

Administrative Capacity for Municipalities: Comparison of Sample Case Municipalities of Central Anatolia Region and the State of Arizona*

Belgin UÇAR KOCAOĞLU¹
Mustafa Kemal ÖKTEM²

Abstract

The aim of this study is to compare the administrative capacity of municipalities with populations of 100,000 to 250,000 in Central Anatolia (Turkey) and the State of Arizona (the United States of America), and to make recommendations for improving the administrative capacity of each municipality. In this context, the concept of administrative capacity is defined as “municipalities’ ability to regulate, develop and manage the physical, financial, human and information resources allocated to them in order to provide the necessary services to their citizens.” Data was collected from sample municipalities in the Central Anatolia Region of Turkey and the state of Arizona through interviews with municipal leaders (manager, director etc.) and a questionnaire about their perceptions.

Keywords: Administrative Capacity, Municipality, Arizona, Central Anatolia.

Belediyelerde Yönetmel Kapasite Değerlendirmesi: İç Anadolu Bölgesi ve Arizona Eyaleti Belediyelerinin Karşılaştırılması

Özet

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, İç Anadolu Bölgesi (Türkiye) ve Arizona Eyaleti (Amerika Birleşik Devletleri)’nde nüfusu 100.000 ile 250.000 arasında yer alan belediyelerin yönetmel kapasitelerini karşılaştırmalı olarak değerlendirmek ve elde edilen veriler çerçevesinde ilgili belediyelere yönetmel kapasitelerini geliştirmelerini sağlayacak çeşitli önerilerde bulunmaktır. Bu çalışmada, ‘belediyelerin kendilerine verilen hizmetleri yerine getirmelerini sağlayacak fiziksel, finansal, insan ve bilgi kaynaklarını düzenleme, geliştirme ve yönetme yeteneği’ olarak tanımlanan yönetmel kapasite kavramı İç Anadolu Bölgesi’nde ve Arizona Eyaleti’nde araştırmamıza konu olan belediyelerde, belediye yöneticileri ile gerçekleştirilen mülakatlar ve yöneticilerin algılarını ölçen anket çalışması çerçevesinde karşılaştırmalı olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yönetmel Kapasite, Belediyeler, Arizona, İç Anadolu.

*This paper is a partial summary of Belgin Uçar Kocaoğlu’s Ph.D. dissertation managed by M. Kemal Oktem in Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Hacettepe University and the paper also presented at the 9th Transatlantic Dialogue Conference in Baltimore in 2013.

¹Assistant Professor, Ph.D. Necmettin Erbakan University, ucarbelgin@gmail.com

² Associate Professor, Ph.D. Hacettepe University, kemalok@hacettepe.edu.tr

1. Introduction

In most countries, administration is mainly carried out by a central government and many decentralized governments. In central government, public services are coordinated in the center and processed by the center as well as other affiliated public institutions and organizations in a hierarchy. In the case of decentralized government, public services are carried out by local government or local institutions and organizations not bound to the central government.

In the United States of America (USA), local government bodies, are examples of decentralized government units, developed in each geographical area and provide services, such as public safety and public works to meet the needs of each community. Legal regulations regarding local governments are not covered in the federal Constitution in the USA. Instead, local governments are empowered by their state constitutions. Because of this, local administrations can be subject to different rules and regulations in different states. However, in Turkey local administrations are established in accordance with Article 127 of the 1982 Constitution of Turkey. In Article 127, local administrations are ‘legal entities elected by voters, established in order to meet the common local needs of provinces, towns and districts in line with the establishment principles stipulated in the law. These legal entities are decision making bodies that are stipulated in the law’. In Turkey local governments have acted as if they have been an extension of central government since they were established (Oktay, 2008, 151; Ökmen and Parlak, 2010, 196). After the 1960’s, some amendments and recommendations were brought into the law regarding local administration bodies in projects like the Central Government Organization Research Project (MEHTAP) and the Public Administration Research Project (KAYA). Later, in 2003 the ‘Public Administration Fundamental Law Draft’ was sent to the Parliament but not approved by the President. Because of this, in 2004 the Law Numbered 5216 for Metropolitan Municipality was enacted. Then in 2005, the Law Numbered 5393 for Municipalities, and the Law Numbered 5302 for Provincial Special Administration was enacted, bringing new duties and responsibilities to local administrations.

Various roles that are assumed by local administrations arise out of certain factors both in the USA and Turkey. The factors such as population growth, technological development, increased rural-urban migration and resulting environmental, political, social and economic problems made it inevitable for local administrations to take more active roles. Those changes and developments also raised the expectations from local administrations, and

increased their duties and responsibilities in many countries. As local governments and municipalities, which are the most important local government units, have to assume more duties and responsibilities now, it has become almost obligatory to investigate their administrative capacity in terms of basic components like human resource management, financial management, information technology management and capital management.

The study consists of three sections. Section one is dedicated to a conceptual framework regarding administrative capacity. Second section focuses on the scope, the method and the limitation of the research. In section three, research findings will be provided and interpreted. Lastly, it will be made some recommendations by analysing the findings of the research.

2. Conceptual Framework of the Study

There are limited studies about administrative capacity in Turkey (Kutlu, 2010; Kutlu, 2012). Turkish studies on administrative capacity are mostly about administration improvement, administration effectiveness, etc. in the public administration and local administration context. In such studies, components of administrative capacity are investigated separately in order to measure administrative capacity or administrative capacity of some institutions in the process of the EU accession. However, studies on administrative capacity are abundant in international literature (Raboca et al., 2010; Boyne, 2010; Donahue et al., 2000; Hacek et al., 2009; Kim and Lee, 2009; Ramani et al., 2009; Farazmand, 2009; Bowornwathana, 2009; Tankha, 2009; Tsao, 2009; Fard, 2009; New Jersey Project Initiative, 2002; Government Performance Project, 1996-2003).

There is not a consensus on the definition of administrative capacity. Howitt (cited in: Honadle, 1981, 576) defines it as 'its ability to identify problems, develop and evaluate policy alternatives for dealing with them, and operate government programs'. Ingraham and her colleagues (2000, 293) put forth the definition 'the state's ability to regulate, develop, manage and supervise human, physical and information capital for fulfilling its policies and programs'. Like the concept itself, components or dimensions of the capacity are not uniform, either. Administrative capacity has many components including human resources, financial, technological, organizational culture, organizational affairs, laws, infrastructure, administration processes, external stakeholders and leadership. Researchers choose among these components in line with the aims of their studies.

In literature, It can be said there are three common frameworks for assessing the capacity and administrative capacity. The first one is the Capacity Assessment Framework of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). This framework includes assessment of topics like accountability and access to information against basic functional capacity criteria such as situation analysis and policymaking. The second one is the ‘European Union (EU) Administrative Capacity Assessment Framework’. In this framework, topics and criteria to be measured are not put forward clearly. Instead, it deals with the administrative capacity needed for implementing the rules contained in the European Union agreements and some other relevant legal documents. The third template is the ‘Government Performance Project (GPP)’ administrative capacity assessment framework developed by ‘The Maxwell School’. The GPP framework was prepared with the direct purpose of assessing the administrative capacity. Many states in the USA have been assessed against certain criteria using this framework.

In our study, the concept of administrative capacity is considered as in Ingraham and her colleagues’ (2000, 293) definition of “municipalities as the ability to regulate, develop and manage the physical, financial, human and information resources allocated to them to provide services.” Using this definition the municipalities involved in the study is assessed on the four components of human resource management, financial management, information technology management and capital management, and questionnaires and interviews derived from the GPP administrative capacity assessment.

3. Scope, Method and Limitations of the Research

Since the GPP framework has been used for assessing the administrative capacity of many states in the USA and played an important role in assessment of administrative capacity, literature review was partly carried out there. Considering the fact that practicalities might vary from state to state, Arizona was selected randomly among the 51 states. The Central Anatolia District was selected from Turkey due to its location far from the sea. The two districts have some aspects in common. For instance, they both are not on the seacoast, and continental climate reigns in both regions despite some differences. In the selection process, it was also thought that similar climatic and geographical conditions of the towns might bring similarities regarding services.

In the literature, municipalities are divided into three groups as small scale, medium scale and large scale with populations below 100,000, between 100,000 and 250,000 and

above 250,000, respectively³. Three of the scales were not involved in this study because of different structures, financial limitations, scale economies and the short research period. For Turkey, smaller municipalities were excluded from the study because most of them don't have units such as human resource and information technology management. As for the larger municipalities, they were not involved in the study due to the application of separate administration models and the high financial and time requirement of that type of a study.

During the study period, there were 6 municipalities⁴ with a population of 100,000 to 250,000 in Arizona and there were 5 in Central Anatolia. While 4 of the municipalities in Arizona were volunteers to participate in the study, 5 of the municipalities in Central Anatolia agreed to do so.

For each of the districts, population and surface area data for the sample municipalities are given in Table 1 below. As seen in Table 1, there are 10.5 million people in Central Anatolia, whereas the population of Arizona is 6.392 million. As for the size, Central Anatolia's surface area is 391.09 square miles, but Arizona is 113,594.08 square miles. It should be noted that the Central Anatolian Region has a higher population density than Arizona. Population of the sample municipalities varies between 100,000 and 250,000. Specifically, 3 of the sample municipalities in Arizona have a population above 200,000. As for surface area, municipalities are close to each other, Scottsdale being the largest one with an area of 183.92 square miles. The smallest ones are Kırıkkale and Niğde Municipalities with areas of 16.98 square miles and 17.37 square miles, respectively.

Table 1. Municipalities of Arizona and Central Anatolia Involved in the Research

	Population (2010)	Area
Central Anatolia Region /Arizona State	10.5 million/6.392 million	391.09 /113,594.08 square miles
Central Anatolia Region Municipalities	Population (2010) *	Area**
Aksaray	176,504	76.83
Niğde	109,724	17.37
Karaman	135,185	69.49
Kırıkkale	193,093	16.98
Kırşehir	108,628	96.52
Arizona State Municipalities	Population (2010) ***	Area***
Tempe	161,719	39.93
Scottsdale	217,385	183.92
Chandler	236,123	64.41
Gilbert	208,453	67.96

Kaynak: (*Union of Municipalities of Turkey, 2011 **Obtained from administrators of municipalities *** United States Census Bureau, 2013)

³ See: Aarts, S.C.M. (2009); Nederland, T. (2004); Houghton, G. and Hunter, C. (1994); Tisdell, C. (1975).

⁴ Upon 2010 census, the municipality of Surprise with a population of 117.517 was covered under our research. But as the 2010 census results hadn't been announced when the research was started, municipalities were selected in the thesis on the basis of 2000 census results.

Besides secondary sources such as books, papers, articles, thesis, newspapers, reports, laws, regulations and internet, primary sources were also used in this study. For instance, interviews were held with nearly 40 people from the sample municipalities in both Arizona and Central Anatolia. In addition to the interviews, a questionnaire was also given to 277 people regarding administrator perceptions. A majority of the items on the questionnaire were developed according to the administrative capacity criteria in the GPP of ‘The Maxwell School’. The criteria found on that project were adapted to a 4-item Likert type scale. Though not all of the criteria on the project were included in the present study, most of the basic criteria were considered. In this framework, other criteria and questions were included in the questionnaire as well. Some of them are 5-item questions. The questionnaires were carried out with local administrators (in municipalities) and most of them were analyzed using a statistical “package program” for social sciences. *Reliability test, frequency distributions, one-way ANOVA and independent t tests* were carried out on the samples.

Among the main limitations of the study are those regarding the concept of capacity, comparison of two regions with different administration approaches, different languages, survey scale used in the study, the questionnaire method itself and document access.

4. Research Findings and Interpretations

Findings and other data obtained from the survey and interviews held in the Central Anatolia Region of Turkey and Arizona are discussed from aspects of human resource management, financial management, information technology management and capital management, which are basic components of administrative capacity. Study findings and interpretations are only relevant to municipalities that participated in this study.

4.1. Human Resource Management

The findings regarding human resource management were classified in 4 sub-groups: recruitment process, number of staff, in-service training and questionnaire results.

Recruitment Process

Within the Arizona sample, each of the municipalities applies its own staff management approach. For example, one municipality gives a written test, while another interviews the candidates before recruitment. Concerning this item, municipalities in Arizona do not face lots of legal challenges. On the other hand, the problems such as employing the right person for the right job and inadequate financial sources were found to be common.

In the Central Anatolia sample, all of the municipalities with populations of 5,000 to 750,000 are subject to and act according to the Law Numbered 5393 for Municipalities. Strict requirements limiting the municipalities create some challenges related with the laws. One challenge is about recruiting permanent workers. It is done through a written test given by the central government. It was understood from interviews with the municipal leaders that such a test might lead to two challenges. First, the staff employed through such a test might be unfamiliar with that province and will be unwilling to live there. The motivation of new recruits, such as *'once I become a civil servant, it does not matter what province it is. I can move to another place later'*, can affect adversely the functioning discipline in municipalities. The second challenge is about recruiting people for some units like the fire department through a written test. For instance, a candidate with fear of heights might start working as a fire officer as a result of the written test, which would cause a problem. Another challenge regarding the governing law arises from the requirements regarding employing contracted staff in paragraph 3 of article 49 of the Law Numbered 5393 for Municipalities. Under paragraph 3, municipalities can employ only specialists and technical staff including lawyers, architects, engineers (civil and topographical engineers), urban and regional planners, analysts, doctors, specialized doctors, midwives, nurses, vets, chemists and technicians. Therefore, the municipalities cannot recruit other staff that they may need.

Number of Staff

At the beginning, it was planned to summarize the numbers of staff as well as education status in the sample municipalities in both countries for assessing the human resource management. However, education data of the staff in Arizona could not be gained because most of the municipalities do not keep proper records about this matter. Thus, the municipalities in the sample group could be compared in terms of gender and number only. As for the number of staff per capita (on full time and regular basis), every 1000 people in the Central Anatolia municipalities have almost 3 workers, while the number is 7.2 across Arizona. This might imply that the human resource capacity of the municipalities affiliated with Arizona is better than that of the Central Anatolian municipalities. But, it would be incorrect to assess the capacity based on the number of staff per capita only, because personal skills, experience, knowledge, training and competence of the workers as well as the volunteers' effect on the overall capacity would be neglected. This is one of the main limitations of this study. Still, including data about education status of the workers in the questionnaire might present a tiny hint about education facts of the workers. The

questionnaire carried out with municipal leaders showed that almost 7% of the Central Anatolian participants have a postgraduate degree, while 50% have an undergraduate degree. As for the participants in Arizona, 50% of them have an undergraduate degree, while 38% have a postgraduate degree. In Arizona, nearly 90% of the municipal leaders completed an undergraduate or postgraduate program, while 60% were completed in Central Anatolia.

In regard to volunteers, the position is mentioned in article 77 of the Law Numbered 5393 for Municipalities. It was not found to exist in any of the sample municipalities in Central Anatolia. On the contrary, the participant municipalities in Arizona meet their staff needs using volunteers. For example, around 2000 volunteers took part in municipal services offered by the Tempe and Chandler municipalities throughout 2011.

In-service Training

Another important subtopic of human resource management is training support provided by municipalities for their staff. All of the municipalities in the research were asked for training programs they had carried out in 2011. Comparing the two districts this research showed that the training topics covered in Central Anatolia corresponded to approximately one fifth of the topics covered by the Arizona municipalities. There are both theoretical and on-the-job topics in the training schedule of Arizona, whereas there are only theoretical topics in the Central Anatolian municipalities. The participant municipalities in Central Anatolia may not be keeping records of the practical training events they hold. In addition to that, two of the municipalities in Arizona have a special department for training affairs, while training services are arranged by the human resource manager in Central Anatolia sample. The municipalities in both of the districts run training events on ethics, first aid, personal development and effective writing methods but there were some differences on other topics such as discrimination or sexual harassment. That is, the latter topics are not covered under training curriculums in the Central Anatolian municipalities. Still, it shouldn't be assumed that discrimination or harassment problems don't take place in the Central Anatolia sample. The staff might be too discreet to disclose such treatment fearing they could cause extra problems. As an example, the victims of discrimination or harassment could be afraid of losing their current posts.

Questionnaire Results

According to the results of the questionnaire filled in by leaders in the sample municipalities, significant differences were found between the municipalities in Central

Anatolia and Arizona in regard to remarks under human resource management such as ‘our municipality is capable of doing a strategic analysis of both present and future human resource needs’ and ‘the legal framework allows selecting municipal workers in a competitive manner in our municipality’. The average⁵ for the first remark was found to be higher for Central Anatolia, while it was lower for the second remark. The lower average value calculated for the Central Anatolia sample for the remark ‘the legal framework allows selecting municipal workers in a competitive manner in our municipality’ could be supported by the finding that the municipalities in the Central Anatolia sample face more law-related challenges than those in Arizona.

4.2. Financial Management

Financial management findings are collected under two subheadings: revenues-expenditures and questionnaire results.

Revenues- Expenditures

As one of the significant components of administrative capacity, financial management is about whether municipalities have enough income to carry out their duties and services with the budget, and the extent at which they are able to balance their revenues and expenditures. For this, budgets and budget realizations of the municipalities in both groups were going to be compared, but it couldn’t be done because the municipalities in Arizona and Central Anatolia have different features and cover different periods. Additionally, analyzing the budget reports of the municipalities in Arizona requires another research project due to the limitations of time and resources. It was discovered in the interviews held with heads of financial departments in Arizona municipalities that there is a gap of 1-2 % between real budgets and budget estimate. However, in Central Anatolia, the gap varies between 7% and 37% from one municipality to another. According to the interviews carried out with heads of financial departments in Arizona, the main financial problem was caused by the overall financial crisis in the states and decreased sales. The decrease of sales decreased sales taxes collected by the municipalities, which is the leading income source for them, and this put them into a financial bottleneck. As for the Central Anatolian municipalities, the most important financial drawback was found as insufficient financial sources and going into debt. Shortage of financial sources means insufficient funds allocated to those municipalities by the central government.

⁵ Average refers to the arithmetic average of participants’ responses as 1- Totally Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Agree, 4- Completely Agree.

Questionnaire Results

The results of the questionnaire given to the municipal leaders in the sample groups show a significant difference between the financial management views of Central Anatolia and Arizona in regard to the remark ‘our municipality managed to adopt a long-term budget perspective’. The average value for Arizona municipalities was calculated higher than Central Anatolia. This finding seems supportive of above-mentioned data regarding the gap between real budget and requested budgets of the Central Anatolian and Arizona municipalities.

4.3. Information Technology Management

The findings in regard to information technology management are collected in three groups: problems faced e-municipality and questionnaire results.

Problems Faced

In interviews held with people in charge of the information technology departments, it was seen that the municipalities in both districts suffer from insufficient financial resources, shortage of specialized personnel and higher salary rates in the private sector compared to the public sector. There are some other challenges in both groups. Among these are integration problems faced by municipal leaders in Central Anatolia with other institutions, and in the municipalities of Arizona security problems especially encountered in the police department in regard to information technology management. Such a difference between the two districts might be born out by discrepancies in administrative issues and services offered by the municipalities. For example, since the municipalities in Turkey are not responsible for providing security services, potential problems regarding confidentiality of the police records are not applicable for them. From the inter-institutional integration point of view, the fact that the municipalities under Arizona don’t face problems under this heading might be explained with duties and responsibilities they have. To explain, the municipalities in Arizona have considerable authority in their areas such that they are competent to collect various taxes and determine tax rates applied within the borders set by the state. Thus, it seems understandable that they don’t have much conflict over integration with other institutions. On the other hand, the municipalities in Central Anatolia often have conflicts with several units under the central government, especially with land registry offices.

E-municipality

E-municipality implementations constitute an important part of information technology management. In the scope of e-municipality, municipalities provide many of their

services for citizens in the electronic environment, and the variety of the services they provide is considered as an important indicator of the capacity of the municipalities. In our study, the lists of services offered through the Internet by the municipalities were analyzed and compared as of 3/23/03 by means of a scale developed in reference to several sources (Parlak and Sobacı, 2008: 243-244; Backus, 2001: 6-7; Polat, 2006: 12; Vrabie and Öktem, 2011: 13). In total, 16 services under three types: informing, interaction and online transactions, were checked to see if they are available electronically. The municipalities were given 1 point for each positive finding. In the end, the municipalities in Central Anatolia received 7.8 out of 16 points, and Arizona received 14.5.

It was discovered that the municipalities in Central Anatolia have some shortcomings in informing and interaction, whereas it was not the case in Arizona. Both Central Anatolia and Arizona have some problems with online transactions, but, the municipalities in Central Anatolia face more problems than those in Arizona.

Questionnaire Results

According to results of the questionnaire given to the municipal leaders regarding information technology management, there were significant differences between the Central Anatolia and Arizona samples in the context of the remarks: ‘our municipality can supply the software it needs’ and ‘our municipality can supply the information technology staff it needs’. For both remarks, the average values obtained for Central Anatolia are higher than Arizona. As for the use of the web to offer municipal services, though Arizona seems in a better situation, the Central Anatolian participants got higher average values than the Arizona municipalities in regard to both of the remarks above. This could be explained by Central Anatolia sample’s relatively better status in relevant areas than Arizona’s sample, or by discrepancies between perceptions of the municipal leaders involved in the research. For instance, the municipal leaders in the Central Anatolia sample might be thinking their organizations are quite good at information technology management. On the other hand, the participants from Arizona might not find their municipalities competent in information technology management though they might be better than the former in reality.

4.4. Capital Management

The findings regarding capital management are summarized under three headings capital plans, civil participation and questionnaire results.

Capital Plans

According to the interview results, planning regarding infrastructure services and maintenance of physical assets are carried out properly in both Central Anatolia and Arizona. However, some of the interviewees in Central Anatolia stated that they plan ahead but allow for maintenance of the physical assets in case of need only. The interviewees in the municipalities affiliated with Arizona pointed that they face several financial problems and make plans as much as possible.

Civil Participation

Interviews carried out with the heads of capital management departments demonstrated that there is not enough civil participation in capital management planning in both of the sample groups. One municipal leader in Central Anatolia explained that they do not encourage civil participation, as citizens may not be able to see the big picture in urban services. However, municipal administrators in Arizona issued questionnaires to get citizens' opinions regarding some infrastructure services, which implies that they attach importance to public opinion before providing services. One administrator from the Arizona sample stated that they convene three public meetings before implementing any project during the planning of infrastructure services. One of the meetings is held for disseminating information in the beginning. One is held while planning approximately 70% of the project, and the last one is held after the closing of the projects. Citizens, contractors, municipal administrators and other stakeholders participate in the third meeting to raise their queries and comments regarding the projects. Neither of the municipalities was found to be using any monitoring software on projects. (As for maintenance of the physical assets, municipalities in Arizona have an advantage over municipalities in Central Anatolia because municipalities in Arizona were established later than those in Central Anatolia.

Questionnaire Results

As for the results of the questionnaire regarding management of the physical resources, no significant difference could be found between the two sample groups.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This research is about human resource management, financial management, information technology management and capital management components of administrative capacity in selected municipalities around Central Anatolia and the state of Arizona. Under *human resource management*, the research studied the number of staff and volunteers per

1000 residents, the amount of in-service training administered, and the education status of the questionnaire respondents. The municipalities affiliated with the State of Arizona seem to be in a better situation than those in Central Anatolia. Also the interviews conducted by the human resource managers show that the municipalities in Central Anatolia mostly face challenges related with applicable laws, while the municipalities of Arizona have difficulties in recruiting the right personnel. As for *financial management aspect*, the participant municipalities in Arizona perform better than their Central Anatolian counterparts regarding budget estimates. The Interviews by relevant managers demonstrated that the basic problems of the municipalities in Central Anatolia is shortage of financial resources allocated by the central government, whereas the main financial challenge faced by the municipalities in Arizona is shortage of financial resources because of decreased sales incomes mainly caused by the economic recession. In connection with *information technology management*, the participant municipalities were compared in terms of the services they provide on web sites, and Arizona was found to provide better services than Central Anatolia. The interviews conducted by heads of the relevant units show that the municipalities all suffer from such factors as higher wages in the private sector and lack of specialized staff. But they face different challenges in connection with security and integration. Last but not the least, in *capital management*, there is not enough civil participation in preparing capital plans with the participation level being less in Central Anatolia than Arizona.

Some recommendations are made in light of the comparative study findings. The recommendations to improve administrative capacity of the participant municipalities are proposed in connection with certain components of the concept.

In regard to the first component of administrative capacity, the following recommendations can be made about human resource management. *In-Service Training*: The municipalities in Central Anatolia might expand in-service training topics and hours both during recruitment and in the following years. In-service training constitutes one of the basic indicators of administrative capacity and plays an important role in both capacity building and improvement. Municipalities must attach great importance to both theoretical and on-the-job training events if they want to improve performance. Who should run in-service training is another important aspect. Training needs to be provided by specialized people. It can be from heads of the relevant departments or academic people. *Volunteers*: Though it is mentioned in the Law for Municipalities, there were no volunteer workers in any of the Central Anatolian municipalities involved in the research. Municipalities may not be aware that volunteers can

contribute to their overall administrative capacity. At the same time, the citizens may not be willing to participate in such services. Still, municipalities should work on this issue. They should encourage citizens to join municipal services through colorful and attractive flyers. Currently, there are no advertisements for volunteers to work on the premises or web sites of the municipalities in Central Anatolia. It is likely that the citizens may not know about such opportunities.

The following recommendations are made for financial management, which is another component of the administrative capacity. *Replacement of Financial Administrators upon Changing of the Central Government:* The replacement of some of the employees in municipalities that depends on the central government poses an obstacle to the improvement of the administrative capacity. Such replacements adversely affect the overall administrative capacity as it takes a long time for financial managers to train themselves and have insight into the problems. One administrator in a Central Anatolian municipality commented during the interview that due to the replacement of important people, orientation procedures must be prepared for potential newcomers about the nature of the job and what risks it has. Though a sensible idea, such a recommendation might not be put into action. Any administrator who is expected to leave her/his position after a while may not volunteer to share information and experience with her/his successor because of political opposition. Therefore, it is suggested that technical and critical departments should be administered by nonpolitical people and not have replacements connected with the government. *Establishing Income Sources Themselves:* A large amount of municipalities' income is allocated by the central government in the Turkish case. They don't have other sources of income except for estate taxes. Since they are short of income sources, municipalities face several challenges because their sources of income remain mostly unchanged despite increased duties and responsibilities. So, the Central Anatolian municipalities should boost their revenue by adding other sources of income.

For another component of administrative capacity, the following suggestions are made in light of the findings about information technology management. *Using Information Technology More:* The use of information technology in providing services for the sample municipalities should be more popular both as a facilitator for citizens and for the municipalities' mitigating expenses. Analysis of the use of web sites showed that the municipalities in Arizona offer more online services than those in Central Anatolia. The municipalities in Central Anatolia could improve their administrative capacity by using more information technology in services such as informing and join the tender. Similarly, the

municipalities in Arizona could set up the information infrastructure that will allow citizens to join tenders online ultimately improving their administrative capacity.

Lastly, these recommendations are made in regard to capital management, the last component of administrative capacity. *Municipal Cooperation*: Bearing in mind the high costs of the municipal materials and equipment and the financial shortages in the municipalities, it would be reasonable for municipalities to collaborate in the capital management area. The municipalities should work towards a means of cooperation with neighboring municipalities. *Monitoring of Infrastructure Services Projects and Civil Participation in Planning of Infrastructure Services*: The municipalities from both Arizona and Central Anatolia should monitor infrastructure projects they implement using computers. In this way, the projects can be monitored easily during all phases of the project implementation. On the other hand, civil participation in planning infrastructure projects should be proposed as a must. So far, active civil participation in developing projects is not done in either of the two districts. If municipal authorities would allow sufficient participation of beneficiaries (of municipal services) during the planning of the infrastructure services, potential difficulties could be eliminated.

In conclusion, the municipalities whose administrative capacity that were compared in this research should duplicate the good practices of the other municipalities and take these recommendations to improve administrative capacity.

References

- 1982 CONSTITUTION (1982) *T.C. Official Gazette* No: 17863, <http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/1113.html>. Access Date: 03.04. 2012.
- 5393 NUMBERED MUNICIPAL LAW (2005), <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/Metin.Aspx?MevzuatKod=1.5.5393&sourceXmlSearch=5393&MevzuatIliski=0>, Access Date: 05.03.2012.
- AARTS, S.C.M. (2009), *The Dutch Shopping Place 2 Be: Clever City Branding or Just Good Like*. Master Thesis. Delft University of Technology, repository.tudelft.nl/assets/uuid...5303.../Scriptie_Sander_Aarts.pdf, Access Date: 01.01.2013.
- BACKUS, M. (2001), *E-Governance and Developing Countries: Introduction and Examples*. Research Report, No. 3, editor.iicd.org/files/report3.doc, Access Date: 12.01.2013.
- BOWORNWATHANA, B. (2009), 'The Need to Build Administrative Capacity in the Age of Rapid Globalization: A Modest Prescription or a Major Blueprint', *Public Administration Review*, pp. 1031-1033.
- BOYNE, G. A. (2010), 'Capacity, Leadership, and Organizational Performance: Testing the Black Box Model of Public Management', *Public Administration Review*, Volume 70, Issue 3, pp. 443-454.
- DONAHUE, A. K; SELDEN, S. C. and INGRAHAM, P. (2000), 'Measuring Government Capacity: A Comparative Analysis of City Human Resources Management Systems', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10: 2, pp. 381-411.

- FARAZMAND, A. (2009), 'Building Administrative Capacity for the Age of Rapid Globalization: A Modest Prescription for the Twenty-First Century', *Public Administration Review*, pp. 1007-1020.
- FARD, H. D. (2009), 'An Administrative Manifesto for Survival in the Twenty-First Century', *Public Administration Review*, pp. 1025-1027.
- HACEK, M. and BAËLIJA, I. (2009), 'Administrative Capacity in Slovenian Municipalities', *Journal of Local Self Government*. Vol.7, No.3, pp. 307-327.
- HONADLE, B.W. (1986), 'Defining and Doing Capacity Building: Perspectives and Experiences', In Part I. Honadle, B. W. and Howitt, A. M. (Ed.) (1986). In *Perspectives on Management Capacity Building (SUNY Series in Urban Public Policy)*, Albany: Suny Press.
- HOUGHTON, G. and HUNTER, C. (1994), *Sustainable Cities*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- INGRAHAM, P. W. and DONAHUE, A. K. (2000), 'Dissecting the Black Box Revisited: Characterizing Government Management Capacity', Heinrich, C J. and JR., Laurence E. Lynn (Ed.). *Governance and Performance: New Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. (Kindle Edition).
- KIM, S. E. and LEE, J.W. (2009), 'The Impact of Management Capacity on Government Innovation in Korea: An Empirical Study', *International Public Management Journal*, 12(3), pp. 345-369.
- KUTLU, Ö. (2010), *Konya İl Özel İdaresi Kurumsallaşma ve Kurumsal Kapasitenin Geliştirilmesi Projesi Raporu*, Mevlana Kalkınma Ajansı. Teknik Destek Programı TR52- 10.TD01, Konya.
- KUTLU, Ö. (2012), *Selçuklu Belediyesi Kurumsal Kapasite Geliştirme Çalışması Raporu*, Selçuklu Belediyesi, Konya.
- NEDERLAND, T.; STAVENUITER, M.M.J. and SWINNEN, H.R.A.M (2004), *Freedom in Restraint: Local Social Inclusion Policy in the Netherlands (Second report on the implementation of the NAP/Inclusion 2003-2005)*, www.verwey-jonker.nl/doc/participatie/D1352337def.pdf, Access Date: 01.01.2013.
- NEW JERSEY INITIATIVE (2002), *The New Jersey Initiative: Building Management Capacity in New Jersey Municipalities*, New York: Alan K. Campbell Public Affairs Institute.
- ÖKMEN, M. and PARLAK, B. (2010), *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Yerel Yönetimler: İlkeler Yaklaşımlar ve Mevzuat*, Bursa: Alfa Yayıncılık.
- OKTAY, T. (2008), 'Belediye Kurumunun Tarihsel Gelişimi' R. Bozlağan and Y. Demirkaya (Ed.), *Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetimler*, Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- PARLAK, B. and SOBACI, M. Z. (2008), 'Türkiyede'ki Büyükşehir Belediyelerinin Website Temelli Hizmetleri: Karşılaştırmalı Bir İşlevsellik Analizi', B. Parlak (E.d.). *Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Vizyonlar*, Ankara: Turhan Kitapevi, pp. 227-254.
- POLAT, K. R. (2006), '*E-Belediyecilik Kılavuzu Yerel Yönetim Vatandaş Etkileşimi*', Türkiye Strateji Araştırmalar Merkezi (TASAM), <http://www.ziyaguney.com/dosyalar/pdf/ebelediyecilik.pdf>, Access Date: 15.01.2013.
- RABOCA, H.M.; LAZAR, L.; LAZAR, P.S. and ZAGAN-ZELTER, D.A. (2010), 'An Exploratory Analysis of the Management Capacity within the Local Public Administration from Romania', *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, No. 31, pp. 133-146.
- RAMANI, K.V. and MAVALANKAR, D. (2009), 'Management Capacity Assessment for National Health Programs: A Study of RCH program in India', *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, Vol.23, No.1, pp. 133-142.
- TANKHA, S. (2009), 'Building Administrative Capacities in Developing Countries: SWAT Teams or Beat Cops?' , *Public Administration Review*, pp.1028-1030.

- TISDELL, C. (1975), The Theory of Optimal City-Sized: Elementary Speculations about Analysis and Policy. *Urban Studies*, 12, 61, <http://usj.sagepub.com/content/12/1/61.extract>, Access: 1 January 2013.
- TSAO, K. K. (2009), 'Building Administrative Capacity: Lessons Learned From China' *Public Administration Review*, pp.1021-1023.
- Union of Municipalities of Turkey (2011), 2010 Yılı Belediye Nüfusları, http://www.tbb.gov.tr/resimler/files/ADKS_2010_Belediye_Nufuslari.pdf, Access: 10.09.2011.
- UNITED STATES CENSUS BUREAU (2013), <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/04000.html>, Access: 15 February 2013.
- VRABİE, C. and ÖKTEM, M.K. (2011), 'Local e-Government. A Comparative Study of Romania and Turkey', *33rd EGPA Annual Conference*, Bucharest (Romania), Oral Presentation, EGPA/IIAS.