their annual incomes are. This is one of the obvious indicators of the need to update the Municipal Law.

The lack of participation of the people in the administration. As indicated at the beginning of our discussions, Turkey does not have a strong tradition of local government, and public opinion is not sensitive to the affairs of the municipalities. There are two basic reasons to explain this insensitivity: (1) Turkey has a strong tradition of centralization and a very strong central administration, and generally people believe that if there is any problem involving any public organization, the only authority that will solve that problem is the central administration. Since everything is expected from central administration whenever there is a problem, the attentions of the people is directed towards the central authority. (2) There are not any established specific mechanisms, other than elections and having the chance to elect the mayor and the members of municipal assembly every five years, to facilitate the participation of people in the municipal administration. Thus, there is a lack of participation.

3. METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES

The Metropolitan municipality (Büyükşehir Belediyesi) concept is a relatively new one in the Turkish local government system; it was introduced first in 1983. A metropolitan municipality is basically a municipality, but it differs from the others by the fact that there are more than one sub-province within its boundaries. It is specifically designed for the provision of municipal services in metropolitan areas. There are a number of individual municipalities bordering each other and taking municipal services to the people living in the metropolitan area. Since each one of these municipalities is an autonomous local governmental unit and authorized to provide municipal services only within its own boundaries, there is a need for an organization to coordinate the activities of the municipalities within the metropolitan area. Metropolitan municipalities were introduced to the system because of the above mentioned need for coordination and increasing the efficiency in the provision of municipal services in the metropolitan areas.

The duties of the metropolitan municipality.

The law establishing metropolitan municipalities lists their duties, and thus, introduces a division of labor between the regular (sub-provincial) municipalities and the metropolitan municipality. According to this division of labor metropolitan municipalities are given the followings duties: to prepare and implement metropolitan city planning; to construct and maintain the major roads and streets, and undertake the necessary activities required by traffic regulations; to construct and maintain the infrastructure necessary for water, gas and sewage systems, to provide public

transportation within the metropolitan area; and to coordinate fire fighting services in the metropolitan area.

The organs of the Metropolitan Municipality.

Metropolitan Municipal Council (Büyükşehir Belediye Meclisi). This is the basic decision making organ of the Metropolitan Municipality. It is composed of elected members but the members are not directly elected to the metropolitan municipal council; they are the municipal council members of sub-provincial municipalities. The constituent municipalities within the boundaries of the metropolitan municipality are represented in the metropolitan municipal council by their respective mayors and proportional representatives from the constituent municipal councils.

Metropolitan Standing Committee (Büyükşehir Belediye Encümeni). Metropolitan Standing Committee is composed of the department heads and the secretary general of the Metropolitan Municipality. The chairman is the metropolitan mayor. As is seen to be in contrast with the regular municipalities, there are no elected council members on the Metropolitan Standing Committee.

Metropolitan mayor (Büyükşehir Belediye Başkanı). The metropolitan mayor is directly elected by the residents of the metropolitan area for that position. He/she is the chief executive of the metropolitan municipal administration and represents the public legal personality of Metropolitan Municipality.

The metropolitan mayor has the right to review the decisions of Metropolitan Municipal Council and the Sub-provincial Municipal Councils, thus all decisions of the above-mentioned councils are sent to the office of the metropolitan mayor for his examination. The metropolitan mayor has the right to send a decision back to the Municipal Council for reconsideration. If the Municipal Council adopts the same decision with a two-thirds majority, the decision is final, and the metropolitan mayor cannot do anything about it. The metropolitan mayor is in a position to coordinate the activities of sub-provincial and metropolitan municipalities, the authority given to him to send a decision back to the municipal councils should be interpreted as an effective tool given to the mayor to be used in coordinating the activities of different municipalities. The law establishing the Metropolitan Municipalities defines the Metropolitan Municipality as “those municipalities which have more than one sub-province within municipal boundaries” (Article 1 of Law No.3030). When this Law was enacted in 1983, there were only three municipalities (Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir) which qualified to be called Metropolitan Municipalities, and thus only three such municipalities were established. In determining the revenues of the Metropolitan Municipalities, Law No 3030 made an exception and indicated that in addition to the municipalities’ share of centrally collected taxes, which was to be distributed on the basis of the population of the municipality, the Metropolitan Municipalities were to receive 3 % of the taxes collected within Metropolitan Municipality as their revenue. This clause of the law only served to prompt some of the other large size municipalities, and they put pressure over the government to change their status to that of Metropolitan Municipality. Their objective was simply to have additional revenue at their disposal. In response to these pressures, right after Law No.3030 went into effect, a number of new Metropolitan Municipalities were established

through legislative action: Through the enactment of laws establishing new sub-provinces within the boundaries of certain large municipalities, the central government provided the necessary conditions for the establishment of new Metropolitan Municipalities. As a result of this, new Metropolitan Municipalities were established in Adana, Bursa, Gaziantep, Kayseri and Konya, thus the number of such municipalities has increased. But the pressures on the central government have continued, and in 1993, a decree having the force of law, and establishing seven new metropolitan municipalities, was issued by the government (KHK/504) which indirectly changed the definition of Metropolitan Municipality, and it became possible to establish Metropolitan Municipalities by a decision of the Council of Ministers, without going into the trouble of enacting a new law. At the moment there are 15 Metropolitan Municipalities, and their number is likely to increase in the future.

There exist great variations between the Metropolitan Municipalities with regard to their sizes, if population is taken as a criterion, as the following table clearly indicates. There are great variations between the Metropolitan Municipalities, and all of them are subject to the mandates of the same law, Law No 3030. The majority of the above municipalities do not have metropolitan characteristics, but they are treated as if they are. If such practices continue in the future, which is very likely, grouping local governments as Metropolitan Municipalities and municipalities will be meaningless, and the problems of those municipalities which are operating in metropolitan areas will not be the focus of future legislative actions.

THE SIZES OF METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITIES
(Population taken as a criterion.)*

Istanbul	6,620,241
Ankara	2,559,471
Izmir	1,75,414
Adana	916,150
Bursa	834,576
Gaziantep	603,434
Konya	513,346
Mersin	422,357
Kayseri	421,362
Eskisehir	413 082
Diyarbakir	381,144
Antalya	378,203
Samsun	303,979
Izmit	256,882
Erzurum	242,391

- General Population Census of 1990.

4. VILLAGES

Villages, as indicated earlier, are the smallest units of local government. The village is a traditional local administrative unit administered according to the Village Law enacted in 1924. According to the Village Law Article 1 “Villages are communities having a population of less than 2,000”. Article 2 of the same law defines a village as, “People owning common property such as a mosque, school, pasture, grazing ground and wood, and who live either in grouped or scattered houses, together with their vineyards gardens and fields, form a village”.

The duties of village administration

According to the Village Law, the duties of the village administration are divided into two categories; those which are compulsory and those which are optional. All villagers are required to participate in compulsory duties, and those who do not are fined by the village administration. There is no such obligation for optional duties.

There are 37 items listed as compulsory duties in the Village Law. Compulsory duties are generally related to the protection of health, the strengthening of social relations, the maintaining of order and security, and the cleaning and construction activities in

the village. Optional duties, although of the same nature as the compulsory ones, are usually aimed at increasing the welfare of the village.

Organs of village administration.

Village Assembly (Köy Derneği). The Village Assembly is comprised of all the electors living in the village: men and women who are Turkish citizens above the age of 18, who are registered as village inhabitants or who must have lived there for at least six months, and they must not have been convicted of a high crime. The basic duties of the Village Assembly are; electing the village headman and the Council of Village Elders, and converting optional duties to compulsory duties.

The Council of Village Elders (Köy İhtiyar Heyeti). The Council of Village Elders is comprised of four members in villages with a population of less than 1,000, and six members in those which have more than one thousand inhabitants. These are elected by the Village Assembly from among its members. In addition to the elected members, the village imam and teacher or the principal of the primary school are ex-officio members. To be elected to the Council of Village Elders one has to be over the age of 25.

The Council of Village Elders meets at least once a week and decides on village activities, determines priorities for village duties, audits the expenditures made by the headman, reviews the village budget, and imposes fines on those villagers who do not comply with their obligations.

Headman (Muhtar). The headman is elected by the Village Assembly for a period of five years. One has to be over the age of 25 to be elected as a headman, and political parties cannot nominate any candidates in the election. The headman is the chief executive of the village administration and represents the public legal personality of the village as a unit of local government. The headman has a dual role, on the one

hand he is the head of village administration as a local government, and on the other he is the executive agent of the central administration in the village. As the agent of central government, the headman is responsible for informing the villagers of the changes in the laws, and also responsible for maintaining law and order in the village. He receives his salary from the central government.

The duties of the headman are: to ensure fulfillment of the village administration functions; to advise villagers on their optional duties; to organize the villagers for collective work; to publicize laws and regulations issued by the government; to recruit for military service; to communicate court verdicts; to report contagious and epidemic diseases to the government; and to prevent unauthorized practice of medicine.

Budget and revenues.

The village budget is prepared by the headman and Council of Village Elders and can be implemented after the approval of either Provincial or Sub-provincial Governor. The main source of revenue of the village administration is house-hold tax (Salma). The Salma is assessed by Council of Village Elders for each family in the village. All inhabitants of the village and all those people who have property within the village boundaries are subject to the salma. Another important source of revenue is the “collective work obligation” (imece). By this customary device, all villagers contribute their physical services for the accomplishment of the compulsory duties of the village. The Council of Village Elders has wide discretion in deciding which tasks should be performed by whom, where and when, and how.

Anyone studying the Village Law might get the impression that villages are the most autonomous and democratic form of local governments when compared with the other types, because a village has its own public legal personality, an elected executive (village headmen) and a decision making organ (Council of Village Elders), and the Village Assembly which is composed of all of the electors in the village. But the village administration cannot function as an autonomous local government because of a lack of financial means. According to the Village Law basic revenues of village administration are household tax (“salma” in Turkish), and collective work obligation (“imece” in Turkish), where people living in the village contribute their labor for the accomplishment of communal services. Household tax is assessed by the Council of Village Elders and its upper limit is determined as 20 TL by the Village Law, which was enacted in 1924. In those days, 20 TL was a significant amount of money, but in today’s Turkey smallest unit of currency is 5,000 TL -- 20 TL does not exist. As this fact clearly indicates, the Village Administrations may have the necessary labor force through the “collective work obligation”, but they do not have financial means to purchase the material things needed in the provision of services. The implication of the above is simple: Village Administrations have elected executive and decision making organs and their own public legal personality, and in this sense they are autonomous local governments, but due to the lack of financial means, they are not able to bring services to the people. Because of this, Village Administrations have to rely on the field units of central administration for delivering local services to the people and are therefore subject to the hierarchical authority of the center. There is no need to mention the fact the conditions described above are the biggest obstacle in the realization of the autonomy of the Village Administration, which is one of the principles indicated in the Constitution with regard to the structuring and functioning of the local governments. Thus, there is a need to

reorganize the structuring and functioning of the village administrations in view of the prevailing conditions of contemporary Turkey.

Precinct Administration (Mahalle Yönetimi)

Turkish cities are divided into precincts, and precincts have their own elected administrative organs, but precincts are not local governmental units. The precinct does not fit the definition made by the Constitution regarding what a local government is. Although they have elected decision making organs, they do not have a public legal personality; this feature differentiates them from local governments. The establishment of precincts within the boundaries of municipalities can be done by the decision of the municipal council and with the approval of the provincial governor.

A precinct administration has certain minor duties given by various laws, some of which are: to issue and attest birth certificates, to provide necessary information on military notifications and communicate summons, to issue documents certifying poverty, good conduct and residence, and to inform the government of persons under suspicion, etc.

The organs of the precinct administration are “Council of Elders“ and the “headman” who are directly elected by the citizens residing in that precinct, for a period of five years. The precinct does not have a unique budget of its own, but is entitled to receive a fee in return for the services rendered to the citizens. The fee is determined by the central administration.

5. COOPERATION AMONG LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The local governments may cooperate with each other in performing one or more of their legally assigned functions through collective action. Local governments may either act by agreement or may establish unions to undertake services which they are not able to provide by themselves. Acting by agreement or establishing unions are two possibilities for joint action regulated by the related laws.

Joint action by “agreement”.

Neighbouring provincial local governments may come together and form a Joint Standing Committee composed of elected members from each provincial general assembly. The formation and functioning of a joint standing committee is subject to the approval of the Ministry of Interior. The decisions of the joint standing committee can be executed only after the approval of the related provincial general assemblies. If one of the provincial general assemblies does not approve the decision, the matter is taken to Council of State, through the Ministry of Interior, whose decision is final.

Neighbouring villages are also able to take joint action through agreement. In this case, the headman and Council of Elders of related villages come together in a joint meeting, and the decision made is implemented after the approval of the provincial governor or sub-governor. If there is no agreement reached in a joint meeting, upon the request of the one of the sides, the governor or sub-governor may ask for another meeting under his chairmanship and solve the dispute.

Joint action through the establishment of “Local Government Unions”.

The local governments may establish unions to undertake their legally assigned duties. The establishment of unions is regulated by the Municipal Law, according to which, unions may be established either by local governments of the same type or by local governments of different types. Provincial local governments, municipalities, and villages may establish unions for the purpose of undertaking their obligatory or optional duties by constructing joint plants and administrations. The establishment of such unions is subject to the approval of the central administration, but there are conflicting statements in the Constitution and Municipal Law. According to the Constitution, the establishment of such unions is subject to the approval of the Council of Ministers, but according to Municipal Law, the establishment of unions is either approved by the provincial governor (in cases where participating local governments are within the boundaries of a single province), or by the Ministry of Interior (in cases where participating local governments are located in several provinces). Local government unions are public establishments having a legal entity, that is, each one has its own public legal personality, and in that sense, they are autonomous organisations like other local governments.

The organs of local government unions. Local government unions have their own unique organs which are the “Union Assembly”, the “Union Standing Committee”, and the “executive” (union president).

The Union Assembly. Members of the Union Assembly are elected by the assemblies of the local governments participating in the union, each local government elects two members. The Union Assembly has to meet at least twice a year TO exercise control over the activities of the union. The Union Assembly enjoys the functions and powers of municipal councils, provided that these do not exceed the rights, powers and functions delegated through by-laws.

The Union Standing Committee. This is composed of four members elected by the Union Assembly from among its members. Functions terminate with the end of the term of the Union Assembly. The Union Standing Committee operates according to provisions regulating functions and powers of municipal standing committees, provided that the powers delegated by the by-laws are not surpassed.

The Union President (chief executive of the union). He is elected in the first meeting of the Union Assembly, and the decision of the assembly is subject to the approval of the provincial governor or ministry of interior (in cases where the activities of the union cover more than one province). If there are participating provincial local governments the “President of the Union” is appointed either by the provincial governor or Ministry of Interior. The Union President deals with the execution of decisions, the budgetary expenditures and the direction of other union work and presides over the Union Standing Committee.

VII. OTHER PUBLIC ORGANISATIONS

There are a number of public organisations which are not placed under the hierarchical authority of the central administration, and also are not considered as local governments. Some of these organisations are described as “autonomous” (the degree and kind of autonomy is specified either by the Constitution or the organic law of the related organisation), and some are described as “impartial” because of the nature of their activities. Some of them are economic organisations producing goods or services and operating under market conditions, as if they were private sector organisations. One characteristic, which is common to all, is that they all have their own “public legal personality” or “corporate status”.

1. UNIVERSITIES

Universities are generally considered as being autonomous organisations because of the nature of their activities, and in general the consensus is that they should be autonomous organisations. In the case of Turkish universities, Article 130 of the Constitution says the following ; “For the purpose of training manpower under a system of contemporary education and training principles and meeting the needs of the nation and the country, universities comprising several units will be established by the State and by law as public corporations having autonomy in teaching, assigned to educate, train at different levels after secondary education, and conduct research, to act as consultants, to issue publications and to serve the country and humanity”. The above article of the Constitution clearly indicates that the autonomy granted to the universities is only related to their academic activities, and having autonomy only in academic activities does not make a university an autonomous organisation. The

continuation of the above article of the constitution states that ,”Universities and units attached to them are under the control and supervision of the State, and their security is ensured by the state”. The constitution clearly indicates that universities are placed under the control and supervision of the State, and thus they are not autonomous organisations. The kind of autonomy recognised by the 1982 Constitution is quite different than the kind granted by the 1961 Constitution.

1961 Constitution stated that “Universities are public corporate bodies enjoying academic and administrative autonomy. Universities shall be administered and supervised by organs consisting of qualified members of the teaching staff elected from among themselves”. The above statement indicates that in the 1960s, universities were autonomous organisations in the true meaning of the word. The first limitation brought to the autonomy of the universities was introduced after the military intervention of 1971, which is known as the “coup by memorandum”. In 1971, there were a number of amendments made to the Constitution, and the amendments made also affected the above article in the following manner: ”Universities are public corporate bodies enjoying autonomy....Universities, under the supervision and control of the State, shall be administered by organs elected by themselves”. The above article stated that universities were autonomous, but it did not attempt to define or specify the kind of autonomy they had, thus it was ambiguous and open to any kind of interpretation. It is also indicated that there would be supervision and control of the state over the administrative organs of the universities. After such restrictions introduced by the Constitution the autonomy of the universities remained only on paper, and this was an abstract concept of autonomy. The concept of autonomy introduced by the 1982 Constitution is not much different from the one introduced in 1971. Having academic autonomy does not mean much if it is not accompanied by administrative and financial autonomy.

Organs of the university

According to the Higher Education Law the organs of the university are the Rector, the Senate, the University Administration Board. The Rector is the chief executive of the university and is appointed by the President of the Republic. Before the appointment ,an election is held at the university and the 6 professors who have received most of the votes in this election are nominated to the Higher Education Board as official candidates for the position of Rector. The Higher Education Board reviews the candidates and nominates three out of the six to the President of the Republic as eligible candidates to be appointed as Rector, and the President appoints one of the three as Rector. The Rector undertakes the following: to chair the boards of the university; to implement the decisions of the higher boards of the higher education; to prepare the budget and submit it to Higher Education Board, and to perform other duties given by the Higher Education Board.

The University Senate, under the chairmanship of the Rector, is composed of the assistant rectors, the deans of the faculties, one faculty member elected from each faculty for a term of three years, and the directors of the institutes attached to the rector’s office. The Senate is the academic organ of the university, that is, its decisions are related to the academic activities.

The University Administration Board, under the chairmanship of the Rector, consists of the deans of the faculties and three professors elected by the Senate for a term of four years. The University Administration Board assists the Rector in handling the administrative activities of the university.

Universities are divided into faculties, and the number and variety of the faculties differ from one university to the next. The Administrative organs of the faculty are the dean, the Faculty Board, and the Faculty Administration Board. The Dean is appointed by the Higher Education Board from among the three professors nominated by the Rector of the university. The Dean is the executive of the faculty and undertakes administrative activities similar to those of the rectors' but at a lower hierarchical level, and he/she is accountable to the Rector. The Faculty Board, under the chairmanship of the Dean, is composed of the chairmen of the departments, three professors elected from among the professors of the faculty, two associate professors elected by the associate professors of the faculty, and one assistant professor, again elected by the assistant professors of the faculty. The Faculty Board is an academic board, and thus makes decisions in relation to its academic activities. The Faculty Administration Board, under the chairmanship of the Dean, is composed of three professors, two associate professors, and one assistant professor who are elected by the Faculty Board for a term of three years. It is a board assisting the Dean in his/her administrative activities.

Faculties are composed of the Departments which are administered by the Department Chairman who is appointed by the Dean of the Faculty

Superior Bodies of Higher Education

The Higher Education Board (Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu, YÖK). According to the Constitution, “The Higher Education Board shall be established to plan, organise, administer, and supervise the education provided by institutions of higher education, to orient the activities of teaching, education and scientific research, to ensure the establishment and development of these institutions in conformity with the objectives and principles set forth by law, to ensure the effective use of the resources allocated to the universities, and to plan the training of the teaching staff”. The Higher Education Board is a superior organ authorised to formulate policies and make vital decisions regarding the functioning of the universities.

The Higher Education Board is composed of 24 members: the President of the Republic appoints seven members (priority is given to professors who have successfully served as faculty members or rectors) ; the Council of Ministers selects seven members from among prominent high level bureaucrats or retired bureaucrats; the Chief of General Staff selects one member: the Ministry of National Education elects two; and finally Inter-university Board selects seven members. The appointment of the members to Higher Education Board is finalised by the approval of the President of the Republic.

There are criticisms that have been directed at the Higher Education Board since the day it was established. The board is given an extensive authority over the functioning of the universities with regard to administrative, financial and even academic matters, but the universities are not able to exert their influence on the decisions of the board. The composition of the board clearly indicates that the universities are not properly represented on such an important board which makes vital decisions with regard to their functioning. They are represented through the members who are selected by the

Inter-university Board, and thus universities are not effective and/or influential in the decision making process of the Higher Education Board under this composition. There are only seven members, out of a total of 24, who truly represent the universities. The members (seven high level, prominent bureaucrats) selected by the Council of Ministers and two members selected by the Ministry of National Education represent political power, and their selection is based purely on political considerations, and thus they cannot be expected to represent the interests of the universities. The members who are selected by the President of the Republic will act in line with the expectations of the President, even if they are active teaching members of the universities. It is difficult to understand why Chief of General Staff selects a member to Higher Education Board, or justify this.

Inter-university Board (Üniversitelerarası Kurul).

The Inter-university Board is another superior body in the functioning of the universities. It is composed of the rectors of the universities and a professor elected from each university by the Senate of that university. The Inter-university Board is basically an academic advisory organ, and unlike the Higher Education Board all of the universities are represented and universities are active and effective in the decision making process of the board.

2. STATE ECONOMIC ENTERPRISES (KAMU İKTİSADİ TEŞEBBÜSLERİ)

When the Turkish Republic was established in 1923, economic conditions were difficult. The new Republic's industrial base was already weak because Ottoman industries had been undermined by the capitulations (special agreements between the Ottoman Empire and various foreign governments giving those governments and their citizens and subjects exemptions from taxes and regulations). During the 19th Century, European economic interests penetrated the empire and disrupted the traditional economic system. As a result of the above mentioned developments, foreign industrial products displaced the productions of Turkish artisans this was especially felt in the field of textiles. After the foundation of the Republic, Turkish economic policy was relatively liberal, favouring the private sector until 1930. The government, being aware of the lack of capital accumulation, introduced certain measures to support and help the development of private entrepreneurs and capital accumulation, such as the establishment of İş Bankası and the enactment of the Law for the Encouragement of Industry of 1927.

As a result of the world economic depression, by 1930 external markets for Turkish agricultural exports had collapsed with an end result of a sharp decline in the national income. The government of the time took measures to recover the economy, and thus "etatism" was adopted as an official economic strategy. According to this new strategy, individual enterprise was to play a fundamental role in the economy, but active government intervention was a necessity for developing the Turkish economy. Etatism was conceived of as an intermediate road between capitalism and socialism. According to this new policy, industrialisation was to be promoted through five-year plans and creating public enterprises for making vital investments in the face of the lack of capital accumulation in the country. Such public enterprises were to be established in those areas where the private sector was reluctant and unable to undertake investment because of insufficient capital. In accordance with this line of

policy, many State Economic Enterprises (SEE) were established between the years 1923 and 1950: Sümerbank in 1933; Etibank in 1935; the Machinery and Chemical Industries(Makine Kimya Endüstrisi Kurumu) in 1950; the Soil Products Office (Toprak Mahsulleri Ofisi) in 1938; the Petroleum Office (Petrol Ofisi) in1941; the Real Estate Credit Bank of Turkey(Türkiye Emlak ve Kredi Bankası) in1946; Turkish Airlines (Türk Hava Yolları) 1933; the Peoples Bank of Turkey (Türkiye Halk Bankası) in1938; the National Lottery Administration (Milli Piyango İdaresi) in 1939; the Bank of the Provinces (İller Bankası) in 1945 are some examples of the SEEs established in this period.

After 1950, the number of SEEs increased, and the SEEs dominated those sectors considered to be of national importance and also those sectors where private investors hesitated to invest because the capital requirements were too high in the light of expected returns. SEEs were established and played important roles in the fields of national transportation, communications, banking, mining, petrochemicals, and energy, providing inputs used by manufacturers and often determining a large share of their production costs. Among the SEEs established after 1950, the followings should be mentioned: ÇAY-KUR; ÇİTOSAN; Deniz Nakliyatı T.A.Ş.; Devlet Hava Meydanları İşletmesi; Devlet Malzeme Ofisi; Karadeniz Bakır İşletmeleri A.Ş.; Petkim Petrokimya Holding A.Ş.; SEKA; T.C.Devlet Demiryolları İşletmesi; TEKEL; Türkiye Demir Çelik İşletmeleri; Türkiye Denizcilik İşletmeleri; Türkiye Elektrik Üretim İletim A.Ş.; Türkiye Gemi Sanayii A.Ş.; Türkiye Gübre Sanayii A.Ş.; Türkiye Kömür İşletmeleri Kurumu; and Türkiye Şeker Fabrikaları A.Ş. In the late 1980s, the SEEs retained an extensive influence on Turkish economy, accounting for over half of all industrial employment and controlling about 40 % of industrial capacity.

The State Economic Enterprises are public corporate bodies. Their capital is owned by the State, they have autonomy in their commercial activities, and they are subject to private law in their dealings with other parties. According to a decree having the force of law and issued in 1984, the State Economic Enterprises are administered by a General Director and a Board of Directors appointed by the central administration. The executive organ of a SEE is its General Director, and he/she is appointed by a joint decree upon a nomination made by the relevant minister. The General Director is the Chairman of the Board of Directors. Each SEE has a Board of Directors consisting of five members, who are appointed through a joint decree. Two members are appointed upon the suggestion of the relevant minister, one member is appointed upon the suggestion of the minister who is given responsibility over the Undersecretariat for the Treasury, and two members are appointed from among the Assistant General Directors upon the suggestion of the relevant minister. Those who are to be appointed to the Board of Directors have to have the general qualifications necessary for being appointed as civil servants, they have to have university diplomas, and be specialists in the field of activity of the SEE concerned.

Since State Economic Enterprises play an important role in Turkish economy, their effective and efficient functioning is a national concern. There have been complaints about, and criticism directed at, the structure and functioning of SEEs, especially in times of economic crisis. When economic difficulties affecting their performance are encountered attempts are made by the government to reorganise them. Almost all of the Five-Year Development Plans included SEEs in their analysis of Turkish public administration and proposed certain measures to increase their efficiency and

effectiveness. Since the 1980s, SEEs have been the subject of privatization efforts (for further information, see Aksoy,1993)

3. PUBLIC PROFESSIONAL ORGANISATIONS (KAMU KURUMU NİTELİĞİNDEKİ MESLEK KURULUŞLARI)

According to the Turkish Constitution, “Public professional organisations and their higher organisations are public corporate bodies established by law, with the objectives to meet the common needs of the members of a given profession, to facilitate their professional activities, to ensure the development of the profession in keeping with the common interests, and to safeguard professional discipline and ethics in order to ensure integrity and trust in relations among its members and with the public”. Among the public professional organisations the Turkish Bar Associations (Türkiye Barolar Birliği); the Turkish Engineers and Architects Association (Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği); the Turkish Veterinarians Association (Türk Veteriner Hekimleri Birliği); the Turkish Pharmacists Associations (Türk Eczacıları Birliği); the The Union of Chambers of Commerce, Industry, Maritime Trade and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (Türkiye Ticaret, Sanayi, Deniz Ticaret Odaları ve Ticaret Borsaları Birliği); and the Turkish Medical Doctors Association (Türk Tabipler Birliği) may be mentioned. These professional organisations are considered and treated like public organisations, and their establishment requires the enactment of a law. Their members are the members of the profession, and they cannot practice their profession unless they are registered members of the related organisation. For example, the Turkish Engineers and Architects Association is a public professional organisation, its members are either engineers or architects, and no engineer or architect in Turkey can privately practice his/her profession without being registered and thus being a member of the above mentioned organisation. (Persons regularly employed in public organisations, or in State Economic Enterprises are not required to become members of public professional organisations).

These are basically professional organisations bringing together the members of a certain profession under the roof of an organisation with the objective of taking necessary measures for the protecting and developing of the traditions and practices of the profession; and the protecting of the rights and interests of their members as well as those of the public and the country. For example, the organic law of the Turkish Pharmacists Association dated January 25, 1956, states the purpose of the association as “to regulate the relations with each other, and with public and official authorities, of all pharmacists authorised to practice within the national boundaries; to prevent the establishment of institutions that seek to benefit through illegal means, and also to prevent acts of pharmacists contrary to laws and regulations; to study the drug and health problems of the country; to preserve professional ethics, honour and dignity; and to protect the rights and interests of colleagues”. As can be seen clearly from the above statement of purpose, the organisation has two basic objectives: firstly protecting the practice of the profession and the interests of its members, and secondly the protection of the public against ill practices. That is why they are called public professional organisations.

According to the Constitution the organs of the public professional organisations are elected through secret ballot by their members from among themselves in accordance

with the procedure set forth in the law, and under judicial supervision. Political parties cannot nominate any candidates in the election of the organs, and cannot undertake any campaign activity either in favor of, or against ,any candidate.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

The concept of administrative reform, “the removal of faults or errors in the system of administration, and converting it to another and better form, or making a change for the better”, has existed ever since man conceived better ways of organising his social activities. In the early years, administrative reform did not receive much attention because more interest was shown in stability. But ever since the industrial revolution, because of changing economic and social conditions and turbulent environment, increasing attention has been paid to the causes and consequences of continuous social changes, and as a result, to the public organisations which play an important role in regulating order in societies. Thus, administrative reform has been placed on the agenda and has started to receive more attention. The systems idea, through emphasising the vital relationship between an organisation and its environment, and the necessity of adapting the organisation to the changing conditions of environment, have further emphasised the need for reforming the administration.

Administrative reform is the artificial inducement of administrative transformation against resistance. It is artificial because it is man-made, deliberate, and planned; it is not natural, accidental or automatic. It is induced because it involves persuasion, argument and, if necessary, the threat of sanctions. Because reform movements aim to change the status quo, those who have vested interests in the existing system will display a resistance to change. In short, administrative reform simply refers to administrative transformation mobilised by the changing conditions. The term, “administrative reform”, and the term, “reorganisation”, are quite similar in the sense that both are related to the introduction of change into the administration and/or organisation, and the aim of both is to improve the system of administration. The terms, “administrative reform” and “reorganisation” have been used synonymously in the Turkish public administration literature, and the same practice will be followed here, and the terms will be used interchangeably.

Administrative reform rests on the assumption that there is always a better alternative to the status quo, the present administrative system which has certain deficiencies.

What constitutes administrative deficiency depends on one's idea of administrative health. There are different concepts of administrative health, and depending upon the reformer's conception of administrative health, the degree, the extent of administrative transformation will be different. The object of administrative reform is to improve the existing administrative system by removing defects, introducing new ways and means of undertaking action for preventing ill practices and curing administrative faults. Within this framework, administrative reform is subjective and evaluative.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM ATTEMPTS IN TURKEY

There has been a number of attempts, since the foundation of the Republic, for reforming Turkish public administration, among which, the following are worthy of mention:

Neumark Report

Prof. F. Neumark of Istanbul University, upon a request from central government, prepared and submitted a report on the "Principles of rational action in the State organisations and institutions" (Devlet Daire ve Müesseselerinde Rasyonel Çalışma Esasları Hakkında Rapor, 1949). As the title indicates, the Neumark Report emphasized the need for reorganising the public administration and elaborated the reasons why such reorganisation was a necessity. In addition to an analysis of the problems encountered by the administration, Neumark Report also discussed how the reorganisation of the administration should be accomplished; among his proposals were the establishment of rationalisation committees in every ministry and the empowerment of the Ministry of Finance with regard to reorganisation activities.

Barker Report

Barker Report, financed jointly by the Turkish government and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Milletlerarası İmar ve Kalkınma Bankası), was prepared by a committee and submitted to the Turkish government on May 1950. The committee was given the duty of conducting an extensive study on the Turkish economy, so that the Bank would be in a position to give advice and provide proposals to the Turkish government in relation to long term public policies. Although the committee was given the duty of studying the Turkish economy, in the final report submitted, with the sub-title of "Public Administration", the committee expressed its opinion regarding the necessity of conducting a comprehensive survey of the entire governmental activities. According to the committee the time was ripe for such an extensive survey to be conducted by a team composed of foreign and Turkish experts. In addition to the above mentioned, the Barker Report also included proposals regarding such issues as delegation of authority, relations between the center and its field organisations, financial administration, personnel, and accounting matters.

Martin and Cush Report

This was another important study on the reorganisation of central government. The Martin and Cush Report, originally titled the "Report on the Organisational, Methodological and Personnel Problems of the Ministry of Finance", was prepared by two foreign experts and submitted to the government in 1951. The report, as the

title indicates, basically dealt with the problems encountered by the Ministry of Finance.

The above-mentioned administrative reform attempts clearly indicate that the need for reviewing and reforming the administration was felt in the early years of the Republic and reform actions were initiated by the Turkish governments. But due to the lack of expertise such reform attempts were undertaken mostly by foreign experts. At the turn of the 1960s and with introduction of the national development plans, unlike the early years of Republic, Turkish experts became the architects of the reform efforts. The early 1960s became a turning point for reforming the administration, because the 1961 Constitution made social and economic planning a duty of the State and State Planning Organisation, which was given the responsibility for preparing long-term and annual plans, was established. Since the preparation and implementation of national development plans necessitated an effectively functioning administration, the State Planning Organisation was also given tasks related to the reorganisation of the Turkish public administration. The first important reorganisation attempt of the planned era was the Research Project on the Organisation and Functions of the Central Government of Turkey (Merkezi Hükümet Teşkilatı Araştırma Projesi), commonly known as MEHTAP.

Research Project on the Organisation and Functions of the Central Government of Turkey (MEHTAP)

The research was conducted, under the supervision of a Project Managing Board appointed by the Council of Ministers, jointly by the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East, the State Planning Organisation, the State Personnel Department, and relevant faculties of the universities, ministries and other related central agencies. The research was carried out by a Central Research Group with the cooperation of 93 representatives representing the organisations within the scope of the project. The objective given to the project board was to study the division of labour among central agencies (with the exception of the Grand National Assembly, the General Staff, the Ministry of National Defence, the National Intelligence Organisation, the universities, and the state economic enterprises) and to scrutinise this division of labour as to its efficiency in the provision of public services, and to advise and make recommendations to the government on these matters. Within the above-mentioned framework, the central research group studied the existing division of labour among central agencies, identified and analysed the problems encountered in the functioning of the system, and made recommendations. Recommendations were related to such issues as the distribution of tasks among central agencies, improving the structure of central government, increasing the efficiency of planning and coordinating activities, and increasing the effectiveness of financial control and personnel administration.

In the 1960s, in addition to MEHTAP, there were other studies conducted in relation to the organisation of the field units of the central administration and reorganisation of local governments (For these studies refer to Payaslıoğlu, 1966; and Yavuz, 1966).

National Development Plans and Reorganisation

The issue of administrative reform or reorganising the Turkish public administration occupied a substantial place in the Five Year Development Plans. In the First Five Year Development Plan it was clearly indicated that “.. in order to be successful in the realisation of the goals of the plan, it is absolutely necessary to make public

administration capable of fulfilling what is expected of it, as it is the most important instrument in the implementation of the plans". As the statement above shows, the planners were aware of the need for an efficiently functioning public administration to insure the effective implementation and, thus, accomplishing the goals of development plans. As a result of such lines of thinking, the reorganisation of public administration was considered one of the goals of the plans. Thus, it is possible to find statements and evaluations with regard to the reorganisation of Turkish public administration in the development plans. For example, in the Second Five Year Development Plan, the reorganisation of the major public units or organisations was considered a factor of prime importance in the achievement of the economic and social goals determined in the plan. In the Third Five-Year Development Plan it was stated that "There is a direct relationship between planning and effective and efficient public administration. The achievement of the goals determined in the plans, the proper allocation of the resources, and keeping track of them are dependent upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the public administration. Because of this, the reorganisation of public administration has been the major concern of governments during the planned period" (Ar, 1984). In the following Five-Year Development Plans there were similar statements made with reference to the reorganisation of the public sector, thus, in a sense it can be argued that the need for reforming or reorganising the Turkish public administration was incorporated into the Five Year Development Plans.

The Report of the Administrative Reform Consultation Board (İdari Reform Danışma Kurulu Raporu)

In the program of the First Nihat Erim Government, which was called the reform government at the time (1971), the issue of administrative reform was given prime importance and an Administrative Reform Consultation Board was established to determine the direction and the strategy of the reorganisation of the public sector. The Consultation Board did not prefer to employ a research group for conducting studies in determining the reform needs of the government sector, instead the board decided to review the previous administrative reform attempts like MEHTAP for the purpose of determining the general principles to be followed in the reorganisation of the public sector. The report prepared by the Administrative Reform Consultation Board proposed general principles to be followed by all public organisations (organisations of central administration, field units of the centre and local governments) in their effort to reorganise their structure and functioning.

Research on Public Administration (Kamu Yönetimi Araştırma Projesi "KAYA")

KAYA is the most recent attempt (1991), initiated by the State Planning Organisation and conducted by the Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East, to reorganise the public administration system of Turkey. The objective of KAYA has been to study the central administration, its field units, and local governments as to their efficiency and effectiveness in delivering public services and making recommendations for improving their organisational structures and functioning. It also aimed to study, analyse and identify the difficulties involved and make recommendations in the distribution of duties and responsibilities, the allocation of resources and how they are used, and the problems encountered in terms of communications and public relations. In addition to studying the existing system of

public administration, KAYA also reviewed the previous reform attempts or reorganisation efforts so as to find out the problems they have encountered, to what extent they were taken into consideration and put into effect.

2. GENERAL EVALUATION OF REFORM ATTEMPTS

The following evaluation of the reform attempts will exclude KAYA because as indicated above it was completed in 1991, thus the time is too early for making a fair evaluation of it yet. Making a general evaluation of reform attempts, especially of MEHTAP and Administrative Reform Consultation Board, it can be argued that reform attempts did not end up with the expected results. A study conducted by Dinçer and Ersoy, for the purpose of evaluating the implementation of MEHTAP, indicates and analyses the kind of problems encountered in carrying out such reforms or reorganisation plans (Dinçer and Ersoy, 1974). According to the findings of the above study, one of the major problems faced in the implementation stage was the absence of a central leadership. In the absence of a central leadership, or the avoidance of central authority playing the leading role in the implementation, the execution is left to the executives of the related organisations. Because of the above mentioned problem, the farsightedness of the executive, and his/her ability to exercise authority and struggle against vested interests become important factors in the implementation of reform projects. Within this framework, it may be argued that, in Turkish public administration, reorganisation or reform movements are not approached in a systematic manner but left to the discretion of individual administrators. When there is no central authority or a leading central leadership, it is inevitable that there will be different practices among public agencies. It has been observed that in traditional ministries, the implementation of MEHTAP's suggestions were not accomplished at the level they reached in newer ministries. Thus, one of the biggest obstacles to success, in the implementation of the reform projects, is this attitude of individualistic approach and leaving the business of reorganisation to the discretion of individual administrators.

3. PROPOSALS ON THE REORGANISATION OF TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Turkish public administration, specifically its structure, has been critically evaluated in the previous sections. In this evaluation, field units of central administration and local governments have received more attention because of the problems encountered in their functioning. This does not necessarily mean that these are the only areas where Turkish public administration has problems, because there are others where serious problems are also experienced. Within the limitations of this study, the proposals for reorganisation will be related to the field units of the centre and local governments because of the importance given by the author to their functioning.

1. Proposals for reorganising the field units of central administration.

As has been indicated, in the previous chapters, in the organisation of the field units there are two approaches: (1) organising field units on the basis of provinces, or (2) through grouping provinces, establish regions as field units. Because of the above-

mentioned different methods, in practice, there are single-function (regional) and multiple-function (provincial) administrative units existing side by side in the functioning of Turkish public administration. According to the Turkish Constitution, provincial division is the basis for the establishment of the field units of central agencies. Studies conducted regarding the sizes of the provinces have come to the conclusion that provinces are small administrative areas for facilitating the efficient provision of public services (Polatoğlu, 1985). Thus, there is a need for the establishment of larger administrative divisions, and the establishment of regional units since 1960 is a clear indication of that need. The establishment of regional units, by grouping provinces, is an increasing trend but is creating problems. In the establishment of regions, there is no coordination among central agencies with regard to the grouping of provinces. As a result, in practice, there are different groupings of provinces and, thus, different regional set-ups. Having such a variety of single-function regional units and multiple-function provincial units operating in the same geographical area is creating coordination problems in the efficient provision of public services. When the increase in the number of provinces is taken into consideration the problem becomes more important, because with the addition of each new province, the picture becomes more complex and the need for coordination increases.

At first glance, the solution to the problem seems simple: if the provinces are small administrative areas why not abolish them and establish larger administrative units better suited to the needs of central administration? Abolishing the provinces is not an easy job, because provincial division is a constitutional mandate and necessitates an amending of the Constitution. But under prevailing political conditions, amending the constitution requires a consensus between more than two political parties having seats in the Grand National Assembly, and that is rather very difficult, if not impossible. Under these conditions, the only way to reorganise the system is the introduction of measures which would solve the complexity caused by different regional set-ups and mechanisms which would insure the coordination of activities between regional and provincial units.

In the reorganisation of field units, priority should be given to the establishment of uniform regions by grouping provinces, because the experiences of several central agencies clearly indicate that provincial division does not facilitate efficient provision of public services. In grouping the provinces, and thus in the establishment of regions, the objectives of national development, regional characteristics and regional needs should be taken into consideration. Since Turkey has been preparing national development plans and trying to increase its speed of development through such planning, there is the need to design the field organisation of the centre in a way to facilitate the efficient implementation of plans, because field units of the centre have been playing an important role in the implementation of the Five Year Development Plans.

The boundaries of the regions and their centres should be determined in view of the above mentioned criteria. Then, all of the central agencies that have their field units at the regional level should be asked to reorganise their field units on the basis of this new regional set up. Within this new set up, the regional directorates of all public organisations would undertake their activities in the same uniform regional system consisting of the same grouping of provinces (Polatoğlu, 1989). Regional directorates should be placed under the supervision of a Regional Coordinator, appointed by, and working under direct control of, the centre. The establishment of uniform regions would bring a new order to the functioning of the field units of the central

administration; on the one hand there would be multi-functional provincial units operating under the authority of the governor, and on the other, there would again be multi-functional regional units operating under the supervision of a regional coordinator directly reporting to the centre. This would end the existing complexity and variety among regions, and the headquarters of all Regional Directorates would be located in the city that is determined as the regional centre.

In addition to the creation of such uniform regions there is a need for a new unit that would insure coordination between regional and provincial units and undertake activities regarding the preparation of a work program or plan for the region. With this objective in mind, a Regional Planning and Coordination Unit, which would work under the authority of the Regional Coordinator should be established. The Regional Coordinator, appointed by the Council of Ministers, and assisted by a group of specialists would be directly responsible for the preparation and implementation of the regional plans. A Regional Planning and Coordination Board, consisting of regional directors and provincial governors should be established for the purpose of insuring coordination among the field units central administration within the region.

In the functioning of the above mentioned model, the Regional Coordinator would review the yearly activity programs prepared by the provincial governors and regional directors and would prepare a regional plan with the help of the group of specialists who are placed under his authority. In this tentative plan, the priorities and measures necessary for coordinating the activities of related organisations for an effective implementation of the plan throughout the region would be determined. The above-mentioned proposals prepared by the Regional Coordinator regarding the implementation of the plan would be sent to the provincial governors and regional directors for their evaluation. Then, in the meeting of the Regional Planning and Coordination Board, where regional and provincial units are represented, the planned activities of provincial units within their provinces and the activities of regional units within the region would be related to each other. If there were any clashes between the activities of related organisations, they would be solved, the priorities would be determined, and harmonious working of the involved organisations would be insured.

It is known that part of the coordination problems encountered at the provincial and regional levels are reflections of problems taking place among the central agencies at the centre. Because of that, the establishment of a coordination unit at the centre would help to solve some of the problems of coordination at the regional level. The establishment of an Undersecretariat for Coordination directly attached to Prime Minister's office would be the correct thing to do.

The Regional Coordinators, placed under the hierarchical control of the Undersecretariat for Coordination, would be able to find solutions to the problems that they are not able to solve at the regional level by bringing the problem to the attention of the Undersecretariat. The functioning of the regional coordinators under the hierarchical supervision of the Undersecretariat would pave the way for the development of new principles, methods and mechanisms for coordination, which would be applicable in all regions.

For the purpose of insuring a harmonious relationship between the activities of local governments, private organisations and regional plans, a Regional Planning Council (an advisory council) should be established. This Regional Planning Council would be composed of regional directors, provincial governors, representatives of local

governments and private sector, and members of Parliament elected from that region. Regional Planning Council by bringing together officials of the central government, local government, politicians and private sector organisations would increase the speed of information exchange concerning regional plans and would play an important role in insuring the participation of private sector and local governments in the preparation and execution of regional plans.

The application of the model described above aiming to solve planning and coordination problems at the regional level would not be difficult. The model does not create a new hierarchical level, thus it would not increase the number of structural levels of the central government organisation. Provinces would be kept as they are and the establishment of uniform regions would be encouraged. The changes proposed in the model do not necessitate an amendment of the Constitution, and in that sense, if adopted by the party in power it could easily be implemented.

The proposed model has a vital importance in today's Turkey, where there are pressures on governments to increase the number of provinces and governments are willing to do so. The creation of new provinces is done by dividing the existing ones, and with the creation of new provinces, the existing problems of coordination among field units is going to increase and become more complex.

2. How to reorganise the local government system?

The evaluations of different types of local governments, in previous chapters, clearly indicate the need to introduce certain measures which would modify the local government system and facilitate its effective and efficient functioning in view of the prevailing conditions of the Turkish society. There have been a number of studies conducted in recent years with the objective of reforming the system (the Turkish Industrialist's and Businessmen's Association 1995, the Ministry of Interior 1996, the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East 1991, Ziya Çoker 1995). All of the above mentioned studies propose minor modifications intended to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the functioning of local governments. All of the above studies, in their efforts to reorganise the system, have advocated a local government system which would be autonomous, democratic and would facilitate the participation of local people into the administration. But their proposals are not in conformity with the general framework or the general description of the system advocated. For example, all of the above studies are in favour of keeping the Provincial Local Government and, for increasing its efficiency and effectiveness, establishing a new local government at the sub-provincial level. The interesting aspect of their proposals is the protection of the position of the Provincial Governor (an agent of the centre) at the top of the Provincial Local Government as its executive and as the official of the centre exercising control over local activities. A similar position is envisaged for the Sub-provincial Governor to head the proposed Sub-provincial Local Government. It is not possible to establish an autonomous local government so long as either the Provincial or Sub-provincial Governor is kept as the chief executive at the top of the local government. Because of such inconsistencies, the above studies are not going to be evaluated here in detail, instead we will be focusing on our own proposals for improving the system.

Our proposals are basically directed to the creation of autonomous and democratic local governments, where local people would be able actively to participate in their

administration. In this sense, we will focusing on municipal administrations, because we believe that municipalities have a better chance for improvement when compared with the other types. At the end of our detailed study of Turkish local governments, we have come to the conclusion that Provincial Local Governments and village administrations both seem already to have become already meaningless in terms of their functions and resources allocated to them. In other words, they have too limited resources to enable them to undertake their functions assigned by the laws. As indicated earlier, provincial local governments are simply the extensions of central government, almost a field unit of the centre, thus the efforts to improve them as units of local governments will not be fruitful because of their inherent characteristics and their traditional organic ties with the central administration. The scale of operations of Village Administrations are too small for a local government unit and the best solution seems to be incorporating villages into other local governments where village inhabitants are represented in their administration thorough their own representatives.

A. Proposals for Improving the Municipal Administrations

The question of optimum minimum size. As we have indicated, the majority of Turkish municipalities are small municipalities, 80.7% of them having a population of less than 10,000 and out of the total number of 2,710 municipalities, 1,017 have a population of less than 5,000. The smallness of the size is causing certain problems in providing the municipal services, as discussed earlier. Thus, in reorganising the local government system of the country, the first step taken should be the reconsideration of the optimum minimum size. A population of 2,000 which is the requirement in effect for a community to establish municipal administration, has become too small for the performance of not only traditional functions but more especially of the newer functions expected from the municipalities. Thus, it is necessary to conduct an extensive study for the determination of an optimum minimum size for the municipalities, under existing contemporary conditions.

In the determination of optimum minimum size, prime consideration should be given to such concepts of efficient use of resources, decreasing the cost of services, and facilitating the participation of people in the administration. In this sense, the scale of operation should be determined in a manner which will insure efficiency in the use of resources and in bringing services to the people. But efficiency should not be the only criterion taken into consideration, efficiency should not be accomplished at the cost of democracy and participation by the people in the administration. In determining the optimum minimum size, the nature of services, and the technology and the machinery to be employed in the provision of services have to be studied carefully to prevent idle capacity and, thus to increase the efficiency and reduce the cost.(Polatoğlu, 1996). Once the optimum minimum size is determined, the communities having a population equal to or more than the optimum minimum size would be entitled to establish a municipal administration. This would be an important step in the development of the local governments, in the sense that local governments would be able to decrease the cost in the provision of services because they would be operating at an appropriate economic scale.

Participation of people in the administration. As we have indicated in the

beginning, Turkey does not have a strong tradition of local government, thus local people are not sensitive to the affairs of municipal administration. When the citizenry is not sensitive to the affairs of administration, it is difficult to insure participation. Participation requires an extensive interaction between the citizens and organs of municipal administration; interaction is an indispensable element of participation. In the case of Turkey, public opinion is not sensitive to the affairs of the municipality, and there do not exist mechanisms that will facilitate interaction between citizens and organs of the municipality. Municipal services are brought to the people through an organisation that is placed under hierarchical control of the mayor, and this organisation is located at a certain centre or location in the city. Thus, there exists a physical distance between the municipality organisation and the citizens. The policy making organ of the municipality is the Municipal Council composed of elected members, but the election system is the biggest obstacle to the development of close relationships between the members of the Municipal Council and citizens. According to the law in effect, nominations for the Municipal Council membership are done by political parties on the basis of the totality of the city. That is, the Municipal Council members are elected to represent all of the citizens living within municipal boundaries. Since they are not elected from a specific section of the city to represent the people residing in that particular quarter, it is difficult for the average citizen to relate himself or herself to one of the Municipal Council members and initiate communication with regard to the municipal services.

For the purpose of facilitating participation, it is necessary to solve the problem of physical distance by modifying the organisational structure of the municipalities. In other words, what we are suggesting is to decentralise the organisation of the municipalities within the boundaries of the cities. This line of consideration will take us to the establishment of municipal branches and precinct administration, which will function as a bridge and increase the volume of communication between the people and the municipality. In the case of the Turkish municipalities, the existing precinct administration can easily be transformed into branches of the municipality. Traditionally, Turkish municipalities are divided into precincts, which are similar to local administrations; precinct administrations are based on a 1944 Law, and its organs are elected by the people, but they do not have corporate status. Establishing, abolishing and uniting precincts is given to the authority of the municipality, with the approval of related governor. On the basis of circumstances prevailing in 1944, the precinct administrations were given a variety of duties, many of which were transferred to other public organisations with additional legislation. The precinct administrations of today are performing a limited number of functions, but are places where citizens pay frequent visits, because of the nature of their tasks. As can be seen, precincts are losing their traditional functions, but because of the nature of their duties, they are in continuous interaction with the citizens. By taking legislative action, precinct administrations can be transformed into branches of municipalities and still perform their tasks given by the law. Thus, precincts would be turned into places where people could have face to face contact with municipal administration, file their complaints about the municipal services, have information about the nature of services and pronounce their wishes and expectations regarding municipal services.

In addition to transforming precinct administrations into branches of municipalities, by changing the law which regulates the election of the members of municipal council, the elections of members could be based on the boundaries of precincts. The

present system of elections permits the candidates to run on a political party ticket, which covers the whole city, and as a result municipal councils are controlled by such powerful groups as trade unions. With the introduction of such a change in the election law, the inhabitants of every precinct would be represented by the individuals who are residing within the very same neighbourhood, and it would not be difficult for the average individual to contact the councilperson from his own precinct with regards to the affairs of the municipality.

We are not claiming that the above proposals, if accomplished, would solve the problems of participation rapidly. What we are simply arguing is that within the existing structure, participation is not possible unless there is a strong tradition of local government and sensitive public opinion. In societies where you do not have a strong tradition of local government and sensitive public opinion, the priority should be given to shorten the distance between the citizens and municipal administration and bring them closer to each other. If this can be accomplished, participation in the administration may be facilitated and promoted.

Grouping municipalities and assigning functions and allocating financial means in proportion to their sizes. As we have elaborated in the preceding pages, there are great variations among municipalities with regard to population, size of area, the nature of economic activity dominant in the region, and the revenues allocated by the centre. Because of such above-mentioned differences, municipalities have different needs and they are encountering different operational problems, but all of them are subject to the mandates of the very same municipal law, and this situation is creating serious problems for municipalities. What need to be done to overcome this problematic is simple: a comparative study for identifying the common characteristics of different sizes of municipalities should be conducted, and on the basis of the findings of that study municipalities having similar characteristics should be grouped together and brought under the same category. Then, each group should be assigned duties and allocated resources in view of their needs and problems. Such a measure will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of municipalities.

A new definition for “Metropolitan Municipality”. The existing practice of establishing metropolitan municipalities, giving that title to municipalities lacking metropolitan characteristics for the sole objective of increasing their revenues, should be abandoned. In this sense, there is a need for a new definition of metropolitan municipality, indicating its metropolitan characteristics, replacing the existing definition in the related legislation. Such a measure would prevent the current ill practice of establishing “artificial” metropolitan municipalities.

B. Some new concepts: “Rural Municipality” ; “Regional Local Government”.

As indicated earlier, as a result of our extensive study of the local government system of Turkey, we have come to the conclusion that “Village Administrations and Provincial Local Governments” have become obsolete as units of local governments, in view of the prevailing conditions of the country. Thus, these two types of local governments should be abolished, but establishment of new types of local governments to replace these is needed. “Rural Municipality” and “Regional Local Government” are new concepts, new approaches intending to create new formations which could answer the needs of the local people in these areas. (Polatoğlu, 1999).

“ Rural Municipality” : “Rural Municipality” is a new concept introduced for the purpose of establishing a new local governmental unit to replace village administration and bring public services to the people of the locality. What we are proposing, by introducing this new concept, is simply bringing together a number of villages and establishing a municipal administration that will serve all of them. The villages should be brought together on the basis of the optimum minimum size mentioned earlier. Thus, a rural municipality would be composed of nearby villages grouped under a municipal administration and each village would be considered as a precinct, thus a branch of the “Rural Municipality”. The establishment of rural municipalities would enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of public services brought to the people in rural areas, and the participation of the people in the activities of local administration would be possible. There would be municipal council members elected by each locality, in proportion to its population, thus, facilitating the representation of local inhabitants in the municipal council.

“ Regional Local Government”. “Regional Local Government” is another new idea for establishing a new local governmental unit to replace Provincial Local Governments. In terms of central administrative organisation, Turkey is divided into provinces, and the provinces, in turn, are divided into smaller areas, and central agencies establish their field units on the basis of provincial division. The main administrative unit for central government activities is the province. Thus, provinces are on the one hand field units of central administration, and on the other local governments.

As has been discussed in the previous sections, the foundations of Turkish provincial administration were basically established in the 1920s, thus reflecting the conditions of the times. (For example provincial areas were kept small so that every community in the province would be at a reasonable distance easily reached from provincial centres by the means available under the technology of the times.) But over the years, rapid economic and social developments and the progress in transportation systems with their shortening of travel times have affected the system used in the establishment of provinces. As the country has progressed technologically, economically, and socially, the governmental functions have become more specialised, grown in complexity, and operation costs have increased. As a result of these developments, provinces have become too small, as multiple function administrative areas, for bringing the new services needed by the modern society. Starting with 1950s new central agencies with the purpose of performing new functions needed by the modern society have begun to appear on the Turkish scene. But instead of conforming their field units to the existing provincial division, they have chosen to set up their own administrative divisions, and thus, several single function regional organisations have been established without regard to provincial boundaries. Since then the number of such regional organisations has increased rapidly.

In today’s Turkey, it is obvious that provinces as multiple-function administrative areas are too small for the execution of many governmental functions. Since the increased scope of state activity has made the use of a large number of specialists indispensable, and the establishment of an increasing number of single-function regional units creates complexity and confusion in coordinating several

governmental functions, Turkey is faced with redesigning her provincial administrative division by creating larger administrative regions better suited to the exigencies of modern government. In view of the above mentioned, and taking the intentions of the central administration to transfer some of the centrally taken public services to local governments into consideration, we are proposing that a new local government, to operate on a larger scale than provinces, should be established. This would increase the efficiency in delivering public services, and those public services which require a regional approach would be provided more efficiently.

The chief executive of Regional Local Government should be elected directly by the people living in the region. The basic decision-making organ of this new local government (the Regional Council) should be composed of elected members. Members of the Regional Council either could be elected directly by the people for that position, or the local governments in the region could be represented on the Regional Council by their respective mayors and proportional representatives from municipal councils in the region.

The establishment of regional local governments would enhance the efficiency of public services and facilitate regional planning. For the purpose of ensuring a harmonious relationship between the activities of central administration, local governments, private organisations and regional plans, a Regional Planning Council, an advisory body, should be established. The Regional Planning Council should be composed of representatives of the field units of central administration operating in the region, representatives of local governments and private sector organisations, and members of parliament elected from that region. The Regional Planning Council, by bringing together officials of central government, local governments and representatives of private sector organisations would increase the speed of information-exchange concerning regional affairs and plans, and would play an important role to ensure the participation of the involved sides in the preparation and execution of regional plans.

REFERENCES FOR PART TWO

- Aksoy, Şinasi., and Polatoğlu, Aykut., "Decentralisation and the Strengthening of Local Government", Council of Europe Local and Regional Authorities in Europe, Publication no: 48, 1991.
- Aksoy, Şinasi., "Turkish Experience with Privatization: An Overview and Evaluation" Turkish Public Administration Annual, Vol: 17-19, 1991-1993.
- Ar, Fikret A., "Administrative Reform Efforts in Turkey" Turkish Public Administration Annual, Vol:11, 1984.
- Çoker, Ziya., Yönetimde Yeniden Yapılanma, (Ankara: 20 Mayıs Eğitim, Kültür Ve Sosyal Dayanışma Vakfı, 1995)
- Dinçer, Nabi. Ve Ersoy, Turan., Merkezi Hükümet Teşkilatı Araştırma Projesi (MEHTAP) Tavsiyelerinin Uygulama Durumunu Değerlendirme Araştırması, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1974)
- Ergun, Turgay., ve Polatoğlu, Aykut., Kamu Yönetimine Giriş, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları, 1992)
- Karaer, Tacettin., "Kamu Yönetimini Yeniden Düzenleme Girişimleri ve Sonuçları Üzerine Bir Deneme", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Cilt:20, Sayı 2, Haziran 1987.
- Keleş, Ruşen., "Yerel Yönetimler Özerklik Şartı Karşısında Avrupa ve Türkiye", Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler, Cilt 4, Sayı 6, Kasım 1995.
- Keleş, Ruşen., Avrupa'nın Bütünleşmesi ve Yerel Yönetimler, (Ankara: Türk Belediyecilik Derneği, 1999.)
- Mahalli İdareler Genel Müdürlüğü., Mahalli İdareler Reformu Kanun Taslakları, (Ankara: İçişleri Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1997)
- Payashoğlu, Arif., Merkezi İdarenin Taşra Teşkilatı Üzerinde Bir İnceleme, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü ve Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Ortak Yayını, 1966)
- Polatoğlu, Aykut., "The Turkish Province as an Administrative Division of Central Government", Turkish Public Administration Annual, Vol.2, 1975.
- Polatoğlu, Aykut., "İl Yönetiminde Eşgüdüm Sorunu ve Yeni Bir Yönetim Modeli", Amme İdaresi Dergisi, Cilt:18, No:4, Aralık 1985.

- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Bölge Valiliđi Üzerine Düşünceler”, Mülkiyeliler Birliđi Dergisi, Şubat 1998.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Bölge Planlaması ve Yönetmel Yapı”, (İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2. Ulusal Bölge Planlaması Kongresine sunulan Tebliđ.), Bildiriler, İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi Baskı Atelyesi, 1989.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Kent Yönetiminde Sorun Alanları ve Örgütlenme”, Şehircilik Hukuk ve Yönetim İlişkileri (12. Dünya Şehircilik Günü Kollojyumuna sunulan tebliđler), A.Ü.Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Basın Yayın Yüksek Okulu Basımevi, 1990.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Türk Kamu Örgütlerinde İletişim”, Amme İdaresi Dergisi , Cilt: 21, No: 2 , Haziran 1998.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., (Ed.), Özelleştirme Tartışmaları, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1994)
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Southeastern Anatolia Project and Administrative Organisation”, METU Studies in Development, 22(2), 1995.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Mahalli İdarelerin Yeniden Yapılandırılmasına İlişkin Yasa Tasarısı Üzerinde Bir Deđerlendirme”, Çađdaş Yerel Yönetimler, Cilt:5, Sayı:3, Mayıs 1996.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “Administrative Structure: Regional considerations” paper presented to the Workshop on Local Government Structuring, organized by Center for Public Policy and Urban Research (METU) with the participation of Birmingham and Manchester Universities, Ankara, October 13, 1997.
- Polatođlu, Aykut., “A Critical Look at the Turkish Local Governments:The Urgent Need for Reform”, Middle Eastern Studies , (To be published), 1999.
- Soysal, Mümtaz., 100 Soruda Anayasanın Anlamı: 1982 Anayasasına Bilimsel Yaklaşım (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1986)
- Türkiye ve Orta Dođu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü., T.C. Devlet Teşkilatı Rehberi, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları, 1998)
- Türkiye ve Orta Dođu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü., Kamu Yönetimi Araştırması, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları, 1991)
- Türkiye Sanayicileri ve İşadamları Derneđi., Yerel Yönetimler: Sorunlar, Çözümler, (İstanbul:TÜSİAD Yayınları, 1995)
- Yalçındađ, Selçuk, “Local Government in Turkey: Problems and Solutions” Turkish Public Administration Annual, Vol. 22-23, 1996-1997.
- Yavuz, Fehmi., Türk Mahalli İdarelerinin Yeniden Düzenlenmesi Üzerinde Bir Araştırma, (Ankara:Türkiye ve Orta Dođu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü ve Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Ortak Yayını, 1966)

GLOSSARY

A

abuse of authority... yetkiyi kötüye kullanma
accounting officer... sayman
administrative action... yönetsel işlem
administrative clerk... tahrirat katibi
administrative court... idare mahkemesi
administrative functions... yönetsel işlevler
administrative law... idare hukuku
administrative reform... yönetsel reform
administrative tutelage... idari vesayet
advancement... terfi
advisor ... danışman
Air Force... Hava Kuvvetleri
allocation... ödenek
annexed budget... katma bütçe
appeal... temyiz
appoint... atama
appointment... atanma
approval... aklama
assembly... meclis
assistant... yardımcı
assistant governor... vali yardımcısı
attached organisation... bağlı kuruluş
auditor... mali denetmen
autonomy..... özerklik

B

balanced budget... denk bütçe
Bank of Provinces... İller Bankası

Bar Association...Baro
Board of Directors...Yönetim Kurulu
Board of Inspectors...Teftiş Kurulu
bribe...rüşvet
budget...bütçe
budget committee...bütçe komisyonu
bureau...büro
Bureau Head (Chief)...Büro Şefi
by-law...yönetmelik

C

Cabinet...Kabine (Bakanlar Kurulu)
central administration...merkezi yönetim
Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey...Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Merkez
Bankası
central sub-province... merkez ilçe
centralisation...merkeziyetçilik
census...nüfus sayımı
chain of command...komuta birliği
chairman (chairwoman)...başkan
chairperson...başkan
Chief of the General Staff...Genelkurmay Başkanı
Chief Public Prosecutor...Baş savcı
circular...genelge
citizen...vatandaş
citizenship...vatandaşlık
city hall...belediye sarayı
civil servant...kamu görevlisi (memur)
coalition...koalisyon
coalition government...koalisyon hükümeti
coercion...zorlama
compensation...ödenek
competence examination...yeterlik sınavı
competitive examination...yarışma sınavı
confiscation...zoralım
contract employee...sözleşmeli personel
corruption...yolsuzluk
Collective work obligation...İmece
Commander of the Army...Kara Kuvvetleri Komutanı
Commander of the Navy...Deniz Kuvvetleri Komutanı

Commander of the Air Force...Hava Kuvvetleri Komutanı
Comptroller of the Court of Accounts...Sayıştay Denetçisi

Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions...Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları
Konfederasyonu (Türk-İş)
consultative functions...danışmanlık işlevleri
constitution...anayasa
Constitutional Court...Anayasa Mahkemesi
Coordinating Governor...Koordinatör Vali
corporate status...tüzel kişilik
Council of Ministers...Bakanlar Kurulu
Council of State...Danıştay
Council of Village Elders...Köy İhtiyar Heyeti
Court of Accounts...Sayıştay
Court of Cassation...Yargıtay
Court of Jurisdictional Conflicts...Uyuşmazlık Mahkemesi
criminal law...ceza hukuku

D

decentralisation...ademi merkezîyetçilik (yerinden yönetim)
delegation of authority...yetki devri
delegation of authority to sign...imza yetkisinin devri
deconcentration of authority...yetki genişliği
decree...kararname
decree having force of law...kanun gücünde kararname
Department of Religious Affairs...Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı
Deputy Prime Minister...Başbakan Yardımcısı
devolution of authority...yetki devri (merkezden yerel yönetimlere)
Director of Legal Affairs...Hukuk İşleri Müdürü
Director of Security...Emniyet Müdürü
Director of National Education...Millî Eğitim Müdürü
Director of Primary Education...İlk Öğretim Müdürü
Director of Public Works...Bayındırlık Müdürü
Director of Population Registry...Nüfus Müdürü
disciplinary penalty...disiplin cezası
discretionary power...takdir yetkisi
district...bucak
District Director...Bucak Müdürü
division...daire

Division Head...Daire Başkanı
dysfunction...işlevsel bozukluk

E

election...seçim
Electoral Law...Seçim Kanunu
electorate...seçmenler
executive branch...yürütme organı
ex-officio member...doğal üye
expenditure...gider
expropriation...kamulaştırma

F

fee...harç
feedback...geri bildirim
field organisation...taşra örgütü
field unit... taşra birimi
foreign trade...dış ticaret
foundation...vakıf
functionally autonomous organisation...hizmet yönünden yerinden
yönetim kuruluşu

G

gendarme...jandarma
General Budget...Genel Bütçe
General Director...Genel Müdür
General Directorate...Genel Müdürlük
General Directorate of Foundations...Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü
General Directorate of Highways...Karayolları Genel Müdürlüğü
General Directorate of National Lottery Administration...Milli Piyango
İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü
General Directorate of Press, Broadcasting and Information...Basın,
Yayın ve Enformasyon Genel Müdürlüğü
General Directorate of Retirement Fund...Emekli Sandığı Genel
Müdürlüğü

General Directorate of Security...Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü
General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works...Devlet Su İşleri Genel
Müdürlüğü

General Directorate of Youth and Sport...Gençlik ve Spor Genel
Müdürlüğü

General Directorate of Village Services...Köy Hizmetleri Genel
Müdürlüğü

General Staff...Genelkurmay
governance...yönetişim
government program...hükümet programı
government property...devlet malı, kamu malı
Governor...Vali
Governor of the centre...merkez valisi

H

Headman...Muhtar
High Board of Privatisation ...Özelleştirme Yüksek Kurulu
High Board of Science and Technology...Bilim ve Teknoloji Yüksek
Kurulu
High Board of Southeastern Anatolia Project...Güneydoğu Anadolu
Projesi Yüksek Kurulu
High Control Board of the Prime Ministry...Başbakanlık Yüksek
Denetleme Kurulu
High Court of Appeals...Yargıtay
Higher Education Board...Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu
High Planning Board...Yüksek Planlama Kurulu
household tax...salma

I

indivisibility of administration...yönetimin bölünmez bütünlüğü
impartial...tarafsız
independence...bağımsızlık
informal organisation...doğal örgüt
inspector...müfettiş

inspection...teftiş
interpellation...gensoru
Interuniversity Board...Üniversitelerarası Kurul
investigation...soruşturma (tahkikat)

L

law and order...kamu düzeni
leadership...önderlik
legitimacy...meşruiyet
local government...yerel yönetim
local autonomy...yerel özerklik

M

manpower planning...insangücü planlaması
martial law...sıkıyönetim
Mayor...Belediye Başkanı
merit system...liyakat sistemi
Metropolitan Municipality...Büyükşehir Belediyesi
Metropolitan Mayor...Büyükşehir Belediye Başkanı
Metropolitan Municipal Council...Büyükşehir Belediye Meclisi
Metropolitan Standing Committee...Büyükşehir Belediye Encümeni
Minister...Bakan
Minister of State...Devlet Bakanı
ministry...bakanlık
Ministry of Agriculture and Village Affairs..Tarım ve Köyişleri
Bakanlığı
Ministry of Construction and Settlement...Bayındırlık ve İskan
Bakanlığı
Ministry of Culture...Kültür Bakanlığı
Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources...Enerji ve Tabii Kaynaklar
Bakanlığı
Ministry of Forestry...Orman Bakanlığı
Ministry of Health...Sağlık Bakanlığı
Ministry of Industry and Commerce...Sanayi ve Ticaret Bakanlığı

Ministry of Interior...İçişleri Bakanlığı
Ministry of Ecology...Çevre Bakanlığı
Ministry of Finance...Maliye Bakanlığı
Ministry of Foreign Affairs...Dışişleri Bakanlığı
Ministry of Justice...Adalet Bakanlığı
Ministry of National Defense...Milli Savunma Bakanlığı
Ministry of National Education...Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı
Ministry of Tourism...Turizm Bakanlığı
Ministry of Transportation...Ulaştırma Bakanlığı
Ministry of Work and Social Security...Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik
Bakanlığı
municipality...belediye
Municipal Council...Belediye Meclisi
Municipal Law...Belediye Kanunu
municipal police...belediye zabıtası
Municipal Standing Committee...Belediye Encümeni

N

nation state...ulus devlet
national...ulusal
National Intelligence Organisation...Milli İstihbarat Teşkilatı
National Security Board...Milli Güvenlik Kurulu
National Union of Chambers of Commerce, Chambers of Industry, and
Commodities Exchanges...Türkiye Odalar Birliği (TOB)
nationality...vatandaşlık, yurttaşlık
nepotism...kayırmacılık
nomination...aday gösterme

O

obligatory duties...zorunlu görevler
officer...memur
Official Gazette...Resmi Gazete
operational expenditures...cari harcamalar
optional duties...isteğe bağlı görevler
order...emir
organic law...kuruluş kanunu

P

- parliamentary investigation...meclis araştırması
parliamentary inquiry...meclis soruşturması
parliamentary immunity...dokunulmazlık
performance appraisal...performans değerlendirme
Precinct...Mahalle
Presidency...Cumhurbaşkanlığı
Private Secretary of the Minister...Özel Kalem Müdürü
Private Secretariat of Ministry...Bakanlık Özel Kalem Müdürlüğü
Political Parties Law...Siyasi Partiler Kanunu
Population Registry Officer...Nüfus Memuru
Prime Minister...Başbakan
Prime Ministry...Başbakanlık
Prime Ministry Mass Housing Administration...Başbakanlık Toplu
Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı
principal proceeding...iptal davası
privatization...özelleştirme
promotion...terfi
property tax...emlak vergisi
province...İl
Provincial Administration Act...İl İdaresi Kanunu
Provincial Administrative Board...İl İdare Kurulu
Provincial Coordination Board...İl Koordinasyon Kurulu
Provincial director...İl şube müdürü
Provincial General Assembly...İl Genel Meclisi
Provincial Standing Committee...İl Daimi Encümeni
Provincial Local Administration...İl Özel İdaresi
provisional budget...geçici bütçe
Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East...Türkiye
ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü
public finance...kamu maliyesi
public legal personality...tüzel kişilik
Public Physician...Hükümet Doktoru
Public Prosecutor...Cumhuriyet Savcısı
public legal personality...kamu tüzel kişiliği
Public Professional Organisation...Kamu Meslek Kuruluşu

R

recruitment...işe alma
red tape...kırtasiyecilik
referendum... referandum
Regional Administrative Court...Bölge İdare Mahkemesi
Regional Director...Bölge Müdürü
Regional Directorate...Bölge Müdürlüğü
Regional Governor...Bölge Valisi
Regional Governorship...Bölge Valiliği
remuneration...ücret
resignation...istifa
revenue...gelir
rule of law ...hukuk devleti
rural municipality...kırsal belediye

S

secret fund...örtülü ödenek
section...şube
Section Head...Şube Müdürü
secular...laik
secularism...laiklik
separation of powers...kuvvetler ayrılığı
social justice...sosyal adalet
span of control...denetim alanı
special session...olağanüstü toplantı
State Control Board...Devlet Denetleme Kurulu
State Economic Enterprise...Kamu İktisadi Teşebbüsü
state of emergency...olağanüstü hal
state of law...hukuk devleti
State Personnel Department...Devlet Personel Başkanlığı
State Planning Organisations...Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı
State Security Court...Devlet Güvenlik Mahkemesi
State Statistic Institute...Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü
Sub-governor...Kaymakam
Sub-provincial Governor...Kaymakam
sub-province...ilçe
supremacy of law...hukuk devleti
Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors...Yüksek Hakimler
ve Savcılar Kurulu

Supreme Electoral Council...Yüksek Seçim Kurulu
Supreme Military Council...Yüksek Askeri Şura

T

Turkish Confederation of Employers' Union...Türkiye İşveren
Sendikaları Konfederasyonu (TİSK)
Turkish Industrialist's and Businessmen's Association...TürkSanayicileri
ve İşAdamları Derneği (TUSİAD)
Turkish Radio-Television Corporation...Türkiye Radyo-Televizyon
Kurumu
Treasurer...Defterdar
Treasurer of Sub-province...Mal Müdürü

U

Undersecretary...Müsteşar
undersecretariat...müsteşarlık
Undersecretariat of Customs...Gümrük Müsteşarlığı
Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade...Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı
Undersecretariat of Marine Affairs...Deniz Müsteşarlığı
Undersecretariat of Treasury...Hazine Müsteşarlığı
Unions of Local Government...Yerel Yönetim Birlikleri
Union Assembly...Yerel Yönetim Birliği Meclisi
Union Standing Committee...Yerel Yönetim Birliği Encümeni
unity of command...komuta birliği

V

Village Assembly...Köy Derneği
Village Clerk...Köy Katibi
Village Guard...Köy Korucusu
Village Law...Köy Kanunu
vote of confidence...güven oyu
vote of inconfidence...güvensizlik oyu

INDEX

Administration
 definition
Administrative Behavior
Administrative organisation of province
Audit Court
Authority
 definition
 delegation of authority
Authoritarian leader

Barker Report
Barnard, Chester
Behavioral approach
Budgeting

Centralisation
Chain of command
Classical organization theory
Collective work obligation
Communication
 downward communication
 upward communication
 horizontal communication
Comparative Public Administration
 traditional
 modern
Controlling
Constitutional Court
Constitutional-Legal-Historical Approach
Coordination
Coordinating

Council of State
Council of Village Elders
Court of Jurisdictional Conflicts

Democratic leader
Democratic state
Decentralisation
Deconcentration
Departmentalisation
Directing
Division of labor
Duties of municipalities
Duties of Metropolitan Municipalities
Duties of Provincial Local Governments
Duties of Village Administration

Effectiveness
Efficiency
Enderun
Environment of organisation

Follet, Marry Parker
Fayol, Henry

General characteristics of local governments
Grand National Assembly
Goal
 operative goals
 official goals
 multiplicity of goals
Goodnow, Frank J.,
Gullick, Luther

Headman
High Court of Appeals
Higher Education Board
Household tax
Huntington, Samuel P.

Independence of judiciary
Indivisibility of administration
Interuniversity Board

Job specification
Job description
Joint action through agreement
Judiciary
Judicial review of the administrative actions
Judicial review of the constitutionality of laws

Line
Lindbloom, Charles
Local government union

Martin&Cush Report
Mayor
MEHTAP
Metropolitan Mayor
Metropolitan Municipality
Metropolitan Municipal Council
Metropolitan Standing Committee
Ministers without portfolio
Minnowbrook Conference
Modern theories of organisation
Mooney, James D. & Reilly, Allan C.
Municipal Council
Municipal Standing Committee

National Development Plans and Reorganisation
National Security Board
Neoclassical Theory of Organisations
Newmark Report

Open system
Organisation
 definition
 formal organisation
 social organisation

- informal organisation
- organisation as system
- organising
- Organisations attached to the Prime Ministry
- Organs of local government unions
- Ostrom, Vincent

Planning

POSDCORB

Power

President

- duties related to legislative

- duties related to executive

- duties related to judiciary

Prime Minister

Precinct administration

Problems faced by municipalities

- size

- need for grouping

- need for updating the Municipal Law

- lack of participation

Proposals for reorganising the field units of central administration

Proposals for improving the municipal administrations

Provincial Coordination Board

Provincial General Assembly

Provincial governor

- appointment

- removal

Provincial Standing Committee

Provincial units

Public administration

- definition

- scope

- development of the discipline

Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East

Public Professional Organisations

Rationality

- limited rationality

- objective rationality

Regional Local Government

Regional units

Relations between regional units and provinces

Report of the Administrative Reform Consultation Board

Research on Public Administration

Revenues of Municipalities
Revenues of Provincial Local Government
Rohr, John A.
Rural Municipality

Scalar and functional processes
Scalar principle
Scientific Management
Scott, William G.
Secular state
Separation of powers
Simon, Herbert
Sizes of provinces
Social state
Span of control
Staff
Staffing
State Economic Enterprises
State of law
State Planning Organisation
Structure
Structural Descriptive Approach
Structural levels
Supreme Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors

Taylor, Frederick W.

Unity of command
Universities

Weber, Max
Wilson, Woodrow

Village Assembly

