

## HUMAN BEING DIGNITY-BASED PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE ROAD TO EFFECTIVE GOOD GOVERNANCE

### İNSAN ONURUNA DAYALI KAMU YÖNETİMİ: ETKİN İYİ YÖNETİŞİM YOLU

**Dr. Said Vakkas GÖZLÜGÖL\***  
*Human being first!*

#### ABSTRACT

*In modern societies, individual expectations have variedly increased over time in parallel with rapid social and other changes. Accordingly, public administration, as the means of providing and facilitating for legal and natural persons, should be updated in compliance with these expectations, social realities and values to live up to the need of individuals in time and place.*

*In this article, the effective application of generally recognized principles, the correlative prerequisites of good governance, transparency, accountability, citizen participation have been suggested for overcoming common obstacles in the public administration network on the road to effective good governance. Since these concepts are seen of paramount importance to a human being dignity-based way of public life, the scope of this article has been limited with these concepts.*

#### ÖZET

*Modern toplumlarda bireysel beklentiler, sosyal ve diğer değişimlere paralel olarak zamanla çeşitlenerek artmış bulunmaktadır. Buna göre, gerçek ve tüzel kişilere hizmet aracı olarak kamu yönetimi, bu beklentiler, sosyal gerçekler ve değerler doğrultusunda zamanında ve yerinde güncellenmelidir.*

*Bu makalede, etkin iyi yönetim yolunda kamu yönetimi ağlarında yaygın bulunan engelleri aşmak için, genellikle kabul gören iyi yönetişimin önkoşullarını oluşturan ilkelerin -saydamlık, hesap verebilirlik, vatandaş katılımı- insan onuruna dayalı olarak etkin ve etkili şekilde uygulanması önerilmektedir. Bu kavramlar insan onuruna dayalı kamusal bir hayat biçimi için hayati önemde görüldüğünden, bu makalenin kapsamı bu kavramlarla sınırlı tutulmuştur.*

---

\* Vali, Merkez Valileri Kurulu, İçişleri Bakanlığı, svgozlugol@hotmail.com

**Key Words:** Human dignity, transparency, accountability, citizen participation, good governance, the rule of law of human rights.  
**Anahtar Kelimeler:** İnsan onuru, saydamlık, hesap verebilirlik, vatandaş katılımı, iyi yönetim, insan hakları hukukunun üstünlüğü.

## INTRODUCTION

Today, all concepts inevitably evolve into time. Economic, social and cultural values dramatically change mostly for the better. At the same time, every society or organization is inevitably exposed to new challenges such as economic, social, and environmental problems. Thanks to technological advancement, communication with other societies has become constant. Leading a public department has become a real challenging task. No ivory tower is left available to public officials. The age of top-down decision-making processes is already over. Hopes and expectations of human beings constantly change and increase in varied forms, even in the same homogeneous society. Thus, in the public domain, sequential reform processes, redistribution of roles and decision-making powers have become necessary.

Before 1980s, public administration was seen as a 'life-long secure employment', and administrators used to be imperious and domineering in stance (Bovaird and Löffler, 2009: 6). However, a new public administration understanding has begun to prevail in the theory and practice of public administration since then. The deployment of some principles like transparency, accountability, citizen participation and ethics has begun in governmental efforts to better the public administration (Eryılmaz and Biricikoğlu, 2011). Thus, there has been an important shift from the concept of government to governance in terms of public administration. In other words, the understanding of serving public has been transformed into an understanding of co-producing public services. So every stakeholder has a responsibility to take a role in the development of public policies and services (Löffler, 2009: 219).

With regard to this new understanding, this article is meant to be a contribution to identify important obstacles on the road to good governance, on the one hand, and to highlight the question of how to overcome these obstacles, on the other. The most common obstacles in today's public administration are identified in general terms as deficit in mutual trust, deficit in predictability, democratic deficit in policy and decision-making processes, carelessness of officials in attitudes, fear of change, political influence, privileges, unfair and unequal treatments, and corruption. Without doubt, these obstacles reduce the effectiveness of governance networks. With respect to the question of how to reduce or remove these obstacles from the administration, the merits of the application of prerequisite principles of good governance, transparency, accountability and citizen participation have been discussed. Since these prominent features of good governance are widely applicable to many realms outside the domain of public sector, the scope of

the article has been limited to the domain of public administration, and due to space limitations and the impossibility of giving a comprehensive account of all obstacles, as a matter of choice, the emphasis will generally be placed on these obstacles, confronting contemporary societies and reducing effectiveness of governance networks. A different approach of good governance from the conventional one has been suggested, with the purpose of encouraging thinking about how to improve public administration, and with the ultimate aim of putting human dignity first and above all both in theory and in practice. However, these generally recognised principles are not suggested as such a magic cure for all problems present and future. To a great extent, it is true that in conformity with their quality they can critically make the difference between a successful and an unsuccessful governance network.

Overall, this analysis is based on the presumption that well-functioning democratic institutions, effective protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law are properly in place, for democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law shape the way in which the state operates and exercises governmental power (Popelier, 2011: 556). Democracy *per se* is not a sufficient precondition of the real condition of lives of people in which human dignity may flourish. Moreover, the requisite criteria for that are peace, justice (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948) and an effective good governance network.

### 1. OBSTACLES ON THE ROAD TO GOOD GOVERNANCE

Despite spectacular advancements in scientific knowledge and despite many governmental efforts, there have been achieved no perfect governing system on the planet yet. Depending on the public administration, there exist still many defaults need to be tackled. Variations, definitions and degrees of the obstacles develop under the influence of many factors, and therefore they can be seen in various forms in various countries. The correlative means and modes to overcome the obstacles also vary from country to country. In this regard, some countries have developed positive instruments and initiated strategic policies to provide and facilitate for effective and responsive good governance (Salminen and Ikola-Norrbacka, 2010: 647). For instance, Austria and Turkey have introduced *e-governance* applications as a means of facilitating electronic access to certain public services for citizens (OECD, 2007; Meesters and Jaremba, 2007; Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008; Çayhan, 2008).

However, no uniform solutions to the obstacles can be deemed successful in every situation since there can be no uniform obstacle or shortcoming in any given specific administration. Each country circumstances produce their own obstacles. For this reason, the means and modes to overcome these obstacles should be designed on a country specific basis in a manner that is receptive to good practices and achievements by international community, and from empirical studies. As it is suggested

public administration can best meet constantly changing needs of persons and corresponding requirements through institutional mobility and positive reforms. And citizens' expectations are indeed in this direction (Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008: 49).

### **1.1. Deficit in Trust**

By and large, deficit in trust can be seen in a two-way form. That is, deficit in citizens' trust may be seen in public officials and institutions, on the one hand, officials' trust in citizens, on the other. In this respect, deficit in mutual trust is one of the most general shortcomings reducing the quality of the public services and ultimate progress.

With respect to deficit in trust, mention should be made of some critical questions. Can transparency enhance public trust and create a new culture of openness in governance or cause adverse consequences? How can the grounds for suspicion or excessive secrecy be removed? Can more interaction and connection with citizens fill the gap?

Indeed, the answers to these and many other questions may vary. Having made this point, mention should be made of secrecy which is generally associated with suspicious situations. In order to lessen secrecy and preclude suspicious situations, transparency and openness in measures and procedures should be promoted through proper strategies and policies in addition to effective accountability for actions, inactions or delays, and due citizen participation.

This obstacle may appear in the form of deficit in dialogue. Then, establishing an active dialogue mechanism between the public and private spheres may help reduce the deficit to some extent. Another form of deficit in trust can be identified as deficit in communication between persons and governance network. In order to bridge the gap, as a way of establishing dialogue and communication with stakeholders, citizen participation, no matter in which form, should be well designed and implemented. Otherwise, an inadequate or insufficient participation mechanism "may delay decisions, increase conflict, disappoint participants, and lead to more distrust" (Yang and Pandey, 2011: 880). So, effective citizen participation through dialogue and communication based on flexible and situation specific mechanisms are considered crucial for mutual trust.

As another way of enhancing trust, more information and communication from public authorities to the public may bring them more trust and more legitimacy in turn. As Bovaird and Löffler emphasise, public positions need citizens' trust for their legitimacy (Bovaird and Löffler, 2009: 3). To that end, there have been efforts such as more disclosure of information to citizens so as to maintain citizens' trust over time and space (Monfardini, 2010: 632-633).

With respect to deficit in trust in citizens by public official, surveys clearly indicate that there is a considerable distrust of administrators in citizens about their capacity for effective participation in both developing and

developed countries (Waheduzzaman, 2010; Salminen and Ikola-Norrbacka, 2010; Yang and Pandey, 2011: 883). Building trust in citizens will encourage public actors to receive and appreciate citizen participation (Yang and Pandey, 2011: 882). Ultimately, when participants realise that their perspectives, concerns or interests are taken into account by the public authorities, they gain confidence in the authorities and attribute legitimacy to their decisions and implementation (Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008: 29).

It is worth emphasising that mutual trust is considered as an important condition for democratic governance, and is essential for the efficacy of citizen participation in governance network. Without mutual trust between public authorities and citizens, there can be no sufficient and effective citizen participation. And trust has to be essentially based on equality principle (Yang, 2005: 273, 281, 283). Fewer deficits in trust mean stronger society together with the governance and its people.

### **1.2. Deficit in Predictability**

Beyond doubt, *red tape* that consists mainly of unreasonable, unrealistic, inadequate, burdensome rules, or frequently changing requirements leads to unpredictability. In other words, uncertain public actions, ambiguous regulations, and complex procedures adversely affect the efficiency of public administration. Moreover, these obstacles pave the way for adverse effects such as the lack of trust in public authorities and a grave deficit in predictability of public domain.

To reiterate, the red tape refers to ambiguous rules and procedures and their unreasonably complex and time consuming requirements. For instance, ambiguous rules and procedures may prevent adequate flow of information to citizens to pinpoint when and how to participate, and this situation adversely affects their effective participation. So, relevant rules and procedures should be explicit for effective outcomes of the participation (Yang and Pandey, 2011: 882).

Here, the application of transparency and citizen participation can help remove the red tape forms from the public domain to a greater extent. Indeed, citizen involvement in the development of policies and decision-making processes can substantially reflect citizens' concerns, perspectives and current expectations. Thus, citizens gain control over processes and have no difficulty in predicting or understanding rules and procedures. Hence, with due citizen involvement through transparent mechanisms to improve the legal and institutional framework, and through incremental positive advancements in governance networks the red tape can be removed from the road to effective good governance.

Together with the attitude of mind of public service providers including administrators at all levels, a secure legal order, explicit procedures and processes can provide all persons with equal access to services. Furthermore, persons those who exercise public power should be held responsible for their abusive actions, careless omissions and unreasonable delays under the rule of law. Consequently, persons, before or behind the

table, can feel confident for either their business or personal development with dignity.

Overall, the right to development as an inalienable and fundamental human right is explicitly recognised by the international community (The United Nations General Assembly, 1986; World Conference on Human Rights, 1993). Full enjoyment of this right will enable individuals to optimise their potential so as to participate fully in the whole process of political, social and economic development in the society.

### **1.3. Democratic Deficit in Policy and Decision-making Processes**

Real democracy functions through communicative processes, that is, decisions are made through deliberation with people who may be affected by the decision made by public authorities (Smismans, 2004: 68). Despite the fact that the imposition fixed preferences and top-down decisions have no place in advanced democracy any longer, public policy and decision-making processes may not be democratic enough. This is also true for the executive processes. Such democratic deficit makes public question the legitimacy of the authorities and their decisions, and implementation. In this respect, to what extent the prerequisites of effective good governance can help amplify democratic decisions and policies in the public realm?

Multilevel decision-makers may not make perfect decisions. However, they can make justifiable and responsive decisions by deploying collective decision-maker processes, for instance, through participation of related people. Hence, the key means is the participation of the stakeholders to curb the deficit in decision-making processes in addition to accountable, transparent, deliberative and effective democratic governance mechanisms. This is also essential to a healthy democracy in which the state fulfils its obligations to facilitate for all persons *on equal terms*. Ultimately, this will in turn lead to greater consensus, acceptance and legitimacy of the decisions (Popelier, 2011: 557).

### **1.4. Careless Attitudes**

A careless culture may develop even in the most competent administrative structures. Legal framework may not be sufficient for the establishment of a caring, *due diligent* network. The proper execution of a governance network largely depends not only on persons' physical attitude, but also the attitude of minds. It can be said that attitude is everything that can lead either to careful or careless culture. Among public officials careless attitudes towards individuals often take place for many reasons. The rationale behind these careless attitudes may sometimes be avoiding the risk, and sometimes the belief of 'the less work done, the less complaint received'. Typical examples for these attitudes may appear as 'I do not care. I come to the office in time and spend the necessary time there, and do not bother to ensure whether work is done properly in time', and 'Go home today and come tomorrow'. Obviously, beyond question, such attitudes irreversibly undermine human being dignity since it is inherent in all human beings to

stand on their dignity. Without any exception everyone has the right to be treated with proper respect.

At this point, this obstacle requires attention to the questions that how can it be possible to turn this kind of culture into an altruistic and careful one? Could application of the prerequisite principles of good governance help change this manner of work among public officials into a careful institutional behaviour?

It is obvious that the existence of explicit rules and procedures, clear distribution of roles and tasks can prevent such attitudes to a great extent. Hence, transparency requires accountability for arbitrary actions, omissions or delays by public officials at all levels. Ultimately, citizen involvement with *due care and attention* to public affairs and policies will pave the way for a more altruistic institutional culture.

### **1.5. Fear of Change**

Fear is often articulated with change. For many, change means new troubles. People tend not to change the way how they work or what they used to do. Fear of change may appear as habits such as ‘we do in this way’, ‘we are used to do in that way’, and ‘that is the rule’. Does fear of change, in such various forms, prevent progress and development? Of course, in terms of such *status quo*, there can be no progress or advancement, neither for governance network nor for persons.

In the face of inevitable change in needs and expectations of citizens, change for the better is inevitable for either public officials or public networks. To live up with the change, organisations and their competent officials should be flexible enough to confront new challenges. For many, this requirement means a fundamental change of work culture (Osborne, 2004: 293). This requisite requires more transparency and more accountability to overcome the fear of change on the road to effective good governance.

### **1.6. Political Influence, Privileges, Unfair and Unequal Treatments**

Obstacles like political influence, privileges, unfair and unequal treatments fundamentally undermine human dignity. Political influence upon the administrative actors and decision-making procedures and their implementation paves the way for inefficiency in public administration and ultimately lead to injustice, and many other adverse consequences. Without doubt, political influence develops a deep sense of social injustice.

There should be no place for privileges, unfair and discriminative treatments in a system where the rule of law applies. To reiterate, such treatments essentially undermine human being dignity. Under the rule of law, it is supposed that an effective good governance system would prevent such influences. And, once the law passed from the parliament executive authorities must be independent and impartial in the implementation processes. To that end, substantial and procedural law should be transparent

so that privileges, unfair and unequal treatments can be easily noticed and ultimately sanctioned by explicit provisions. Thus, it is very unlikely that anybody dare treat people unfairly and unequally in a transparent and accountable legal order.

In the public domain, individuals, including managers at all levels, work in a changing and pressing environment under a variety of internal and external effects or influences. In particular, external forces such as political interest, media, interest groups, citizens' expectations and needs may affect the whole administrative process. For example, while individuals in an inferior position tend to please their superiors, administrators tend to please primarily political actors and their superiors (Cayer and Weschler, 1988: 1-5). When the latter tendency exceeds the general public interest, the worse comes, and it affects the overall efficacy of the public network. Both of these tendencies pave the way for neglecting the primary responsibility to persons. Yet, the individuals who make up the administrative network exist to facilitate in a spirit of cooperation so as to provide for the efficacy of the network for the benefit of all.

Unfair political intervention to affect procedures, implementation and the correlative results will inevitably pave the way for corruption. Indeed, arbitrary intervention itself consists of a serious form of corruption.

### **1.7. Corruption**

Corruption is another important obstacle to the good governance. As a matter of fact, there should not be any exaggeration in saying that corruption is the worst of all, and therefore the inevitable result of all other obstacles or shortcomings. It occurs even in the most developed administrative networks and consequently leads to a great deficit in individuals trust (Giray, 2010; Kapucu, 2010: 3; Salminen and Ikola-Norrbacka, 2010).

For many, holding information is an important power, and controlling public resources is a privilege. In order to maintain the power and the control of resources, officials tend to pave the way for many other obstacles. Unnecessary confidential procedures make these officials more powerful whilst more power frequently leads to corrupt. To overcome this grave obstacle, due application of transparency (Etzioni, 2010: 393) and due accountability of individuals exercising power and in control of resources particularly help prevent corruption and other forms of misuse of powers (Eryılmaz and Biricikoğlu, 2011: 20). In order to preclude corruption in public life, the state has to optimise the quality of transparency in both substantive and procedural processes. This task requires the state to put a proper legal framework in place. In addition to this primary obligation, the state has to take positive measures and actions to ensure the proper implementation of the law and policies, progressively and effectively. Otherwise, neglect, insensitivity and the pursuit of self-interest by public officials will lead to a weak implementation of rules and regulations. No matter how competent the legal framework, the weak implementation

adversely affects the desired success and progress beyond doubt. Moreover, it will pave the way for corruption and the pursuit of self-interest on the part of people in power controlling public resources. Among many other means of fighting corruption, Giray suggests *e-government* applications as an efficient means of curbing corruption, together with a transparent and accountable administrative network. This application is also an efficient means of increasing transparency and accountability in public administration (Giray, 2010).

To summarise, it is evident that these obstacles are by no means exhaustive. It is also evident that they are correlative and interdependent. Their features are also inextricably linked with each other. In parallel to the constant challenges and developments, better substantive and procedural instruments should be developed in an incremental manner. Equally importantly, public authorities or officials should also be receptive to new and useful ideas and perspectives, innovative, flexible, adaptable, and ready to face change for progressive and effective outcomes. From an optimistic point of view, the aforementioned obstacles are deemed surmountable. They can be curbed to a great extent through providing and facilitating for transparency in administrative procedures and processes; accountability for actions, inactions or delays by public officials; and citizen participation in developing policies and strategies, democratic decision-making processes and respective implementation with a strong political will.

In this section of the article, particular emphasis will be placed on the application of transparency, accountability and citizen participation principles in the structure of public administration so as to achieve and maintain an effective good governance network for everyone under the rule of law of human rights beyond the general rule of law, for the better of all.

## **2. PREREQUISITES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE**

### **2.1. Transparency**

Transparency refers to explicit rules and procedures for both service receivers and service providers. It essentially requires easy and equal access to information on demand. That is, an uninterrupted flow of necessary information should be available for everyone. Constantly available information, explicit rules and concise procedures amplify the competency of governance networks and the quality of public services (Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008: 29). In this regard, transparency is deemed to be one of the most important prerequisites for good governance. In fact, it is about individual awareness of public sphere. That is, the more transparent system is, the more individuals know about facts and procedures (Osborne, 2004: 292). In simpler words, people should be aware of what the authorities are doing for them and how it is going to be implemented, and what the costs and benefits are. They should also be able to know how and when they can act a part in case needed. Thus, the quality of transparency in public administration depends considerably on qualified citizen participation.

According to Etzioni, transparency is a preventive means of reducing corruption, *inter alia* (Etzioni, 2010: 393). In other words, it substantially prevents the abuse of public power. It helps abusive actions and omissions of the public officials be noticed and revealed (Kapucu, 2010). However, according to Osborne, apart from its better results, it can make public actors more risk averse and consequently this may result in a reduction of productivity. Excessive transparency can prevent risk-taking manners and innovations in the public sphere (Osborne, 2004: 293). From another point of view, transparency has limited consequences and is nothing other than a government regulation, and in lieu of more transparency, there must be more regulations unless transparency is backed up by another regulation (Etzioni, 2010).

These arguments recall the question whether there should be any limits on transparency? And to what extent is transparency possible? It is reasonable that there should be a clear limitation on transparency under certain circumstances. Indeed, Osborne underlines that national security and defence, investigation of crimes, trade competition, data protection and individual privacy must be essentially confidential (Osborne, 2004: 293). In addition, private property and secret ballot rationales necessarily limit the transparency (Etzioni, 2010: 392).

In brief, through providing for overall effective transparency, most of the obstacles to effective good governance can be overcome to a substantial extent.

## **2.2. Accountability**

The accountability of public authorities for their misuse of public power requires the rule of law, in the first instance. Accountability requires proper clarity and certainty in the distribution of roles, tasks and the public processes in the manner of separation of powers, even between different sections of public administration (Osborne, 2004: 294). Full and meaningful application of the law, rules and regulations should prevail at all levels of governance (Fisher, 2004: 503). In simpler words, accountability depends on overall effective transparency which provides for visibility of public domain. Visible public domain activates accountability through which it can be possible to assess the effectiveness of those who exercise public power (Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008: 30-31).

As mentioned above, the prerequisites of good governance are correlative in that one necessitates the others simultaneously. Transparency is one of the most essentials of effective accountability, that is, accountability necessitates transparency. Enjoyment of civil participation requires transparency, and so forth. Without transparency there would be no accountability. Without accountability there would be no transparency. Ultimately, there would be no effective good governance without them altogether. They are prerequisites for a durable but at the same time responsive good governance in both private and public sector.

Without doubt, public officials at any level should be held responsible and accountable by law, not only for their fiscal accounts, but also for their arbitrary actions, omissions and delays. Public officials should not be accountable to any actor other than the law or according to the law for their unlawful actions and omissions. This means a safeguard that will lead to impartial and fair treatments to individuals. And this means promotion of equality and justice which should have an essential place in a real political democracy governed by the rule of law. Without facilitating proper accountability for actions, inactions or delays by public authorities or officials to the law, *inter alia*, innovation, and individual development would be impossible. Caring attitudes would have no prize, and consequently careless culture would prevail in governance network.

No question is about public actors' accountability for and to, but on the ways how to make them accountable (Roberts, 2002: 658). Under certain circumstances, having based on empirical evidences, Roberts suggests *dialogue* as a means of employing accountability principle, depending on public actors' willingness to take risks of two-way interactions with stakeholders. Dialogue in an equal fashion between public actors and stakeholders paves the way for mutual understanding and help build two-way trust. However, due to its openness, dialogue may also fail and result in decreased reputation for public officials (Roberts, 2002). Another important means of providing wider and better accountability to the public and to overcome the obstacles is the disclosure of information to citizens and thus allowing their involvement in certain decision-making processes (Monfardini, 2010).

Here, one may recall the question whether there is any disadvantage of accountability principle. Indeed, excessive accountability may have negative impacts on public actors. They may take it for granted as a sign of mistrust and unnecessary work. This negative effect may well result in lower performance of the public servants (Osborne, 2004: 293-295). However, overall advantages of the application of accountability principle in the public sector well outweigh its slight disadvantages.

### **2.3. Citizen Participation**

Citizen participation is generally defined as an interactive communication between citizens and public officials, in a broader sense between stakeholders and public actors that rely on *dialogue* in administrative decision-making and implementation processes (Yang and Pandey, 2011: 880). It is more than citizen involvement (Roberts, 2002: 660). It requires citizens' initiatives rather than waiting actions from upstream levels. This aspect helps also create the updated agenda.

Through effective participation, individuals help maintain transparency and visibility of the public domain (Osborne, 2004: 293), on the one hand, legitimacy of public governance can be developed (Sørensen and Torfing, 2009: 237), on the other. By virtue of allowing citizens 'to enter and see how the "black box" does work', citizen participation facilitates for

increased transparency and accountability of governance network (Monfardini, 2010: 633). By taking part in public affairs, in a way, citizens assume responsibility for helping to build a sense of belonging to a future for public. Citizens are primarily entitled to participate in decision making processes in order to use their rights to have a say in governance (Bingham, Nabatchi and O'Leary, 2005: 555). Different interests and needs of non-governmental organizations, corporations, and other members of civil society require multilevel interactions and mechanisms so that all concerned persons would be able to participate in and to be heard and appreciated (Weber, 2010: 15). As an important means of caring about individuals, *listening to persons* promotes openness, accountability, respect for differences, and will in turn bring deeper 'understanding of complex situations and facilitating imaginative approaches', and more 'open-mindedness, relationship and acceptance of difference' (Stivers, 1994). Active citizen participation will enable governance be more democratic and ultimately more effective (Irvin and Stansbury, 2004: 55). It is also deemed (Randolph and Bauer, 1999, cited by Irvin and Stansbury, 2004: 57) that citizen participation may importantly reduce litigations over public decisions and implementation.

For proper citizen participation, national and local administrative institutions should employ an *inclusive approach* when developing and implementing strategies and policies. Incidentally, good governance and its correlative requirements are not only a national task but also a European commitment (Commission of the European Communities, 2001: 10; Bundschuh-Rieseneder, 2008: 28-29, 49-50). Accordingly, all groups of people including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in the society should be provided with equal participation in the political and decision-making processes (O'Connell 2010: 266).

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, many challenging problems particular to public domain can only be overcome in a participatory manner. However, application of citizen participation is not an easy task. Martin (2009: 284-294) gives some forms of participation: Citizens' participation does not mean necessarily all citizens should join the network in all circumstances, but it means related stakeholders' participation in the processes, in some cases it involves all citizens, in other cases it involves specific groups of the public under certain circumstances. That is, it depends on the situation. According to Martin, sustainable citizen participation can be applied through a right flow of adequate information from governance network to related persons, a dialogue between governance network and stakeholders, and a collective supply of public service delivery to related persons by stakeholders and governance network. Stivers suggests 'skilful listening' for public actors as a practice of responsiveness and also as a way of bettering their responsiveness, and thus they develop a sense of sharing the same common space with citizens. Consequently, by virtue of responsiveness, real needs and current expectations of individuals can be visible, useful experience and different perspectives, neglected voices can have room in the competency of governance network. Such competency will significantly enhance the effectiveness of the network (Stivers, 1994). Ultimately, this reflection will

help bridge the gap in communication and knowledge. In other words, increased listening capacity in public administration will lead to a workforce receptive to new ideas and useful perspectives. Sequentially, such amplified capacity will enable administrators to engage in communication and dialogue with the public.

Under the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights, it is a positive obligation of the state to take the interests of all concerned people into consideration when regulating important issues (*Evaldsson v Sweden*, App no. 75252/01, 13 February 2007; *Aizpurua Oortiz v Spain*, App no. 42430/05, 2 February 2010). The realisation of this obligation is of paramount importance to *deliberative governance*. Indeed, the efficacy of citizen participation relies on ‘more dynamic’ and ‘more deliberative processes’ of governance network (King, Feltey and Susel, 1998).

In Western countries until recently, citizen participation has been seen as a means of being ‘close to citizens’ to gain trust and legitimacy (Martin, 2009: 279), but now this approach is not enough to increase trust in public network and politicians’ legitimacy. The need to reform public services in parallel with rising expectations of citizens requires more citizens’ participation in governance network. More citizen participation leads to more distribution of roles and responsibilities, and this helps develop a more transparent and more accountable governance network which modern societies, particularly developing countries are seeking for.

### 3. GOOD GOVERNANCE

In recent years, the concept of good governance has reached a substantial importance. There has been an increasing interest in transparent, accountable and participatory good governance system of administration among scholars (Osborne, 2004; Bingham, Nabatchi and O’Leary, 2005: 548; Bovaird and Löffler, 2009: 10; Etzioni, 2010; Kapucu, 2010; Eryılmaz and Bircikioğlu, 2011; Holmen, 2011), and also among reformist practitioner, think tanks, multinational corporations, national and international organisations such as the United Nations, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the World Bank, the Council of Europe and the European Union (OECD, 2007; Löffler, 2009: 216; Sørensen and Torfing, 2009: 236).

In terms of public administration, governance is described as a mechanism using executive power for the benefit of the public as a whole with all stakeholders (Hupe and Edwards, 2012). The concept of governance, as Holmen points out, refers to a ‘network’ requiring interactive dialogue between citizens and public administration, predictability and openness of the actions and consequences of the administrative activity. This ‘network’ activity results in transparency and accountability. Both transparency and accountability make citizens able to control over governance. In an open and accessible sphere, citizens can enjoy full access to the information, easily reach the authorities involved, and affect the situation through dialogue and

diverse arguments. This sequential interaction will lead to trust and legitimacy in governance, on the one hand, and will generate a sense of belonging and responsibility of the citizens, on the other (Holmen, 2011: 400-401).

To overcome obstacles and solve problems undermining the human being dignity-based public administration, a well-functioning good governance network should be in place in advance. In this respect, good governance refers to efficiency in services, effectiveness in enjoyment of rights and freedoms, and responsiveness to the need of individuals. Central to good governance network, proper administrative responsiveness is essential to tackle the problems, but collaborative responsiveness from non-governmental organisations, corporations, volunteers and citizens is also equally of great importance (Yang, 2007). Equally importantly, proactive administration network is essential to accountability (Stivers, 1994: 365). Effective good governance requires a transparent, accountable and participatory public administration network in place in a progressive manner. Needless to say that this *per se* is not enough. Actors in governance network, in particular public administrators, should also be free from corruption, be just, proactive, responsive, open, receptive to difference, and able to pay attention to the public and respect for democratic values, particularly the right to information and *to have a say in* (Stivers, 1994: 367-368; Salminen and Ikola-Norrbacka, 2010: 650).

To achieve good governance, the state has to amplify its competency and capacity to provide a higher level of living standards for all persons without any distinction or exception. This competency and capacity should prevail at all national levels, not only administrative, but also judicial and legislative. All authorities in the public network should be simultaneously vigilant in their exercise of power. Public network should be designed to make public authorities exercise *due diligence* so as to provide respect for human dignity. Attitudes in compliance with due diligence should be encouraged and promoted. This will in turn help build persons' trust in public authorities and processes.

In order to put human being dignity first, the state has to provide for an institutional network through all available measures so that individuals can enjoy decent standards of living such as working conditions, participation in decision-making processes, and equal opportunity to individual development for enhancing human capability (Fredman, 2006: 29).

On the other end of the spectrum, a deficit in governance network would reduce the competency of the state to exercise overall control, and ultimately pave the way for adverse effects of the obstacles. Furthermore, prosperity of a society depends on good governance network, not on the resources the county has (Werlin, 2003). Likewise, foreign aid or donor-assisted projects do not make any difference unless a well-functioning governance network is properly in place. In this respect, Werlin draws particular attention to two countries which are rich in natural and human resources, Angola and India respectively. However, these countries poor in

good governance are struggling with poverty which fundamentally undermines human dignity, absolute contrary to their resources. India with vast human resources does not function better than Hong Kong with relatively fewer human resources. Thus, it is evident that prosperity or humane living conditions is not a matter of having abundant resources, instead, it is a matter of effective administration of the resources (Werlin, 2003). That is why an effective good governance network is necessary for putting human being first, and that is why a responsive good governance network should be based on human dignity.

When it comes to identify the prerequisites for good governance based on human being dignity, there can be a large number of prerequisites that effective good governance depends on. However, in this article, transparency, accountability and citizen participation principles have been examined in an inclusive manner. These basic principles should be essentially built upon human rights and fundamental freedoms, that is to emphasise, upon the essential requirements of human being dignity. In all procedures and processes at all levels, protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms should be taken into account in a comprehensive manner. Public authorities and their collaborators should function and work in a spirit of putting human dignity first and above of all else. Respect for human dignity should be the primary and ultimate purpose of all their actions or inactions.

As there are no limited requisites, Kapucu suggests that good governance should be based on accountability, transparency, rule of law, and participation (Kapucu, 2010:3). Commission of the European Communities (2001) suggests five political principles openness, accountability, participation, effectiveness and coherence as a means of underpinning the rule of law and democracy, and ultimately establishing good governance at all level of administration. Some also go further, as Bovaird and Tizard suggest, there should be ten demanding criteria for good governance: citizen participation, transparency, accountability, equality and social inclusion, ethical and honest behaviour, fair procedures and processes, willingness and ability to collaborate, ability to compete, leadership and sustainability (Bovaird and Tizard, 2009: 242).

Based in general on these principles, the development and implementation of good governance policy require dynamic interactions between all stakeholders such as individuals, volunteers, media, politicians, corporations and public service provider's organisations. Neither of these stakeholders *per se* is powerful enough to shape the public policy and its outcomes (Löffler, 2009: 219-223). However, they can achieve better results together.

In brief, overall good governance is a cooperating public service network, open to change, open to individuals' participation, open to be assessed, and open to be examined.

## CONCLUSION

Introducing a certain way of good governance as a panacea for current or future shortcomings of public administration is undoubtedly beyond the scope of this article. However, since no perfect governance could be achieved overnight, through effective application of the generally recognised aforementioned principles -transparency, accountability and citizen participation- a good governance network should be established under the rule of law, particularly under the rule of human rights law. The full and meaningful application of these principles to the public administration will enhance the efficacy and efficiency of rules and regulations, decisions, and correlative implementation and deliveries of public services undertaken by public authorities and their affiliations.

Furthermore, first and foremost, it is important to stress that everyone is entitled to the right to good administration. It is incumbent upon the state to amplify its governance competency in a dynamic manner to provide everyone with the right to effective and responsive good governance within its jurisdiction. So, good governance based on the aforementioned fundamental principles is not a matter of choice or will, but an absolute necessity for the governments who are obliged to protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. These basic principles as substantive and procedural requirements for the purpose of a living governance network should be essentially designed in an institutional manner. The efforts and positive measures to that end should be carried out progressively and incrementally. Without doubt, all natural and legal persons will fairly benefit from a dynamic and effective good governance network established under the rule of law, participatory democracy and human dignity. Thus, there can be enough common space for all to live together in peace, prosperity, and coherency. As a result, they can rely on the networks in which they live in a fairer, freer, and safer environment to dream, decide and act as they wish about their present being and future.

To this end, it should be again emphasised that states must design their public order in accordance with the requirements of human being dignity in the first instance. Then, they should value every occasion as a progress. To illustrate, relying on the presumption that Turkey is in compliance with the principles of democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law, as Turkey currently struggling hard to make a civil constitution, it had better structure the constitution on transparent, accountable and participatory grounds for effective good governance networks in a spirit of putting human dignity above all else.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BINGHAM, Lisa Blomgren, NABATCHI, Tina and Rosemary O'LEARY (2005), "The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 65, No 5, pp. 547-558.
2. BOVAIRD, Tony and Elke LÖFFLER (2009), "Understanding Public Management", in Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler (ed), *Public Management and Governance* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 3-13.
3. BOVAIRD, Tony and John TIZARD (2009), "Partnership Working in the Public Domain", in Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler (ed), *Public Management and Governance* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 233-247.
4. BUNDSCHUH-RIESENEDER, Friederike (2008), "Good Governance: Characteristics, Methods and the Austrian Examples", *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Volume 24, Issue 3, pp. 26-52.
5. CAYER, N. Joseph and Louis F. WESCHLER (1998), *Public Administration: Social Change and Adaptive Management*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
6. ÇAYHAN, Behire Esra (2008), "Implementing e-government in Turkey: A Comparison of Online Public Service Delivery in Turkey and the European Union", *The Electronic Journal on Information Systems in Developing Countries*, Volume 35, Issue 8, pp. 1-11, <http://www.ejisdc.org>, 15.05.2012.
7. COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (2001), *European Governance, A White Paper*, (COM)2001 428 Final, Brussels, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001\\_0428en01.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0428en01.pdf), 21.01.2012.
8. ERYILMAZ, Bilal and Hale BIRİCIKOĞLU (2011), "Kamu Yönetiminde Hesap Verebilirlik ve Etik" [Accountability and Ethics in Public Administration], *Turkish Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 4, Issue 7, pp. 19-45.
9. ETZIONI, Amitai (2010), "Is Transparency the Best Disinfectant?", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Volume 18, Issue 4, pp. 389-404.
10. FISHER, Elizabeth (2004), "The European Union in the Age of Accountability", *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, Volume 24, Issue 3, pp. 495-515.
11. FREDMAN, Sandra (2006), "Human Rights Transformed: Positive Duties and Positive Rights." *University of Oxford Legal Research Paper Series No 38/2006*, pp. 1-29, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=923936>, 12.03.2012.

12. GIRAY, Filiz (2010), “Yolsuzlukla Mücadelede e-devlet ve Türkiye’deki Durum” [e-government to Combat Corruption and the Case in Turkey], *Sosyoekonomi*, Volume 2, pp. 154-178.
13. HOLMEN, Ann Karin Tennaas (2011), “Governance Networks in City-regions: In the Spirit of Democratic Accountability?”, *Public Policy and Administration*, Volume 26, No 4, pp. 399-418.
14. HUPE, Peter and Arthur EDWARDS (2012), “The Accountability of Power: Democracy and Governance in Modern Times”, *European Political Science Review*, Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 177-194.
15. IRVIN, Renée A. and John STANSBURY (2004), “Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort?”, *Public Administration Review*, Volume 64, No 1, pp. 55-65.
16. KAPUCU, Naim (2010), *Governance Reforms: Comparative Perspectives*, Usak Publications, Ankara.
17. KING, Cheryl Simrell, FELTEY, Kathryn M. and Bridget O'Neill SUSEL (1998), “The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration”, *Public Administration Review*, Volume 58, No 4, pp. 317-326.
18. LÖFFLER, Elke (2009), “Public Governance in a Network Society”, in Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler (ed), *Public management and governance* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 215-232.
19. MARTIN, Steve (2009), “Engaging With Citizens and Other Stakeholders”, in Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler (ed), *Public management and governance* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 279-296.
20. MEESTERS, Marco and Urszula JAREMBA (2007), “E-government in Austria”, *Stichting Itafit*, pp. 1-19, [http://www.zenc.nl/uploads/29/54/2954d277fd8e53ab168d1ae55d8c85a2/egovernment\\_in\\_austria.pdf](http://www.zenc.nl/uploads/29/54/2954d277fd8e53ab168d1ae55d8c85a2/egovernment_in_austria.pdf), 15.04.2012.
21. MONFARDINI, Patrizio (2010), “Accountability in the New Public Sector: A Comparative Case Study”, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Volume 23, No 7, pp. 632-646.
22. O’CONNELL, Rory (2010), “Realising Political Equality: The European Court of Human Rights and Positive Obligations in a Democracy”, *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly*, Volume 61, No 3, pp. 263-279.
23. OECD (2007), *OECD e-devlet Çalışmaları* (Turkish version) [OECD e-government Studies: Turkey (Turkish version)], Information Society Department in the State Planning Organisation, OECD Publishing, Turkey.

24. OSBORNE, Denis (2004), "Transparency and Accountability Reconsidered", *Journal of Financial Crime*, Volume 11, Issue 3, pp. 292-300.
25. POPELIER, Patricia (2011), "Governance and Better Regulation: Dealing with the Legitimacy Paradox", *European Public Law*, Volume 17, No 3, pp. 555-569.
26. ROBERTS, Nancy C. (2002), "Keeping Public Officials Accountable through Dialogue: Resolving the Accountability Paradox", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 62, No 6, pp. 658-669.
27. SALMINEN, Ari and Rinna IKOLA-NORRBACKA (2010), "Trust, Good Governance and Unethical Actions in Finnish Public Administration", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Volume 23, Issue 7, pp. 647-668.
28. SMISMANS, Stijn (2004), *Law, Legitimacy, and European Governance: Functional Participation in Social Regulation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
29. SØRENSEN, Eva and Jacob TORFING (2009), "Making Governance Networks Effective and Democratic through Metagovernance", *Public Administration*, Volume 87, Issue 2, pp. 234-258.
30. STIVERS, Camilla (1994), "The Listening Bureaucrat: Responsiveness in Public Administration", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 54, No 4, pp. 364-369.
31. THE UNITED NATIONS, General Assembly Resolution, *Declaration on the Right to Development*, A/RES/41/128, 4 December 1986, <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm>, 23.04.2012.
32. THE UNITED NATIONS, World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, A/CONF.157/23, Vienna, Austria, 14-25 June 1993, [http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/\(symbol\)/a.conf.157.23.en](http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/(symbol)/a.conf.157.23.en), 15.02.2012.
33. WAHEDUZZAMAN (2010), "Value of People's Participation for Good Governance in Developing Countries", *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, Volume 4, Issue 4, pp. 386-402.
34. WEBER, Rolf H. (2010), "New Sovereignty Concepts in the Age of Internet?", *Journal of Internet Law*, Volume 14, Issue 2, pp. 12-20.
35. WERLIN, Herbert H. (2003), "Poor Nations, Rich Nations: A Theory of Governance", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 63, No 3, pp. 329-342.
36. YANG, Kaifeng (2005), "Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 65, No 3, pp. 273-285.

37. YANG, Kaifeng (2007), "Responsiveness in Network Governance: Revisiting a Fundamental Concept: Symposium Introduction", *Public Performance & Management Review*, Volume 31, No 2, pp. 131-143.
38. YANG, Kaifeng and Sanjay K. Pandey (2011), "Further Dissecting the Black Box of Citizen Participation: When Does Citizen Involvement Lead to Good Outcomes?", *Public Administration Review*, Volume 71, No 6, pp. 880-892.