

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindsor

---

Major Papers

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

---

January 2023

### Factors Influencing Cross-Border Cooperation in North America

Mary Fiagbe

fiagbem@uwindsor.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Fiagbe, Mary, "Factors Influencing Cross-Border Cooperation in North America" (2023). *Major Papers*. 235.  
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers/235>

This Internship Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in Major Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact [scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca).

# **Factors Influencing Cross-Border Cooperation in North America**

By

**Mary Fiagbe**

An Internship Paper  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
through the Department of Political Science  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Arts  
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2022

© 2022 Mary Fiagbe

**Factors Influencing Cross-Border Cooperation in North America**

By

**Mary Fiagbe**

APPROVED BY:

---

S. Brooks  
Department of Political Science

---

J. Sutcliffe, Advisor  
Department of Political Science

December 19, 2022

## **DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY**

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

## **ABSTRACT**

Cross border cooperation (CBC) and integration can contribute to the socio-economic development of states since they allow for international collaboration through the removal of some of the restrictions or barriers that arise from the existence of national borders. Recent academic studies on borders explain that borders have become principal zones of state transformation central to the social and economic growth and development of states and their local and regional communities. It is therefore necessary to understand and examine the factors that contribute to and shape cross-border relations and interactions. These factors can either support or negatively influence cross- border activities and cooperation levels. This, consequentially, impacts the socio-economic growth and development of cross-border regions and their respective states.

This paper examines five factors that shape and influence CBC in North America: border types, political institutions, educational institutions, border security, and social capital and inclusion. The paper studies the importance of these five factors to cross-border relations and how they influence the cooperation of North American cross-border regions. By analyzing and comparing the presence and similarities of these factors, the paper highlights the degree to which they impact the creation and functioning of cross-border interactions in two Canada-United States border regions. This will not only aid in showing how important the five forces are in shaping cooperation between border regions but will also explain why certain cross-border regions experience higher CBC levels compared to others.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY</b> .....	iii
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	iv
<b>CHAPTER 1</b> .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Review of Literature .....	2
Research Hypothesis .....	19
Methodology .....	20
<b>CHAPTER 2</b> .....	21
The United States - Canada Border Regions.....	21
The Cascadian Border Region .....	26
Ontario-Michigan Border Region .....	36
<b>CHAPTER 3</b> .....	46
Comparison of both Case Studies .....	46
Conclusion .....	50
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	56
<b>VITA AUCTORIS</b> .....	80

## CHAPTER 1

### **Introduction**

Cross-border relations are important components of economic growth and development and as such continue to receive considerable political and academic attention. The aim of this paper is to study cross-border cooperation (CBC) by focusing on the factors that influence how cross-border relations are developed and their impact on the promotion of CBC. To properly analyze these factors, it is necessary to first understand the importance of border zones or regions since they form one of the most important routes through which cross-border relations and resultantly CBC are formed and promoted. This is because border regions act as important drivers for the creation of socio-economic, institutional, political, and cultural collaboration and partnerships (Pipkin, 2018) since they usually serve as the starting point at which neighbouring states develop cross-border interactions with one another (Slusarciuc, 2015). Not only do border regions contribute to the facilitation of the movement of people, and goods and services but they also impact the formation of strategies and policies tied to cross-border interactions (Border Policy Research Institute, 2019). This makes border regions significant components to be examined when it comes to the determining what factors influence CBC and the extent to which these factors are present and shape cross-border relations and interactions.

Most border region studies or research on the development of CBC and cross-border regions tend to focus on inter-state economic competitiveness or cooperation and its effects on the participating states. They principally also focus on Europe as their study area due to the continent's regionalization process in the shape of the European Union (E.U.) system. This paper, however, focuses on not just the economic forces that influence and lead to CBC, but also analyzes the

social, institutional, political, and cultural elements that affect CBC and how similarities and differences in these factors impact cross-border relations. It also focuses on the US-Canada border. The central questions to be addressed in this paper are: what factors shape cross-border cooperation? And to what degree are these factors necessary for the development and functioning of cross-border relations and interactions?

The paper examines five factors that affect cross-border cooperation – types of borders, political institutions, educational institutions, border security (foreign related policies), and social capital and social inclusion levels – in case studies of two Canada-United States cross-border regions. While these two states are socially and economically similar and are economically interdependent, there are however still significant differences in their cross-border integration levels owing to factors such as the structure of their political institutions, security concerns, civic participation, and social inclusion levels.

The paper will first examine the factors that affect cross-border relations through a review of literature sources on cross-border cooperation. It will then examine the presence of the factors in both of these border regions and the level of impact the factors have on the creation of cross-border interactions and CBC in the two cases.

### **Review of Literature**

According to Palmowski and Federico (2019), the development of socio-economic and political ties between states or regions of different countries is tied to the emergence of cross-border regions. This is because, despite being usually peripherally located, border regions act as important contributing areas to the functioning of the state and its development due to their role in shaping cross-border relations and interactions (Brunet-Jailly & Dupeyron, 2007; Sohn, 2014;



Medeiros, 2021; Opilowska & Sus, 2021). This is due to the functional duality of borders in their ability to act as both territorial barriers and areas of connectivity and is largely dependent on the kind of relations that neighbouring countries have with one another (Husak, 2010; Korneevets et al., 2019). In addition, it is through these border regions that states can establish relationships and promote partnerships and cooperative activities or programs. While the formation of cross-border regions is facilitated by socio-economic and political factors, it is crucial to also highlight the necessity of these factors in ensuring the development and growth of cross-border cooperation.

Sousa (2013) explained that the degree of CBC of border regions varies from one area to another depending on various factors or conditions, such as the economic, political, cultural, historical, and geographic structure of states and their border regions. Cross-border cooperation is affected by the following factors: types of borders; political institutions; educational institutions; border security (foreign related policies); and social capital and social inclusion levels (Tripl, 2010; Wong Villanueva et al., 2020). These five factors are examined below.

### ***Types of Borders***

The identification of the type of border is an important factor that influences how cross-border relations can be developed. This is because, without knowing the type of border that exists between states, it will be difficult to determine if the enhancement of CBC is possible. This is because where there are tensions between neighbouring states, whether cultural, political, or economic, cooperation is difficult because states cannot effectively work with one another in the presence of unresolved issues. In their analysis of the cross-border movement of people between Russia and Poland, Zaitseva et al. (2016) make note of four types of border regions based on Oscar Martinez's (1994) approach to border analysis, which spans from the classification of border

regions in terms of integration levels and cross-border relations development, namely: alienated, co-existing, interdependent, and integrated border regions. As per Martinez's (1994) approach to studying cross-border interactions, Zaitseva et al. (2016) examine how border regions are formed based on their cross-border contact owing to environmental and human-related conditions that either curb or promote the development of cross-border ties. By examining these four types of border regions, the study helps determine how existing border types and their levels of interaction and integration impact cross-border relations and cooperation levels. This highlights the role and the level of influence that border types have on cross-border relations and the effective functioning of CBC.

In the alienated border regions, Zaitseva et al. (2016) note the absence of cross-border ties due to politically, ideologically, ethnically, religiously, and military-motivated conflicts in the region. The next two, co-existing and interdependent border regions, have varying degrees of cooperation. The former is more economically and culturally centred than the latter, which seeks full cooperation, even socially, without limiting it to just the borderlands (Zaitseva et al., 2016). Integrated border areas have the highest cross-border integration levels, encompassing all aspects of cooperation. This ranges from the social to environmental spheres and is coupled with the free movement of people, trade in goods and services, knowledge and innovation flows, and high institutional capacity (Zaitseva et al., 2016). Europe's Schengen agreement is an example of such an integrated border relationship where 26 member states allow for the free movement of people without any border controls (Basboga, 2020). According to Basboga, by deepening regional integration, the cross-border labour markets of European states have become highly integrated. Trade and investment and the spillover of knowledge and innovation have also been promoted, thus boosting cross-border regional growth.

Cross-border regions can also be classified in terms of the levels of cross-border integration by considering the forms which cross-border relations can take (Lundquist & Tripl, 2013). These levels consist of three stages of integration systems: the weakly integrated, semi-integrated, and strongly integrated cross-border regional systems (Lundquist & Tripl, 2013). In the weakly integrated regions, there are low levels of economic relations owing to several factors, such as low knowledge flows and exchanges between borders, high levels of institutional and functional distances (uneven distribution or levels of innovation, knowledge, and performance capabilities), low community acceptance of integration processes, low or uneven state-level support and contribution to CBC initiatives and structures, as well as lacking political or administrative cross-border capabilities (Lundquist & Tripl, 2013: 455). The U.S.-Mexico border region is an example of a weakly integrated regional system (Brunet-Jailly, 2006; Medeiros, 2021). Semi-integrated regions, such as the Cascade Gateway, which is the region between Seattle in the United States and Vancouver in Canada (Brunet-Jailly, 2008), however, experience growing relations and interactions that help in their cross-border relations but are still lacking when compared to strongly integrated cross-border regions with significantly high levels of cross-border relations due to their symmetric innovation-oriented systems of integration (Lundquist & Tripl, 2013).

Sohn's (2014) examination of positional and differential benefit rationales, which are tied to cross-border integration and the role of the border as a resource for the development of a cross-border metropolis or urban space, also elucidates how border regions are beneficial to CBC levels. The positional benefit rationale involves how the presence of cross-border regions factors into reductions in transportation costs and the establishment of cross-border transport infrastructures for the movement of both people and goods between sovereign territories, not forgetting privileged access to foreign markets, products, or foreign investments (Sohn, 2014; Cappellano & Makkonen,

2020). The differential benefit, which has a more classical modernization approach as explained by Sohn (2014), also impacts CBC. This stems from the ability of states to harness the comparative advantages exclusive to border regions to foster development through a range of socio-economic interactions and economic competition between states (Sohn, 2014). By taking advantage of the mobilisation of resources, specialization, and the analysis of differential costs, interregional production networks are created through cross-border economic interactions to aid economic growth. One instance of this is the application of the international division of labour, where border regions can develop and employ labour resources that will increase their competitive edge (Sohn, 2014). More importantly, by countries adopting economic interactions for their competitive and comparative advantages, some border regions evolve into agents for CBC, thus becoming both functionally and institutionally integrated.

The close proximity of border regions does not necessarily mean high cross-border interaction between states since influencing factors could have negative or positive consequences (Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020). An essential element that can be explored to understand such a situation is where states have high proximity but are alienated from or hostile to one another. In these cases, cross-border interaction is difficult to attain (Zaitseva et al., 2016). Internal state perceptions, political ideologies, economic status, corporate economic interests, and public opinion also play a significant role in determining the extent to which border security is tightened (Mayer, 2011; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). The long-term consequences of the September 11th, 2001, terrorist attacks, in which the United States not only tightened their security and immigration policies but also became more wary of Canada due to the latter's laxer immigration laws, are a clear example of how border defence and security can be altered due to national security concerns

(Mayer, 2011; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). This creates more institutional and relationship asymmetries between neighbouring states and, as a result, affects CBC levels.

### ***Political Institutions***

The issue of governance and local or regional policies or strategies highlights the need to examine institutionalism and its impact on CBC. This refers to the government, public institutions, or organizations, as well as non-governmental organisations and private-public partnerships that support CBC and development (Nelles, 2013; Zumbusch & Scherer, 2015). This is because not only are cross-border institutions established to promote CBC, but their expansion and development are usually the result of CBC activities. This makes political institutions valuable to the development of cross-border relations and the maintenance of CBC.

According to Kurowska-Pysz and Szczepanska-Woszczyna (2017), inter-organizational cooperation is embedded in borderland regions and relies on the 'interaction of people and institutions; cross-border planning; procedures and support mechanisms; and the current environment—that is, historical affinity; geographical proximity of border regions; and support systems at the local and regional levels—for sustainable cross-border cooperation in border regions (p.1)'. By focusing on the European borderlands of Polish-Czech and Polish-Lithuanian as study areas, the authors stress the importance of institutions. They note that even non-governmental organizations such as foundations, chambers of commerce, and other institutions through the utilization of culture, sports, education, tourism, and other forms of cooperation help establish mutual interests and relationships between border regions and their residents (Kurowska-Pysz & Szczepanska-Woszczyna, 2017).

Despite focusing on the business environment in examining factors for cross-border cooperation, Cankar et al.'s (2014) study still provides some noteworthy points in researching the development of cross-border regions. They examine how forms of cross-border cooperation differ not just because of the political or formal actors involved but also due to the type of cooperation and institutional frameworks present (Cankar et al., 2014; Zumbusch & Scherer, 2015). These different levels of cooperation can result in either short-term or long-term forms of cooperation across various fields. Cankar et al. (2014) explain how state institutional arrangements and the modus operandi of regional actors affect the functioning of cross-border relations. The study also highlights the political, economic, and social factors that impact such cooperation. Dividing them into internal and external factors, the authors explain how these factors either enhance or become barriers to CBC. These factors include international political relations; provincial, regional, or local administrative structures; language skills; local and cross-border partnerships or innovation; and intellectual ability (Cankar et al., 2014).

Nelles (2011) employs a similar approach in her analysis of cross-border inter-municipal relations in the Detroit-Windsor borders of the United States (U.S) and Canada. Nelles (2011) notes the contextual variable of institutional conditions and its effect on institutional integration in shaping governance capacity and cross-border relations (Nelles, 2013). She explains that the relationship between different government tiers, both internally in one state and externally across state borders, influences CBC. This means that in regions where internal relations between the tiers of government in a state there is a positive impact on cross-border partnerships and institutional integration, with a vice versa consequence for conflict-prone regions (Nelles, 2011). This is because where the relationship between the central government and the other tiers of government in a state is not problem-ridden and tense, there is more allowance for cooperation

and the development of policies or strategies to allow lower levels of government to gain more autonomy when it concerns cross-border activities. A similar explanation can also be used to analyze the influence of central government relationships on CBC. The unfriendly relations between Russia and Ukraine versus those between Russia and China is a perfect example of the analysis of CBC between neighbouring border regions and how inter-governmental relations could impact cross-border relations (Korneevets et al., 2019).

Functional autonomy, where local governments are supported and have some autonomy in their legislative and administrative institutions, also aids cross-border cooperation. By introducing legislative and administrative institutions in analyzing CBC levels between the US and Canada, Nelles (2011) considers political factors and the importance of cross-border region similarities in influencing CBC levels. Both regions have different legislative practises in their local governments, with municipalities on the US side having more latitude for engagement in regional cooperation. Nelles (2011) also explains that the similarity in their legislative and political environments—tied to their democratic framework—helps prevent significant hindrances to cross-border cooperation.

The presence of institutions is an indispensable guide to the development of cross-border relations since they act as barriers or enablers for the emergence and maintenance of cross-border interactions (Miörner et al., 2018; Hataley & Leuprecht, 2018). In their discussion on the pre-conditions needed for the flow of knowledge in cross-border regions, Miörner et al. (2018) associate institutions as structural frameworks that guide how organizations and individuals behave or contribute to socio-economic development. They are divided into formal and informal rules, regulations, and legally enforced organizations, and are morally and socio-culturally

governed or recognized. Despite having their own institutional dynamics, these two forms are simultaneously interrelated in their coordination since they influence the behaviour of involved actors and tend to affect one another (Zumbusch & Scherer, 2015). Hence, they play a crucial role in influencing the development and growth of CBC (Tripl, 2010; Miörner et al., 2018).

### ***Educational Institutions and Economic ties***

Educational factors are necessary for the development of cross-border relations and the promotion of CBC. Cross-border education helps to build human and institutional capacity (Kang & Jiang, 2020) and acts as a guide that allows neighbouring countries to partner with and learn from one another. This assists in establishing highly functional and innovative educational systems to contribute to promoting CBC and interactions.

Kurowska-Pysz and Szczepanska-Woszczyzna (2017) take a knowledge-based approach in examining the reasons behind low levels of interest in the strategic planning of development in border zones. They do this by tying these reasons to cross-border partner and stakeholder actions, decrease in demand and skills for such planning, and the lack of awareness of the importance of CBC to development. This helps show that education is a factor necessary for improving cross-border ties and interactions. Through the presence of educational institutions and their role in cross-border interaction, economic openness is promoted, and ties between neighbouring states are enhanced thus allowing for socio-economic, geopolitical, and academic benefits that aid in boosting CBC (OECD, 2007). Graf (2021) also explains the need for increased attention to the development of education and training in cross-border regions because of the integral role they play in production processes and institutional and development planning systems in such areas. Furthermore, not only should border communities or regions promote their educational



institutions, but they should concern themselves with those of neighbouring countries, notably in how their institutional features improve their CBC levels (Graf, 2021). This is not just for amending their existing educational structures through knowledge creation and diffusion (Kang & Jiang, 2020) but also for the creation of cross-border partnership programs or collaboration to improve overall state and regional development.

As explained by a 2007 OECD report on cross-border tertiary education in Europe, the idea of promoting and supporting academic recognition as a mode of encouraging the free mobility of students and workers to contribute to the Single Market has allowed for more CBC. This has been carried out by utilizing intra – European programs and partnerships that benefit students from member countries through the implementation of higher education subsidies by host countries (OECD, 2007). Such strategic educational alliances aid in establishing institutional linkages across border regions and can take a variety of forms, such as student mobility, joint curriculum or research development and initiatives, and seminars (OECD & World Bank, 2007).

In 2007, in collaboration with the World Bank, the OECD published a report on cross-border tertiary education, analyzing its role in capacity building and maintenance for state development (OECD & World Bank, 2007). This kind of capacity building occurs through the training and education of individuals to produce highly skilled and knowledgeable human capital for development (Chetro-Szivas, 2010; Oyèkólá, 2021). The quality of such education is also of essence since low-quality education – owing to the form, size, associated costs, existing regulations, or other regional or national barriers – could harm capacity development.

Mexico is an excellent example of a state where the need for higher quality education and modernization through the development of skilled workers and trained professionals has resulted

in state support for partnerships and programs supporting the internationalization of education (OECD, 2007). This helps explain why educational institutions should be considered one of the factors that affect the functioning of CBC. Aside from knowledge development and transfer functions, another important function of formal and informal education to cross-border relations is that they aid in reducing barriers to CBC through the shaping of public opinion and institutional capacity (Cankar et al., 2014).

Educational institutions can promote community engagement to foster cross-border relations and development. This, as highlighted by Jacob et al. (2015), occurs in two forms; using the resources of educational institutions to address pressing matters of social and civic natures and secondly by facilitating the interaction of academic and civic groups or associations. Darroch (2015), in his analysis of the cultural scene of the Windsor-Detroit area, highlights how universities are important locations for the accumulation of social capital since they generate forms of learning and practises that surpass their intended functions. These groups and institutions can discuss and tackle pressing issues as they arise while also allowing for further collaboration or partnership between the academic field and communities on the local, regional, or state levels. This makes educational institutions critical to the development of cross-border relations (Lane et al., 2015).

It is necessary to note, however, that cross-border education is also highly dependent on the political nature of involved states as well as government efforts in the modernization and internationalization of educational institutions within state borders (Lane et al., 2015). Depending on how involved regional or state-level political actors and institutions are, the promotion of cross-border education may differ in neighbouring states and their border regions. An important example of this is how differences in Canadian and U.S. foreign policies surrounding higher education and immigration may affect the admission of international students into formal educational institutions.

With varying immigration requirements attributed mainly to their fragmented political structure or system, Canada's international student policies appear to be laxer and better student-oriented than the U.S., which has a more rigid immigration system (Capellano & Makkonen, 2020). The level of cooperation that can be derived from educational partnerships by means of cross-border interaction is therefore affected.

### ***Social Capital and Inclusion***

Social capital can be referred to as a set of values or framework used to describe social interactions and relationships by way of local, regional, state, and international associations or networks that influence how individuals behave and social trust is generated to promote collective action for the effective functioning of society (Kaldaru & Parts, 2008; Osth et al., 2018). The values shared by individuals and the social rules governing their attitudes and interactions also form part of society's social capital. These civic norms, values, or networks give way to collective action and allow border regions to be able to form close-knit groups and associations that contribute to the development of border communities and promote cross-border relations and interactions. It is also relevant to note that social inclusion is also dependent on social capital levels since they promote social cohesion (solidarity) among societal groups. Social inclusion can therefore be considered as the process through which civic and political participation is encouraged by building a sense of belonging and identity in spite of inherent individual differences. This means that societies with higher levels of social capital are better equipped to handle social inclusion problems and have better institutional cooperation and integration (United Nations, 2016).

Pipkin's (2018) social approach to cross-border economic development focuses on social capital as its primary variable. By challenging the role of the community through collective

capacity (without invalidating it) – that is, the ability to collectively regulate individual and group behaviour – in establishing cross-border relations, Pipkin (2018) examines how traditional economic and social capital approaches are not always enough in analyzing CBC levels. Pipkin (2018) uses an ethnographic and interview research method to study the economic divergence between the cross-border regions of South Texas and Mexico – McAllen and Reynosa. Despite the fact that the regions implemented similar economic development projects through the maquiladora industry (Patrick, 2007; Lee et al., 2013), there were significant differences in their economic success (Pipkin, 2018). Pipkin’s study reveals the ineffectiveness of relying on just economic development strategies—mainly based on production systems—when it comes to the development of cross-border relations and interaction (Hataley & Leuprecht, 2018).

Kurowska-Pysz and Szczepanska-Woszczyna (2017) also note how development planning strategies and policies can only go so far in developing CBC. This is because, though they are helpful, they fail to yield long-term benefits in the absence of other vital components necessary for maintaining cross-border relations. This includes components based on institutional arrangements and those tied to the presence of similar interests and conditions. According to the quantitative research findings of a Polish-Czech border-zone study analysing how shareholders in border regions view cross-border development planning strategies and projects, only a 40 to 44 percent range of interest was shown on both sides of the border in undertaking explicitly strategic joint planning for border region development (Kurowska-Pysz & Szczepanska-Woszczyna, 2017: 11). This was relatively low compared to a higher percentage of interest in other institutionalized forms of cross-border cooperation tied to more community involvement in both border regions (Kurowska-Pysz & Szczepanska-Woszczyna, 2017: 10–11).

In their analysis of factors that promote development, Kaldaru and Parts (2008) also examine the importance of social capital, which can also be applied to the development of cross-border relations. Although the authors are mainly concerned with economic-related development, their examination of social capital contributes to how trust and civic norms and networks are necessary for the effective functioning of cross-border relations and interactions (Osth et al., 2018). Kaldaru and Parts (2008) focus on how both formal and informal institutional relations between individuals and groups enable and facilitate cooperation and collective action in areas tied to human capital, income redistribution and equality, and the improvement of institutional capacity—all of which are important to CBC since they aid in the establishment of cross-border interactions (United Nations, 2016). This, in effect, determines the level of cooperation that is possible in cross-border regions and, as a result, how effectively cross-border relations will be developed. Where there is no trust between cross-border communities, CBC is difficult to maintain.

Without the presence of social capital, the establishment of trust, community identity, even political cultures and identities, and mutually beneficial cooperation, which serve as meaningful components of border area relations, is difficult (Kaldaru & Parts, 2008; Dillahunt, 2014; United Nations, 2016). This is because social capital, whether formal or informal, influences how individuals behave and become mutually understanding and tolerant of one another and thus contributes to improving the institutional capacity of their administrative and legal systems (as well as encouraging decision-making transparency and credibility) (Kaldaru & Parts, 2008; Osth et al., 2018). The level of social capital in these regions thus affects trust levels and influences mobility rates, social and economic inclusivity, as well as civic and political participation levels.

Social capital can hence be tied to social inclusion, which according to Drolet (2014) is focused on the "full and equal participation of all citizens in society and the economy, including access to public services and facilities for their well-being" (Drolet, 2014:31). Largely facilitated through the institution of social protection systems or measures by states, particularly in developed countries, social inclusion can be said to emanate from the ability of states to cultivate social capital (Osth et al., 2018). This is because, without elements of social capital such as trust, mutual understanding and solidarity, and civic and political participation, it is difficult for states to be able to generate social protection programmes and ensure the active participation of members of society (Drolet, 2014; Huang & Cai, 2021; United Nations, 2016) in programmes or strategic partnerships developed for CBC.

The analysis carried out here helps to show why social capital is relevant to cross-border cooperation. First and foremost, to generate trust in state policies or strategies for CBC, members of the community need to have confidence in their local governments and its programmes to allow for more civic and political participation and the establishment of civic networks that could improve cross-border interaction and activities. The lack of trust in government systems and domestic policies could therefore prevent the establishment of cross-border institutions and the enhancement of governmental institutional capacity. In addition to this, dissimilarities in the level of trust accorded to the political administrations by communities on both sides of the border could negatively impact cross- border relations and make cooperation difficult to maintain. For cooperation to be possible and worthwhile, partners on both sides of the border should be interested in CBC. It is, therefore, important to understand that the interests and ideas of cross-border regions also need to be considered when it concerns cross-border interactions. According to Lange (2018), the imposition of CBC initiatives in border regions does not necessarily ensure the acceptance and

contribution of border communities unless they believe such projects will benefit them. As such, for effective cooperation to occur, cross-border regions need to have mutual interests and common elements and conditions (Cankar et al., 2014).

### *Security*

Border security is another important factor that contributes to how CBC is promoted. This is because the level of security measures put in place can affect how cross-border relations are formed since highly restrictive measures could slow down CBC activities or even negatively impact the development of cross-border interactions in certain cross-border regions. On the other hand, where security measures that are enforced by states are on par with one another, it encourages cross-border relations since it improves cross-border trust in security measures employed by involved states. As explained by Ramos, "security and trade are linked. Therefore, increases in security will facilitate trade if involved states have confidence in the security measures employed by both sides" (Ramos, 2007: 265-266). Security can range from policies, systems, or infrastructures put in place to prevent terrorism and protect its citizens from any harmful foreign activities or policies that may pose a threat to the state's national security. The emphasis here, however, is on the checks that have been put in place in the form of policies, strategies, and procedures that prevent the unlawful and illegal entry of persons, goods, or services that pose a high risk to citizens' and the state's safety (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). These include immigration policies, border control measures, and foreign-related policies or strategies that have been put in place to eliminate security and immigration concerns. Examples of such checks are border control procedures that have been established to prevent the illegal entry of migrants and drug and weapons trafficking into Canada and the United States.

Hataley and Leuprecht's (2018) study on the determinants of cross-border cooperation is another piece of literature that can be looked at when examining border regions. Here, the authors note how border security elements affect CBC and the development levels of border regions. They also explore how security barriers and controls have socio-economic and political costs to local communities in border regions, thus affecting development processes for the regions involved. Michael Patrick's article on the economic cost of border security explains how border security tension and cross-border trade in North America are most profound in the U.S. southern border region with Mexico (Patrick, 2007, p.197-230). By conducting a study on the U.S. VISIT program to aid in increasing border security between Mexico and the US, he found that there was a high degree of reluctance by Texas-based communities in implementing the program (Patrick, 2007, p.197-230). The reason for this was the fears of the economic challenges it may cause for the local communities (Brunet-Jailly, 2007). This included concerns about delays in the movement of people, and goods and services, leading to significant declines in revenue and employment rates.

Brunet-Jailly (2007) also notes that the success of CBC depends on the proper planning and institution of border security measures and the participation of the local border communities. While border security measures are necessary for the protection of states and have become highly evident in today's pandemic-prone world, there is still a huge level of interest in examining border de-securitizing through community engagement. The purpose of this is to help ease and increase CBC for regional and state development (Hataley & Leuprecht, 2018).

In Europe, the Schengen Agreement (Anderson, 2012) – by means of intelligence sharing, state cooperation, and institutional and policy coordination – allows states to work together to tackle regional security concerns. This provides more leeway for the use of resources to promote CBC among member states (Brunet-Jailly & Dupeyron, 2007; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). The



implementation of such policy harmonization between Canada and the US, which Anderson (2012) refers to as *the perimeter approach*, would not only eliminate security and immigration concerns but could also improve trade and socio-economic integration among involved states. However, it will be difficult to execute across all three North American countries, as they still have intra-state considerations that prevent complete harmonization of their institutional structures, political identities and culture, security concerns.

To better understand the impact of the structure and operation of border security measures and policies on states, it is necessary to look at the level of influence border communities have on border policies and how such policies also affect such cross-border areas (Brunet-Jailly & Dupeyron, 2007; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). This is because local and regional administrations, as well as non-state actors and regional stakeholders such as civic groups, corporate actors, and the public also factor in when it comes to decision-making on the border security policies and their implementation (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). This is not to say that the central government, especially in the case of North America, has no binding authority on how foreign security policies are instituted. It, however, explains that state decisions are significantly shaped by public opinion and underlying political cultures and ideologies that are dominant in the concerned states, especially in the borderland regions (Brunet-Jailly, 2007).

### **Research Hypothesis**

The paper compares the presence of the factors discussed above in cross-border regions to examine how similarities and differences in the five factors shape CBC levels. The hypotheses are that the higher the uniformity of the five factors examined above in cross-border regions, the higher the development of cross-border interactions, and higher levels of such cross-border interactions

encourage more cross-border cooperation and integration. This also means that significant differences of the factors in each region have the potential to negatively impact cross-border relations and interactions. These hypotheses will be tested through the comparative analysis of two cross-border regions of Canada and the United States, namely, the Cascadia Corridor border region of Vancouver and Seattle (between the province of British Columbia and Washington State) and the Windsor-Detroit border region (Ontario and Michigan). The analysis of these two border regions is based on the fact that both states have close diplomatic ties (bilateralism) to each other that span not just economic relations but also political and socio-cultural relations. Since both countries have a strong cooperative relationship with each other, they form a significant area of study since they will aid in determining if and how the presence and uniformity of the five factors does shape and impact how CBC is developed and functions.

### **Methodology**

Research conducted on cross-border regions typically uses case studies to describe and examine CBC and the relevance of institutions to the economic development of border zones. The paper follows suit and employs a mixed method approach using both qualitative and quantitative research to provide a ‘most-similar’ comparative analysis of CBC between the selected cross-border regions. The paper will use a comparative analysis (Gupta, 2012; Blackman et al., 2013) of two North American countries – Canada and the United States – based on their similar land mass size, strong bilateralism, and their geographical proximity to one another. This mixed method approach will involve content and discourse analysis of studies, literature, and reports and briefs written by or on behalf of international organizations on the topic (Blackman et al., 2013). This will be done to examine the role of the above-mentioned factors in the selected cases and their impact on the development of cross-border relations.

While the research could be used as a pilot study for further research into the topic, based on proximity, bilateralism, and cross-border integration as its premise for comparison, generalization issues may occur when the paper is applied to other cross-border regions that do not experience similar bilateral and proximity ties.

## CHAPTER 2

### **The United States - Canada Border Regions**

While it is true that the political systems of Canada and the United States are similar in that they have federal governments, their styles of governance are different (Nelles, 2011; Zeemering, 2012; Thomas & Biette, 2014). The functioning and administrative structure of their political institutions and policy-making procedures take varying forms depending on the existing political climate as well as public opinion in each border region and the overall state (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018).

The United States has a presidential style of government, while Canada employs a parliamentary constitutional monarchy system with strong party discipline and a non-partisan bureaucracy, which makes its policy-making procedures and features significantly different from the former (Forsey, 2005; Bakvis & Skogstad, 2012; Thomas & Biette, 2014; Abu-Laban et al., 2019). Simeon and Radin (2010) explain that Canada's political system at the federal level is marked with little independence due to the need to toe party lines. Members of parliament are not able to meaningfully advocate for the interests of local, municipal, or provincial administrations at the federal level of government. The U.S. political system, on the other hand, is characterized by the existence of a system of checks and balances coupled with the institutional veto power of

the president (Abu-Laban et al., 2009; Thomas & Biette, 2014). This impacts how legislation is enacted or amended (Forsey, 2005), thus affecting governmental decision-making and their institutional and administrative structures.

When it comes to the administrative divisions of both countries, differences in their provincial or state divisions also has an impact on the way power is delegated both regionally and municipally. For the United States, its large number of decentralized states (50), makes the federal government more inclined to develop closer ties to regional and even municipal governments due to the amount of economic and political contributions they make not just locally but also at the federal level, not forgetting their increasing involvement in foreign-related affairs (Simeon & Radin, 2010; Nelles, 2011; Klaus, 2021). Another notable factor pertains to the level of trust that the public tends to have for local and state governments compared to the federal level. According to a recent governance poll by Gallup, about 67 percent of Americans continue to have a higher level of confidence in their local government compared to the federal government. The same survey found 47, 43, and 38 percent of respondents expressing trust in the judicial, executive, and legislative branches respectively (Jones, 2022).

The U.S. federal government is being encouraged by local and state political actors to institutionalize stronger political ties not only with U.S. states but also with local governments, which could potentially influence their administrative institutions and functions (Pipa & Bouchet, 2021). This, coupled with a higher delegation of power to local governments by U.S. states, makes them significantly different from Canadian provinces, within which municipalities are still more tightly controlled by their provincial governments in terms of the way they operate (Dewing et al, 2006; Thomas & Biette, 2014). However, Canadian provinces compared to U.S. states are

considered to be more decentralized with a higher resistance to federal level intervention, hence making them more financially autonomous compared to U.S. states (Simeon & Radin, 2010; Bakvis & Skogstad, 2012; Thomas & Biette, 2014). As a result, Canadian provinces are considered to have significantly higher provincial expenditures than states in the United States (Thomas & Biette, 2014).

Regardless of these differences, both countries have multi-level political systems, making coordination, cooperation, and the process of policy planning, development, and implementation complicated and time-consuming (Simeon & Radin, 2010). This is one of the factors that affects institutional capacity for the development of cross-border cooperation strategies and plans. Hence the need to examine the institutional and administrative capacity of municipalities and regional governments (provinces and states) when it comes to cross-border interactions for the functioning of CBC.

While there is a significant history of friendly relations between Canada and the U.S, both states still impose security measures along their border (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018; Greaves, 2020). Particularly pertaining to the United States, which after the 9/11 disaster became an extreme advocate of border security and national security, the security of their border regions continues to be one of their most enforced foreign policies, regardless of their economic interdependence with Canada (Greaves, 2020). Not only is the execution of border security measures costly for both the United States and Canada, but the imposed border measures also tend to put a strain on the movement of people and goods across US-Canada border regions, thereby impacting CBC (Anderson, n.d). This ranges from border traffic and delays, slow visa application processes,

security regulation compliance, psychological stress for occasional travellers, and other issues that negatively impact cross-border movement and cooperation.

The United States continues to remain sceptical of Canada's border security measures. At the same time, the latter continues to be concerned about ways to reduce the thickening of the U.S.-Canada border by recommending border security alternatives such as the 2001 *Smart Border Accord* and the *Beyond the Border Action Plan* introduced in 2011 (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). The aim of these initiatives and programmes is to support U.S. national security concerns and prevent breakdowns in their cross-border economic cooperation (Ramos, 2007). These security concerns tend to shift focus from intergovernmental state cooperation and institutional integration that yield better CBC and integration, to strategies concerned with improving the physical security of state borders. These security strategies, as noted by Ramos (2007), are nevertheless difficult to implement due to the differences in their political and administrative institutions and the level of importance attached to national security.

As mentioned by Sutcliffe and Anderson (2018), immigration is another relevant aspect of security that affects how border security is evaluated, especially since it deals with the movement of people, which consequently has social and economic effects on the state (Anderson, 2012). Aside from the United States' stringent immigration requirements, the time spent on employment applications and obtaining travel documents (such as the NAFTA TN visas, which could take about four to six months) to be able to gain eligibility to work in the U.S. is another impeding factor that affects workforce mobility and, consequently, cross-border cooperation and integration (Renaud et al., 2017; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018).

The U.S. is said to have more stringent immigration and security policies (Trautman et al., 2019) that considerably impact the free movement of labour, capital, and goods (Anderson, n.d.). A wide array of restrictive regulations and procedures are also enforced, thereby affecting the migration of people into the state (Anderson, n.d.; Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018). Canada, however, possesses a more business-friendly immigration system, which, according to Trautman et al. (2019), allows U.S. companies to get better access to Canadian resources. The U.S. political climate, which is formally shaped at the federal level and influenced by public opinion, is also considered a major deterrent to increasing cross-border integration and collaboration.

Not only do the United States and Canada share a long international border with about 120 ports of entry, but the bilateral relationship between both states is also considered to be one of the closest and most extensive, thus encouraging their interdependency, especially when it concerns trade (U.S. State Department, 2022). Both states share one of the largest trading relationships with over a trillion dollars' worth of trade in goods and services between both countries in 2021 alone (Statistics Canada, 2022). According to the U.S. State Department (2022), there is more than 2 billion dollars' worth of trade in goods and services each day between both states. Trade in goods and services is not only tied to the export of manufactured goods or commercial services, but also involves trade in sectors connected to oil, energy, electricity, and even nuclear power. This level of relationship between both states not only aids in boosting trade exports between both states but also contributes to increases in the employment levels of both countries through the creation of more job opportunities. This explains the level of importance that the trade relationship between Canada and the United States has on the promotion of the economic interdependency of both countries and the need to further promote cross-border activities and cooperation (Government of Canada, 2022).

## The Cascadian Border Region

The Cascadian region forms the Pacific Northwest border of the United States and Canada and consists of three Canadian provinces and territory, namely: British Columbia, Alberta, and Yukon, as well as five U.S. states: Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana (Bates-Eamer et al., 2021 & Phillips, 2004). Focus in this paper will be placed on the Cascade Gateway, which is the border region between Seattle (Washington) and Vancouver (British Columbia) (Cappellano et al., 2020). Population wise, the Cascadian region is home to over 9 million people, with the number continuing to increase every year because of the region's economic successes in technological and infrastructural growth and the creation of new job opportunities (Cascadia Innovation Corridor, 2020).

Vancouver is considered as the largest city and one of the most populous cities of the 23 local authorities (of the Metro Vancouver district) in the British Columbia province with a land mass of 44 square miles (City of Vancouver, 2022 & Metro Vancouver, 2022). While the city population was estimated to be about 662,248 in 2021, the Greater Vancouver area (Metro Vancouver) population which stretches from Maple Ridge to Bowen Island was estimated to be about 2.6 million in 2021 (Statistics Canada, 2022 & Metro Vancouver, 2022). Seattle on the other hand, is regarded as a *first-class city* (a Charter city with a population of more than 10,000 at the time of organization or reorganization) in the state of Washington with a population of about 737,015 and a metropolitan population size of more than 4 million (The Municipal Research and Services Centre, 2022 & City of Seattle, 2022). The city has the largest population of cities in King County in Washington State, with a land mass of 83.83 square miles (United States Census Bureau, 2022).



When compared to the United States which features both *home rule* and *Dillon's law* models of local government, Canadian municipalities (which usually feature the *Dillon's law* model), according to Sancton (2011), are governed under the *Municipal Acts* which grants local governments local jurisdiction over a wide range of subjects that involve organizing, operating, and providing needed services to their communities. In terms of the models, while the *home rule* allows individual states to delegate powers to cities to pass statutes freely so long as they are not in conflict with those of the state in question and the federal government, *Dillon's law* model, on the other hand, restricts local government powers to those areas or jurisdictions that are explicitly given to them by the state. While this is also the case in Vancouver Young, 2013), institutional there are differences in terms of the level of powers allocated to the city by the province, compared to other municipalities in the region (Government of British Columbia, 2022).

The 1953 Charter of the City of Vancouver (serves as the city's own legislation) grants the local government more powers than enjoyed by other municipalities in British Columbia (Smith et al., 2010). While the Charter sets out the city's jurisdictional powers and its governing structure that align with those of other municipalities, it also provides the local government with autonomy in matters relating to civic structures such as public works, planning, and business taxation as well as procedures and operations related to formal decision-making and civic distribution of power (The Charter of the City of Vancouver, 2022). This autonomy is presently not enjoyed by other municipalities in the province.

The City of Vancouver has a mayor-council political framework which consists of a mayor, and 10 councillors, who make up the legislative council and are elected for 4-year terms. The mayor is the Chief Executive Officer of the executive branch and the Chair of the City Council who is responsible for not only providing leadership through by-law recommendation and

resolutions, but also overseeing council meetings, their conduct, as well as establishing and appointment committee members among other duties. (Government of British Columbia, 2022 & City of Vancouver, 2022). The Council, on the other hand, is required to consider the well-being and interests of the municipality and its community and is responsible for the development and evaluation of municipal policies and programs and local government collective decision-making (Government of British Columbia, 2022 & City of Vancouver, 2022). In effect, both the mayor and the council are responsible for providing local services to the municipality and its residents. In terms of how they are selected, both the mayor and the council are elected at-large for four-year terms. Other municipal governance offices that promote accountability and oversight over the Office of the Mayor, the City Council, and City administrators are the Auditor General and the Integrity Commissioner (City of Vancouver, 2022).

The City of Seattle has a similar mayor-council local government framework, which consists of a mayor and 9 council members with 4-year terms – with each member chairing one standing committee, which forms part of the city’s administration (City of Seattle, 2022). The City Attorney, unlike the Attorney General in Vancouver, is also elected for a 4-year term. The municipality also has a Charter which was adopted via general election in 1946. The mayor is considered the head of the executive department and the president of the City Council (city’s primary legislative body) and is responsible for overseeing the city’s daily operations and carrying out the municipal policies formulated, amended, and adopted by the council. Unlike Vancouver where all members of the council are elected at-large, Seattle’s City Council members are elected through a mixed system of district and at-large representation, with the first 7 positions elected by districts and the last two positions 8 and 9 being elected from the city at-large (The Charter of the City of Seattle, 2022). Aside from the mayor’s power to nominate and appoint departmental

directors, the City Council also has the power to appoint, suspend, or remove from office appointive officers, such as the City Auditor, upon the affirmative vote of majority of the City Council. Compared to the Vancouver Charter that does not stipulate the mode of removal of the mayor from office, the Charter of the City of Seattle does detail the removal of the mayor through an affirmative vote of two-thirds majority of all members of the council for any willful violation of duty or offense of a moral turpitude (The Charter of the City of Seattle, 2022).

The region's predominant economic features are widely based in its technology, manufacturing, health services, maritime, trade, and transportation and logistics industries. Talent development also forms a basis for the human development and industrial growth in the region. In the Seattle Metropolitan area for instance, about 13.7 percent of the workforce were employed in the technology industry (which had an economic impact of about 133 billion US dollars) in 2021 (City of Seattle, 2022). Seattle has also been identified as a tier 1 city for technology talent. This has, resultantly, led to increasing attention being paid to education and training, which has resulted in more cross-border education projects and collaborations especially in the technology field. In addition, the health services industry, which involves the provision of medical services, research and development, and education and training in the region also serves as another important industry to Seattle's economy. The industry not only employs more than 90,000 medical workers, but also contributes to more than 4 billion dollars in annual wages (City of Seattle, 2022).

The City of Vancouver, which is regarded as a *global gateway*, is also seen as a major technology and innovation hub, and commercial and trade centre with a strong service-related and infrastructural economy (City of Vancouver, 2022). Some of the other top sectors in the city and its metropolitan area includes its finance and insurance, natural resources, green economy sectors.

The city's economy is also deeply tied to its life sciences sector which is involved in biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, medical devices and products, and bioenergy and employs over 11,000 professionals and generates more than 800 million per year in revenue to the British Columbia province (Vancouver Economic Commission, 2022).

The form of cross-border cooperation in the region is highly reliant on the technology and innovation, health and trade industries present in both the Seattle and Vancouver regions (Policy Research Initiative, 2006 & Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). The Cascadian region, over the years, has seen a steady growth in its technology, and health and life sciences (especially in biotechnology) industries with over 400,000 cross-border professionals. The region, to improve its position as a key gateway to global trade and talent development, is also largely involved with transportation and infrastructural arrangements to ease the flow of people (particularly human capital and tourists) and goods and services in the region (Border Policy Research Institute, 2019). The region also has a robust trading relationship, with exports between both British Columbia and Washington being higher than exports to other Canadian provinces or U.S. states (Peacock, 2018). The state of Washington is also considered to be the most trade-dependent state in the United States, with approximately 40 percent of all jobs in the state being tied to trade (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). In 2017, for instance, British Columbia's merchandise exports to Washington amounted to about 30 percent of all U.S. bound exports – totalling about 6.5 billion dollars, which is twice more than what the province exports to California, a U.S. state with a population that is about five times larger than that of Washington (7.4 million) (Peacock 2018). This level of commitment to economic and civic welfare development, influenced by the region's key sectors, has played a significant role in shaping cross-border cooperation in the region.

Cross-border cooperation in the Cascade Gateway is affected by the advantages that the B.C. economy and its immigration policies have in motivating U.S. companies to move their operations or activities to Canada. Compared to the United States, which has a higher cost of living and more rigid immigration rules, Canada, and in this case, British Columbia, has much lower wages (due to the competitive rate of the U.S. currency) in its technology sector as well as less stringent immigration policies that incentivize U.S. companies to set up operations, employ technology professionals, or encourage the immigration of workers north of the border (Moscatto et al., 2020). This catalyst for the movement of people, capital, and services to expand the technology and innovation industries (which includes companies such as Amazon and Microsoft) has aided in the improvement of cross-border ties between British Columbia and Washington. These cross-border relations have also expanded to include the role of higher education institutions in fostering stronger cooperation within the cross-border region. This form of cooperation has not only occurred due to its economical advantages by means of talent development, but also due to similarities in the structure of the educational systems of both countries, where education is provincially/state regulated with limited federal influences (U.S. Department of State, 2021 & Wallin et al., 2021). This means that most education-related decisions or policies and funding are made on the provincial/state and local government levels.

Aside from research partnerships between universities or academic scholars to contribute to developing and enhancing their technology sectors, educational institutions also allow for the sharing of knowledge by building a bridge between both border areas by employing similar curricula and facilitating academic and research scholarships in fields such as information technology, software development, and health care (Moscatto et al., 2020). Examples of universities that participate in such programmes include the University of British Columbia, the

University of Washington, the University of Victoria, Simon Fraser University, and Western Washington University. This not only encourages student mobility, cross-border education, and the fostering and recruitment of highly skilled people, but also contributes to the establishment of new companies and more technological innovation to enhance economic growth. In addition, such partnerships also impact civic participation and the establishment of cross-border institutions or organizations across the border.

Another form that CBC takes in the region is through infrastructural development projects and strategies, consisting of the promotion of cross-border transportation services and networks and the establishment of transportation infrastructure such as high-speed rail systems (Cappellano et al., 2020). The aim of such an undertaking is to aid in maximizing the region's competitive advantage and its position as a technology and innovation hub (Cappellano et al., 2019). Such infrastructural improvements will not only reduce travel times but also encourage cross-border integration and provide new opportunities for regional economic growth through job creation and more cross-border partnerships and entrepreneurship. The ongoing transportation projects are also largely sponsored and led by private stakeholders, such as the Business Council of British Columbia and Challenge Seattle, with public partnerships usually at the provincial/state and federal levels (Cappellano et al., 2020).

The provincial/state governments of British Columbia and Washington along with the local governments of the metropolitan areas of Vancouver and Seattle, in efforts to improve cross-border relations and cooperation, have put in place cross-border organizations or institutions that are largely influenced by the private sector. The recent cross-border initiative, the Cascadia Innovation Corridor (CIC), was signed in 2016 by the province of British Columbia and Washington State to

promote economic integration and technological innovation in both regions (Inslee, 2018; Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020; Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). This is to be carried out through cross-border cooperation between their local and regional governments as well as business corporations and educational institutions, such as the Universities of British Columbia and Washington (Trautman et al. 2019). Even with this, cross-border relations are still specifically economically oriented with the goal of expanding the economic interdependence of both cross-border regions (Trautman et al., 2019; Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020). A specific example of this is the fact that CIC has to date been continuously supported by two influential business organizations, namely, the Business Council of British Columbia and Challenge Seattle (Cappellano et al., 2020).

The CIC initiative is still not fully strategically integrated and still lacks significant municipal government involvement (Cappellano et al. 2020). As explained in the study on the embeddedness of the border regions of Vancouver and Seattle in the CIC through social network analysis, not only is Vancouver the only city to be ranked among the 10 most connected public-private actors, but that the city government's interactions are mainly with stakeholders on the Canadian side of the border rather than with U.S. counterparts (Cappellano et al., 2020: 9). This, as explained by Cappellano and Makkonen (2020), is due to the local and regional planning discrepancies between the two regions owing to their institutional differences.

Cappellano and Makkonen (2020) explain that although the Cascadian region breeds a high level of economic prosperity due to its technological influences, CBC lacks a strong formal institutional system with most of its collaboration and interactions being of a private nature—that is, mostly led by private actors for economic gains. Furthermore, focus is placed on business

development rather than addressing cross-border issues. Nelles (2011) notes that cross-border networks in the Cascadia region are mostly sector-specific and typically driven by the private sector. Hence, compared to economically beneficial activities or partnerships, social-related forms of development that require more strategic input to benefit the general public such as health care, housing, and income assistance programs are not given as much attention.

The partnership also aims to facilitate the generation of a shared sense of identity by enhancing connectivity between both regions by means of knowledge exchanges, technological cooperation, and the integration of transportation and infrastructural needs (Office of the Premier, 2016), which could strongly contribute to higher levels of cross-border relations. Implemented projects, however, still tend to take a more economic approach, thereby preventing a more thorough development of civic participation and social inclusion to encourage the building of more cross-border relations that are not just economically. Blatter (2001: 200; 201) elaborates on this by stating how the Cascadia region's cross-border relations and integration are tied to the sharing of ideas that are focused on economic development. That is, the regions cooperate for mutually beneficial economic reasons without adequate regard for "(re)distributive tasks" (Blatter, 2001:201), which can be assumed to involve social areas of development tied to improving quality of life. According to Blatter (2001), the cross-border region lacks a comprehensive set of cross-border institutions that could aid in promoting more civic involvement in cross-border activities.

The existing institutions tend to be divisive in their focus areas and decide to work together on activities targeted at specific sectors of mutually beneficial economic relevance (Policy Research Initiative, 2008; Brunet-Jailly, 2008). These institutions and cooperative organizations present on both sides of the border, according to Cappellano and Makkonen (2020), are not only



mainly composed of and led by private actors and businesses but also tend to lack structured institutional frameworks, which affect CBC processes. This lack of institutionalization of cross-border public and subnational (privately led) strategies, policies, and plans is largely due to the differences in political structures of both regions. This is because they have varying institutional and administrative structures and procedures that impact the development and enhancement of formalized cross-border institutions or organizations (Alper, 2004).

In their analysis of integration based on a proximity framework, Cappellano and Makkonen (2020) also explain how cognitive proximity, which refers to the similarity of knowledge bases, skills, and their use between cross-border regions, tends to affect economic integration and interaction levels. This is because the Cascadia region relies on highly skilled cross-border human capital and the transfer of technological innovation to further its economic interests (Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020). Through their quantitative study on the Cascadia region, it can be concluded that the region does possess a high level of knowledge sharing base, thus making knowledge and skill transfer, their economic structures (Policy Research Initiative, 2008), and the levels of technological innovation similar on both sides of the border. The educational institutions on both sides can therefore be confirmed to be similar in structure and functioning. Despite this, the educational institutions in the cross-border region are still considerably lacking in their interaction and integration levels, even with their physical proximity, due to the limitations in their collaborations and partnerships (Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020).

The manner of civic and community participation, the administrative capacity of local governments, and regional security concerns, mainly those related to immigration, also tend to influence how educational institutions function, and cooperate with one another. These elements

are pertinent in ensuring that cooperation is enhanced not just through educational institutions but also by way of other socially and politically relevant institutions.

The examination of the Cascadian region highlights how important cross border cooperation is to the cross-border region especially since it aids in the promotion of the region's technological development. This, as such, makes the region's cross border activities mostly economically centred with increasingly high reliance on private sector involvement. While this is the case, differences in the institutional capacities and structures of the local governments within the region also continues to greatly impact their ability to develop highly functional formal cross-border institutions that are independent of private stakeholders and go beyond the economic sphere to include social and political improvements – such as housing, health care, and cross-border immigration policies and programs – to their cross-border communities.

### **Ontario-Michigan Border Region**

The Ontario-Michigan border region geographically consists of Windsor, which is in the southwestern part of Ontario, and Detroit, the largest U.S. city in the state of Michigan with a land area of 138.73 square miles, north of the border between Canada and the United States. The Windsor metropolitan area consists of the City of Windsor, Tecumseh, Amherstburg, Lasalle, and Lakeshore, which all form a portion of Windsor-Essex County. At the time of the 2021 census, the population of the City of Windsor was 229,660 and that of the entire Windsor-Essex County was 422,860 (Statistics Canada, 2021). The City of Detroit, on the other hand, according to the 2021 United States Census, has a population of 632,444, with the wider Detroit metropolitan area, made up of the Detroit, Warren, and Dearborn areas, being home to about 4.3 million people (United States Census Bureau, 2022). The cross-border region has a combined metropolitan population of

about 5.9 million, with more than 90 percent of residents living on the U.S. side (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021).

The city of Detroit has a municipal government that employs a mayoral and city council structural system with four-year election cycles, where the mayor acts as the city's chief executive and the city council (9 seats) serves as the primary legislative body of the city (City of Detroit, 2022). Despite being non-partisan elected positions, elected officials can still be removed from office through a recall election where voters can file a petition, or by the state Governor, and on occasion where the City Council initiates a recall (Charter of the City of Detroit, 2012). The city administration also consists of an elected city clerk, 11 policy advisory boards and 13 commissions that are made up of appointees who offer advise to legislators on various policy issues, as well as the offices of the Inspector General, Auditor General, and Ombudsman (City of Detroit, 2022).

The municipal government of the City of Windsor is governed by a municipal council consisting of a local mayor (head of the council and Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation of the City of Windsor) – who is elected at large by all voters in the municipality – and municipal councillors, who have been elected in wards for 4-year terms (Government of Ontario, 2022 & City of Windsor, 2022). Over the years, there have been several changes in the structure of the council which has resulted in increases in the city's ward (administrative divisions) structure, with the current number being 10 in total with one-member representation in each ward (City of Windsor, 2022). The duties of the council involve making decisions about municipal financing and services. Unlike Detroit, the City of Windsor is also referred to as a separated municipality, where despite being geographically part of Essex County does not form part of the said county in administrative terms (City of Windsor, 2022). To add to this, unlike in Detroit where the council

can initiate a recall to remove elected officials from their position, the same is not possible with the City of Windsor since the council does not have the authority to remove the mayor but can only go so far in curbing mayoral powers by overriding mayoral veto power with two-thirds council majority votes (Government of Ontario, 2022 & Husser, 2013).

The border region of Ontario and Michigan is a highly regarded area of economic integration and interdependence between the United States and Canada (Anderson, 2012; Darroch, 2015; Brunet-Jailly, 2022). With over 3000 Canadian health care workers commuting across the border daily (Nelles, 2011), the region is not only important for labour market synergies, but it also accounts for more than 25% of the more than \$700 billion in trade between the United States and Canada (Sutcliffe, 2012; Border Policy Research Institute, 2021; Government of Ontario, 2021). The region is, therefore, considered to be the most important connection of cross-border trade in goods between Canada and the United States (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). The City of Windsor is also believed to be more economically aligned with Detroit, Michigan, than it is with the rest of Canada. Following the 2008 financial crisis, the city's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) levels declined in line with that of the city of Detroit, with similar rates of recovery (Windsor Works Report, 2021).

This level of economic alignment also tends to affect employment rates, with both cross-border regions experiencing similar levels of unemployment (Nelles, 2011). In 2010, for example, Statistics Canada found that the Windsor-Essex region accounted for the highest rate of unemployment in Canada at 12.7 percent, with Detroit following suit with a higher rate of 14.8 percent, according to the 2010 Bureau of Labour Statistics (Nelles, 2011). Also, despite recent differences in the unemployment rates of both regions, with the unemployment rate of the Windsor

in August being 7.5 percent (Statistics Canada, 2022) and that of the Detroit region being about 3.5 percent (United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2022), the cross-border region is still considered to be economically similar due to its trade intensive and automotive manufacturing economies.

The predominate economic features of Windsor-Detroit cross-border region consist of sectors such as the manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and logistics, agrifood, tourism and gaming, and healthcare industries (Workforce Windsor-Essex, 2017 & Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). There have also been increases in the participation in scientific-based and technical industries such as those focused on engineering, information technology, and software development. The Windsor-Detroit region's manufacturing industries are mostly framed around the automotive industry, which when combined accounts for about 22 percent of automotive output in North America (Government of Ontario, 2021). This has made the region's automotive supply chain highly integrated and encouraged continuous cross-border cooperation of both regions with each other.

The form which cross-border cooperation takes in the Windsor-Detroit region is due to similarities in their trading activities, technological advancement, and educational structures. The region's high level of cross-border involvement in the automotive industry is in large part due to its economic history. This history is tied to the long-standing investments of United States' auto companies in Canada and the 1965 Automotive Products Trade Agreement between both countries before the implementation of the Free Trade Agreement decades later. This deep-rooted partnership has continued to improve and develop over the years, thereby resulting in a continuous pattern of integrated automotive production (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). In addition

to this, because both areas have trade-intensive economies and are heavily involved in the auto-manufacturing industry, they tend to lean towards similar cross-border activities mainly for economic benefits.

Despite similarities (Darroch, 2015), differences in the political culture of both the United States and Canada also factor into how cross-border interactions are shaped. This is because differences in political culture in terms of civic and political participation, trust, and national identity can influence how cross-border networks or organizations can be formed for cross-border collaboration. The United States' high national identity levels and its differing political culture compared to Canada have played a role in preventing the formal development of cross-border civic organizations that can effectively promote CBC (Nelles, 2011). As such, existing organizations are mostly economic and informal in nature and functionally divisive in addressing cross-border issues—that is, they deal only with issues that are economically beneficial to them with little internal or cross-border integration (Nelles, 2011). Most of these civic networks also focus on forming associations with participation from local actors as opposed to counterparts from cross-border communities.

Cross-border cooperation in the region has been facilitated through trade in goods and the exchange of manufacturing and technical services as well as the establishment of cross-border institutions or organizations for knowledge sharing, research, and training partnerships. This can partly be attributed to the high degree of integration in the automotive and technology supply chain management of both the Windsor and Detroit regions. One example of such a cross-border organization is the Fiat Chrysler Automobiles (FCA) Research and Development Centre, which was founded in 1996 as a partnership between the automotive industry and academia (the

University of Windsor) to promote research and education for increased automotive and technology innovation (Windsor Star, 2018).

In a similar manner to cross-border activities that promote trade through the establishment of freight connections for the cross-border movement of goods and services, the region has also seen partnerships centred around infrastructural and transportation improvements, such as the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel Corporation and the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (Nelles, 2011). One recent example of this is the Goldie Howie International Bridge project, which is currently undergoing construction thanks to a public-private partnership. Not only is this aimed at easing the movement of people and goods across the border, but it is also important for ensuring more cross-border interactions that contribute to enhancing economic productivity through more cross-border education, higher student mobility, skilled worker mobility, and opportunities for more cross-border job creation (Workforce Windsor-Essex, 2017).

In terms of education and training, the Windsor-Detroit region has put in place certain cross-border strategies and programmes that aim to promote knowledge sharing, develop human capacity, and improve relations between both countries (Koehn, 2012; Olsen, 2013). This includes federal level loan programmes and educational subsidies where U.S. students are given tuition discounts to encourage admission to the University of Windsor (Windsor Works Report, 2021). Aside from this, there have also been joint programmes and research partnerships between educational institutions in both border regions (Renaud et al., 2017; Workforce Windsor-Essex, 2017). This can be seen in the post-secondary law programme partnership, where University of Windsor law students are able to enrol in dual law programmes with the Detroit Mercy Law School, allowing them to graduate with Canadian and American Juris Doctor (JD) law degrees

(Renaud et al., 2017; Windsor Works Report, 2021). Another example of such partnerships is the health care partnership (Hacking Health Windsor-Detroit) between Windsor and Detroit that connects information technology and healthcare professionals on both sides of the border to encourage innovations in the health care industry (Workforce Windsor-Essex, 2017).

Even with these educational programmes and collaborations, cross-border institutional cooperation and integration in terms of research and academic joint partnerships is still low in the region due to the low degree of policy harmonization since the local governments are unable to effectively work together to develop strategies and policies that will be mutually beneficially to both cross-border areas owing to institutional capacity differences (Nelles, 2011). Differences in population density and size (Nelles, 2011) also contribute to the low educational cooperation in the region, resulting in joint partnerships between few post-secondary educational institutions. This is because, with both regions having different population sizes, the number of higher education institutions and their levels of educational cooperation are also affected since both have varying requirements when it comes to the establishment of such institutions to serve the educational and training needs of residents. For instance, with the Detroit metropolitan area's higher population size of more than 4 million people, the incentive to establish educational institutions for both social development and the economic advantages is much higher compared to that of the Windsor-Essex region with less than 500,000 residents. This, consequently, has an impact on the degree to which cross-border educational partnerships are established since differences in the number of universities or colleges cuts down on cross-border educational collaborations.



The border community of Windsor also faces the problem of skills and talent retention (brain drain) of students, especially international students, after their graduation from tertiary institutions in the city. Despite having a higher post-secondary graduate population than Detroit (about 21 percent compared to Detroit's 13 percent), the Canadian border community still struggles to attract high-skilled labour (Windsor Works Report, 2021). This, according to a 2021 Windsor Works report, is due to the belief that career advancement is difficult in the city, especially due to the significant decline in available job opportunities and comparatively lower pay than in Canadian cities with stronger economies. This affects development levels in the border region and, in the process, puts a strain on cross-border cooperation opportunities – especially those concerned with human capital development and the mobility of highly skilled workers across the Windsor-Detroit border regions (Renaud et al. 2017).

Even with high bilateral trade relations and the movement of goods across the border with an especially highly integrated automobile industry, the region to date still experiences low levels of cross-border interaction among its lower government levels (Anderson, 2012; Nelles, 2011). To elaborate, concerns with cross-border issues are usually under the primary responsibility of provincial/state and federal levels of governance, with minimal engagement from municipal political actors and administrations. Nelles (2011), in analyzing the cross-border intermunicipal relations of the Windsor-Detroit region, also reveals how, despite their similarities, the two cities experience weak institutional integration and political cooperation. This low level of political interaction, according to Anderson (2012), results from differences in their political systems, institutional and governance structures, and the attitudes and opinions of the public and other stakeholders when it comes to the role of the government in the economy.

In explaining what form political integration can take, Sutcliffe and Anderson (2018) highlight that while it is most often limited to inter-governmental cooperation and policy coordination and harmonization, newly formed institutions can also become political in nature and enjoy some autonomy from state intervention. This, both authors explain, will allow them to contribute to shaping policy making. The problem with this, however, is that even with the creation of these politically influential institutions, cross-border collaboration is still scarce. This is because the economic development strategies and partnerships that are implemented by most of these locally based institutions and organizations are usually excessively competitive in nature and do not factor in cross-border communities (Brunet-Jailly, 2004).

Most policy initiatives to promote CBC, which are tied to curbing border delays (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018) and other relevant cross-border activities, are usually under the jurisdiction of the federal government, with only a few being implemented by municipal and provincial/state governments (Anderson, 2012). An example is the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, a federal-level crown corporation, which is overseeing the construction and operation of the Gordie Howie International Bridge between Windsor and Detroit. This has contributed to the low inter-governmental coordination of municipal administrations across the Windsor-Detroit border regions (Brunet-Jailly, 2004; Nelles, 2011; Darroch, 2015). The only major exception to this is the Windsor-Detroit tunnel, which is jointly controlled by the municipal governments on both sides of the border.

This dependence on the federal level of government limits the ability of local and municipal governments to use their insight when it comes to understanding community needs and societal stances on certain issues to ensure that strategies and plans developed earn the approval of the

local community (Sutcliffe, 2012). Sutcliffe (2012) elaborates on this by detailing how some scholars believe that the role of municipal governments and local actors play in policy making is extremely valuable. This is because their involvement makes it possible for both provincial and national policies to become more reflective of local issues. Even in situations where lower levels of government are highly involved in cross-border projects, such as those concerned with infrastructure development, there is still a lack of formally binding agreements or policies to better protect them (Anderson, 2012). Hence, the need for political integration (Sutcliffe & Anderson, 2018) to allow for policy harmonization, which is currently lacking in US-Canada relations.

Finally, regional identity and social capital are other areas that affect cross-border cooperation in the Windsor-Detroit region. In spite of the socio-cultural similarities shared by both borderlands, the region can be considered as significantly lacking a common identity stemming from differences in political culture and the level of importance attached to national identity (Nelles, 2011). This, in turn, affects the establishment and maintenance of cross-border civic organizations and the level of civic and political engagement of the public and local actors (Nelles, 2011). Thus, the success of civic networks in aiding cross-border cooperation is also reliant on civic trust and how interactions between communities are shaped.

To conclude, by having cross-border communities that are of similar socio-cultural characteristics, the Windsor-Detroit region is considered to have a high degree of economic integration and interdependence, particularly, in fields related to auto manufacturing, distribution and logistics, and health care. Despite these similarities, the cross-border region has not been able to frame a common identity for itself to aid in its cross-border cooperation. This has been especially due to existing differences in the region's governmental institutional structure and capacity,

political culture, and national identity. These differences not only make political integration and policy harmonization in the region difficult, but it also hinders the establishment of cross-border civic networks and organizations that could aid in boosting cross-border interactions and collaboration. As such, for cross-border cooperation to be properly established and maintained in the region, there is the need for higher municipal institutional capacity, more formal political cooperation, and involvement of the region's municipal governments – that are not entirely business interest based.

## CHAPTER 3

### **Comparison of both Case Studies**

When comparing both case studies, it can be noted that in spite of their political structural, population, and land mass differences, similarities can still be found in their cross-border activities. This is in large part because both regions are trade-intensive and allocate a large amount of their resources to ensure the maintenance and improvement of their trading activities, both in goods and services (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). This degree of commitment in enhancing commercial trade has contributed to more infrastructural developments in transportation and logistics to ease and reflect existing traffic conditions between cross-border regions. For instance, in the Windsor-Detroit region, existing and developing cross-border transportation routes – such as the Ambassador Bridge, the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel, the rail tunnel that moves freight trains, and the Gordie Howe International Bridge, which is currently being constructed – all serve as important infrastructure for the easing of traffic and passenger flows between both cities, mostly for cross-border commercial trading and economic integration activities (Border Policy Research Institute, 2019). The Cascade Gateway also promotes bilateral trade and promote cross-border

mobility by means of not just high-volume land crossings, but also by way of cross-border marine, air, and rail services such as connecting ferries and the Amtrak Cascades trains (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). These commercial trading activities span from not just trade in merchandise or commodities, but also from health services, educational services, and other professional and technical services.

Despite the proximity and high economic interdependence between the two North American states, significant differences still exist in their CBC levels due to differences in the economic structures and the varying levels of impact that the five forces have within their cross-border regions. These factors influence how cross-border interactions are shaped and result in significant impacts on CBC and integration. One example of the issues that tend to affect both cross-border regions have to do with the United States' security concerns, which tend to overshadow continental integration that could improve CBC between both states. For example, in the Canadian regions, immigration rules and policies are not as rigid and complicated as they are in the United States. This therefore allows for more skilled labour mobility into Canadian cities, but at the same time restricts Canadian labour access to the United States' labour market.

Even though both regions are important trading ports, there are still differences in their cross-border flows. That is, while the Cascadian region considers cross-border flows or mobility of skilled labour to be valuable to its highly advanced and diversified service-based economy, the Windsor-Detroit region is more of a manufacturing powerhouse that considers the cross-border flow of automotive products and technologies to be particularly important to the economy (Richardson, 2017). This makes cross-border initiatives in the Windsor-Detroit region less structured and less diversified when compared to those in the Cascadian region (Friedman, 2019).

The Cascade region has seen more public involvement and initiatives to promote cross-border activities than can be said about the Windsor-Detroit region. This is, in part, because municipal cross-border initiatives are not as restricted in the Cascadian region as they are in the other. With both Vancouver and Seattle being one of the largest and most economically stable metropolitan areas in their province/ state, there has been more public involvement, particularly in the form of rather strong sub-national organizations or networks such as the Border Policy Research Institute, the Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNER), and the Cascadian Innovation Corridor (CIC) (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). These organizations encompass both cross-border provincial/state and regional or metropolitan level actors (including various sectors of local government, private sector, and civil society) in promoting cross-border collaboration and projects centred around innovation and development (Border Policy Research Institute, 2019).

When compared to organizations or networks established in the Windsor-Detroit region – primarily of a metropolitan scale– it is evident the Cascadian region has stronger cross-border capabilities due to the nature, culture, and scale of collaboration, as well as their levels of personal relationships and high municipal and organizational capacity (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). Even bi-national networks or initiatives such as the International Mobility and Trade Corridor Program (IMTC), developed for the Cascade region, are stronger and have relatively wider scope compared to that of the Windsor-Detroit region, which have narrowly scoped intergovernmental projects focused primarily on trade and transportation despite their significant sizes and level of authority.

This further highlights the importance of public opinion to the development and maintenance of cross-border cooperation. In the case of Vancouver, for example, public pressure

based on demands for more and better services, has resulted in a higher amount of direct collaboration among the federal, provincial, and municipal governments which is clearly different from traditional intergovernmental relations, one that is highly visible in the City of Windsor – where there is limited cross-border local government cooperation (City of Vancouver, 2022 & Nelles, 2011). The increase in the level of collaboration between all three government levels in Vancouver, for instance, builds local government confidence of provincial and federal acceptance of local development activities. This results in the spillover of collaboration attempts in accessible and neighbouring areas such as cross-border communities thereby affecting interaction and integration levels. Also, political relations and collaboration between both local and senior levels of government actors is much higher and better coordinated in the Cascadian region than it is in the Windsor-Detroit region. Not only have their provincial/state governments been able to sign a number of memorandums of understanding (MOUs), but they have also seen more legislative-executive cooperation and advocacy compared to that of other cross-border regions. One example of this is the 2017 address of the Washington Governor in the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia (Border Policy Research Institute, 2019).

Considering these similarities and differences in these cross-border regions, one important feature does stand out. This has to do with the fact that cross-border cooperation in both cross-border regions is highly influenced by private-sector networks and driven by economic interests. In the Windsor-Detroit region for instance, stakeholders continue to utilize trade as an economic development strategy to boost job growth and economic output (Friedman, 2019). These networks not only influence local and senior government activities, but also impact intergovernmental policies and cooperation (Nelles, 2011). This results in the creation of aligned cross-border innovative ecosystems that impact areas such as labour mobility, talent development, education,

and capital flows (Friedman, 2017). This, as such, contributes to making cross-border cooperation in the regions primarily focused on building and improving economic relationships and interests both internally and across the border. One particularly dominant sector in which this occurs is the closely knitted hi-tech industry present in both Seattle and Vancouver, where tech companies, such as Microsoft and Amazon, have managed to influence cross-border cooperation by connecting several sectors such as infrastructure, professional and technical services, and education and training with one another for economic objectives.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the comparative analysis carried out in this paper, political and economically centred institutions are valuable and hold significant importance to the development of cross-border relations. These two factors are also linked to social capital and inclusion, thereby making the presence of all three necessary for the effective functioning of CBC and integration. With trust and civic participation being necessary elements of strong institutional capacity, the building of cross-border relations aids in the growth of diplomatic ties and promotes the development of cross-border social and economic networks in borderland communities for sustainable growth and development.

Regardless of recent efforts to incorporate formal institutional capacity into addressing regional development by using CBC – for instance through the implementation of the Cascadia Innovation Corridor (CIC) – by local authorities at both the municipal and provincial or state level, focus is still largely placed on business development (Border Policy Research Institute, 2021). This is due to the asymmetries in cross-border planning strategies of both border regions and the



dominance of private organizations—especially on the US side—compared to public institutions in enhancing cooperation and integration (Cappellano & Makkonen, 2020).

Similarly, business interests influence local policy decisions because of their economic importance to the community and the extent to which they support or assist local government efforts to provide public services. It is therefore important to understand that private actors and businesses considerably influence the role and institutional capacity of political institutions (Sutcliffe, 2014). This could either hinder or enhance development through the building of internal and external relationships with other regions, which could have cross-border capabilities.

The impact of business interests on cross-border cooperation can also be further examined by means of Sutcliffe's (2014) research on the impact of business interests on local politics. The research helps explain how political actors acknowledge the capacity of business interests to shape the economic development of local communities. Depending on how their interests will be affected by institutional capacity, administration, or enforced policies, businesses can decide to either remain or relocate to other locations that will better enable them to access or use resources to better their economic interests. Local actors and governments, as such, pay significant attention to the opinions of private businesses. Sutcliffe (2014) explains that this level of reliance on such businesses highlights the degree to which local political actors are encouraged to develop policies that benefit private businesses. This consequently shapes the way CBC is affected since it influences the extent to which cross-border relations are formed or developed. For instance, the business interests of local economic actors could play a role in determining if political actors will be encouraged to promote cross-border interaction or not. This is because, where the economic interests of local businesses will be negatively affected by such cross-border relations, some

business actors may be tempted to try and prevent strong CBC for fear of losing their competitive edges and vice versa.

This analysis of the economic interests of private actors brings into view the importance of public participation in the decision-making process of local government (Sutcliffe, 2008). This allows the community to be more involved in making their opinions heard by the local political actors who are supposed to act as their government representatives. It also contributes to improving the quality of services available to the local community by ensuring that local leaders and the institutional administrations are aware of the kind of assistance or services community members need to improve their quality of life through active political participation. By having an effective municipal administrative system and great institutional capacity enforced through community participation and the existence of civic engagement and groups (social capital), political actors can develop more effective policies and strategies that would gain popular support within the local community (Sutcliffe, 2008; Opilowska & Sus, 2021).

Citizen involvement in policy-making decisions and development strategies and plans can significantly determine the extent to which CBC can be developed or improved. Without community acceptance and participation, strategies and plans to encourage cross-border relations will prove challenging (Brunet-Jailly et al., 2008; Kaldaru & Parts, 2008). This confirms that the institutional framework and capacity of local governments are valuable to how CBC and integration are enhanced and sustained. As Lundquist and Tripp (2013) explained, one key feature of a robust integration system is how cross-border activities are considered a norm and part of daily life and not seen as varying sections of state development. This means that for CBC to be effective, cross-border interaction and integration strategies should be infused into state policies

and institutions at all government levels to aid in making governance and civic participation much easier.

Border proximity is also another element of border types that acts as an important component of cross-border relations that significantly influences CBC levels. This is because it can encourage higher levels of intergovernmental interactions for more cross-border activities since involved states are geographically close to one another compared to bilateral or multilateral relations of states in different geographic locations. It is, however, necessary to note that while border proximity is important for the development of cross-border relations, it does not always guarantee political and institutional collaboration between municipalities in cross-border regions.

In terms of the level of cooperation needed for the establishment of cross-border institutions, there is a significantly low degree of such cooperation among state, provincial, and national government levels of both Canada and the United States. (Blatter, 2004). This is partly because the harmonization of policies concerning trade, businesses, foreign policies, and cross-border activities or cooperation is dependent on the institutional capacity of cross-border governments, and differences in institutional capacity influences how cross-border cooperation can be developed (Cappellano et al., 2020). In addition, focus on cross-border activities is usually placed in the hands of senior levels of government, with minimal local or municipal level participation (Nelles, 2011). Furthermore, the ability of cross-border regions to develop formal institutional structures for cooperation is also dependent on the condition that cross-border actors, or community and local stakeholders, have the desire and are willing to work together to achieve them (Policy Research Initiative, 2008; Norman & Bakker, 2009).

By analyzing both cases, it is evident that political institutions, educational institutions, border security, and social capital are necessary factors that influence how cross-border relations are developed. Without these factors, as per the literature review, it would be difficult to attain a high degree of cross-border interaction. This is because the establishment and effectiveness of these factors is what is needed to promote cross-border activities. Likewise, without education and training as well as social capital (trust and civic participation), it would be difficult to ensure the effective functioning of such cross-border institutions or organizations. To ensure that CBC is maintained, it is also important that border security between cross-border regions need to be on par with one another as highly restrictive security measures will negatively influence the degree at which cross-border activities are carried out.

There is, therefore, a need for both countries, especially the United States, to cooperate with Canada to develop federal level institutional plans or strategies that could help ease security restrictions that slow down or negatively impact cross-border relations while keeping U.S. security concerns as a binding factor. Two such important areas are those concerned with immigration rules that affect cross-border employment and education for citizens of both countries. An example of such an immigration model would be the creation of a highly secure model shared by both states that could facilitate access to relevant information on cross-border employment and education applicants (who grant permission) to reduce procedural wait times for visa applications for US-Canadian citizens.

The Cascadian region through the comparative analysis of the two case studies can be considered to have a more advanced stage of cross-border relations and cooperation compared to that of the Windsor-Detroit region (Cappellano et al., 2020). This is because their political

institutions are more developed, cooperative, and accepting of cross-border partnerships and programmes. Also, communities and stakeholders on both sides of the border are more inclined to participate in cross-border activities not just because of the number of benefits they reap from such partnerships, but also due to the region's long history of state-provincial and local collaboration which has fostered higher levels of support and trust between actors compared to the Windsor-Detroit region (Friedman et al. 2019). The region's organizational framework has managed to shape the region, making it more geared towards ensuring the development of the cross-border region through the establishment of cross-border networks and organizations (Cappellano et al., 2020). These organizations, unlike in the Windsor-Detroit region, have been formally instituted with designated leadership to push cross-border agendas that span over a variety of areas and not those centred on just trade and transportation (Friedman, 2019). Moreover, according to Cappellano et al. (2020), the political actors of the regions, particularly the Premier of British Columbia and the Governor of Washington, also have a more solid relationship than those of the Windsor-Detroit region. This long-standing relationship at the leadership level encourages more trust and therefore makes cross-border interaction much easier than for regions with limited political connections or estranged leaders.

While we might expect Canada-US cross-border cooperation for various reasons: they are both democratic systems, similarities in culture and educational structures, they are military partners, there are strong economic ties (such as integrated supply chains in manufacturing), cross-border relations are, however, limited, although more advanced in Cascadia than in the Ontario-Michigan region.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Laban, Y., Jhappan, R., & Rocher, F. (2019). *Politics in North America: Redefining Continental Relations* (Y. Abu-Laban, R. Jhappan, & F. Rocher, Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442689794>
- Alper, D. K. (2004). Emerging Collaborative Frameworks for Environmental Governance in the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Ecosystem. *Journal of Borderland Studies*, 19(1), 79-98.
- Amaral, A., Tavares, O., Cardoso, S., & Sin, C. (2016). Shifting Institutional Boundaries Through Cross-Border Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(1), 48–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315315587108>
- Anderson, B. (nd). The border and the Ontario Economy. Cross-Border Transportation Centre. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from <http://cbinstitute.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/The-Border-and-the-Ontario-Economy.pdf>
- Anderson, B. et al. (2021). The Gordie Howe International Bridge and the Bi-National Great Lakes Economic Region: Assessing Economic Impacts and Opportunities. Final Report Summary. Cross-Border Institute. <https://www.cbinstitute.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Gordie-Howe-Internation-Bridge-Full-Report.pdf>
- Anderson, W.P. (2012). "Public policy in a cross-border economic region", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 25 No. 6/7, pp. 492-499. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513551211260694>
- Bakvis, H., & Skogstad, G. D. (2012). *Canadian federalism: Performance, effectiveness, and legitimacy*. Oxford Press.

- Bardhan, P. (2006). "Institutions and Development". In: D. Clark (ed.). *The Elgar Companion to Development Studies*, Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 2-56.
- Basboga, K. (2020) The role of open borders and cross-border cooperation in regional growth across Europe, *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 7:1, 532-549, DOI: [10.1080/21681376.2020.1842800](https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2020.1842800)
- Bates-Eamer, N., & Hallgrímsdóttir, H.K. (Eds.). (2021). *British Columbia's Borders in Globalization* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003219583>
- Blackman, T., Wistow, J., & Byrne, D. (2013). Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis to understand complex policy problems. *Evaluation*, 19(2), 126-140.
- Blatter, J. (2001). Debordering the World of States: Toward a Multi-Level System in Europe and a Multi-Polity System in North America? Insights from Border Regions. *European Journal of International Relations - EUR J INT RELAT.* 7. 175-209.  
[10.1177/1354066101007002002](https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066101007002002).
- Blatter, J. (2004). From "spaces of place" to "spaces of flows"? Territorial and functional governance in cross-border regions in Europe and North America. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(3), 530–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00534.x>
- Bolychev, O., Gumenyuk, I., Kuznetsova, T. (2015). Local border traffic and the development of retail trade in the Kaliningrad region and Polish borderlands. *Baltic Region*, 4(26), 135-149.

Border Policy Research Institute, Western Washington University; University at Buffalo, The State University of New York; and Cross-Border Institute, University of Windsor.

(2019). "Border Barometer". *Border Policy Research Institute Publications*. 112.

[https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri\\_publications/112](https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri_publications/112)

Border Policy Research Institute, Western Washington University. (2021). "Border Barometer".

*Border Policy Research Institute Publications*. 127.

[https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri\\_publications/127](https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri_publications/127)

Bronckers, M., & Gruni, G. (2021). Retooling the sustainability standards in EU Free Trade Agreements. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 24(1), 25–51.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/jiel/jgab007>

Brunet-Jailly, E. (2004). Comparing local cross-border relations under the EU and NAFTA. *Canadian American Public Policy*, (58), 1–52.

Brunet-Jailly, E. (2007). *Borderlands: comparing border security in North America and Europe*. University of Ottawa Press.

Brunet-Jailly, E. (2008). Cascadia in Comparative Perspectives: Canada-U.S. Relations and the Emergence of Cross-Border Regions. *Canadian Political Science Review*, 2, 104-124.

Brunet-Jailly, E. (2022). Cross-border cooperation: a global overview. *Alternatives*, 47(1), 3–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754211073463>



- Brunet-Jailly, E., & Dupeyron, B. (2007). Introduction: Borders, Borderlands, And Porosity. In E. Brunet-Jailly (Ed.), *Borderlands: Comparing Border Security in North America and Europe* (pp. 1–18). University of Ottawa Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1ckpchh.5>
- Brunet-Jailly, E., Sawchuk, G. D., & Payan, T. (2008). The emergence of cross-border regions along the Mexican-US border and in Europe lessons for Canada. Government of Canada, Policy Research Initiative.
- Cankar, S., Seljak, J., & Veronika Petkovšek. (2014). Factors that influence cross-border cooperation between businesses in the Alps–Adriatic region, *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 27:1, 304-319, DOI: [10.1080/1331677X.2014.952091](https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2014.952091)
- Cappellano, F., Border Policy Research Institute, Western Washington University; & Borders in Globalization, University of Victoria. (2019). Cross Border Innovation Economies: The Cascadia Innovation Corridor Case. Border Policy Research Institute Publications. 116. [https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri\\_publications/116](https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri_publications/116)
- Cappellano, F., & Makkonen, T. (2020). The Proximity Puzzle in Cross-Border Regions. *Planning, Practice & Research*, 35(3), 283–301. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2020.1743921>
- Cappellano, F., Richardson, K., & Trautman, L. (2020). Cross-border regional planning: insights from Cascadia, *International Planning Studies*, DOI: [10.1080/13563475.2020.1779672](https://doi.org/10.1080/13563475.2020.1779672)

Cascadia Innovation Corridor. (2020). CASCADIA VISION 2050: How the Cascadia Innovation Corridor can serve as a global model for sustainable growth. Retrieved from: [https://connectcascadia.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Cascadia-Vision-2050\\_Published.pdf](https://connectcascadia.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Cascadia-Vision-2050_Published.pdf)

Champion, M., Drozdiak, N., & Follain, J. (2022, April 8). *Race On to Rearm Eastern Front That May Decide Ukraine War*. Bloomberg.com. Retrieved April 9, 2022, from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-04-08/race-is-on-to-rearm-eastern-front-that-could-decide-ukraine-war>

Chetro-Szivos, J. (2010). Cross-border Tertiary Education: The Challenges and Opportunities for Intercultural Understanding. *Journal of Intercultural Management*. 2. 5-22.

Chojnicki, Z. (2010). Socio-Economic Development and its Axiological Aspects. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 29(2), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10117-010-0010-9>

City of Detroit. (2012). Charter of the City of Detroit. Retrieved from: [https://detroitmi.gov/Portals/0/docs/Publications/COD%20Charter/2\\_29\\_2012\\_CharterDocument\\_2\\_1\\_WITHOUT\\_COMMENTARY\\_1.pdf](https://detroitmi.gov/Portals/0/docs/Publications/COD%20Charter/2_29_2012_CharterDocument_2_1_WITHOUT_COMMENTARY_1.pdf)

City of Detroit. (2022). Government. Retrieved from: <https://detroitmi.gov/government>

City of Seattle. (2022). Office of Economic Development. Retrieved from: <https://www.seattle.gov/office-of-economic-development/industries-and-workforce>

City of Seattle. (2022). Office of Planning and Community Development. Census 2020 Data. Retrieved from: [About Seattle - OPCD | seattle.gov](https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/about-seattle-opcd)

City of Vancouver. (2022). About Vancouver.

Retrieved from: <https://vancouver.ca/news-calendar/geo.aspx>

City of Vancouver. (2022). The 1953 Charter of the City of Vancouver. Retrieved from:

<http://vancouver.ca/your-government/the-vancouver-charter.aspx>.

City of Windsor. (2022). Mayor and Council. Retrieved from:

<https://www.citywindsor.ca/mayorandcouncil/Pages/Mayor-and-City-Council.aspx>

City of Windsor. (2022). Ward Boundaries and Maps. *Ward Boundary Options*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.citywindsor.ca/cityhall/Municipal-Election/Ward-Boundaries-and-Maps/Pages/Ward-Boundary-Options.aspx>

Darroch, M. (2015). Border Scenes: Detroit ± Windsor. *Cultural Studies* (London, England),

29(3), 298–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2014.937935>

Desan, M. H. (2014). Bankrupted Detroit. *Thesis Eleven*, 121(1), 122–130.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513614526158>

Dewing, M., Young, R., Tolley, E. (2006). Municipalities, the Constitution, and the Canadian Federal System. Government of Canada Publications. Retrieved from:

<https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.561275/publication.html>

Dillahunt, T. (2014). Fostering social capital in economically distressed communities.

Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 531–540. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557123>

Doucet, B. (2019). DIY Detroit: Making Do in a City without Services by Kimberley Kinder (review). *Technology and Culture*, 60(2), 645–647.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/tech.2019.0050>

Drolet, J. (2014). *Social Protection and Social Development International Initiatives* (1st ed. 2014.). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7878-8>

European Commission, Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy, Peyrony, J., Rubio, J., Viaggi, R. (2021). *The effects of COVID-19 induced border closures on cross-border regions: an empirical report covering the period March to June 2020*, Publications Office. Retrieved from <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2776/342537>

Forsey, E. (2005). *How Canadians govern themselves* (6th ed.). Library of Parliament, Public Information Office.

Friedman, K., Conteh, C., & Phillips, C. (2019). *Cross-Border Innovation Corridors: How to support, strengthen and sustain cross-border innovation ecosystems*. Brock University. Niagara Community Observatory. Retrieved from: <https://brocku.ca/niagara-community-observatory/wp-content/uploads/sites/117/NCO-Policy-Brief-42-Friedman-Cross-Border-Innovation-FINAL.pdf>

Głodowska, A. (2017). Economic Growth versus Socio-Economic Development of the European Union Countries: The Scale of Divergence and Diversification (Chapter 2). In T. Lazibat, K. Wach & B. Knežević (Eds.), *Growth, Competitiveness and International Trade from the European Perspective*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, pp. 29-43.

Government of British Columbia. (2022). Local Government Legislative Framework.

Retrieved from: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/local-governments/facts-framework/legislative-framework>

Government of British Columbia. (2022). The 1953 Charter of the City of Vancouver. Retrieved

from: [https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/vanch\\_00](https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/vanch_00)

Government of Ontario. (2021). Ontario Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. Ontario and Michigan Partnering on Cross-Border Transportation Technologies.

Retrieved from: <https://news.ontario.ca/en/release/1000752/ontario-and-michigan-partnering-on-cross-border-transportation-technologies>

Government of Ontario. (2022). Laws: Municipal Act 2001. Retrieved from:

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25>

Government of Canada. (2022). Canada-United States Relations. Retrieved from:

<https://www.international.gc.ca/country-pays/us-eu/relations.aspx?lang=eng>

Graf, L. (2021). Leveraging Regional Differences and Cross-Border Collective Institutions: The Case of Skill Formation and Employment in the Border Region of France, Germany, and Switzerland. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 27(2), 369–389.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12442>

Greaves, W. (2020). Democracy, Donald Trump and the Canada-US Security Community. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 53(4), 800-820.

doi:10.1017/S0008423920000542

- Gupta, K. (2012). Comparative Public Policy: Using the Comparative Method to Advance Our Understanding of the Policy Process. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(S1), 11-26.
- Halas, M. (2007). Development of cross-border cooperation and creation of Euroregions in the Slovak Republic. *Moravian Geographical Reports* 15, no. 1: 21–31.
- Hataley, T., & Leuprecht, C. (2018). Determinants of Cross-Border Cooperation. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 33(3), 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2018.1482776>
- Hodgson, G. (2006). What Are Institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40:1, 1-25, DOI: 10.1080/00213624.2006.11506879
- Huang, G., & Cai, Z. (2021). Understanding Social Security Development: Lessons From the Chinese Case. *SAGE Open*, 11(3), 215824402110326–. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211032633>
- Hurrell, A., & Gomez-Mera, L. (2018). NAFTA. In *A Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics and International Relations*: Oxford University Press.
- Husák. (2010). Regional policy of the European Communities and cross-border cooperation within the South Bohemia Region. *Agricultural Economics (Praha)*, 56(No. 6), 292–300. <https://doi.org/10.17221/15/2010>
- Husser, A. (2013). Calls for Resignation: How can a mayor be removed from office in Canada's largest city? CTVNews. Retrieved from: <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/calls-for-resignation-how-can-a-mayor-be-removed-from-office-in-canada-s-largest-city-1.1531119?cache=%3FclipId%3D89530>

- Inslee, J. (2018, February 7). *What is the Cascadia Innovation Corridor? | provided by Cascadia Innovation Corridor*. The Seattle Times. Retrieved May 14, 2022, from <https://www.seattletimes.com/sponsored/what-is-the-cascadia-innovation-corridor/>
- Jacob, W.J., et al. (2015). Community Engagement in Higher Education. In: Jacob, W.J., Sutin, S.E., Weidman, J.C., Yeager, J.L. (eds) *Community Engagement in Higher Education*. Pittsburgh Studies In Comparative and International Education. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-007-9\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-007-9_1)
- Jones, J. M. (2022, October 12). *Trust in federal government branches continues to falter*. Gallup. Retrieved October 19, 2022, from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/402737/trust-federal-government-branches-continues-falter.aspx>
- Kaldaru, H. & Parts, E. (2008) Social and institutional factors of economic development: evidence from Europe, *Baltic Journal of Economics*, 8:1, 29-51, DOI: 10.1080/1406099X.2008.10840444
- Kang, Y., & Jiang, J. (2020). Revisiting the innovation systems of cross-border cities: the role of higher education institution and cross-boundary cooperation in Hong Kong and Shenzhen. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(2), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1701849>
- Keefer, P. & Knack, S. (2008). Social Capital, Social Norms and the New Institutional Economics. In: Ménard, C., Shirley, M.M. (eds) *Handbook of New Institutional Economics*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69305-5\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69305-5_28)

- Klaus, I. (2022, April 27). Subnational diplomacy evolves: From urban arenas to City Partners. *JIA SIPA*. Retrieved October 19, 2022, from <https://jia.sipa.columbia.edu/subnational-diplomacy-evolves-urban-arenas-city-partners>
- Knack, S., & Keefer, P. (1997). Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 112, Issue 4, November 1997, Pages 1251–1288, <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355300555475>
- Koehn, P. H. (2012). Donors and higher education partners: a critical assessment of US and Canadian support for transnational research and sustainable development. *Compare*, 42(3), 485–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2011.640138>
- Korneevets, V. S., Redkin, A. G., Studzieniecki, T., & Zaitseva, N. A. (2019). INFLUENCE OF BORDER REGIONS RELATIONS ON THE TOURIST CHOICES OF THE POPULATION. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, 25(2), 569–579. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.25223-381>
- Kurowska-Pysz, J., & Szczepańska-Woszczyzna, K. (2017). The Analysis of the Determinants of Sustainable Cross-Border Cooperation and Recommendations on Its Harmonization. *Sustainability (Basel, Switzerland)*, 9(12), 2226–. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9122226>
- Lane, J., Owens, T., & Kinser, K. (2015). Cross-border Higher Education, International Trade, and Economic Competitiveness: *A Review of Policy Dynamics when Education Crosses Borders*. 10.13140/RG.2.1.1875.7207



- Lange, E. (2018). Cross-border Cooperation in Action: Taking a Closer Look at the Galicia–North of Portugal European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 33(3), 415–431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2016.1195701>
- Lee, E., Wilson, C.E., Lara-Valencia, F., de la Parra, C.A., Van Schoik, R., Kristofer Patron-Soberano, K., Olson, E.L., & Selee, A. (2013). *The State of the Border: A Comprehensive Analysis of the U.S. – Mexico Border*. Border Research Partnership. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- León García, F., Eighmy, T., & Ono, S. J. (2021). Higher Education Collaboration in North America: A Review of the Past and a Potential Agenda for the Future. In *Policy File*. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Lundquist, K. & Tripp, M. (2013). Distance, Proximity and Types of Cross-border Innovation Systems: A Conceptual Analysis. *Regional Studies*, 47(3), 450–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2011.560933>
- Makkonen, T., Weidenfeld, A., & Williams, A. M. (2017). Cross-Border Regional Innovation System Integration: An Analytical Framework: CROSS-BORDER REGIONAL INNOVATION SYSTEM INTEGRATION. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 108(6), 805–820. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12223>
- Martinez, O.J. (1994). *The Dynamics of Border Interaction: new approaches to border analysis*. in: C.H. Scofield (ed.), *Global Boundaries: Volume 1 global boundaries*, Routledge, London.

Mayer, E. P. (2011). Beyond Border Binaries: Borderlines, Borderlands, and In-Betweenness in Thomas King's Short Story "Borders". *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, (43), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1009455ar>

McDonald, J. (2014). What happened to and in Detroit? *Urban Studies*, 51(16), 3309–3329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013519505>

Medeiros, E. (2021). *Border Cities and Territorial Development* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003164753>

Metro Vancouver. (2022). Metro Vancouver Overview. Retrieved from: <http://www.metrovancouver.org/>

Midgley, J. (1995). *Social development: The developmental perspective in social welfare*. London: Sage Publications.

Miguez, M. (2021). Autonomy in Foreign Policy: A Latin American Contribution to International Relations Theory. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, 28.

Miörner, J., Zukauskaitė, E., Trippel, M., & Moodysson, J. (2018). Creating institutional preconditions for knowledge flows in cross-border regions. *Environment and Planning C, Politics and Space*, 36(2), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654417704664>

Moscato, D. (PhD), Border Policy Research Institute, & Western Washington University. (2020). *Reporting on Cascadia: The Evolution of a Cross-Border Media Ecosystem*. Border Policy Research Institute Publications. 123. [https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri\\_publications/123](https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri_publications/123)

Nelles, J. (2011). “Cooperation in Crisis? An Analysis of Cross-Border Intermunicipal Relations in the Detroit-Windsor Region”, *Articulo - Journal of Urban Research* [Online], 6.

Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/articulo/2097>; DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.4000/articulo.2097>

Nelles, J. (2013). Cooperation and Capacity? Exploring the Sources and Limits of City-Region Governance Partnerships. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(4), 1349–1367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01112.x>

Nelles, J., & Sutcliffe, J. B. (2013). On the Boundary: Local Authorities, Intergovernmental Relations, and the Governance of Border Infrastructure in the Detroit–Windsor Region. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 23(2), 213–232.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2012.742072>

Norman, E. S., & Bakker, K. (2009). Transgressing Scales: Water Governance Across the Canada-U.S. Borderland. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(1), 99–117. WILEYBLACKWELL PUBLISHING. doi:10.1080/00045600802317218

Norman, L. (2022, April 9). *Fifth Round of EU sanctions enacted against Russia*. The Wall Street Journal. Retrieved April 9, 2022, from <https://www.wsj.com/livecoverage/russia-ukraine-latest-news-2022-04-08/card/what-s-new-in-the-eu-s-latest-sanctions-package-8i2fPZwznj56RUe3cxel>

OECD. (2001). *Policies to Enhance Sustainable Development*. OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264192683-en>.

OECD, & World Bank. (2007). *Cross-border Tertiary Education: A Way towards Capacity Development*. Paris: OECD. © World Bank. Retrieved from:

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/6865>

Office of the Premier. (2016). *British Columbia and Washington State to create Cascadia Innovation Corridor to promote regional economic opportunities in Tech Industries*.

Retrieved May 14, 2022, from <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2016PREM0110-001742>

Olson, C. L. (2013). *A Canadian Lens on Facilitating Factors for North American Partnerships*.

*Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3), 228–243.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312453741>

Opiłowska, E. (2021). *The Covid-19 crisis: the end of a borderless Europe? European Societies*,

23:sup1, S589-S600, DOI: [10.1080/14616696.2020.1833065](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2020.1833065)

Opiłowska, E., & Sus, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Poland and Germany in the European Union: The Multidimensional Dynamics of Bilateral Relations* (1st ed.). Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003046622>

Östh, J., Dolciotti, M., Reggiani, A., & Nijkamp, P. (2018). *Social Capital, Resilience and Accessibility in Urban Systems: A Study on Sweden*. *Netw Spat Econ* 18, 313–336.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11067-017-9375-9>

Oyèkólá, O. (2021). *A cross-country analysis of the roles of border openness, human capital and legal institutions in explaining economic development*, *The Journal of International Trade*

& *Economic Development*, 31:1, 75-108, DOI: [10.1080/09638199.2021.1949380](https://doi.org/10.1080/09638199.2021.1949380)

- Palmowski, T. & Fedorov, G. M. (2019). The development of a Russian-Polish cross-border region: the role of the Kaliningrad agglomeration and the Tri-City (Gdansk—Gdynia—Sopot). *Baltic Region*, 11(4), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.5922/2079-8555-2019-4-1>
- Patrick, J. M. (2007). Chapter 7. The Economic Cost of Border Security: The Case of The Texas–Mexico Border And The US VISIT Program. In Brunet-Jailly, E. (Ed.), *Borderlands: Comparing Border Security in North America and Europe* (pp. 197–230). University of Ottawa Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1ckpchh.12>
- Peacock, K. (2018). *Cascadia Innovation Corridor -West Coast Wonders: B.C. & Washington Cross Border Synergies and Connections*. Business Council of British Columbia. Retrieved from: [https://bcbc.com/dist/assets/publications/west-coast-wonders-b-c-washington-cross-border-synergies-and-connections/BC-Washington\\_Linkages\\_FINAL.pdf](https://bcbc.com/dist/assets/publications/west-coast-wonders-b-c-washington-cross-border-synergies-and-connections/BC-Washington_Linkages_FINAL.pdf)
- Pipa, A. F., & Bouchet, M. (2021). Partnership among cities, states, and the Federal Government: Creating an office of subnational diplomacy at the US Department of State. *The Brookings Institution*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/partnership-among-cities-states-and-the-federal-government-creating-an-office-of-subnational-diplomacy-at-the-us-department-of-state/>
- Pipkin, S. (2018). Cashable Value: Social Capital and Practical Habits in the Analysis of Collaborative Cross-Border Economic Development. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 33(3), 329–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2016.1197789>

Phillips, J.D. (2004). Western Regionalism: Views on Cascadia, 30 Can.-U.S. L.J. 333.

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol30/iss/52>

Policy Research Initiative. (2006). The Emergence of Cross Border Regions Between Canada and the US. Canada Institute at the Woodrow Wilson Centre and the CSIS Smart Border North Working Group Meeting, 23 May 2006, Washington, DC. Government of Canada.

Policy Research Initiative. (2008). The Emergence of Cross-Border Regions Between Canada and the United States: Reaping the promise and public value of cross-border regional relationships. Final Report. Government of Canada.

Pomfret R.W.T. (2021). The Economic Integration of Europe. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ramos, J. M. (2007). Managing Us–Mexico Transborder Cooperation on Local Security Issues and The Canadian Relationship. In E. BRUNET-JAILLY (Ed.), *Borderlands: Comparing Border Security in North America and Europe* (pp. 259–276). University of Ottawa Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1ckpchh.14>

Renaud, K., Teskey, T., Gregg, H., Antoniow, T. (2017). Cross-Border Employment in the Windsor-Essex & Southeastern Michigan Corridor. Workforce WindsorEssex. Retrieved from: <https://www.workforcewindsoressex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Cross-Border-Employment-Report.pdf>

- Richardson, K. E. (2017). *Knowledge Borders: Temporary Labor Mobility and the Canada-US Border Region*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Rudman, A. I., Wood, D., González-Pier, E., Kaiser, M., Moreno, A., Kloppe-Santamaria, G., ... Wilson, C. (2021). *Re-Building a Complex Partnership: The Outlook for U.S.-Mexico Relations under the Biden Administration*. In Policy File. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.
- Sancton, A. (2011). *Canadian Local Government: An Urban Perspective*. Don Mills, Oxford.
- Schildkraut, D.J. (2011). National Identity in the United States. In: Schwartz, S., Luyckx, K., Vignoles, V. (eds) *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Springer, New York, NY. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9\\_36](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_36)
- Sendhardt, B. (2013). Border Types and Bordering Processes: A Theoretical Approach to the EU/Polish-Ukrainian Border as a Multi-dimensional Phenomenon. In A. Lechevalier & J. Wielgoths (Eds.), *Borders and Border Regions in Europe: Changes, Challenges and Chances* (pp. 21–44). Transcript Verlag. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1fxhcq.4>
- Shirley, M. (2005). “Institutions and Development”. In: Ménard, C., Shirley, M.M. (eds) *Handbook of New Institutional Economics*. New York: Springer.
- Simeon, R., & Radin, B. A. (2010). Reflections on Comparing Federalisms: Canada and the United States, *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, Volume 40, Issue 3, Summer 2010, Pages 357–365, <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjq008>
- Slusarciuc, M. (2015). The Economic Potential of Crossborder Areas. Opportunities and Threats. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 32. 801-808. 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01465-3.

- Smith, P., Ginnell, K., & Black, M. (2010). Local governing and local democracy in British Columbia. In Michael Howlett, Dennis Pilon & Tracy Summerville, (Eds.). British Columbia Politics and Government. Edmond Montgomery. Toronto. 245-266.
- Sobantu, M. (2020). Housing and Social Development: Linking Social and Economic Aspects of Development through Housing Delivery. *Social Development Issues*, 42(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.3998/sdi.17872073.0042.206>
- Sohn, C. (2014). The Border as a Resource in the Global Urban Space: A Contribution to the Cross-Border Metropolis Hypothesis. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(5), 1697–1711. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12071>
- Sousa, L. (2013). Understanding European Cross-border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis. *Journal of European Integration*, 35(6), 669–687.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2012.711827>
- Statistics Canada. (2021). Census profile: 2021 Census of Population. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=N9C%201R3&DGUIDlist=2021A00033537,2021A00053537039&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1&HEADERlist=0>
- Statistics Canada. (2022). Census Profile. 2021 Census of Population. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2021001. Ottawa. Released October 26, 2022. Retrieved from: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E> (accessed November 13, 2022).



Statistics Canada. (2022). Trade by exporter and importer characteristics: Goods, 2021.

Retrieved from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220518/dq220518b-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada (2022). Labour force characteristics, three-month moving average, seasonally adjusted. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.25318/1410038001-eng>

Sutcliffe, J. & Anderson, W. P. (William P.). (2018). The Canada-US border in the 21st century: trade, immigration, and security in the age of Trump. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Sutcliffe, J. (2014). Big Business and Local Government: Matty Moroun, the Ambassador Bridge and the City of Windsor. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 23(1), 55–73.

Sutcliffe, J. B. (2008). Public Participation in Local Politics: The Impact of Community Activism on the Windsor-Detroit Border Decision Making Process. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(2), 57–83.

Sutcliffe, J. B. (2012). Multi-level Governance in a Canadian Setting: The Reform of the Detroit River Border Crossing. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 22(2), 141–158.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2012.668137>

Tarvet, R. & Klatt, M. (2021). The impact of the Corona crisis on borderland living in the Danish-German border region with a special focus on the two national minorities,

National Identities, DOI: [10.1080/14608944.2021.1938522](https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2021.1938522)

The Charter of the City of Seattle. (2022). Municipal Code. Retrieved from: [Municipal Code | Seattle, WA | Municode Library](#)

- The Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC). (2022). City and Town Forms of Government. Retrieved from: <https://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Legal/Organization/City-and-Town-Forms-of-Government.aspx>
- Thomas, D. M., & Biette, D. (2014). Canada and the United States: differences that count (Fourth edition.; D. M. (David M. Thomas & D. Biette, Eds.). Toronto [Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Trautman, L., Cappellano, F., & Border Policy Research Institute. (2019). "The Cascadia Innovation Corridor: Advancing a Cross-Border Economy". *Border Policy Research Institute Publications*. 117. [https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri\\_publications/117](https://cedar.wvu.edu/bpri_publications/117)
- Trippl, M. (2010). Developing Cross-Border Regional Innovation Systems: Key Factors and Challenges. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 101(2), 150–160.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2016). Identifying social inclusion and exclusion. In *Report on the World Social Situation 2016* (pp. 17–31). United Nations. <https://doi.org/10.18356/5890648c-en>
- United States Bureau of Labour Statistics. (2022). Detroit Area Economic Summary. Retrieved from [https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/summary/blssummary\\_detroit.pdf](https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/summary/blssummary_detroit.pdf)
- United States Census Bureau. (2021). QuickFacts: Detroit City, Michigan. Retrieved from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/detroitcitymichigan/POP010220>
- Uphoff, N. (2000). Understanding social capital: learning from. *Social capital: A multifaceted perspective*, World Bank Publications, 215.

U.S. Department of Education. (2021). The Federal Role in Education. Retrieved from:  
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html#:~:text=Education%20is%20primarily%20a%20State,requirements%20for%20enrollment%20and%20graduation.>

U.S. Department of State. (2022). U.S. Relations With Canada. Bilateral Relations Fact Sheet. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs. Retrieved from: <https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-canada/>

Vancouver Economic Commission. (2022). Key Industries. Retrieved from:  
<https://vancouvereconomic.com/vancouver/key-industries/>

Von Hauff, M. (2002). “The Relevance of Social Security for Economic Development” in Erfried Adam, Michael von Hauff and John Marei (eds), Social Protection in Southeast and East Asia, Singapore: FES

Waddell, D. (2018). This is where cars come to be broken. Windsor Star. Retrieved from <https://windsorstar.com/news/local-news/this-is-where-cars-come-to-be-broken>

Wallin, D., Young, J., & Levin, B. (2021). Understanding Canadian Schools: An Introduction to Educational Administration 6th Edition. Retrieved October 31, 2022, from <https://openpress.usask.ca/understandingcanadianschools/>

Walsh, D. (2018). Michigan workers’ wages rise, but so do costs. Crain’s Detroit Business, 34(34), 1–.

Wielgoths, J., & Lechevalier, A. (2013). Introduction. In J. Wielgoths & A. Lechevalier (Eds.), *Borders and Border Regions in Europe: Changes, Challenges and Chances* (pp. 9–18).

Transcript Verlag. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1fxhcq.3>

Windsor Works Report. (2021). An Economic Development Strategy for the City's Future Growth. Public First. Retrieved from:

<https://www.citywindsor.ca/mayorandcouncil/Documents/Windsor-Works-Report.pdf>

Wong Villanueva, J., Kidokoro, T., & Seta, F. (2020). Cross-Border Integration, Cooperation and Governance: A Systems Approach for Evaluating “Good” Governance in Cross-Border Regions. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 1–24. Retrieved from:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2020.1855227>

Workforce Windsor-Essex. (2017). Cross-Border Employment in the Windsor-Essex & Southeastern Michigan Corridor. Retrieved from

<https://www.workforcewindsorsex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Cross-Border-Employment-Report.pdf>

Young, R. (2013). Multilevel governance and public policy in Canadian municipalities: reflections on research results. Paper presented to the Canadian Political Science Association, Victoria.

Zaitseva, N.A., Korneevets, V. S., Kropinova, E. G., Kuznetsova, T. Y., & Semenova, L. V. (2016). Cross-border Movement of People between Russia and Poland and Their Influence on the Economy of Border Regions. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(4), 1690–1695.

Zeemering, E. S. (2014). International Connections for Local Government Sustainability Initiatives: Networks Linking Detroit and Windsor. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(1), 119–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9906.2012.00648.x>

Zumbusch, K., & Scherer, R. (2015). Cross-Border Governance: Balancing Formalized and Less Formalized Co-Operations. *Social Sciences (Basel)*, 4(3), 499–519. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci4030499>

## VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Mary Fiagbe

PLACE OF BIRTH: Accra, Ghana

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1993

EDUCATION: Akosombo International High School, Akosombo  
Ghana, 2012

University of Windsor, B.A., Windsor, ON, 2018

University of Windsor, M.A., Windsor, ON, 2023