E·S·R·C
ECONOMIC
& SOCIAL
RESEARCH
COUNCIL

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
POLARIS HOUSE
NORTH STAR AVENUE
SWINDON SN2 1UJ
Tel: 01793 413000
Fax: 01793 413001
GTN 1434

REFERENCE NUMBER
RES-000-23-1295

TITLE
Democratic anchorage of governance networks in three European countries

INVESTIGATORS
Prof. Chris Skelcher; Prof. Helen Sullivan

INSTITUTION
University of Birmingham

REPORT

Background

Our previous ESRC awards on partnership governance (Skelcher et al) and user/citizen engagement (Sullivan et al) examined how institutions to promote collaborative policy making between state, civil society and business had developed at arm's-length to traditional forms of representative government in the UK. These studies raised questions about the roles of politicians and public officials in these institutions, and the extent to which such institutions enacted the fundamental principles of democratic governance.

Contact with continental European researchers on democratic network governance caused us to reflect on whether the neo-liberal, managerialist explanations of our empirical observations from the UK were context sensitive. We were also stimulated to challenge the often highly normative and uncontextualized literature about the causes and nature of changes in governance – an issue also raised by a small group of 'governance critics' including Davies (2007) and Marinetto (2003).

Objectives

The aim of the research was:

> To explain the extent of governance networks and their democratic performance[1] through comparative analysis, and to identify normative principles and approaches that can strengthen their institutional design and resultant democratic practices.

We undertook comparative research into the governance of new migrant integration and neighbourhood regeneration in Birmingham, Copenhagen and Rotterdam.

Objective 1: To identify and explain the democratic anchorage of governance networks. The study developed a stronger critical analysis of the network governance literature. We framed the debate in terms of four conjectures, and showed how national and policy factors mediate wider pressures to develop and implement policy at arm's-length to representative government.

Objective 2: To establish the role of elected politicians in governance networks. Our research added to the conceptual, theoretical and empirical literature on politicians within network governance, challenging conventional views about their marginalisation.

Objective 3: To develop advanced methodologies to investigate democratic anchorage. Our project developed rigorous and systematic methods in order to overcome methodological weaknesses in the field, especially through the use of Q Methodology and exploration of the contribution of three approaches to discourse analysis. We undertook significant capacity building activity with doctoral students and other academic colleagues internationally.

Objective 4: To facilitate knowledge generation and transfer to and between policy-makers and practitioners. We undertook knowledge exchange with policy makers, civil society actors and politicians through discussions, workshops, policy reports and professional journal articles.

Methods

---

[1] Although the research project uses the term 'democratic anchorage', we subsequently adopted the more neutral term 'democratic performance'.

We employed an interpretive research strategy due to the exploratory nature of the study, the overall research aim, and the small number of cases. This involved qualitative and quantitative methods.

Comparative research. We sampled two policy issues (integration of migrants; neighbourhood regeneration) in three cities (Birmingham, Copenhagen and Rotterdam).

The two policy areas were sampled on theoretical grounds. The conventional wisdom in the literature is (a) that network governance is universal in Western nations (in the sense that it is not confined to particular countries) and (b) it is adopted by politicians because it enables them to meta-govern at a distance. Consequently our hypothesis was that we would expect to find evidence of its presence across policy issues, and particularly being deployed where new, complex issues had arisen. The regeneration policy sector was selected because it is a longstanding issue involving a wide range of public policy questions, including the level of community self-governance. Integration of migrants was selected because it has emerged as a new, complex and politically contested issue.

The cities were chosen because:
1. Regeneration and integration of migrants were significant policy issues.
2. There were differences in their governmental and democratic traditions.
3. Strong relationships with and support from Erasmus/ Roskilde Universities.
4. English widely spoken in Netherlands and Denmark.

Q Methodology study of public managers' attitudes to democracy and network governance.
Early in the study we set out a normative agenda for achieving a higher level of methodological rigour and transparency in the democratic analysis of governance networks (Mathur and Skelcher 2007). We argued that Q Methodology was a potentially valuable technique to complement existing interpretive research methods, enabling us to identify the patterns of subjective perspective held by actors involved in governance networks.

We made considerable investment in developing a robust and effective application of Q methodology. This involved identifying statements reflecting the scope of the debate on 'democracy and network governance'. We used systematic sampling to reduce our initial pool of 250 statements down to 36. We used web-enabled Q Methodology software, and after piloting selected FlashQ. This simulates the 'Solitaire' method where respondents sort each statement into a quasi-normal distribution in terms of their level of agreement/disagreement. We sampled 120 public managers in the three cities, and achieved a response rate of 50% in both Birmingham and Rotterdam, but to date have had a poor response from Copenhagen. We are currently repeating the survey with a wider sample to increase the response N, although Q is validated for use with relatively small numbers.

We benefited from the advice of Prof. Stephen R. Brown (Kent State University, USA - the originator of Q in political science), Prof. John Dryzek (Australian National University, who has used Q in cross-national studies), and two of the leading UK exponents of the method – Prof. Wendy Stainton-Rogers (Open University) and Dr. Simon Watts (Nottingham Trent).

Mapping. We used the Governance Assessment Tool, developed in our previous ESRC study, to classify the formal features of the organisations at the heart of each governance network. This enabled us to establish the explicit institutional design in terms of rules covering transparency, internal governance, ethical conduct and external accountability.

Case studies. We conducted interviews with 66 government, third sector, community and business actors across the 2 policy sectors and three cities. Interviews followed a topic guide and were digitally recorded, professionally transcribed, and then analysed using NVivo. Interviews were easy to arrange

and conduct, other than in relation to actors from organisations representing migrants where we were unable to obtain as many interviews as we wished, despite the assistance of experts in this area. This low response rate is to be expected given the social and political status and experience of these individuals.

We obtained significant assistance from academic colleagues in the collaborating universities in identifying relevant actors and organisations, translation of key terms, and induction into each city/policy sector's governance. These contacts also assisted in piloting the Q Sort (see above) with academic and policy colleagues.

Results

Our overall conclusion is that the connections between the institutions of network governance and those of representative democracy vary much more than the literature suggests. The democratic milieu of each nation and the political salience of the policy issue are important in determining the extent to which institutional arrangements tend towards network governance and away from representative government through public bureaucracies, and also the extent of involvement by politicians. In addition, it cannot be assumed that network governance forms a major part of the response to new complex policy issues, as the theory suggests. The deployment of network governance solutions is more contingent.

Our seven conclusions are:

Conclusion 1: The theoretical relationships between representative democracy and network governance can be clarified through their representation as four conjectures

Our literature review found that the relationship between network governance and representative democracy has lacked theoretical precision. The debate has been framed largely in terms of the consequences for accountability and transparency of relocating governmental decisions to arenas at arm's length to elected politicians. The theoretical debate is polarised. One view, often associated with a normative perspective on deliberative democracy, sees networks as arenas that offer new ways of connecting public policy-making to citizens, overcoming the limitations of representative democracy. The contrasting view is that networks give private interests a structural advantage in the public policy process.

We identified four conjectures (nominated output 1):
1. **The incompatibility conjecture** argues that representative democracy and governance networks conflict because each is predicated on a different set of institutional norms. Representative democracy is premised on the primacy of electoral politics and a conception of the general (i.e. public) interest, represented through rules for transparency and accountability. This is threatened by governance networks whose norms are to do with flexible institutional designs that enable involvement of a variety of actors through self-selection, nomination, appointment and – only occasionally – election. The institutional designs are associated with lower levels of transparency and accountability.
2. **The complementarity conjecture** proposes that governance networks oil the wheels of representative democracy as it struggles to govern in a complex environment. Governance networks engage a wider range of actors in the policy process, connecting them in new ways with elected politicians and public managers and thus increasing the sensitivity of public decisions and programme implementation.
3. **The transitional conjecture** posits a wider evolution of governance forms from state-centric government to a network form consisting of decentred, distributed nodes of

authority. Globalization, digital society, value plurality, and diminishing social capital in Western societies are causing representative democracy to lose its importance as a governing system. The emergent network society is generating new forms of governance that more effectively enable collective choices to be made across overlapping jurisdictions.

4. **The instrumental conjecture** rests on the view that governmental actors increase their impact through the instrumental use of networks. Networks provide an instrument to structure the inputs to and outcomes from the policy process so that their alignment with dominant agendas is increased. This perspective applies a more critical reading to the relationship between governance networks and representative democracy, and can be located either in a notion of local elite strategies or the wider debate about changing forms of societal regulation in a neo-liberal context.

These conjectures provided a theoretical context for the research and stimulated comparative analysis with European collaborators (Klijn and Skelcher 2007; Skelcher et al 2006).

Conclusion 2: Existing research methods for analysing democratic performance privilege representative forms of government

In Sullivan and Skelcher (2007) we conclude that criteria-based assessment of governmental institutions should move beyond a dependence on the corner-stone of representative democracy if they are to engage with emergent democratic institutions and practices. We draw on the work of Dahl, Held, Scharpf and other political theorists in proposing that governance institutions in a democratic context have to resolve three basic problems:

1. How to provide legitimacy for the institutional form of network governance
2. How to enable *ex ante* consent for its policies, programmes and budget, and
3. How to ensure *ex post* accountability for its actions.

These three conditions do not presuppose any particular form of democracy or governance, and thus enable an assessment of the democratic performance of network governance that avoids the assumptions of the other approaches. We have utilised this framework in analysing empirical data from our own cases, and has stimulated comparative analysis with colleagues in European (Skelcher et al 2007) and elsewhere.

In adddition, we conclude that different forms of discourse analysis – critical discourse analysis, policy discourse theory, and post-structural discourse theory – have much to offer the study of the field, and that Q methodology can play an important role in enabling a more transparent and rigourous identification of policy disocurses (Farrelly et al 2008).

Conclusion 3: The form and extent of network governance is mediated by the democratic milieu at national or sub-national level

Our empirical analysis develops the critical position of Davies, Marinetto and others, who argue that talk of the end of government in the face of governance has been overstated. In this age of globalisation and regionalisation, as Hay (2004) and others have argued, we cannot assume a convergence either of the trajectories of change or their outcomes.

In the migration policy sector, Copenhagen City Council governs through an executive politician working through traditional public administration, linked to an advisory Integration Council of elected migrants and nominated social partners and experts. Birmingham has a network governance solution, with an evolving multi-sector partnership board in which a wide range of stakeholders negotiate and take executive responsibility for the policy, with (until recently) no direct involvement of elected

politicians and weak links to political steering mechanisms. Rotterdam has elements of institutional designs expected from network governance but also a clear relationship to elected politicians and city council departments.

In the neighbourhood regeneration policy sector, there is a greater uniformity of approach. Each city uses a multi-sector structure at neighbourhood level, involving residents, third sector agencies, government and business actors. These agencies operate within national and city guidelines, but have considerable discretion in establishing local policy solutions and programme implementation structures.

We use the concept of democratic milieu as the explanatory variable. This refers to the norms of governance and democracy found in a particular nation or region. We use this instead of 'political culture', since conventionally this concept tends to be associated with the predominant form of representative politics (even though Almond and Verba's and Dahl's definitions are somewhat wider). This reflects the problem of developing a conceptual language and methods for undertaking research where representative democracy is not privileged, as discussed above.

Our empirical research enabled us to further identify dimensions of democratic milieu:
1. Structural - the power and authority enjoyed by local government and its relationship with national government, e.g. Danish local government is more secure in its constitutional position than English local government.
1. Constitutional - the capacity for flexibility and pragmatism in the legal and administrative foundations of governmental structures
2. Salience - policy issues such as integration of migrants were more politically salient in some cities than others such as neighbourhood renewal
3. Discursive - the shared narrative about how democracy is enacted, e.g. Denmark and the Netherlands have democratic discourses that are more 'consensual' than that in England.

Thus, Birmingham case is explained by a strong English discourse of 'partnership' and interactive policy making that has been current since the early 1990s, and by a pragmatic approach to constitutional questions. The prevailing governance discourse prescribes network forms as the norm for new policy issues. So, there is a process of *transition* from traditional public administration to network governance, and of seeking a new settlement between the role of elected politicians and that of other actors.

The Netherlands, by contrast, has a longstanding tradition of negotiated political solutions drawing from the discourse of consociationalism. It has traditionally been a pillarised society in which elites negotiate through a consociational bargaining system, although this is now becoming a more explicitly politicised system (Andeweg 2007). Thus, the Social Platform has an *instrumental* role in relation to representative democracy, in particular as a mechanism to support the implementation policy priorities and to maintain political legitimacy.

In Denmark, representative democracy is understood in the context of civic associationalism. It has a long tradition of interaction between government and civil society associations, and of consensus seeking in politics (Jørgensen 2002). Alongside elected politicians, individuals engage indirectly in political activity through their membership of sports clubs, trade unions, and other interest- and identity-based organisations, who are represented in government advisory bodies. This is precisely the model for Copenhagen's Integration Council. Network governance thus *complements* and fosters representative democracy.

Our study reinforces the contingent position taken by Kriesi et al (2006), who argue that a mix of country- and policy-specific variables determines power configurations.

Conclusion 4: Network governance reshapes the roles of elected politicians, but does not necessarily marginalise them

Neoliberal critiques propose a marginalisation of elected politicians due to a diminished role for 'the political' (Leitner et al 2007), leading to a democratic deficit in societal governance. This conclusion was supported by our previous ESRC research in the UK. However our comparative analysis reveals a more complex picture (Farrelly and Sullivan 2008).

We identified a number of different roles that elected politicians play in contributing to the democratic performance of governance networks. As meta-governors elected politicians govern from a distance, setting the framework for undertaking and regulating activity. We found evidence of meta-governance in Birmingham's regeneration and integration networks. Elected politicians were members of strategic partnership bodies, responsible for setting the framework for local activity but at arms length from the delivery of specific programmes. They provided, in the words of one public manager, a 'political steer'.

The executive role has politicians as decision takers closely involved with the delivery of services or the development of new policy initiatives including cross sector initiatives. In Copenhagen's policy for the integration of migrants, elected politicians were involved in all aspects of decision making and the council committee was the key forum for policy making and resource allocation. The mayor reorganised the administrative infrastructure in an effort to increase control over the policy agenda and to coordinate the work of other parts of the city council.

In the context of governance networks the representative role is about ensuring that citizens and other relevant actors are able to participate and, though their involvement, can engage in the co-production of solutions. We found evidence of both these roles in the neighbourhood regeneration scheme in Copenhagen. In one neighbourhood programme the local elected politician saw her role as enabling citizens to contribute to the programme both by helping those who sat on relevant committees have their say, but also taking sounding from those who were not directly involved, for example older people's groups and representing those views in the deliberations.

Finally, the scrutiny role offers elected politicians the opportunity to ensure that governance networks are accountable for their actions to a wider constituency. Our empirical research in the three cities found very limited evidence of interest in or practice of the scrutiny role. This is in keeping with other evidence from England. However de Groot et al's (2007) recent research in the Netherlands suggests that turnover of councillors has resulted in the recruitment of new councillors more sympathetic to the scrutiny role.

Conclusion 6: Public managers have enhanced autonomy in governance networks, but retain an alliance with representative democracy

Neoliberal reforms promote the autonomy of public managers, and the empirical data from the three cities demonstrates that the greater flexibility offered by network forms of governance support this managerialisation. However our Q methodology study reveals that public managers remain positive about democracy in general and the place of representative government in particular (Jeffares and Skelcher 2008; nominated output 2).

The factor analysis of results reveals two principal viewpoints:
1. **Networks develop new forms of democracy and do not pose a threat to local government**: Participants clustering on this factor view networks as new opportunities for inclusion, especially where policy processes lack effective internal debate. They do this by

offering a flexible approach to policy making in contrast to traditional bureaucratic methods, and allow actors to get things done where traditional methods have failed. As a Dutch manager commented: 'It's up to the people to bring their own ideas into networks directly, you don't want the distorted version of the people's ideas as told by a politician'.

2. **Representative democracy should be the main way of making decisions**: Participants clustering on this factor regard networks as exacerbating rather than alleviating problems of representative democracy, for example by including actors 'who have simply put themselves forwards', as one respondent put it. They think that representative democracy brings – in the words of one English manager – 'a direct albeit imperfect line of legitimacy and accountability'. In this context, these participants viewed networks as a complementary platform for inclusion in order to enhance existing structures of representative government.

Public managers in the Netherlands are slightly more disposed to the second factor, in comparison with their colleagues in England. However the differences between nations are not clearly defined. This may indicate attitudinal cleavages within the population of public managers across countries.

Conclusion 7: Public managers should have a stronger appreciation of democratic principles when designing new forms of governance

Our normative implications focus on public managers holding the first of the two viewpoints exposed by the Q analysis. These managers see new opportunities to express democratic practices, but also to realise the managerialist agenda of flexibility and devolved authority. Qualitative evidence from the case studies indicates that these do not easily sit together.

For example, the Birmingham regeneration case shows that managerial preferences trump democratic principles, whereas in Copenhagen there is a greater appreciation of what it means to be democratic. Although these conclusions are limited by the problem of undertaking comparative research on a small number of cases, we think that they offer valuable insights.

We conclude that public managers in these two cities have different levels of understanding of the fundamental democratic principles set out in conclusion 2. The discourse of democracy in Denmark is more unified and has clearer modes of enactment (i.e. managers are clearer what actions and structures constitute 'being democratic') than in England.

We think that in England, comparatively, norms of democracy have been dismantled in the somewhat chaotic process of searching for new forms of managerial autonomy and governance of the past two decades. Thus, managers working outside the traditional public administration model may align with ideas about new democratic possibilities, but have little sense of what this entails at the level of institutional design and individual behaviour. We conclude that there is an urgent need for public managers to be able to understand the principles of democracy and the ways in which it may have practical expression.

<u>Activities</u>

We have initiated capacity building activity:
- Jeffares and Skelcher led a one day Master class on Q Methodology as part of the ESRC National Centre for Research Methods *Networks for Methodological Innovation* initiative, led by University of Essex. This was attended by 15 academics, doctoral students and practitioners, and held at University of Birmingham (10 November 2008).

- Jeffares convened a one-day Q Methodology workshop at the University of Birmingham attended by 20 academics, doctoral students and public managers, with a keynote by Professor Steven R. Brown, Kent State University, the leading exponent of Q in political science (16th July 2007).
- Jeffares and Skelcher led half-day workshops on Q Methodology for academics and doctoral students at Erasmus University, Rotterdam (18 June 2007) and Roskilde University, Denmark (14 November 2007).
- Jeffares and Farrelly convened a panel on 'Comparative Research on Democracy and Urban Governance', at the *58th Political Studies Association Annual Conference*, Swansea University, 1 - 3 April 2008, where we specifically included papers from doctoral students and their supervisors.
- Various Q Methodology programmes have been evaluated, and our preferred programme - FlashQ freeware - has been adapted for use in research on democracy and governance networks, and is freely available for colleagues to utilise and further develop.

We have deliberately used our project to build capacity in the doctoral student community.
- Doctoral students collaborated with team members on one published article, one book chapter in press, and three conference papers.
- Skelcher and the team's European partners - Sørensen, Torfing, and Klijn – won Danish Research Council funding for a 5 day intensive course on 'Researching Network Governance', attended by 20 doctoral students from Europe and Australia. There will be a follow-up in 2009.
- Farrelly and Jeffares, our 2 research fellows, developed links with doctoral students in the Netherlands and Denmark, and joint papers are planned.
- University of Birmingham doctoral students in our wider research group have regularly attended team meetings, and we have provided workshops for doctoral students at Erasmus and Roskilde on our visits there.

We also built new relationships with doctoral students and staff working on similar questions in Belgium, Switzerland, the US and Australia, including collaborating on joint articles and research applications.

We have engaged with a variety of academic audiences:
- Members of the team have given invited seminars at the universities of Melbourne, Erasmus, Roskilde, Open University, Leuven (Belgium), Sydney University of Technology, Auckland, Hong Kong, and Birmingham.
- Sullivan was invited to give keynote addresses to the FP7 CINEFOGO conference, *Citizen participation and policy making* at University of the West of England (2007).
- Skelcher and Klijn convened a Europe/US double panel on 'Public management in a democratic context: tensions and connections' at the *11th International Research Symposium on Public Management*, Potsdam, 2nd – 4th April 2007.
- Skelcher was invited as the only non-US member of a plenary panel on 'A state of agents?' at the *US Public Management Research Association Biennial Conference*, Tucson, Arizona (2007), and subsequently was invited to contribute his paper to a special issue of *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (due 2009).
- Skelcher was an invited member of an interactive panel on 'Collaborative public management', convened by Prof. Myrna Mandell, California State University, at the *11th* and *12th International Research Symposia on Public Management* (2007, 2008).
- Skelcher was invited by the Swiss National Centre of Competency in Research 'Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century' programme to participate in a workshop on 'The shift from input to output legitimacy: empirically substantiated, or fashionable discourse', hosted by Professor Yannis Papadopoulos, University of Zurich (2007).

We made presentations on our research to a number of policy audiences, including:
- The team ran a 24 hour workshop for 25 public managers, politicians and civil society actors from Birmingham, Rotterdam and Copenhagen to explore the policy implications of our research on migration governance (2007).
- Sullivan gave a presentation on the research to a policy audience at the Association of Public Service Excellence conference on 'The enabling authority – orthodoxies and issues' (2008).
- Sullivan is consulting with senior managers from health and social care in Wales on the development of effective partnerships, including using Q Methodology as one of the diagnostic tools.
- Skelcher teaches on network governance and democracy on the Governance module on Birmingham's Public Service MBA and MSc Public Management, which attract some 50-60 part-time UK public and third sector managers annually.
- Skelcher and two doctoral students associated with the project presented to a symposium for 30 NHS and local authority senior managers at the Health Services Management Centre (2007).
- Skelcher and Sullivan gave invited presentations and ran development workshops to some 200 state and city managers and politicians in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, Australia (2008).
- Skelcher gave a presentation to 20 public managers in the Flanders region of Belgium (2008).

Outputs

We presented 21 refereed academic conference papers at international conferences, including: *European Group on Public Administration Annual Conference* (2008), *Political Studies Association Annual Conference* (2008; organised panel), *European Urban Research Association* (2007), *American Society of Public Administration/ European Group on Public Administration Transatlantic Dialogues* (2006, 2007, 2008), *International Research Symposium on Public Management* (2006, 2007 organised panel, 2008), *Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference* (2006, 2007, 2008 organised panel), *US Public Management Research Association* (2007), *FP6 Network of Excellence on New Forms of Governance in Europe* (2007), *Urban Affairs Association* (2006), *European Consortium on Political Research Joint Sessions* (2006), **Conference on Multi-Organizational Partnerships and Networks** (2007).

We have published or had accepted 3 academic journal articles in: *Public Policy and Administration* (co-authored with 2 PhD students), *Public Management Review*, and a Dutch language article in *Bestuurswetenschappen* (*Administration*) (co-authored with Dutch and Belgian collaborators), and have articles under review for *Administrative Theory and Praxis* (co-authored with Danish, Dutch and Swiss collaborators), *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, and *Regulation and Governance* (co-authored with Danish collaborators).

We have published or had accepted 3 chapters in internationally edited books (all invited contributions), and have one book proposal (by Klijn and Skelcher) under review by Oxford University Press and another (by Sullivan, Skelcher, Farrelly and Jeffares) in preparation. Full details, including copies of the conference papers, are available on the ESRC's Society Today web site.

We produced a policy report 'Governance of Migration: Strategies for European Cities' based on the workshop attended by participants from Birmingham, Copenhagen and Rotterdam, and supported by an ESRC Impact Grant. This has been disseminated through our web site and by e-mail to European policy networks (e.g. Eurocities – the network of over 130 large European cities).

Impacts

The collaboration with Roskilde enabled Skelcher and Sørensen to win a Danish Research Council Collaborative Doctoral Scholarship on network governance and local integration networks, with the students (who commenced spring 2007) spending 50% of her time at each institution. The doctoral student's work is designed to build two years further research on migration governance after this ESRC research award ends.

The Governance of Migration report was featured in *Public Manager* (23 October 2008), and Klijn and Skelcher contributed an article on the implications of different ways of understanding the relationship between democracy and network governance in *Public Finance* (15 August 2008). We have other short articles for policy audiences under consideration (e.g. by *Local Government Chronicle*).

We linked our research with that of academics in 10 other European countries, and submitted a highly-rated (14.5/15) FP7 research project. This also involved the Active Citizenship Network - a European civil society organisation representing 80 citizens' organizations from 30 EU and candidate countries - and Deloitte, a major consultancy. Although obtaining the top score, the proposal was not funded. We are currently exploring alternative resources for this major project.

Local Government Association invited Sullivan to advise them on developments in partnership working, and Sullivan and Skelcher have been invited by the National Audit Office to tender for a study to support their work on policy implementation through networks and partnerships.

The democratic performance methodology has been utilised by researchers in the US (Justice at Delaware) and Belgium (de Rynke and Voets at Ghent/Leuven), and applied to their empirical data, leading to collaborative conference papers, articles and book chapters with our research team.

Future Research Priorities

Skelcher developed links with Considine and Lewis at University of Melbourne, building on a relationship started under an ESRC Fellowship and maintained through this study. Melbourne has invited Skelcher, Sullivan, and their European collaborators to a workshop to explore future research agendas on network governance and democracy, chaired by Prof. Rod Rhodes. This will lead to collaborative publications and research applications.

Jeffares and Skelcher are developing a research application on the use of Q Methodology to map evolving subjectivities across networks, linked to Lewis's (Melbourne) development of social network analysis to track the temporal dynamics of collaboration in public services.

ANNEX:

References

Andeweg, R. (2007) "Coalition politics in the Netherlands: From accommodation to politicization" **Acta Politica**, 43 (2-3): 254-277

Davies, J. (2007) "Against 'partnership': Towards a local challenge to global neoliberalism" in J. Gross and R. Hambleton (eds.) **Governing Cities in the Global Era**, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

de Groot, M., B. Denters, and P-J. Klok (2007) "Recent European Reform: Strengthening the Councillor as a Representative and Scrutiniser" Unpublished paper to ESRC seminar, 28 February, London

Farrelly, M., S. Jeffares and C. Skelcher "Rethinking network governance: new forms of analysis and the implications for IGR/MLG" in A. Massey and E. Ongaro (eds) **Governance and Intergovernmental Relations in the European Union and the United States: Theoretical Perspectives**, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Farrelly M. and H. Sullivan (2008) "Neighbourhoods, governance, and citizens: An analysis of discourses in urban renewal projects" paper to **European Urban Research Association Annual Conference**, Glasgow

Hay, C. (2004) "Common trajectories, variable paces, divergent outcomes? Models of European capitalism under conditions of complex economic interdependence" **Review of International Political Economy** 11 (2): 231-262

Justice, J. B., and C. Skelcher, under journal review, "Analyzing democracy in third-party governance: Business improvement districts in the U.S. and U.K."

Klijn, E-H and C. Skelcher (2007) "Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not?" **Public Administration** 85 (3): 587-608

Kreisi, H., S. Addam and M. Jochum (2006) "Comparative analysis of policy networks in Western Europe" **Journal of European Public Policy** 13(3): 341-361

Kristensen, N. N. (2005) "Images revisited - Postmodern perceptions of power and democracy: Political empowerment in the Danish case" **Scandinavian Political Studies** 28 (1): 47-68

Leitner H., J. Peck and E. S. Sheppard (2007) **Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers**, New York: Guilford Press

Marinetto, M. (2003) "Governing beyond the centre: A critique of the Anglo-governance school" **Political Studies** 51 (3): 592-608

Mathur, N. and C. Skelcher (2007) "Evaluating Democratic Performance: Methodologies for assessing the relationship between network governance and citizens" **Public Administration Review** 67 (2): 228-237

Skelcher, C. and H. Sullivan (2007) "Public Partnerships, Citizen Participation and Democratic Governance" Paper for **Conference on Public Partnerships and Collaborative Governance: the Citizenship Challenge**, University of Manchester, May

Skelcher, C., E-H Klijn, D. Kübler, N. Mathur, E. Sorensen and H. Sullivan (2007) "Governance networks, democratic anchorage and the impact of national political culture" **2nd American Society of Public Administration/ European Group on Public Administration Transatlantic Dialogue**, Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, Belgium, June

Skelcher, C., F. de Rynck, E-H. Klijn and J. Voets (2007) **"**Designing democratic institutions for collaborative economic development: Lessons from Belgian and Dutch cases" in M. Considine and S. Giguere (eds) **The Theory and Practice of Local Governance and Economic Development**, Basingstoke: Palgrave