

WORK IN PROGRESS SECTION

RELATIONS REVISITED: A NUANCED APPROACH TO TYPES OF MULTI-LEVEL GOVERNANCE

Dion Curry, PhD Candidate
University of Sheffield
D.Curry@sheffield.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Inter-governmental relations are often complex and multi-layered, and this has become more evident as countries increasingly move to share power and responsibility, often with shifts both upward, sometimes to supra-national institutions, and downward, to local governmental levels. However, different governments have had to deal with this pressure in different ways, with different bases as their starting points. Federal states, as they were set up in a manner that already divided powers between several levels of government, have a different reference point in dealing with inter-governmental relations in policy areas than a government that does not have a significant historical base for sharing jurisdictions among several levels.

These new forms and trends in governance have changed the nature of intergovernmental cooperation. Instead of the former model whereby hierarchical relations tended to exist between international, state, and sub-state actors, new literature suggests that often a more nuanced, heterarchical relationship defines relations between governments. New and strengthening levels of governance (such as the European Union and sub-state actors) and the nature of certain processes of governance (such as policy

implementation) have created this situation in which actors that previously had little formal power now are able to exert significant influence in informal ways. These factors call for more study in areas dealing with types and intricacies of governance processes, informal relations between formally unconnected governmental levels, and how these changes are manifested in the policy process.

2. Research Questions

The core question of this research will address the issue of types of governance. How does a system contending with a relatively short historical association with shared jurisdictions and multi-level policy cooperation deal with these intergovernmental relations as compared to a case with a long-standing history of shared jurisdiction and multi-level governmental cooperation? While the thesis will aim to answer this broader question, specific emphasis will be placed on the role and impact of this cooperation at the local level. On a more general note, this thesis questions whether the theory of multi-level governance can be more widely applied than has traditionally been the case. The term ‘multi-level governance’, however, risks facing conceptual stretching,¹ and this work will

¹ See Giovanni Sartori, “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics.” In *The American Political*

aim to more clearly identify types of multi-level governance and establish the boundaries of this theoretical framework. The more specific research question can also be further developed and enhanced by several secondary questions. Do these different starting points, or perhaps some other factor, create different forms of multi-level governance? If they do, how do these differences affect cooperation between governmental levels? Third, does the nature of cooperation differ when looking at horizontal (intra-governmental) and vertical (intergovernmental) relationships, and are these processes complementary or constraining? Related to this question, what factors act to facilitate or constrain cooperation in policy making between governmental levels? An additional question will deal with the role and impact of specific governmental levels in a multi-level governance situation. What are the roles of formal and informal powers in facilitating or constraining cooperation between levels, and how are governmental levels able to fit into the policy process given their relative level of power? Development of the idea of specific types of multi-level governance will open up new areas of question in this area of research. While the thesis aims to create dialogue in this field, some future directions of research can be considered given the nature of the research. Specifically, the research will allow for the development of the question of whether the nature of intergovernmental cooperation and multi-level governance changes over the policy cycle. For

example, the same actors, cooperation and intergovernmental relations that are important at the decision-making phase may not be the same actors and processes that are important when the policy is implemented. These questions are important for several reasons. First, they will further develop the notion of multi-level governance and help to distinguish the types of multi-level governance and the distinction of the idea from simple multi-level government. Second, and most importantly, multi-level governance is often treated as a static phenomenon, and these questions and the ensuing research will provide a more nuanced view of the processes – and any changes or shifts thereof – at work within the wider rubric of ‘multi-level governance’.

3. Preliminary Hypotheses

Although more work must be done in order to solidify the hypotheses of this work, certain preliminary ideas can be raised. Related to the preliminary research question, this work hypothesizes that the two types of multi-level governance identified by Hooghe and Marks are becoming less clearly defined, and systems are beginning to adapt to necessities and benefits of both types in providing policy and governance. A second preliminary hypothesis is that rather than operating in tandem, if integration between the governmental levels is not prevalent at the decision-making phase (that is, policy is decided upon unilaterally or without full cooperation of all relevant actors), then this integration will be more likely to occur at the later policy stage in order to

achieve successful implementation, with all decision-making and implementing actors playing an important role. If integration of different governmental levels is present at the decision-making stage, cooperation is less necessary at the implementation phase and the power of the actors will not be as evenly dispersed as it would be if integration did not exist at the decision-making phase. There is not much literature in this area of policy studies, but some literature supports the idea of cooperation and non-cooperation at the decision-making and implementation phases. Most importantly, Falkner et al. note that if an actor's interests are not met at the decision-making phase, opposition is stronger at the implementation phase.² While this would not seem likely to provoke cooperation between levels, opposition by the implementers would force discussion and negotiation by the decision-makers who wish to see the policy implemented, thus creating a situation of 'grudging cooperation'.

A third possible hypothesis revolves around the specificities of local governance, namely the split between urban and rural cases. This work tentatively hypothesizes that the size and strength of the local government will affect both the nature of multi-level governance and the importance and types of cooperation exhibited between the levels of governance. Additional hypotheses may cover areas such as the

importance and roles of horizontal and vertical cooperation in governance processes and the diverging points of different types of multi-level governance.

4.1 Scope Conditions

It will also prove helpful to outline the scope of this thesis and explain what it is *not* trying to accomplish. By no means is this work aiming to be a definitive and comprehensive typology of multi-level governance. However, apart from Hooghe and Marks' work on the subject, little literature exists that deeply examines the nature, similarities, and differences between so-called type 1 and type 2 forms of multi-level governance. This thesis aims to provide this more nuanced look at types of multi-level governance, their relation to the policy cycle, and whether any type of convergence of types is occurring. The findings of this study can likely be applied to other policy areas, and in understanding other cases of multi-level governance and power sharing, but other possibly important factors such as electoral systems (as a democratic outlet), European integration, and supra-national institutions will not be probed in any depth.

Due to the nature of this work, the findings will only be applicable in policy situations where many governmental levels are involved in the process. However, these shared-jurisdiction areas are becoming increasingly prevalent, making research on this form of intergovernmental connectivity important. In addition, increased downloading of policy responsibility has resulted in a

² G. Falkner et. al. "Non-Compliance with EU Directives in the Member States: Opposition through the Backdoor?" *West European Politics*, v.3, n.4, (2004): 452-473

greater role and need for intergovernmental cooperation in forming and implementing policy. At this time, there is no reason to believe that research in the policy field of service delivery cannot be extended to other shared-jurisdiction areas.

5. Cases

This thesis will use a small-n approach, studying the cases of Canada and the United Kingdom. More specifically, case selection was accomplished in several steps. First, the overarching states of interest had to be determined. As part of the European Union, where the idea of multi-level governance originated, the United Kingdom provides a good starting case, and several conditions make it an interesting and useful case for this research even within a European Union context. As this research is interested in mapping the differences between countries with long-established systems of multi-level governance and countries with relatively nascent forms of multi-level governance, the United Kingdom provides a strong case of a country with a relatively new – but exceptionally widespread – form of multi-level power sharing. Traditionally a unitary state, within the last ten years the UK has not only seen increasing integration with the European Union, but also devolution of powers downwards to the regions and local governments. This provides a new but remarkably fully-formed multi-level system to study.

The Canadian case was also chosen for several important reasons. First, this

research does not want or aim to have the European dimension be the focal point of the research. This is why a federal European case, such as Germany, was not chosen. Instead, the focus is on the domestic and sub-domestic level, and thus a case should be used that provides a non-European dimension to the analysis, allowing for a theoretical separation of the concept of multi-level governance from its traditional European moorings. This separation is important, as the research aims to address the *types* of multi-level governance, and thus should not limit itself by selecting cases with similar overarching multi-level governance structures. In addition, Canada has a long history of multi-level ‘government’ structures, and one that has many informal and indirect facets too, which means that it also increasingly fits with the idea of multi-level ‘governance’. Therefore, taken together these two cases provide one case (the UK) of new multi-level power sharing and one with a firmly entrenched multi-level structure. Together, these cases work well in providing the ability to contrast the two systems in terms of multi-level governance and cooperation, while maintaining a similar Westminster-style system in both cases, thus limiting the chances of certain external factors affecting the results of the work. In addition, both systems rely heavily on intergovernmental cooperation. Canada is constitutionally and in practice a federation with a complex division of authority between provincial and federal governments. Plus, through informal institutions, the division of jurisdiction between the two formal levels of government has become less clear and

local governments have played an increasingly important role in the policy process, especially at the implementation stage. In the British case, the increased prominence of the European Union, coupled with the devolution of some powers to regional governments such as Scotland, has led to a situation where more governmental actors are involved in the policy process and, again, intergovernmental cooperation plays a vital role in achieving policy goals. Finally, both share other potentially important characteristics such as urban and rural population splits and service delivery issues, allowing for a relatively large number of variables to be controlled for in this real-world test.

Specific cases within the countries had to be selected along two inter-related dimensions. Firstly, it was important to consider the policy area under study. As one of my hypotheses posits that multi-level governance operates according to urban and rural patterns, it is important to choose a policy area where there is significant difference across urban and rural cases. Although additional resources would allow for study in other policy areas, due to time and financial constraints only one policy area will be studied. In addition, this policy area must include a local, sub-national, and national dimension. For these reasons, the area of service delivery (ie. water, sewage, etc.) was chosen. This area shows significant interesting diversities between urban and rural situations and can provide a good test of the role of the policy area and the size of the population in affecting types of multi-level governance. This policy area

will be further refined as research progresses. This policy issue can be examined throughout the stages of the policy process, but a deeper focus may be applied to certain important stages with significant intergovernmental facets, such as decision-making and implementation.

Secondly, and more importantly, cases had to be selected based on their geographical and political characteristics. In the United Kingdom, this involved selecting an area with political power, in order to provide a relatively direct comparison to Canadian provinces. Given the nature of devolution in the UK, Scotland provides the strongest and clearest case. In Canada, all provinces have the same power, but do not exercise it in the same ways. Therefore, case selection is less restricted in the Canadian case, and this work does not aim to be a comprehensive study of multi-level governance in every Canadian case. Instead, it aims to focus on the theory and possible differences between types of multi-level governance, and thus a case with a similar structure to the Scottish case should be chosen, even though they will, obviously, be coming from different starting points. Given the emphasis on urban/rural service delivery, a province with a similar geographical, economical, demographic, and social makeup is important. While the similarity of all these variables cannot be perfectly met, British Columbia provides a fair representation, as both cases are coastal regions with significant resource-based economies, large population centres, and very remote areas. The aim, therefore, is to go for a most similar systems design; all factors

possible are kept constant (ie. service delivery issues, political structure, economy, population and demographics) except for the differences in governance, the variable under study.

The urban case chosen in Canada is that of Vancouver, while the Scottish urban equivalent is Glasgow. These cases were chosen for several reasons. Firstly, neither is a capital city and thus does not have an implicit stake in that characteristic of governance or a “muddiness” between levels. While capital cities could have been chosen, that would add an additional complexity to the research. The populations of Glasgow and Vancouver are similar, with approximately 545,000 inhabitants in Vancouver and 577,000 in Glasgow. The population of the metropolitan areas of each are also similar, with approximately 2 million in Vancouver and roughly 1.2 million in Greater Glasgow.³ The economies of both cities are the largest in their respective regions and, even though the actual major industries are not the same, there is significant overlap in sectors such as

³ Statistics can be found for British Columbia at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities (www.civicnet.bc.ca). Statistics for Scotland came from National Statistics Online (www.statistics.gov.uk). It should be noted that Glasgow metropolitan statistics are much less precise than those for metropolitan Vancouver. This is due to the fact that there exists a strong and clearly defined Greater Vancouver Regional District, whereas ‘metropolitan’ is a more nebulous concept in the Scottish case. Numbers for greater Glasgow range from approximately 867,000 for the Greater Glasgow Health Board, through 1.2 million for the urban area, up to 2.3 million for its travel-to-work (transportation) area.

tourism, financial services, and software development. Politics in both cities are run by strong city councils, but in Vancouver there also exists two-tiered local governance, with the Greater Vancouver Regional District.

The rural cases chosen are Alert Bay and Unst (Shetland Islands) in British Columbia and Scotland, respectively. Again, these cases share as many similarities in non-governance factors as can reasonably be expected. Both are part of similar-sized regional districts (~20,000 inhabitants) and local population sizes (583 in Alert Bay, and 720 in Unst).⁴ Both are also situated in remote areas, on islands not directly connected to large centres, creating an interesting and very different reality in the policy area of service delivery than the urban areas. The economies of both areas are similar, with a reliance on fishing. Finally, they exhibit similar political structures, with regional and local governments and strong community ties. Using the two urban and two rural cases as starting points, governmental and non-governmental actors can be clearly identified by working upwards from the local level to identify key policy players at other governmental levels.

6. Theoretical Framework and Relevant Literature

European literature on governance, in this case defined as the power and interplay of

⁴ Statistics can again be found at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities and National Statistics Online.

different governmental levels, has followed three distinct theoretical paths. Some political scientists argue for a neo-functional approach, theorizing that new supranational institutions (like the European Union) create a fundamental shift towards a new form of governance. This explanation argues that the EU has or will become the dominant form of government in the region.⁵ On the other end of the spectrum, intergovernmentalist literature argues that the states remain the most prominent actors in governance, acting as a gatekeeper of sorts between European and domestic politics. This state-centric view argues that European integration has not created a new paradigm in the region.⁶ Even though it stems from neo-institutional literature,⁷

multi-level governance literature approaches governance in a manner somewhere between the other two approaches.

6.1 Multi-Level Governance

The term ‘multi-level governance’ is defined in the European context as a theory that envisages political authority as being dispersed among several governmental and non-governmental actors with horizontal and vertical integration of these levels, instead of being concentrated at either the supra-national or national level.⁸ This theory applies to policy networks, where power is diffused to a number of different governmental and possibly non-governmental actors that are related in a heterarchical fashion.⁹ These relationships are ones of influence and interdependence rather than ones of control and clearly delineated power structures. This definition, especially in shared-jurisdiction policy areas, more closely fits with the ideas espoused with regard to the European Union, a political organization that emphasizes “fluidity, the permanence of uncertainty and multiple modalities of authority.”¹⁰

Multi-level governance literature in Europe is fairly widespread and becoming an increasingly accepted approach to EU

⁵ See, for example, E.B. Haas. *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Economic and Social Forces*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), J. Tranholm-Mikkelsen. “Neo-Functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC” in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 20:1, (1991): 1-22, or B. Rosamond. *Theories of European Integration*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

⁶ Rainer Eising. “Multilevel Governance and Business Interests in the European Union.” In *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, Vol. 17, no. 2, (2004): 211-245. Also see S. Hoffman. “Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe” in *Daedalus*, 85:3, (1966): 862-915, G. Garrett and G. Tsebelis. “An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism” in *International Organization*, 50:2, (1996): 269-299, or P. Taylor. “The European Community and the State: Assumptions, Theories and Propositions” in *Review of International Studies*, 17, (1991): 109-125.

⁷ Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks (a). *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001): 3.

⁸ Hooghe and Marks. *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*: xi.

⁹ Karl Heinz Ladeur. “Towards a Legal Theory of Supranationality – The Viability of the Network Concept.” In *European Law Journal*, Vol. 3, no. 1, (1997): 33-54.

¹⁰ Rosamond. *Theories of European Integration*.

and British governance studies, moving beyond its origins stemming from neo-institutionalism. In Europe in general and Great Britain for the purposes of this work, multi-level governance is affected by two notable factors: European integration and regionalization. Integration has shifted authority away from the nation state and towards the supra-national European institutions. Meanwhile, regionalization has shifted some power away from the nation state towards subnational forms of governance.

By our reckoning, no policy area is more centralized at the national level in the year 2000 than in 1950, nor is there a single country in which regional governance has become weaker over the same period.¹¹

With increased European integration and regionalization, decision-making and other policy processes are now shared by actors at different governmental (and sometimes non-governmental) levels. In addition, political arenas have become interconnected rather than nested, meaning there is decreasing separation and increasing cooperation not just in subnational/national and national/international relations, but also between subnational and international actors. In essence, governmental levels can no longer be viewed hierarchically from the bottom to the top. Rather, there exist connections between all levels, with multiple actors having authority in policy and politics. Regions have gained power in the EU through numerous channels. Strong regional voices have developed,

especially in countries where power is diffused more to subnational levels, subnational offices and transnational networks have developed in Brussels and between regions, and regions have some power (albeit admittedly limited) in the European Commission, especially through cohesion policy, which aims to reduce disparities between regions.¹² This is true in Canada, too, where decentralization has taken place at the national and provincial levels. While multi-level governance literature does argue that the nation states have lost considerable power to both subnational and international governments, it must be remembered that the nation state is still an important actor but is no longer the sole authority in many areas where power is now dispersed over several actors.¹³ Actors other than the nation state (political or otherwise) now play a more important role in politics in the EU.

Hooghe and Marks identify two types of multi-level governance, and it is from this typology that this research will be based. Type one systems, which can also be termed systems of multi-level *government*, sees dispersion of authority being limited to a prescribed and formal number of levels and specified jurisdictions, with little or no overlap of these governments or jurisdictions. The second type of multi-level governance, and one that has since been further developed, sees governance as a fluid and changing structure, with overlap between jurisdictions, no clear hierarchical bounds, and more room for

¹¹ Hooghe and Marks, 2001(a): xii.

¹² Hooghe and Marks, 2001(a): 82-88.

¹³ Hooghe and Marks, 2001(a): 3-4.

non-governmental actors.¹⁴ While Hooghe and Marks picture the reality of governance to be more a spectrum than a strict typology, this article has helped to define the bounds of multi-level governance and identify specific and differing ideas in types of governance.

While Canada represents a definitional federal structure, the traditional exclusive legal-political orientation of federalist discussion in Canada fails to adequately address all aspects of political discourse and network activity in inter-governmental relations in the country, and Hooghe and Marks' conditions outlined as regards multi-level governance can be applied to Canada. In constitutionally and legally shared jurisdictions such as the environment, neither provinces nor the federal government have power over the other level, creating a heterarchical situation where power is dispersed among the actors. In addition, Canadian governments have moved increasingly towards decentralization, with local and urban actors playing an important role, especially in policy implementation. Even if the context is slightly different in the Canadian case, the idea of multi-level governance is still relevant in study of that country.

6.2 Policy Theory

This work will also rely on policy theory and literature, as the research will help to explain the interplay between policy and

politics. The research will use the idea of the policy cycle to apply governance issues to policy. A sophisticated analysis of the policy cycle is developed by Howlett and Ramesh,¹⁵ who clearly identify, explore, and expand on the stages of policy development, from agenda setting to policy evaluation. Decision-making and implementation will likely be studied in the most depth, as those policy areas typically exhibit and necessitate high levels of cooperation between governing levels.

7. Methodology

7.1 Network Analysis

Network theoretical literature will also be useful. Methodological background, such as Wasserman and Faust,¹⁶ will be used to develop the framework for studying networks in this study. Network analysis is a sociological method that looks at social ties between individual actors in different cases. This can be easily expanded to examine business and political networks, and this approach also adds new insight into relations and processes at work in politics. Network analysis bases its methodology on different premises than most political research. Most importantly, network analysis focuses on the *relation* between actors, rather than the actors themselves. This is decidedly different from a rational

¹⁴ Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks (b), "Types of Multi-Level Governance." In *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 5, no. 11, (2001), available at <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-011a.htm>.

¹⁵ Michael Howlett and M. Ramesh. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2003).

¹⁶ Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

choice actor-centric approach, which takes actor preferences as the focus and somewhat ignores the linkages between actors. However, some linkages can be made, as Putnam identifies the importance of certain actors, such as negotiators in international policy making.¹⁷ Also, network analysis assumes that actors are interdependent rather than autonomous. This meshes well with multi-level governance literature and is especially applicable in situations such as policy implementation in the EU where actors cannot often easily operate alone and independently. Third, linkages between actors behave as conduits for the flow of information or resources. Fourth, the ties between actors do not have to be symmetrical, with differences possible in content and intensity of information flow. Again, this is an important consideration in policy sciences, as different actors may exhibit different characteristics in relations with each other in implementing policy. Fifth, direct ties are not the only important network relation, and thus the network as a whole must be analyzed. This allows for the consideration of indirect influence and other linkages that may not be immediately evident.¹⁸ This quick overview of network analysis illustrates the benefit of a different approach to the study of the long-existing

problem of implementation of policy. In addition, network analysis, often in a slightly simplified form, has been applied in other related political science literature, such as Rohrschneider and Dalton's¹⁹ study of transnational cooperation among environmental groups and Agranoff and McGuire's²⁰ work on intergovernmental relations and network theory.

A network approach has the unique benefit of easily identifying and assessing actor-related factors that may not be immediately noticeable using a different approach. For example, the role of intermediate actors is easily ascertained using network analysis, and in general actors, no matter their relative importance, can easily be incorporated and any influence they have on the policy process ascertained. Direction of ties between actors (hence showing power relations) are visible and easily analyzed, and other attributes can be accounted for. Finally, use of this method opens the door to using valuable network analytic tools to determine central players, equivalence between actors, the strength of connections within the network, and the relative distances between actors in cooperation.

The aforementioned research questions will be addressed using elite interviews to

¹⁷ Robert Putnam. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" in Evans, P., Jacobson, H., and Putnam, R. eds., *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993): 457.

¹⁸ See Wasserman and Faust, *Social Network Analysis*, and B. Wellman and S.D. Berkowitz. *Social Structures: A Network Approach*. (Greenwich: JAI Press, 1997).

¹⁹ R. Rohrschneider and R. Dalton. "A Global Network? Transnational Cooperation Among Environmental Groups." In *The Journal of Politics*, v.64, n.2, (2002): 510-533.

²⁰ R. Agranoff and M. McGuire. "Inside the Matrix: Integrating the Paradigms of Intergovernmental and Network Management." In *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 26, no. 12, (2003): 1401-1422.

map the networks that exist in developing and implementing policy both within and between governmental levels. By studying and analyzing the links between actors using network analysis, it will be possible to draw inferences regarding the nature of cooperation between and within the governmental levels. Network analysis looks at ties between actors and assumes that actors are interdependent rather than autonomous. These network linkages between actors in networks behave as conduits for the flow of information or resources, but are not necessarily symmetrical and both direct and indirect ties matter. The network analysis approach works well with the idea of multi-level governance and provides a sophisticated, non-hierarchical, and actor-centric analysis of governance processes. In addition to the analysis of the full networks, in-depth interviews with key players will be conducted, and review of relevant documents undertaken. This will result in triangulation of the data and decrease the reliance of the research on only one form of data or method.

8. Importance/Contribution to the Literature

This research is important for several reasons. As mentioned before, multi-level governance is sometimes seen as too broad an idea in danger of concept stretching, and this work will help to clarify the meaning of this term, tether it down, and locate its usefulness in the field. It will further develop the theory underpinning multi-level governance and help to provide depth to the concept and distinguish the types of multi-level

governance. Second, multi-level governance is often treated as a static phenomenon, and these questions and the ensuing research will provide a more nuanced view of the processes – and any changes or shifts thereof – at work within the wider rubric of ‘multi-level governance’. In addition, this thesis will approach the idea of cooperation in a manner not often used in the political science literature. The thesis develops from the idea that actor linkages, rather than actor preferences, will play an important role in determining the nature and extent of cooperation between governments. While network analysis has become increasingly predominant in the study of politics, it is often used in a limited manner, or in a different way than the sociological approach to network analysis. Exploiting this inter-disciplinary tool will bolster the understanding of cooperation in politics. Comparisons between Canada and Europe will prove to be fruitful, as the political climate in both cases has resulted in situations moving more towards power sharing between several levels of government, but in markedly different ways.

In general, this thesis will add to the theoretical knowledge of the idea of multi-level governance. The research will examine what factors facilitate and constrain the policy process and what role actors (and more specifically the ties between actors) play in establishing governance relations, a notion that is often approached in only a limited way, or sometimes overlooked in favor of an institutional approach. In addition, this thesis aims to address the urban/rural

divide, and thus it will be possible to examine whether the ties between actors have more or less of an impact on policy implementation in urban or rural contexts. As regards the UK, this thesis aims to address the question of whether changes in sub-state and supra-state governance have manifested themselves in the process of policy implementation. Has the increasing power of the EU and the devolution of power to sub-state actors resulted in a new form of governance in regard to policy implementation? Through a network comparison to an established federal system, it can be considered whether the system in the United Kingdom fits into a pattern similar to a federal system, or whether it has remained a different and separate type of governance. If it follows a federalist mould, this will lead to a better understanding of the EU in the policy process as a whole and specifically in policy implementation, and if it does not resemble a federal model, this will still help to understand the role of the EU and open up questions as to whether the EU represents a new form of governance. From a Canadian perspective, the multi-level nature of the European Union and the ways in which the EU are represented in the policy process in the UK will lead to a better understanding of the changing nature of federalism, where the control over the policy process is no longer a power clearly delineated to one governmental level or another. Although multi-level governance was originally seen as a method for examining the European Union, it is being used increasingly often in other situations, such as the study of Canadian politics.

Traditional federalism literature does not often account for the informal processes and increasing interdependence of federal and provincial levels of government, as well as the powers of local government in many of the provinces.

Bibliography and Selected Relevant Literature

- Agranoff, R. and McGuire, M. "Inside the Matrix: Integrating the Paradigms of Intergovernmental and Network Management." In *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 26, no. 12, (2003): 1401-1422.
- Bache, I. "The Extended Gatekeeper: Central Government and the Implementation of EC Regional Policy in the UK" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6:1, (1999): 28-45.
- Bache, I. And Flinders, M. *Multi-Level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Beach, D. "Why Governments Comply: an Integrative Compliance Model That Bridges the Gap Between Instrumental and Normative Models of Compliance" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12:1, (2005): 113-142.
- Benz, A., and Eberlein, B. "The Europeanization of Regional Policies: Patterns of Multi-Level Governance" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6:2, (1999): 329-348.
- Borgatti, S.P., Everett, M.G., and Freeman, L.C. *Ucinet for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis*. Harvard, MA: Analytic Technologies, 2002.
- Carmichael, Laurence. "Cities in the EU Multi-Level Governance," Conference Paper, American Political Science Association, 2003 Annual Meeting, Philadelphia.

- Daguerre, A. "Policy Networks in England and France: the Case of Child Care Policy 1980-1989" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:2, (2000): 244-260.
- Downs, G., Roche, D., and Barsoom, P. "Managing the Evolution of Multilateralism" in *International Organization*, 52:2, (1998): 397-419.
- Elgstrom, O., and Jonsson, C. "Negotiation in the European Union: Bargaining or Problem-Solving?" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:5, (2000): 684-704.
- Elgstrom, O., and Smith, M. "Introduction: Negotiation and Policy-Making in the European Union – Processes, System and Order" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:5, (2000): 673-683.
- Elmore, R. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions" in *Political Science Quarterly*, 94:4, (1979): 601-616.
- Esson, G., Reekie, B., and Jackson, T. "'Objective-Led' SEA in a Scottish Local Authority" in *European Environment*, 14, (2004): 153-164.
- Falkner, G., et. al. "Non-Compliance with EU Directives in the Member States: Opposition through the Backdoor?" *West European Politics*, v.3, n.4, (2004): 452-473.
- Flinders, M. "Distributed Public Governance in the European Union" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11:3, (2004): 520-544.
- Garrett, G. and Tsebelis, G. "An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism" in *International Organization*, 50:2, (1996): 269-299.
- Goggin, M. "The 'Too Few Cases/Too Many Variables' Problem in Implementation Research" in *The Western Political Quarterly*, 39:2, (1986): 328-347.
- Gualini, E. "Challenges to Multi-Level Governance: Contradictions and Conflicts in the Europeanization of Italian Regional Policy" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10:4, (2003): 616-636.
- Hambleton, R., Savitch, H.V., and Stewart, M. *Globalism and Local Democracy: Challenge and Change in Europe and North America*, New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Hoffman, S. "Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe" in *Daedalus*, 85:3, (1966): 862-915.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G (a). *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2001.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G (b). "Types of Multi-Level Governance." In *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 5, no. 11. Accessed 8.12.2006 at <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-011a.htm>.
- Howlett, M. and Ramesh, M. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Jordan, A., Brouwer, R., & Noble, E. "Innovative and Responsive? A Longitudinal Analysis of the Speed of EU Environmental Policy Making, 1967-97." *Journal of European Public Policy*, v.6, n.3, (1999): 376-398.
- Knodt, M. "International Embeddedness of European Multi-Level Governance" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11:4, (2004): 701-719.
- Kriesi, H., Adam, S., and Jochum, M. "Comparative Analysis of Policy Networks in Western Europe" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13:3, (2006): 341-361.
- Ladeur, K. "Towards a Legal Theory of Supranationality – The Viability of the Network Concept." In *European Law Journal*, Vol. 3, no. 1, (March 1997): 33-54.
- Marshall, A. "Europeanization at the Urban Level: Local Actors, Institutions and the Dynamics of Multi-Level Interaction" in

- Journal of European Public Policy*, 12:4, (2005): 668-686.
- Mbaye, H. "Why Nation States Comply with Supranational Law" in *European Union Politics*, 2:3, (2001): 259-281.
- Montpetit, E. *Misplaced Distrust: Policy Networks and the Environment in France, the United States, and Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2003.
- Montpetit, E. "Policy Networks, Federal Arrangements, and the Development of Environmental Regulations: a Comparison of the Canadian and American Agricultural Sectors" in *Governance: an International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 15:1, (2002): 1-20.
- Moravcsik, A. "Preference and Power in the European Community" in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31:4, (1993): 473-524.
- O'Toole, L. "Networking Requirements, Institutional Capacity, and Implementation Gaps in Transitional Regimes: the Case of Acidification Policy in Hungary" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4:1, (1997): 1-17.
- Oye, K. "Explaining Cooperation Under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies." In *World Politics*, v.38, n.1, (1985): 1-24.
- Pollack, M. "Representing Diffuse Interests in EC Policy-Making" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4:4, (1997): 572-590.
- Putnam, R. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" in Evans, P., Jacobson, H., and Putnam, R. eds., *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Richardson, J., Gustafsson, G., and Jordan, G. "The Concept of Policy Style." In *Policy Styles in Western Europe*, Richardson, J. ed. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1982.
- Rosamond, B. *Theories of European Integration*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Sartori, G. "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." In *The American Political Science Review*, v.64 n.4, (December 1970): 1033-1053.
- Scharpf, F. "The Joint-Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration" in *Public Administration*, 66, (1988): 239-278.
- Sellers, J. "The Nation-State and Urban Governance: Toward Multilevel Analysis" in *Urban Affairs Review*, 37:5, (2002): 611-642.
- Skogstad, G. "Legitimacy and/or Policy Effectiveness? Network Governance and GMO Regulation in the European Union" in *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10:3, (2003): 321-338.
- Taylor, P. "The European Community and the State: Assumptions, Theories and Propositions" in *Review of International Studies*, 17, (1991): 109-125.
- Thomson, R., Boerefijn, J., and Stokman, F. "Actor Alignments in European Union Decision Making" in *European Journal of Political Research*, 43, (2004): 237-261.
- Torenvlied, R. and Akkerman, A. "Theory of 'Soft' Policy Implementation in Multilevel Systems with an Application to Social Partnership in the Netherlands." In *Acta Politica*, Vol. 39, (2004): 31-58.
- Tranholm-Mikkelsen, J. "Neo-Functionalism: Obstinate or Obsolete? A Reappraisal in the Light of the New Dynamism of the EC" in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 20:1, (1991): 1-22.
- Wasserman, S., and Faust, K. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Weaver, R., & Rockman, B. *Do Institutions Matter?* Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1993.

Wellman, B., & Berkowitz, S.D. *Social Structures: A Network Approach*.
Greenwich: JAI Press, 1997.

Young, R. (Publication Forthcoming).
*Multilevel Governance and Public Policy
in Canadian Municipalities*.