

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

Stimulating
intellectual
curiosity
since 1900



In what way do the institutional setting of metropolitan areas influence transport system outcomes?

Dr Louise Reardon, INLOGOV (l.h.reardon@bham.ac.uk)

Three Key Reflections

- Multi level governance – questions of accountability
- Importance of time for positive network outcomes
- Reflexive governance as key enabler of transformation – to what extent do existing networks exhibit reflective capacity?

Type I Multi Level Governance



- Federalist influence
- General-purpose
- Clear demarcation of jurisdiction and competence
- Non-intersecting memberships
- Limited number of levels
- System wide architecture

Type II Multi Level Governance



- Functionalist influence
- Task specific
- Intersecting memberships
- Working across level
- Intermingling roles and responsibilities
- No limit to the number of jurisdictions
- Flexible in design
- Nested within a system

In practice...



Type II alongside Type I

‘Type II governance tends to flourish specifically when there is a need for a tailored government body to address an issue that is not susceptible to policy action by a Type I organisation...The empirical data... show that Type II governance occurs extensively in settings where the high boundary integrity of Type I governmental systems produces a competency constraint, in other words where mainstream governmental organisations are unable to respond flexibly to policy issues that intersect their jurisdictions.’

Skelcher, C. (2005) ‘Jurisdictional Integrity, Polycentrism, and the Design of Democratic Governance’, *Governance*, 18 (1), 89-110.

Political Choice: Different Biases



- Community orientated
 - Rigid in longevity
 - Preferences voice over exit
 - Contestation allowed to flourish – mechanisms for dispute resolution
- Problem orientated
 - More fluid/short lived
 - Preferences exit over voice
 - Insulated decision-making

To what extent are we at risk of democratic 'paradoxes' (Olsson 2003) in metropolitan transport governance?

- Institutional design marginalising the role of local and regional politicians
- 'The Problem of Many Hands' (Wood and Flinders 2014) – Depoliticisation?
- Consensus – technocratic elitism
- Ability to 'buy' democratic influence

Importance of time

- If networked governance is to thrive:
'....generalised trust, honesty, and solidarity must transcend any minor negotiating infringements' (Thompson 2003)
- Appreciative system (Rhodes 1996), a combination of interests, expectations, values that determine 'rules of the game'
- 'logic of appropriateness' based on learning, and developing shared norms

To what extent are existing institutions capable of acting reflexively?

Policymakers have 'frames' ...a 'way of selecting, organizing, interpreting, and making sense of reality to provide guideposts for knowing, analysing, persuading, and acting'

Schön, Donald A. and Martin Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*.

- Frames are therefore exclusionary in nature
- Not all evidence is treated equally
- Networks resistant to change – hierarchy? – but central government actors can be part of networks

Keys to Unlocking Reflexivity

- ‘Change occurs not only in regulations and accountability but also in longer term institutional capacities to produce alternative futures, transportation related or otherwise’ (Davis 2019, 283)
 - Information/knowledge; Skills; Finance
- Dialogue – opportunity/willingness to understand different perspectives
- Experimentation – willingness to take risks
- Networks then enact ‘strategic steering’ (Hopkins and Schwanen 2018)

Summary: Three Key Questions

- Multi level governance – To what extent are we at risk of democratic ‘paradoxes’?
- Importance of time for positive network outcomes – to what extent should be patient or rather focus on fostering networks rather than outcomes?
- Reflexivity for transformation - to what extent do existing institutions and/or networks exhibit reflective capacity?