

Title: Integrative Governance in Northern Ireland

Authors: Dubnick M. J., Queen's University Belfast/Rutgers University-Newark, Meehan, E. M., Queen's University Belfast.

Abstract: We view integrative governance as a varied response to un-centering and de-centering trends and offer a framework that highlights three 'paths' to integration: proactive, reactive and emergent. This frame is applied to Northern Ireland and we draw some preliminary conclusions about both the potential usefulness of the model and the insights it generates about Northern Ireland governance. The principal insight is that reactive integration tends to suppress the emergence of third sector alternatives while proactive integration has the opposite effect.

Keywords: integrative governance; Northern Ireland; emergence, civil society; third sector

Introduction

Integrative governance is hardly a new problem, and in fact might be regarded as a core issue in the history of modern political and administrative thought. Broadly defined,¹ governance involves any sustained efforts to provide solutions to collective problems for a given community on whatever level.

Governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest. (Commission on Global Governance, 1995, p. 2)

The qualifier "integrative" indicates a form of (or approach to) governance that incorporates an underlying, pervasive or overarching rationale; that is, a governance process designed and implemented to achieve its purposes through mechanisms and means that assure some degree of coordination or cooperation. This is the "problematic" factor that gives *integrative* governance its definition and distinctiveness as an analytic concern. As important is the concern that efforts at attaining integrative governance be both credible (i.e., effective and, more recently, efficient) and legitimate (i.e., authoritative and trusted).

Understanding the role that this integrative factor plays in governance is central to the present paper. We are particularly interested in three distinctive 'paths' to integration evident in recent efforts to deal with the centrifugal forces unleashed over the past several decades -- forces that have literally transformed the paradigms and practices of governance. In Part I of this paper we provide a brief overview of the un-centering and de-centering trends that have characterized that transformation and then consider (in Part II) the different forms of integration that characterize our 'three paths' model. We then turn our attention to examples of how these forms of integrative governance are manifest in the case of Northern Ireland. Finally, we conclude this work with comments about the implications of this perspective on the study of governance in general and Northern Ireland in particular.

I. Centrifugal Trends in Contemporary Governance

The present interest in integrative governance is a response to issues raised by the diffusion and dispersion of authority brought about by centrifugal forces unleashed over the last three decades. The tenuous dynamic balance between credible performance and legitimacy that defines modern governance seems threatened by a number of trends and events rooted in the reaction to big government launched during the 1970s. The de-regulation reforms of the 1970s were based on an emerging anti-government, pro-market consensus that found favor on both sides of the political spectrum (Tolchin and Tolchin, 1983, Stanbury and Thompson, 1982, Gerston et al., 1988, Ball, 1984). This was accompanied by the growing popularity of bureaucracy bashing and anti-welfare state images in the media and policy discussions (Kass and Catron, 1990, Terry, 1997, Hill, 1991) – all reinforced by and culminating in electoral upheavals that would transform the very concept of governing (Peters and Savoie, 1995, Pierson, 1994, Savoie, 1994).

¹ On the various "uses" of the term and a classic effort at definition, see Rhodes, 1996.

The resulting governance landscape is filled with such a diversity of organizational forms and relationships that concepts and words used to describe government in the past are no longer up to the task. In very general terms, it is a landscape dominated by centrifugal forces that have simultaneously *un-centered* and *de-centered* public sector functions and operations. “Agencification”² and “autonomization”³ are terms that have been recently applied to the overall trends, but even these have proven less than satisfactory for most analysts.

The “un-centering” has taken the form of dispersing authority and responsibility for governmental functions among autonomous units, creating what Elazar terms a “non-centralized” system of governance.⁴ This form of “autonomization” involves something quite different from merely creating and empowering individual agents or organizational units to conduct the work of a central authority (see below). Rather, it involves the legal authorization (i.e., legitimation) of an independent entity to operate “freely” (i.e. to exercise its own political and economic will within the bounds of ‘political space’⁵) within an arena of social action. At the level of national constitutions, this form of autonomization is inherent to confederations and the traditional arrangements of federations (see Davis, 1978, Elazar, 1976). Within political economies, it is the idea behind royal and corporate charters (Campbell, 1990, Maier, 1993, Micklethwait and Wooldridge, 2003) that created what Blackstone termed “little republic[s]” (Blackstone, 1897). And within contemporary government structures, they have gained prominence as quangos, “government corporations” and “public authorities” of various sorts (Leazes, 1987, Mitchell, 1992, Wettenhall, 2001). Under the rubric of New Public Management (NPM) reforms, this approach has taken a range of forms from “privatisation” (Henig, 1989, Hodge, 1999, Savas, 1987) to “corporatisation” (Christensen and Lægreid, 2003, Harding and Preker, 2000, Jakab et al., 2002, Jørgensen, 1999).

De-centering trends have been more prominent in recent years, but they are hardly new. They reflect a desire to maintain some form of control and consistency while operating within a highly differentiated and increasingly dispersed task environment that made de-centering a necessity in contexts where the scale and reach of organizations became technologically feasible. Some would argue that this growing organizational capacity is the major reason for development of the modern state (Scott, 1998) as well as various forms of the modern corporation and managerialism (Chandler, 1977). Despite surface resemblances to un-centered forms, the essential feature of de-centering is the retention of ultimate authority in the center.

As with un-centering, de-centering is reflected in the form and operations of governance at various levels. Unitary constitutions are often implemented through regional or departmental arrangements (Paddison, 1983) and government agencies are more often than not designed along decentralized lines both structurally and operationally (Fesler, 1965, Fesler, 1959, Hutchcroft, 2001, Kaufman, 1969, Kaufman, 1967). And despite the rhetoric that implies an emphasis on un-centered (i.e., high autonomization) arrangements, NPM reforms are most often examples of de-centering, typically pursued as “devolution”⁶ in a number of jurisdictions (Bradbury and McGarvey, 2003, Bradbury and Mitchell, 2001, Cole et al., 1999, Conlan, 1998, Micheletti, 2000) and promoted on a global scale as a necessary foundation for modernization and development (McCarthy, 2004).

Despite the differences and variations in form, both un-centering and de-centering have generated a counter trend toward integrative governance that requires greater comprehension as to its own forms and directions. There have been many “paths” to integrative governance (Hooghe and Marks, 2003), and here we shall focus on three: proactive, reactive and emergent.

II. Proactive, Reactive and Emergent Integrative Governance

Proactive integrative governance involves those efforts taken to promote a particular image or agenda of “good governance” associated with administrative reform movements. Historically, these movements are driven by “doctrines”⁷ that are sometimes clearly explicated (e.g., Taylor’s ‘scientific management’; Kanigel, 1997, Taylor, 1967) and in other instances tied to some vaguely stated (and often contradictory) shared notions or themes (e.g., the New Public Management; see Hood, 1995, Hood, 1991). In most instances, the changes

² See Beblavý, 2002, Fyfe and Fitzpatrick, 2002, Gill, 2002, Pendlebury and Karbhari, 1997, Pollitt et al., 2001

³ See especially Christensen and Lægreid, 2003, Christensen and Lægreid, 2004, ter Bogt, 2003, ter Bogt, 1999.

⁴ Elazar posited the ‘non-centralization’ concept in presentations designed to stress the distinctiveness of federalism as a system of governance; see Elazar, 1976, Elazar, 1973, Elazar, 1971.

⁵ On the idea of ‘political space’, see Ferguson and Mansbach, 2002, Jones, 2002.

⁶ On the long and instructive history of the UK experience with “devolution,” see Bogdanor, 2001, Bogdanor, 1999.

⁷ On administrative doctrines, see Hood and Jackson, 1994, Hood and Jackson, 1991.

required by these reforms – whether they involve establishing greater power at the center of government or dispersing power away from the center – call for an integrated approach from the center. The mechanisms for change can range from new constitutions (literally “reconstituting” governance) and creating or eliminating new institutions and agencies (“reorganizing”) to establishing and enforcing new operating standards and rules of behavior (“regulating”) and providing effective training and incentives. From the reformers’ perspective, changes that are attempted without the support of proactive integrative governance are very likely to prove less successful (Lynn, 1996, Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000).

A second basis for integrative governance is the reactions to those same efforts for change. *Reactive* integrative governance is likely to reflect the responses of those whose power and authority is perceived to be negatively impacted by the movements toward governance change (Blais and Dion, 1991, Christensen, 2000, Niskanen, 1971). It can also be attributed to an enlightened form of guardianship, where those at the center seek to “save” their nations from what they regard as “barbarians at the gate” who might threaten the public good in the name of some thoughtless radical or foreign ideology. Thus, Lynch characterizes some South Asian regimes (e.g., China, Singapore, Burma, Malaysia) as “resister states” which, in the face of international pressure to democratize, react by adopting forms of integrative governance that attempt to apply some degree of control or restraint over the autonomous forces being released through economic globalization (Lynch, 2004). In American public administration, ambiguities related to the role of bureaucracy in governance has led to the development of two guardianship perspectives, with one school of thought advocating a civil service committed to defending the Constitution and its values (Wamsley et al., 1990) and the other seeking a public service devoted to promoting social equity⁸ (Frederickson, 1980, Marini, 1971). These reactive forms of integrative governance can take several forms, from recalcitrance in cooperating in the authorization or implementation of the change to explicit efforts to institute formal or informal counter measures to offset the reform.

*Emergent*⁹ forms of integrative governance differ from the other two in their lack of explicit association with some design or strategy driven toward (or against) some intent to bring about a change in governance. The idea that governance patterns are “naturally emergent” has strong roots in classical social contract theories where the characteristics of human nature in a state of nature (today posited as “drives”) generated certain forms of governance (Dienstag, 1996, Lawrence and Nohria, 2002) and it complements recent work in socio-biology (Anderson and McMillan, 2003). In the present context, however, it reflects specifically the observation that governance patterns oftentimes develop unintentionally from the interactions of social actors overtime in problematic situations. In lieu of the explicit intentions or doctrines that shape and direct proactive and reactive efforts, emergent integrative governance will build upon extant relationships, norms and rules, and “governmentalities”. From relationships, emergent forms of integrative governance are manifest in the networks that link and cut across jurisdictional boundaries and overcome structural obstacles and legal barriers (Ansell, 2000, Considine and Lewis, 2003, Peters and Pierre, 1998, Rhodes, 1996). Similarly, rules and norms become institutionalized over time and emerge as regimes where attitudes, expectations and standards of cooperation guide and direct individual and collective behavior (Crawford and Ostrom, 1995, Pettit, 2002). Finally, the assumed knowledge or truth about governing within a society – its “regime of power” (what Foucault termed “governmentality”) -- will do much to shape the emergence of integrative governance (Cawley and Chaloupka, 1997, Foucault et al., 1991).

Governance: Design Processes Control	Integrative approach:		
	Proactive	Reactive	Emergent
	Plan Implementation Evaluation	Agreement Enforcement Monitoring	Network Interaction Mutual Adjustment

Figure 1: Governance Under Integrative Forms

A central issue in our effort to understand how each of these integrative forms impact on governance is where in the governance endeavor would we find their imprints. Figure 1 provides a preliminary conjecture on

⁸ Associated initially with the New Public Administration movement on the 1960s, this perspective has become part of the formal agenda of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA); see the work of NAPA’s Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance at http://www.napawash.org/aa_social_equity/index.html.

⁹ On the concept of “emergence” and potential issues related to its use, see Goldstein, 2000.

that point by noting three points in governance that seem “vulnerable” to integration: the *design* of governance arrangements; the nature of the governance *processes*; and the forms of *control* applied to promote or assure the coordination and cooperation that governance seeks.¹⁰

Under proactive integration, governance is designed to reflect a plan of action or vision of governance arrangements. Typically this reflects an implicit or explicit model program or strategy. In its most extreme manifestations it involves the imposition of some idealized “one best way” of governing (Scott, 1998), as represented in the history of US public administration by Taylor’s ‘scientific management’ or the ‘principles of administration’ perspective of the 1930s (Gulick and Urwick, 1937). Even without an explicit design we see the influence of established proactive forms in the almost automatic reliance on hierarchical designs when a new agency or office is developed (Kahn and Kram, 1994, Meyer, 1995). Such governance “plans” are subject to an implementation agenda that dominates governance processes (Peterson, 1984) as well as control mechanisms that evaluate how well the governance process is living up to the design standards (Roberts, 2000).

Reactive integration, in contrast, would tend to manifest itself in agreements and compromises that reflect negotiated approaches to governance – not some model or vision of good governance, but a more pragmatic approach that provides solutions that deal with the various interests involved (Maser, 1998). Here the design of governance is established in agreements in the form of contracts, expectations or legally binding standards, and the process of governance tends to focus on enforcement through contract and regulatory regimes that rely on inspection, oversight and audits for its control mechanisms (Vincent-Jones, 2000, Considine, 2000, Tuohy, 2003, Sweet, 1999, Shapira, 2000).

Emergent integration has preoccupied students of governance in recent years who have found that coordination and cooperation surfaces with the development of networks (Ansell, 2000, Börzel, 1998, Rhodes, 1996). Within these network polities, the processes of governance are defined by the interactions that take place over time (Considine and Lewis, 2003), and the control mechanisms reflect a constant effort at mutual adaptation through transactions and exchanges as each participant adjusts to the relationships formed in the network settings (Jones et al., 1997).

To test the value of this perspective on integrative governance, we turned to the case of Northern Ireland.

III. Integrative Governance in Northern Ireland

On close examination, Northern Ireland is the ideal setting for such a study.¹¹ Beyond the well known divisions manifest in its recent history of Troubles, it is a region subject to a wide range of pressures that constantly challenge its governance systems (Furniss, 1975, Carmichael and Osborne, 2003). The responses to those challenges have been varied and seemingly without rhyme or reason beyond a case-by-case analysis. In an effort to make sense of the Northern Ireland case – as well as to enhance our understanding of integrative governance in general – we offer this attempt to view the situation in Northern Ireland through the lens of proactive, reactive and emergent integrative governance.

Before introducing examples of modern integrative responses in Northern Ireland, it is necessary to say a little about the past as it is a result of the past that many of the extant relationships that underlie emergent integrative government now exist.

The very existence of Northern Ireland as a legal entity within the UK was the product of an early effort at un/de-centering that preoccupied several sessions of Parliament during the late 19th and early 20th century (Bogdanor, 2001), and for at least 40 years thereafter it was ruler of its own domain within a setting of relative autonomy.¹² While London retained a significant interest and role in the collection of tax revenues, it was deferential and somewhat indifferent to Stormont when it came to specific programmes and expenditure decisions. Provided with considerable discretion on matters of local social and economic policy during the 1930s, Northern Ireland’s Unionist leaders tended to follow British policy initiatives over time, but without any explicit tie-in to UK governance and with the assumption that they had considerable leeway. When that arrangement seemed threatened by the post-war victory of the Labour Party, there was brief consideration among Unionists of seeking Dominion status as a means for assuring their autonomy, but eventually deals were made that brought Northern Ireland into the UK welfare state through the use of parallel legislation and step-by-

¹⁰ For a classic and too often overlooked contribution to governance studies that focuses on these features, see Dahl and Lindblom, 1953.

¹¹ Northern Ireland is notable, at least among sociologists, as one of the worlds most researched societies; see Brewer, 2001.

¹² For an overview of the pre-Troubles era, see Hennessey, 1997, chapter 2.

step local implementation that retained at least some degree of Ulster autonomy. Put in terms of our model, the system of proactive integrative governance represented by the extension of the UK welfare state to Northern Ireland was ameliorated by implementation schemes that allowed Unionist leaders to insert reactive governance features into the process. Lurking in the background during this period, however, was the perceived threat to that autonomy posed by that possibility of an Anglo-Irish agreement. That threat came to an abrupt end when Ireland declared itself a republic and cut its ties to the Commonwealth in 1948. As a consequence, Unionist-dominated Ulster's standing was legislatively enhanced in the Ireland Act of 1949 which noted that any future changes in the status of the six counties would require approval of the Northern Ireland Parliament.

The reactive approach to the integrative governance problem during the pre-Troubles period was not only used to maintain Unionist autonomy in the face of proactive pressures from London, but was applied as well to restrict the emergence of alternative forms from the minority Nationalist community. Relying on "special powers" granted in the 1920s (Donohue, 1998), the strategic use of tokenism in appointing judges and other officials, and its control of access to power through the manipulation of electoral districts and the franchise, the Unionist leadership was able to keep the Nationalist community from formal positions of power, and differences and divisions within the Nationalist community itself undermined whatever nascent alternatives emerged from time to time. That situation changed in the 1960s with the succession of Terence O'Neill to prime ministers office in Northern Ireland and his efforts to adopt an agenda ("O'Neillism") that reflected a more proactive solution to Ulster governance (Hennessey, 1997, pp. 121-126). This shift to a proactive form of integrative governance included an explicit outreach to the moderate Nationalist community, and one result was the successful formation of community-based pressure groups that would eventually form the basis for a Civil Rights movement. At the same time it also sparked a reaction in the Loyalist community and generated support for a countermovement led by Ian Paisley (Hennessey, 1997, pp. 126-139).

It could be said that the 1960s Civil Rights movement was an attempt to bring about what would feel for them an effective and legitimate means for contending with collective problems (to those in power, this was regarded as already in existence through the devolved form of government which had existed since 1922). For reasons which are contested (Hennessey, 1997, pp. 138-170), the movement was followed by or subverted into violent conflict which escalated to the point in 1972 at which UK Prime Minister Edward Heath saw no alternative but the seeming reactive response of proroguing the Northern Ireland parliament and imposing Direct Rule.¹³ It could, however, also be said - from the point of view of those who regarded themselves as marginalized by the unionist hegemony - that Heath was responding proactively to a situation of disintegrated governance by changing the constitution and reorganizing the instruments of government. It was not intended that the new arrangements would be permanent. Indeed, two years later there was the first attempt to find a power-sharing arrangement in re-devolved institutions (the Sunningdale Agreement). This Assembly was short-lived and further, similar attempts were made in the 1980s. It was not until 1998 that a more durable (despite its current suspension) set of arrangements was agreed to by the parties and accepted by the people in a referendum. The Good Friday or Belfast Agreement was, in the words of Séamus Mallon, former Deputy Leader of the SDLP and former Deputy First Minister, "Sunningdale for slow learners."

Thus, for 26 years, Northern Ireland was governed under Direct Rule from London. It is difficult to characterize how Direct Rule operated as a form of integrative governance. Northern Ireland's separate party system meant (and means) that no person elected in Northern Ireland to Westminster can be in government since no Ulster MP is a member of the two parties, Conservative and Labour, that are in a position to form a government. Its Secretary of State and Departmental Ministers were (and are, during the current suspension) people elected by voters in other parts of the UK. Legislation was, by and large,¹⁴ made by extending legislation for Great Britain to Northern Ireland through Orders in Council, a method that means there can be no amendments tabled or discussed in the House of Commons. There was also an ongoing (and always frustrated) effort to come up with some agreed upon form of government that would reflect the various political forces unleashed during the Troubles (Hennessey, 1997, chapter 5). In that sense, on the political level, Direct Rule

¹³ Heath was also somewhat exasperated by the inability or unwillingness of Northern Ireland's leadership to implement certain reforms that had been called for by the Civil Rights movement and acknowledged by the Northern Ireland Prime Minister O'Neill, and which were regarded as legitimate claims - for example, the removal of the property qualification for voting in local elections.

¹⁴ Some of the "progressive" legislation of the 1960s and 1970s - homosexual law reform, abortion law reform and new race relations legislation - was not extended to Northern Ireland. Homosexual law reform came about as a result of a petition by a Northern Ireland citizen to the European Court of Human Rights. Race Relations legislation eventually came to Northern Ireland in the 1990s. Nothing has changed in respect of abortion.

was a continuous search for a reactive integrative governance arrangement – a search that did not end until 1998.

Administratively, this odd situation meant that Northern Ireland's civil servants were in an unusual situation of having to follow a reactive "path" when implementing policy. During the period of Direct Rule (and during the current suspension of institutions), they were, per force, obliged to "provide the stability and continuity in the administration of key services that produced some semblance of normality." (Carmichael and Osborne, 2003, Knox, 1999). That their Ministers were present for only a day or two a week politicized the place of the bureaucracy in the sense of giving the latter greater leeway for decision-making, and the relative inaccessibility of the former to the public laid greater responsibility on civil servants to perform the legitimating role. As a result, there grew up a stronger pattern of consultation between civil servants and citizens than was customary elsewhere.¹⁵ This tendency was reinforced by the UK's membership of the European Community/Union, accession to which had coincided with the imposition of Direct Rule.

Part of the UK's bargaining tactics in the period leading up to accession and during the subsequent renegotiation of the terms of membership included the introduction of regional development policy. At first, this involved the rather modest European Regional Development Fund to complement the European Social Fund. During the 1980s, however, regional cohesion was accorded a significant priority. Structural funding was introduced for regions in member states which had less than 75 *per cent* of the average GDP. Although Northern Ireland's GDP was some 76 *per cent* of the average, its special problems were regarded sympathetically and it was deemed eligible for structural funding. Other Community Measures were also introduced, with more universal eligibility; for example, to contribute to improvements in employability and urban and rural renewal. A special measure was introduced to support development in regions contiguous with regions in other member states (INTERREG) (see Laffan and Payne, 2001), for the impact on the border regions on the island of Ireland). Later, in the 1990s, the special problems of Northern Ireland, in the context of the achievement of the cease-fires in 1994, were given further recognition through the introduction of the Special Programme for Peace and Reconciliation.

During this period, the UK was governed by the Conservative Party and subject to Mrs. Thatcher's determination to un-center the state and to eliminate corporatism as a means of making decisions. However, the philosophy of European funding was and is that the "social partners" (which came to include the "civic partners") should be involved in decision-making at every level from the design of projects, through their implementation, enforcement, monitoring and evaluation (Meehan, 1993). This requirement was based on a sense of what was legitimate (the "European social model") and what would be effective (the people on the ground knowing best what would work). The British government was taken to task, locally (Wilson et al, 1993) and beyond, during the first round of structural funding for handling it in Thatcherite fashion. In the second round, the government complied with the EU approach with the curious result that Northern Ireland was allowed to implement an approach to community and regional development that was being excised from the politics of Great Britain (Hodgett and Meehan, 2003, Hodgett, 1996). The policy roles conferred on and assumed by the voluntary and community sectors in unlikely circumstances became "normal" with the advent of a Labour Government which, under the leadership of Tony Blair, had abandoned the old Clause 4 of its constitution and substituted for it compacts with the "peak" voluntary associations in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and a commitment to "inclusive" decision-making (Morison, 2001). This, then, was the background to the post-1998 forays into the three "paths" of integrative governance. It is perhaps fitting to begin with the Agreement, itself, before exploring its outworkings that exemplify the "paths".

In one sense the Agreement could be described as proactive in the sense that it introduced a new constitution - different from that which had been prorogued in 1972 and different from what had followed since. It also reorganized bureaucratic structures and introduced new rules to regulate political behaviour. But, in another, it is reactive: in that it seeks to reinstate representative governance, albeit not in the mould of Westminster (given the presence of two sets of allegiances in Northern Ireland) but still consistent with the canon of the vertical chain of command model to be found in liberal democracies (Morison, 2001; cf Thompson, 1999, Wilford, 2001, Farren and Mulvihill, 2000, Campbell et al., 2003). Moreover, in serving as a legitimizer for unionist positions and Nationalist aspirations (Horowitz, 2002), it preempts, for the time being, the possibility of any completely different outcome such as a systematic form of "Third Way" governance, a reunited Ireland, joint sovereignty over Northern Ireland by both Ireland and the UK, or some combination of the first with either of the other two (Evans and Tonge, 2003).

¹⁵ Some in Northern Ireland would deny that they enjoyed greater access to this level of decision-maker but, compared to London, they did.

A novel institution authorized by the Agreement is the Civic Forum, which combines proactive and emergent features. As noted, circumstances had given unusual prominence to Northern Ireland's civil society. A number of the new parties to the formal talks leading to the Agreement were rooted in community politics (paramilitary and "normal"). One of these was the Northern Ireland Women's Coalition (NIWC) which, in the pattern identified by Freeman (Freeman, 1975), was based on a "pre-existing communications network" (in this case, both local [community groups] and global [as a result of the UN Beijing Women's Conference]) and was "galvanized" into existence by the "catalytic event" of the prospect of talks. In order to ensure that post-1998 politics would not be reactive by removing civic networks from the policy process (and, hence, removing "new thinking" from the new institutions) the NIWC proposed the introduction of the Civic Forum (Fearon, 1999). The NIWC was also of the view that such a body could pick up thematic issues that cut across departmental responsibilities and make recommendations about them. Other community-based parties supported them and the conventional parties eventually ended their resistance to the idea. Ambivalence by the main parties in government towards this example of proactive integrative governance and, hence, the way they went about setting it up dogged the early days of the Civic Forum (Guelke, 2003). Nevertheless, it has the potential to promote citizen participation as solution to governance issues (McCall and Williamson, 2001, Bell, 2004).

Proactive and emergent "paths" to integrative governance can also be seen in the use of substantive policy objectives as integrative mechanisms. This can be found in the "equity" push in pre-Agreement period by the Equality Coalition which, together with some of the political parties sought to ensure that the Agreement, and subsequent Northern Ireland Act of 1998 which enacted it, included a legal basis for the pursuit of stringent equality and human rights standards (Finnegan, 1998; Donaghy, 2003). Section 75 of the Act requires all public bodies to examine the potential impact of all their policies on nine categories of person (persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation; men and women generally; persons with or without a disability; and persons with or without dependants). In addition to the role played by the voluntary and community sectors in bringing about these provisions, they are heavily involved in their implementation as the Equality Commission is obliged to consult extra-governmental groups about the draft Section 75 documents produced by the public bodies. According to Donaghy, mainstreaming models may be participatory or bureaucratic and that the version adopted in Northern Ireland is unusually participatory by international standards (Donaghy, 2003; cf Osborne, 2003).

The adoption of a combination of proactive and emergent "paths" can be seen in the perceived need to develop images of a shared future as a vehicle for integrative governance (Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister., 2004), but evidence of people's behaviour (e.g., to live in segregated areas) and differential attitudes, according to community origin, over winners and losers from the Agreement indicates that this may not emerge given (Leach and Williams, 1999, NILTS., 1998.). A proactive "path" with some signs of the emergent "path" is appearing in the shift of the police paradigm from the "colonial to Anglo-Saxon model" (McGloin, 2003), along the lines recommended in the Patten Report. At the moment, control of policing matters remains with the UK; Sinn Féin has not yet agreed to join the board of the Police Service of Northern Ireland (formerly the Royal Ulster Constabulary) on the ground that retention of central control means that the Patten Report has not yet been fully implemented and Unionists are still concerned by the policy of 50:50 Catholic and Protestant recruitment. But it has succeeded in beginning to persuade people of the reality of its ethos that it is a police service for the whole community (overseen by local policing boards/partnerships) instead of a police force for part of it and, at some stage, policing is likely to be redevolved.

Virtually all policies with an EU dimension reveal (eventually) the adoption of proactive and emergent paths to integrative governance. The INTERREG programme is now in its third manifestation. In its first version, it was reactive, the two governments resisting the EU requirement that management of cross-border projects be in cross-border hands and promoting, instead, what was called "back-to-back" developments. That is, projects were initiated in the two capitals and implemented through national agencies. Lessons were learned in the second phase and it seems as though third stage projects are being carried out through cross-border partnerships in something that does begin to look like "multi-level governance" (Laffan and Payne, 2001). With respect to measures internal to Northern Ireland, the "LEADER II" rural development programmes began as proactive integrative initiatives, but were successful only after they generated or linked up to emergent governance drawn from the community - which effectively changed nature of programme. (Scott, 2002). The URBAN initiative in Londonderry/Derry worked as integrative governance only in sense that it led to the activation of linkages between local government and local communities and generated emergence (similar to what happened in LEADER). (Murtagh, 2001).

Similar conclusions are drawn from an examination of the impact of financial incentive programs for economic development provided by external donors (e.g., the International Fund for Ireland and EU Special Programme for Peace and Reconciliation). The examples of proactive initiatives - designed specifically to stir reconciliation -- may have failed to have the desired impact of bridging community differences, but they

nevertheless seemed to encourage and strengthen the community networks that are central to emergent solutions (Byrne and Irvin, 2001). These initiatives need further research, as do those programs designed (whether intentionally or not) to avoid potential difficulties by maintaining financial mechanisms that sustain segregated funding. The prime example here was the creation of the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) in 1971 as an integrative governance solution to the issue of discriminatory housing policies that had sparked the Civil Rights movement in the late 1960s. While intended to deal with the problem of housing provision fairness in social housing programmes, the approach taken has one that stressed monitoring and assuring equity and fairness in the distribution of (and access to) housing resources rather than a more proactive agenda of fostering integrated communities (Murtagh, 1998, Paris et al., 2003). In fact, it was not until 1999 that NIHE explicitly addressed its *potential* role in bridging the sectarian divide (Murtagh, 2001). Programmatically, Northern Ireland's housing policies, although notable for their contribution to ameliorating past inequities and discrimination, were de facto reactive in the integrative sense.

More research is needed regarding other programmes have fallen into similar patterns of reactive integrative governance. There is a growing awareness and concern in Northern Ireland that the cost of managing a divided society (providing two sets of things) is an inefficient use of public money, does little to promote good relations on a non-segregated basis, and is increasing disenchantment in the rest of the UK, particularly England, where there is *lower per capita* public expenditure.

There are other policy areas that look like promising areas for applying the integrative governance lenses. For example, Section 75 may be leading to proactive "paths" to land use planning efforts (Ellis, 2001). Proactive "paths" are also being taken in the overall planning system. Functions have been move to the center and an attempt has been made to make it more strategic (Crawford, 2003), but pressures for more local responsibility (reactive?) are present (see also Neill and Gordon, 2001). We can also see proactive responses in efforts to promote volunteering in Northern Ireland health trusts (Brudney and Williamson, 2000). Education policy is an area where there are both proactive and reactive forms in evidence: potential "paths" in plans to use (integrated) education as vehicle for change and which are generating reactions and obstacles (Dunn and Morgan, 1999), as is the inclusion of civic education and citizenship in the *curriculum* (Kerr et al., 2002).

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations:

This brief survey of Northern Ireland's experience with integrative governance is preliminary and sketchy at best, and yet we can posit a few observations about what we have learned about both integrative governance in general and the role of integrative governance in Ireland in particular.

Lessons about integrative governance: First and foremost, the case of Northern Ireland reinforces the idea that integrative governance is a constant and complex process that can take many forms and operate at several levels simultaneously. While there might be a salient (e.g., the Belfast Agreement) or overarching (e.g., O'Neillism) attempt at generating integrative governance within a jurisdiction at any point in time, there are likely to be similar (and sometimes competing) efforts going on at the sub-jurisdictional and programmatic levels as well. Integrative governance is not a specific plan or agenda – it is a pervasive fact of modern political and administrative life that needs more attention.

Second, our case study confirms that integrative governance does take several analytically meaningful and distinct forms. Here we applied one particular set of distinctions based on the idea that integrative efforts differ as to whether they reflect proactive (visionary), reactive (reactionary) or emergent roots. This distinction proved fruitful, but needs "sharpening" in further applications. But there are perhaps others lenses to apply and explore. One specific conclusion, however, is that studies of integrative governance require at least a middle range theoretical construct if they are to prove analytically viable.

Third, the Northern Ireland case has thus far generated two major of propositions about the different forms of integrative governance: first, that *reactive forms of integrative governance generally have a negative influence on the development of emergent alternatives*, and second, that *proactive forms of integrative governance tend to have a positive impact on the development or emergent alternatives* – although not necessarily intentionally. These observations are interesting not merely for our general understanding of integrative governance, but for what they indicate about the future of Northern Ireland governance as well (see below).

In addition to testing these very general observations, a great deal more needs to be done in our examination of integrative governance in Northern Ireland. The authors need to do further work on institutions. For example, despite the overarching reactive nature of governance under Direct Rule, Northern Ireland government was subject to many of the same proactive "modernisation" initiatives that were implemented in the UK since early 1980s. (Greer, 2001, Eldowney, 2003, Carmichael and Osborne, 2003, Sullivan and Stewart, 2002, Hyndman and Eden, 2001, Knox, 2002, Knox, 2002, Carmichael, 2002). Secondly, there is the whole

question of whether political parties can adopt the emergent “path” as potential integrative governance mechanisms. Each of the party systems in Northern Ireland (unionist/Protestant and nationalist/Catholic) reflects the dynamics of intra-sectarian attitudes that drive one away and one toward constitutional compromise (Evans and Duffy, 1997). It remains to be seen if all the other “paths” can reduce the reactive impulse to control their “own” people and key ministries to demonstrate that “their” side has either won or, at least, not lost too much.

Lesson for Northern Ireland: In the Northern Ireland context there exist a mixtures of integrative governance efforts. At the center have been two major examples of reactive integrative governance (with proactive traces); Direct Rule and the Agreement. Both are examples of attempts to establish order through a reliance on traditional government rationalities, and to that extent they tend to place limits on the types of proactive initiatives that can be attempted.

On the face of it, they perhaps work against emergent integrative governance. That is, the setting does not necessarily provide the “space” necessary for third sector – or third political force – to take on significance. However, paradoxically, in compensation for the defects of Direct Rule (as well as because of EU requirements), that space was provided before the Agreement. So embedded was it that there were tensions between civic associations and local political parties at the point when re-devolved government was on the cards. The voluntary and community sectors were afraid that their expertise and participation would be devalued and some politicians were not slow to tell them that they were unaccountable and that their day would be over once representative institutions were restored at the regional level. Hence, the great interest in some quarters in trying to combine systems or representative and participatory democracy in the coexistence of a conventionally elected Assembly and a Civic Forum filled through elections amongst blocs of the “social” and “civic” partners.

This exploration of “paths” to integrative governance in Northern Ireland suggests that proactive initiatives tend to be narrowly programmatic and reflect the logic and perspective of the external initiator (e.g., EU or UK-wide initiatives) rather than being adapted at the outset to the distinct Northern Ireland environment. As a result, implementation of these initiatives is difficult. However, although the programmes themselves have little substantive success (e.g., LEADER II and URBAN), they do tend to mobilize otherwise uninvolved communities and actually are the main source of emergent integrative governance initiatives. Emergent integrative governance initiatives are present in Northern Ireland, particularly in the voluntary (Third) sector. That sector seems to be creating its own “space” in the governance of Northern Ireland, but the cases indicate that:

- proactive integrative governance initiatives can be used as an effective means for stimulating emergent integrative governance; but that
- the focus of current attention on new forms of reactive integrative governance places constraints on their development.

References:

- ANDERSON, C. & MCMILLAN, E. (2003) Of Ants and Men: Self-Organized Teams in Human and Insect Organizations. *EMERGENCE*, 5, 29-42.
- ANSELL, C. (2000) The Networked Polity: Regional Development in Western Europe. *GOVERNANCE: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLICY & ADMINISTRATION*, 13, 303-333.
- BALL, H. (1984) *CONTROLLING REGULATORY SPRAWL: PRESIDENTIAL STRATEGIES FROM NIXON TO REAGAN*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.
- BEBLAVÝ, M. (2002) Understanding the waves of agencification and the governance problems they have raised in Central and Eastern European Countries. *OECD JOURNAL ON BUDGETING*, 2, 145-170.
- BELL, V. (2004) Spectres of Peace: Civic Participation in Northern Ireland. *SOCIAL & LEGAL STUDIES*, 13, 403-428.
- BLACKSTONE, W. (1897) *COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND*, St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Co.
- BLAIS, A. & DION, S. (Eds.) (1991) *THE BUDGET-MAXIMIZING BUREAUCRAT: APPRAISALS AND EVIDENCE*, Pittsburgh, PA, University of Pittsburgh Press.
- BOGDANOR, V. (1999) Devolution: Decentralisation or Disintegration? *POLITICAL QUARTERLY*, 70, 185-194.
- BOGDANOR, V. (2001) *DEVOLUTION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM*, Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.
- BÖRZEL, T. A. (1998) Organizing Babylon - On the Different Conceptions of Policy Networks. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 76, 253-273.

- BRADBURY, J. & MCGARVEY, N. (2003) Devolution: Problems, Politics and Prospects. *PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS*, 56, 219-236.
- BRADBURY, J. & MITCHELL, J. (2001) Devolution: New politics for old? *PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS*, 54, 257.
- BREWER, J. D. (2001) The Paradox of Northern Ireland. *SOCIOLOGY*, 35, 779-783.
- BRUDNEY, J. L. & WILLIAMSON, A. (2000) Making Government Volunteering Policies More Effective: Research Evidence From Northern Ireland. *PUBLIC MANAGEMENT [REVIEW]*, 2, 85-103.
- BYRNE, S. & IRVIN, C. (2001) Economic aid and policy making: building the peace dividend in Northern Ireland. *POLICY & POLITICS*, 29, 412-429.
- CAMPBELL, B. A. (1990) Social Federalism: The Constitutional Position of Nonprofit Corporations in Nineteenth-Century America. *LAW AND HISTORY REVIEW*, 8, 149-188.
- CAMPBELL, C., NÍ AOLÁIN, F. & HARVEY, C. (2003) The Frontiers of Legal Analysis: Reframing the Transition in Northern Ireland. *MODERN LAW REVIEW*, 66, 317-345.
- CARMICHAEL, P. (2002) Briefing paper: Multi-level Governance. Belfast, Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland.
- CARMICHAEL, P. & OSBORNE, R. (2003) The Northern Ireland Civil Service under Direct Rule and Devolution. *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES*, 69, 205-217.
- CAWLEY, R. M. & CHALOUPKA, W. (1997) American governmentality: Michel Foucault and Public Administration. *AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST*, 41, 28-42.
- CHANDLER, A. D., JR. (1977) *THE VISIBLE HAND: THE MANAGERIAL REVOLUTION IN AMERICAN BUSINESS*, Cambridge MA, Belknap Press/Harvard University Press.
- CHRISTENSEN, J. G. (2000) The Dynamics of Decentralization and Recentralization. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 78, 389-408.
- CHRISTENSEN, T. & LÆGREID, P. (2003) Accountability and power -- the effects of 'autonomization' of governmental bodies. *19th IPSA World Congress, Research group 27/SOG Panel on "Politicians and Public Sector Reform: How to Balance Political Control and Management Consequences"*. Durban, South Africa.
- CHRISTENSEN, T. & LÆGREID, P. (2003) Coping with Complex Leadership Roles: The Problematic Redefinition of Government-owned Enterprises. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 81, 803-831.
- CHRISTENSEN, T. & LÆGREID, P. (2004) Governmental autonomization and control. *Centro Estudios Internacionales*. Mexico City.
- COLE, R. L., HISSONG, R. V. & ARVIDSON, E. (1999) Devolution: Where's the revolution? *PUBLIUS*, 29, 99-112.
- COMMISSION ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (1995) *OUR GLOBAL NEIGHBORHOOD: THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE*, Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.
- CONLAN, T. J. (1998) *FROM NEW FEDERALISM TO DEVOLUTION: TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL REFORM*, Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution Press.
- CONSIDINE, M. (2000) Contract regimes and reflexive governance: Comparing employment service reforms in the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, New Zealand and Australia. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 78, 613-638.
- CONSIDINE, M. & LEWIS, J. M. (2003) Bureaucracy, Network, or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW*, 63, 131-140.
- CONSIDINE, M. & LEWIS, J. M. (2003) Networks and interactivity: making sense of front-line governance in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Australia. *JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN PUBLIC POLICY*, 10, 46-58.
- CRAWFORD, J. (2003) Planning and Democracy in Northern Ireland. *PLANNING THEORY & PRACTICE*, 4, 357-362.
- CRAWFORD, S. E. S. & OSTROM, E. (1995) A Grammar of Institutions. *AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW*, 89, 582-600.
- DAHL, R. A. & LINDBLOM, C. E. (1953) *POLITICS, ECONOMICS, AND WELFARE: PLANNING AND POLITICO-ECONOMIC SYSTEMS RESOLVED INTO BASIC SOCIAL PROCESSES*, New York, Harper Torchbooks.
- DAVIS, S. R. (1978) *THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE: A JOURNEY THROUGH TIME IN QUEST OF MEANING*, Berkeley CA, University of California Press.
- DIENSTAG, J. F. (1996) Between History and Nature: Social Contract Theory in Locke and the Founders. *JOURNAL OF POLITICS*, 58, 985-1009.
- DONAGHY, T. B. (2003) Mainstreaming: Northern Ireland's Participative-Democratic Approach. *Queen's University Centre for the Advancement of Women in Politics, Occasional Papers, No. 2*. Belfast, Northern Ireland.

- DONOHUE, L. K. (1998) Regulating Northern Ireland: The Special Powers Acts, 1922-1972. *HISTORICAL JOURNAL*, 41, 1089-1120.
- DUNN, S. & MORGAN, V. (1999) 'A fraught path'--Education as a basis for developing improved community relations in Northern Ireland. *OXFORD REVIEW OF EDUCATION*, 25, 141-153.
- ELAZAR, D. J. (1971) Community Self-Government and the Crisis of American Politics. *ETHICS*, 81, 91-106.
- ELAZAR, D. J. (1973) Cursed by Bigness: Toward a Post-Technocratic Federalism. *PUBLIUS*, 3, 239-298.
- ELAZAR, D. J. (1976) Federalism vs. Decentralization: The Drift From Authenticity. *PUBLIUS*, 6, 9-19.
- ELDOWNNEY, J. (2003) Public management reform and administrative law in local public service in the UK. *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES*, 69, 69-82.
- ELLIS, G. (2001) Social exclusion, equality and the Good Friday Peace Agreement: the implications for land use planning. *POLICY & POLITICS*, 29, 393-411.
- EVANS, G. & DUFFY, M. (1997) Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The Social Bases and Political Consequences of Nationalist and Unionist Party Competition in Northern Ireland. *BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE*, 27, 47-81.
- EVANS, J. A. J. & TONGE, J. (2003) The Future of the 'Radical Centre' in Northern Ireland after the Good Friday Agreement. *POLITICAL STUDIES*, 51, 26-50.
- FARREN, S. & MULVIHILL, R. F. (2000) *PATHS TO A SETTLEMENT IN NORTHERN IRELAND*, Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, Colin Smythe.
- FEARON, K. (1999) *WOMEN'S WORK: THE STORY OF THE NORTHERN IRELAND WOMEN'S COALITION*, Belfast, Northern Ireland, Blackstaff Press.
- FERGUSON, Y. H. & MANSBACH, R. W. (2002) Remapping Political Space: Issues and Nonissues in Analyzing Global Politics in the Twenty-First Century. IN FERGUSON, Y. H. & JONES, R. J. B. (Eds.) *POLITICAL SPACE: FRONTIERS OF CHANGE AND GOVERNANCE IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- FESLER, J. W. (1959) Field Organization. IN MARX, F. M. (Ed.) *ELEMENTS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
- FESLER, J. W. (1965) Approaches to the Understanding of Decentralization. *JOURNAL OF POLITICS*, 27, 536-566.
- FINNEGAN, M. (1998) Equity as a policy objective: the case of Northern Ireland. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS*, 25, 1367-1379.
- FOUCAULT, M., BURCHELL, G., GORDON, C. & MILLER, P. (Eds.) (1991) *THE FOUCAULT EFFECT: STUDIES IN GOVERNMENTALITY: WITH TWO LECTURES BY AND AN INTERVIEW WITH MICHEL FOUCAULT*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- FREDERICKSON, H. G. (1980) *NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, University, Ala., University of Alabama Press.
- FREEMAN, J. (1975) *THE POLITICS OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION: A CASE STUDY OF AN EMERGING SOCIAL MOVEMENT AND ITS RELATION TO THE POLICY PROCESS*, New York, David McKay.
- FURNISS, N. (1975) Northern Ireland as a Case Study of Decentralization in Unitary States. *WORLD POLITICS*, 27, 387-404.
- FYFE, T. & FITZPATRICK, T. (2002) Distributed public governance Agencies, authorities and other autonomous bodies in Canada. *OECD JOURNAL ON BUDGETING*, 2, 93-120.
- GERSTON, L. N., FRALEIGH, C. & SCHWAB, R. (1988) *THE DEREGULATED SOCIETY*, Pacific Grove CA, Brooks/Cole.
- GILL, D. (2002) Signposting the zoo: From agencification to a more principled choice of government organisational forms. *OECD JOURNAL ON BUDGETING*, 2, 34-92.
- GOLDSTEIN, J. (2000) Emergence: A Construct Amid a Thicket of Conceptual Snares. *EMERGENCE*, 2, 5-22.
- GREER, J. (2001) *PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND: IMPROVING PERFORMANCE*, Aldershot, Hampshire, England, Ashgate.
- GUELKE, A. (2003) Civil Society and the Northern Irish Peace Process. *VOLUNTAS*, 14, 61-78.
- GULICK, L. H. & URWICK, L. F. (Eds.) (1937) *PAPERS ON THE SCIENCE OF ADMINISTRATION*, New York, Institute of Public Administration.
- HARDING, A. & PREKER, A. S. (2000) Understanding Organizational Reform: The Corporatization Of Public Hospitals. *Health, Nutrition and Population (HNP) Discussion Paper*. Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- HENIG, J. R. (1989) Privatization in the United States: Theory and Practice. *POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY*, 104, 649-670.
- HENNESSEY, T. (1997) *A HISTORY OF NORTHERN IRELAND, 1920-1996*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan.
- HILL, L. B. (1991) Who Governs the American Administrative State? A Bureaucratic-Centered Image of Governance. *JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND THEORY*, 1, 261-294.

- HODGE, G. A. (1999) *PRIVATIZATION: AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press.
- HODGETT, S. (1996) *The European Union and Community Development in Northern Ireland*. Belfast, Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action.
- HODGETT, S. & MEEHAN, E. (2003) Multilevel Governance in the European Union: The Case of Northern Ireland. IN MAGONE, J. M. (Ed.) *REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND GOVERNANCE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION*. Westport, Conn., Praeger.
- HOOD, C. (1991) A Public Management for All Seasons? *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 69, 3-19.
- HOOD, C. (1995) The "new public management" in the 1980s: variations on a theme. *ACCOUNTING, ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETY*, 20, 93-109.
- HOOD, C. & JACKSON, M. (1991) *ADMINISTRATIVE ARGUMENT*, London, Dartmouth Publishers (UK).
- HOOD, C. & JACKSON, M. (1994) Keys for Locks in Administrative Argument. *ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIETY*, 25, 467-488.
- HOOGHE, L. & MARKS, G. (2003) Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance. *AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW*, 97, 233-243.
- HOROWITZ, D. L. (2002) Explaining the Northern Ireland Agreement: The Sources of an Unlikely Constitutional Consensus. *BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE*, 32, 193-220.
- HUTCHCROFT, P. D. (2001) Centralization and Decentralization in Administration and Politics: Assessing Territorial Dimensions of Authority and Power. *Governance*, 14, 23-53.
- HYNDMAN, N. & EDEN, R. (2001) Rational Management, Performance Targets and Executive Agencies: Views from Agency Chief Executives in Northern Ireland. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 79, 579-598.
- JAKAB, M., PREKER, A. S., HARDING, A. & HAWKINS, L. (2002) The Introduction of Market Forces in the Public Hospital Sector: From New Public Sector Management to Organizational Reform. *Health, Nutrition and Population (HNP) Discussion Paper*. Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- JONES, C., HESTERLY, W. S. & BORGATTI, S. P. (1997) A General Theory of Network Governance: Exchange Conditions and Social Mechanisms. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 22, 911-945.
- JONES, R. J. B. (2002) Governance and the Challenges of Changing Political Space. IN FERGUSON, Y. H. & JONES, R. J. B. (Eds.) *POLITICAL SPACE: FRONTIERS OF CHANGE AND GOVERNANCE IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- JØRGENSEN, T. B. (1999) The Public Sector In An In-Between Time: Searching For New Public Values. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, 77, 565-585.
- KAHN, W. A. & KRAM, K. E. (1994) Authority at work: Internal models and their organizational. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 19, 17-50.
- KANIGEL, R. (1997) *THE ONE BEST WAY: FREDERICK WINSLOW TAYLOR AND THE ENIGMA OF EFFICIENCY*, New York, Viking.
- KASS, H. D. & CATRON, B. L. (Eds.) (1990) *IMAGES AND IDENTITIES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- KAUFMAN, H. (1967) *THE FOREST RANGER: A STUDY IN ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR*, Baltimore MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- KAUFMAN, H. (1969) Administrative Decentralization and Political Power. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW*, 29, 3-15.
- KERR, D., MCCARTHY, S. & SMITH, A. (2002) Citizenship Education in England, Ireland and Northern Ireland. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION: RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND POLICIES*, 37, 179-191.
- KNOX, C. (1999) Northern Ireland: At the Crossroads of Political and Administrative Reform. *GOVERNANCE: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLICY & ADMINISTRATION*, 12, 311-328.
- KNOX, C. (2002) Briefing Paper: Partnerships. Belfast, Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland.
- KNOX, C. (2002) Briefing Paper: Public Sector Reform. Belfast, Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland.
- LAFFAN, B. & PAYNE, D. (2001) *Creating Living Institutions: EU Cross-Border Cooperation after the Good Friday Agreement*. Armagh, Northern Ireland, Centre for Cross Border Studies.
- LAWRENCE, P. R. & NOHRIA, N. (2002) *DRIVEN: HOW HUMAN NATURE SHAPES OUR CHOICES*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- LEACH, C. W. & WILLIAMS, W. R. (1999) Group Identity and Conflicting Expectations of the Future in Northern Ireland. *POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 20, 875-896.
- LEAZES, F. J. (1987) *ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE BUSINESS STATE: THE STRUCTURE OF FEDERAL CORPORATIONS*, New York, Praeger.
- LYNCH, D. C. (2004) International "Decentering" and Democratization: The Case of Thailand. *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES QUARTERLY*, 48, 339-362.

- LYNN, L. E., JR. (1996) Assume a Network: Reforming Mental Health Services in Illinois. *JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND THEORY*, 6, 297-314.
- MAIER, P. (1993) The Revolutionary Origins of the American Corporation. *WILLIAM AND MARY QUARTERLY*, 50, 51-84.
- MARINI, F. (Ed.) (1971) *TOWARD A NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE MINNOWBROOK PERSPECTIVE*, Scranton PA, Chandler Publishing.
- MASER, S. M. (1998) Constitutions As Relational Contracts: Explaining Procedural Safeguards in Municipal Charters. *JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND THEORY*, 8, 527-564.
- MCCALL, C. & WILLIAMSON, A. (2001) Governance and Democracy in Northern Ireland: The Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector after the Agreement. *GOVERNANCE: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLICY & ADMINISTRATION*, 14, 363-383.
- MCCARTHY, J. F. (2004) Changing to Gray: Decentralization and the Emergence of Volatile Socio-Legal Configurations in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *WORLD DEVELOPMENT*, 32, 1199-1223.
- MCGLOIN, J. M. (2003) Shifting paradigms: Policing in Northern Ireland. *POLICING: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLICE STRATEGIES AND MANAGEMENT*, 26, 118-143.
- MEEHAN, E. (1993) Citizenship and the European Community. *POLITICAL QUARTERLY*, 64, 172-186.
- MEYER, H.-D. (1995) Organizational Environments and Organizational Discourse: Bureaucracy between Two Worlds. *ORGANIZATIONAL SCIENCE*, 6, 32-43.
- MICHELETTI, M. (2000) End of Big Government: Is It Happening in the Nordic Countries? *GOVERNANCE: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLICY & ADMINISTRATION*, 13, 265-278.
- MICKLETHWAIT, J. & WOOLDRIDGE, A. (2003) *THE COMPANY: A SHORT HISTORY OF A REVOLUTIONARY IDEA OF*, New York, Modern Library.
- MITCHELL, J. (Ed.) (1992) *PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND PUBLIC POLICY: THE BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT*, New York, Praeger.
- MORISON, J. (2001) Democracy, Governance and Governmentality: Civic Public Space and Constitutional Renewal in Northern Ireland. *OXFORD JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES*, 21, 287.
- MURTAGH, B. (1998) Planning for Anywhere: Housing Policy in Northern Ireland. *HOUSING STUDIES*, 13, 833-839.
- MURTAGH, B. (2001) Integrated Social Housing in Northern Ireland. *HOUSING STUDIES*, 16, 771-789.
- MURTAGH, B. (2001) The URBAN Community Initiative in Northern Ireland. *POLICY & POLITICS*, 29, 431-446.
- NEILL, W. J. V. & GORDON, M. (2001) Shaping our Future? The Regional Strategic Framework for Northern Ireland. *PLANNING THEORY & PRACTICE*, 2, 31-52.
- NILTS. (1998.) Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey. Belfast, Northern Ireland UK, ARK: Northern Ireland Social and Political Archive; <http://www.ark.ac.uk/nilt/>.
- NISKANEN, W. A. (1971) *BUREAUCRACY AND REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT*, Chicago, IL, Aldine Atherton.
- OFFICE OF THE FIRST MINISTER AND DEPUTY FIRST MINISTER. (2004) A Shared Future. *A Shared Future*. Belfast, Northern Ireland UK, Community Relations Unit, Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister; <http://www.asharedfutureni.gov.uk/>.
- OSBORNE, R. D. (2003) Progressing the Equality Agenda in Northern Ireland. *JOURNAL OF SOCIAL POLICY*, 32, 339-360.
- PADDISON, R. (1983) *THE FRAGMENTED STATE: THE POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY OF POWER*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- PARIS, C., GRAY, P. & MUIR, J. (2003) Devolving Housing Policy and Practice in Northern Ireland 1998-2002. *HOUSING STUDIES*, 18, 159-175.
- PENDLEBURY, M. & KARBHARI, Y. (1997) Management and Accounting Developments in Executive Agencies. *FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY & MANAGEMENT*, 13, 117-138.
- PETERS, B. G. & PIERRE, J. (1998) Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration. *JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH AND THEORY*, 8, 223-243.
- PETERS, B. G. & SAVOIE, D. J. (Eds.) (1995) *GOVERNANCE IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT*, Montreal, Canada, Canadian Centre for Management Development (McGill-Queen's University Press).
- PETERSON, K. D. (1984) Mechanisms of Administrative Control Over Managers in Educational Organizations. *ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY*, 29, 573-597.
- PETTIT, P. (2002) *RULES, REASONS, AND NORMS: SELECTED ESSAYS*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- PIERSON, P. (1994) *DISMANTLING THE WELFARE STATE? REAGAN, THATCHER, AND THE POLITICS OF RETRENCHMENT*, Cambridge (UK), Cambridge University Press.
- POLLITT, C., BATHGATE, K., CAULFIELD, J., SMULLEN, A. & TALBOT, C. (2001) Agency Fever? Analysis of an International Policy Fashion. *JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE POLICY ANALYSIS*, 3, 271-290.

- POLLITT, C. & BOUCKAERT, G. (2000) *PUBLIC MANAGEMENT REFORM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS*, Oxford [UK], Oxford University Press.
- RHODES, R. A. W. (1996) The new governance: Governing without government. *POLITICAL STUDIES*, 44, 652-667.
- ROBERTS, N. (2000) The synoptic model of strategic planning and the GPRA: Lacking a good fit with the political context. *PUBLIC PRODUCTIVITY & MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 23, 297-311.
- SAVAS, E. S. (1987) *PRIVATIZATION: THE KEY TO BETTER GOVERNMENT*, Chatham NJ, Chatham House.
- SAVOIE, D. J. (1994) *THATCHER, REAGAN, MULRONEY: IN SEARCH OF A NEW BUREAUCRACY*, Pittsburgh, PA, University of Pittsburgh Press.
- SCOTT, J. C. (1998) *SEEING LIKE A STATE: HOW CERTAIN SCHEMES TO IMPROVE THE HUMAN CONDITION HAVE FAILED*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- SCOTT, M. (2002) Delivering Integrated Rural Development: Insights from Northern Ireland. *EUROPEAN PLANNING STUDIES*, 10, 1013-1025.
- SHAPIRA, Z. (2000) Governance in Organizations: A Cognitive Perspective. *JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE*, 4, 53-67.
- STANBURY, W. T. & THOMPSON, F. (1982) *REGULATORY REFORM IN CANADA*, Montreal, The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- SULLIVAN, H. & STEWART, M. (2002) Briefing paper - 'Joining-up' Governance - The Co-ordination and Integration of Arrangements in Northern Ireland. Belfast, Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland.
- SWEET, A. S. (1999) Judicialization And The Construction Of Governance. *COMPARATIVE POLITICAL STUDIES*, 32, 147-184.
- TAYLOR, F. W. (1967) *THE PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT*, New York, W. W. Norton.
- TER BOGT, H. J. (1999) Financial and Economic Management in Autonomized Dutch Public Organizations. *FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY & MANAGEMENT*, 15, 329-351.
- TER BOGT, H. J. (2003) A Transaction Cost Approach to the Autonomization of Government Organizations: A Political Transaction Cost Framework Confronted with Six Cases of Autonomization in the Netherlands. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS*, 16, 149-186.
- TERRY, L. D. (1997) Public administration and the theater metaphor: The public administrator as villain, hero, and innocent victim. *PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW*, 57, 53-61.
- THOMPSON, B. (1999) Transcending Territory: Towards an Agreed Northern Ireland? *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON MINORITY AND GROUP RIGHTS*, 6, 235-266.
- TOLCHIN, S. J. & TOLCHIN, M. (1983) *DISMANTLING AMERICA: THE RUSH TO DEREGULATE*, Boston, MA, Houghton Mifflin.
- TUOHY, C. H. (2003) Agency, Contract, and Governance: Shifting Shapes of Accountability in the Health Care Arena. *JOURNAL OF HEALTH POLITICS, POLICY AND LAW*, 28, 195-215.
- VINCENT-JONES, P. (2000) Contractual Governance: Institutional and Organizational Analysis. *OXFORD JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES*, 20, 317-351.
- WAMSLEY, G. L., BACHER, R. N., GOODSSELL, C. T., KRONENBERG, P. S., ROHR, J. A., STIVERS, C. M., WHITE, O. F. & WOLF, J. F. (1990) *REFOUNDING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*, Newbury Park CA, Sage Publications.
- WETTENHALL, R. (2001) Public or Private? Public Corporations, Companies and the Decline of the Middle Ground. *PUBLIC ORGANIZATION REVIEW*, 1, 17-40.
- WILFORD, R. (Ed.) (2001) *ASPECTS OF THE BELFAST AGREEMENT*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- WILSON, R., CARLIN, T., MORRISSEY, M. & TAILLON, R. (1993) The participation of trade unions and other social partners in the Community Support Framework for Northern Ireland. *Irish Congress of Trade Unions*. Belfast, Northern Ireland.