



## QUASI AUTONOMOUS NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (QUANGOS): A STRUCTURAL ANALYZING

**Sevil Zengin**

*Bozok University, Turkey*

History is a class struggle for all human society and consists in the transformation of state nature itself. In this doctrine, all human society is shaped on forces of production and the relations of production so this is Marxian method's feature. In this circumstance, British history and structure has unique feature in other words *sui generis*<sup>1</sup> to govern society that depends on its history itself. British organization pattern depends on its traditional structure but this structure does not refer to stable system, it refers to relativistic transition. Moreover, British governmentality looks like social, economical and more importantly political roots. Especially, thanks to neoliberal politics after 1980, new shape for government occurred in the name of Quangos as regulatory power. Thanks to Liberian thoughts, these non-governmental organizations can be a cure for governmental or fiscal illnesses. This hybrid organization's- apart from traditional British organizations- aim is controlling, auditing and mostly consulting for public services in the both inner and outer frame in terms of achieving efficient, effective and economic government system. This research claims that Quangos have political spirit as well as good governance ethos.

**Keywords:** Governance, Accountability, Organization, Agency, Regulation.

### Introduction

British unique qualification of political, economical and administrative experiences has let it in a different position from any other European countries. Despite the European countries which first industrialized with then capitalization, British one first capitalized with then industrialization so this is the organic outcome that based on British idea of ruling class not national unity. Like at an early date of 16<sup>th</sup> century, capitalist system developed in central London within agricultural way. One of the vital reasons of this process can be seen in 1640 revolution that is a grand social movement like 1789 French Revolution in Britain (Hill, 1983: 13). In this kind of framework, the economic growth which occurs in early modern Britain is related to the relatively freedom of property relations. The expansion of production and capital (especially agricultural) which constitute to the origin of capitalist ideology refers to disengagement from feudalism and also it has transformed to the property relations. In other words, British capitalism is inherent to changes in political, economical and ideological and what's more to their relationship with each other. Despite this and with it, since Middle Ages, British history- in an administrative sense- barely witnessed to break in an interesting way; it has maintained its traditional structure and reproduces it. For instance, with and since the revolution of 1688, even today, British social and political system in terms of

---

<sup>1</sup> A Latin phrase meaning of its (his, her, or their) own kind; in a class by itself.

state level is to act with the principles of parliamentary supremacy. On the contrary to European state, British state's stable positioning in the way of cultural meaning, corresponds to British public administration into a dynamic structure. Such reformist structure of British Public Organizations mostly resulted in setting a new organization in different periods of power. With the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century, it can be observable that the government's restructuring process started. In particular, 1980s indicates a period in which the spread of new public management ideology all over the world. After 1980, monistic and centralized structure that reflects general characteristic of British Public Organization have transformed traditional executive format with the documents which Next Steps Reform, Competing for Quality, Citizen Charter Program, and Civil Service White Paper. Quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations which as a reflection of the new public management has given birth to the units that primarily responsible for the implementation of public services and consulting, licensing, supporting private initiatives, and with some other many functions like supervision and regulation has let them to diversification of organizations. After the 2000s, the increase in quasi-autonomous organizations has turned to reduce the number of them with the period of coalition government and minimalist approach of British government. This kind of organizations that characterized to multi-part structure, even so, has become substantial tools in almost every period of the policy-making power.

### **Administrative and Legal Structure in Britain**

Britain or United Kingdom or with the official name The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as a sovereign state in Europe consist of Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. This kind of unique merge creates a foundation to the political and administrative traditions for Britain. As a constitutional monarchy, The United Kingdom that resulted from the both principles of parliament and separation of powers is governed by a parliamentary democracy. Unlike Continental Europe, British system depends on the parliament concentration not on a concept of state. The layout of parliament system consists of three main institutions: The Crown, The House of Lords and The House of Commons. The most powerful organ in this triptych system is The House of Commons. Parliament is the sole and absolute competent body to make laws. The executive power consists of The Crown, Privy Council, Cabinet, Government, Prime Minister and Civil Service. Although these each organization has specific structure still they cannot be seen separated from themselves. The Crown as a body is the cornerstone of the British Government, original owner of The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and also representing the royal family. For today, even if The Crown has no determining role it is the head of executive body of Britain. Besides the head of executive body and state, The Crown has vital roles in terms of judicial, militaristic and spiritually. Indeed, The Crown is the head of British Judicial System, the top of commander of the armed forces and the supreme representative of the Anglican Church of England. The other institution which is under the Executive Body is Privy Council. The Privy Council is one of the oldest institutions of British State Tradition. Today, having 400 members, the Council carries out its work by creating special commissions that related to every ministry. In addition to these two symbolic and auxiliary structures, the main carrier element of British executive system is the government that composed by Prime Minister and its cabinet ministerial. The Government has approximately 100 members. All the ministers are member of government but only some of them are member of The Cabinet. Therefore, the concept of The Cabinet and The Government represent different meanings in The UK (Eşki, 2009: 68).

British legal system is expressed by the system of England and Wales because Scotland and the Northern Ireland have different legal system. In Britain, there is no distinction between public and private law but there is common law. British legal system has no written constitution but based on case law and legislation. In this sense, the British Constitution accedes to three basic principles which are the separation of powers, the supremacy of parliament and the supremacy of the rule of law. The state authority consists of the power of legislative, executive and judicial in terms of the principle of separation of powers. Another fundamental principle of the British constitution is the supremacy of the parliament.

In Britain, the Parliament is the highest source of law. The Parliament acts by Bill of Right. The supremacy of law as a last principle is put forward by British jurist Dicey and contains three elements. First of all, there can be no applicable sanctions without any lawbreaking. Secondly, the rules will be applied to everyone. Finally, personal rights will be secured by not a written constitution but a judicial decision (Okan, 2005: 34).

The Public Bodies in the UK organized with the Cabinet that is located in the center of political system and the Cabinet Office with ministry that directly attached with the public bodies. This unit has an important function in determination of public directions, preparation of public administration reforms and in implementation and coordination of them. All in all, it conducts planning, controlling and personnel affairs that concern bureaucratic procedures. The department of Ministry is the traditional service units of the public bodies and it is also a part of central administration. The structure and size of ministry varies according to their functions. For instance, one of the most powerful and most effective authorities in the government is Ministry of Treasury in the UK. In general, ministries have many deputies, political officer and deputy minister with a minister. In addition, all ministries have a departmental board or corporate management board. In the department of ministry, apart from central department of ministry there are ministerial bodies which have a legal entity and financial and administrative autonomy. These autonomous bodies organized by the principle of local administration (Karasu, 2013: 175- 188). Quasi autonomous bodies can be considered as an agency first of all. The criteria for examining this kind of body should be consisting of (Pollitt and Talbot, 2004: 5):

- at arm's length (or further) from the main hierarchical 'spine' of central ministries/departments of state
- carrying out any public tasks (service provision, regulation, adjudication, certification) at a national or federal level
- staffed by sometimes public servants (not necessarily 'civil servants')
- financed (in principle) by the state budget (in practice some are financed up to 100 per cent from their own revenues, but even here the state remains liable for their financial condition)
- subject to at least some public/administrative law procedures (i.e. they are not predominantly or entirely private law bodies).

This paper tried to examine that those ministerial bodies, in privately, focus on Quango (Quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations). Furthermore, this paper has limited so it is not taking into consideration all the quasi governmental entities like government-sponsored enterprises (GSE) or federally funded research and development corporations<sup>2</sup>.

### **Make Quangos Visible by Neo-Liberal Policies**

As a result of the right wing policies, after 1980s, the government witness that the search of alternative methods for organizing and financing of public services. This "third way seeking", in theoretically called as *Third Way Movement* by Anthony Giddens, initially established in the USA during the Clinton presidency; however, it spreads out the world thanks to UK experience by Tony Blair and New Labor in 1997. From its beginning, the Third Way that has a variety of roots represents a new modern not an old-fashioned approach in political centre. The concept of third way suggests that a middle way between liberal capitalism and authoritarian communism (Geyer, 2001: 2). Third way approach consists of many phenomenons like democratic, social investor state, democratic civil society, the new mixed economy, stakeholder capitalism, governance, equality and positive welfare. The Third Way Movement can be seen as a synthesis between old forms of social democracy and the new right policies and it is a kind of new orientation that will allow overcoming the antagonism between collectivism and individualism.

---

<sup>2</sup> For further reading: Kosar, R. Kevin, "The Quasi Government: Hybrid Organizations with Both Government and Private Sector Legal Characteristics", *Congressional Research Service*, 2011, p. 1- 33.

Furthermore, the Third Way Movement can be considered as a rescue attempt for Labor Party to get rid of their former socialist roots (Karasu, 2009:118). Third Way Movement is an outcome for implementing neoliberal policies in both economy and civil society.

The writer and activist Susan George identified that as an economic ideology neoliberalism can be found over the past two decades by the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The concept of neoliberalism consists of three fundamental freedoms: freedom of investment; freedom of capital flows; and freedom of trade (Ferguson, 2004: 2). Pramono defined neoliberalism as;

In global politics, neoliberalism preoccupies itself with the promotion of four basic issues: (1) global democracy, (2) free trade, (3) global governance through international organizations, and (4) collective security. Neoliberalism focuses on regime creation and institutional building. It attempts, and with great success, to expand the global agenda beyond a mere military strategy (i.e. the agenda of traditional realist called the high politics); (micro) economics is now the prima donna of the show (Pramono, 2002: 116).

Neoliberal policies suggests that the market should keep maximize the public interest and the government intervention covered just to help the weaknesses of the market. It sees that the government and market are unity and with the ignorance of class discrimination it suggests that a political consensus based on collective participation in the planning process (Ateş and Demirel, 2014: 3). In other words, the less government involvement in the both economy and civil society the more market involvement in these spheres so that less problems occurred in that areas. Certainly, an open-economy regime is suitable for implementing neoliberal policies. Thus, the one of the most useful tool to carry out neoliberal policies for the government that is use Quangos in their organization chart.

Quangos as a body that is create to perform a task for the government within the level of European Union (European Regulation, 2005). They perform this task within sometimes federal or national level (quango) and or regional or urban level (qualgo) (Friedrich and Ukrainski, 2012: 4). For the UK, quangos established as an umbrella organization that comprises foundations, voluntary organizations, technology services (TECs), the National Health Service (NHS), BBC, Sport Council and Committee, advisory bodies, regulatory bodies, Legal Aid Board and some kind of research councils which have no clear or limited definition (Greve and others, 1999: 137).

### **Hybrid Bodies in Political and Administrative Structure**

Quango has a very complex notion and hard to determine and define of the scope of it. The reason for this confusion is due to the nature ad hoc of the British State and also is still considered as a political issue (Deacon and Monk, 2000: 155). Quasi Autonomous Non-Governmental Organizations (Quango) or Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB) or Arm's Length Bodies or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are usually used interchangeably in the literature. Also, they can be seen as an agency in terms of institutional and legal structure (Laking, 2005: 11). Although, in many sources, NDPB which is firstly used by Sir Leo Plaitsky in "Report on Non-Departmental Bodies" is more preferable than Quango, Quango is still used in broad context. These bodies can have different denotation according to different legal systems. For instance, In American law, they called as Independent Regulatory Agencies (IRA), in British law, Quasi Autonomous Non Governmental Organization (QUANGOs) and in French law, they can call as Autorites Administratives Independentes (AAI). Even these bodies have different names in the same country. For example, the independent administrative authorities that operating in the field of banking called as Supervisory Authority in the United States. In Sweden, they called as "åmbetsverk" and in the Netherlands, they called as "zelfstandige bestuursorganen" (Sobacı, 2006: 160). Moreover, these bodies called as Grey Organization (GSo) in some sources (André, 2010: 272). In specific to Britain, large-scale public administration reforms vary in the last fifty years. This process reached its peak thanks to the 1968 Fulton Report by Ministry of Public Service and Public Service School (Andrews and others,

2013: 8). The change thanks to new-right wing Thatcher Government in 1979 and in 1988 “Next Steps Program” has accelerated in the way of flexibilisation. After that time, administrative actors, in national political systems, act according to the distribution of authority relations, the principles of accountability of political actors and citizenship relations (Curtin, 2007: 524). Especially, the principle of accountability can be seen as a new trend in the framework of public administration (Greve and others, 1999: 129). Thus, over the past fifty years with 1960/ 1970s caused fast changes for British Government. Beginning of 1980/ 1990s caused the shrinking the state, the end of 1990s and 2000s caused implementing privatization policy in everywhere except health sector (Andrews and others, 2013: 9).

Significantly, the current Labour government has not notably reduced the size of the quasi-governmental sector, despite its trenchant criticism of the Conservative government's responsibilities for the growth of “the quangoid state” when in opposition. Indeed, in its first year of office the Blair government commissioned 192 new task forces, policy review bodies and advisory groups. The reasons for this resilient expansion in the quasi-government sector reflects, on the one hand, the increasingly diverse and recondite administrative demands of government and, on the other, the dominance of a new “managerialist” ethos in the UK public sector which has encouraged “the deconstruction of large public bureaucracies and their re-emergence as a multiplicity of smaller bodies in contractual and market-type relationships with each other” (Deacon and Monk, 2001: 154).

Quasi autonomous non-governmental organizations, in a general way, have a wide freedom of movement and in a financial manner; all of their entities or some part of it belongs to the state (Calder, 1984: 87). Furthermore, Quangos can be defined as the organizations that using public budget to perform a public act but they are also independent bodies within a certain degree from the elected representatives (Lee and Wang, 2005: 46). In other words, sometimes they can finance themselves in their act so this kind of feature shows that these organizations cannot be exposed to sanctions of the state administration.

There are currently over 900 public bodies in the United Kingdom. They perform a range of tasks from regulating industry to providing guidance and protection to consumers. Some advise on senior appointments while others act as stewards of national assets, promote changes in public behaviour or provide expert scientific advice to Government. A number are responsible for the distribution of large amounts of taxpayers’ money in the form of grants to business, universities and research bodies. As the Institute for Government’s (IfG) recent report notes “they [public bodies] are fundamental to the effective running of the British state” (House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee Report, 2010: 5).

In general, there are four types of Quangos: Executive Bodies, Advisory Bodies, Tribunal Bodies and Independent Monitoring Bodies. They are all aim to influence government decisions in political sphere (Gay, 2010: 57). Executive Bodies are established in a written legal format and they have power to determine edit or control their own budget. British Council, Parole Board, Environment Agency, Competition Board, Art Council England and Medical Research Council are some of the example that include in Executive Bodies. Advisory Bodies that rarely have their own budgets and have a limited number of specific experts usually produce information and doing research for ministries<sup>3</sup>. Boundary Commissions and Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs are the examples of Advisory Bodies. Tribunal Bodies are agencies that have jurisdiction in private law<sup>4</sup> and generally concerned with the rights and obligations of people that in a relation to a branch of government or other kind of public authority.

<sup>3</sup> In Britain Government, the ministries can take different names according to their historic. The oldest ministries called as Office and newest one called as Ministry or Department (Eroğul, 2012: 29). So the all title can be used for each other.

<sup>4</sup> That does not refer to the difference between public- private law because there are no difference between jurisdiction and adjudication in Britain judicial system.

Valuation Tribunals, Foreign Compensation Commission and Traffic Commissioners can be given as examples. Independent Monitoring Bodies or called as Other Bodies established and stands for prisons and immigration removal center and immigration holding facility. The aim of this body is to satisfy themselves as to the state of an establishment: the premises, the administration, and the just and decent treatment of prisoners and detainees (the UK Cabinet Office Records, 2012). Moreover, there have been some differences of opinion on this general framework of Quango categorization (Lewis, 2005: 1). For instance, in 2010, the report of “Read Before Burning” by Taxpayers Union suggests that at least 11 types of Quango should be identified in the Government (Maer, 2011: 4).

### **The Rise & Fall of the Quangos**

In Mark Twain famous aphorism “History does not repeat itself but it does rhymes” pointed out that- in terms of public mind, public awareness or political agenda on specific issues could re-emerged. Existing the new form of the organizations in the early 1980s in the UK provide a significant data to analyze that both historical and institutional structure of governance and quasi autonomous bodies. Britain can be taking into consideration as a homeland for the formation of regulatory state in Europe. The reason is that it is not the first time of seeing quasi autonomous agencies in this country besides the first example of this organization emerged in Germany not in Britain. The main reason is why Britain can be seen as a homeland for quasi autonomous bodies that Britain is the first country to apply the program of economy should be purified from politics and so pruning of the social and economic function of the state in the UK (Uysal, 2007: 14).

The view is widespread that we live in the era of the Regulatory State. The traditional sovereign state model with its command-and-control policy style, public ownership and nationalization, was appealing because it aimed to reconcile a variety of partly conflicting goals in a multifunctional state. In contrast, the goals of the Regulatory State are much narrower, namely to improve the efficiency of the economy, promote competition, and protect consumers and citizens. Other traditionally important considerations, such as democratic aspects, political control, peoples’ rights, the participation of affected interest groups, etc., are de-emphasized (Christensen and Laegreid, 2005: 4).

As a regulatory body Quangos provide an effective substitute for the government. They all have unique regulation process (Koppell, 2003: 148). Moreover, as it is known that cyclical composed of the British policy make it position in a different space. For instance, the term Quango is new in China (Lee and Wang, 2005: 45). In Korea, although the concept of Quango is not new for this country, many discussions occur in politicization of the board of Quangos (Park and Cho, 2011: 6).

The exact number of Quangos cannot be estimated but when it was first founded they were followed increasing trend. These organizations have passed into the decline phase after the global financial crisis changed the rule of the game against the Quangos. Especially, after the crisis, the bill of expenditures written for the government spends and because of this circumstances Quangos easily seen as a guilty for the expenditures of the government. Tangible practice can be seen in 2009 for the UK government:

In September 2009, David Cameron promised that a future Conservative government would carry out a review of all Quangos and achieve large savings from those that were to be abolished. Just weeks later, Gordon Brown’s Labour government announced that it had already identified 120 candidates for abolition and that these closures would generate at least £500 million in savings. It was therefore not surprising that the manifestos of all the three main parties included commitments to reduce the number of Quangos; but what was more surprising was the sheer pace of change with which the coalition government subsequently took forward its reform agenda. It took just five days to move from the publication of the formal coalition (Flinders and Skelcher, 2012: 328).

Most of the time, reducing the Quangos can be seen as a right choice to avoid bureaucratic loss and financial burden so within almost every election period, Quangos exposed to abolish. In October 2010- after the general election in the UK with the Coalition government, the government announced the revenue from Quangos. On 14<sup>th</sup> October, in speech of British Conservative Party member Francis Maude suggested that the 481 of existing public organizations should be changed structurally. At the same time, the substantial reforms were proposed for the same one. Foregone conclusion, the out of a total of 901 public bodies, non-ministerial departments and government owned public corporations and trading funds, 192 of it will cease to be public bodies; 118 will be merged into other 57 bodies; 171 will undergo substantial reform whilst retaining their current status. So, another 40 were still “under review” (Maer, 2011: 1). The given table illustrates the changing in Executive Bodies within distribution by years from 1979 to 2012 (Flinders and others, 2014: 6- 10):

<i>Years</i>	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>Total Expenditure £B</i>
1979	492	6.15
1982	450	8.33
1985	399	7.77
1986	406	8.24
1987	396	9.10
1988	390	9.45
1990	374	13.08
1991	375	13.75
1993	358	18.33
1996	309	22.40
1997	305	24.13
2000	297	23.90
2001	276	25.17
2002*	192*	20.77*
2003	206	25.54
2004	210	29.48
2006	199	36.75
2007	203	37.02
2008	198	42.99
2009	192	46.49
2012**	185**	31.20**

P.S.: In addition to this, the UK Government stopped to publish the annual statistic after 2009.

\*Sudden decline for number of Quangos and their total expenditure in 2002 was largely due to devolution at that time.

\*\*This includes £25.7 billion of total direct government funding with the remainder derived through fees, charges, etc.

Although the Coalition government has overseen the introduction of a far-reaching Quango reform agenda, it has not solved the basic and fundamental ‘Quango conundrum’ from which a broad range of secondary challenges (accountability, transparency, control, etc.) flow. The government focused their reform programme almost exclusively on one organizational form of arm’s-length body, NDPBs- a narrow approach which neglected the opportunity to substantially reform and re-envisage the public bodies landscape (Dommett, 2014: 135).

Today, changes in radical and comprehensive transformation process are experienced in public administration. In particular, the new forms of organization shape the government dramatically. These new organization generally called as Quango in the UK government. The main purpose of Quangos is help to public administration to be more effective, efficient, accountable and transparent. The main reason to consume these popular notions into public sphere is the problems seen in public sphere and private sector are the same and the solution for them is to obtain data from private sector. British Quango originally born as a solution for public administration but later it has been seen as the source of problem in government. Because of the dichotomy relation in the nature of administration, although Quangos established for reducing government expenditure, strengthen accountability in public administration and create transparency administration the main reason to reducing Quango still is their extra cost for the government budget. In other words, atypical organizations which are established for emphasize on socialization and also on good management have been isolated from the social dimension and they are now subjected to a pure cost-benefit analysis.

## Conclusion

The administrative mechanism of governance or in economic way, neoliberal policy which consists of public administration, private sector and civil society organization on one hand blinks to managerialism on the other hand reinforces to political power in governmental systems. The success to apolitical presentation of governance paradigm lies in the use of marketing techniques/ strategies which already belong to business economics. The transfer of administration regimes which occur in first Western society and also developed there open the foreign door easily to other countries within the concept of democracy, transparency, participation, and efficiency because of positive perception of these notions for less developed countries. Thanks to wrapped into popular and universal dress of these terms, they are generally just consumed and they turned to rhetorical words without any real practice in most of countries. Quangos have many trends and factors in their born and developed process. Originally, Quangos come into existence in the result from legal, administrative and political discussions in the UK. In other words, British Quangos spring to life after internal dynamics and needs of Britain and also cyclical developments of this country. The structure of these kinds of organizations shows that even if they are reduced as a number they are still important tool for policy making process of the government. However, Quangos still have not gained a proper place in searching legitimacy of British traditional public organizations. Put it differently, Quangos which live on neoliberal policies in policy making process and reform packages in the election periods still have uncertain position in a structural way.

## References

1. André, Rae, "Assessing the Accountability of Government- Sponsored Enterprises and Quangos", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2010, p. 271- 289.
2. Andrews, Rhys, Downe, James and Guarneros-Meza, Valeria, "Public Sector Reform in the UK: Views and Experiences from Senior Executives", *Coordination for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future (COCOPS)*, May 2013, p. 1- 46.
3. Ateş, Hamza and Demirel, Demokaan, "Üçüncü Yol ve İngiltere'de Blair Dönemi Kamu Reformları", *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 47(3), 2014, p. 1- 18.
4. Calder, John, "Lessons from the Death of a Quango: The British Columbia System of Lay-Councils: 1977-1983", *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 14(2), 1984, p. 83 89.
5. Christensen, Tom and Laegreid, Per, "Regulatory Reforms and Agencification", 2005, <http://regulation.upf.edu/ecpr-05-papers/tchristensen.pdf>
6. Curtin, Deirde, "Holding (Quasi-) Autonomous EU Administrative Actors in Public Account", *European Law Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 4, July 2007, p. 523-541.



7. Deacon, David and Monk, Wendy, "New Managerialism in the news: Media Coverage of Quangos in Britain", *Journal of Public Affairs*, 1(2), 2001, p. 153- 166.
8. Dommett, Katharine, Flinders, Matthew, Skelcher, Chris and Tonkiss, Katherine, "Did They 'Read Before Burning'? The Coalition and Quangos", *The Political Quarterly*, 85(2), 2014, p. 133- 142.
9. Erođul, Cem. *Çağdaş Devlet Düzenleri*. İmaj Yayınevi, Ankara, 2010.
10. Eşki, Hülya, "Düzenleyici Kurumlara İngiltere Örneği Üzerinden Bakmak", *Sayıştay Dergisi*, No: 72, 2009, p. 67- 84.
11. Ferguson, Iain, "Neoliberalism, the Third Way and Social Work: the UK Experience", *Social Work & Society*, 2(1), 2004, p. 1- 9.
12. Friedrich, Peter and Ukrainski, Kadri "Measuring Public Entrepreneurship of Quangos", *The University of Tartu*, 2012, p. 3- 30.
13. Flinders, Matthew and Skelcher, Chris, "Shrinking the Quango State: Five Challenges in Reforming Quangos", *Journal of Public Money & Management*, 32(5), 2012, p. 327- 334.
14. Flinders, Matthew, Dommett, Katharine and Tonkiss, Katherine, "Bonfires and Barbecues: Coalition Governance and the Politics of Quango Reform", *Contemporary British History*, 28(1), 2014, p. 56- 80.
15. Gay, Oonagh, "Quangos", *House of Commons Library Research- Key Issues for the New Parliament 2010*, 2010, p. 56- 57.
16. Geyer, Robert, "Beyond the Third Way: The Science of Complexity and the Politics of Choice", *Joint Session of ECPR*, 2001, p. 1 -17.
17. Greve, Carsten, "Quangos in Denmark and Scandinavia: Trends, Problems and Perspectives", içinde Matthew V. Flinders and Martin J. Smith (editors), "Quangos, Accountability and Reform: The Politics of Quasi-Government", *Macmillan*, 1999, England, p. 83-108.
18. Greve, Carsten, Flinders, Matthew and Thiel Sandra "Quangos- What's in a name? Defining Quangos from a Comparative Perspective", *Governance*, 12(2), p. 129-146.
19. Hill, Christopher. *1640 İngiliz Devrimi*. Çev. Neyyir Kalaycıođlu, Kaynak Yayınları, İstanbul, 1983.
20. House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, "Smaller Government: Shrinking the Quango State", *Fifth Report of Session*, 2010, p. 1- 132.
21. Karasu, Koray, "Yeni Kamusal Örgütler: Kamu Yararı Şirketleri", *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 64(3), 2009, p. 117- 147.
22. Karasu, Koray. *Kamu Yönetimi Ülke İncelemeleri*. İmge Yayınevi, Ankara, 2013.
23. Koppell, G. S. Jonathan. *The Politics of Quasi- Government- Hybrid Organisations and the Dynamics of Bureaucratic Control*, *Cambridge University Press*, the UK, 2003.
24. Kosar, R. Kevin, "The Quasi Government: Hybrid Organizations with Both Government and Private Sector Legal Characteristics", *Congressional Research Service*, 2011, p. 1- 33.
25. Laking, Rob, "Agencies: Their Benefits and Risks", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 4(4), 2005, p. 7- 25.
26. Lee, Sang-Cheoul and Wang, Yunxia, "A Study on the Establishment and Transformations of Chinese Type Quangos", *International Review of Public Administration*, 10(1), 2005, p. 45- 57.
27. Lewis, Dan. *The Essential Guide to British Quangos*. Centre for Policy Studies, London, 2005.
28. Maer, Lucinda, "Quangos", *Parliament and Constitution Centre*, 2011, p. 1- 21.
29. Okan, Neval, "İngiliz Hukuk Sistemi İçinde Ticari Yargı Sistemi", *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 2005, p. 33- 70.
30. Park, Sanghee and Cho, Jik, Yoon, "Top Leadership and Performance of Quasi Government Organizations in Korea", *Public Management Research Conference*, Syracuse, NY, 2011, p. 1- 33.
31. Pollitt, Christopher and Talbot, Colin. *Unbundled Government- A Critical Analysis of the Global Trend to Agencies, Quangos and Contractualisation*. Routledge Publications, London, 2004.
32. Pramono, Siswo, "The Genocidal Global Politics and Neoliberalism", *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, 4(2), 2002, p. 115- 138.
33. Sobacı, M, Zahid, "Türk İdari Teşkilatındaki "Adalar": Bağımsız İdari Otoriteler", *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 55(2), 2006, p.157- 180.
34. Uysal, Mehmet "Bağımsız İdari Otoriteler ve Türk Kamu Yönetimine Etkileri", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Isparta, 2007, p. 1- 161.