

POLYCENTRICITY THOUGHT AND GOVERNANCE RELATIONSHIP IN VINCENT OSTROM*

Sevinç SOYOCAK ÖZALP¹

Citation: Soyocak Özalp, S. (2023). Polycentricity thought and governance relationship in Vincent Ostrom. *Hitit Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(2), 316-328. doi: 10.17218/hititsbd.1362329

Abstract: The end of the 1960s and the 1970s were the years when the social, political and administrative events experienced for the whole world were criticized in the name of democracy. These years were also a period in which the American public administration was not qualified to respond to the conditions of the period, social welfare was not distributed fairly, the ongoing poverty, violence, racism, and gender-based inequality in the society were discussed, and the decreasing trust in institutions and its traditionality were questioned. One of the important names of this period of interrogation is Vincent Ostrom. While Ostrom included his criticisms of traditional public administration in his work titled "Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration" published in 1973, he advocates polycentrism against a single-centered hierarchical administration. Ostrom's idea of polycentricity and his search for democratic governance is the subject of this study. The study accepts that Ostrom's concept of polycentricity and democratic administration thought are compatible with the governance model and form the basis for the governance process. In addition, the study aims to clarify the relatively little discussed "Vincent Ostrom framework" in the Turkish literature.

Keywords: Polycentricity, Democratic Administration, Participation, Governance, Ostrom.

Atıf: Soyocak Özalp, S. (2023). Vincent Ostrom'da çok merkezlilik düşüncesi ve yönetim ilişkisi. *Hitit Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16(2), 316-328. doi: 10.17218/hititsbd.1362329

Vincent Ostrom'da Çok Merkezlilik Düşüncesi ve Yönetişim İlişkisi

Özet: 1960'ların sonu ve 1970'ler tüm dünya için yaşanan toplumsal, siyasal ve yönetsel olayların demokrasi adına eleştirildiği yıllar olmuştur. Bu yıllar aynı zamanda Amerikan kamu yönetiminin de dönemin koşullarına cevap verecek nitelikte olmadığı, toplumsal refahın adil dağıtılmadığı, toplumda devam eden yoksulluğun, şiddetin, ırkçılığın, cinsiyet temelli eşitsizliğin tartışıldığı ve kurumlara azalan güven ile gelenekselliğinin sorgulandığı bir dönem olmuştur. Bu sorgulama döneminin önemli isimlerinden birisi de Vincent Ostrom'dur. Ostrom, geleneksel kamu yönetimine yönelik eleştirilerine 1973 yılında yayımladığı "Amerikan Kamu Yönetiminde Entelektüel Kriz" adlı eserinde yer verirken, tek merkezli hiyerarşik bir yönetim karşısında çok merkezliliği savunmaktadır. Ostrom'un çok merkezlilik düşüncesi ve demokratik yönetim arayışı bu çalışmanın konusunu oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma, Ostrom'un çok merkezlilik kavramının ve demokratik yönetim düşüncesinin yönetim modeliyle uyumlu olduğunu ve yönetim sürecine temel oluşturduğunu kabul etmektedir. Ayrıca çalışma, Türkçe literatürde nispeten az miktarda tartışılmış "Vincent Ostrom çerçevesine" açıklık kazandırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çok Merkezlilik, Demokratik Yönetim, Katılım, Yönetişim, Ostrom

Teorik Makale/Theoretical Article

Makale Geliş Tarihi / Submitted: 18.09.2023

Makale Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 01.12.2023

* Bu çalışma, 8-14 Şubat 2021 tarihlerinde Ufuk Üniversitesi ev sahipliğinde gerçekleştirilen 1. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi'nde sunulmuş olan bildirinin içerik olarak genişletilmiş halidir.

¹ Doç. Dr., Hitit Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, sevincozalp@hitit.edu.tr | <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3577-858X> | <https://ror.org/01x8m3269>

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Hitit University, Faculty of Economics and Administration Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, sevincozalp@hitit.edu.tr | <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3577-858X> | <https://ror.org/01x8m3269>

1. INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy, as a reflection of modern-era rationality, has been considered the most effective organizational form within a legal and rational society, and it has been closely associated with the organization and functioning of the modern state. Bureaucracy has been idealized for its dedication to adhering strictly to legislative rules, purportedly based on popular sovereignty, and its independence from personal inclinations and politics in the pursuit of efficiency and effectiveness for the common interest and benefit of society. However, this idealization, which also forms the foundation of modern administration thought, namely the bureaucratic administration paradigm, began to be criticized in the name of democracy by the end of the 1960s. This process, starting with criticisms directed towards traditional public administration through the New Public Administration approach, questioned the unilaterally centralized bureaucratic administration structure with the New Public Management approach supported by neoliberal policies in the 1980s. And in the 1990s, it was embraced the governance model as a multi-actor, participatory, and pluralistic approach. In this context, the foundations of the governance model are rooted in the critical stance developed against traditional public administration, ongoing discussions on democratic governance in conjunction with globalization and neoliberal policies.

One of the most prominent figures in the theory of democratic government and the New Public Administration approach, Waldo, criticizes the efforts of traditional public administration to construct a science in public administration in the name of rationality and efficiency. He associates the foundations of the field of administration with the human element, which can be defined by its capacity for thinking and imbuing values. Waldo argues that in public administration, efficiency is attributed to values consciously considered and goals pursued in line with individual preferences. He also emphasizes that efficiency in administration can be achieved through a participatory, pluralistic, and democratic understanding. Moreover, during this period, the contributions of George Frederickson's criticisms of administrative power concentration (Ciğeroğlu and Özgür, 2015) and Robert Dahl's concept of polyarchy (pluralism) identified with democracy have become significant in the rising discussions on democracy and democratic public administration. Dahl sees democracy not only as a system based solely on elections but also as a process rooted in active citizen participation, effective decision-making processes, and individual freedoms. In a sense, Dahl acknowledges democracy not only as a system based solely on elections but also as a process rooted in active citizen participation, effective decision-making processes, and individual freedoms (Yurtoğlu Pek, 2023, p.227). It is observed that the traditional public administration thinking, which was based on universal principles, centralized structures, and uniform organizations, is confronted with societal and pluralistic values. Concepts such as heterogeneity, differentiation, fragmented structures, and authority division are discussed in the context of democratic public administration.

One of the figures who contributed to this era with his views and is central to the subject of this study is Vincent Alfred Ostrom. Ostrom's democratic administration theory, as discussed in his work "The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration" published in 1973, appears to be compatible with the paradigm of the time. Ostrom, in parallel with the New Public Administration paradigm, is recognized for criticizing the Weberian centralized bureaucratic structure, as well as Woodrow Wilson's politics-administration distinction. Furthermore, among Ostrom's numerous contributions to public administration, politics, and political science, the concept of polycentricity is considered his most significant legacy. This concept is seen both as an early expression of the governance process and as one of his seminal contributions. In this

context, this study seeks to present Ostrom's views on democratic administration through his work "The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration," while also examining the concept of polycentricity and evaluating its contribution to the governance process.

2. OSTROM'S THOUGHTS ON DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

Centralization is defined as a "governing method where authority and power are concentrated at a certain point" (Reyhan, 2007, p.10). The most significant characteristic of centralization is the consolidation of all services in one place, where all services are provided from this center. In this context, one of the main drawbacks of centralization is seen as its incompatibility with democracy in terms of public participation in decision-making regarding the execution of tasks (Gözübüyük, 2006, pp.95-96). This view, in a sense, implies that in a centralized structure where individuals do not participate in decisions with their own preferences, there is a deviation from the concept of democratic administration. Ostrom supports this view by suggesting that a democratic political order can only be produced by many different potential beneficiaries-participants who actively engage in collective action. He also emphasizes that such an order can primarily serve the public interest. It is noted that Ostrom's views criticize the Wilsonian "good government" syndrome, which has had a significant influence in political science (Buchanan,1999, 235). In this context, Ostrom's quest for a democratic administration theory in American public administration begins with her rejection of Wilson's foundational work in the field of public administration.²

In his work "The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration," published in 1973, Ostrom critiqued the prevailing assumption in American public administration studies that had persisted for over half a century. This assumption equated good administration with efficiency, in other words, excellence within a hierarchical organization. Consequently, bureaucratic administration was embraced as the preferred theory (Ostrom, 1973, p.48). According to Ostrom, this assumption had two interconnected implications derived from Wilson's "one best rule for good administration for all governments" thesis. The first implication was that a administration theory or science could be universally applied to all political regimes, and the second was that the relationship between administration and politics was an immutable one across all government systems. Therefore, an administration theory that could universally apply to all political systems was seen as the single rule for "good" government, namely, bureaucratic administration theory. However, Ostrom believed that Wilson's quest for "good government" was insufficient for a democratic administration conception (Ostrom, 1973, pp.26-28). In a sense, Ostrom considered democratic administration theory as an alternative approach that rejected Wilson's assertion of a universal bureaucratic administration theory applicable to all modern government systems (Ostrom, 1973, p.74). Furthermore, Ostrom argued that Max Weber also continued Wilson's entire thesis. Weber idealized bureaucratic administration by associating rationality in administration with the structure of hierarchical relationships. Bureaucracy, as the administrative expression of Weber's concept of legal-rational authority, was identified with the modern state's administrative apparatus, characterized by the rule of law, the presence of strict regulatory rules, and technical superiority. In this sense, the entrenched modern public administration concept rooted in Weberian bureaucracy was considered capable of providing equally effective and efficient service delivery to any political structure due to its centralized, hierarchical, impersonal, and specialized nature, devoid of personality and politics (Yıldırım, 2009, p.386). According to Weber, the democratization process of modern society was seen as the use of technical superiority embedded

² Ostrom's work encompasses a wide range of contributions and influences from various scholars. However, due to the limitations of this study, we have focused primarily on his views related to the most influential figures.

in the rational norms of this bureaucratic state apparatus and the increasing bureaucratization and centralization. In a way, the applied bureaucratic process or bureaucratization was viewed as a means of mass democracy that weakened the role of actions driven by individual initiatives and balanced different statuses within society. In this context, the criteria used by Weber to characterize democratic administration, included minimizing the scope of command authority, authorizing everyone to participate in the execution of public affairs, and thus independent administration where voters' equality was maintained as a form of public administration (Becer, 2018, pp.197-199; Swingewood, 1998, pp.223-224). However, Ostrom considered Weber's idealized bureaucratic administration model, characterized by its planned, centralized, or monocentric structure, as far from independent and democratic administration. A monocentric structure was defined as a structure where all officials were integrated within a hierarchy that culminated in a single ultimate authority center, and the unity of command was realized without exceptions (Ostrom, 1973, p.78). Ostrom believed that through this structure, bureaucracy served any political master, but even at the highest level, it equally chained both bureaucrats and the dependent masses managed by bureaucrats to the bureaucratic mechanism, rendering them "powerless" in the face of the mechanism (Kolev, 2019, p.15). Ostrom argued that the bureaucratic administration advocated within the American classical public administration model, in its pursuit of good administration, distanced individuals and structures from democratic public administration. Ostrom viewed the primary purpose of public administration as internalizing a democratic style rather than focusing on efficiency (Üstüner, 1995, p.64). While critiquing bureaucratic governance as an alternative decision-making arrangement to centralized and individual choices, Ostrom aimed to strengthen democratic governance theory (Doğan, 2017, p.34). At this point, Ostrom argued that democratic administration theory could coexist alongside bureaucratic administration as a general form of public administration without obstructing it.

Ostrom's exploration of democratic administration began with an examination of the works of Madison, Hamilton, and Tocqueville, whom he considered the first democratic administration analysts and whose ideas were initially rejected by Wilson during the formative stages of his work. Ostrom focused on their views on polycentrism and the concept of a united republic³. According to Ostrom, when compared to Weber's criteria, the works of Hamilton, Madison, and Tocqueville encapsulate the American experiment based on democratic administration. He regarded their contributions as pivotal in charting a new course for human development (Ostrom, 1973, pp.81-98). In his work, Ostrom primarily delved into Alexander Hamilton and James Madison's "The Federalist Papers"⁴, finding the basis for his ideas in their writings. In these papers, Madison advocated leaving a residue of sovereignty that does not concern national interests to each state, while Hamilton, although favoring a stronger central authority, proposed a balance of power between national and state governments (Targonski, 2002, p.33). According to Ostrom, the administration system envisioned by Hamilton and Madison within the American federal system would operate within the context of a political system where all public institutions are shaped according to principles of self-government. However, Ostrom noted that both figures did not explicitly list the principles⁵ of self-government, but the different principles they discussed

³ In a single republic, all the power representing the people is consolidated and entrusted to the administration of a single government, similar to the way power is concentrated in monarchies. On the other hand, in a compound republic, the power representing the people is initially divided between state and federal governments, and subsequently further subdivided among different and separate branches or divisions.

⁴ "The Federalist Papers" is a series of articles written by John Jay, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton in 1787 and 1788. These papers are considered the most authoritative source that articulates the ideas of those who were instrumental in preparing the United States Constitution. They are regarded as a highly influential and authoritative collection of essays that laid out the principles and arguments in favor of Constitution.

⁵ Ostrom provides detailed discussions of these principles in his book. See Ostrom (1973, pp.88-89) for further reference and in-depth exploration of these ideas.

throughout "The Federalist" could potentially be among the principles of self-government applicable to all public institutions. He argued that these principles embedded within a complex democratic decision-making structure could reduce hierarchical control and enhance democratic control mechanisms (Ostrom, 1973, pp.88-91). Ostrom considered these principles of self-government to be consistent with the defining characteristics of democratic administration as outlined by Weber. In his work, Ostrom also examined Tocqueville's thoughts on democratic administration, particularly focusing on his work "Democracy in America" (1835). He argued that Tocqueville based American democracy on the principles of voluntary association and self-government, considering them as pivotal elements in shaping the spirit of American democracy (Ostrom, 1973, pp.91-95). In this work, Tocqueville analyzed the emerging American society, which was characterized by concepts like equality, freedom, democracy, and government for the people. He believed that these concepts, which he thought would profoundly influence other societies in the future, were underpinned by voluntary association and self-government (Tocqueville, 1994, pp.14-15). Tocqueville's key concept when examining democracy in America is "centralization." He discussed administrative centralization from two perspectives: administrative centralization, which he criticized, and governmental centralization, which he endorsed. According to Tocqueville, governmental centralization involved the central government handling all matters that concerned everyone, thereby allowing for decision-making in matters of common or general interest. In contrast, administrative centralization involved the central government not only handling national-level tasks but also tasks related to local interests. Consequently, the central government would monopolize all activities. The issue of centralization or decentralization is crucial in terms of democracy and individual liberties. Excessive centralization concentrates power, posing a threat to individual freedoms. In Tocqueville's view, representative democracy at the national level should be complemented by participatory democracy at the local level to alleviate these concerns. Both systems should incorporate checks and balances against the tyranny of the majority (Aron, 1994, pp.167-173). Tocqueville regarded civil society and local governments as essential for preserving individual liberties (Raynaud, 2003, 886). Madison, on the other hand, saw civil society as a realm where personal interests diverged, different classes and interest groups formed, and divisions based on private property occurred. He viewed civil society as a counterbalance to the strong, centralized, and cohesive structure of the central government. In contrast to the political level, which he believed should have a strong, centralized, and cohesive government, he considered society at large as fragmented along professional, religious, and class lines, which would act as a safeguard against majority despotism (Hacker, 2000, p.142). However, according to Tocqueville, the local government structure, characterized by local interests, supplements the principles of self-government, allowing local issues to be resolved through public participation and local government authority (Tocqueville, 1994, pp.53-75). Ostrom states that, in characterizing democratic government, Tocqueville adopted the features used by Weber to define democratic government, but further stated that everyone should take part in reviewing all important decisions as well as participating in the conduct of public affairs. Consequently, democratic government should not be characterized solely by centralization but by polycentrism, a system where power is distributed across multiple centers (Ostrom, 1973, pp.96-98). In essence, Ostrom considered it important to formulate a framework for organizing collective action to protect individual interests within a system characterized by regular complexity in social relations.

3. OSTROM'S CONCEPT OF POLYCENTRICITY AND GOVERNANCE

It can be observed that with his work published in 1973, Ostrom attempted to offer an alternative paradigm, by going beyond the early studies of administrative science. According to Ostrom, democratic administration is a stable system that provides an alternative structure for the organization of public administration through a system consisting of overlapping spheres of authority and the sharing of authority. Ostrom is seen to address the "intellectual crisis" of public administration by juxtaposing two broad and opposing paradigms. It is observed that Ostrom defines the first paradigm as the cause of the crisis and accepts the second paradigm as the remedy (Golembiewski, 1977, p.1488). According to him, the first paradigm, which is the cause of the crisis in public administration, is characterized by a bias towards traditional public administration or the Weberian bureaucratic model, which assumes authority to be concentrated "top-down" and has a long-lasting impact. Ostrom argues that in this model, authority is an extreme form of sovereignty that allows infiltration into the hierarchy of state enterprises in various ways. In essence, the traditional paradigm assumes the existence of a single center of sovereign power in any government system. However, Ostrom argues that this assumption generally arises due to the dichotomy between politics and administration, which is a problem or contradiction faced by all modern governments. She contends that this dichotomy is due to the leadership of a hierarchical administration composed of experts and politically neutral professionals. Ostrom opposes Wilson's separation of politics and administration and argues that treating bureaucracy as a neutral technical tool would lead to the concentration of power at the center. Furthermore, Ostrom states that within a hierarchical structure, the accountability of specialized public services to a single center of power would reduce the ability of a large administrative system to respond to the diverse preferences of citizens regarding public goods and services. Similarly, efficiency cannot be maximized by measuring time, energy, and resources with minimal cost. Therefore, Ostrom emphasizes that individuals, both as members and customers of public institutions, should have a broader role in influencing public policy and administration. According to Ostrom, under rapidly changing conditions, two necessary conditions exist to maintain a stable and democratic political order that can increase individual welfare. The first is the division of authority among various decision centers with multiple veto powers in any sphere of authority, and the second is the development of numerous spheres of authority that overlap at very different scales. The fundamental elements of democratic public administration are seen as preventing bureaucratic domination and expanding participation. Public administration is efficient to the extent that it is democratic, and democratic administration is polycentric rather than monocentric (Doğan, 2017, p.34). At this point, it is evident that Ostrom advocates a more heterogeneous form of democratic administration from bottom to top as the second paradigm and solution (Golembiewski, 1977, p.1489). He emphasizes a polycentric political system as the solution. This emphasis is clear in Ostrom's article "The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry," co-authored with Tiebout and Warren in 1961. In this article, Ostrom and others defend polycentricity in metropolitan areas against criticisms that consider the plurality of political units (federal and state government institutions, special districts, etc.) as a pathological phenomenon. In a sense, in response to criticisms that claim "too many governments exist in metropolitan areas, but not enough effective government," Ostrom and others affirm a polycentric political structure, stating that it can respond to citizens' diverse preferences at different levels. According to them, although the optimum production scale for all urban public goods and services may not be the same, some services can be produced more efficiently on a large scale, while others can be produced more efficiently on a small scale.

Therefore, the existence of different interacting institutions in urban governance is considered important not as a pathological condition but rather as a means to maintain competition and enhance efficiency, as in market economies (Ostrom et al., 1961; Çınar et al., 2009, p.16). However, in public economy, polycentricity is generally considered as the repetition of services, wastefulness, and inefficiency, and the solution is seen as the regulation of overlapping spheres of authority and repeated service areas, which coincides with the division of authority (Ostrom, et al., 1961). In this regard, in an article published in 1965, Elinor and Vincent Ostrom expressed that the relationships between different government units, public institutions, and private enterprises operating in public economics could be coordinated through various interinstitutional regulations. They argue that polycentricity in urban governance will exhibit characteristics similar to the market in terms of responding to diverse preferences and will enhance efficiency by providing differentiated services through various levels of regulation (Ostrom and Ostrom, 1965, pp.140-141). The fundamental characteristic of a polycentric political system is considered to be the allocation of limited and relatively autonomous privileges to many authorities or decision-making bodies to determine, implement, and change legal relationships. However, the functioning of this polycentric structure is accepted to depend on measures taken by decision-makers at various levels who determine, implement, and change legal relationships through interinstitutional regulations. According to Ostrom, the maintenance of any social organization model that is polycentric will depend on the use of various potential sanctions possessed by some decision-makers to regulate their legal relationships with other decision-makers. Therefore, while no office or decision structure has ultimate control over the legitimate use of power, the distribution of decision-making abilities in this temporary social system, which includes multiple decision centers with limited and autonomous authorities operating under inclusive rules, can reduce inequalities in decision-making levels between those who have ultimate authority in a monocentric political system and those subject to that authority (Ostrom, 1972, pp.1-5). In a sense, polycentricity is important for democracy due to the division of authority through interinstitutional regulations and the distribution of decision-making abilities.

In this context, the concept of a polycentric political system discussed by Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren in 1961 as a way to make sense of the fact that most metropolitan areas in the United States lacked a dominant political leader refers to "a multitude of decision-making centers that are formally independent of each other" (Stephan et al., 2019, pp.21-22). Polycentricity is also considered as the distribution of all authority in a manner subject to boundaries. In their article, Ostrom and her colleagues argue that the fragmentation of authority and self-organized collective actions defined by overlapping spheres of authority within a set of constitutional limits can provide successful and democratic administration at the local community level. However, it can also be observed that Ostrom and her colleagues accepted the existence of a central political system, which they deemed appropriate for providing public services on a single and large scale (e.g., national scale) (Stephan et al., 2019, p.25). The possibility of a polycentric political system does not preclude the possibility of a monocentric political system. In a sense, under semi-market conditions, a public administration system that operates through competition among numerous spheres of authority to resolve interjurisdictional conflicts and with strong democratic controls is considered to generate patterns of democratic administration with distinct features compared to bureaucratic administration (Ostrom, 1972, pp.3-21). Unlike the vision of bureaucratization, hierarchy, command, and control, this perspective prioritizes competition, pluralism, open elections, and maximizing personal freedoms, favoring alternative forms of constitutional

collective action (Aligica, 2015, p.117). In this context, it is seen that Ostrom's thinking on democratic administration draws inspiration from Hamilton's formulation of creating a limited national government that would operate concurrently with state governments and Madison's emphasis on regulating governmental powers according to "opposite and rival interests" (Ostrom, 1987, pp.8-40). It is acknowledged that Ostrom's concept of a polycentric political system or democratic administration is influenced by the societal and intellectual foundations laid by the founders of the United States, especially Hamilton and Madison (Üstüner, 1995, p.64).

The concept of polycentricity is known to have been first used in the literature in 1951 by Karl Polanyi in his book "The Logic of Liberty," and it emerged as a result of his interest in social conditions that protect freedom of expression and the rule of law. In the subsequent period, it is acknowledged that the concept laid the foundation for law, urban networks, and governance models with contributions from Ostrom (Aligica and Tarko, 2011, p.237). Governance, which emerged in the 1980s following the crisis of capitalism in the 1970s and supported the restructuring of the state, is considered a reflection of the New Public Management approach's market-based state model, which was advocated by neoliberal policies (Bayramoğlu, 2002). This new style of government, advocated in the 1990s as an alternative to bureaucratic state-centric approaches, supports a participatory administration approach that is decentralized and moves control from bureaucracy towards society, aiming for democracy and efficiency. In this context, it is expected to facilitate cooperation among the public, private sector, and NGOs and take on a catalytic role (Güzelsarı, 2004). In a sense, the governance model is evaluated from a perspective that is more flexible, characterized by mutual contracts and partnerships, after a centralized, hierarchical perspective that directed society and policies, which was characterized by the state's control over social and political matters (Capano et al., 2015, pp.312-313). In this context, Ostrom and his colleagues' concept of polycentricity for metropolitan areas or the emphasis on a polycentric political system can be considered as a pioneering and significant reference for the governance model. This is because it anticipates that, for the efficient delivery of local public services, the state should be more effective, produce policies more efficiently, coordinate with other decision-making centers, and address different preferences and needs (McGinnis and Ostrom, 2011, pp.15-16). Ostrom and his colleagues' approach draws attention to the involvement of different actors (private, public, individuals, NGOs) in the administration public enterprises or common goods, the presence of multiple decision-making centers, competitive and collaborative relationships, as well as factors involving cost and benefit. This approach is seen as far ahead of its time (Stephan et al., 2019, p.22; Capelari et al., 2017, p.211). The emphasis on a polycentric political system for the administration of metropolitan areas implies viewing authority centers, when it comes to processes related to public common property resources, as independent individuals and actors related to each other within a general rule system. According to Ostrom, the presence of these various actors and the continuation of their relationships imply the delivery of public services at different scales and forms. In this context, the ability of these actors to put forth their own wills, in other words, the principle of self-governance, is considered important for the sustainability of various public services preferred at the local level and the achievement of the public interest (Ostrom, 1972, pp.19-20). Therefore, in metropolitan areas, this polycentric political system, which leads to a model of policy formation characterized by flexibility, mutual contracts, and partnerships, where authority is not fully controlled by the government but takes place within a certain regulation or coordination method, is seen as an expression of society's capacity for self-governance. In a sense, Ostrom's characterization of democratic administration with polycentricity can be defined as a system's capacity for self-governance (Van Zeben, 2019,

pp.16-17). According to Ostrom, democratic administration requires a complex combination and collaboration of numerous autonomous units and various types of organizations in the public, private, and voluntary sectors, each with overlapping responsibilities and functional capacities.

5. EVALUATION

The governance model, which emerged as a new paradigm in the field of public administration in the 1990s, is considered a result of the changes in the traditional roles and functions of the state. Governance criticizes the centralized, bureaucratic structure of traditional public administration, emphasizing a shift towards a more participatory and flexible style of administration where bureaucracy is reduced, various actors with administrative and financial autonomy participate, and where power is more dispersed. This new style of government, adopted within the framework of a democratic administration approach, is fundamentally a result of mutual relationships, less guided by official authorities, and even evolving towards self-organizing systems without any hierarchical form as it effectively coordinates complex policy formation in today's public administration. The increasing emphasis on democracy and participation in the field of public administration, especially in the 2000s, brings about the increased importance of interaction between individuals and groups, and the common values determined as a result of mutual dialogue and negotiations of many independent and autonomous actors with the capacity to self-manage in the public policy determination and implementation process. It is seen that network-based governance forms based on collective cooperation are supported in the name of democratic public administration. In this context, government processes, in the face of rapidly changing conditions in public administration, are recognized as evolving towards multi-centered governance forms that support not only a more pluralistic and participatory approach but also society's self-governing process, thus eliminating the unilateral decision-making dominance of the centralized bureaucratic state over society.

In this regard, the democratic administration style conceptualized by Ostrom as a self-governing process within the framework of polycentric arrangements, and the search for a multiple administration approach that suits the conditions where people govern in democratic societies instead of assuming that central governments govern, are regarded as precursors to network-based and multi-centered governance forms. Ostrom's concept of polycentricity and the pursuit of democratic administration, based on the collective action of independent and autonomous actors in addressing contemporary public policy issues, are seen to support a pluralistic perspective aimed at enhancing effectiveness and efficiency. Ostrom's idea of polycentric political systems or polycentricity can be considered an early expression of governance networks, characterized by multiple decision-making centers, each to some degree autonomous, as a complex governance form.

Geliş Tarihi Kabul Tarihi Yayın Tarihi	18 Eylül 2023 01 Aralık 2023 31 Aralık 2023
Yazar Katkısı	Sevinç SOYOCAK ÖZALP
Hakem Değerlendirmesi	Çift taraflı kör hakemlik
Etik Onay	Bu makale, insan veya hayvanlar ile ilgili etik onay gerektiren herhangi bir araştırma içermemektedir.
Çıkar Çatışması	Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.
Finansal Destek	Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir
Telif Hakkı & Lisans	Yazar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanır. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/deed.tr
Submission Acceptance Publication	18 September 2023 01 December 2023 31 December 2023
Author Contribution	Sevinç SOYOCAK ÖZALP
Peer-review	Double-blind peer review
Ethical Approval	This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by the authors.
Conflicts of Interest	The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.
Grant Support	The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.
Copyright & License	Author publishing with the journal retain(s) the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

REFERENCES | KAYNAKÇA

- Aligica, P.D. and Tarko, V. (2011). Polycentricity: from Polanyi to Ostrom and beyond. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, 25(2), 237–262. doi:[10.1111/j.1468-0491.2011.01550.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2011.01550.x)
- Aligica, P.D. (2015). Public administration, public choice and the Ostroms: the achievements, the failure, the promise. *Public Choice*, 163, 111–127. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24507593>
- Becer, F. (2019). Max Weber sosyolojisinden demokrasi çıkarımları. *Journal of International Social Research*, 12(64), 421-429. doi:[10.17719/jisr.2019.3364](https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2019.3364)
- Buchanan, J.M. (1999). Vincent Ostrom, the meaning of democracy and the vulnerability of democracies: a response to Tocqueville's challenge. doi: [10.1023/A:1018359716550](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018359716550)
- Capano, G., M. Howlett and M. Ramesh. (2015). Bringing governments back in: governance and governing in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 17(4), 311-321. doi:[10.1080/13876988.2015.1031977](https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2015.1031977)
- Capelari, M.G.M, Calmon, P. and Araujo, S.M. (2017). Vincent and Elinor Ostrom: Two confluent trajectories for the governance of common property resources. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 20(1). 203-222. doi: [10.1590/1809-4422asoc20150135r1v2012017](https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422asoc20150135r1v2012017)
- Cigeroğlu, M. and Özgür, H. (2015). H. George Frederickson ve kamu yönetimi disiplinindeki yeri. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 29, Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/dpusbe/issue/4771/65669>
- Çınar, T., Çiner, C.U. and Zengin, O. (2009). Büyükşehir yönetimi, bütünleşme süreci. Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları
- Doğan, K.C. (2017). Postmodern kamu yönetiminin kuramsal temelleri çerçevesinde yönetim yaklaşımı: literatür taraması. *Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 27-45. doi: [10.25287/ohuibf.297170](https://doi.org/10.25287/ohuibf.297170)
- Fişek, K. (2005). Yönetim. Ankara: Paragraf Yayınları
- Golembiewski, R.T. (1977). A critique of 'democratic administration' and its supporting ideation. *American Political Science Review*, 71(4), 1488-1507. doi: [10.2307/1961491](https://doi.org/10.2307/1961491)
- Gözübüyük, Ş. (2006). Türkiye'nin yönetim yapısı. Ankara: Turhan Yayınları.
- Güzelsarı, S. (2004). Kamu yönetimi disiplininde yeni kamu işletmeciliği ve yönetim yaklaşimleri. A.Ü.SBF-GETA Tartışma Metinleri, 66, 1-27. Erişim tarihi: <https://sbfdergi.ankara.edu.tr/dergi/tartisma/2004/selime-guzelsari.pdf>
- Hacker, A. (2000). Siyaset biliminin temelleri: amerikan sistemi (Haz. Ahmet Ulvi Türkbağ), İstanbul: Der Yayınları
- Kolev, S. (2019). Antipathy for Heidelberg, sympathy for Freiburg? Vincent Ostrom on Max Weber, Walter Eucken, and the compound history of order. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>
- McGinnis, M.D. and Ostrom, E. (2011). Reflections on Vincent Ostrom, public administration and polycentricity. *Public Administration Review*, 72(1), 15–25. doi:[10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02488.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02488.x)
- Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C. M. and Warren, R. (1961). The organization of government in metropolitan areas: a theoretical inquiry. *The American Political Science Review*, 5(4), 831-842. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/abs/organization-of-government-in-metropolitan-areas-a-theoretical-inquiry/>

-
- Ostrom, V. and Ostrom, E. (1965). A behavioral approach to the study of intergovernmental relation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 359, 137-146. doi:[10.1177/000271626535900115](https://doi.org/10.1177/000271626535900115)
- Ostrom, V. (1972). Polycentricity. Prepared for delivery at the 1972 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10535/3763>
- Ostrom, V. (1973). The intellectual crisis in American public administration. USA: University Alabama Press. Retrieved from: https://archive.org/details/intellectualcris00ostr_0
- Ostrom, V. (1987). The political theory of a compound republic: designing the American experiment. Retrieved from: <https://archive.org/details/politicaltheoryo0000unse>
- Pek Yurtoğlu, E. (2023). Robert Dahl ilkeleriyle demokratikleşmenin koşulları: Türkiye örneği. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Policy*, 8(2), 225-238. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/joep/issue/79312/1297415>
- Raynaud, P. (2003). Alexis De Tocqueville 1805-1859. (Çev. İsmail Yerguz), Siyaset Felsefesi Sözlüğü içinde (s.887). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Reyhan, C. (2007). Osmanlı'da iki tarz-ı idare: merkeziyetçilik-ademi merkeziyetçilik. Ankara: İmge Yayınevi
- Stephan, M., Marshall, G., and McGinnis, M. (2019). An introduction to polycentricity and governance. *Governing complexity: Analyzing and applying polycentricity*, 1431487, 21-44. doi: [10.1017/9781108325721.002](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108325721.002)
- Swingewood, A. (1998). Sosyolojik düşüncenin kısa tarihi (Çeviri: O. Akınhay), Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları
- Targonski, R. (2002). Ana hatları ile ABD devlet yapısı. ABD Dışişleri Bakanlığı Yayınları. Retrieved from: <http://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/turkish/oagt.pdf>
- Tocqueville, A. (1994). Amerika'da demokrasi. (Çev. İhsan Sezal-Fatoş Dilber), Ankara: Yetkin Yayınları
- Üstüner, M.Y. (1995). Kamu yönetimi disiplininde kimlik sorunsalı. Retrieved from: <https://open.metu.edu.tr/handle/11511/70583>
- van Zeben, J.A.W., and Bobic, A. (2019). Polycentric as a Theory of Governance. In *Polycentricity as a Theory of Governance* (pp. 9-27). Cambridge University Press. doi:[10.1017/9781108528771.003](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108528771.003)
- Yıldırım, M. (2009). Modernizm, postmodernizm ve kamu yönetimi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 380-397. Retrieved from: <https://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423936659.pdf>

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Vincent Ostrom, geleneksel kamu yönetimine yönelik eleştirilerine 1973 yılında yayımladığı “Amerikan Kamu Yönetiminde Entelektüel Kriz” adlı eserinde yer verirken, tek merkezli hiyerarşik bir yönetim karşısında çok merkezliliği savunmaktadır. Ostrom’un çok merkezlilik düşüncesi ve demokratik yönetim arayışı bu çalışmanın konusunu oluşturmaktadır. Bununla birlikte çalışma, kamu yönetimde 1980’lerle başlayan dönüşümle birlikte 1990’larla gündeme getirilen merkeziyetçi, tek taraflı karar verme süreçleri karşısında bireylerin karar ve denetim süreçlerine katıldığı çok aktörlü bir demokratik yönetim anlayışı olarak benimsenen yönetim modeli ile Ostrom’un görüşleri arasındaki benzerliği incelemektedir. Çalışma, Ostrom’un çok merkezlilik kavramının ve demokratik yönetim düşüncesinin yönetim modeliyle uyumlu olduğunu ve yönetim sürecine temel oluşturduğunu kabul etmektedir. 1990’larla kamu yönetimi alanında yeni bir paradigma olarak yükselişe geçen yönetim modeli, devletin geleneksel rol ve görevlerinde yaşanan değişimin bir sonucu olarak kabul edilmektedir. Yönetişim, geleneksel kamu yönetiminin merkeziyetçi, bürokratik yapısını eleştirirken bürokrasinin daraltıldığı, idari ve mali özerkliğe sahip çeşitli aktörlerin yer aldığı, katılımcı ve esnek bir iktidar tarzı olarak benimsenmektedir. Demokratik bir yönetim anlayışı çerçevesinde benimsenen bu yeni iktidar tarzının, özellikle de toplumsal sorunların giderek karmaşıklaştığı, çok düzeyli çözümlerin tartışıldığı ve çözüm taraflarının giderek çoğaldığı günümüz kamu yönetiminde, temelde karşılıklı ilişkilerin bir sonucu olduğu, resmi otoritelerce daha az yönlendirildiği hatta herhangi bir hiyerarşi biçimi olmadan karmaşık bir politika oluşumunun fiili koordinasyonu olarak kendi kendini örgütleyen sistemlere doğru evrildiği kabul edilmektedir. Bu bağlamda yönetim sürecinin, kamu yönetiminde hızla değişen koşullar karşısında merkeziyetçi bürokratik devletin toplum üzerindeki tek taraflı karar hakimiyetini ortadan kaldırırken, daha çoğulcu ve katılımcı bir yönetim anlayışı çerçevesinde toplumun kendi kendini yönetme sürecini de destekleyen çok merkezli yönetim biçimlerine doğru evrildiği de kabul edilmektedir. Ostrom’un çok merkezli düzenler bağlamında bir özyönetim süreci olarak kavramsallaştırdığı demokratik yönetim tarzı ile çoklu bir yönetim arayışı, literatürde son dönemde tartışılan ağ temelli ve çok merkezli yönetim biçimlerinin öncülü olarak da kabul edilmektedir.