Citizen, Customer, Partner: What Should Be the Role of the Public in Public Management in China?

John Clayton Thomas, Ph. D.
Professor of Public Management and Policy
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University

Min Su
Doctoral Candidate of Public Management and Policy
Georgia State University & Georgia Institute of Technology

Abstract

Scholars and practitioners have long debated what role, if any, the public should play in public management. When members of the public interact with the administrative side of government, should they be treated as customers or as citizens or in some other manner? What is gained or lost from the choice of perspectives?

This paper takes as its premise that members of the public assume three principal roles relative to public management: as customers, as partners, and as citizens. Individual members of the public come to government sometimes as *customers* seeking discrete services, such as a garbage pick-up when a collection is missed. At other times, they are needed as *partners* with government, as when they are asked to sort recyclables from other waste prior to collection. On still other occasions, members of the public may exercise a responsibility as *citizens,* deliberating with public managers over the direction of government, as perhaps in debating whether to adopt new recycling programs. Separately and in combination, these three roles likely capture most interactions between the public and public managers.

The effectiveness of public management and of government requires that public managers re-think their attitudes to recognize and adapt to the reality of these three roles for the public. This paper examines what roles the public should play in public management—as customers, partners, or citizens--specifically in the Chinese context. The paper first introduces the evolving sense of the three roles in the history of public administration, as well as the nature of the three roles. Then, using cases primarily from China and the United States, it discusses how this model applies to Chinese public management. Last, it provides guidelines for public managers and administrators in China on how to work with the public in the several roles.

The purposes of this paper are (1) to help public administrators and other public officials to understand the nature of the public they face as citizen, customer, and partner, including what the public expect in those roles and what government might expect in return, and (2) to provide guidance for how public administrators can most effectively interact with the public in each of those roles.

Today's public managers in China face more managerial challenges than their predecessors. Traditional Chinese society has been highly centralized marked as "strong state, weak society." The founding of P. R. China strengthened this characteristic due to its adoption of the former Soviet Union model for the first three decades. Building upon this base, China has formed a state-centered governance paradigm, which views government as a monopoly system rather than the construction from democratic consensus. This governance paradigm favors control rather than governance; and it focuses on elite planning and policy-making instead of engaging the publics in decision-making process. Under this paradigm, public managers have taken it for granted that "the ruler rules and the ruled listen." The public has little voice in public management (Lan 2000, p.460). However, since the 1980s, China has experienced significant changes in terms of ideology, politics, economy, and social structure (Chengfu Zhang and Zhang 2001). Especially in the recent few years, the public, led by a rising middle class, has been constantly requiring participating in the policy making, implementation, and management of public affairs. The social paradigm changes have posed new challenges for public administrators in China. On the one hand, they need to rethink the nature of the public and the roles the public should play in public management. On the other hand, they need to know how to interact with the public effectively. This paper, which is based on the book *Citizen, Customer, Partner: Engaging the Public in Public Management* (Thomas 2012), intends to (1) help public administrators and other public officials to understand the nature of the publics they face as citizens, customers, and partners, including what people expect in those roles and what government might ask in return, and (2) to provide guidance for how public administrators can most effectively interact with the public in each of the roles.

The Public's Three Primary Roles

Controversy persists among public administration scholars and practitioners over how to view the public's role in public management. The principal disagreement in Western democracies focuses on whether to view the public as citizens or customers. Proponents of the citizen perspective argue that that the public owns government. They have the legal right to be involved in decision making (Frederickson 1992; Schachter 1997). Contemporary public involvement dates to the 1960s when public administration in Western countries became concerned about its supposed bias and injustice toward society's disadvantaged groups (Marini 1971). Efforts had been made to bring the disadvantaged into discussions of any public policies or programs that might affect them. Although early citizen participation experiments were often disappointing, requirements for public involvement and actual involvement of the public in administrative decision-making both appeared to have grown steadily since the 1960s. The idea of engaging the public in administrative decision-making has been widely accepted in the U.S. and elsewhere, especially in Western Europe and Anglo-American democracies (i.e., Australia, Canada, New Zealand).

Thinking about the public as customers of government developed in the 1990s as a component of the New Public Management reform. Proponents of the customer perspective believe that the market mechanism such as competition can improve the quality of public services and the overall government performance. Governments are suggested to view the public as customers and serve them with courtesy, friendliness, and promptness (Osborne and Gaebler 1993). As the New Public Management movement became known, the idea of improving customer service in government has exerted enormous influence on the practice of public administration in many countries.

The citizen versus customer debate oversimplifies reality by ignoring other roles the public plays in public management. Most obviously, there is the partner role where members of the public assist government in producing a service. Scholars and practitioners recognized a generation ago in the brief popularity of "coproduction," the idea that effective production and delivery of public services require joint contributions from both government and members of the public (Sharp 1980; Whitaker 1980; Brudney and England 1983). U.S. scholars mostly abandoned coproduction within a decade's time. However, interest in coproduction revived among a new generation of scholars outside the U.S., mostly in European countries (Pestoff 2006; Needham 2008; Alford 2009; Osborne 2010).

The three roles gained prominence in the discourse of public administration and management over a period of a half-century, beginning in the 1960s and extending to the present. The following part of the paper will introduce the three roles as each relates to public management, from the most basic (the customer role), to the more complex (the partner role), and to the most complex (the citizen role).

The Public as Customer

What is the customer role?

Case 1: The End of the Line for DMVs?

> *The Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) offices in the U.S. are usually infamous for long delays and unfriendly service. Many people can recall arriving at a DMV office in need of a driver's license, only to wait for hours before receiving indifferent or hostile service. In order to reduce the need for members of the public, as customers, to wait in line, some DMV offices in the state of Missouri have adopted a new "virtual line*

management" system that includes online reservation, mobile phone text alerts, and the walk-in touchscreen monitors. With this system, mobile phone users can use their phone numbers to hold a place in line at the DMV office, freeing them for other tasks while waiting. When their turn has come, text messages will alert them (Nichols April 26, 2010).

Individuals resemble customers in two crucial respects when they come to a DMV for a license or take a request to many other public agencies. First, they seek a discrete product or service usually for its personal value to them, not for its value for the larger community. Second, a public agency is responsible for providing that good or service, sometimes for a price (e.g., driver's license fee), just as a private business might provide a good or service, typically for a price.

Based on this definition, more people probably interact with government as customers than in any other roles, coming mostly to the administrative side of government in pursuit of discrete goods and services for themselves. At the local level in the U.S., for example, according to a variety of survey data, the proportions of residents who contact their municipal government in a given year with "a request for service or a complaint," a customer-like behavior, range as high as 60-70 percent or higher (Coulter 1992, p.306; Hirlinger 1992, p.558; Thomas and Melkers 1999). Those proportions substantially exceed the magnitude of any other involvement with government.

The reasons they initiate these contacts defy full enumeration, but include (a) complaints about garbage not being collected, (b) complaints about potholes on residential streets, (c) inquiries about public health insurance reimbursements, (d) questions about late pension

payments for the elderly, and (e) requests for information on recreation programs. In each case, the request usually reflects the caller's personal need, not the need of any larger community.

In making such requests, the individual may expect to be treated like a customer, that is, with courtesy, friendliness, promptness, and as much help as possible. That treatment can be as important to them as whether the request is actually granted. As Van Ryzin (2011) found in a 33-nation study, the process by which government treats people exerts much more influence on their trust in government than does the actual outcome people receive. The process sometimes even *becomes* the outcome since "customers find it difficult to distinguish clearly between the quality of an intangible service and the process by which the service was rendered" (Fountain 2001, p.4).

Responding to the public as customer

Where members of the public come to an agency most frequently as customers, the agency should be especially conscientious about providing good customer service. Public managers should ask at least these questions about how the agency interacts with the public:

1. *Are employees available when sought by the public?*
2. *Do those employees listen carefully to the public's requests and complaints?*
3. *Do they help to the extent they can?*
4. *Do they personalize their responses?*
5. *Do they respond promptly?*
6. *Do they respond courteously?*

Wanting to serve the public well should lead to an interest in providing better customer service by being courteous, friendly, prompt, and helpful. In some cases, however, customer

service falls short of these standards. Those cases could require employee training on customer service or, in the worst case, a radical change in organizational culture.

Governments face a special challenge in providing good customer service: how to ensure that individuals who contact government can easily reach someone who can provide *any* service. For example: which department is responsible? Which phone number is appropriate? Anyone who has called a government office for assistance has probably at some time been passed from one person to another. These questions point to a need for easily accessible and navigable systems for the public when they want government's help. Many local governments in the U.S., for example, have instituted centralized the "311" call centers. The simple three-digit number can direct all public's inquires to the right agencies. Some governments have also adopted the parallel "311 online" contact centers. These central call centers and Websites have proved enormously popular in the U.S., and have demonstrated their effectiveness in enhancing customer service.

Similar initiatives can be observed in China, such as the "12319" urban service hotline and the "12345" government complaint hotline. Some case studies have shown that those hotlines make governments more responsive, and improve citizen satisfaction with government (Yuanfang, Lei et al. 2009; Gao 2012).

Government agencies and public administrators also benefit from using this innovation to better understand the public they serve as customers. Information collected by the hotlines could be converted and automatically imported to the customer/citizen relations management (CRM) system. CRM systems typically incorporate other performance data in addition to what comes from citizen contacts. Those data are likely to include (1) workload data on where employees are assigned, (2) employee reports, ranging from crime reports to numbers of potholes filled, (3) data

provided by third parties (e.g., economic data), (4) data from citizen surveys, plus other data as appropriate and available.

The GRM system provides public administrators a reliable source of information for performance monitoring. It also provides public administration scholars potential "gold mines" to analyze the data in order to better understand what services does the public want—or not want—from government? And how good a job does the public feel government is doing in providing specific services? So far, we have not found evidence from any news report or academic study showing that governments in China have adopted such GRM system. We would recommend governments that have already been using the hotlines also institute this GRM system to maximize the potential of the hotlines.

Challenges to Chinese public administrators

To improve customer service in government, Chinese public administrators face additional challenge, that is, to provide equal access to fundamental public services, such as public education, labor and employment services, health care, housing services, social security, and so on. Currently, disparities in service between urban and rural areas, different population groups and across regions remain pervasive. Governments and public administrators should channel more social resources toward rural areas, poor regions, and disadvantaged social groups to ensure that all people have equal access to public services.

The Public as Partner

What is the partner role?

Case 2.1: Mobile Application for Urban Problem Reporting

Urban problems, such as holes in the pavement, poor accesses to wheelchairs, or broken streetlights, are becoming a general concern for local governments. The city of Boston has launched a smartphone application, called Citizen Connect, to allow residents report urban problems to the city government. Residents can download the app to the smartphones and register with an e-mail address. The GPS component of the app identifies the location of the reported problems and users can take photographs to attach to their report (City of Boston July 2010).

Case 2.2: Microblogs Combat Child-Trafficking

In China, thousands of children are snatched and sold every year to desperate, usually boy-less couples. Government authorities have launched several crackdowns in the past two decades, but the crime has persisted. To combat child-trafficking, parents and activists have been using microblogs to share information about cases and draw public attention to child abduction. Chinese public-security ministry has encouraged police to join internet groups that discuss child abductions and to engage with members openly. The police actively use information provided by microbloggers to track child-trafficking suspects (Zhou 2013).

In the first case, residents in Boston play a partner role of the city government as they attempt to help the government identify problems. In the second case, members of public in China collaborate with the police to fight against child abduction crime. Across a wide range of public service and programs, effective production and delivery requires joint contributions from government and members of the public. Without the public partnering in service production and delivery, many services stand to suffer or fail. Crime prevention and education are cited as two

prominent examples. Crime prevention supposedly cannot be achieved by police action alone; it requires assistance from citizens and communities, an insight that has inspired the spread of "neighborhood watch" programs where residents agree to report to the police any suspicious activities. With schools similarly, government can provide classrooms and teachers, but education outcome hinges on students doing their part, preferably with the support of their parents.

The partnership will sometimes be straightforward, discrete, and bounded, as when waste collection officials ask that residents bag and haul their trash to the curb. Often, though, the partnership will be complex and ongoing, as when public programs designed to move welfare beneficiaries to work rely on extensive efforts by clients in order to succeed—government can provide job training and arrange job interviews, but, for the program to succeed, clients must learn from the training and how to impress the job interviews.

Coproduction occurs with both individuals and groups. At the individual level, a member of the public could join in coproduction through such simple effort as stopping one's car at a stop sign. Or, individuals make more extensive contributions serving as volunteers in the "neighborhood watch" programs. At the group level, coproduction could occur when an environmental organization joins with a government agency in cleaning up a highway. Or, some grass-root NGOs collaborate with government in earthquake relief. These realities carry substantial implications for public administrators. Most basically, public administrators need to understand when and how their efforts could benefit from the public's assistance, and they need to know what strategies might be used to obtain that assistance.

Responding to the public as partner

Public officials and public administrators need to recognize the reality that nowadays, in almost every function where government is involved, it requires contributions from the public. Public administrators should view themselves as lead partners in service development and delivery rather than the sole providers. John Alford (2009) provides some valuable advice for public administrators to interact effectively with the public as partners:

1. *Simplify the task:* The first strategy is to simplify the task to the extent possible. This builds from the recognition that members of the public have limited time and abilities to offer. If the task is too complex and the coproduction is time-consuming, members of the public might be discouraged from assisting the government. The Boston case where residents could use a smartphone application to report urban problems is a good example of simplifying the task for the public.
2. *Enhance the abilities of the public:* Public's ability could be improved by "providing them with information, skills, and knowledge to assist them to work" (Alford 2009, p.200). For example, after adopting a new recycling program, many city governments would employ multiple ways to inform residents the new program: television stations or newspapers may be asked to announce the new public service; municipal officials may speak at neighborhood meetings to describe how the program works; flyers may be circulated through mail or emails to tell residents how items should be sorted in recycling bins; etc. All of these are to improve residents' ability to better comply with the program (Thomas 2012).
3. *Provide incentives for the public to contribute:* Simplifying the tasks and educating the public are not sufficient to motivate the public to participate in coproduction. In many cases, no matter how simple the tasks are, people still need reasons why they

should contribute their time and effort (Thomas 2012). Public administrators need to know how to structure incentives to encourage that assistance. Those incentives may include: material incentives, beliefs and values, social networks, and so on. One incentive that is especially appealing to Chinese public administrators is social norms. After the Chinese government has championed the ideas of "collectivism" and "national interests" for years, people in China have embedded the obligation of serving the mass. They seem to be more ready to be called upon to contribute to coproduction. This makes it easier for Chinese public administrators than their counterparts in Western countries where individualism is favored to encourage the public to assist public service production and delivery.

Challenges to Chinese public administrators

Barriers to increased coproduction mainly come from the government side in China. China has been perceived as having a "big government" and a "small society." Governments in China have strong paternalistic characteristics and are often considered as the sole provider of public goods and services. Members of the public are viewed as beneficiaries rather than partners. Many grass-root NGOs and private charities are reported to "struggle under the big government" (Wong June 23, 2013). In 2012, a well-known China Central Television host and presenter Cui Yongyuan berated Department of Education in Hunan Province as "no effort, no principle, and no shame" in his microblog (Wong June 23, 2013). Mr. Cui runs a public welfare foundation that provides training to teachers from rural areas. When he tried to get some support from the Department of Education in Hunan Province, the education authority replied that "[we] do not oppose, support or [plan to] participate in the Rural Teacher Project" (Wong June 23, 2013). Most NGOs and private charities in China are in their infancy. Without support from government,

it is difficult to get work done. Public administrators and public officials in China need to change their managerial outlook and rethink their roles and the public's role in providing public services. The above advice by Alford could provide some insights, but to know how to nurture coproduction and how to interact with the public effectively is a constant learning process.

The Public as Citizen

What is the citizen role?

Case 3.1: Rebuilding Roombeek

> *After an explosion killed 22 residents and devastated the Roombeek district in the Netherlands' city of Enschede, city leaders pursued "maximum feasible participation" of residents and displaced residents in planning the area's future. Officials developed an elaborate "process architecture," including "multiple participatory arenas," and engaged a representative public,* as citizens*, in formulating and ultimately approving a comprehensive plan for the area (Denters and Klok 2010).*

The public probably plays its most important role in public management when its members participate in decision-making, joining with public managers in deliberating about the nature of public programs and their implementation. Members of the public here take the citizen role, sharing responsibility for determining the course of government. In the Dutch case, residents in Roombeek were asked to help the city government to decide how to rebuild the devastated parts of the city. The decisions they were asked to make included: should we spread shops throughout the neighborhood or concentrated in a shopping mall? Should we build mainly low-rise buildings or a mix of low- and high-rise buildings? Should we arrange parking lots on streets and squares throughout the area or concentrated in a car park? And so on. This

engagement may constitute the public's most important role because it involves citizens in the core democratic function of defining the course of government.

The Roombeek citizen participation demonstrates the case of extensive citizen participation, where citizens were asked to formulate plans and proposals from the outset of an issue arising. In other cases, public administrators only consult with the public seeking ideas from citizens, but reserving the prerogative to decide. At its minimal extensive, public administrators ask for reactions from the public to a decision that has already been made.

Citizen participation has received increasing attention in China, too. We choose a land requisition case as a snapshot to learn citizen participation in China since land requisition conflicts between residents and government are becoming headline news these days. Land requisition is a complicated issue involving the interests of local government, developers, demolition companies, residents and farmers, and other parties. During the past decade, rapid urbanization and the conversion of rural land for urban development have led to numerous social conflicts between Chinese government and its people. Sometimes, the tension between government and local residents escalated to blood violence. Chinese public officials and administrators have realized the importance of citizen participation and have started to use citizen participation as a possible way to tackle this problem. The following case of Guangzhou Development District land requisition has been considered as a "highly successful" example, as there were no violent clashes between the authorities and affected villagers.

Case 3.2: Land Requisition in Guangzhou

> *The Guangzhou Development District (GDD) was established in 1983 and continued to expand in the 1990s. In 2004, to support the construction of Guangzhou Science City in*

the GDD, the city government announced to relocate several villages that were within the planning boundaries of the project. To implement their campaign, the GDD authority strategically targeted the village leaders as a focal group, because village leaders' attitudes towards government policies had a tremendous influence on their fellow villagers. They also provided public meetings, hotlines, and suggestion boxes to inform villagers about their compensation and resettlement arrangement. Yet, some 20 households remained unsatisfied with the government compensations and they hired a lawyer to take legal action against the GDD. However, the GDD officials convinced the lawyer to withdraw from the appointment (Tang, Wong et al. 2008).

The GDD land requisition is considered as a "successful" land requisition example as there were no violent clashes during the process (Tang, Wong et al. 2008). But as a citizen participation case, it is far from success. There were some limited ways of engaging villagers including public meetings, hotlines, suggestion boxes, and village leader representations. However, this sort of citizen participation was aimed at compliance rather than consultation. The GDD officials encouraged villagers to participation in the hope that they would support the land requisition proposal and all opposition could be removed. Such community involvement was not directed to identifying alternatives, but rather to justify the already-made decisions.

Responding to the public as citizen

Engaging the public in joint decision-making promises a number of benefits, beginning with a greater likelihood that the public will accept and comply with any decisions they help to make. Moreover, feedback from the public could also better inform policy makers so that they

can make better decisions (Beierle 2002). Effective citizen participation might also strengthen community capacity for future efforts.

Yet, citizen participation in practice brings problems, too. It could be costly, at a minimum by requiring more time of public administrators to interact with the public, at a maximum by delaying programs or raising program costs in order to meet the public's demands. Sometimes, participants would not be representative of the overall community. Fearing these problems, many public managers have sought to avoid citizen participation. As discussed in more detail below, citizen participation in making decisions will be desirable under some circumstances, but not others. Public administrators can enhance their chances for success by keeping a handful of guidelines in mind (Thomas 2012):

1. *Know what you want from the public:* Public involvement offers better information on the public's preferences and an increased likelihood of public acceptance of decisions. Public administrators should be clear whether they need or want these benefits before pursuing any public involvement.
2. *Define agency goals or constraints in advance:* All public decisions come with some constraints. Public administrators should define in advance any agency goals and those constraints, such as scientific or technical standards, budget limitations, etc. They should try to minimize those decision parameters in order to maximize latitude for the public's influence.
3. *Recognize that public involvement requires sharing decision-making:* The public may reasonably expect that their ideas will influence the eventual decision; given the time and efforts they have contributed. Public administrators should honor that expectation and do not invite the public unless they know they will utilize the results.

4. *Define in advance who should be involved and recruit them aggressively:* Representative participation by the public is a *sine qua non* for successful decision-making with public involvement. Public administrators must do their best both to identify the relevant people and groups that represent the stakeholders and to persuade them to become involved in deliberations.
5. *Encourage face-to-face two-way communication in deliberations*: People will feel involved and develop trust in a decision-making process only if they can communicate face to face with each other.
6. *Select appropriate decision-making forums and facilitate decision-making*: There are multiple ways to promote public involvement, such as public meetings, advisory committees, focus groups, and the like. Specific techniques tend to work better in some situations, worse in others. The best choice depends on the appropriate decision-making approach and the nature of the public. And also, public administrators should employ mechanisms, in particular the use of a trained facilitator, to ensure that deliberations progress toward decisions.

Challenges to Chinese public administrators

Citizen participation in China falls behind most of the Western countries. The lack of will in promoting effective citizen participation has its roots in China. Politically, Chinese governmental system is a hierarchical monopoly rather than the construction from democracy consensus. Ideologically, the Chinese government has successfully championed the ideas of "collectivism" and "serving the mass", by which the public are expected to sacrifice their personal interests for the collective interests rather than to persist their individual rights. And culturally, Confucianism places emphasis on loyalty to the emperor (Lan 2000). The

combination of the above factors have created a unique environment that is not friendly in nurturing public involvement.

To promote citizen participation in China, public officials and administrators need to change their managerial outlook first. They should not insulate themselves from the public, seeing themselves as experts in decision making. They should recognize the value of ideas from the public and the benefits of involving the public in making administrative decisions. They should also make sure that their agency personnel share the same understanding.

Compared to their counterparts in Western countries, Chinese public administrators face an additional challenge, which is how to motivate and facilitate the public in joint decision making. Unlike the public in Western democracies who have more than half a century's experience in public participation, citizens in China are new to this phenomenon. Some of them may hold the opinion that it is the public officials' obligation to make decisions for the public. Others who have the motivation to participate may not be clear of the involvement process or lack the capacity to make meaningful contributions. Public administrators thus need to encourage the public to participate by letting them know why their involvement is important and how their involvement can benefit themselves and the community as a whole. Moreover, public administrators should provide trained facilitators to educate the public in order to improve their capacity in understanding public issues and decision making.

Conclusion

For more than a quarter-century, students of public administration have debated how public administrators should view the public's role in public management. This paper began with the premise that the public should be viewed as assuming three principal roles relative to

government: as *customers* and *citizens* and *partners*. The three roles separately and in combination probably describe most interactions between the public and public managers. The effectiveness of public management and government depends on public administrators recognizing and acting on this reality. They need to know what the public expects in those roles and what government might expect in return. They also need to know how to respond to the public in each of those roles, as this paper has discussed.

Although the model of viewing public's role as citizen, partner, and customer is derived from theories and practices in the Western world, judging from cases profiled in China, we find that many Chinese public administrators already know how to engage the public and interact with the public successfully in these roles. This implies two kinds of good news: First, this model could be applied to public management in Chinese context. Second, public administrators might take encouragement from their "pioneer" exemplary peers who have successfully interacted with the public in the three roles.

The guidelines defined in this paper are intended first to help public administrators, the officials with the principal responsibilities, effectively interact with the public. They could also be valuable for elected officials and street-level bureaucrats both of whom, from opposite ends of the governmental hierarchy, interact with the public as citizens, customers, and partners. In this age of blurring lines between sectors, the guidelines could also interest many nonprofit and private sector managers, especially those who work extensively with the public.

References

Alford, J. (2009). Engaging public sector clients: From service-delivery to co-production, Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke,, UK.

Beierle, T. C. (2002). "The quality of stakeholder-based decisions." Risk analysis **22**(4): 739-749.

Brudney, J. L. and R. E. England (1983). "Toward a definition of the coproduction concept." Public administration review: 59-65.

Chengfu Zhang and M. Zhang (2001). Public Administration and Administrative Reform in China for the 21st Century--From State-Center Governance to the Citizen-Center Governance. American Society for Public Administration. Newark, New Jersey.

City of Boston (July 2010). Citizens Connect Mobile Applications Terms of Service. Boston, U.S.

Coulter, P. B. (1992). "There's a Madness in the Method Redefining Citizen Contacting of Government Officials." Urban Affairs Review **28**(2): 297-316.

Denters, B. and P.-J. Klok (2010). "Rebuilding Roombeek: patterns of citizen participation in urban governance." Urban Affairs Review **45**(5): 583-607.

Fountain, J. E. (2001). "Paradoxes of public sector customer service." Governance **14**(1): 55-73.

Frederickson, H. G. (1992). "Painting bull's eyes around bullet holes." Governing **6**(1): 13.

Gao, J. (2012). "How Does Chinese Local Government Respond to Citizen Satisfaction Surveys? A Case Study of Foshan City." Australian Journal of Public Administration **71**(2): 136-147.

Hirlinger, M. W. (1992). "Citizen-initiated contacting of local government officials: A multivariate explanation." Journal of Politics **54**(2): 553-564.

Lan, Z. (2000). "Understanding China's administrative reform." Public Administration Quarterly: 437-468.

Marini, F. (1971). Toward a new public administration: The Minnowbrook perspective, Chandler Pub. Co.

Needham, C. (2008). "Realising the potential of co-production: negotiating improvements in public services." Social Policy and Society **7**(2): 221.

Nichols, R. (April 26, 2010). The End of the Line for DMVs? Government Technology.

Osborne and T. Gaebler (1993). Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. New York, Penguin Books.

Osborne, S. P. (2010). "Delivering public services: time for a new theory?".

Pestoff, V. (2006). "Citizens and co-production of welfare services: Childcare in eight European countries." Public Management Review **8**(4): 503-519.

Schachter, H. L. (1997). Reinventing government or reinventing ourselves: The role of citizen owners in making a better government, State University of New York Press.

Sharp, E. B. (1980). "Toward a new understanding of urban services and citizen participation: the coproduction concept." The American Review of Public Administration **14**(2): 105-118.

Tang, B. S., S. W. Wong, et al. (2008). "Social impact assessment and public participation in China: A case study of land requisition in Guangzhou." Environmental Impact Assessment Review **28**(1): 57-72.

Thomas, J. C. (2012). Citizen, customer, partner: Engaging the public in public management, ME Sharpe.

Thomas, J. C. and J. Melkers (1999). "Explaining Citizen-Initiated Contacts with Municipal Bureaucrats Lessons from the Atlanta Experience." Urban Affairs Review **34**(5): 667-690.

Van Ryzin, G. G. (2011). "Outcomes, process, and trust of civil servants." Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory **21**(4): 745-760.

Whitaker, G. P. (1980). "Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery." Public administration review: 240-246.

Wong, G. (June 23, 2013). "China: NGOs Struggle Under the "Big Government"." Global Voices.

Yuanfang, P., X. Lei, et al. (2009). The Conceptual Transformation from Government to Governance and Its Representations--A Case Study on the Innovations in City Management of Hangzhou The 4th International Conference of the International Forum on Urbanism. Amsterdam.

Zhou, T. (2013). "A Cruel Trade." The Economist.