BECOMING AN EFFECTIVE PUBLIC MANAGER IN THE GLOBAL WORLD: DISTRICT GOVERNORS IN TURKEY

Muhammet Kösecik(*) Naim Kapucu(**) Yasin Sezer(***)

Abstract

The paradigm shift from the traditional model of public administration to new public management since the mid-1980s in the western countries, coupled with the opportunities and challenges of the globalisation for the governments, puts public servants at the crossroads requiring them to adapt to new principles of public sector management. Public servants particularly in high-profile public offices now need to adjust themselves to a new style of public manager' characteristic. This study seek to examine the extent to which characteristics of public managers in the new form of public management exist in the case of selected district governors and to explore how general source of constraints within the Turkish public administrative system are perceived by district governors as significant obstacles to be effective and efficient public managers. The findings of the research shows that district governors in general are considerably good at managing internal components and external constituencies of the organization for which they are responsible. However, they need to develop their personal capital in certain aspects. Respondent district governors complaint that certain source of constraints in Turkish administrative system exist as significant obstacles to be effective and efficient public managers.

Key Words: New Public Management, Public Managers, District Governors.

1. Introduction

The 1980s and 1990s have seen a plethora of reinventing, rationalizing, reengineering and reforming initiatives designed to improve the organizational efficiency and effectiveness of the public service. The rigid, hierarchical, bureaucratic form of public administration, which has predominated for most of the twentieth century, is changing to a flexible, market-based form of public management. Traditional public administration has been discredited theoretically and practically, and the adoption of new public management means the emergence of a new paradigm in public administration (Hughes, 1998; Aucoin, 1990; Cohen and Eimicke, 1995).

(*) Assist.Prof., Pamukkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Public Administration Department
(**) Ph.D. Student, University of Pittsburg, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
(***) Assist.Prof., Pamukkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Public Administration Department

The core reform ideas and principles included in most national efforts of the past two decades are frequently lumped under the term of 'managerialism' (Pollitt, 1993; Peters, 1996; Aucion, 1990), 'new public management' (Hood, 1991); 'market-based public administration' (Lan, Zhiyong and Rosenbloom, 1992); 'the post bureaucratic paradigm' (Barzelay, 1992) or 'entrepreneurial government' (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). These essentially described the same phenomenon. Rhodes, drawing from Hood (1991), saw managerialism in Britain as a 'determined effort of economy, efficiency and effectiveness at all levels of British government and argued that central principles of new public management have focused on management, not policy, and on performance appraisal and efficiency; the desegregations of public bureaucracies into agencies which deal with each other on a user-pay basis; the use of quasi-markets and contracting out to foster competition; cost cutting; and a style of management which emphasizes, amongst other things, output targets, limited-term contracts, monetary incentives and freedom to manage' (Rhodes, 1991:1).

Osborne and Gaebler in the United States develop a more positive approach deriving from their view that governments need to be 'reinvented'. They claim that they believe in government and government can do much that markets cannot. Yet, they claim that bureaucracy is neither necessary nor efficient and therefore new management techniques should be transferred and used in the public sector. They set out a ten-point programme for what they term entrepreneurial governments (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992:20).

> Most entrepreneurial governments promote competition between service providers. They empower citizens by pushing control out of the bureaucracy, into the community. They measure the performance of their agencies, focusing not on inputs, but on outcomes. They are driven by their goals-their missions-not by their rules and regulations. They redefine their clients as customers and offer them choices…they prevent problems before they emerge, rather than simply offering services afterward. They put their energies into earning money, not simply spending it. They decentralize authority, embracing participatory management. They prefer market mechanism to bureaucratic mechanism. And they focus not simply on providing public services, but on catalysing all sectors-public, private and voluntary-into action to solve their community's problems.'

'Reinventing government' was closely followed in the United States by the National Performance Review conducted by Vice-President Al Gore. This review was clearly influenced by Osborne and Gaebler in diagnosing the problem of too much bureaucracy, the solutions advanced and the language of reinvention used. Gore report argued (Gore, 1993:3):

From the 1930s through the 1960s, we built large, top-down, centralized bureaucracies to do the public's business. They were patterned after the corporate structures of the age: hierarchical bureaucracies in which task were broken into simple parts, each the responsibility of a different layer of employees, each defined by specific rules and regulations. With their rigid preoccupation with standard operating procedure, their vertical chains of command, and their standardized services, these bureaucracies were steady-but slow and cumbersome. And in today's world of rapid change, lightning-quick information technologies, tough global competition, and demanding customers, large, top-down bureaucracies-public or private-don't work very well.

Though the various term, new public management, managerialism, entrepreneurial government are used, they actually point to the same phenomenon. This is the replacement of traditional bureaucracy by a new model based on markets. Among the key principles underpinning the new model are the following (Ingraham, 1997; World Bank, 1997; Kettl, 1993): The government should only be involved in those activities that cannot be more efficiently and effectively carried out by non-governmental bodies; any commercial enterprises retained within the public sector should be structured along the lines of private sector companies; the goals of governments, departments, and individual public servants should be stated as precisely and clearly as possible; potentially conflicting responsibilities should, wherever possible, be placed in separate institutions; there should be a clear separation of the responsibilities; preference should be given to governance structures that minimize agency costs and transaction costs; in the interests of administrative efficiency and consumer responsiveness, decision-making powers should be located as close as possible to the place of implementation. No one now is arguing for increasing the scope of government or public bureaucracy.

2. Public Administrators to Public Managers

The difference in meanings of 'public administration' and 'public management' reflects the change of the philosophy in traditional form of public administration model. Public administration is an activity serving the public, and the public servants carry out policies derived from others. It is concerned with procedures, with translating policies into action and with office management. Management includes administration (Mullins, 1996:398-400), but also involves organization to achieve objectives with maximum efficiency, as well as genuine responsibility for results. These two elements were not necessarily present in the traditional public administration system. Public administration focuses on process, on procedures and propriety, while public management involves much more. In this sense, a typical definition of an administrator include the following of rules and regulations, the carrying out of

decisions that are taken by others, following routines, bureaucratic, risk-avoiding and so on. In contrast, a manager, instead of merely following instructions, a public manager focuses on achieving results and taking responsibility for doing so, being dynamic, entrepreneurial, innovative, flexible and so on (Lawton and Rose, 1994:8; Hughes, 1998:6).

In parallel to change from public administration to public management, there has been a trend towards the use of the words 'management' and 'manager' within the public organizations. 'Public administration' has clearly lost favour as a description of the work carried out. The term 'manager' is more common, where once 'administrators' was used. Pollitts notes that they were formerly called 'administrators', 'principal officers', 'finance officers' or 'assistant directors'. Now, they are 'managers' (Pollitt, 1993). Spann emphasizes that this change may simply be a 'fad' or 'fashion' but it reflects a real change in expectations of the person occupying the position, pointing to differences between administration and management (Spann, 1981).

In most of public organizations in advanced states today, public servants increasingly see themselves as managers instead of administrators. They recognize their function as organizing to achieve objectives with genuine responsibility for results, not simply as following orders. Thus, new form of public management also shifts traditional assumptions of skills and attitudes of public services. Particularly, public managers in higher positions are required to embrace principles of new public management or managerialist approach in producing and providing public services. Besides, the technological, political, social, economic and cultural globalisation has changed the context in which governments operate. The challenge to public policy makers is made more acute by "institutionalisations" in fields such as crime, communications, population movements, and product and service markets. Domestic issues are increasingly affected by international actors and events that national governments can not to handle either individually or collectively. The structures of government and policy making systems need to be adjusted if governments are to function effectively in a global environment. A changed global policy environment requires developing of the skills and competences of the public service, especially amongst public officials (OECD, 1996).

The literature on skills and attitudes of public managers in the new form of public management draw a clear picture for effective managers to manage internal components and external constituencies of the organizations, and also to have necessary personal qualifications or skills. Summing up the relevant literature (Hughes, 1998; Behn, 1998; Denhart and Denhardt, 2000; Redman and Mathews, 1997; Kaboolian, 1998; Denhart, 1999; Selvarajah, Duignan and

Suppiah, 1995; Gray, 1995; Synnerström; Lynn, 2001; OECD, 1996; Marshall, Wray and Epstein, 1999) public managers in the new form of public management are required:

-To establish and reiterate clear mission, vision, goals and priorities based on forecast of the external environment and the organization's capacity and to devise operational plans to achieve these objectives;

-To be entrepreneurs of a new, leaner organizations, disposed to take risks, purposeful, imaginative and intuitive, inclined to act;

-To look for opportunities to act;

-To enable effective community participation, forge partnership, managing the processes that enhance problem solving;

-To have a knowledge of international affairs, cross-cultural sensitivities and foreign language skills;

To have skills to organize, motivate and direct the actions towards the creation and achievement of goals that warrant the use of public authority and competent use of public authority;

-To have clearly defined responsibility within the administrative context;

-To improve the quality of the output, improve external communications, develop services and to explain what the public institutions are doing and why;

-To create incentives for performance improvement;

-To have global and holistic perspectives and an ability to coordinate their work with both national and international institutions;

-To enable decisions to be made at the lowest possible level thus promoting delegation of authority and creating smaller and stronger units, to sense trends that will influence the organization's future environment –global and local- and position the organization to benefit from new opportunities;

-To stay alert and view change as an opportunity;

-To help the organization reinvent itself by constantly exploring and examining the mind-sets, perceptions and practices of members, constituencies, staff, and other stake holders;

-To deploy and disperse power;

-To create an environment where all individuals are encouraged to participate fully in the organization, to make their maximum contribution, regardless of race, gender, functional specialty, physical challenge, geographic origin, age, lifestyle, social status, tenure in the organization or position;

-To manage technology and distribute information and keep it relevant so that it meets individual needs to achieve desired outcomes;

-To model integrity and ethical behaviour since political activity around the globe are being scrutinized an public is demanding change and retribution, honesty and virtue;

-To respects and values people, put people first, cares about them;

-To allow people to bring their total potentials to work, providing the means for all workers to develop their own ideas;

-To achieve continuous monitoring of the environment and to reflect the demands of the environment to organizational changes;

-To mobilize resources and motivate people;

-To articulate their organization's purpose and motivate people to achieve it;

-To encourage people to develop new systems for pursuing that mission;

-To posses commercial, negotiating, communication and management skills;

-To be customer/citizen oriented, creative and innovative;

-To posses a strong sense of personal responsibility as well as strategic corporate perspective.

3. A Research on District Governors: Sample, Objectives and Methodology

The main concern of this study is to assess the extent to which characteristics of managers in the new form of public management exist in management skills and attitudes of high–profile public servants, district governors of Turkish administrative system. Field administration of the Turkish administrative system is divided into provinces on the basis of geographical situation and economic conditions and public service requirements; provinces are further divided into lower tier of administrative districts. The administration of each of these divisions is headed by an official who is the local representative of the government and has authority over all the civilian branches of the central department in the division, including the police but except the military forces. The head of the a province is the 'governor' *(vali),* who is assigned to the post following an appointment process, the proposal of the minister of Interior, the

decision of Council of Ministers and the approval of the President of the Republic. The head of a sub-province or district is the 'district governor' *(kaymakam),* who is appointed by a joint decree signed by the minister of Interior, the Prime minister and the President of the Republic (İl İdaresi Kanunu, md. 6, 29). Most of the ministries are normally located in the provinces and districts through their local branches staffed by civil servants appointed by the related ministers. Local branches or field administration of ministries carry out their duties under the orders, directives and hierarchy of the governors and district governors, who are the top agents and representatives of each ministry in their assigned territories. Besides, in order to reduce the drawbacks of absolute centralization, the governors are authorized to make certain decisions independently from the central departments. This limited degree of devolution of authority is provided for district governors to have more limited extent under the directions and supervision of governors (Gözübüyük, 2001:154, 158; Günday, 2002:394, 399; Ansay and Wallace, 1996:59).

Despite this limited authority under the control of governor, district governors are responsible from proper functioning of administrative mechanism of state, provision of certain public services in acceptable standards and forging links between citizens, local organizations, voluntary and private, with state institutions and authorities. District governors are selected among very qualified graduates of social sciences and appointed following three-year candidateship period in which they are trained in accordance with requirements of profession. The impetus behind selecting district governors as sample of this study is that district governors are in significant positions to create a necessary environment for the better functioning of ministries' local branches, thus, achieving the effective and efficient public services. In addition, district governors constitute a valuable resource for appointments of future governors or high-profile public servants within the Turkish administrative system. Thus, the examination of their managerial skills and attitudes might help us to comment about some aspects of future directions of public administration in Turkey.

This study is also significant as relevant researches on the leadership attitudes of public administrators (Yıldız, 2002:242) and particularly on managerial/administrative characteristic of governors and district governors in the Turkish administrative system (see Ministry of …) are very limited. Until the 2000s, three major studies deserve particular attention. In 1957, a joint study by Ankara University and New York University on district and province administration was carried out (Feyzioğlu, 1957). Two American researchers conducted a study in 1966 and published in 1971 on public managers in Turkey (Ross and Ross, 1971). Another research was accomplished in 1979 by a

research group producing a comprehensive study on public administrators in the field administration (Fişek, 1976). Following the period requiring radical changes in public administration models of developed countries in the 1980s and 1990s, Ministry of International Affairs Strategy Centre and Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences carried out a valuable survey on governors and district governors (see Ministry of …). The survey sought to assess all aspects of governorship and district governorship as a profession and to critically examine the future of this profession. According to the findings of this study, governors and district governors believe at higher rates (ranking from 75% to 100% out of 100) that for being successful in their profession, they should certainly be initiator, egalitarian, prudent, entrepreneur, realist, participative, leader, amicable, public leader and intellectual. Negative management values within the new form of public management, being archivist, protectionist, rules-oriented, pragmatist, nepotist, showy, emotional, utopian and romantic, are not very much valued as required characteristics for governors and district governors. As for possessed management values, they much believe to have new management values (8,6 point out of 10), while they think to acquire traditional administrative values and traditional state/public service perception values at lower levels, 6.7-6.8. Results also show that great majority of governors and district governors know a foreign language (changing from 90% to 96% according age groups); a considerably high proportion of them use computer (changing from 23% to 95,5% and rising in the younger age groups of under 29 and between 30-39) and internet (changing from 12% to 88% and rising again in the same age groups). However, their level of following professional publications is relatively low, slightly rising from 32% to 47% in middle and following age groups.

In this study, examining 'how constraints or problems within the functioning of Turkish public administration are assessed by selected district governors' is another purpose. General source of constraint or obstacles are well presented in the relevant literature (DPT, 2000; Polatoğlu, 2001; Eryılmaz, 1999; Aktan, 1999; Öztürk and Coşkun, 2000; Tortop, İsbir and Aykaç, 1999; Öztekin, 1997; Ergun and Polatoğlu, 1992) and summarised in Table 3 for the purpose of this study.

Hence, this study has two objectives;

- To examine the extent to which characteristics of public managers in the new form of public management exist in the case of selected district governors,

- To explore how general source of constraints within the Turkish public administrative system are perceived by district governors as significant obstacles to be effective and efficient public managers.

Pursuing these objectives, a questionnaire including manager's characteristics in the new form of public management in three parts (managing internal components, external constituencies and for personal capacity) and source of constraints to be effective and efficient managers, administered to 100 –randomly selected- district governors. The population of districts for which selected governors are responsible to administer range -representing the various population level of those tiers within the Turkish administrative system- from 2,000 to over 51,000 (16 districts between 2,000-10,000, 13 between 11,000-25,000, 23 between 26,000-50,000 and 10 over 51,000). The number of districts is 873 according to 1997 numbers (SIS, 1997). The returned number of questionnaires was 62, which represents about the 7.1% of the total number of district governors.

The questionnaire was completed by a self-assessment method of responding district governors. Allowing respondents to assess themselves has certain limitations, and therefore, the results should be handled with hesitation; but even using this method gives significant insights into this study. The second thread of the questionnaire, an assessment of sources of constraints to be effective and efficient managers would also make valuable contribution to the understanding of obstacles for public servants in performing their professions.

4. Research Findings

The findings of the questionnaire are presented in the following sections.

Table 1: Personal Attributes of District Governors by Age, Education, and Language

Age (%)		Education (%)		Foreign Language Skills (%)	
25-35	48 (77.4)	University	47 (75.8)	Unsatisfactory	-
36-45	12 (19.3)	Master/PhD	15 (24.1)	N. Good nor bad	20 (32.2)
46-55	2 (3.2)	-		Good	34 (54.8)
-		-		Very good	8 (12.9)
Total	62 (100)	Total	62 (100)	Total	62 (100)

Table 2: Personal Attributes of District Governors by Using Computer & Internet

Using Computer (%)		Using Internet (%)		
Doesn't have a computer either in office or		Has a personal	Yes- 7	No 55

home 2 (3.2)	web site	(11.2)	(88.7)
has a computer either in office or home but not connected to internet 3 (4.8)	His org. has a web site	Yes- 21 (33.8)	No 41 (66.1)
has a computer either in office or home and benefiting from internet very much 38 (61.2)	Has e-mail address	Yes- 54 (87)	No 8 (12.9)
has a computer either in office or home and benefiting from internet not too much 19 (30.6)	-	-	-

The majority of respondents are in a younger age group (77.4 % of them is between 25-35), university graduates (75.8 %) with a considerable proportion have master or PhD certificates (24.1 %). More than half of respondents' foreign language level (54.8) appears to be good, while only 12.9 % of respondents' language ability seems to be very good and the rest of sample (32.2 %) possess neither good nor bad language abilities.

As for personal attributes of sampled district governors in using computer and internet facilities, the major part of respondents (61.2 %) replied they have a computer either in office or home and benefit from internet very much, while 30.6 % of them stated they have a computer either in office or home but do not benefit from internet very much. Others stated that they have a computer, either in office or home, but not connected to the internet (4.8 %), or do not have a computer either in office or home (3.2 %). The vast majority of respondents stated that they have a-mail address (87 %), but sweeping number of them appeared to be not having a personal web site (88.7 %). A significant proportion (66.1 %) also stated that the organization for which they are responsible does not have an official web site.

A-CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC MANAGERS

Table 3: Managing Internal Components[1]

Characteristics (Skills or Attitudes) of Public Magers	Very Good(%)	Fairly Good (%)	Neither Good nor Bad (%)	Bad (%)	Total (%)
Setting ambitious but attainable goals for self and the unit	6 (9.6)	44 (70.9)	11 (17.7)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Identifying priorities and deal with them effectively	17 (27.4)	39 (62.9)	5 (8)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Focusing on the results of the service and seeking constant feedback and act on client feedback	24 (38.7)	31 (50)	6 (9.6)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Taking personal responsibility for quality of services	25 (40.3)	29 (46.7)	7 (11.2)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Taking ownership and responsibility for decisions even with a risk of failure	28 (45.1)	25 (40.3)	8 (12.9)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Enabling personnel to participate in policy formulation and key stages of implementation processes	24 (38.7)	27 (43.5)	7 (11.2)	4 (6.4)	62 (100)
Ensuring that personnel, superiors or key decision makers are well informed	28 (45.1)	30 (48.3)	3 (4.8)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Setting client-centred delivery performance targets and establishing performance control system to evaluate results and reward the success	15 (24.1)	33 (53.2)	12 (19.3)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)
Coaching personnel on a client-centred approach	12 (19.3)	29 (46.7)	16 (25.8)	5 (8)	62 (100)
Questioning traditional assumptions/activities/decisions and generating innovative solutions	18 (29)	29 (46.7)	14 (22.5)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)

---

[1] The scale was initially "very good, fairly good, neutral (neither good nor bad), fairly bad and very bad". However, replies to fairly bad and vary bad option was presented in a single category, 'bad' as no respondents saw himself in the 'very bad' category with regard to given characteristics. This point also applies to other replies given in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Table 3: Managing Internal Components (Continued)

Characteristics (Skills or Attitudes) of Public Managers	Very Good(%)	Fairly Good (%)	Neither Good nor Bad (%)	Bad (%)	Total (%)
Promoting an environment conducive to creativity	7 (11.2)	35 (56.4)	16 (25.8)	4 (6.4)	62 (100)
Encouraging all individuals to participate fully in the organisation, to make their maximum contribution regardless of race, gender, functional specialty, physical challenge, geographic origin, age, lifestyle, social status or position in the organisation	28 (45.1)	26 (41.9)	7 (11.2)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Recruiting capable or qualified personnel when required	5 (8)	18 (29)	25 (40.3)	14 (22.5)	62 (100)
Using and directing human, financial, material resources in an effective and efficient way	12 (19.3)	33 (53.2)	15 (24.1)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)
Enabling the organisation to benefit from technology (communication channels, computer-based services, information systems, etc.)	8 (12.9)	32 (51.6)	19 (30.6)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Recognising how/when teamwork is/is not an efficient approach	16 (25.8)	32 (51.6)	11 (17.7)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Enabling personnel to use available sources at a maximum level	6 (9.6)	36 (58)	17 (27.4)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Delegating authority to lower levels in suitable conditions rather than trying to do everything on his own	16 (25.8)	27 (43.5)	16 (25.8)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Providing opportunities for personnel development and training to adjust themselves to change and innovation	11 (17.7)	30 (48.3)	18 (29)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Applying the principles of project management (planning & programming)	11 (17.7)	32 (51.6)	15 (24.1)	4 (6.4)	62 (100)

When we look at the findings about skills and attitudes of district governors in managing internal parts of the organization, they appear to be, or

they regard themselves considerably good. They believe that they are very or fairly good –listing the best skills and attitudes and looking at total number of very good and fairly good replies- at ensuring that personnel, superiors or key decision makers are well informed (93.4%), identifying priorities and deal with them effectively (90.3%), focusing on the results of the service and seeking constant feedback and act on client feedback (88.7 %), encouraging all individuals to participate fully in the organisation, to make their maximum contribution regardless of race, gender, functional specialty, physical challenge, geographic origin, age, lifestyle, social status or position in the organisation (87 %), taking personal responsibility for quality of services (87%), taking ownership and responsibility for decisions even with a risk of failure (85.4 %), enabling personnel to participate in policy formulation and key stages of implementation processes (82.2%), setting ambitious but attainable goals for self and the unit (80.5%) and questioning traditional assumptions, activities or decisions and generating innovative solutions (75.7%).

Regarding neither good nor bad skills and attitudes, they appear to be neither good or bad at recruiting capable or qualified personnel when required (40.3%), enabling the organization to benefit from technology (communicating channels, computer-based services, information systems) (30.6%), providing opportunities for personnel development and training to adjust themselves to change and innovation (29%), enabling personnel to use available sources at a maximum level (27.4%), coaching personnel on a client-centred approach (25.8%), delegating authority to lower levels in suitable conditions rather than trying to do everything on his own (25.8%), promoting an environment conducive to creativity (25.8%). using and directing human, financial, material resources in an effective and efficient way (24.1%), applying the principles of project management (planning and programming) (24.1%), and setting client-centred delivery performance targets and establishing performance control systems to evaluate results and reward the success (19.3%).

When we look at the replies concerning the characteristics at which they regard themselves bad, replies which came ahead of neither good nor bad characteristics, in general, look at the front again; recruiting capable or qualified personnel when required (22.5%), coaching personnel on a client-centred approach (8%), enabling personnel to participate in policy formulation and key stages of implementation processes (6.4%), promoting an environment conducive to creativity (6.4%), applying the principles of project management (planning and programming) (6.4%), enabling the organization to benefit from technology (communicating channels, computer-based services, information

systems) (4.8%), and providing opportunities for personnel development and training to adjust themselves to change and innovation (4.8%).

The replies of sampled district governors presented in Table 4 about managing external constituencies of the organization look very good indeed. They regard themselves good –very or fairly- at respecting for standards of decency and ethical conduct, modelling integrity and honesty (100%), treating people with fairness, dignity and honour commitments (96.7%), showing transparent management style and being open to inform public (93.5%), providing cooperation, partnership and efficient connections with other public organizations (93.5%), avoiding conflict of interests and maintain political neutrality towards politicians and citizens in performing their duties (91.9%), understanding the inner workings of the public service and policy making process in government (90.2%) and acting as a catalyst between public, private and voluntary organizations towards solving social problems (87%). They believe that they are neither good nor bad at setting long term objectives and pursuing cooperation with private and voluntary organization to achieve those plans (14.5%), acting as a catalyst between public, private and voluntary organisations towards solving social problems (9.6%), understanding the inner workings of the Public Service and policy-making process in government (8%), affecting politicians in necessary decisions, contributing the policy making process of the government and demonstrating cooperation with politicians (6.4%), avoiding conflict of interests and maintain political neutrality towards politicians and citizens in performing their jobs (6.4%), and acting in the public interest and understanding the obstacles preventing public interests and goods from being achieved (6.4%). Others regard themselves bad at affecting politicians in necessary decisions, contributing the policy making process of the government and demonstrating cooperation with politicians (14.5%), setting long-term objectives and pursuing cooperation with private and voluntary organizations to achieve the plans (4.8%).

Table 4: Managing External Components

Characteristics (Skills or Attitudes) of Public Managers	Very Good (%)	Fairly Good (%)	Neither Good nor Bad (%)	Bad (%)	Total (%)
Understanding the inner workings of the Public Service and policy-making process in government	29 (46.7)	27 (43.5)	5 (8)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Affecting politicians in necessary decisions, contributing to the policy making process of the government and demonstrating cooperation with politicians	10 (16.1)	38 (61.2)	4 (6.4)	9 (14.5)	62 (100)
Avoiding conflict of interests and maintain political neutrality towards politicians and citizens in performing his job	41 (66.1)	16 (25.8)	4 (6.4)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Providing cooperation, partnership and efficient connections with other public organisation	27 (43.5)	31 (50)	4 (6.4)	-	62 (100)
Acting in the public interest and understanding the obstacles preventing public interests and goods from being achieved	44 (70.9)	14 (22.5)	4 (6.4)	-	62 (100)
Showing transparent management style and being open to inform public	31 (50)	27 (43.5)	2 (3.2)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)
Respecting for standards of decency and ethical conduct; modelling integrity and honesty	40 (64.5)	22 (35.4)	-	-	62 (100)
Setting up long-term objectives and pursuing cooperation with private and voluntary organisation to achieve those plans	15 (24.1)	35 (56.4)	9 (14.5)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Acting as a catalyst between public, private and voluntary organisations towards solving social problems	14 (22.5)	40 (64.6)	6 (9.6)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)
Treating people with fairness, dignity and honour commitments	49 (79)	11 (17.7)	2 (3.2)	-	62 (100)

Table 5: Personal Capacities

Characteristics (Skills or Attitudes) of Public Managers	Very Good (%)	Fairly Good (%)	Neither Good norBad (%)	Bad (%)	Total (%)
Committing continuous learning for themselves and their environment and listening for understanding and learning	20 (32.2)	40 (64.5)	2 (3.2)	-	62 (100)
Knowing how to balance his workload and personal life and investing extra effort when required without jeopardising own balance	14 (22.5)	39 (62.9)	6 (9.6)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Developing intellectual capital and making activities in this way (participating in professional meetings and local/national media events, writing articles to professional/academic journals, etc.)	7 (11.2)	26 (41.9)	22 (35.4)	7 (11.2)	62 (100)
Having satisfactory knowledge and skills of international relations and developments, international law and politics, cross-cultural sensitivities that is important for your current or future responsibilities	7 (11.2)	32 (51.6)	17 (27.4)	6 (9.6)	62 (100)
Using and taking advantage off technology (information systems, computer, internet, etc.) to assist in achieving results	15 (24.1)	32 (51.6)	13 (20.9)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)
Possessing required language (foreign) skills to perform his/her duties	13 (20.9)	34 (54.8)	13 (20.9)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)

When we look at the skills and attitudes of managers for personal capacity, the picture significantly differs from the previous results as a considerable numbers of district governors indicating the absence of required characteristics. They see themselves good –very or fairy- at committing continuous learning for themselves and their environment and listening for understanding and learning (96.7%), knowing how to balance their workload personal life and investing extra effort when required without jeopardising own balance (85.4%), using and taking advantage off technology (information systems, computer, internet, etc.) to assist in achieving results (75.7%), possessing required language (foreign) skills to perform their duties (75.7%),

having satisfactory knowledge and skills of international relations and developments, international law and politics, cross-cultural sensitivities that is important for their current or future responsibilities (62.8%) and developing intellectual capital and making activities in this way (participating in professional meetings and local/national media events, writing articles to professional/academic journals, etc.) (53.1%). They regard themselves neither good nor bad at developing intellectual capital and making activities in this way (participating in professional meetings and local/national media events, writing articles to professional/academic journals, etc.) (35.4%), having satisfactory knowledge and skills of international relations and developments, international law and politics, cross-cultural sensitivities that is important for their current or future responsibilities (27.4%), possessing required language (foreign) skills to perform their duties (20.9%), and using and taking advantage off technology (information systems, computer, internet, etc.) to assist in achieving results (20.9%). They regard themselves bad at developing intellectual capital and making activities in this way (participating in professional meetings and local/national media events, writing articles to professional/academic journals, etc.) (11.2%), having satisfactory knowledge and skills of international relations and developments, international law and politics, cross-cultural sensitivities that is important for their current or future responsibilities (9.6%), knowing how to balance their workload and personal life and investing extra effort when required without jeopardising own balance (4.8%), possessing required language (foreign) skills to perform their duties (3.22%), and using and taking advantage of technology (information systems, computer, internet, etc.) to assist in achieving results (3.2%).

B-SOURCES OF CONSTRAINTS TO BE EFFECTIVE PUBLIC MANAGERS

Table 6: Source of Constraints to be Effective Managers

Source of Constraints	Very imp Cons. (%)	Uite imp. Cons (%)	Neither & Neutral (%)	Not at all a const. (%)	Total (%)
Public administration system is inefficient in general and the government involved itself in too many activities	26 (41.9)	30 48.3)	-	6 (9.6)	2 (100)
Public managers do not possess management skills/attitudes compared to private sector managers' management approach that is what managers in public organisations need.	11 (17.7)	35 (56.4)	5 (8)	11 (17.7)	62 (100)
Ethical values and disciplines of individuals in performing their jobs are weak, therefore, effectiveness and efficiencies of organisations are not easy	32 (51.6)	25 (40.3)	2 (3.2)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Corruption within the public organisations and political dictation from higher offices negatively affect taking and implementing decisions	41 (66.1)	7 (27.4)	3 (4.8)	1 (1.6)	62 (100)
Resources are lacking (personnel, equipment, financial) and modernising available resources is slow or inadequate	28 (45.1)	30 (48.3)	1 (1.6)	3 (4.8)	62 (100)
Public managers are not able to recruit highly skilled personnel and have inadequate personnel development	25 (40.3)	4 (54.8)	1 (1.6)	2 (3.2)	62 (100)

Table 6 Source of Constraints to be Effective Managers (Continued)

Source of Constraints	Very imp. Cons. (%)	Quite imp. Const. (%)	Neither & Neutral (%)	Not at all a const. (%)	Total (%)
Central government embraces centralised approach in taking and implementing decision, interferes with internal workings of organisations, and avoid delegating authority to lower levels	34 (54.8)	26 (41.9)	1 (1.6)	(1.6)	2 100)
Views of public managers at lower levels are not asked or taken into consideration in decision-making processes	22 (35.4)	32 (51.6)	3 (4.8)	5 (8)	2 100)
Successful career and good performance are not appraised and appointments and promotions to higher levels are made by political considerations and nepotism rather than meritocracy	30 (48.3)	28 (45.1)	4 (6.4)		2 100)
Unnecessary rules, processes, formalities and red-tape	17 (27.4)	40 (64.5)	3 (4.8)	2 (3.2)	2 100)
Planning, coordination and project management approach are lacking in taking and implementing decision	15 (24.1)	44 (70.9)	2 (3.2)	1 (1.6)	2 100)
Pressure of interest groups and local/national media	20 (32.2)	28 (45.1)	10 (16.1)	4 (8.4)	2 100)
Managers and personnel avoid changing or questioning traditional assumptions/activities/decisions	14 (22.5)	32 (51.6)	10 (16.1)	6 (9.6)	2 100)
Public managers face difficulties to develop his management abilities and intellectual capital because of inadequate time and resources	10 (16.1)	34 (54.8)	5 (8)	13 (20.9)	2 100)

The findings of the questionnaire shows that great majorities of district governors accept almost all sources of constraints are important –very or quite- obstacles to be effective public managers in the Turkish administrative system. If we list from the most important constraints, central government embraces centralised approach in taking and implementing decision, interferes with internal workings of organisations, and avoid delegating authority to lower levels (96.7%), public managers are not able to recruit highly skilled personnel and have inadequate personnel development (95.1%), planning, coordination and project management approach are lacking in taking and implementing decision (95%), corruption within the public organisations and political dictation from higher offices negatively affect taking and implementing decisions (93.5%), successful career and good performance are not appraised and appointments and promotions to higher levels are made by political considerations and nepotism rather than meritocracy (93.4%), resources are lacking (personnel, equipment, financial)and modernising available resources is slow or inadequate (93.4%), unnecessary rules, processes, formalities and red-tape (91.9%), public administration system is inefficient in general and the government involved itself in too many activities (90.2%), views of public managers at lower levels are not asked or taken into consideration in decision-making processes (87%), pressure of interest groups and local/national media (77.3%), and managers and personnel avoid changing or questioning traditional assumptions/activities/decisions (74.1%). 20.9% of replies do not agree with the constraint of 'public managers face difficulties to develop his management abilities and intellectual capital because of inadequate time and resources'; 17.7% of respondents do not accept the constraint of 'public managers do not possess management skills/attitudes compared to private sector managers' management approach that is what managers in public organisations need'.

5. Conclusion

The findings of the research show that respondent district governors in general possess new management values with regard to internal components and external constituencies of the organization for which they are responsible. This general conclusion coincides with the major findings of the MIAR research. However, results indicate that they need to develop their personal capital in certain aspects mainly in developing intellectual capital and making activities in this way, having satisfactory knowledge and skills of international relations and developments, international law and politics, cross-cultural sensitivities that is important for their current or future responsibilities, knowing how to balance their workload and personal life and investing extra effort when required without jeopardising own balance, possessing required language skills

to perform their responsibilities and using and taking advantage of technology to assist in achieving results.

The results also manifest that there are certain constraints within the Turkish public administrative system impeding being effective public managers. Major constraints are found as centralist top-down approach of central government, corruption within the public organizations and political pressure from higher offices, lacking resources (personnel, equipment, financial), inability of managers to recruit qualified personnel, appointments based on political considerations and nepotism, unnecessary rules, processes, formalities and red-tape, lacking of planning, programming and project management principles and so on.

The general conclusion for Turkish central government is very explicit. Crucial parts of its administrative apparatus, district governors, underline the generally recognized problems of the public administration system and regard them as very important obstacles to be effective and efficient public managers. The onus is explicitly on the government to reform the public administration system to catch up with the changes in the public management systems of advanced countries of the global world and to be able to benefit from its qualified, dynamic and determined public servants in providing public services in modern forms.

ÖZET

KÜRESEL DÜNYADA ETKİN BİR KAMU YÖNETİCİSİ OLMAK: TÜRKİYE'DE KAYMAKAMLAR

Batı ülkelerinde, 1980'lerin ortalarından itibaren, geleneksel kamu yönetimi modelinden yeni kamu işletmeciliğine doğru gelişen ve küreselleşmenin yarattığı fırsatlar ve tehditlerle birleşen paradigma değişimi, kamu yöneticilerini açısından, kamu sektöründe oluşan yeni prensiplere uyum sağlama zorunluluğu doğurmuştur. Kamu yöneticilerinin, özellikle üst düzey görevde bulunanların, artık kamu yönetimindeki yeni kamu işletmeciliği modelinin gerektirdiği yeni stile uyum sağlamaları gerekmektedir. Bu çalışma, yeni kamu işletmeciliği modelinde gereken yönetici niteliklerinin kaymakamlar örneğinde ne ölçüde bulunduğunu incelemeye ve Türk kamu yönetimi sistemindeki genel sorun alanlarının, kaymakamlar tarafından, başarılı bir yönetici olmayı engelleyen faktörler olarak nasıl algılandığını ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır. Çalışmanın bulguları, kaymakamların genel olarak, yönetiminden sorumlu oldukları çevreye ait iç ve dış unsurlar açısından başarılı olduklarını

göstermektedir. Bununla beraber, kaymakamların belirli açılardan kişisel kapasitelerini geliştirmeye ihtiyaç duydukları ortaya çıkmıştır. Türk yönetim sistemindeki yapısal sorunlar ise, başarılı bir kamu yöneticisi olmayı zorlaştıran önemli engeller olarak görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yeni Kamu Yönetimi, Kamu Yöneticileri, Kaymakamlar.

REFERENCES

AKTAN, Coşkun Can (1999), "Türkiye'de Toplam Kalite Yönetiminin Kamu Sektöründe Uygulanmasına Yönelik Öneriler", *Türk İdare Dergisi,* Mart, Sayı. 422.

ANSAY, Tuğrul and WALLACE, Don (1996), *Introduction to Turkish Law* (London: Kluwer Law International).

AUCOIN, Peter (1990), "Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums." *Governance,* 3 (2), 115-137.

BARZELAY, Michael (1992), *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

BEHN, Robert D. (1998), "What Right do Public Managers have to Lead", *Public Administration Review,* V. 58, No. 3, pp. 209-24.

COHEN, Steven and WILLIAM EIMICKE (1995), *The New Effective Public Manager.* San Francisco: Jossey - Bass Publishers.

DENHART, Robert (1999), "The Future of Public Administration", *Public Administration & Management,* Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 279-292.

DENHART, Robert B. and DENHARDT, Janet Vinzant (2000) "The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 549-59.

DPT (2000) VIII. *Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı Kamu Yönetimi Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu* (Ankara: DPT)

ERGUN, Turgay and Polatoğlu, Aykut (1992), *Kamu Yönetimine Giriş,* 4. Basım (Ankara: TODAİE).

ERYILMAZ, Bilal (1999), *Kamu Yönetimi* (İstanbul: Erkam Matbaacılık).

FEYZİOĞLU, Turhan, Arif T. PAYASLIOĞLU, Albert GORVINE and Mümtaz SOYSAL "Carriedout this Study Together with Contributions of Gisbert Flanz, Şeref GÖZÜBÜYÜK, Sait OBUT, Cemal AYGEN and Orhan TÜRKAY See", *Kaza ve Vilayet İdaresi Üzerine Bir Araştırma* (A Research onDistrict and Province Administration) (AÜ SBF Yayın No: 77 – 59, 1957).

FİŞEK, (Ed.) Kurthan, *Toplumsal Yapıyla İlişkileri Bakımından Türkiye'de Mülki İdare Amirliği: Sistem ve Sorunlar* (Field Administrators in Turkey in Tersms of Social Structure: System and Problems) (Ankara, Türk İdareciler Derneği, 1976).

GORE, Al (1993), *The Gore Report on Inventing Government: Creating a Government that Works Better and Cost Less*, Report of the National Performance Review (New York: Times Books).

GÖZÜBÜYÜK, Şeref (2001), *Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı,* 7. Bası (Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi).

GRAY, Sandra T. (1995), "Fostering leadership for the new millennium", *Association Management*, Vol 47 (January)

GÜNDAY, Metin (2002), *İdare Hukuku,* 5. Baskı (Ankara: İmaj Yayıncılık)

HOOD, Christopher, (1991), "Public Management for All seasons" *Public Administration,* V. 69 (3).

HUGHES, Owen (1998), *Public Management & Admnistration* (London: Macmillan).

İl İdaresi Kanunu, No: 5442, Tarih: 10/06/1949, R.G. Tarihi: 18/6/1949, R.G. Sayı: 7236.

INGRAHAM, Patricia W. (1997), "Play it again, Sam; it's still not right: searching for the right notes in administrative reform". *Public Administration Review*, July-August v57n4 p325.

KABOOLIAN, Linda (1998), "The new public management: challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate", *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 189-93.

KETTL, D. 1993. *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private markets.* Washington DC: Broodings Institution

LAN, Zhiyonk and ROSENBLOOM, David H. (1992), "Editorial", *Public Administration Review,* 52, (6).

LAWTON, Alan and ROSE, Aidan (Organisation and Management in the Public Sector (London: Pitman).

LYNN, Laurence E. (2001), *Handbook of Public Administration* (London: Sage Publication).

MARSHALL, Martha, Wray, Lyle and Epstein, Paul (1999), "21st century community focus: better results by linking citizens, government, and performance measurement", *Public Management,* Vol. 81, no. 10, pp. 12-18.

Ministry of International Affairs Strategy Centre and Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences, *MİAR: Mülki İdare Araştırması* (www.ankara.edu.tr/faculty/political/html/eng/miar/).

MULLINS, Laura J. (1996), *Managament and Organisational Behaviour* (London: Pitman).

OECD (1996) *Globalisation: What Challenges and Opportunities for Governments?* (Paris: OECD).

OSBORNE, David and Gaebler, Ted (1992), *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley).

ÖZTEKİN, Ali (1997) *Yönetim Bilimine Giriş* (Ankara: Turhan).

ÖZTÜRK, Namık Kemal and Coşkun Bayram (2000) "Kamu Hizmetlerinde Kalite: Etiksel Bir Bakış", *Türk İdare Dergisi,* Mart 2000, Sayı 426.

PETERS, Guy B. (1996), *The Future of the Governing: Four Emerging Models.* Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

POLATOĞLU, Aykut (2001), *Kamu Yönetimi: Genel İlkeler ve Türkiye Uygulaması* (Ankara: METU Press).

POLLITT, Cihristopher (1993), *Managerialism and the Public Services: Cuts or Cultural Change in the 1990s* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

REDMAN, Tom and MATHEWS, Brian P. (1997), "What do recruiters want in a public sector manager", *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 26 (Summer 1997), pp. 245-56.

RHODES, R.A.W. (1991), "Introduction", *Public Administration*, 69, (1).

ROSS, L. Leslie, Jr. and Noralau P. Ross, *Managers of Modernization and Elites in Turkey* (Cam. Mass; Harvard Univ. Press, 1971).

SEVARAJA, Christopher T., Duignan, Patrick and Suppiah, Chandraseagran (1995), "In search of the Asean leader: an exploratory study of the dimensions that relate excellence in leadership", *Management International Review,* Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 29-44.

SIS (State Institure of Statistics) (1997), *İstatistiki Bilgiler* (Ankara: SIS).

SPANN, R.N. (1981), "Fashions and fantasies in public administration", Australian Journal of Public Administration), 40, pp. 12-25.

SYNNERSTRÖM, Staffan (1998), "Professionalism in Public Service Management: The Making of Highly Qualified, Efficient and Effective Public Managers", paper presented at National and International Approaches to Improving Integrity and Transparency in Government, organized by OECD, the organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Economic Development Institute (EDI) of the World Bank, Paris, 15-16 July.

TORTOP, Nuri, İSBİR, Eyüp G. and AYKAÇ, Burhan (1999), *Yönetim Bilimi* (Ankara: Yargı).

World Bank. (1997), *World Development Report.* Washington: D.C.: World Bank.

YILDIZ, Murat (2002) "Liderlik Yaklaşımları ve Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Liderlik Araştırmaları", *Türk İdare Dergisi*, Sayı 435, Haziran 2002, Yıl 74, s. 242.