


# Chapter 7

## Higher Public Officials on Direct Citizen Participation in Turkey: Institutionalized vs. Curious Public Administrators

**Ayşegül Saylam**

*Hacettepe University, Turkey*

**Naci Karkın**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0321-1212>  
*Pamukkale University, Turkey*

**Belgin Uçar Kocaoğlu**

*Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey*

### ABSTRACT

*Governments are expected to introduce public policies to empower citizens to engage in government business for various reasons including trust building. This chapter presents enablers/barriers before direct citizen participation (DCP) in Turkey by employing interviews conducted with higher public administrators at the ministerial level. The results reveal that DCP is mostly used for informing and consultation purposes rather than fostering a citizen deliberation. The main barriers before DCP are found as centralized bureaucratic structure, lack of administrators' awareness for DCP, and a lack of participation culture. The authors argue that DCP could be fostered where public officials are curious rather than institutionalized.*

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-2372-8.ch007

This chapter published as an Open Access Chapter distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and production in any medium, provided the author of the original work and original publication source are properly credited.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Direct citizen participation (DCP) is a process where citizens are regarded as stakeholders, rather than being subjects with regard to designing and implementing public service, including a number of important sub-processes. It has also a number of dimensions that would attract various disciplines. In this chapter, the authors focus on public administration (PA) dimension. DCP is the key for co-production of public service provision, of which there are some preliminary stages ranging from access to information to providing citizens with empowerment to engage in public affairs. Leaving aside some important questions on citizen participation (i.e. who to participate, how to participate and to which extent to participate) in order to discuss in following sections in detail, direct citizen participation is functional for many reasons. There are many reasons for governments to promote DCP and its supporting mechanisms (i.e. access to information and dissemination of open government data). Raising government legitimacy and trust building seem the most important (Dudley, Webb Farley, & Banford, 2018). Thus we aim to give a theoretical and conceptual perception of citizen participation with regard to current public administration theories, approaches and paradigms while referencing to a plea for new kind of practical, conceptual and theoretical perspectives. The growing need to give more room for cases from developing countries (Xue, 2018), reorganization of PA curricula (Roberts, 2018) and a new administrative doctrine as curious public administrator (Hatcher, 2019) could be stated as examples.

The authors selected Turkey as a study case since she reflects some complicated status with regard to DCP. Turkey, on the one hand, aims to finalize negotiations to prove necessary for accession to the EU, thus fosters many mechanisms including DCP. On the other hand, it is largely affected by turmoils in the Middle East causing to be accused of an axis shift. From a theoretical perspective, Turkey is a follower country, mostly and deeply affected by Anglo-Saxon PA tradition, though being a continental European country set its administrative structure similar to the French administrative system.

The chapter thus has an aim to seek possible answers for the following questions as:

- What is the level of DCP and how it is perceived by appointed high officials in Turkey?
- What are the advantages, the disadvantages and the obstacles of DCP?

The chapter includes five parts. In the first part, the authors present conceptual and theoretical frameworks. In the following part, a brief and descriptive note on the Turkish PA context and development of DCP in Turkey are given. Part three consists of a case study performed with senior and middle level administrators

in concurring with ministerial website research, and analysis of various official reports. In part four the authors aim to lay down the level of DCP in Turkish PA in align with the scope of the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) citizen participation typology. In the final part the authors make discussions and draw the conclusion.

## **THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND**

From a conceptual point of view, there are some interchangeable words used for DCP as citizen engagement, citizen involvement, citizen participation, public participation, or community participation. Although the terms might differ from each other in essence, they are usually used interchangeably in the literature (Nabatchi & Amsler, 2014).

Traditional public administration little or no promotes citizen-government interactions, or citizen participation into government business, except for classical public relations (PR) function. Actually, it is asserted that “the role of participation in public administration has historically been one of ambivalence” (King, Feltey & Susel, 1998, p.318). Even PR function is designed as a one-way relationship until late when governments are expected to develop multi-way interaction with their stakeholders, including public at large.

Interest shown on DCP in PA is a result of various factors (King et al., 1998), including transparency, accountability, and collaboration which would increase the citizen trust in return. Yet regarding DCP in PA, citizens and administrators are required to have a transformation in their mindsets. This is in line with the latest plea in literature on transforming PA curricula to educate PA students better and fit with the demands coming from bottom-up (Brinkerhoff, 2018; Nabatchi, 2018) and the curious public administrator (Hatcher, 2019). Among all, it is utmost necessity to be aware of DCP acceptance level of public administrators with regard to its basic assumptions given the traditional PA theory. Thus the authors need to look at assumptions and presuppositions of current theories in relation to DCP at first.

DCP in traditionally framed administrative and political context is hard, even in administrative structures that foster active citizenship like US (King et al., 1998). Among causes, the mindset shaped by traditional PA theory comes at front. DCP is mostly an issue of modern and post-modern theories. In the 1970s, some issues in PA caused by the welfare state were addressed by adopting the principles of the ‘New Public Management’ (NPM) approach. The NPM approach defends a neo-liberal perspective, mainly by economical sense. NPM argues that efficiency and effectiveness in public sector are a matter of implementation of private management techniques in public sector settings. In this context, a good number of

public administrations began to adapt the new approach by implementing private management techniques in government business (Spano, 2009). Later in 1990s, it was proved that NPM added new issues to the PAs since its main perspective was about economical and financial variables rather than promoting public service ethos. Diefenbach (2009, p. 893) states that “the basic idea of NPM is to make public sector organizations – and the people working in them! – much more ‘business-like’ and ‘market-oriented’, that is, performance-, cost-, efficiency- and audit-oriented.” Thus, O’Flynn (2007, p. 353) argues that “cracks have appeared and the search for a new way of thinking about, and enacting public management practice has begun, in part to address the supposed weaknesses of NPM.” Therefore, it is clear that a few theoretical and conceptual attempts emerged to replace the NPM in public sector settings. Among them, public value(s) perspective (PVs), new public service (NPS) and some derivatives of governance and cooperation through actors in networks are at front. Lately the curious public administrator is plead as the new administrative doctrine (Hatcher, 2019) to foster public participation and empathy among public officials. As for previous examples, Stoker (2006) asserts that PV constitutes a new paradigm in post-NMP era (p. 46). In particular, in his seminal work, Moore (1995, p. 53) pointed out that the PV approach is different from the aims of the public and private sector because the latter aims at obtaining profit while the main objective of the public sector is to produce PVs. On the one hand, he simply argues that “the aim of managerial work in the public sector is to create public value just as the aim of managerial work in the private sector is to create private value” (1995, p. 28). However, it is arguable that Moore abstains from defining what the public value is and how it should be framed (Jorgensen and Bozeman, 2007, Fisher and Grant, 2013) while he insists that the main of the public sector is to produce PV (1994, p. 296; 1995, p. 28, 55). On the other hand, Denhardt and Denhardt (2001) emphasize that basic democratic values as being more important than mere economical efficiency and effectiveness efforts, if publicness is at stake. They see promoting citizens to articulate shared interests more crucial than steering the government business (2000, p. 549). In parallel with these views, efforts to DCP have begun to appear widely in the field of public administration discipline and practice. Jakobsen, James, Moynihan and Nabatchi (2016) strongly favor that the PA scholarship should focus more on the interactions between citizens and government and the role of citizens in public policy formulation and implementation. Lowndes, Pratchett and Stoker (2001) asserts that central government imposes new regulations on local governments to engage more with consulting the local public, which is concurrent with innovation of some local governments to do more with their local constituents.

The main benefits of DCP include the informing the citizens, increasing trust towards public institutions among others. It also strengthens the relationship between the citizens and public institutions. In this context, DCP is supposed to ensure transparency, accountability and legitimacy of public institutions, improving the quality of decisions taken by the public authorities, and to develop justice and fairness (Lukensmeyer & Jacobson, 2013; Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015; Gramberger, 2001; Callahan, 2007). Dudley et al. (2018) argues that while public agencies do work to engage the public into government business, there are still many challenges to achieving meaningful public participation. Similarly, Hong and Cho (2018) argues that few scholars have produced evidence to support benefits of DCP. Roberts (2008, p.7), on the other hand, expressed some dilemmas of DCP including headers' size, excluded or oppressed groups, perceived risk, technology and expertise lack. Those opposed to the idea of DCP argue that it is unreal, time-consuming and costly, and increases complexity, citizens are not knowledgeable or professional enough to participate in a meaningful way, and often they are motivated for their own interests rather than for the public good (Callahan, 2007). For this very point, it should be noted that some questions are crucial in terms of DCP: who is to participate, how to be participated and to which extent participation is allowed? (Sæbø, Rose, & Flak, 2008; Hansen & Prosperi, 2005).

Nabatchi (2012a, p. 6) thinks "public participation is the process (es) by which public concerns, needs, and values are incorporated into decision-making". Based on the definition provided for DCP, fundamental point in DCP is the power share between the governed and the administration (Bishop & Davis, 2002). This share brings an aforementioned questions to mind that to what extent the power will be shared by the administration and citizens or at what extent will it influence the process of decision-making by citizens? In here, it is assumed to give a reference to expectations, opinions and attitudes of appointed public officials since it is feasible that grasping a government's attitude towards citizen participation is reflected via attitudes and opinions of its bureaucrats. Lavee, Cohen and Nouman (2018) asserts the role of street-level bureaucrats on public policy formulation and implementation by arguing their strong influence on policy outcomes and their influence on daily lives of citizens. Thus, it is of importance whether and how higher public officials see and evaluate DCP with regard to public policy design and citizen co-production of public services. In literature, there are some papers dealing with how public administrators evaluate DCP, or related concepts. Yang (2005) asserts that public administrators have neutral affection towards citizens with regard to citizen involvement efforts.

Participation typologies show the levels where the government shares its power with citizens on decision-making and problem-solving process with regard to public policy making. Among the most referenced typologies in the literature, Arnstein's 'Ladder of Citizen Participation' (LCP) (1969, p. 217) takes the front line. As a

seminal work, LCP consists of eight steps, which has been followed by many other participation typologies developed later (Pretty, 1994; Gramberger, 2001). Developed by the IAP2, the public participation typology has recently been the source for many important studies (AbouAssi et al., 2013; Lancer, 2012).

The typology, named as public participation spectrum by IAP2 (see Table 1), consists of 5 levels as ‘inform, consult, involve, collaborate, and empower’. At the ‘inform’ level, the main objective of citizen participation is to inform citizens adequately about the problems, alternatives and solutions. At the ‘consult’ level, citizen feedback is collected by using focus groups and surveys tools. The main objective of the ‘involve’ level is to work directly with citizens with through workshops so as to reflect citizens’ concerns and desires regarding the decisions to be taken. At ‘collaborate’ level, collaboration with citizens is expected in each aspect of the decision to be taken. Lastly, ‘empowerment’ is the stage where citizens are most influential in decision-making, and the main purpose is to leave the last decision to the citizens (IAP2, 2018).

IAP2’s participation typology has received some criticism that citizen participation is examined in terms of decision-making only, while the communication models at every participation stage are not referred (Nabatchi, 2012b). Despite having some gaps, it provides non-negligible convenience in determining level of participation as it clearly gives room to some sample participation tools and aims.

The typologies related to DCP, on the one hand, provide significant contribution to the literature on participation. On the other hand, the studies relating to participation tools constitute another significant research field in the literature. IAP2 (2018), in its typology relating to citizen participation, uses various tools which can be applied in every stage of participation (see Table 1).

Today the citizen participation tools, especially upon development of the ICTs, have developed and diversified. Nonetheless, for selecting the participation tool, it is necessary to have adequate knowledge about the purpose of participation. Failure to select the convenient participation tool would cause a great matter of time and cost for administrations. It also may cause damage to citizens’ trust in government by disappointing them (Lukensmeyer & Jacobson, 2013; Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). In the following part of the chapter, the authors present a brief explanation about the development of DCP in the Turkish Public Administration (TPA).

## **APPEARANCE OF TURKISH PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Having roots in late periods of Ottoman Empire, TPA is shaped by both Eastern and Western dynamics. Endorsing regarded studies (Kapucu & Palabiyik, 2008; Sezen 2011; Sözen 2014; Üstüner & Yavuz, 2018) in literature to its chronological

Table 1. IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate	Empower
Public participation Goal	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the Public	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
Example Techniques	Fact sheets Web sites Open house	Public comment Workshops Focus groups Surveys Public meetings	Deliberative polling	Citizen Advisory Committees Consensus-building Participatory decision making	Citizen Juries Ballots Delegated decisions

Source: Own elaboration adapted from IAP<sup>2</sup> spectrum at IAP<sup>2</sup> website.

developments, this paper gives a description with regard to her latest structure and functions. As is known, TPA is led by one party-in-power and a strong leadership since 2002, excepting a short term of temporary government in 2015. During the Erdogan administration, it must be noted that TPA has been deeply transformed, if not a complete type of change. These changes got a momentum since June, 2017 election. After this election, TPA is to be governed under presidency rule, where the authority and duty of executive functions is solely bearded upon the President.

Establishing all the executive powers under presidency, central administrative agencies of TPA are important from several aspects. First of all, Turkey is a unitary state and the administrative structure is categorically divided into two main sections: the central administration (capital administration and provincial branches) and the local administrations. Having a centralized administration tradition, Turkey experienced an era in which considerable duties and powers were transferred to the local governments with various reforms carried out since the 2000s. Yet main decision-making and implementing powers are still vested into the presidency due to bearing one-and-only executive power. However, in implementing the policies designed at presidency level, the central administration and its field branches take the front as the provincial extensions of the central administration. Given the limitations of the chapter, the authors focus on the citizen participation in the TPA to investigate the DCP in the ministries as the organizations of the central administration.

## **CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE TPA**

The development of DCP in the TPA seems to be in parallel with the developments taking place in contemporary countries. In 80s, with the accelerated movement of liberalization, as apart from rising global NPM paradigm, was also experienced in Turkey under a centralized rule. The principles of NPM gained re-momentum 2000s in the TPA after the Erdogan administration.

There are many developments supporting the DCP movement gained a relative strength when compared to prior terms. An important step for direct citizen participation was taken with the enforcement of the Law on Right to Information on April 24th, 2004. As a result, regarded officials and units were constituted in all public institutions and citizens (and foreigners on the principle of reciprocity) became entitled to request all kinds of information and documents regarding themselves from all kinds of public institutions and organizations, with some exceptions. Moreover, the public financial management and control law included various provisions to support DCP in public administration. Particularly in local administrations, which are the closest units to citizens, DCP practices such as ‘city councils’ have started to widely take place in local governments upon enacting the law on municipalities.



Although abundant studies are available on DCP practices in local governments in Turkey (Adıgüzel, 2013; Demirci, 2010), the literature does not provide any research regarding comprehensive DCP in the central organization of the public administration. Considering this research gap, the authors think that the views and expectations of public officials on DCP in public administration of great importance since they are direct agents of public policy implementation.

## **CASE STUDY: CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION IN TPA**

In this chapter, the authors employed short surveys, semi-structured interviews, and various reports published via the websites of some ministries. Categorical and frequency content analysis were used in the data analysis.

Content analysis, which has a significant place in the analysis of semi-structured or open-ended interviews, has been used widely in quantitative research analysis in recent years (Burnard, 1991). Content analysis is defined by Downe (1992, p. 314) as: “content analysis is a research method that provides a systematic and objective means to make valid inferences from verbal, visual, or written data in order to describe and quantify specific phenomena”. Content analysis is used for analyzing the interviews and a variety of texts regarding citizen participation. For example; in a study by AbouAssi et al. (2013) investigating citizen participation in Lebanon public administration, the instruments such as survey, interview and data archival were used, and the archival data were analyzed with content analysis. King et al. (1998) investigated how to make citizen participation work effectively for both administrators and citizens by using a variety of qualitative tools including interviews and focus group studies.

## **Research Methodology**

In this chapter, the authors first employed a short questionnaire via e-mail to ministries to figure out the level of participation of citizens in TPA with regard to IAP2 typology. Through the questionnaire it is mainly sought which type of participation techniques are employed by the ministries. The e-mails were sent in accordance to the law on the right to information. The data collected through these questionnaires were analyzed with categorical and frequency content analysis in reference to the IAP2. However, the replies from the high level officials at ministries remained below the expected level. Nearly 25% of the recipients denied giving information in reference to article 25. Article 25 of the law says that institutions and organizations have to right to reject demands on information and documents if their own staff and in-house practices are in question. Another 20% were unresponsive

for different reasons, 30% of the recipients did not even send a response without any justification, leaving 25% of the recipients to complete the questionnaire. Since the response rate was low, it seemed unlikely to do content analysis. Yet, in the later stage of the study, an attempt was made to determine the citizen participation level by utilizing other information obtained from the interviews and official documents.

Considering the low rates of responses to the survey, assessments were directed to higher officials of some ministries as Ministry of National Education (MoNE), Ministry of Health (MoH), and Ministry of Family and Social Policies (MoFSP). Selected ministries also correspond to the criteria where DCP has crucial importance. Once the participant ministries had been identified, interviews were held with senior and middle level administrators from those ministries. In the present survey, four senior and two mid-level administrators from the MoH; three senior and two mid-level administrators from the MoNE; and four senior and two mid-level administrators from the MoFSP were interviewed. In the content analysis, the interviewees from the MoH were coded as MH, the MoNE as MNE, and the MoFSP as MFSP. Each interview lasted from 1 to 1.5 hours on average and interviews were conducted through May-July, 2016. The resulting data were coded by using the qualitative form of content analysis.

## **Research Findings**

The data obtained from the interviews were primarily analyzed in connection with research questions (RQs) such as;

RQ1. What is DCP?

RQ2. What are the advantages of DCP?

RQ3. What are the disadvantages of DCP? and

RQ4. What are the obstacles of DCP in TPA?

Then, the authors have directed their efforts to determine the level of DCP in the TPA in light of the interviews and information and documents obtained from the ministries concerned.

RQ1. What is direct citizen participation in public administration?

In light of the interviewees' responses, the question "What is DCP in PA?" was examined under categories of participation through individual feedback during the policy implementation process, active participation of citizens in services, citizens' direct participation in the decision-making process, participation in the

decision-making and implementation process via non-governmental organizations, participation in the decision-making process through democratic elections.

It is observed that three of the representatives of the MoH described direct citizen participation as “citizens’ contribution to the revision of policies by providing feedback through mechanisms such as citizens’ wishes, proposals and complaints” (MH1, MH3, and MH5). Only one administrator outlined citizen participation in public administration as “citizens’ direct participation in the decision-making process” (MH2). However, the respondent added that people should be trained and has certain awareness about the policy to be implemented to ensure the direct participation of citizens in the decision-making process. The interesting point here is that two administrators described direct citizen participation in public administration as “citizens’ active participation in services (MH4)”; “citizens’ receipt of effective services from the institution” (MH6). This can be perceived as an indication that the concept of DCP is not well established among high level administrators yet.

In the MoNE, three respondents defined direct citizen participation as “directing the policies through mechanisms such as complaints and proposals” (MNE3, MNE4, and MNE5). One interviewee defined it as “the involvement of the directly affected person in decision-making process” (MNE1). The remarkable response here was that one of the respondents explained that citizen participation in public administration is realized “by means of political elections” as a means of indirect representation (MNE2).

In the MoFSP, while most of the participants identified direct citizen participation in public administration with direct involvement as “citizens’ reporting their request in person in decision-making” (MFSP2), “identification of the service to be rendered by citizens” (MFSP3), “citizens’ application in the determination of the service” (MFSP4), and “determination of citizens’ request straight from the person” (MFSP5). One interviewee referred to direct citizen participation as “participation in decision-making and implementation process through non-governmental organizations” (MFSP6). Another participant defined the concepts as “participation in policy-making and application process democratic elections and civil society organizations” (MFSP1).

All of the responses from the ministries on RQ1 could be seen in Table 2.

**RQ2. What are the advantages of direct citizen participation in public administration?**

As a response to the question, the participants’ answers were analyzed in categories increasing the quality of decisions and/or services, increasing public awareness, increasing the legitimacy of services and/or policies, transparency in institutions, and ensuring the institution’s control.

## Higher Public Officials on Direct Citizen Participation in Turkey

Table 2. What is DCP in PA?

	Participation Through Individual Feedback During the Policy Implementation Process	Active Participation of Citizens in Services	Citizens' Direct Participation in the Decision-Making Process	Participation in the Decision-Making and Implementation Process Through Non Governmental Organizations	Participation in the Decision-Making Process Through Democratic Elections
<b>MoH</b>					
MH1	*				
MH2			*		
MH3	*				
MH4		*			
MH5	*				
MH6		*			
<b>MoNE</b>					
MNE1			*		
MNE2					*
MNE3	*				
MNE4	*				
MNE5	*				
<b>MoFSP</b>					
MFSP1				*	*
MFSP2			*		
MFSP3			*		
MFSP4			*		
MFSP5			*		
MFSP6				*	

The views falling under the category “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services” were divided into the lower categories of “elimination of shortcomings and mistakes”, “quality”, “effectiveness”, “efficiency”, “productivity”, “planning”, and “determining the needs”. The category “educating citizens” was taken as a sub-category under “increasing public awareness” since it generally indicates to an increase in public awareness. Lastly, the categories “citizens as a reason why institutions exist” and “acceptance of the practices” were described as sub-categories under “increasing the legitimacy of services and/or policies”.

It is seen that the responses of the interviewees from the MoH regarding the advantages of DCP in PA were clustered around the categories of “increasing the legitimacy of services and/or policies” and “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services”. It is also observed that all of the interviewees placed an emphasis on “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services” by making explanations such as “determining the right policies” (MH1), “making the right decision” (MH2 and MH3), “identification of shortcomings” (MH4), and “elimination of shortcomings and mistakes in the service delivery” (MH5 and MH6). In addition, the respondents stressed the advantage of DCP in increasing the legitimacy of services and policies with explanations such as “public administration is for the people” (MH1), “acceptance of practices (MH1), “stance regarding the *raison d’être* (MH 3), “avoiding being against the resource that produce the policy” (MH3), “acceptance of the services and policies” MH3), and “citizens as our target audience” (MH2). Moreover, they made references regarding “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services” by means of explanations such as “planning the future more properly” (MH3), “setting the expectations” (MH3), and “ensuring quality, efficiency, and productivity in the services” (MH5). Apart from that, other explanations were found, though less frequent, such as “educating citizens by informing them” (MH6), “transparency” (MH6), and “increasing the institution’s control” (MH4).

In the MoNE, advantages of DCP in PA were mainly reported as “increasing the legitimacy of services and/or policies” and “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services”. The participants stressed the citizens’ approval in the acceptance of policies and services with propositions such as “citizens affected from policy and decision and provided service” (MNE1), “citizens as recipient of the service, *raison d’être* of the institution, and the approval authority” (MNE4). Another theme was found as “educating the citizens about the policies” (MNE3) and it was also said that “direct participation leads transparency and control in the institution” (MNE2).

In the MoFSP, the advantages of the DCP in PA were seen to cluster around “increasing the quality of decisions and/or services” and “increasing the legitimacy of services and/or policies”. The participants referred to “elimination of shortcomings or mistakes in decisions and/or services” with clues such as “focusing on the problem” (MFSP5), “determining the right service” (MFSP3), and “eliminating the shortcomings” (MFSP4). Another advantage was found to be “increasing the legitimacy of services and policies” implied with statements such as “public administration is for people” (MFSP 2) and “the purpose of the public administration is the citizens, if the public institution alone decides on citizens’ behalf, the institution cannot exist” (MFSP5).

All of the responses from the ministries with regard to RQ2 could be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. What are the advantages of DCP in PA?

	Increasing the Quality of Decisions and/or Services							Increasing Public Awareness	Increasing the Legitimacy of Services and/or Policies		Transparency	Ensuring the Institution's Control
	Elimination of Shortcomings and Mistakes	Quality	Effectiveness	Efficient	Productivity	Planning	Determining the Needs		Citizen as Reason D'être of the Institution	Acceptance of the Practices		
MoH												
MH1	*								*	*		
MH2	*									*		
MH3	*					*		*		*		
MH4	*									*		*
MH5	*	*	*		*							
MH6	*							*			*	
MoNE												
MNE1	*									*		
MNE2	*	*									*	*
MNE3	*							*				
MNE4	*									*		
MNE5		*										
MoFSP												
MFSP1									*			
MFSP2										*		
MFSP3	*											
MFSP4	*											
MFSP5	*		*							*		
MFSP6		*		*				*				

RQ3. What are the disadvantages of direct citizen participation in public administration?

The interviewees' responses were divided into categories of "delaying the decision-making process", "chaos", "cost" and "failure to make the right decision and/or service". Under the latter, the following sub-categories were identified: "failure to ensure representation", "not having sufficient knowledge", "perceiving politics at the level of political discourse" and "individual interests".

In the context of the MoH, the disadvantages of DCP in PA were found to be mainly related to "failure to make the right decision and/or service". Since health issues mostly include policies and services requiring a necessary level of expertise, the disadvantages put forward by the officials from the MoH mainly fell under the sub-category of "not having sufficient knowledge" affiliated with "failure to make the right decision and/or service". Under this category, the participants implied "citizens do not have sufficient knowledge" with ideas such as "citizens' low level of knowledge related to national policy or decisions" (MH1), "demands aren't reasonable" (MH3), "level of knowledge is low" (MH4), and "citizens interested in policies do not have sufficient knowledge" (MH6). In addition, the administrators indicated the disadvantage "delaying the decision-making process" by mentioning "delayed works" (MH5) and "elongation of the process" (MH6). Apart from these, the statements such as "one person's demand may have negative consequences for someone else" (MH1) and "appearance of improper personal requests" (MH5) were under the category "individual interests". Lastly, the statements of some participants such as "lack of homogenous participation" (MH1) and "inability to represent the average expectations" (MH3) were found to refer to "failure to ensure representation" ultimately stressing "failure to make the right decision and/or service".

In the MoNE, the disadvantages noted by the administrators were mainly about "delaying the decision-making process" and "chaos". They pointed out that DCP in PA would "delay the decision-making process" with clues "slowing down the decision-making process" (MNE2), "delaying the decision-making process" (MNE1), "elongation of the decision" (MNE4), and "disruption of the policy" (MNE5). In addition, some gave references to "conflict" (MNE2) and "chaos" (MNE3).

Lastly, in the MoFSP, the disadvantages were seen to be focused on "delaying the decision-making process" and "chaos". The administrators reported the disadvantage of delaying the decision-making process with statements "elongation of the decision" (MFSP1), "elongation of the decision process" (MFSP2), and "delayed decision-making" (MFSP6). Moreover, the statements such as "representation problem" (MFSP2), "personal benefit can be claimed" (MFSP6) and "high costs incurred by the institution for establishment of the system" (MFSP5) lead to the disadvantages "failure to ensure representation", "personal interest" and "costs", respectively.

Table 4. What are the Disadvantages of DCP in PA?

	Delaying the Decision-Making Process	Chaos	Failure to Make the Right Decision and/or Service				Cost
			Failure to Ensure Representation	Not Having Sufficient Knowledge	Perceiving Politics at the Level of Political Discourse	Individual Interests	
MoH							
MH1			*	*		*	
MH2							
MH3			*	*			
MH4		*		*	*		
MH5	*					*	
MH6	*			*			
MoNE							
MNE1	*						
MNE2	*	*					
MNE3		*					
MNE4	*						
MNE5	*						
MoFSP							
MFSP1	*						
MFSP2	*	*	*				
MFSP3							
MFSP4							
MFSP5							*
MFSP6	*	*				*	



All of the responses from the ministries regarding RQ3 could be seen in Table 4.

RQ4. What are the obstacles before direct citizen participation in Turkish public administration?

In the light of the interview data, the research question “what are the obstacles before direct citizen participation in the TPA?” was discussed with notions as “insufficient level of citizen knowledge”, “participation culture”, “bureaucratic elite”, “unconscious administrators for citizen participation”, “underdeveloped NGOs”, “legal arrangements”, “poverty”, “disadvantages of the centralized structure”, and “lack of trust in bureaucrats”. Under the “insufficient level of citizen knowledge” there are two sub-categories as “lack of education” and “lack of expertise”. Other sub-categories such as “difficulty in access”, “failure in equal and fair distribution of sources”, “failure to identify needs”, and “clumsiness” were listed under notion of “disadvantages of the centralized structure”.

The interviewees from the MoH reported the main obstacles of DCP as “unconscious administrators for citizen participation”, “disadvantages of the centralized structure”, “participation culture”, and “insufficient level of knowledge”. Apart from that some arguments as “bureaucrats are more likely to do whatever politicians say” (MH1), “it is primary that administrators want citizen participation (MH2)”, “bureaucrats lack of the attendance understanding and culture” (MH4), “no such culture of bureaucrats” (MH5), “participation is ensured if bureaucrats want to do so, but bureaucrats are more likely to obey their superior’s orders” (MH6) placed emphasis on “unconscious administrators for citizen participation”. Moreover, some statements as “indifference of citizens” (MH3), “state knows best (MH4)”, “lack of demand from citizens” (MH5), “lack of democracy culture of citizens” (MH1), and “the state as father metaphor” (MH6) seem to account for the failure to establish the involvement culture in the country as barriers before participation. The disadvantages of centralized administration such as “difficulty in access to the centre (MH1, MH3, MH5, and MH6), “inability of the centre to determine the needs” (MH6), and “clumsiness” (MH4) were described as main obstacles before citizen participation. Finally, “citizens’ inadequate education regarding the ministry’s services and decisions” (MH1, MH2, MH3, MH4, and MH6) and “expertise” (MH1, MH4, and MH6) were mentioned as major obstacles before participation.

From the point of view of the MoNE administrators, some obstacles were asserted mainly related to “unconscious administrators for citizen participation” and “disadvantages of centralized administration”. It is seen that the explanations such as “administrators deliver and care what they want, do not deliver or care what they do not want” (MNE1), “administrators may not encourage citizen participation” (MNE3), and “bureaucrats often take into account the demands of the hierarchical superior”

Table 5. What are the obstacles of DCP in TPA?

	Insufficient Level of Knowledge (of Citizens)		Participation Culture	Bureaucratic Elite	Unconscious Administrators for Citizen Participation	Underdeveloped NGOs	Legal Arrangements	Poverty	Disadvantages of the Centralized Structure				Lack of Trust in Bureaucrats
	Lack of Education	Lack of Expertise							Difficulty in Access	Failure in Equal and Fair Distribution of Sources	Failure to Identify Needs	Clumsiness	
MoH													
MH1	*	*	*		*	*			*				
MH2	*				*			*					
MH3	*		*					*	*	*			
MH4	*	*	*		*			*				*	
MH5			*		*		*		*				
MH6	*	*	*		*				*		*		
MoNE													
MNE1					*			*	*			*	
MNE2				*									
MNE3	*	*			*								
MNE4				*	*				*				
MNE5					*			*	*				
MoFSP													
MFSP1				*									
MFSP2					*				*				
MFSP3					*			*	*				
MFSP4					*			*	*				
MFSP5			*				*		*				*
MFSP6			*		*				*				

(MNE4) imply administrators' being unconscious of citizen participation. In addition, "inability to access, reach bureaucrats" (MNE1, MNE4, and MNE5) emphasize the "difficulty of access" as a disadvantage of the centralized administration. The striking point here seems that the statements such as "bureaucrats' belief they know best" (MNE2), "they do the best on behalf of citizens" (MNE4) and the concept of "bureaucratic elite" are perceived as obstacles to citizen participation.

The participants from the MoFSP frequently mentioned the obstacles "unconscious administrators for citizen participation" and "difficulty of access to bureaucrats" as a disadvantage of the centralized administration. It is thought that "administrators' mindset is low regarding citizen participation" (MFSP2), "administrators are often single-minded" (MFSP3), "bureaucrats are sometimes not open to different ideas" (MFSP4), "administrators may not want their participation" (MFSP6) all refer to the "unconscious administrators for citizen participation". Another striking explanation seems as "the perception that citizens' demands will not be considered even if conveyed to bureaucrats" (MFSP5) suggests that citizens do not trust bureaucrats.

All of the responses from the ministries regarding RQ4 could be seen in Table 5.

The data obtained from the interviews conducted with participant administrators were used to elicit categories in accordance with content analysis. In the following stages of the study, the citizen participation levels of the particular ministries were evaluated considering the IAP2 participation typology.

## **DISCUSSION**

As a result of field research, the authors found out that DCP in PA is conceived by participants, as seen in Table 6, under categories of citizen participation via feedback in policy implementation process (f6) and direct participation in the decision making process (f6). However, since some administrators describe direct citizen participation as active citizen participation in services (f2), participation in the decision-making process through non-governmental organizations (f2) and through political elections (f3), the authors argue that there is a confusion about DCP at public officials' side. This is in comply with the arguments developed by Meyer-Sahling & Yesilkagit (2011) since conceptualization of public administrators is highly framed by their respective administrative traditions and legacies.

In TPA context, high level officials consider the most important benefit of direct citizen participation as 'increasing the quality of decisions and/or services' by eliminating the shortcomings or mistakes in decisions and/or services (f13). As another advantage, they mentioned increasing the legitimacy of services and policies (f11) so as to legitimize the institution. The positive relation between legitimizing the institution and DCP in PA implies that the reason of institutional existence is

for the citizens. This finding is in line with Dudley et al. (2018) as they argue that DCP yields consequences for legitimacy and trust.

On the other hand, administrators points out that ‘delaying the decision making process (f9)’ and ‘incapable of making decision or providing service inefficiently (f11) are the most important failures of citizen participation. As one of the most important reasons for the latter, the participants assert that citizens do not have the sufficient level of information regarding the decisions, or services. As a remarkable point, cost is considered as a disadvantage by one administrator only. It is understood that overall benefits of citizen participation would be higher than its potential costs. This finding is not in line with the most of the studies in literature. As depicted by Yang (2005), public administrators have mostly negative feelings towards public involvement due to various reasons from losing their assumed authorities to competency issue. Yet this chapter shows and supports the studies in literature on some obstacles before DCP.

The biggest obstacles before direct citizen participation in TPA were listed as; administrators’ being unconscious about citizen participation (f13), difficulty of access as a disadvantage of the centralized structure (f 12), low level of citizens’ knowledge (f10), participation culture (f7), and poverty (f7).

It is arguable that administrators’ being unconscious about citizen participation and low level of citizens’ knowledge is major barriers to DCP in TPA. This is actually due to the lack of a participation culture among administrators and citizens. Thus, an emergent need to train both citizens and administrators for the sake of participation can make an important contribution to overcome this problem. It is undeniable that such training will ultimately contribute to the development of the participation culture in the society at large. This finding is a good example of a need for developing new theories or conceptualizations that would incorporate different administrative traditions. It is clear that PA literature is mainly shaped by studies either developed, or applied in Western world (Welch & Wong 1998; Cheung 2012; Meyer-Sahling & Yesilkagit 2011; Xue, 2018). Thus there should be more room in mainstream public administration literature for Asian, East European, Eastern or African cases in order to understand the developments, or to evaluate the cases aligned with their local roots and context.

During the interviews, the administrators were asked for their opinions about what should be done to overcome the disadvantages falling under the category of the disadvantages of the centralized structure. Seven participants (MFSP2, MFSP3, MFSP4, MNE5, MH3, MH5, and MH6) advocated the strengthening of the regional units of the central administration to overcome this obstacle. Three of the administrators (MFSP5, MFSP6, and MNE1) defended determination of the framework and effective supervision by the central administration. Another three administrators (MNE4, MH1, and MH4) argued that the central administration

should be the decision-making mechanism, but public services should be provided by local government units.

As far as data analyzed infer, solutions for the problems arising from the centralized structure are sought within the structure itself. Nevertheless, the discourses for localization and localization of services seem remarkable. Another interesting point here is that administrators do not regard legal arrangements as obstacle to the participation of citizens in general. Administrators often think laws should not be regarded as an obstacle to an administrator who has consciousness and culture of participation (Table 6).

## CONCLUSION

As is seen from the findings and discussion part, the attitudes and opinions of high level officials regarding DCP are not endorsing full coverage of the public participation spectrum. In our analyzed country case, it is clear that DCP has not gone further than the inform and consult level, though applications related to citizen participation have recently and relatively increased.

*Table 6. Overall Results*

What Is DCP in PA?					
	Participation Through Individual Feedback During the Policy Implementation Process	Active Participation of Citizens in Services	Citizens' Direct Participation in the Decision-Making Process	Participation in the Decision-Making and Implementation Process Through Non Governmental Organizations	Participation in the Decision-Making Process Through Democratic Elections
Total	6	2	6	2	2

*Table 7.*

What Are the Disadvantages of DCP in PA?							
	Delaying the Decision-Making Process	Chaos	Failure to Make the Right Decision and/or Service				Cost
			Failure to Ensure Representation	Not Having Sufficient Knowledge	Perceiving Politics at the Level of Political Discourse	Individual Interests	
Total	9	5	3	4	1	3	1

Table 8.

What Are the Disadvantages of DCP in PA?													
	Increasing the Quality of Decisions and/or Services							Increasing Public Awareness	Increasing the Legitimacy of Services and/or Policies			Transparency	Ensuring the Institution's Control
	Elimination of Shortcomings and Mistakes	Quality	Effectiveness	Efficient	Productivity	Planning	Determining the Needs		Educating Citizens	Citizen as Reason D'être of the Institution	Acceptance of the Practices		
Total	13	4	2	1	1	3	3	2	7	4	2	2	

Table 9.

What Are the Obstacles of DCP in TPA?													
	Insufficient Level of Knowledge (of Citizens)		Participation Culture	Bureaucratic Elite	Unconscious Administrators for Citizen Participation	Underdeveloped NGOs	Legal Arrangements	Poverty	Disadvantages of the Centralized Structure				Lack of Trust in Bureaucrats
	Lack of Education	Lack of Expertise							Difficulty in Access	Failure in Equal and Fair Distribution of Sources	Failure to Identify Needs	Clumsiness	
Total	6	4	7	3	13	1	2	7	12	1	2	2	1

Among the causes many factors could be included, including the fact that Turkey has a tradition of centralized administration. Thus it seems that the way to benefit from citizen participation at full spectrum passes through the increase of the administrators' consciousness. However, it is also pointed out to a notion as political leadership. In our country case, it is also notable to talk about a system change from parliamentary democracy to presidential democracy, where executive power is vested in the president. Therefore, participation culture and opinions about the DCP in Turkey is strictly linked to views and opinions of the president as the national leader. It is plausible to argue that some similar trends are observable in US public administration during the Trump administration. All the public officials might be expected to be a follower (institutionalized) in basic conceptualizations and understandings set forth by the executive function, the government or the President.

As complimentary applications, there is also a need for particular educational processes for public officials to align with the basic necessities demanded by participative culture. For future directions, the authors plea for new studies as to what would be needed to increase awareness of the citizens and administrators about citizen participation, including studies on PA curricula, how to design and implement policies on public employee entrance mechanisms, and lifelong intra-service education.

The results of the chapter has shed light on a number of issues, some of which are regarded as emerging issues in PA literature. Thus the authors specify the contributions of this chapter as such: First of all, the chapter shows that the DCP in PA is not internalized in officials' side. This is mostly in comply with the studies in relevant literature. However, as coherent with the plea of Hatcher (2019, p.3), there is some indication of curiosity in officials' side with regard to public participation. This is to say that empathy and curiosity of bureaucrats are of crucial if the input from stakeholders, citizens in this case, are at stake in order to improve quality of decision-making and building trust in government and its business. Second it is very clear that some of the traditional barriers set by the studies in literature might not have effect on public officials. One prominent example is of potential preventing function of legal framework. The chapter shows that public officials are eager to foster public participation even though legal framework may not support, or empower them to do so, if not completely preventing.

This chapter asserts a need for studies to make a differentiated evaluation how administrative concepts and developments are fostered by elected and how they are evaluated and implemented by appointed public officials. As is known, DCP is politically fostered at national and international levels. However, it is also crucial to determine whether and how street-level bureaucrats, or high level public officials think of regarding its implementation. Another contribution of the chapter is the necessity that we need to see an incorporation of developing case studies in

mainstream public administration literature. Main literature is shaped by studies either developed, or applied in Western world (Welch & Wong 1998; Cheung 2012; Meyer-Sahling & Yesilkagit 2011; Xue, 2018). Thus there should be more room in mainstream public administration literature for Asian, East European, Eastern or African cases in order to understand the developments, or to evaluate the cases aligned with their local roots and context. As last this chapter contributes to extant literature by showing that public administrators have complicated but affection loaded (not neutral) perspectives towards DCP.

## REFERENCES

- AbouAssi, K., Nabatchi, T., & Antoun, R. (2013). Citizen Participation in Public Administration: Views from Lebanon. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(14), 1029–1043. doi:10.1080/01900692.2013.809585
- Adıgüzel, Ş. (2003). Yerel Düzeyde Yönetime Katılım ve Yerel Yönetim Sürecindeki İşlevleri Açısından Yerel Gündem 21: Malatya Belediyesi Yerel Gündem 21 Örneği. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 12(1), 45-63.
- Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. doi:10.1080/01944366908977225
- Bishop, P., & Davis, G. (2002). Mapping Public Participation in Policy Choices. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 61(1), 14–29. doi:10.1111/1467-8500.00255
- Brinkerhoff, J. (2018). *Why we should teach gray*. Retrieved from <https://statecrafting.net/why-we-should-teach-grey-3fba76541bcc>
- Burnard, P. (1991). A Method of Analysing Interview Transcripts in Qualitative Research. *Nurse Education Today*, 11(6), 461–466. doi:10.1016/0260-6917(91)90009-Y PMID:1775125
- Callahan, K. (2007). *Elements of Effective Governance: Measurement, Accountability and Participation*. In *Public Administration and Public Policy* 126 (pp. 149–172). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Cheung, A. B. L. (2012). Public administration in East Asia: Legacies, trajectories and lessons. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(2), 209–216. doi:10.1177/0020852312438843



Demirci, M. (2010). Katılımcı Demokrasi Açısından Kent Konseyleri: Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirme [City Councils in terms of Participatory Democracy: A Critical Assessment]. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 19(1), 21-46.

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549–559. doi:10.1111/0033-3352.00117

Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2001). The New Public Service: Putting Democracy First. *National Civic Review*, 90(4), 391–400. doi:10.1002/ncr.90410

Diefenbach, T. (2009). New Public Management in Public Sector Organizations: The Dark Sides of Managerialistic ‘Enlightenment’. *Public Administration*, 87(4), 892–909. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01766.x

Downe, B., & Wamboldt, R. N. (1992). Content Analysis: Method, Applications and Issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13(3), 313–321. doi:10.1080/07399339209516006 PMID:1399871

Dudley, L., Webb Farley, K. E., & Banford, N. G. (2018). Looking Back to Look Forward: Federal Officials’ Perceptions of Public Engagement. *Administration & Society*, 50(5), 679–698. doi:10.1177/0095399718763162

Fisher, J., & Grant, B. (2013). Public Value: Recovering the Ethical for Public Sector Managers. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(4), 248–255. doi:10.1080/01900692.2012.757618

Gramberger, M. (2001). *Citizens as Partners: OECD Handbook on Information. Consultation and Public Participation in Policy Making*. Paris, France: OECD.

Hansen, H. S., & Prosperi, D. C. (2005). Citizen Participation and Internet GIS – Some Recent Advances [Editorial]. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 29(6), 617–629. doi:10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2005.07.001

Hatcher, W. (2019). The Curious Public Administrator: The New Administrative Doctrine. *Public Integrity*, 21(3), 225–228. doi:10.1080/10999922.2018.1564002

Hong, S., & Cho, B. S. (2018). Citizen participation and the redistribution of public goods. *Public Administration*, 96(3), 481–496. doi:10.1111/padm.12521

International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). (2018). *IAP<sup>2</sup> Spectrum of Public Participation*. Retrieved from [https://www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum\\_8.5x11\\_Print.pdf](https://www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf)

Jakobsen, M., James, O., Moynihan, D., & Nabatchi, T. (2016). JPART Virtual Issue on Citizen-State Interactions in Public Administration Research. *Journal of Public Administration: Research and Theory*. doi:10.1093/jopart/muw031

Jorgensen, T. B., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values: An inventory. *Administration & Society*, 39(3), 354–381. doi:10.1177/0095399707300703

Kapucu, N., & Palabiyik, H. (2008). Turkish public administration: From tradition to modern age. Ankara, Turkey: International Strategic Research Organization (ISRO) Publications.

King, C. S., Feltey, K. M., & O'Neill Susel, B. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4), 317–326. doi:10.2307/977561

Lancer, P. J. (2012). Engaging Hispanics in Governance: A Social Constructivist Interpretation. In H. L. Schachter & K. Yang (Eds.), *The State of Citizen Participation in America* (pp. 195–224). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lavee, E., Cohen, N., & Nouman, H. (2018, June). 82018). Reinforcing public responsibility? Influences and practices in street-level bureaucrats' engagement in policy design. *Public Administration*, 96(2), 333–348. doi:10.1111/padm.12402

Law on the Public Financial Management and Control Law. (2003). Retrieved from <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5018.pdf>

Law on the Right to Information. (2003). Retrieved from <http://www.judiciaryofturkey.gov.tr/English-version-of-Law-on-the-Right-to-information-is-available-on-our-website->

Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L., & Stoker, G. (2001). Trends in Public Participation: Part 2 – Citizens' Perspectives. *Public Administration*, 79(2), 445–455. doi:10.1111/1467-9299.00264

Lukensmeyer, C. J., & Jacobson, W. (2013). *Bringing Citizen Voices to the Table: A Guide for Public Administrators*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer-Sahling, J. H., & Yesilkagit, K. (2011). Differential Legacy Effects: Three Propositions on the Impact of Administrative Traditions on Public Administration Reform in Europe East and West. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18(2), 311–322. doi:10.1080/13501763.2011.544515

Moore, M. H. (1994). Public Value as the Focus of Strategy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 53(3), 296–303. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.1994.tb01467.x

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.

Municipal Law. (2005). Retrieved from <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5393.pdf>

Nabatchi, T. (2012a). *A Manager's Guide to Evaluating Citizen Participation*. Fostering Transparency and Democracy Series, IBM Center for the Business of Government. Retrieved from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un-dpadm/unpan048340.pdf>

Nabatchi, T. (2012b). Putting the 'Public' Back in Public Values Research: Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Values. *Public Administration Review*, 72(5), 699–708. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02544.x

Nabatchi, T. (2018). *Leading in turbulence requires soft skills*. Available at: <https://statecrafting.net/leading-in-turbulence-requires-soft-skills-320a00e4ae7b>

Nabatchi, T., & Amsler, L. B. (2014). Direct Public Engagement in Local Government. *American Review of Public Administration*, 44(4), 1–26.

Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public Participation for 21st Century Democracy*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/9781119154815

O'Flynn, J. (2007). From New Public Management to Public Value: Paradigmatic Change and Managerial Implications. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(3), 353–366. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2007.00545.x

Pretty, J. N. (1994). Alternative Systems of Inquiry for Sustainable Agriculture. *IDS Bulletin*, 25(2), 37–48. doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.1994.mp25002004.x

Roberts, A. (2018). *NASPAA panel: Preparing leaders for a turbulent world*. Available at: <https://aroberts.us/2018/08/08/naspaa-panel-preparing-leaders-for-a-turbulent-world/>

Roberts, N. C. (2008). The Age of Direct Citizen Participation: An ASPA Classics Volume. In N. C. Roberts (Ed.), (pp. 3–9). New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Sæbø, Ø., Rose, J., & Flak, L. S. (2008). The shape of eParticipation: Characterizing an emerging research area. *Government Information Quarterly*, 25(3), 400–428. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2007.04.007

Sezen, S. (2011). International versus domestic explanations of administrative reforms: The case of Turkey. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 77(2), 322–346. doi:10.1177/0020852311399229

### ***Higher Public Officials on Direct Citizen Participation in Turkey***

Sözen, S. (2014). New public administration in Turkey. In C. Rodríguez, A. Ávalos, H. Yılmaz, & A. I. Planet (Eds.), *Turkey's Democratization Process* (pp. 223–240). London: Routledge.

Spano, A. (2009). Public Value Creation and Management Control Systems. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 328–348. doi:10.1080/01900690902732848

Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 41–57. doi:10.1177/0275074005282583

Üstüner, Y., & Yavuz, N. (2018). Turkey's Public Administration Today: An Overview and Appraisal. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(10), 820–831. doi:10.1080/01900692.2017.1387147

Welch, E., & Wong, W. (1998). Public Administration in a Global Context: Bridging the Gaps of Theory and Practice between Western and Non-Western Nations. *Public Administration Review*, 58(1), 40–49. doi:10.2307/976888

Xue, L. (2018). *We need a new kind of public administration*. Retrieved from <https://statecrafting.net/we-need-a-new-kind-of-public-administration-1024a73daed4>

Yang, K. (2005). Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3), 273–285. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00453.x

## **ADDITIONAL READING**

Creighton, L. J. (2005). *The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions Through Citizen Involvement*. Jossey- Bass.

Denhardt, J., Terry, L., Delacruz, E. R., & Andonoska, L. (2009). Barriers to Citizen Engagement in Developing Countries. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(14), 1268–1288. doi:10.1080/01900690903344726

Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1S1), 66–75. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x

Mansuri, G., & Vijayendra, R. (2013). *Localizing Development-Does Participation Work. A World Bank Policy Research Report*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank; Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/11859/9780821382561.pdf?sequence=1>

Saxena, N. C. (2011). What is meant by people's participation? In A. Cornwall (Ed.), *The Participation Reader* (pp. 31–33). London: Zed Books.

Thomas, J. C. (1995). *Public Participation in Public Decisions: New Skills and Strategies for Public Managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.