

Multi-level Governance

27.11.09

”Theories of European Integration”

Michael Kull, Dr.Soc.Sc.

Multi-level Governance

■ Structure:

- Historical & Theoretical Contexts – From "proto-integration" to MLG
- Important Contributors to the Conceptualisation of MLG
- Governance Definitions
- MLG in the EU
- Problems & Shortcomings
- Final Remarks

Multi-level Governance

- **Historical and Theoretical Contexts – From “proto-integration” to MLG**
- Post WW II: Federalism, Functionalism and Transactionalism > How to re-organise the nation-state system in Europe
- The 1950 & 1960s: Monnet & Haas > Spill-over & neo-functionalism vs. state-centric explanations. Focus on the outcome & on why integration takes place
- The 1960s > Rise of intergovernmental explanations
- The 1980s & 1990s – Shifting to analyses of governance > What kind of political system is the EU?

Multi-level Governance

- **Intergovernmentalism (State-Centric) and Functionalism / Neofunctionalism (focus on issue-areas)**

- **Intergovernmentalism:**
 - EU member states as key actors
 - State executives control overall direction of policy-making in the EU
 - States have the "competence-competence"

- **Functionalism / Neofunctionalism:**
 - Integration process driven by civil servants at supranational level in strong supranational institutions (COM, EP)
 - Integration starts in less controversial policy fields (agreements easily reached) and "spills-over" into other fields
 - Incremental, technocratic, step-by-step integration

Multi-level Governance

■ Important Contributors to the Conceptualisation of MLG:

- Gary Marks
- Liesbet Hooghe
- Beate Kohler-Koch
- Markus Jachtenfuchs
- Fritz W. Scharpf
- Ian Bache
- Andrew Jordan

Multi-level Governance

■ GOVERNANCE DEFINITIONS

■ "Governance" in different languages

■ Most governance definitions/perceptions:

- Share an inclusion of non-public, none-state and non-governmental actors in decision-making processes
- Focus on different forms of interaction those actors create with the public sector or government institutions (e.g. formal or informal networks)

Actors search and find new forms of interaction and potentially bypass traditional layers of hierarchy (e.g. deal directly with & within Brussels institutions, bypassing the regional or national level)

Multi-level Governance

- **Hierarchy in systems of governance is not equally perceived:**
 - *Simon Hix*: Governance in the EU is “multi-level, non-hierarchical, deliberative and apolitical (...), via a complex web of public/private networks and quasi-autonomous executive agencies”
 - *Guy Peters and Ion Pierre*: relations between different actors is more by “dialogue and negotiation than command and control”
 - *Tanja Börzel*: hierarchy and market as two “traditional forms of governance” – networks a new form

Multi-level Governance

■ Multi-Level Governance in the EU:

- Gary Marks analyses interaction of multiple actors in EU Structural Policy (1993) > The term MLG is suggested
- During the process of European Integration > Power shifts upwards (EU level) & downwards (sub-national levels)
- In some policy-fields, such as Regional Policy: Public, private & social actors participate in policy initiation, decision-making & implementation
- Decision-making: Competencies shared by actors at different levels rather than monopolized by state executives
- Political arenas rather interconnected than nested
- Clear separation between domestic & international politics, as assumed in state-centric models, is blurred under multi-level governance
- Institutions have been set up incrementally

Multi-level Governance

- MLG I & MLG II:
- Co-existent: Type II embedded in Type I
- Type I: "Classical" MLG with focus on EU, MS, Regional & Local Level (of government)
- Type II: Policy problems/functions
- Advantage: Reflect on structure, function or on both

Multi-level Governance

The EU's multi-level structure (MLG I)

Functional, task specific units (MLG II)

Multi-level Governance

Table 2: Types of Multi-Level Governance

TYPE I	TYPE II
general-purpose jurisdictions	task-specific jurisdictions
non-intersecting memberships	intersecting memberships
jurisdictions organized in a limited number of levels	no limit to the number of jurisdictional levels
system-wide architecture	flexible design

Source: Hooghe, L. / Marks, G. (2003): "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of MLG"

Multi-level Governance

- **Problems in Systems of MLG:**
- Participation
- Co-ordination
- Accountability
- Effectiveness
- Openness
- Coherence

Multi-level Governance

- ***MLG - A critical view***
- MLG as an important alternative to other approaches
- MLG as one of few approaches to pay attention to sub-national and local levels of governance
- MLG helped building bridges to other academic fields - Andrew Jordan: “successfully carries European studies into other sub disciplines of politics and public administration”
- MLG criticised for:
 - Focus on technocratic policy-fields
 - Often rather describing recent developments instead of offering testable explanations
 - Being “network-centred”
 - Overstating autonomy of sub-national actors
 - Being methodological weak (e.g. questions of hierarchy and agency)
 - Power and agency?