

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

Arganoff investigates the structure of collaboration networks while also providing advice to public managers about costs and benefits of collaborative efforts. This article is an empirical study of fourteen collaborative networks at regional and governmental levels, as well as discussions with more than 150 public officials and managers. He suggests that the network is an emerging policy action tool, and yet it is extremely difficult to label collaboratives; as self-organizing organizations, they are all different. Networks are "...vehicles for resource pooling, mutual exploration, and knowledge creation." Performance, joint learning, and knowledge expansion are a couple of the many goals of collaborative networks, which come as a result of working in a group rather than alone. While any collaborative project will eventually face conflicts and power struggles, they all tend to have a champion, a political core, a technical core, and staff working together towards a common goal. Agranoff fills the gap in the literature by taking a look inside the inner-workings of collaborative networks, specifically researching their organization and management.
2. Alter, Catherine and Jerald Hage. 1993. Organizations Working Together. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Alter and Hage expound upon previous literature to determine that collaborative efforts, as an emerging approach to accomplish goals, are more flexible, and therefore are able to reach more creative goals in a shorter time than any organization working alone. Through a review of related literature, the authors find that in a more and more globalized world and economy, working together may become the most competitive route for producing new goods and services. Rather than focusing solely on wealth and power, collaboratives also allow for the development of knowledge on a global scale.
3. Ansell, Chris and Alison Gash. 2007. "Collaborative Governance in theory and practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. Vol 18. pgs 543-571.

Ansell and Gash reviewed 137 examples of collaborative governance in various policy sectors to determine what organizational features lead to effective collaborations. Collaborative governance involves a partnership between public agencies and private stakeholders to form public policy through collective decision-making. Collaborative governance is a cyclical process that begins with problem setting before moving through direction setting to reach the goal of implementation of a public policy; time, trust, and interdependence are necessary for a successful collaboration. The authors also find that local resource issues are one of the foremost policy concerns dealt with through collaborative governance.
4. Bidwell, Ryan and Clare Ryan. 2006. "Collaborative Partnership Design: The Implications of Organizational Affiliation for Watershed Partnerships." *Society and Natural Resources* 19(9): 827-843.

This case study sought to determine the connection between the structure of a collaborative group strategy and its activities and outcomes. Bidwell and Ryan studied

twenty-nine collaborative watershed partnerships in the state of Oregon that were a part of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. Through personal interviews and content analysis, the authors examined the impact of design-relevant characteristics on partnerships' achievement of specific policy outcomes. The partnerships were varied in age, composition, and focus. Applying the typology suggested by Moore and Koontz (2003), which categorized partnerships by their composition into three types: "citizen-based, agency-based, and mixed", this study discovered that "mixed" partnerships (i.e. including community and government members) were more likely to develop an action plan and complete an assessment. In addition, they found that all three groups appeared to make decisions to act based on the availability of funding, and that all of the groups seemed focused on planning and implementing projects to improve the state of local watersheds. Bidwell and Ryan stressed the importance of diverse participation and financial resources in these groups; however, when agencies were involved in a group, the partnership tended to be more uniform in makeup, and less likely to develop an action plan. In addition, they found that "agency-affiliated" partnerships tended to adopt goals and missions, reinforcing institutional norms set by the parent agency providing the funding.

5. Bryson, John. M, Barbara Crosby, and Melissa Middleton Stokne. 2006. "The design and implementation of cross-sector collaboration: propositions from literature." *Public Administrative Review*. 66:44.

This article fills the literature gap of a basic understanding of the conditions and necessities for collaboration by examining the difficulties and challenges associated with the process and outcomes of cross-sector collaboration. Through a review of literature, the authors find that cross-sector collaboration takes shape when individual ventures to address a problem fail; therefore, both self-interest and interdependence lead to collaboration between multiple stakeholders. The design of a cross-sector collaboration must include accountability, leadership, trust, and mutual gain. This article provides propositions that would allow stakeholders to understand the design, composition, and implementation of cross-sector collaborations and the best way to have them succeed.

6. Conley, Alex and Ann Moote. 2003. "Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management." *Society and Natural Resources* 16:371-386.

This article explores the varying types of evaluation utilized when considering collaborative efforts for natural resource management. The authors state that evaluations are critical towards reaching environmental goals of various stakeholders; Conley and Moote describe what is evaluated in these studies, the criteria used, and whether or not it is possible to determine the success of a study. This article concludes that evaluation of collaboration efforts is key in determining whether or not collaborative governance really leads towards improved environmental conditions.

7. Crosby, Barbara C. and John M. Bryson. 2005. "A Leadership Framework for Cross-Sector Collaboration." *Public Managers Review*. 7(2): 177-201

In this article, Crosby and Bryson propose the Leadership for the Common Good Framework as an approach to collaborative leadership, backed up with the initial success of the case example of the African-American Men Project in Minnesota. The authors claim that collaborative efforts can succeed in cases where government alone cannot

solve complex policy problems. Their framework is comprehensive, allowing for multiple levels of action with both individual and collective efficacy, while focusing on mutual gain for all participants. Crosby and Bryson conclude that including a group of diverse stakeholders can aid in the process by bringing in both expert and practical knowledge in order to have a multi-faceted view of the policy problem.

8. Dietz, Thomas, Elinor Ostrom, and Paul Stern. 2003. "The Struggle to Govern the Commons." *Science*. 302: 1907-1912.

This article discusses the opportunities and struggles for addressing common pool resource issues, promoting on a mix of institutional types that allow programs to experiment with different actions, fostering learning and change. This allows adaptation and flexibility, rather than a top-down approach, which leaves local authorities with little means to address local environmental issues. These human-environmental interactions allow local leaders to work together to focus on sustaining resources. Social capital is also crucial, which requires communication, social networks, and trust between participants. Rather than government, a private company, or a community operating alone, partnerships allow participants to work together on promoting the sustainability of resources.

9. Dolsak, Nives and Julianna Mandler. 2011. "Collaborative Environmental Management for Solving Complex Marine Problems: An evaluation of Puget Sound Salmon Recovery." Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management.

This article looks to examine the performance of the collaborative effort involved in the Puget Sound salmon recovery project. Collaborative environmental governance works especially well for salmon recovery efforts because of the complexity of the issue combined with the inability of a single government agency to solve the problem. Indicators for success used in this study include membership selection, stakeholder performance, stakeholder accountability, and enforcement of outputs. Dolsak and Mandler's findings establish the importance of funding, number and availability of staff, external help, and the use of regulatory and incentive-based approaches.

10. Dukes, Frank. 1993. "Public Conflict Resolution: A Transformative Approach." *Negotiation Journal*. 45-57.

In his article, Dukes focuses on how conflict resolution in the public sphere can serve as a transformative process for organizations seeking change and social justice. Because of the inadequacies of our institutional arrangements, Dukes states that expenses, delays, dissatisfaction, and unproductivity can result. This "crisis of governance" expounds from individuals pursuing their own self-interest, and so Dukes suggests a transformative role in the field of public conflict resolution. The transformative approach involves updating the established institutional culture that has resulted from the disintegration of community, alienation from institutional arrangements, and the inability to adequately resolve conflict and solve public problems. Instead of viewing disputes as static clashes of interests, collaborations should be seen as social and dynamic organisms that can lead towards the creation of sustainable relationships. Dukes argues that we should focus on engaging the community, having a

more responsive governing regime, and creating the capacity for problem solving and conflict resolution.

11. Ferreyra, Cecilia and Phil Beard. 2007. "Participatory Evaluation of Collaborative and Integrated Water Management: Insights from the Field." *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 50(2): 271-296.

The authors of this article investigate the Maitland Watershed Partnerships in Ontario, Canada in order to present ten lessons learned from the multi-stakeholder collaboration groups. Filling the literature gap of sustaining collaborative initiatives, Ferreyra and Beard use structured interviews of partnership members to research process and outcome evaluation in this social learning experiment. They discover the importance of difference, diversity, and divergence among members and different groups, with holistic goals pursuing compromise and agreement. Some of the lessons learned include setting both long-term scientific and value-laden goals, developing collaborative advantage, building networks, strong communication, and acknowledging the difference between outputs and actual outcomes.

12. Gerlak, Andrea K. and Tanya Heikkila. 2007. "Collaboration and Institutional Endurance in U.S. Water Policy." *Political Science & Politics* 40(1):55-60.

In this article, Gerlak and Heikkila seek to shed light on an important gap in collaborative governance literature regarding what factors lead to the need for stakeholders to form an alliance to collaborate on water policy issues as well as their endurance after their formation. The authors use four expansive watershed collaborations as case studies to examine collaborative efforts in water policy. Gerlak and Heikkila stress the importance of trust, reciprocity, shared knowledge, leadership, and common goals for success. Positive past experiences with cooperation and previous scientific data about resources issues helps lead to collaboration. This concept of constant learning promotes endurance in watershed collaborations, as it creates a focus on adaptive management and governance. A sort of "open door policy" for information and scientific knowledge is also crucial as ecological issues are constantly changing.

13. Gilbert, Margaret. 2006. "Rationality in Collective Action." *Philosophy of Social Sciences* 3(1): 3-17.

Gilbert defines collective action as both "a combination of different individuals" and "acting together." Individual efforts must be melded together through discussion with other participants in order to act together. However, the problems associated with collective action are well articulated by the prisoner's dilemma, or the issue of self-interest. Gilbert says that these problems associated with coordination must be recognized and rules must be established to address these.

14. Gray, Barbara and Donna Wood. 1991. "Collaborative Alliances: Moving from Practice to Theory." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27(2): 3-22.

Gray and Wood define collaboration as "a process through which parties who can see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible." This means that collaborations form in order to deal with complex and turbulent problems, with

collaboration referring to the process and collaborative alliances as the forms to address these problems. Gray and Wood state that public-private partnerships have the capabilities to tackle pressing urban problems, such as environmental issues. The authors use nine case studies to investigate the theoretical perspectives on the interdependencies of the antecedents, processes, and outcomes of collaborations. Gray and Wood state that the preconditions of collaboration must be designed to produce change, maximize efficiency, reduce transaction costs, and the need for collective responses around the common issue. The important features of the collaboration process are a dynamic, longitudinal outlook, the organization and duration of the collaboration itself, and shared responsibility. The outcomes of collaborative approaches include solved problems, achieved shared norms, and the ultimate survival of the partnership. Gray and Wood conclude by stating that no one single perspective, either preconditions, process, or outcomes, can fully conceptualize collaboration precisely because of its broad nature.

15. Hardy, Scott D. and Tomas M. Koontz. 2008. "Reducing Nonpoint Source Pollution through Collaboration: Policies and Programs across the U.S. States." *Environmental Management*. Vol. 41, no. 3: 301-310.

Hardy and Koontz focus on the effectiveness of collaboration in their article, as collaborative partnerships between government, states, and citizens are becoming more and more prevalent forms of addressing nonpoint source pollution policy needs. The authors acknowledge that success in addressing nonpoint problems is connected to the availability of financial resources. The article examines the implementation of the Section 319 of the Clean Water Act amendments, utilizing email surveys and phone interviews of 104 people from organizations from all 50 states. The \$204 billion budget gives states flexibility in choosing how to allocate their funds, to either incremental projects to restore water health or more general base funds. Survey respondents called for more consistent funding, as well as increased availability of funds for storm water issues, and more structure and longer time frames for fund allocation. Much of this financial assistance, about 35 percent, goes towards supporting collaborative watershed groups, both financially and technically, as well as promoting training. The results of this study begin to illustrate the connection between government programs and the widespread growth of watershed partnerships, from 12 to 50 since 1990.

16. Hardy, Cynthia, Thomas B. Lawrence, and David Grant. 2005. "Discourse and Collaboration: The Roles of Conversation and Collective Identity." *Academy of Management Review* 30(1): 58-77.

This article builds upon previous literature in order to investigate the causal relationship between dialogue among collaborative participants and the success of these partnerships. The authors emphasize that tension is actually important towards strengthening partnerships because this allows for the balanced relationship of cooperative and assertive conversations among members. Finding a common construction is also crucial, where participants come to general agreement by discussing causes, solutions, and goals relating to the issue the collaboration is attempting to address. As participants both begin and continue to interact, this will allow for a collective identity to be formed, legitimizing the partnership.

17. Heikkila, Tanya and Andrea K. Gerlak. 2005. "The Formation of Large-scale Collaborative Resource Management Institutions: Clarifying the Roles of Stakeholders, Science, and Institutions." *Policy Studies Journal* 33(4): 583-612.

Heikkila and Gerlak focus their research on the emergence of large-scale watershed partnerships in the United States, a study broad in both geographic sense and institutional scope, using four groups as case studies. The key factors in the formation of these collaboratives are science, leadership, and experience. Science brings stakeholders together by triggering public attention on an issue and neutralizing value differences among participants. External forces are also crucial, including outside political leadership and financial support, as these factors contribute to a collaborative's formation as well as possibly its longevity and success.

18. Himmelman, Arthur T. 1996. "On the Theory and Practice of Transformational Collaboration: from Social Service to Social Justice" in Creating Collaborative Advantage edited by Chris Huxham, 19-34. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

This chapter argues that collaborative efforts should focus on challenging existing power relationships and reducing inequality, rather than solely social service initiatives and cost-effectiveness. Himmelman states that this is necessary in order for collaboratives to become more customary and prevalent in the future. These collaboratives must include shared responsibility, shared power, and a shared vision in order to lead to community-wide problem solving. A balance between administration and management must be sought, while allowing the community to participate in the collaborative process as well. Community members will feel compelled to participate in collaborative movements when the focus is on empowerment rather than betterment, with an opportunity to change beliefs and practices.

19. Imperial, Mark T. 2005. "Using Collaboration as a Governance Strategy: Lessons from Six Watershed Management Programs." *Administration and Society* 37(3): 281-320.

Imperial states that while collaboration is widely believed to have a positive impact on environmental conditions, it is not well understood, especially regarding exactly how it is better than individual stakeholder initiatives. In this article, the author investigates different types of collaborative activities, the different levels of activities, and the interrelatedness of activities. Imperial builds on previous research and compares six collaborative watershed initiatives to investigate the action sets of collaborative partnerships. Imperial concedes to the collaborative nature of partnerships, in determining that there is no "one size fits all" for designing collaborative governance strategies.

20. Imperial, Mark T. and Tomas Koontz. 2007. "Evolution of Collaborative Organizations for Watershed Governance." *Paper presented at 29th Annual Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM) Research Conference*. Washington, DC.

This article seeks to fill a hole in collaborative water governance literature regarding the evolution of collaborative partnerships, their structure, and their ability to endure over time. With insight into the structure of collaborative governance, it would be easier to understand the problems and decisions partnerships face and how to address these issues. As watersheds do not respect established geographic boundaries, they are the perfect policy area to study and establish collaborative partnerships, as multiple

stakeholders work together to improve ecological conditions. Instead of facing the traditional concerns of governmental hierarchy, collaborative partnerships focus more on consensus and cooperation in making collective decisions. Reliability, accountability, and cooperation are the foundations of watershed collaborative partnerships, and are essential towards the enduring nature of a successful collaboration. Non-centralized collaboration allows all participants to contribute to activities as well as an accelerated process to bring forth new ideas and actions. However, the authors claim that collaboration is not a solve-all for ecological issues; they admit that more research needs to be done to determine if collaboration results in positive outcomes.

21. Innes, Judith.E. and David E. Booher. 1999. "Consensus building and complex adaptive systems; A framework for evaluating collaborative planning." *Journal of American Planning Association*. 65(4): 412-423.

In this article, the authors look to link processes and outcomes in collaborative planning through empirical research and practice of case studies. The article claims that consensus building allows flexibility in policymaking, where decisions are based on stakeholder interests and offer mutual gain for all participants through its systematic nature and inclusiveness. The framework of consensus building requires communicative rationality, meaning it is grounded in dialogue and sharing knowledge. Not only do outcomes include tangible products, but intangible products as well, including social, intellectual, and political capital. The authors find that the pros of consensus building include new ways of influencing public action, as well as a source of learning for all participants. Finally, Innes and Booher state that the process and outcomes of consensus building are blurred, but a process that is inclusive, well informed, and aims for consensus is more likely to come up with a solution to the problem at hand.

22. Jones, Peter JS and Burgess Jacquelin. 2005. "Building partnership capacity for the collaborative management of marine protected areas in the UK: a preliminary analysis." *Journal of Environmental Management* 77(3): 227-243.

Jones and Burgess investigate collective action problems in the United Kingdom as a way to solve common pool resource problems. The authors utilize fifteen case studies involving inshore marine protected areas to determine which partnership models are the most successful. They determine that incentive structures and social capital allow partnerships to often have more success in solving common pool resource problems than those acting alone. The authors claim that this must involve a balance between top-down and bottom-up initiatives, with the state taking more of a facilitation role than controlling the entire process. The central government should not undermine local authority, but instead allocate and share power with local partnerships. Jones and Jacquelin conclude that social capital is crucial as its value increases the longer the partnership lasts, leading to more cooperation between stakeholders.

23. Koehler, Brandi, and Tomas M. Koontz. 2008. "Citizen Participation in Collaborative Watershed Partnerships." *Environmental Management* 41: 143-154.

This article investigated citizen participation in watershed collaborative partnerships, including the groups' demographics and representation of the general public and the actual participation rate of members. Their research process involved examining

and surveying members of twelve collaborative groups in Ohio. Many of the groups' characteristics correlated with the dominant-status model, meaning that there were positive relationships between membership and education, white ethnicity, higher income, older individuals, political activity, and rural locations. Also, less than sixty percent of members actively participated in the group. This article illustrated that belonging to a collaborative environmental group is different from being an active member; their conclusion also acknowledged the difficulty of getting the public involved in collaborative environmental efforts.

24. Koontz, Tomas M. 2005. "We finished the Plan, So Now What? Impacts of Collaborative Stakeholder Participation on Land Use Policy." *The Policy Studies Journal* 33(3): 459-481.

In this article, Koontz views the end result of policymaking as a product of the level of stakeholder participation at the local level. Focusing on land use policy, he examines fifteen land use partnerships in Ohio through the Institutional Analysis and Development framework on organizational structure to determine how policy decisions are made. Koontz conducted semi-structured interviews of county commissioners, county planners, and members of the farmland preservation task forces. The results show a connection between population density and policy outcomes, with rural areas focusing on increasing interest and awareness, but having low levels of near-term policy change. On the other hand, more suburban areas with higher population growth and loss of farmland had comprehensive land use plans and much higher levels of policy change, stemming directly from the task forces. The variables affecting these differing levels of near-term policy change were community, rules, and members' beliefs. This article illustrates that full citizen participation and the necessity for policy change can have an effect on policy outcomes.

25. Koontz, Tomas M. and Craig W. Thomas. 2006. "What Do We Know and Need to Know about the Environmental Outcomes of Collaborative Management?" *Public Administration Review* 66(6): 109-119.

Koontz and Thomas reviewed previous literature on the subject of environmental collaborative governance to provide a foundation of outcomes of these processes. The authors determined that beginning in the 1990s, collaborative management has grown to allow local environmental degradation to be addressed by multiple stakeholders, including public and private groups. Koontz and Thomas determined that future research must address whether or not collaborative governance actually improves environmental conditions, as well as whether collaborative efforts are more advantageous than noncollaborative work on environmental issues.

26. Koontz, Tomas M., Toddi A. Steelman, JoAnn Carmin, Katrina Smith Korfmacher, Cassandra Moseley, and Craig W. Thomas. 2004. *Collaborative Environmental Management: What Roles for Government?* Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

In this book on collaborative environmental management, the authors seek to describe and utilize six different cases of environmental collaboration, each with a different level of governmental involvement and different environmental focus. Governments can follow, encourage, or lead in collaboratives; the authors note that

governmental, top-down management has now progressed into partnerships between government, business, independent organizations, and individuals. The authors investigate outcomes in both environmental and social terms; while it is still relatively unknown whether or not ecological conditions are improved as a result of collaboration, the general thought is that its ability to focus on local and time-appropriate issues makes it more successful. There are also positive social outcomes stemming from collaborative efforts, as it promotes interaction between government and local actors, leading to improved networks and legitimacy in policy actions from these collaboratives.

27. Leach, William D. and Paul A. Sabatier. 2005. Are trust and social capital the keys to success? Watershed partnerships in California and Washington. In Sabatier, Paul A., Will Focht, Mark Lubell, Zev Trachtenberg, Arnold Vedlitz, and Marty Matlock (eds.), *Swimming Upstream: Collaborative Approaches to Watershed Management*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 233-258.

Leach and Pelkey undertake a review of empirical literature on watershed partnerships in order to present a series of “lessons learned” for researchers and practitioners. After reviewing two public policy theories and thirty-seven relevant studies, the authors came up with 210 lessons and twenty-eight thematic categories identifying watershed partnerships. Some of the most prominent themes were ample funding, efficient management, trust, and having participants committed to the partnership’s goals. In investigating what makes watershed partnerships work, Leach and Pelkey assert that power is shared in a collaboration and that the goal of partnerships is to find opportunities to address problems before the problems have been fully observed or articulated. Other factors that have a positive impact on a successful collaboration are time, flexibility, adequate resources, and a set of narrowed and defined goals. However, many stakeholders often disagreed on core values of the partnership, mainly the debate over environmental quality versus economic freedom.

28. Leach, William D., Neil W. Pelkey, and Paul A. Sabatier. 2002. “Stakeholder Partnerships as Collaborative Policymaking: Evaluation Criteria Applied to Watershed Management in California and Washington.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21(4): 645-670.

This study focuses on identifying what a stakeholder partnership is before using forty-four watershed partnerships in California and Washington as case studies to study the effectiveness of these partnerships. Leach, Pelkey, and Sabatier define a stakeholder partnership as a group with indefinite duration that focuses on a broadly defined issue area, including participants from multiple levels of government. The criteria used in the study include improved watershed conditions, social capital improvements, agreement among stakeholders, project implementation, project monitoring, and outreach projects. Participants overall were mostly motivated to join the partnership in order to improve the watershed, and tended to be supportive of collaboration in addressing these issues. The main point the authors make is that success in partnerships takes time, often four years or more, to achieve goals and implement projects. This article emphasizes the age of the partnership as a strong indicator of success; on average, the older the partnership in the study, the more likely it was to have perceived ecological improvement, social capital gains, and outputs.

29. Lubell, Mark, Mark Scheider, John Scholz, and Mihrye Mete. 2002. "Watershed Partnerships and the Emergence of Collective Action Institutions." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1): 48-63.

In this article, Lubell et al look to address the gap in literature of what factors lead to the creation of decentralized collaborative partnerships to solve water policy issues. The authors investigate the emergence of 958 watershed partnerships across the United States utilizing the number of partnerships and the number of their activities as variables. Water partnerships are often the most cost-effective solution to ecological problems, especially for non-point pollution sources, which federal policies have not been successful at addressing. However, Lubell et al mention the importance of maturity, commitment, and especially funding as being crucial towards the success of collaborative partnerships. The authors conclude that common interests are not enough for successful collaboration, and that effective outcomes are crucial towards the continuation of environmental partnerships.

30. Mandarano, Lynn A. 2008. Evaluating Collaborative Environmental Planning Outputs and Outcomes. Restoring and Protecting Habitat and the New York-New Jersey Harbor Estuary Program." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 27: 456-468.

This article investigates the difference between outputs and outcomes in collaborative environmental partnerships to provide a foundation linking process, quality outputs, and social and environmental outcomes. This was done through a case study of the Habitat Workgroup of the New York-New Jersey Harbor Estuary Program to determine the impact of collaborative environmental management on environmental conditions. Mandarano emphasizes the differences between outputs and outcomes; outputs are the plans and projects undertaken by collaboratives, while the outcomes are the actual effects of these outputs on social and environmental conditions. Some of the most important outcomes identified were both social and environmental in nature, including new relationships, trust, consensus building, innovation, the number of acres restored, and the amount of money invested. Seventy-five percent of interviewees acknowledged that the habitat program helped them perceive necessary changes that could not have happened without the partnership.

31. Margerum, Richard D. 2008. "A Typology of Collaboration Efforts in Environmental Management." *Environmental Management* 41:487-500.

In this article, Margerum categorizes different collaboratives based on how they attack environmental problems. Margerum applied a typology to thirty-six collaboratives in his study from the United States and Australia through a series of interviews, observation, document analysis, and surveys. The collaboratives were categorized based on the level at which they focused activities: operational, organizational, and policy. The typology revealed functional differences in the types of participants involved, management arrangements for implementation, and differing approaches to implementing change. Margerum states that different goals require different types of collaboratives. In highlighting these differences, this study offers insights to participants, government, evaluators, and researchers to understand collaboratives and improve their functioning.

32. McGuire, Michael. 2006. "Collaborative Public Management: Assessing what we know and How we know it." *Public Administrative Review* 66:33.

In his article, McGuire seeks to aggregate previous research on collaborative public management, focusing on what we have learned from a governmental perspective. McGuire describes various types of collaborative practices across governmental and non-profit spheres, both temporary and permanent. McGuire defines a collaborative partnership as beginning with activation, or a commitment to collaborate, and then framing, mobilization, and synthesizing. Collaborative partnerships are a blend of hierarchal and collaborative governance, for strong leadership is still crucial for collaborative environmental governance. However, collaborations should be permeable and interdependent among its members, where power is dispersed. McGuire states that "...collaboration is the new form of governance," (39) and yet collaboration should be a means to an end, not a goal itself. Collaboration is increasingly becoming a way to deal with complex issues that government has not been allowed to solve alone.

33. Moore, Elizabeth A. and Tomas M. Koontz. 2003. "A Typology of Collaborative Watershed Groups: Citizen-based, Agency-based, and Mixed Partnerships." *Society and Natural Resources*. Vol. 16, no. 5: 451-460.

Moore and Koontz look to theorize on identifying and describing the impact of the different typologies of collaborative watershed partnerships, including government-directed, citizen-directed, and a hybrid of the two. The authors did this by compiling results from a survey of sixty-four watershed partnerships and focus-group interviews from six of these groups. It is stressed that different kinds of partnerships accomplish different sets of goals; for instance, mixed partnerships were more likely to have a structured management plan while citizen-based groups focused on lobbying and policy change, but are also less collaborative. Also, mixed and citizen groups focused much more on public awareness of environmental issues than governmental groups.

34. Payan, J., Svensson, G. 2007. "Cooperation coordination, and specific assets in interorganizational relationships." *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(7/8): 797-812.

Payan and Svensson use cooperation, coordination, and specific assets as their variables in this study to analyze the relationships between trust, commitment, and satisfaction. The authors state that organizations working together rather than competing allows for a greater chance of success in their goals. They conduct their research through a random sample of 600 managers and owners as the main decision-makers involved in collaborative processes. Their results begin to hint at positive relationships between cooperation and coordination with trust and satisfaction, while specific assets have a strong negative association with trust and satisfaction. So while this suggests that specific assets can be a threat to collaborative efforts, it does have a positive relationship with commitment. Therefore, the authors conclude that while coordination does not necessarily lead to cooperation, they are explicitly linked with trust and satisfaction when collaborating.

35. Raymond, Leigh. 2006. "Cooperation without Trust: Overcoming Collective Action Barriers to Endangered Species Protection." *The Policy Studies Journal* 34(1): 37-57.

Raymond investigates and refutes the importance of trust when building collaborative efforts. While many other researchers have emphasized the necessity of

social capital for collective action, Raymond actually states that trust is overrated. He tests this theory through two case studies involving habitat conservation plans. Raymond's argues attempting to build trust does not inhibit collaboration, but it does waste time and turns the group's exertions into merely symbolic, and not productive, objectives. According to the author, it is possible to have commitment from participants with a lack of trust and no real sense of teamwork. This is a due to the fact that many collaboratives do not often meet face-to-face, and instead rely on outside political leadership to move the process along. Rather than trust, the most important factors in collaborative efforts are financial incentives and institutional mechanisms.

36. Sabatier, Paul A., Chris Weible, and Jared Ficker. 2005. "Eras of Water Management in the United States: Implications for Collaborative Watershed Approaches." In Sabatier, Paul A., Will Focht, Mark Lubell, Zev Trachtenberg, Arnold Vedlitz, and Marty Matlock (eds.), *Swimming Upstream: Collaborative Approaches to Watershed Management*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 233-258.

The research design of Sabatier's book was to bring together a group of authors to interpret STAR findings funded by the EPA to determine the importance of participation in watershed management. Some of the questions this book sets out to answer are how collaborative partnerships form, which actors should be involved in collaborative efforts, and whether or not collaborative watershed partnerships actually improve ecological wellbeing. This book provides a history of watershed management and collaboration before covering short-term and long-term collaborative projects across the country with a focus on process, outcomes, and the endurance of watershed collaboration projects. Sabatier et al provide guidelines for how and when to structure an environmental collaborative project, which help the practitioner to think about the benefits of collaborative governance. Sabatier's research hints at a positive relationship between collaboration and improved ecological conditions, but this is still inconclusive.

37. Teisman, Geert R. and Erik-Hans Klijn. 2002. "Partnership Arrangements: Governmental Rhetoric or Governance Scheme?" *Public Administration Review*. 62(2):197-204.

Teisman and Klijn seek to study the ambiguity that is a function of partnerships. The authors analyze this theory through the case study of the expansion of the Rotterdam harbor and conclude that the present policy making realm does not truly allow for joint decisions because it is founded on decisions coming from individual organizations. The increased complexity of policymaking comes from both the increased number of parties involved as well as different perceptions of the problem and solutions. The authors conclude that while collaborative governance could be the answer to an increasingly networked society, government structure still does not allow for true public-private partnership decision-making, but more of a contracting-out scheme. Partnerships are still difficult to form and succeed due to this contradiction.

38. Thomas, Craig W. and Tomas M. Koontz. 2011. "Research Designs for Evaluating the Impact of Community-Based Management on Natural Resource Conservation." *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 3(2): 97-111.

This article looks to shed light on different design practices for community-based environmental management by looking at the benefits and trade-offs associated with

different design practices. This article states that community-based partnerships produce better policy because those that participate in these groups are invested in their local community's interests. The authors create a logic model linking inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes as a result of community-based natural resource management. Thomas and Koontz argue partnerships should combine quasi-experiments, which identify the causal links between outputs and outcomes, with case studies to understand interactions among variables in community-based natural resource management. The authors conclude by calling for further research on the results of collaborative governance practices in natural resource management.

39. Thomson, Anne Marie and James L. Perry. 2006. "Collaboration processes: inside the black box." *Public Administrative Review*. Vol. 66. pg 20.

In this article, Thomson and Perry look to address the literature gap on the interactive process of collaboration. Collaborative partnerships are not static; instead, collaboration is cyclical, with partnerships evolving over time as concern grows and they continue to interact and work together towards participative decision-making. While reciprocity and trust are necessary for collective action, various self-interests must also be aggregated into a mutual understanding for collective choices and decisions. The authors conclude that one of the biggest criticisms of collaboration is that the outcome may not be the best possible solution, but a shared vision that all can agree on.

40. Thomson, Ann Marie, James L. Perry, and Theodore K. Miller. 2007. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Collaboration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(1): 23-56.

The authors of this article sought to describe and measure collaborative efforts through a review of related literature and a mail questionnaire sent to 1,382 directors of AmeriCorps organizations. This article provides a solid foundation for collaboration research, describing collaboration as a route towards reaching goals in complex policy areas through collective action. They state that collaboration is a multidimensional discipline, and the authors stress that collaboration cannot be static, as there are many ways to form and functionalize a collaboration; it requires the elements of governance, administration, mutuality, norms, and organizational autonomy. Participants of collaborative efforts must make joint decisions and avoid the autonomy-accountability dilemma stemming from self-interest. Thomson et al claim that collaboration requires reciprocity, trust, and interdependence. While time of existence has a positive effect on the success of collaboration, the size of the collaboration does not.

41. Wood, Donna and Barbara Gray. 1991. "Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27(2): 139-162.

In this article, Wood and Gray seek to define collaboration and investigate how collaborations are formed, the role of the convener, environmental complexity implications, and the relationships between self-interest and collective interest. The authors imply that collaborative efforts allow more flexibility, as working together leads to greater and more widespread possibilities than individual organizations acting alone. Pulling from an assortment of possible collaborative definitions, Wood and Gray come up with the broad definition that "...collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous

stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain.” Establishing this definition allows researchers and practitioners to both recognize and distinguish collaborations from other occurrences. Collaboration almost always requires a trustworthy and credible convener, but retains its informal authority in practice. The goal of collaborative efforts is to reduce environmental complexity, uncertainty, and turbulence. Shared rules for governance through bilateral relationships and joint governance must be established in the new social norm of collaboration. Wood and Gray conclude that while collaboration requires input from a variety of different stakeholders and opinions, stakeholders must have a shared purpose in collaborative environmental efforts.