10-31-2005

Public Administration and Shared Power: Understanding Governance, Networks, and Partnerships

H. George Frederickson
University of Kansas, gfred@ku.edu

David Matkin
University of Kansas, matkin@ku.edu

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Public Administration and Shared Power:

Understanding Cooperation

H. George Frederickson and David S. T. Matkin

University of Kansas

Introduction

Much of the work of modern public administration has been appropriately referred to as power sharing (Kettl, 1993). Because almost all public administrators work for or represent jurisdictions, power sharing between jurisdictions is best described as interjurisdictional cooperation. In this little study of interjurisdictional cooperation we begin with a description of the jurisdiction in the context of the so-called end of geography—the forces and factors that compel cooperation. We then turn to a brief review of the literature on interjurisdictional cooperation in American metropolitan areas, and particularly in greater Kansas City. We conclude with a description of findings from a recent experimental study of the propensity of local officials in greater Kansas City to cooperate.

Jurisdiction and the End of Geography

Traditional public administration is entirely based on assumptions of jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is a place, a rooted territory defined by precise frontiers, boundaries that describe the spaces within and without. The jurisdiction has constitutions, laws, regulations, sovereignty or autonomy, and, not least, taxing authority. And, jurisdiction accounts for residency, citizenship, patriotism, and civil society. Jurisdiction also defines itself by what it is not: it is not a social group, it is not a religious group, it is not a racial group, it is not a language (Guehenno 1995, p. 4). Jurisdictions reflect the

special circumstances that prevailed at the time they were established and the boundaries of their territory were determined. As circumstances have changed, most jurisdictional boundaries have stayed the same. Jurisdictions are spatially arranged horizontally--such as Canada, the United States, and Mexico—and vertically--such as the United States, the state of California, Los Angeles County, the city of Santa Monica. In a literal sense these spatially expressed jurisdictions are both the places where public administrators work and the governments that employ them.

Jurisdiction lacks meaning without power and authority. In democratic governmental traditions, power and authority are conveyed through a generalized popular commitment to preestablished constitutions, to electoral based representation, to legislatively passed law and the executive execution of the law. Jurisdictions claim sovereignty over territory, sovereignty understood to be "supreme authority within a territory" an authority based on "some mutually acknowledged source of legitimacy—natural law, divine mandate, hereditary law, a constitution, even international law (Philpott 2001). Nation-states are unitary, which is to say they presume to contain all power and sovereignty over their territory and people. In fact, however, all nation-states are either regionally decentralized or federated with multiple subgovernments claiming territorial jurisdiction and exercising either formal or delegated power in a downward diffusion of sovereignty. Under these arrangements each of us is a national citizen as well as a state, county, city, and school district resident and therefore subject to multiple layers of sovereign claims, constitutions, laws, regulations, and taxes. In their professional lives government leaders execute the work of territorially based governments and subgovernments including cities, counties, and special districts each with their share of sovereignty, their charter and ordinances, and their taxes.

There is a widely acknowledged mismatch between jurisdictional boundaries and jurisdictional problems. At the level of the nation-state, Daniel Bell describes it this way: "(T)he

nation is becoming too small for the big problems of life, and too big for the small problems of life. It is too small for the big problems because there are no effective international mechanisms to deal with such things as capital flows, commodity imbalances, the loss of jobs, and the several demographics tidal waves that will be developing in the next twenty years. It is to big for the small problems because the flow of power to a national political center means that the center becomes increasingly unresponsive to the variety and diversity of local needs. In short, there is a mismatch of scale." (1993, p. 12) In American metropolitan areas, high levels of suburbanization and jurisdictional fragmentation have deeply eroded the capacity of metropolitan areas to deal with their problems. Rural county lines drawn in the era of horse and buggy now make little sense. The problems faced by the least advantaged of us—crime, drugs, little or no public transportation, chronic underemployment, inadequate affordable housing, air and water pollution—ignore arbitrarily drawn jurisdictional boundaries and tend not to stay put. The match between jurisdictions and the problem faced by those who live in jurisdictions is getting weaker and weaker. But, short of war or scandal, it is politically very difficult to change jurisdictional boundaries.

Threats to our national security are as likely to come from stateless terrorist groups as from other countries. Changes in the European and Asian economy are as likely to influence our economy as vice versa. The global economy challenges jurisdictionally based systems of taxation, particularly as more transactions are made over the Internet. And because of the Internet, American laws against, for example, child pornography and gambling are extremely difficult to enforce. The mobility of capital is so great that nation-states, states, and cities now constitute markets in which firms shop for low wages, favorable tariffs, tax breaks, and lax regulation. With the freedom of human mobility, both physically and literally, people with resources can find *places* favorable to their interests, homes abroad, off-shore tax shelters, and the like. The capacity of the state to deal

with complex social and economic issues has eroded significantly. Crime, for example, often has its origins in other jurisdictions. Acid rain and water pollution start in one set of jurisdictions and profoundly affect many others. The oceans, seas, and rivers are polluted by sewage and fertilizer run-off. Immigrants and a growing number of refugees move across porous borders. Infectious diseases pay no attention to jurisdiction. As the borders and the sovereignty of jurisdictions decline in importance, there is a corresponding decline in the capacity of jurisdictions to contain many public policy issues and, therefore, in the jurisdictions' ability to manage them.

The territory or space of the jurisdiction is of dwindling importance now that agriculture, natural resources extraction, and industry represent a decreasing portion of economic activity. The value of space is diminishing, replaced by the increasing value of competent people. The value of space for production is declining while the value of space for *occupation*, and particularly space with great natural beauty or space in interesting and vibrant cities, is increasing (Florida, 2004).

Wealth is less and less tangible and increasingly abstract and immaterial. The traditional links between wealth and territory are rapidly declining. Value is changing from agriculture, industry, extraction, and exploitation and moving toward connecting-- connecting those who know with those who need to know, those selling with those buying, entertainers with those wishing to be entertained, authors with readers, and so forth. Being plugged into the right networks and knowing how to be effective in these networks is value. In the modern world of telecommunications, networks transcend territory and space, transcend jurisdiction and sovereignty, and, far too often, transcend the rule of law.

In a world in which wealth is less tangible and more abstract, how shall it be taxed? In modern democracies all forms of taxation have a territorial basis—taxes on property, income, and transactions. People and corporations are increasingly mobile—moving to avoid taxes if they are

rich, to find work if they are poor, or to sell their work at the highest price if they have particular skills. What will it come to mean to state and local governments as increasing percentages of sales are over the internet and as increasing numbers of residents earn their incomes elsewhere?

Jurisdictions of all types – nation-states, states, provinces, cities, counties, and special districts – are losing their borders (Strange 1996). The new global economy and the internet are described as "the end of geography." The revolution in telecommunications has forever altered the meaning of physical space and thereby forever altered the importance of borders and boundaries, a primary element of the idea of jurisdiction. These changes in economics and telecommunications have changed human social relationships, particularly relationships between those who are educationally, economically, or politically significant and their places of residence or their citizenship. These people are linked less and less to a single specific locale or jurisdiction and are linked more and more bicoastally, transnationally, or globally. Thus the sovereignty of jurisdictions--nation-states as well as their sub-governments--is evaporating out the top, leaking out the sides, and seeping out the bottom. Under these changing conditions the most important feature of contemporary public administration is the declining relationship between jurisdiction and public management.

Responses to the Declining Salience of Jurisdiction

Responses to the declining salience of jurisdiction and the end of geography are fractal, irregular spatial and territorial adaptations to the macro-forces of centralization and micro-forces of fragmentation. The forces of centralization, to included regionalization and globalization, and the forces of fragmentation including localization and community based governance, unite in all spatial scales. "There is little, and maybe nothing, that is global that does not have some sort of local manifestation. And each local manifestation changes the global context. Place centeredness is the amalgam of global change and local identity." (O'Riordan andChurch, 2001, p.3)

The best way to grasp the dynamics of responses to the declining salience of jurisdiction and the end of geography is to view "them as an endless series of distant proximities in which the forces pressing for greater globalization (or centralization) and those including greater localization interactively play themselves out…One quickly discovers that distant proximities are not simple interrelationships…Distant proximities encompass the tension between core and periphery, between national and transnational systems between communitariansm and cosmopolitanism, between cultures and subcultures, between states and markets, between urban and rural, between integration and disintegration, between centralization and decentralization, between universalism and particularism, and between pace and space." (Roseneau, 2003, pp. 4-5) In a formal and authoritative sense, formal governmental jurisdictions engage the tensions associated with distant proximities. But, because many is not most of the forces encompassed in distant proximities transcend jurisdiction, jurisdictions have only two ways to deal with them—force or cooperation.

Two particularly useful bodies of literature and theory inform our understanding of the dynamic patterns of interjurisdictional cooperation—studies of the European Union and studies of American metropolitan areas (Hooghe and Marks, 2003). From these studies we can make the following generalizations: (1) jurisdictions seldom change their boundaries and seldom disappear; (2) special purpose jurisdictions are established to respond to changing circumstances or particular discontinuities, leaving general purpose jurisdictions in place; (3) jurisdictions cooperate with other jurisdictions in a wide variety of formal and informal power sharing arrangements to respond collectively to changing circumstances or particular discontinuities; (4) in the absence of formal polities (states, cities, etc.) formal and informal patterns of interjurisdictional power sharing arrangements are uniquely bureaucratic. In view of these generalizations, public administration is at

least a primary means, if not the primary means, by which jurisdictions adapt and respond to declining sovereignty, the end of geography, and the forces of distant proximity.

Patterns of Jurisdictional Cooperation in American Metropolitan Areas

Theories of interests, competition, and winners and losers are the dominant political science perspective used to analyze the relationships of interacting organizations and individuals. In response to the declining salience of jurisdiction, public administration, both as a practice and as a body of scholarship, has repositioned itself (Frederickson, 1999). Modern public administration is based on cooperation, power sharing, and the practices of administrative conjunction, defined as "the array and character of formal and informal association between actors representing units in a networked public and the administrative behavior of those actors." (Frederickson, 1999, p. 708) In Kansas City based research it was determined that: (1)interjurisdictional conjunction is a mostly administrative phenomenon. "(P)olitics—campaigns, elections, offices, titles—are jurisdictional, autonomous, and only slightly interdependent. Administration is, by comparison, highly interdependent. This interdependence has resulted in extensive conjunction and remarkably organized patterns of self-cooperation. (Frederickson, 1999, 708); (2) public management professionals work for their jurisdictions. Yet, from the perspective of their policy specializations, they appear to serve a larger, inchoate public; (3) public management professionals engaged in conjunction appear to practice a form of "representation" of a generalized "public interest" extending well beyond their jurisdictions.

Administrative conjunction in greater Kansas City is importantly facilitated by the local "council of governments," the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC). City officials engaged in multi-jurisdictional cooperation most frequently cite MARC as a key facilitator or convening venue in their cooperative enterprises (Wood, 2004). Service delivery is the most common form

of cooperation, followed by public works (Pagano, 1999, Wood, 2004). Those practicing administrative conjunction most often cite economies of scale and service standardization as the most important rationales for cooperation, followed by efficiency and cost savings (Wood, 2004).

Metropolitan administrative conjunction could be fairly described as "picket fence regionalism," a pattern of formal and informal cooperation within specific policy arenas such a law enforcement or public works (Thurmaier and Wood, 2002). Metropolitan administrative conjunction does not exhibit patterns of informal or formal cooperation between policy arenas (Wood, 2004)

Administrative conjunction is elsewhere referred to as collaborative public management. In an extensive study of patterns of economic development collaboration, Robert Agranoff and Michael McGuire indicate that "collaborative arrangements are a unique institutional form, consisting of processes different from the spontaneous coordination of markets or the conscious management of hierarchy (Powell, 1990). A critical issue to understand is why collaboration emerges at all and, if we are to believe the expanding research on the topic, why collaboration is increasing in incidence and importance. One dominant perspective argues that the pace and quality of social change at this point in history are the primary determinants of collaborative management. . . . Just as the bureaucratic organization was the signature organizational form during the industrial age, the emerging information or knowledge age gives rise to less rigid, more permeable structures, where persons are able to link across internal functions, organizational boundaries, and even geographic boundaries (2003, p. 23)."

Agranoff and McGuire found wide variations in patterns of city cooperation—jurisdiction-based cities which aggressively cooperated vertically and horizontally to further their

economic development interests; donor-recipient cities that were less active in horizontal cooperation while actively seeking state and federal aid; top-down cities which emphasized vertical compliance through internal hierarchies; and low-activity cities only slightly engaged in cooperation. Among their conclusions, Agranoff and McGuire indicate that: (1) "in the absence of the legal charter, people join, work, and remain together because some element of trust exists. Trust in collective behavior is linked to the obligation not to do unnecessary harm to another party's interests." (p. 182); and, (2) "managers may also find that the public or collective good, as manifested in a shared belief or common purpose, contributes to holding the collaboration together." (p. 183).

Experimental research using game theory is among the most interesting and useful ways to determine why people cooperate and to understand under what conditions cooperation is likely to emerge. Axelrod (1984) used prisoner dilemma games in his classic study of cooperation. According to Axelrod, cooperation can be explained as a consequence of individuals pursuing their own self-interest even without the coordination or influence of a central authority. Trust, an essential element of long-term cooperation, is developed as self-interested individuals participate in multiple iterations of prisoner dilemma games. Cooperation develops because individuals integrate their interest in future interactions into their present decisions based on increasing trust of other players.

Based on his application of the prisoner's dilemma game, Axelrod proposed several ways to promote cooperation which should be carefully considered by local government officials. One of Axelrod's core arguments regarding the promotion of mutual cooperation is that the "future is sufficiently important relative to the present (p.126)." Mutual cooperation depends on individuals viewing proximal decision as not only effecting immediate payoffs but the payoffs

they expect in the future. Axelrod argues that small groups who frequently interact are most likely to achieve stable and enduring mutual cooperation. This stability in cooperation is possible because the short-run benefit for defection is less than the perceived benefit for long-run cooperation.

Following Axelrod, payoffs do not need to be measurable on an absolute scale. The possibility of a sanction is also not required. Rather, the payoffs for cooperation and defection must be in the proper order. The benefit for defection is always better, in any one interaction, for a participant, regardless of the other party's choice. If participate A chooses to participate, then B will get the most benefit by defecting. If A chooses to defect, B is still better off to choose defection. The amount of points, scores, tokens, or other benefits is not important, only that the order is followed.

An Experimental Study of the Propensity to Cooperate

Our study vulgarizes Axelrod's approach to game theory and departs from it in two important ways. First, he uses games with two players. Our questionnaire is based on the perspective of one local government official amongst many other officials in cities and counties that might possibly cooperate. Second, while our scenario of payoff's follows Axelrod's suggested payoff order, our sucker's payoff (a sucker's payoff is when you cooperate and the other player defects) does not result in the city taking on all the costs with no reward, but rather the cost will exceed the desired level of expected benefits. This element of the game was changed in order to reflect the reality of intergovernmental cooperation. Typically, city officials will negotiate on possible cooperation knowing before hand how many cities must participate in order for the agreement to be made.

To explore intergovernmental cooperation in metropolitan regions, we mailed questionnaires to 654 elected and administrative officials in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The questionnaires described a scenario in which respondents were asked to assume their current government position in the hypothetical town of "Hometown, U.S.A." Respondents were provided with information on the demographics, economic base, historical trends, and financial condition of Hometown, and the metropolitan region, New Hamilton, in which Hometown is located. Respondents were then provided with information on an information technology project that may be developed in greater New Hamilton. Local government officials in several cities in New Hamilton have agreed to undertake the project if 10 local government's agree to cooperate. The respondent must then make a decision on their willingness to participate in the project, given a set of possible risks and benefits to Hometown.

After having selected their willingness to participate on a scale from 1 (don't participate) to 7 (participate), respondents were then asked to turn over the questionnaire and read some additional information and then make a second decision. Respondents randomly received one of two addition information scenarios. Both scenarios explained that a regional council had conducted a study of the proposed development and found that residents of several New Hamilton jurisdictions whose leadership was not expected to participate would receive benefits from the cooperative. One scenario stated that residents from non-cooperating jurisdictions would receive *significant* benefits should 10 cities cooperate, regardless of whether Hometown cooperates. In the second scenario, the benefits to these residents would be *slight*. The wording of the two additional scenarios was identical, except for the use of the words "significant" and "slight."

Our questionnaire was developed with the assistance of the Mid-American Regional Council (MARC) staff, which ensured that the scenario was realistic and represented a plausible intergovernmental cooperative process in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

The questionnaire was sent to elected, appointed, and administrative officials in the Kansas City metropolitan area. We based our selection of administrative position to survey on the position titles that are most common in the Kansas City metro. Questionnaires were sent to mayors, council members, aldermen, chief administrative officers, assistant administrative officers, chiefs of police, parks and recreation directors, and public works directors. 154 surveys were returned, constituting a 23.5% response rate. We expected a small response rate from elected officials, due to time delays in delivering mail to elected officials through city hall staff screening so we over sampled elected officials (62% of surveys) compared to administrative officials. Still, the response rate for administrative officials was 31.7%, and 18.5% for elected officials.

In addition to the data on decisions to participate in the regional program, the questionnaire gathered information on several of the characteristics of officials and their jurisdictions. Respondents indicated the number of years they have been in their current position, how often they meet with their counterparts in other jurisdictions to discuss regional programs/issues, and how much of their time is spent working on regional programs/issues. Various individual characteristics were also gathered on the questionnaire (i.e. age, gender, racial category, and education level).

Each questionnaire was coded in order to identify the type of official and their jurisdiction. The 2000 U.S. Census was used to calculate the percentage of regional population in each official's jurisdiction. This variable was calculated by dividing the jurisdictions

population by the total regional population—region was defined by the jurisdictions service by MARC.

The metropolitan area was divided into four quadrants and each respondent was coded as to the corresponding quadrant for their jurisdiction. The first quadrant comprises the northwest corner of the metropolitan area. This quadrant includes the Unified Government of Wyandotte County, Kansas City, Kansas and Leavenworth County, both in Kansas. The Unified Government represents the most prominent jurisdictional consolidation in the Kansas City metro. The second quadrant is comprises the northeast corner the metropolitan area and includes Platte, Clay, and Ray counties, all in Missouri. The third quadrant comprises the southwest corner of the metropolitan area and includes Johnson County, Kansas and a few cities in Jackson County, Missouri that are on the southwest side of Main Street in Kansas City, Missouri. The fourth quadrant comprises the southeast corner of the metropolitan area and includes Kansas City, Missouri, the Core City in the metropolitan area. This quadrant includes all of Jackson County, Missouri east of Main Street in Kansas City Missouri and Cass County.

Data and Methods

In the following section we describe our analysis and present our findings. The descriptive results and variable descriptions for our dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 1. Correlation coefficients for all independent variables are presented in Table 2. Correlation coefficients provide a quick check for possible colinearity problems, though correlations are not a precise diagnostic.

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for the first and second decision to cooperate by type of official. Mayors and CAOs have the highest average response on the 1st decision, 5.667 and 5.429 respectively. The average response for council members is nearly a full point lower

than the mayoral average and is the lowest of all officials on the first decision at 4.879. It appears that the executive functions are the most willing to cooperate in regional functions and that the legislative positions are the least inclined to cooperate. This finding supports Frederickson's theory of administrative conjunction which argues that the power and focus of the legislative office is focused on internal jurisdictional boundaries and is therefore less likely to engage in interjurisdictional power sharing. This finding also supports viewing elected executive officials as more similar to appointed administrative executives than may have been previously considered.

For each group, the decision to cooperate decreased when respondents discovered in the second decision scenario that other regional residents would benefit from the regional cooperation even though the leadership in these jurisdictions was not expected to participate in the cooperative. Each category of respondents were less inclined to cooperate when they learned there would be slight benefits for residents in other jurisdictions than when they learned that these benefits to residents of other jurisdictions would be significant. Finally, as predicted, among our respondents elected members of city councils were least inclined to cooperate. Without statistical controls, however, these observations are only descriptive. So, we turn to regression models and the parameter estimates from these models.

Regression Model 1

The dependent variable for our first model is the respondents willingness to cooperate in the 1st decision. The variable is on an ordered scale from "1" (don't participate) to "7" (participate). As we do not assume respondents to consider the 1-7 scale as continuous, with equal distances between each ordered value, we have chosen to use an ordered logit regression model (Long, 1997).[i]

The maximum likelihood estimates from the ordered logit regression analysis are presented in table 4. The results support the Axelrod hypothesis, the Wood research results, and Agranoff and McGuire's findings to the effect that experience with interlocal collaboration increases the probability of cooperation on future projects. Collaboration begets cooperation. Increased frequency of interjurisdictional meetings between officials leads to an increased propensity to cooperate. Our second finding is the physical distance between the metropolitan center city and the official's jurisdiction decreases the willingness to cooperate in regional programs. Third, we found that officials in quadrant 1 were more likely to cooperate, compared to the center city quadrant. Quadrant 1 contains a consolidated city/county and this finding supports Axelrod and Wood's positions that past patterns of cooperation are likely to lead to future cooperation. Fourth, mayoral officials demonstrated a significantly higher willingness to cooperate than other officials. This finding suggests that mayors may not be as jurisdictionally focused as was previously thought.

The most probable response for a typical official who never meets with regional counterparts is "5" or a slight willingness to cooperate. Once officials begin to meet monthly, their most probably response increases to "6". These results support Axelrod's position that cooperation evolves from frequent interaction. Officials who spend little to no time meeting with their regional counterparts only have a .50 probability that they will be favorable toward cooperation (a score of 5, 6, or 7). Compare those findings with officials who report at least weekly meetings. Officials that meet at least weekly have a .90 probability to be favorable toward cooperation and .70 probability that they will be moderately to highly favorable. Interjurisdictional interaction begets cooperation.

Regression Model 2

After analyzing respondents first decision to cooperate, we then looked at how the second scenarios effected their decision to cooperate. In order to analyze how the second scenario changed official's willingness to cooperate, we generated a new variable of decision change by taking the difference between the 2nd and the 1st decisions. The range for decision change is -6 to +2. As the intervals between each unit in this variable are not assumed to be equal, we used an ordered logit regression model to estimate the parameters.

Table 4 summarizes the parameter estimates and fit statistics for our second model. The affect of the 2nd scenario on the decision to cooperate is significant. The second decision obliges an official to indicate their propensity to cooperate even when they know that the leadership in other jurisdictions will not cooperate—the free riders—and that their residents will benefit. In game theoretic terms, some of the other possible cooperators defected. In one scenario the benefits to free riders in jurisdictions in which officials defected would be great, in the other scenario, slight. In either case, in classic game theoretic terms, the appropriate response on the part of a player to defection on the part of one or more other players is to also defect, to avoid being a "sucker." Our findings indicate that our players generally defected in the face of benefits to others, but tended to be less inclined to defect if the benefits were significant for the residents of their jurisdictions and more inclined to defect when the benefits were slight. It appears, therefore, that Hometown officials are initially inclined to participate when the game is fair and continue to cooperate if the greater good or the public interest outweighs the fact that the leadership of some jurisdictions ride free while the residents of Hometown and 10 other cities do not.

The next finding in our second regression model is that mayoral, CAO/Assistant, and Department Directors are likely to respond more negatively to other jurisdictions free riding than

council members. In contrast to legislative officials, whose focus is more jurisdictionally based, executive and administrative officials are more likely to respond negatively to the unwillingness of the leadership in other jurisdictions to participate. This finding suggests that the expectation of reciprocal cooperation is a strong executive norm. Willingness to participate in cooperative agreements therefore is determined in part by perceptions that other jurisdictional leaders are not free riding at the expense of ones own jurisdiction.

The third finding is that officials in the central city quadrant are expected to respond more negatively to the free riding jurisdictions than any other metropolitan quadrant. Central cities often bare unequaled service delivery and coordination burdens in the metropolitan area. Central city officials may be more concerned about free riders than other quadrants because of an existing concern about free riding that is not prevalent in other jurisdictions. Thus, we should expect central city officials to resist cooperate when the cost/benefit ratios are more generous for other jurisdictions.

Our vulgar application of game theoretic experimental protocols was designed to evaluate the propensity of jurisdiction based officials to cooperate. Because information technology is indifferent to borders and sovereignty, it is an ideal policy arena for interjurisdictional cooperation. We learn that jurisdictions matter to officials and that jurisdictional self-interest can, under the right circumstances, lead to regional cooperation. Jurisdictional officials appear to "learn" to cooperate with and trust officials from other jurisdictions with whom they collaborate or cooperate. We also learn that asymmetries in cooperation tend to matter less if there are enough cooperators and if the overall benefits are significant.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Analysis

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Description
1st Decision	153	5.131	1.463	1	7	"1" Don't Participate "4" Undecided "7" Participate
2nd Decision	152	4.592	1.641	1	7	Same as Above
Decision Change	151	-.543	1.100	-6	2	Difference between 2nd and 1st Decisions
CAO / Assistant	154	0.273	-	0	1	"0" All other officials "1" CAO/Assistant
Mayor	154	0.058	-	0	1	"0" All other officials "1" Mayor
City Council Member	154	0.429	-	0	1	"0" All other officials "1" City Council Members
Dept. Director	143	0.240	-	0	1	"0" All other officials "1" Department Director
Age	152	50.408	11.618	25	77	Age in years
Education Level	153	2.431	.972	0	5	"0" High School Degree "1" Some College "2" Four-year college degree "3" Masters degree "4" J.D. or equivalent "5" Ph.D. or equivalent
Years in Current Position	150	6.01	5.730	0.5	35	# Years in Current Position
Gender	152	0.217	-	0	1	"0" Male "1" Female
Time Spent on Regional Programs/Issues	148	2.230	1.386	0	5	"0" = None "1" = Seldom (<4%) "2" = Occasional (5%-9%) "3" = Routinely (10%-25%) "4" = Often (>25%)
Frequency of Meeting with Regional Counterparts	147	2.429	1.365	0	6	"0" = Never "1" = Annual or Semi-annual "2" = Quarterly "3" = Monthly or Bimonthly "4" = Biweekly "5" = Weekly "6" = Multi-weekly
Portion of Regional Population in Jurisdiction (ln)	154	0.281	1.574	-3.65	3.79	ln (Jurisdiction Population / Total Regional Population)
North Kansas (Quadrant 1)	154	0.084	-	0	1	"0" All other quadrants "1" Quadrant 1
North Missouri (Quadrant 2)	154	0.214	-	0	1	"0" All other quadrants "1" Quadrant 2
South Kansas (Quadrant 3)	154	0.403	-	0	1	"0" All other quadrants "1" Quadrant 3
South Missouri (Quadrant 4)	154	0.299	-	0	1	"0" All other quadrants "1" Quadrant 4

Table 2: Correlations of Independent Variables

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Scenario	1.000								
2	CAO	0.006	1.000							
3	Mayor	-0.077	-0.149	1.000						
4	Councilmember	-0.033	-0.536	-0.213	1.000					
5	Department Director	0.074	-0.342	-0.136	-0.489	1.000				
6	Age	0.058	-0.380	0.144	0.258	0.019	1.000			
7	Yrs of Education	-0.050	0.240	-0.139	-0.059	-0.108	-0.128	1.000		
8	Yrs in Current Position	-0.049	-0.011	-0.057	0.021	0.018	0.133	0.136	1.000	
9	Gender	-0.102	0.048	-0.058	0.140	-0.182	-0.077	-0.043	-0.048	1.000
10	Time Working on Regional Issues	-0.067	0.023	0.226	-0.168	0.050	-0.041	0.065	0.069	-0.029
11	Time Meeting with Regional Counterparts	-0.064	0.173	0.078	-0.349	0.183	-0.144	0.144	0.062	-0.072
12	Quadrant 1	0.161	0.041	0.036	-0.010	-0.051	0.104	-0.080	0.023	-0.042
13	Quadrant 2	0.015	-0.017	0.020	-0.049	0.065	0.099	-0.071	-0.106	0.003
14	Quadrant 3	-0.178	0.015	-0.012	-0.021	0.015	-0.079	0.106	0.114	0.077
15	Quadrant 4	0.080	-0.025	-0.027	0.073	-0.044	-0.067	-0.001	-0.040	-0.059
16	Miles from City Center	-0.077	0.084	0.172	-0.111	-0.052	-0.128	-0.210	-0.036	-0.051
17	lnPerPopulation	0.161	0.036	-0.141	0.053	-0.023	0.088	0.257	0.016	-0.145

		10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
13	Time Working on Regional Issues	1.000							
14	Time Meeting with Regional Counterparts	0.502	1.000						
15	Quadrant 1	0.023	-0.004	1.000					
16	Quadrant 2	-0.126	-0.117	-0.159	1.000				
17	Quadrant 3	0.072	0.107	-0.246	-0.428	1.000			
18	Quadrant 4	0.023	-0.007	-0.199	-0.345	-0.534	1.000		
19	Miles from City Center	-0.129	-0.079	0.132	-0.185	-0.080	0.171	1.000	
20	lnPerPopulation	0.079	0.031	0.004	-0.227	-0.048	0.253	-0.373	1.000

Table 3: Summary Statistics of Decisions by Type of Official

Type of Official	1st Decision	2nd Decision	
		Significant Benefit to Other Residents	Slight Benefit to Other Residents
CAO	5.429 0.598 21	5.286 0.611 14	4.875 0.991 8
Assistant CAO	5.35 0.988 20	4.900 1.37 10	4.000 1.054 10
Mayor	5.667 1.803 9	6.000 0.632 6	1.500 0.707 2
Council Member	4.879 1.696 66	4.900 1.614 40	3.920 1.956 25
Police Chief	5.105 1.761 19	4.800 2.251 10	4.000 1.803 9
Public Works Director	5.100 1.287 10	5.00 0.816 4	4.167 1.722 6
Parks & Recreation Director	5.375 0.916 8	5.000 1.000 5	3.000 2.000 3
Data includes mean response, standard deviation, and sample size. Decisions are scored: “7” participate, “4” undecided, “1” don’t participate			

Table 4: Maximum Likelihood Ordered Logistics Results

Variables	1st Decision	Change in Decision
Scenario	-0.387 (0.336)	-2.055*** (0.393)
CAO/Assistant	-1.404* (0.771)	1.412 (0.869)
Council Member	-1.396* (0.730)	1.532* (0.832)
Department Director	-1.437* (0.763)	1.070 (0.857)
Age	-0.002 (0.015)	0.015 (0.017)
Education Level	-0.009 (0.184)	-0.267 (0.206)
Years in Current Position	-0.012 (0.030)	-0.032 (0.029)
Gender	0.024 (0.379)	-0.586 (0.430)
Time Spent on Regional Programs/Issues	0.077 (0.138)	0.150 (0.142)
Frequency of Meeting with Regional Counterparts	0.367** (0.144)	-0.103 (0.148)
Distance from Center City	-0.044** (0.020)	0.006 (0.021)
Percentage of Population (ln)	-0.047 (0.122)	0.012 (0.132)
Quadrant 1 (Northwest)	1.707*** (0.634)	1.224* (0.670)
Quadrant 2 (Northeast)	0.019 (0.517)	1.684*** (0.567)
Quadrant 3 (Southwest)	-0.493 (0.393)	0.805* (0.423)
N	144	143
Model χ^2	32.93***	47.93***
Log Likelihood	-208.398	-165.194
Percent Correctly Predicted (count R^2)	35.4%	55.2%
Cut Point 1	-4.544	-4.535
Cut Point 2	-4.182	-2.616
Cut Point 3	-3.689	-0.764
Cut Point 4	-2.856	0.615
Cut Point 5	-1.335	4.152
Cut Point 6	1.082	6.051
Standard Errors in parentheses. *p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01		

[i] Refer to Long's *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*, chapter 5, for a technical description of Maximum Likelihood Order Logit models. Long provides an excellent explanation for why logit, or probit, models are better than OLS models in estimating and interpreting the effect of predictor variables on ordinal dependent variables. These reasons include that logit and probit models will not allow for probability predictions below zero and above one, and they do not assume that the partial effect of a predictor variable will be linear.

References

Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2003. *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments.* Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press. 2003

Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books

Bell, Daniel, 1993. *Communitarianism and Its Critics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Burns, Nancy. 1994. *The Formation of American Local Government: Private Values in Public Institutions.* New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Downs, Anthony. 1994. *New Visions for Metropolitan America.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class.* New York: Basic Books.

Frederickson, H. George. 1999. "The Repositioning of American Public Administration," *PS, Political Science and Politics*. 32:701-711.

Frederickson, H. George. 2006. "Whatever Happened to Public Administration: Governance, Governance Everywhere," in Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., and Christopher Pollitt, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guéhenno, Jean-Marie. 1995. *The End of the Nation-State.* translated by Victoria Elliott. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Judd, Dennis R. 2004. *Special-Purpose Authorities, Policy Communities, and the New Municipal Politics.* prepared for delivery at Cities Futures: An International Conference on Globalism and Urban Change. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. *"Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance," American Political Science Review, Vol. 97 No 2, p.233-243.*

Koppell, Jonathan G.S. 2003. *The Politics of Quasi-Government: Hybrid Organizations and the Dynamics of Bureaucratic Control.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Long, J. Scott 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, David Y. 2002. *The Regional Governing of Metropolitan America*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group.

O'Riordan, Tim and Chris Church. 2001. *"Synthesis and Content,"* in Tim O'Riordan (ed), *Globalism, Localism and Identity: Fresh Perspectives on the Transition to Sustainablit.* London: Earthscan.

Philpott, Daniel. 2001. *Revolutions in Sovereignty.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenau, James N. 2003. *Distant Proximities*: *Dynamics Beyond Globalism.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sharp, Elaine B. 1995. "City Management in An Era of Blurred Boundaries," in *Ideal Practices in Council-Manager Government* (second edition) edited by H. George Frederickson. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association.

Stephens, G. Ross and Nelson Wikstrom. 2000. *Metropolitan Government and Governance: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Analysis, and the Future.* New New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Strange, Susan. 1995. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thurmaier, Kurt and Curtis Wood. 2002. "Inter-local Agreements as Overlapping Social Networks: Picket-Fence Regionalism in Metropolitan Kansas City." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 62, No. 5.

Wood, Curtis H. 2004. *Metropolitan Governance in Urban America: A Study of the Kansas City Region*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Kansas

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please Complete and Return in Enclosed Reply Envelope

Your Role:
As you complete this brief questionnaire, think of yourself as an experienced and well respected local government official in the fictional city of Hometown. Your position in Hometown is the same as the one you currently hold as a public official in the real world.

About Hometown, USA:

- Population: 20,000.
- Suburban city in a large metropolitan area, New Hamilton.
- Modest population growth of 2% over the past 10 years.
- Primary revenue sources: property and sales tax.
- General revenues have been sufficient to cover current expenditures and maintain a 1% general fund balance over the past 10 years.
- Unemployment rate has been consistently below the regional median.
- Maintains a full assortment of city services.

About New Hamilton:

- 80 cities and townships, 7 counties, and 2 states.
- Nearly 2 million people.
- Economy based on a mix of service and manufacturing industries.

The Situation:
A highly respected technology company, TechCo, is in the final stages of developing an innovative information system that promises to substantially improve municipal services in urban regions. TechCo wants to partner with cities in New Hamilton to finish the development of their information system.

You were assigned to lead an important task force to decide whether or not Hometown should agree to join in a partnership with TechCo and other cities in New Hamilton. You will report your decision to the governing body of Hometown, who will most likely follow your recommendation. After multiple presentations and discussions, you and your team are 100% convinced that TechCo's project is credible and will improve service delivery in your city.

Assessing the Partnership:
There is a high fixed cost associated with TechCo's project. The cities in New Hamilton decide that at least 10 cities must commit to the TechCo project or the project will not be undertaken. The fixed cost must be covered by the cities which agree to be partners. Therefore, as more cities participate, the cost to each individual city is lower.

You are confident there is enough support amongst New Hamilton cities that at least 8 cities will commit to participate and an additional 3-8 cities is possible. If Hometown participates and the necessary 10 participants don't commit, Hometown doesn't lose anything. However, you've calculated that 15 New Hamilton cities need to participate in order for Hometown to have a net gain in the project. Each additional city, in excess of 15, that participates will decrease Hometown's portion of the fixed costs and increase Hometown's net benefit. You also understand that if Hometown doesn't participate and the required 10 cities are reached, Hometown may eventually experience all the benefits, with no cost to Hometown.

Your Initial Decision:

Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 7, whether you are more or less inclined to participate. A score of '7' indicates you are sure to participate and a score of '1' indicates you are sure to not participate. Do not read any farther before making your decision.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Don't Participate			Undecided			Participate

STOP. Please don't read further until you have made your initial decision. Once your decision is made, turn over the page and do not go back to update your initial decision.

QUESTIONNAIRE (page 2)
Please Complete and Return in Enclosed Reply Envelope

Do not read further unless you have made your initial decision.

Further Consideration:

Please review the following additional information. The possible benefits and costs to Hometown remain the same as in the above description.

New Hamilton's regional council conducted a study of the Techno project and found that citizens in many New Hamilton cities will receive **significantly** (alternative model reads **slightly**) improved public services if the TechCo project is undertaken. You review the list of the cities whose citizens are most likely to benefit from the TechCo project and are convinced that the leadership of these cities will not participate in the project.

Updated Decision:

Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 7, whether you are more or less inclined to participate. A score of '7' indicates you are sure to participate and a score of '1' indicates you are sure to not participate.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Don't Participate			Undecided			Participate

General Information:

1. What is your title? _____

Elected Officials answer questions 2-4:
2. How many years have you been in your current position? ____
3. How often do you meet with elected officials outside of your jurisdiction to discuss regional programs/issues? ____
4. How much of your time as an elected official is spent working on regional programs/issues? ____

Appointed Administrative Officials, Managers, and Department Directs answer questions 5-9:
5. How many years have you been in your current position? ____
7. How many total years have you been in the local government management profession? ____
8. How often do you meet with your administrative official counterparts in other jurisdictions to discuss regional programs/issues? ____
9. How much of your time as an administrative official is spent working on regional programs/issues? ____

Personal Information:

10. What is your age? ____

11. What is your gender?
___ Male
___ Female

12. Into which racial/ethnic category would you place yourself?

___ African-American	___ Hispanic
___ Asian-American	___ Native American
___ Caucasian	___ Other

13. Please indicate the highest level of education you have completed?

___ High School degree	___ Masters degree
___ Some college	___ J.D. or equivalent
___ Four-year college degree	___ Ph.D. or equivalent