

An Agenda for Comparing Local Governance and  
Institutional Collective Action in Canada and the United States

Eric S. Zeemering  
Northern Illinois University  
School of Public & Global Affairs  
DeKalb, IL 60115

Email: [zeem@niu.edu](mailto:zeem@niu.edu)  
Phone: 815.753.2205

Note: This paper is a draft paper and your comments and feedback are welcome. Please contact the author for an updated version of the paper before citing.

Abstract: As neighboring federal systems, Canada and the United States provide an opportunity to examine how constitutional structures contribute to the design and conduct of institutional collective action (ICA) by proximate local governments. This paper outlines an agenda for studying ICA in Canada and the United States, as well as the occurrence of self-organizing federalism across the international border. After explaining the importance of understanding local governance in Canada and the United States in comparative context, the ICA framework is used to highlight opportunities for comparative research focused on multilevel governance and mechanisms for collective action. The essay then highlights the potential value of cross-border comparative research. Several recent studies of urban policy in Canada stress the relevance of multi-level governance, but the ICA framework provides a theoretical foundation for future inquiries into the formulation of collective action by U.S. and Canadian local governments.

This paper was prepared for the This paper was prepared for the 2015 General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research, held at the Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada, on 27 August, 2015.

At the border between Canada and the United States, local governments sit on the front lines of international diplomacy and emergent approaches to public problem solving. Globalization has challenged scholars of local governance to investigate how local governments engage with policy problems that spill over international borders, while also fostering interest in comparative urban studies. The proximity or salience of global problems is all the more relevant for cities near international borders. In both Canada and the United States, cities have been described as critical actors framing innovative solutions to complex problems ranging from economic development to climate change adaptation (e.g., C. Andrew, Graham, & Phillips, 2002; Katz & Bradley, 2014; Mazmanian & Kraft, 2009). In their recent book *Self-Organizing Federalism: Collaborative Mechanisms to Mitigate Institutional Collective Action Dilemmas*, Richard Feiock and John Scholz (2010) emphasize the importance of understanding how local actors forge new approaches to governance. Their primary argument, they write, “is that collaborative self-organizing institutions provide an essential aspect of federalist systems of governance, and that their dramatic growth in recent decades signals both the increasing complexity of policy interactions in the global system and the adaptive ability of federalist systems” (pg. 315). By studying self-organizing federalism within Canada and the United States and at policy junctures on the international border, our comparative understanding of local governance can be advanced.

The distinct systems of local government in the United States and Canada provide an important venue in which to study the collaborative problem solving efforts of local governments. In both countries, broad trends in governance have pressured local governments to engage in new collaborative approaches to public problem solving (Conteh, 2013; Doberstein, 2013; Donahue & Zeckhauser, 2011). Shared collective action dilemmas on the international border also press local actors into cross-border coordination (Brunet-Jailly, 2008). Yet, these two federal systems of government pose distinct challenges and opportunities for collective action and self-organizing

problem solving by local governments. Local government scholars should view the border between Canada and the United States as an important field of study for advancing our understanding of the emergence and conduct of institutional collective action by local governments.

The ICA framework can serve as a foundation for the comparative study of local governance in Canada and the United States and provide leverage to analyze cross-border coordination by local actors. While these two countries receive special emphasis here, this essay outlines an agenda for deploying the Institutional Collective Action (ICA) framework in comparative local governance research broadly in order to expand our understanding of ICA dilemmas and the mechanisms used by local actors to address them. To illustrate the potential for applying the ICA framework to comparative local government studies in Canada and the United States, we must begin by considering how the ICA framework enriches comparative urban inquiry. As part of this discussion, we focus on how our theoretical understanding of multilevel systems of governance and mechanisms for collective action can be advanced through comparative research. Next, the relevance of the ICA framework for cross-border collaboration is considered. Finally, the paper concludes by advocating for measures to enhancing the comparative study of ICA dilemmas and self-organizing federalism in Canada and the United States.

### **The ICA Framework and Comparative Local Governance Research**

The advancement of a comparative understanding of local governance has become a popular focus in the circles of urban politics and governance research. Scholars point to various reasons to explore local governance processes through the comparative method. At a basic level, comparative research explores phenomena of concern across institutional, cultural, and geographic contexts (DiGaetano & Strom, 2003; Mouritzen & Svara, 2002; Snyder, 2001). Comparative research has honed rational-actor theories of urban governance in order to better account for policy variation

across cities and countries (Pierre, 2005; Stoker, 2000). Also, investigating urban governance across nations can help advance our understanding of multilevel systems of governance and the interface between national and local political processes (Denters & Mossberger, 2006; Gregg, 1974; Sellers, 2005). A common thread linking comparative urban politics research with the broader field of comparative politics is a concern about the nuance of research design and the deployment of the comparative method, with an emphasis on understanding local governance processes in general, beyond descriptive insight about individual cities.

In addition to this theoretical concern, we must also acknowledge the practical need for a comparative understanding of local governments in Canada and the United States. For cities and local governments near borders, an operational understanding of comparative local government is a practical necessity. Regional economic interdependence pressures cities to understand the flows of commerce across the international border and the consequences of federal policy for local economic conditions (McCallum, 1995). Binational treaties call for the incorporation of local actors into the governance of shared environmental resources (Stoett & Temby, 2015). The development of a stronger comparative understanding of local governance in Canada and the United States can be an asset to international relations and public policy challenges that span the two nations' shared border.

When studying Canada and the United States, we have good reason to push below the level of national comparison in order to understand processes of local governance (Olson & Franks, 1993). As Jeffrey Sellers (2005 431) explains, "By taking full account of local and interlocal elements, comparative urban analysis enable more far-reaching explanatory power and greater precision than traditional comparative analyses based on countries." He adds, attention to the local level is useful because, "they are especially suited to accounts of transnational processes that link specific places within and between countries" (Pg. 431). Distinctions between Canadian and U.S. local government might begin by noting the differences in state and provincial power over local

entities and the wider variation in local discretion across states in the U.S. (Jones, 1988). Observers might go on by contrasting the greater ease with which municipal amalgamations can occur in the Canadian provinces while such consolidation has been rare in fragmented U.S. metropolitan areas (Hamilton, 2013; Kushner & Siegel, 2003; Rosenfeld & Reese, 2003). Other foci on structural or cultural differences might be advanced for the comparison of local government in the two countries; but, without a strong theoretical justification, comparison will not achieve the goals outlined by Sellers (2005) or DiGaetano and Strom (2003) for an improved understanding of governance and politics through comparative urban research.

Within this context, the ICA framework can provide a tool for comparative local governance research. Theoretical frameworks provide broad sets of questions to organize social inquiry. According to Elinor Ostrom (2011 8), “Frameworks identify elements and general relationships among these elements that one needs to consider for institutional analysis and they organize diagnostic and prescriptive inquiry.” Ostrom goes on to explain that frameworks can be used to compare theories, pointing the general elements that must be included in theories in order to test related phenomena. The ICA framework directs our attention to the collective action problems faced by institutional actors in the context of local governance. Richard Feiock explains (2013 398), “As a framework to study and understand policy and governance, ICA focuses explicitly on externalities of choice in fragmented systems.” He goes on to state, “The ICA framework compares the impact of alternative mechanisms introduced to mitigate these collective action problems and how these mechanisms evolve, are selected, or are imposed.”

Central to the ICA framework is the collective action dilemma. Feiock and Scholz (2010 3-4) explain, “Fragmented authority produces dilemmas for institutional actors whenever decisions by one authority affect outcomes of other authorities, particularly when independent decisions by each authority lead to poor policy outcomes not favored by anyone: uncoordinated investments by local

governments create excessive capacity and expensive service provisions; one authority's regulations undermine the effectiveness of another's; one agency's project competes with that of another agency rather than complementing it." Such dilemmas have been central to research on local government and intergovernmental relations, and the ICA framework is now directing our attention to new dimensions of these problems. While the framework has been deployed most extensively for research in U.S. metropolitan areas, ICA dilemmas occur in many types of systems that fragment governing authority. Richard Feiock has presented several helpful overviews of the framework and its implications for theory and research (Feiock, 2008, 2009, 2013). As actors approach ICA dilemmas, they select various mechanisms to integrate their work to resolve the dilemma. These mechanisms are assessed by institutional actors in terms of the cost, benefit and risk of using the mechanism. While the reader should consult Feiock's careful presentations of the framework, this sketch makes clear the broad potential application of the ICA framework in comparative local governance research.

Having made the case that the ICA framework can structure comparative research on local government, further discussion explains the potential pay-offs of a comparative approach. To begin a conversation about the role that the ICA framework can play in comparative local governance research, we can unpack two important features of the framework. First, the ICA framework acknowledges local governance processes occur in multilevel systems, with the potential for vertical and horizontal governance processes to address ICA dilemmas. Second, the ICA framework focuses attention on the mechanisms for collective action and their associated costs and benefits. Exploring these two dimensions of the ICA framework through comparative research has the potential to illuminate ICA in more than one country, but more importantly, can advance theoretical refinement and our broader understanding of ICA dilemmas in local governance.

### *Multilevel Systems*

While the ICA framework investigates the occurrence of self-organizing federalism by local units, the framework acknowledges the existence of local governing entities within multilevel systems. Inclusion of multilevel analysis in the ICA framework is sometimes implicit in theoretical overviews, but often explicit in empirical studies deploying the framework. Multilevel analysis is apparent in at least two of the bodies of theory from which the ICA framework draws, as outlined by Richard Feiock (2013) in a recent synthesis essay in *Policy Studies Journal*. Feiock (2013, 399) explains the ICA framework integrates work on local public economies and industrial organization, particularly that from the Ostrom Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University (e.g., McGinnis, 1999). This work assess the dynamics of service provision in metropolitan systems of government that are structured in part by the constitutional design of federal systems. Also, Feiock (2013, 400) draws from theories of social embeddedness, which account for the intergovernmental context of public sector organizations (e.g., Berardo & Scholz, 2010). These roots have provided a foundation for hypothesizing about ICA in nested and multilevel systems of governance. For example, Paul Thurner (2010) addresses ICA dilemmas associated with the multilevel system of the European Union (EU) when he scrutinizes the social embeddedness of policy actors and their informal networks for resolving EU policy disputes. Several other studies have integrated a focus on social embeddedness and local public economics in order to test propositions about vertical and horizontal dimensions of ICA by local government in service delivery and economic development (Carr, Gerber, & Luper, 2009; Hawkins & Andrew, 2011; LeRoux & Carr, 2010). From these and other studies, we are learning that local governments may engage the vertical or horizontal dimensions of governance in order to resolve ICA dilemmas.

Even within multilevel systems that vest significant authority outside the local level of government, local actors, at many centers, have the potential to self-organize and address shared problems. Reflecting on the U.S. system, Vincent Ostrom (1991: 17) writes, “Collective actions, as distinguished from collective decisions, depend upon what people do in responding to the opportunities and exigencies of life. If there is a shared community of understanding and a reasonable level of consensus about how to address common problems, people will exercise a significant influence in monitoring, facilitating, and constraining one another’s behavior rather than presuming that it is only governments that govern.” In order to better understand the development of collective action in multilevel systems, we must explore the emergent local collective action described by Ostrom and its interaction with other levels of problem solving in nested systems. When we study these processes in only one country or federal system, we are limited in our ability to reach conclusions about the extent to which the design of the multilevel system itself influences ICA. Comparative research on ICA in two or more federal systems may yield insight on both multilevel governance and the local response to ICA dilemmas.

Two examples from local governance research in Canada illustrate how the ICA framework could be applied to design comparative inquiry. Recently, Robert Young and his research collaborators have explored policymaking in Canada’s cities through the lens of multilevel governance (Graham & Andrew, 2014; Horak & Young, 2012; Sancton & Young, 2009). In *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada’s Big Cities*, Horak and Young (2012) use a comparative case design to collect observations on city, provincial, and federal government involvement in a range of policy challenges relevant to Canada’s cities. The case study design advanced in the book also explores how actors in civil society engage in governance process to address salient community problems. The book yields helpful descriptive insight on local governance in Canada, and also refines the application of theories of multilevel governance in

federal systems. To extend Horak and Young's (2012) research design, the ICA framework could be used to shape comparative inquiry between select major cities in Canada and the United States. This has the potential to provide additional leverage on the research goal of illuminating how the design of the multilevel systems shapes or constrains local action. For example, one of the policy themes explored in the sites of governance study is local government interaction with federal properties. Framed as an ICA dilemma, federal and local actors might recognize gains from redeveloping federally held land, but significant transaction costs must be surmounted to advance such projects. Two separate chapters linked to the sites of governance work explore problems related to the redevelopment of Toronto's waterfront, and other problems with land controlled in whole or in part by the federal government (Horak, 2012; Sanderson & Filion, 2013). Effective multilevel governance for urban waterfront redevelopment is not a problem distinct to Canada. M. Jasper Rubin (2011), for instance, documents intergovernmental challenges in the redevelopment of San Francisco's waterfront. This ongoing redevelopment challenge in Canada might be illuminated in new ways if scrutinized as an ICA dilemma and systematically compared to a parallel case in the United States or other federal systems.

Another example of ICA dilemmas in multilevel systems can be found in planning for Canada's national capital region. While Ottawa, Ontario is the federal capital of Canada, the Ville de Gatineau, Québec also holds a share of federal office buildings and cultural institutions in the capital region. To add to the complexity, the National Capital Commission (NCC) is a Crown Corporation responsible for the ownership and management of government lands in the region. The fragmented structure of Canada's national capital region is rife for ICA dilemmas, as documented in a recent critique of the federal capital's design and governance by Chattopadhyay and Paquet (2011). Public transportation is one area in which gains might be recognized from collaboration, through the cities and NCC face significant barriers in achieving cooperative outcomes (Champagne, 2011).

Comparative inquiry structure by the ICA framework might hold in contrast the governance of transportation systems in Canada's national capital region and the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area in the United States. With a focus on public economics and the embeddedness of actors in intergovernmental systems, this research design might hone our attention to strengths and weaknesses of multilevel design for capital governance in both countries.

### *Mechanisms of Collective Action*

The ICA framework draws attention to a second theoretical focus for comparison of local governance systems—mechanisms for collective action. Mechanisms for ICA include policy tools ranging from informal networks to the establishment of independent special district governments. Feiock (2013 401) explains these mechanisms can be considered along two key dimensions:

“First, according to whether the mechanism relies primarily on political authority, legal or contractual arrangement, or social embeddedness; and second, by how encompassing the solution mechanism, ranging from bilateral agreements on a single policy dimension to multilateral solutions to more complex problems to ultimately multiplex policy arrangements for collective choice by a larger set of actors.”

Mechanisms are an important focus for comparative research for at least two reasons. First, the national and subnational legal system of each country under investigation may provide for the use of different tools to resolve ICA dilemmas. For legal scholars, documenting and describing access to and allowed use of these tools or mechanisms in multiple governing systems would be a practical aid to local governance. Second, across countries, mechanisms for ICA may entail different costs and benefits. If this is true, testing similarities and differences in the use of a particular ICA mechanism, as well as the assessment of its use, can contribute to our cumulative understanding about local governance. While research based in one particular country may highlight the utility of a mechanism

for resolving ICA dilemmas, comparative research could help us learn more about the portability of mechanisms across countries.

For example, scholars around the globe are giving attention to use of interlocal agreements by local governments to provide municipal services, though few studies offer comparative analysis (Bel, Hebdon, & Warner, 2007; Lackowska, 2009; Wollmann, 2010). In both Canada and the United States, the ICA framework can be used to explain the emergence of voluntary service coordination and interlocal contracting for municipal service delivery, choices that have historically been framed in research through the lens of public choice theory (e.g., Oakerson, 1999; Stein, 1990). To illustrate the potential application of the ICA framework for comparative research, we can consider two papers on the topic from Canada and the U.S. LeSage, McMillan and Hepburn (2008) offer an analysis of inter-municipal collaborative arrangements focused on small municipalities in the Edmonton, Alberta region. Their findings emphasize size and economic correlates of interlocal agreement use, and the authors conclude interlocal agreements are attractive for small municipalities to capture the value of larger markets, particularly in areas like recreation services. Yet, a study of small municipalities in the Midwestern U.S. yielded largely the opposite findings on community size and interlocal agreement use (Mohr, Deller, & Halstead, 2010). If we think of the interlocal agreement as a mechanism for ICA, then comparing the two aforementioned studies might provide motivation for structuring a comparative inquiry. Why is smaller population correlated with increased interlocal agreement use in Canada, but not the United States? Does the ICA framework direct us to study features of the two multilevel systems of governance that might help us hypothesize about different patterns of use? While at least one study of municipal service delivery has attempted to compare service delivery in the U.S. and Canada (Hebdon & Jalette, 2008), the ICA framework might provide a stronger foundation for hypothesizing about differences in governing systems, yielding more insightful conclusions about the consequences of multilevel system design.

In summary, by focusing on collective action in multilevel systems and comparing mechanisms for collective action, the ICA framework can augment existing comparative studies of U.S. and Canadian federalism. The ICA framework points attention to collective action dilemmas that emerge as a consequence of fragmented authority. From this theoretical starting point, complementary theories can be used to hypothesize about the anticipated implications of the framework for the ability of local actors to resolve these dilemmas through various cooperative mechanisms. While this section of the essay focused on theoretical features of the ICA framework that might be deployed in comparative local governance research, the next section highlights how the ICA framework might provide new insight on self-organizing efforts to address ICA dilemmas along the international border.

### **Self-Organizing Federalism at the Border**

Cross-border policy research is a second area in which we might benefit from using the ICA framework as a comparative lens. Communities near international borders find themselves pressed into international relations in order to address a variety of policy challenges that other local governments would only need to consider as problems of domestic politics. Local policy networks that span the border also engage nongovernmental and community actors in the policy process (Sabet, 2008; York & Schoon, 2011). ICA can emerge in border regions; however, treaty law and the role of national governments in foreign affairs may introduce complex vertical dimensions to what might otherwise be horizontal networks of collaborative problem-solving. Still, the advancement of a comparative understanding of local governing processes might be relevant to the local actors who must engage across the border on a regular basis.

The example of local governance of Great Lakes water resources provides one policy field in which the ICA framework can be viewed as a tool for comparative research. Great Lakes water

resources are internationally governed under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between Canada and the United States, which established the International Joint Commission for shared governance (Caldwell, 1988; Clamen & Macfarlane, 2015). The crafting of international institutions by national governments directs our attention away from self-organizing collective action in response to ICA dilemmas, but even under this legal framework, local action proliferates. Clamen and Macfarlane (2015, 40) report a multitude of “local, regional, and special-purpose governing bodies with jurisdiction for some management aspect of the basin or the lakes,” though they point to the IJC as the most consequential governance institution. In 1985, updates to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement between the two countries resulted in the organization of 43 Areas of Concern (AOC) with local public advisory committees to deliberate about impairments to the beneficial use of the water resources. Mark Sproule-Jones (2002 3), in his analysis of the AOC program, described these sites as “small experiments in institutional design.” Within AOCs, projects for water quality remediation can be undertaken by an array of local, state/provincial, and federal actors. Policy is guided by a Remedial Action Plan supported by the public advisory committee, but a review of work within most AOCs points to the possibility of self-organizing collective action.

While various studies have evaluated AOC governance and program outcomes, the ICA offers new dimensions along which to assess the extent to which the seven joint AOC sites perform in comparison to sites located solely within one country. To provide an example of the relevance of the ICA framework, we can assume that actors on both sides of the border might achieve gains from cooperation in addressing the beneficial use impairments within the AOC. However, Canadian and U.S. actors may have different preferences on project implementation and methods of ongoing monitoring and evaluation. Feiock (2013, 412) highlights that homophily of beliefs may aid collective action, a proposition that has been assessed by Weible (2010) and others. So too, the ICA framework directs our attention to ties or patterns of interaction in order to assess the

embeddedness of network problem solving arrangements (S. A. Andrew, 2009; Carr, LeRoux, & Shrestha, 2009; Shrestha & Feiock, 2009). Through careful case selection, the ICA framework can be used to frame a comparative analysis of AOC performance that could illustrate the consequences of belief homophily and network embeddedness for outcomes. Such an inquiry might be a beneficial exercise in program evaluation for any given site, but the comparative design could advance our understanding of systematic strengths of weaknesses in the design of governance and the consequences of the international border for patterns of collective action.

### **Challenges to Advancing Comparative ICA Inquiries**

Four points must be considered as we assess the potential benefits of deploying the ICA framework to structure comparative research on local governance involving Canada and the United States. First, the local government systems in Canada and the United States face common challenges and concerns, but local-level links for dialogue and policy learning cannot be assumed. For example, in a recent study of policy interactions about sustainable development across the international border in the Detroit and Windsor region, economic development offices and chambers of commerce reported regular contact with local counterparts across the international border, but interactions by those working in environmental fields was more limited (Zeemering, 2014). Uneven patterns of coordination are, in and of themselves, interesting observations under the ICA framework, which would label this a functional ICA dilemma (Feiock, 2013 398). As a consequence of functional ICA dilemmas, equal opportunity might not exist to observe the resolution of ICA dilemmas on both sides of the border in a given policy field of interest. The problem of functional ICA dilemmas also has practical consequences for research. The market for the development of a comparative understanding of local governance is uneven. While foundations

or other funders of research may be willing to direct resources to some areas, few would be willing to invest in a general inventory of functional ICA dilemmas on the border.

Second, a similar problem is the fragmentation of cross-border research by policy field rather than the core theoretical concern of collective action. Many researchers approach investigations along the international border with an interest in substantive policy problems. As they seek to understand their policy field, they engage in a description of the institutions engaged in collective action. While a framework for organizing their observations might be useful, they might not think of their work as related to collective action or governance. The ICA framework has the potential to become a theoretical tool to explain the importance of local governance to a broader community of scholars investigating local policy processes in border regions. Expanding the use of the ICA framework to shape comparative inquiry would be a useful step in demonstrating the framework's utility to a broader, interdisciplinary community of scholars.

Third, researchers confront a challenge in developing relevant data for comparison. While this is a problem for all comparative research, the focus on local governance adds weight to this problem. Even in areas rich in data, comparable data might not be available at the local-level of analysis. The municipal service delivery research of Hebdon and Jallette (2008) provides one model for data development. These researchers modeled their survey in Canada on a survey of municipal service delivery regularly conducted by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) in the United States. Another possible approach is the formation of cross-national research teams prepared to implement similar research designs at the local level in the two countries. At the earliest stages of comparative ICA research, in-depth case studies in cross-border regions or in carefully selected U.S. and Canadian cities might also help demonstrate potential for theory refinement or new insights into local governance. To achieve sustained comparative inquiry into

local governance across the two countries, sustained research relationships will be needed for data development.

Fourth, scholars using the ICA framework to structure comparative analysis of local governance will have to make the case that the framework makes distinct contributions to comparative urban politics and policy research. The ICA framework has been critiqued for its focus on rational actors (Andersen & Pierre, 2010), a critique that has also been targeted at some existing comparative urban research programs (DiGaetano & Strom, 2003). However, the ICA framework's emphasis on mechanisms for collective action and the costs and benefits associated with those mechanisms yields great practical value for the implications and research findings that stem from the framework. Comparative inquiry deploying the ICA framework in cross-border research, for example, has the potential to inform local and national governments about the most effective approaches for coordinating action. In fields like environmental protection and restoration or emergency management, new insight into the most effective paths for collective action would be an asset for local governments confronting the challenges of cross-border cooperation.

## **Conclusion**

Problems of scale are endemic to systems of governance (Dahl, 1967; Dahl & Tufte, 1973; Derthick, 1999). Because of this, ICA dilemmas, arising from "the division or partitioning of authority in which decisions by one government in one or more specific functional area impact other governments and other governmental functions" (Feiock, 2013 397), should be expected to occur across nations with diverse constitutional structures. Likely, these dilemmas are more acute in federal systems that purposefully fragment authority. Using comparisons of local governance in Canada and the United States as an example, this essay has argued that deploying the ICA framework in comparative research has the potential to refine the theoretical framework itself,

advance our comparative understanding of ICA dilemmas in local governance, and shed insight on substantive problems facing local governments in border regions. Canada and the United States have been the focus of insightful studies of comparative politics, policy, and federalism (e.g., Lipset, 1990; Olson & Franks, 1993; Radin & Boase, 2000; Zuberi, 2006). Further, in the last decade, complex policy challenges have pressed scholars to take a fresh look at governance processes that bridge the international border (e.g., G. Hale, 2012; G. E. Hale & Gattinger, 2010; Selin & VanDeveer, 2009). Proximity and shared ICA dilemmas will continue the need for a comparative understanding of local governance between Canada and the United States.

## References

- Andersen, Ole Johan, & Pierre, Jon. (2010). Exploring the strategic region: Rationality, context, and institutional collective action. *Urban Affairs Review*, 46(2), 218-240.
- Andrew, Caroline, Graham, Katherine A., & Phillips, Susan D. (Eds.). (2002). *Urban affairs: Back on the policy agenda*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Andrew, Simon A. (2009). Regional integration through contracting networks: An empirical analysis of Institutional Collection Action Framework. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(3), 378-402.
- Bel, Germà, Hebdon, Robert, & Warner, Mildred. (2007). Local government reform: Privatisation and its alternatives. *Local Government Studies*, 33(4), 507-515. doi:10.1080/03003930701417460
- Berardo, Ramiro, & Scholz, John T. (2010). Self-organizing policy networks: Risk, partner selection, and cooperation in estuaries. *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(3), 632-649. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2010.00451.x
- Brunet-Jailly, Emmanuel. (2008). Cascadia in comparative perspective: Canada-U.S. relations and the emergence of cross-border regions. *Canadian Political Science Review*, 2(2), 104-124.
- Caldwell, Lynton K. (Ed.) (1988). *Perspectives on ecosystem management for the Great Lakes: A reader*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Carr, Jered B., Gerber, Elisabeth R., & Luper, Eric W. (2009). Explaining horizontal and vertical cooperation on public services in Michigan: The role of local fiscal capacity. In Richard Jelie & Gary Sands (Eds.), *Sustaining Michigan: Metropolitan policies and strategies*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Carr, Jered B., LeRoux, Kelly, & Shrestha, Manoj. (2009). Institutional ties, transaction costs, and external service production. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(3), 403-427.
- Champagne, Eric. (2011). Transportation failure in the federal capital region. In Rupak Chattopadhyay & Gilles Paquet (Eds.), *The unimagined Canadian capital: Challenges for the federal capital region* (pp. 43-52). Ottawa: Invenire Books.
- Chattopadhyay, Rupak, & Paquet, Gilles (Eds.). (2011). *The unimagined Canadian capital: Challenges for the federal capital region*. Ottawa: Invenire Books.
- Clamen, Murray, & Macfarlane, Danniell. (2015). The International Joint Commission, Water Levels, and Transboundary Governance in the Great Lakes. *Review of Policy Research*, 32(1), 40-59.
- Conteh, Charles. (2013). Strategic inter-organizational cooperation in complex environments. *Public Management Review*, 15(4), 501-521.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1967). The city in the future of democracy. *American Political Science Review*, 61(4), 953-970.

- Dahl, Robert A., & Tufte, Edward R. (1973). *Size and democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Denters, Bas, & Mossberger, Karen. (2006). Building blocks for a methodology for comparative urban political research *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(4), 550-571.
- Derthick, Martha (Ed.) (1999). *Dilemmas of scale in America's federal democracy*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press.
- DiGaetano, Alan, & Strom, Elizabeth. (2003). Comparative urban governance: An integrated Approach. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(3), 356-395.
- Doberstein, Carey. (2013). Metagovernance of urban governance networks in Canada: In pursuit of legitimacy and accountability. *Canadian Public Administration*, 56(4), 584-609.
- Donahue, John D., & Zeckhauser, Richard. (2011). *Collaborative governance: Private roles for public goals in turbulent times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Feiock, Richard C. (2008). Institutional collective action and local government collaboration. In Lisa Blomgren Bingham & Rosemary O'Leary (Eds.), *Big ideas in collaborative public management*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Feiock, Richard C. (2009). Metropolitan governance and institutional collective action. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(3), 356-377.
- Feiock, Richard C. (2013). The institutional collective action framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41(3), 397-425.
- Feiock, Richard C., & Scholz, John T. (2010). *Self-organizing federalism: Collaborative mechanisms to mitigate institutional collective action dilemmas*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, Katherine A.H., & Andrew, Caroline. (2014). *Canada in cities: The politics and policy of federal-local governance*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Gregg, Phillip M. (1974). Units and levels of analysis: A problem policy analysis in federal systems. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 4(4), 59-86.
- Hale, Geoffrey. (2012). *So near yet so far : the public and hidden worlds of Canada-US relations*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hale, Geoffrey E., & Gattinger, Monica. (2010). *Borders and bridges : Canada's policy relations in North America*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, David K. (2013). *Measuring the effectiveness of regional governing systems: A comparative study of city regions in North America*. New York: Springer.
- Hawkins, Christopher V., & Andrew, Simon A. (2011). Understanding horizontal and vertical relations in the context of economic development joint venture agreements. *Urban Affairs Review*, 47(3), 385-412. doi:10.1177/1078087410396300

- Hebdon, Robert, & Jalette, Patrice. (2008). The restructuring of municipal services: A Canada--United States comparison. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26(1), 144-158.
- Horak, Martin. (2012). Multilevel governance in Toronto: Success and failure in Canada's largest city. In Martin Horak & Robert Young (Eds.), *Sites of governance: Multilevel governance and policy making in Canada's big cities*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Horak, Martin, & Young, Robert (Eds.). (2012). *Sites of governance: Multilevel governance and policy making in Canada's big cities*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Jones, Victor. (1988). Beavers and cats: Federal-local relations in the United States and Canada. In Hilda Symonds & H. Peter Oberlander (Eds.), *Meech Lake: From centre to periphery* (pp. 88-115). Vancouver: Centre for Human Settlements, The University of British Columbia.
- Katz, Bruce, & Bradley, Jennifer. (2014). *The metropolitan revolution: How cities and metros are fixing our broken politics and fragile economy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kushner, Joseph, & Siegel, David. (2003). Effect of municipal amalgamations in Ontario on political representation and accessibility. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 36(5), 1035-1051.
- Lackowska, Marta. (2009). Why is voluntary co-operation condemned to failure? Reflections on the Polish and German background. *Lex Localis: Journal of Local Self-Government*, 7(4), 347-369.
- LeRoux, Kelly, & Carr, Jered B. (2010). Prospects for centralizing services in an urban county: Evidence from eight self-organized networks of local public services. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 32(4), 449-470.
- LeSage, Edward C., Jr., McMillan, Melville L., & Hepburn, Neil. (2008). Municipal shared service collaboration in the Alberta Capital Region: The case of recreation. *Canadian Public Administration*, 51(3), 455-473.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. (1990). *Continental divide : the values and institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- Mazmanian, Daniel A., & Kraft, Michael E. (Eds.). (2009). *Toward sustainable communities: Transition and transformations in environmental policy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McCallum, John. (1995). National borders matter: Canada-U.S. regional trade patterns. *American Economic Review*, 85(3), 615-623.
- McGinnis, Michael D. (Ed.) (1999). *Polycentricity and local public economies: Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mohr, Robert, Deller, Steven C., & Halstead, John M. (2010). Alternative Methods of Service Delivery in Small and Rural Municipalities. *Public Administration Review*, 70(6), 894-905. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02221.x
- Mouritzen, Poul Erik, & Svava, James H. (2002). *Leadership at the apex: Politicians and administrators in western local governments*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Oakerson, Ronald J. (1999). *Governing local public economies: Creating the civic metropolis*. Oakland, CA: ICS Press.
- Olson, David M., & Franks, C. E. S. (Eds.). (1993). *Representation and policy formation in federal systems: Canada & the United States*. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor. (2011). Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 7-27.
- Ostrom, Vincent. (1991). *The meaning of American federalism: Constituting a self-governing society*. San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.
- Pierre, Jon. (2005). Comparative urban governance: Uncovering complex causalities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(4), 446-462.
- Radin, Beryl A., & Boase, Joan Price. (2000). Federalism, political structure, and public policy in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 2(1), 65-89. doi:10.1080/13876980008412636
- Rosenfeld, Raymond A., & Reese, Laura A. (2003). The anatomy of an amalgamation: The case of Ottawa. *State and Local Government Review*, 35(1), 57-69.
- Rubin, M. Jasper. (2011). *A negotiated landscape: The transformation of San Francisco's waterfront since 1950* (1st ed.). Chicago, IL: Center for American Places at Columbia College Chicago.
- Sabet, Daniel M. (2008). *Nonprofits and their networks : cleaning the waters along Mexico's northern border*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Sancton, Andrew, & Young, Robert A. (Eds.). (2009). *Foundations of Governance Municipal Government in Canada's Provinces*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sanderson, Christopher, & Filion, Pierre. (2013). The development of the Toronto waterfront: Federal presence, institutional complexity, and planning outcomes. In Michael C. Ircha & Robert Young (Eds.), *Federal property policy in Canadian municipalities* (pp. 110-156). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Selin, Henrik, & VanDeveer, Stacy D. (Eds.). (2009). *Changing climates in North American politics: Institutions, policymaking, and multilevel governance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sellers, Jeffrey M. (2005). Re-placing the nation: An agenda for comparative urban politics. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(4), 419-445.
- Shrestha, Manoj, & Feiock, Richard C. (2009). Governing U.S. metropolitan areas: Self-organizing and multiplex service networks. *American Politics Research*, 37(4), 801-823.
- Snyder, Richard. (2001). Scaling down: The subnational comparative method. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 36(1), 93-110.

- Sproule-Jones, Mark. (2002). *Restoration of the Great Lakes: Promises, practices, and performances*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Stein, Robert M. (1990). *Urban alternatives: Public and private markets in the provision of local services*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Stoett, Peter, & Temby, Owen. (2015). Bilateral and Trilateral Natural Resource and Biodiversity Governance in North America: Organizations, Networks, and Inclusion. *Review of Policy Research*, 32(1), 1-18. doi:10.1111/ropr.12110
- Stoker, Gerry. (2000). Urban political science and the challenge of urban governance. In Jon Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance: Authority, steering, and democracy* (pp. 91-109). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, Paul W. (2010). Enhancing vertical and horizontal self-organization: Harnessing informal networks to integrate policies within and between governments in the European Union. In Richard C. Feiock & John Scholz (Eds.), *Self-organizing federalism: Collaborative mechanisms to mitigate institutional collective action dilemmas* (pp. 261-281). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Weible, Christopher. (2010). Collaborative institutions, functional areas, and beliefs: What are their roles in policy networks? In Richard C. Feiock & John Scholz (Eds.), *Self-organizing federalism: Collaborative mechanisms to mitigate institutional collective action dilemmas* (pp. 179-203). New York: Cambridge.
- Wollmann, Hellmut. (2010). Comparing two logics of interlocal cooperation: The cases of France and Germany. *Urban Affairs Review*, 46(2), 263-202.
- York, Abigail M., & Schoon, Michael L. (2011). Collaboration in the shadow of the wall: shifting power in the borderlands. *Policy Sciences*, 44(4), 345-365. doi:10.1007/s11077-011-9138-2
- Zeemering, Eric S. (2014). International connections for local government sustainability initiatives: Networks linking Detroit and Windsor. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), 119-140.
- Zuberi, Dan. (2006). *Differences that matter: Social policy and the working poor in the United States and Canada*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Private Investment and the Institutionalization of Collective Action in Autocracies: Ruling Parties and Legislatures. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 74, Issue. 2, p. 621.Â The Institutional Turn in Comparative Authoritarianism. *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, Issue. 3, p. 631.Â State capacity and the paradox of authoritarian elections. *Democratization*, Vol. 21, Issue. 7, p. 1265. Zeemering, Eric S. Forthcoming. Local politiciansâ€™ advice networks and the prospect of metropolitan civil society. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2019.1599293>. Zeemering, Eric S. Forthcoming.Â Zeemering, Eric S. 2019. An agenda for comparing local governance and institutional collective action in Canada and the United States. *Urban Affairs Review* 55 (3): 858-886. Eric S. Zeemering.