



AKADEMİK BAKIŞ DERGİSİ
Sayı: 28 Ocak – Şubat 2012
Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi
ISSN:1694-528X İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası
Kırgız – Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Celalabat – KIRGIZİSTAN
<http://www.akademikbakis.org>



REINVENTING GOVERNMENT: HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS, PHILOSOPHY, CRITIQUE, AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS



Dr. Murat ONDER*

Abstract

The history is full of reform movements as a continual search for an ideal governmental form that can deliver services in an efficient, cost effective, accountable, and responsive manner. In 1990's, a new wave of reform movements has been launched with the name of reinventing government in the USA to solve the governmental problem and prepare it to the time and future. The reinventing movement is the latest "wrinkle" in a long history of government reform efforts going back to the progressive era that preceded Richard Childs and his city management movement, and the municipal research bureaus. The influence of refounding movement and new public management were included into the analysis. The historical foundations of reinventing government beginning from late 19th century were evaluated in the context of main contributors to the movement, the main philosophy, the critiques, the adoption, and future implications of reinventing government.

Key words: Reinventing government, communitarianism, historical foundations, critique

DEVLETİN YENİDEN KEŞFİ:

TARİHSEL GELİŞİMİ, FELSEFESİ, ELEŞTİRİSİ VE GELECEĞİ

Özet

Tarih; etkin, etkili, sorumlu ve duyarlı bir şekilde hizmet sunmak isteyen ideal kamu yönetimi yapısını sürekli araştıran reform hareketleriyle doludur. ABD’de 1990 yıllarda, kamu yönetiminin problemlerini çözmek, devleti zamanın gereklerine ve geleceğe hazır hale getirebilmek için “devletin yeniden keşfi” adı altında yeni reform hareketleri dalgası başlamıştır. Devletin yeniden keşfi, Richard Childs’ın şehir yönetim hareketi ve yerel araştırma büroları



AKADEMİK BAKIŞ DERGİSİ

Sayı: 28 Ocak – Şubat 2012

Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi

ISSN:1694-528X İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası
Kırgız – Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Celalabat – KIRGIZİSTAN

<http://www.akademikbakis.org>



dönemi öncesi yenilikçi/ilerlemeci döneme kadar giden, uzun kamu yönetimi reform çabalarının son sahifesini oluşturur. Bu analize yeniden keşif hareketi ile yeni kamu yönetiminin etkileri dahil edilmiştir. 19. Yüzyıldan başlayan devletin yeniden keşfi hareketinin tarihi temelleri; harekete temel katkı sağlayanlar, temel felsefesi, eleştirisi, uygulanışı, ve gelecekle ilgili yansımaları dikkate alınarak değerlendirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler; Devletin Yeniden Keşfi, Komüniteryanizm, Tarihi temeller, Eleştiri

INTRODUCTION

Last two-century witnessed dramatic improvements/changes in world history in general and public administration in particular. In 19th century, industrial society after agricultural society created new issues and problems, and so brought new responsibilities to the government. The government with old functions and duties would not supply the services such as protection of the citizens from bad working conditions, preventing crime, maintaining opportunity for education, and so forth, which expected from government.

To cope with these problems, governments assumed new roles and tasks appropriate to the needs of the time, and even industry needed to be regulated. On the other hand, Americans reacted to the politics, corruption, and spoils with the reform movement in this progressive era. This was an important stage in American Public Administration since reforms pressed for changes in government procedures and structures and gave rise to the academic study of public administration. This era of public administration brought specialization, professionalism, merit-based appointment and promotion, and the application of management sciences to the government (Frederickson, 1997). The public administration was insulated from politics and political parties, and the economy was regulated. The public and citizens strongly supported the reform movement at that time, welfare state with series of reform became very successful at the industrial era.

All governmental reforms, whether date is 1910, 1937, 1949, 1972, 1982, or 1993, seem to share one thing, which began with an assumption that government as typified by the American Federal government was dysfunctional, fragmented, badly organized, and incapable of performing at a level acceptable to the public (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997). In short, we can say that

* m_onder1@hotmail.com



the history of reform movements can be viewed as a continual search for an ideal governmental form that can deliver services in an efficient, cost effective, accountable, and responsive manner at that time/era.

EMERGENCE OF REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Together with 1990's, a new wave of reform movements has been launched with the name of reinventing government in the USA. The Clinton Administration designed the reinventing government campaign with goals that would favor a transformation of administrative machinery to produce “ a government that works better and costs less. Al Gore proclaimed that government should run like America's best businesses.

There is no single intellectual source for the reinventing government movement. It seems to have been improved largely among practitioners of private sector and public administration in different places all over the world but with many similar tenets. To develop a better understanding of the potential impact of the reinvention effort, a review of the origins of the movement and an analysis of some of the basic ideas providing its philosophical core are necessary. However, the impacts of earlier contributors and the refounding movements on the reinventing movement although reinventing government has been evaluated as one of the eole in the refounding movement should not be disregarded. Some authors (Russell & Waste, 1998) note that the refounding movement conceives of itself as more or less bringing an "institutional grounding" to the themes of the New Public Administration or the Minnowbrook Perspective.

Early Contributions

For this section, from reform efforts of Childs, works of New York Bureau, Brownlow Report, and Hoover Commission Report will be overviewed to be able to understand regression of reinventing government from general trend of continual reform efforts. Reform struggles increased at the end of 19th century. Reformists in progressive era generally aimed at reducing the effect of political corruption, increasing participation and efficiency. The objectives of Childs and other reformists at that time were (Stillman II, 1998); the promotion of honest, efficient and economical government, the suppression of vice, charter reform to include home rule and strong mayor government, civil service, the prevention of election frauds, the separation of municipal from state and national politics, non-partisan and businesslike government, the elimination of



politics as basis for the selection of candidates for municipal offices, and simplified, centralized city government through short ballots and at large elections.

While urban reformers had been urging more efficient government since 1880's, the Bureau of Municipal Research represents the first attempt to compare deliberately city work techniques to help agencies perform tasks more expeditiously. Committed to scientific management, the bureau also suggested new concept, "efficient citizenship", and the idea of active, watchful, concerned citizenry in many ways. Efficient citizenship was supposed to work in this manner (Schachter, 1995): Citizens are the owners of the government elect elected officials, and creates bureaus. The bureaus advise to the elected officials, inform citizens (owners), and advice and evaluate professional administrators. Professional administrators appointed and directed by elected officials, make advice to the elected officials and inform the citizens.

Government grew rapidly during the New Deal Period. Poor organizational designs because of time constraints created conflict between the executive and legislative branches. The Brownlow Committee, which would be first official assessment of governmental organizations from managerial perspective, submitted a report in 1937 including following recommendations (Stillman II, 1998; Shafritz & Hyde, 1997):

1-Expand the White House Staff to six administrative assistants responsible to the president,

2-Strengthen develop and an Executive Office of the President with agencies such as budget and personnel offices to serve as staff arms to the president,

3-Expand the merit system to cover all non-policy personnel throughout the federal government,

4-Consolidate all independent and regulatory agencies into a dozen cabinet departments,

5-Revise the fiscal system to improve accountability by Congress and President.

Brownlow (1937) stated that there was one grand purpose, namely to make democracy work in the national government; that is, to make the government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of nation. After World War II, the Hoover commissions, chaired by the President Herbert Hoover prepared the report, almost 75 % of the



recommendations were adopted. Both of the reports had the following purposes (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997):

- 1-The reduction in the number of governmental agencies,
- 2-Strengthening the executive branch,
- 3-Increase managerial capacity,
- 4-The promoting of economy, efficiency and improved services in the transaction of the public business,
- 5-Defining executive functions,
- 6-The curtailment and abolition of government functions and activities competitive with private enterprise.

Refounding Movement and Other Contributions

Last two decades American administrative sciences have seen a new counter movement, “refounding movement”. Dennard (1995) states that the idea of refounding rather than reform was powerful one since it goes back to the origin of ideas about the existence of a state. It includes recent efforts by numerous administrative science scholars to reconsider fundamental issues in the field and pose new answers to old questions regarding public administration such as: What is public administration? Who should govern? The criteria for action? The nature of community? Should administration centralized or decentralized? Redefinition of old concepts like citizenship, the public interest, accountability and responsibility? (Stillman II, 1995), and some others.

The reason why the philosophy these refounders have important is that the direction of reform is determined by the philosophy you have while preparing reform for the government. The actions that will be offered in the reforms most likely depend on how you think about government, state, community etc. Here, the philosophy that six refounder schools have will be given briefly.

The Communitarians

Communitarianism, mainly drawn from the writings of sociologists, focus on themes of balancing rights and responsibilities, nurturing moral ties of family, neighborhood, workplace and citizenship as basis for bringing better society (Stillman II, 1995). And consequently their



concerns can be placed upon collective responsibility, moral values of citizenship which translate into specific policy proposals such as national public service programs, improved crime control, health care, job retraining, child-day care for working mothers welfare reform, and the like.

The Virginia Polytechnic Institute (VPI)

The distinctive characteristic of the VPI, Blacksburg Perspective, is that it is a self-conscious attempt to define or to legitimize positively the field, public administration through its becoming a profession (Dennard, 1995). Their arguments can be given as in the following briefly (Stillman II, 1995): 1) Public administration should be viewed as broadly a governance rather than a management or administration of public sector. 2) An agency perspective should serve as an institutional grounding point for practicing public administrators. 3) The concept of citizenship should be revived and revitalized. 4) Public administration should be linked to the purpose and processes of constitutional government, and thus be legitimized within the Constitution framework. They also argued that public administration must appear to both elected officials and the public as a crucial function to the maintenance of society.

Phenomenologists, Critical Theorist, Interpretive Theorist, and Postmodernists

Bringing ideas of these different groups is very difficult effort, since they even differentiated among themselves. Stillman (1995) argues that there is direct relation between New Public Administration and this group. Their ideas were drawn from a reaction to positivists, and functionalists, and objective approaches in social sciences. They argued for the need to develop legitimacy concepts for public administration from their roots deep into the soil of American political culture. And most of these authors assume that best way of knowing truth is a product of images, simply derived from what is in our heads. Dennard (1995) points that part of the purpose of postmodernists discourse is to question the underlying assumptions of social realities, which may take us the path of bureaucratic government.

The Tools Approach

This approach argues that there are many one best ways of doing things in public administration and policy. Various governments may embody significantly different instrument to public action. Different alternatives/tools are all depend on the situation and goals being



pursued. (Stillman, 1995) However, the academicians do not have consensus on the definition/classification of the tools.

New Bureaucratic Perspectives

The rich writings on public bureaucracy largely come from political scientists. These ideas can be brought together in the context that draw a far more optimistic view of bureaucracy, open to leadership, responsive to democratic oversight, accountable to the public interest, flexible, pluralist, fluid and adaptive to change and so forth.

Other Contributions

Many authors (Miller, 1994 & Dennard, 1995) argue that these school also contributed to the reinventing government, given as follows: The public choice model, the professional scientist model (expert technocrat), the justice and social equity model, the representative civil service model, the policy network and subgovernment model.

REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

Even though reinventing government has been evaluated as one of the schools in the refounding movement, we argue that it should be separated from other intellectual movements since it is an implementation and mostly developed and improved by practitioners in an eclectic manner. It is eclectic, because it includes suggestions of almost all schools in a certain extent despite some slight differences.

The Philosophy and Main Principles

The proponents of reinventing government argue that administrative institutions in the United States were established based on the bureaucratic model of command-and-control and have not changed significantly in their design and operation during the twentieth century. They claim that the onset of modern information age has rendered this bureaucratic form of government as ineffective and obsolete. Their justifications of reinventing government rest on several assumptions. These assumptions are (Wolf, 1997; Kamensky, 1996):

- Federal agencies of the premodern era were designed and operated according to the Weberian bureaucratic model of command and control, which had brought strict hierarchy.
- Agencies of the premodern era did not operate entrepreneurially.



- In general, the design and operation of agencies has not changed significantly during the twentieth century but process of production and service, structure regarding organizational authority and responsibility, the culture, organizations in, changed dramatically.

- Federal agencies with designs based on the bureaucratic model performed effectively during the premodern era, when problems were tractable, goals were congruent, and information was bounded, in contrast to the time.

- With the advance of the information age, the performance of modern era bureaucratic agencies has increasingly worsened.

- The entrepreneurial characteristics within the reinventing government model are the keys to effectiveness for agencies of the modern information age.

United States should have been more entrepreneurial, primarily through a process of reforming administrative institutions. Osborne and Gaebler (1992) argue that complex entrepreneurial paradigm including principles of markets and public service should be model for the bureaucracy now and future. This entrepreneurial government possesses the following characteristics:

- promote competition between service providers;
- empower citizens by transferring control from the bureaucracy to the citizen;
- measure outcomes;
- are motivated by a strong sense of mission, not rules and regulations;
- redefine clients as customers;
- proactively prevent problems rather than merely respond to them;
- strive to earn money, not spend it;
- delegate decision-making authority to operators;
- focus on catalyzing various organizations into action to solve problems; and
- are innovative and flexible.

While bureaucratic government has the characteristics such as formalization, hierarchy, monopoly, political autonomy, and specialization; entrepreneurial government, suggested by reinventers, maintains adaptability, capacity building, client-responsiveness, competition,



delegation of operational decision-making authority, measured outcomes, sense of mission and so forth (Wolf, 1997).

The following items/principles inferred from basic reinvention literature and Al Gore Report represent the new paradigm/reinventing government (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; NPR,1993; Barzelay, 1992);

- Serving the public as customer;
- Cutting unnecessary spending and eliminating red-tape;
- Training programs to improve client or customer service;
- Quality improvement programs to encourage team problem solving and to empower employees;
- Benchmarks for measuring program outcomes or results;
- Strategic planning that produces clear agency mission statements;
- Systems for measuring client or customer satisfaction;
- Simplification and relaxation of human resource (personnel) rules;
- Increasing manager's discretion to transfer funds or carry over year-end funds;
- Privatization of major programs;
- Reduction in the number of levels in the agency hierarchy;
- Decentralization of decision making to lower organizational levels;
- Greater discretion in procurement of goods and supplies.

The NPR adopted the ideas suggested by reinventers. For the NPR two ideas were central: first need to transfer power from Congress to executive like the earlier reform, and second government employees needed to be empowered. Kettl (1994) argues that the NPR build on genuinely fresh notion that private market incentives ought to drive public sector performance. The ideas based in the new economics of organization laid the foundation for this approach. The relationship in government can be seen as a series of contract-like connections. With clear goals, competition among both employees and organizations, for both pay and other resources can create strong incentives that can substitute for authority based supervision. Front-line workers should be empowered, and the focus should be more clearly on the customers and their needs.



Reinventing Government: Eclectic Approach

Reinventing government emerged by the influences of many different perspectives, including characteristics of some of these perspectives in a certain extent, but in a different degree/level. Russel and Waste (1998) note that discourse in American public administration has, for the past decade or more, been bounded by the emergence, or rather the crystallization, of two competing and seemingly incompatible perspectives. Reinventing government, built on a tradition of reform in American governance and coupled that with the emergence of public choice theory as a basis for supplying and evaluating public services. Alternatively, scholars critical of the diminution of theory "grounding" the discourse in public administration, and building on the evolution of the "New Public Administration," advanced a new paradigm they called Refounding Public Administration, or Refounding to many.

The Weberian theory and practice of public administration based on hierarchical order and bureaucratic neutrality is now criticized by the new theory of contemporary public management. Actually, transformation from Public Administration to public management approaches reflects a process of continuous, progressive movement, from Wilson's (1887) and Goodnow's (1900) idea of scientific public administration to Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) notion of reinventing government. This movement signifies the birth and the emergence of a post-bureaucratic model that is anticipatory, strategic, results directed, based on executive leadership, market oriented, customer driven, and entrepreneurial (Jermain, 1997).

Over the past two decades, many private sector organizations recognized that they would have to change their cultures and processes to survive in a rapidly changing world. As a result, they have decentralized authority, flattened organizational structures, increased employees' involvement in and control over the workplace, and focused more on the needs of their customers (Kamensky, 1996). These trends are improving quality and quickening response to customers' needs.

The movement grew parallel to a series of private sector business reform efforts largely outside of the traditional public administration field, including total quality management (Carr and Littman, 1992), business process reengineering, and benchmarking. The public



administration field, meanwhile, was largely focused on issues such as cutback management, hollow government, and so forth.

Many of the problems for example, classic definitions of effective government encourage hierarchical control, specialization, efficiency, reduced duplication, and clearly defined rules and procedures, etc., are rooted in the classical public administration theory's definition of effective government. However, a new paradigm of effective governmental management and accountability is evolving which is not being defined by academics but rather by practitioners. Their slogans are "let the managers manage" and "managing for results" (Kamensky, 1996) Some academics have classified this school of thought as "New Public Management" . New Public Management has some commonalities with several intellectual cousins-public choice theory, principal-agent theory, transaction-cost analysis, and managerialism (Boston, 1991), and served as an inspiration to the NPR effort. Kamensky (1996) argues that Gaebler and Osborne translated the principles of new public management into United States contexts.

Public choice theory seeks to explain how actors will behave in different institutional settings as a consequence of different incentive structures. As Boston (1991) notes, "The central tenet of the public choice approach is that all human behavior is dominated by self-interest." Public choice theorists have tended to reject concepts like "public spirit," "public service," and so forth. In the economists' perspectives, customers/citizens were assumed to be self-interested and behave rationally.

Principal-agent theory assumes a series of contractual or agreed-upon relationships. The agent undertakes various tasks on behalf of the principal, and, in exchange, the principal agrees to reward the agent in a mutually acceptable way (Kamensky, 1996). This theory also contributed to reinventers' emphasis on customer service and competition because these concepts shift the focus of accountability for meeting standards from hierarchies and staff offices (such as headquarter review staffs and auditors) to accountability to customers.

Transaction-cost analysis assumes individuals are self-interested, but it recognizes the importance of authority relations and takes seriously a range of structural and sociological variables often ignored by economists. Organizations generally aim to minimize the costs of



transacting business because therein lies the key to their efficiency and profitability. This includes reducing uncertainty, often through vertical integration (Barney & Hesterly, 1994).

Primarily practitioners and private sector consultants rather than academics or theoreticians drove the reinvention movement. Managerialism has had a significant influence on public administration. The essence of managerialism lies in the assumption that there is something called 'management'...embodying a set of principles that can be applied to public business, as well as in private business. (Boston, 1991).

Since the emergence of public administration as a self-conscious field of enquiry during the progressive era, writers in the field have typically seen government as an institution driven by common substantive purposes or ends or as the embodiment of some collective will. Reinventing government like communitarians, seek to curb economic driven conservatism, and primary importance should be upon collective responsibility and values of citizenship in the context that customers should define the goals and quality of public services (Stillman II, 1995).

A cluster ides in which citizenship and public value were valued, and active participation in public affairs was encouraged. More direct citizen-administrative linkages are often the focus of attention in the civism and communitarianism literature, an implicit and sometimes explicit challenge to the representative model. Indeed, the citizen empowerment to which the civism and communitarianism model aspires seems to vaguely resonate in certain passages of NPR (Miller, 1994). Most of the discussion of empowerment refers to employee empowerment, but there is also some discussion of community empowerment.

Reinventing government centers on how public administration can satisfy their customers. Administrators are the actors; they survey client attitudes, make service more convenient, empower their subordinates, and decide which programs to contract out or decentralize. Actually similar perspective has been seen when the Bureau of Municipal research is analyzed. Efficient citizenship was suggested as an important concept, in which citizens would monitor agencies and make their preferences known. And reform at that time required public empowerment through citizenship education and constant information exchange (Schachter, 1997).

Stillman (1995) states that reinventors favor entrepreneurialism above all other values, which perhaps coming from interpretive and postmodernist theorists in the way that the



reification of the subjective over many values. Like tools approach administrators may decide the tools/the way of alternative service delivery such as contracting out or not. Even reinventing government itself might be evaluated in the context of a tool. Like new bureaucratic perspectives, reinventing government ask for bureaucracy open to change, and democratically responsive.

A CRITIQUE OF REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

When reinventing government came into agenda, the approach was criticized by various aspects. Some authors criticized it from philosophical perspectives; its principles and premises, conflicting assumptions and suggestions, its unrealistic eclecticism and so forth. The other group evaluated the reinventing government in the stage of its adoption; the reasons of failure and success.

Fox (1996) characterizes the reinventing movement as more a manifestation of postmodern symbolic politics rather than substantive reform. The image of reinvention as an attempt to bring government under control and finally to make the bureaucracy responsive to ordinary citizens no doubt helps to account for its popularity among those in elected positions who face relatively short periods of time in office and significant expectations of leadership. The author states that reinvention is a set of proposed reforms aimed at solving persistent problems in government by promising that we can do more with less.

Kellough (1998) argues that there is more than symbolism in the reinvention movement. Actual changes are taking place in the structure and operation of governments. Organizations are being altered and employees are being impacted in a number of ways. Rules and regulations have been revised and sometimes eliminated. The kinds of administrative changes being undertaken or contemplated within the movement warrant our close attention. The legacy of reinvention will be tied to outcomes associated with modifications to administrative practices that are or will be implemented as part of the reform package. Some, in fact, could be long overdue but they may be very difficult to accomplish. Others, however, may have unanticipated and unattractive consequences.

Reinventing movement launched an attack on a phenomenon of bureaucracy, which in fact it is inevitable. Maybe, the benefits of reinventing government could be discussed within the bureaucratic framework. It is imaginary to abolish all bureaucratic rules and regulations that



brought certainty to the functioning of organizations. The businesslike approach was criticized since there are numerous legal and other distinctions that can be drawn between government and businesses and there are important values in government that sometimes take precedence over economy and efficiency (Kellough, 1998). Customer orientation, one of the most important principles of reinventing government, has been evaluated as a problematic since identifying customers in the public sector can be sometimes very difficult; taxpayers, general public, citizens, voters, the agencies or employees, and the like.

In the private sector, an enterprise or productive process is founded because there is an initial demand for the product, a collective result of individual actions. But actions of American government are not the collective result of individual actions, but rather the collective result of pluralism defined by groups wielding political power to achieve their respective interests (Russell and Waste 1998; Miller, 1994).

Reinvention makes assumptions about the nature of public administration that can not be sustained. The role of politics in administration processes is essentially ignored. The politics/administration dichotomy goes back to the early reform movements. The dichotomy referred primarily to the belief that “politics” in terms of partisanship should be kept out of administration of government programs. It became clear today that it would be very difficult to remove politics from administrative activity. Some authors (Russell & Waste, 1998; Kellough,1998) argue that the reinventors appear to assume that legislative, judicial power, and role of politics in public administration is negligible. Multiple goals that, at times, are conflict with each other, not solving major incentive problems, neglecting political dynamics and constitutional system (Kwon & Tang, 1998).

THE ADOPTION OF REINVENTING GOVERNMENT

It has been argued that The Clinton Administration’s reinventing government movement has achieved notable and impressive results (Kettl,1998). And voters rewarded the Republicans by giving them control of both houses of Congress for the first time in a generation. Successful reinvention efforts are frequently reported in the media. Kettl (1998) states that media also played important as motivator factor in adoption stage. However, the researches indicate that the



adoption of reinvention reforms varies across states, cities, and agencies. However, on the other hand, many critics note that reinventing government did not make the difference as expected.

Schneider et al (1995) emphasizes the importance of entrepreneurship in the institutional change. Gabris et al (1998) examined the importance of local government human resources management in the adoption process. Ruhil et al. (1999) examined the adoption of reinventing government by local government. They reduced reforms into three main categories and tested their extent of implementation. They found that leadership, commitment and fiscal concerns are important in the success of adoption.

Durst and Newell (1999) in their research on adoption of reinventing government found that reasons and actors of adoption play very important factor in the successful implementation. While actors are high-level administrators, midlevel managers, employees, governing board, customers/clients, and some other persons and groups; general reasons for implementations are revenue problems, competition, complaints, media criticism, and encouraging leaders.

Brudney et al. (1999) with their survey examined the adoption in agency level and across states. State reform effort, agency type and characteristics, influence of environments, agency director background/attitudes account for changes in the adoption. Although a number of important institutional constraints inhibit reform activity, city manager leadership appears to be critical for overcoming the impediments to efficient governance. City managers may pursue reform not only to improve existing governance structure but also to earn reputational gains that translate into a move up to larger communities with larger staff and larger budgets (Ruhil et al. 1999). Managers stand to benefit in terms of their reputation by successfully introducing reforms. Reputational gains can translate into more tangible rewards: since managers are mobile and participate in a competitive national labor market.

Ruhil (1999) found that city manager is the single actor most likely exerts influence on the extent of the reform activities in his community. Central to his analysis is the role of leadership, known as necessary if a governmental unit is to innovate successfully. Within the structure of local politics, two factors are central: the mayor and city manager. Some researches that compare the South with the North, in their religiosity illustrate that the South is relatively more affected by religion, and more conservative in many issues or toward new ideas (Mezey,



1983; Smidt, 1983). Ruhil at al (1999) tested if there is difference between the North and South in the adoption of reinventing government in local government level and found differences across regions.

In the fifth year report, it has been reported that there are important performance problems in implementing reinventing government (Kettl, 1998). While government tries to reduce its size since interconnected with society more than ever before, it is not be able to manage reduction. Because of indirect policy tools the burdens and responsibilities of government increased than before. The approach against bureaucracy has been tried to be solved by again with bureaucracy.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

The reform movements can be viewed as a continual search for an ideal governmental form that can deliver services in an efficient, cost effective, accountable, and responsive manner. Together with 1990's, a new wave of reform movements has been launched with the name of reinventing government in the USA. The proponents of reinventing government argue that administrative institutions in the United States were established based on the bureaucratic model of command-and-control and have not changed significantly in their design and operation during the twentieth century. It has been claimed claim that the onset of modern information age has rendered this bureaucratic form of government as ineffective and obsolete. So the government and its philosophy should change, and should be more entrepreneurial, including principles of markets and public service, as a model for bureaucracy now and future.

There is no single intellectual source for the reinventing government movement. It seems to have been improved largely among practitioners of private sector and public administration in different places all over the world but with many similar tenets. To develop a better understanding of the potential impact of the reinvention effort, a review of the origins of the movement and an analysis of some of the basic ideas providing its philosophical core were examined. The impacts of earlier contributors –earlier reforms- and the refounding movements on the reinventing movement were been evaluated. Reinventing government emerged by the influences of many different perspectives, in an eclectic manner, including characteristics of some of these perspectives in a certain extent, but in a different degree/level.



Bu maybe most important contribution of reinventers is their frank recognition that the top down bureaucratic authority approach guiding American Bureaucracy is no longer steers the public administration. Reinventing government mainly relied on those principles; serving the public as customer, cutting unnecessary spending and eliminating red-tape, quality improvement programs to encourage team problem solving and to empower employees, measuring program outcomes or results, privatization of major programs, decentralization of decision making to lower organizational levels and so forth.

The main differences of he reinventing government from earlier reforms are that it has post or anti-bureaucratic and governance approach, and consciously excluded academics from their ranks particularly in preparation of Gore report. Reinventers may be evaluated in the stateless group because of their anti-states approach. However, states/governments will never end if they do something, this will be in the context of public administration.

To sum up, governmental understanding of reinventing government is very narrow-minded. The reinventing movement is generally based on economics and economic efficiency as its "justification and end." Any kind of governmental form suggested should be ready to solve the future challenges and problems such as population growth, environmental issues, technological developments, education, employment and so forth.

The prospects of public administration lie in the discovering the fundamental issues which discipline is based, to be able to adapt to the future. These issues regarding the understanding of government should include; how to conduct effective public administration in a democratic political and administrative context; how to balance efficiency, economy, equity and/or equality; how to be moral/ethical public administration responsible for future generations, and being alert to changing forms and newly emerging issues such as information technology.



REFERENCES

- Barney J.B. & Hesterly W. (1994). Organizational economics: Understanding the relationship between organization and economics analysis. Handbook of Organization Studies.
- Boston, Jonathan, (ed.) (1991). Reshaping the State: New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Brownlow L. & Charles E.M. & Gulick L. (1937). Report of President's Committee on Administrative Management. In J. M Shafritz. & A.C Hyde. (1997). Classics of Public Administration. 4th Edition. London: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Brudney, L.J, Hebert F. t & Wright D.S. (1999). "Reinventing government in the American States: measuring and explaining administrative reform." Public Administration Review. 59:1 (pp.19-30).
- Carr, David K & Ian D. Littman (1992). Excellence in Government: Total Quality Management in the 1990s, 2nd ed. Arlington, VA: Coopers and Lybrand.
- Dennard, Linda (1995). Asking Different Questions in the Search for Public Philosophy. Administrative Theory and Praxis. 17:1 (pp. 46-54).
- Durst S. & Newell C.(1999). "Better, Faster Stronger: Government Reinvention in the 1990's". American Journal of Public Administration. 29:1 (pp.61-76).
- Fox, Charles J. (1996). "Reinventing Government as Postmodern Symbolic Politics". Public Administration Review. 56:3 (pp.256-261).
- Frederickson, H. George (1997). The Spirit of Public Administration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gabris G.T., Grenell K.D. & Kaatz J. (1998). Reinventing local government services management. Public Administration Quarterly. 22:1 (pp.74-97).
- Gulick, Luther H. (1990). Reflections on Public Administration, Past and Present. Public Administration Review. 50:6 (pp.599-603).
- Jermain T.M. Lam (1997). Transformation from public administration to management: Success and challenges of public sector reform in Hong Kong. Public Productivity & Management Review. 20: 4 (pp.405-418).
- Kamensky, John M. (1996). "Role of "Reinventing Government" Movement in Federal Management Reform". Public Administration Review. 56:3 (pp.247-256).
- Kearney R.C. & Hays S.W. (1998). Reinventing Government, the New Public Management and Civil Service Systems in International Perspective: The danger of Throwing Baby out with the Bathwater. Review of Public Personnel Administration. 18:4 (pp. 38-54).



- Kellough, J. Edward (1998). “The reinventing government movement: A review and critique”. Public Administration Quarterly, 22:1 (pp.6-20).
- Kettl, Donald F. (1994). Reinventing Government? Appraising the National performance Review. In J. M Shafritz. & A.C Hyde. (1997). Classics of Public Administration. 4th Edition. London: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Kettl, Donald F. (1998). “After the reforms”. Government executive. 30:4 (pp.36-41).
- Kettl, Donald F. (1998). Reinventing Government: Fifth Year Report. Washington: The Brookings Institution.
- Kwon, S. & Tang, S. (1998). “Reinventing Government: A critique from institutional perspective.” International Journal of Public Administration. 21:10 (pp.1449-1471).
- Martin, Daniel (1993). Creating Motives in the Formation of American Public Administration. International Journal of Public Administration. 16:2 (pp. 187-209).
- Miller, Hugh T. (1994). A Hummelian View of the Gore Report: Toward a Post Progressivism. Public Productivity and Management Review. 18:1 (pp. 59-73).
- Osborne David and Ted Gaebler (1992). Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector Schoolhouse to State House. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ruhil A.V.S, Schneider M. & Teske P. (1999). “Institutions and reforms: reinventing local government”. Urban Affairs Review. 34:3 (pp.433-452)
- Russell G.D. & Waste R.J. (1998). The Limits of Reinventing Government. American Review of Public Administration. 28:1 (pp. 325-346).
- Schachter Hindy L. (1995). Democracy, Scientific Management and Urban Reform. Journal of Management History. 1:2 (pp.52-64).
- Schachter Hindy L. (1997). Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves: Role of Citizen Owners in Making a Better Government. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Schneider M, Teske, P & Mintrom M. (1995). Public Entrepreneurs. Princeton: Princeton University press.
- Shafritz J. M. & Hyde A.C. (1997). Classics of Public Administration. 4th Edition. London: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Stillman, II Richard J. (1995). The Refounding Movement in American Public Administration. Administrative Theory and Praxis. 17:1 (pp. 24-45).
- Stillman, II Richard J. (1998). Creating the American State. London: The University of Alabama Press.
- Stillman, II Richard J. (1999). Preface to Public Administration. Second edition. Burke: Chatelaine Press.



AKADEMİK BAKIŞ DERGİSİ
Sayı: 28 Ocak – Şubat 2012
Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi
ISSN:1694-528X İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası
Kırız – Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Celalabat – KIRGIZİSTAN
<http://www.akademikbakis.org>



- Stivers, Camilla (1999). Translating out of Time: Public Administration and its History. Public Administration Review. 59:1 (pp. 362-366).
- Teske P. & Schneider M. (1994). The Bureaucratic Entrepreneur: The Case of City Managers. Public Administration Review. 54:4, (pp. 331-340).
- Wolf Patrick J. (1997). Why we must Reinvent the Federal Government? Putting Historical Developmental Claims to the Test. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 3:353-388.