Smart Urban Intermediaries

Connecting people.
Changing communities.

Urban Intermediaries Working Paper

01-11-2018

About the project

Smart Urban Intermediaries (SmartUrbI) is a collaborative research programme (2017-2019) co-led by Tilburg University, University of Edinburgh, University of Birmingham and Roskilde University. It is funded by JPI Urban Europe (P/693443) through NWO, Innovation Fund Denmark, and the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ES/R002991/1).

SmartUrbI works with a wide range of public, third and community sector partners across the four countries. The purpose is to improve understanding and support for people who make a difference in urban neighbourhood (aka 'smart urban intermediaries'). The project entails collaboration across 'local labs' in Birmingham, Amsterdam, Copenhagen and Glasgow. The labs are sites for co-inquiry between researchers and practitioners exploring barriers and enablers to smart urban development and social innovation. The project will also entail study visits to Portugal and Poland, and a final conference in Denmark in September 2019.

About this working paper

This working paper was co-written by the SmartUrbI team to inform the development of the research, and it's part of a series of papers that reflect on-going thinking rather than final project findings. Questions or comments can be sent to: smarturbi@gmail.com

About the research team

For more information about the project please see our website, where you can also subscribe to the newsletter: http://smart-urban-intermediaries.com/. Follow us on Twitter: @Smart_Urb_I

Urban intermediaries

Working Paper

Rationale

This paper introduces different bodies of literature on urban intermediaries. Since this is a broad and relatively new concept, it introduces some stepping-stones in the literature to enable a substantive discussion about our objects and subjects of research. We will briefly introduce the conceptual bodies of literature, highlighting aspects informing our project, as well as those that will have to be reconsidered to be conceptually innovative and relevant, by including questions:

- What are intermediaries?
- What is intermediation?
- How to identify intermediaries/ mediators?
- How to select intermediaries?
- How to operationalize intermediation as practice?

Topic overview

This topic overview is divided in four sections, considering the questions what intermediaries are, what intermediation is, how intermediaries can be identified, how intermediaries can be selected and how intermediation as practice can be operationalized. This outline aims to address the first and second Research Question of our research project:

- RQ1. How can we identify, systematically and empirically explore, compare and conceptualise urban intermediaries in smart urban development?
- RQ2. How do different urban intermediaries constitute, sustain, and adapt their work for smart urban development?

What are urban intermediaries?

The individual 'who makes a difference' has central attention. Against the background of a more participative society, a differentiated polity, a hollowing out and decline of the state, the emergence of network governance (Rhodes, 1997; 2007) and aims around coproduction, co-creation and self-organisation, civil society associations in general and citizens in particular are (back) in the spotlight (Voorberg et al., 2013; Uitermark, 2014). Against the background of new reform strategies for the public sector (current social challenges and budget austerity) governments are wrestling with the way of 'delivering services' and implementing policies. These new challenges and objectives are pursued through more interactive forms of governance which create space for intermediation between public institutions and wider publics (Torfing and, 2012; Edelenbos and Van Meerkerk, 2017). In the light of these new

civic developments and a 'retrenchment' of the state, this revived attention for civil agency can be understood.

In that regard, numerous studies have been published on what we might call the importance of *intermediation* as process, or more specifically, of *intermediators* or 'in-betweens' as persons. Some labels already existed, others were created recently, but there is a tendency 'to put actors back in the networks' (Rhodes, 2002). The literature has expanded in depicting and better understanding the work of such practitioners. Some 20 and more years after Lipsky started a tradition of studies on 'street-level bureaucrats' (Lipsky, 1980; Hupe & Hill, 2007; Johansson, 2012; Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2012), Kingdon following Dahl in focussing on '(policy) entrepreneurs' (1961; Sheingate, 2003; Miroff, 2003; Kingdon, 1984; Mintrom and Norman, 2009), or the reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983), this evolved into a cascade of labels such as 'competent 'boundary spanners' (Williams, 2002), 'community leaders' (Steadman, 1992; Li and Marsch, 2008; Miller, 2008; van Meerkerk and Edelenbos, 2014), 'everyday makers' (Bang and Sorensen, 1999), 'hybrid planners' (Sehested, 2009), 'frontline workers' (Hartman & Tops, 2005) 'deliberative practitioners' (Forester, 1999), 'public managers' (Feldman & Khademian, 2007), 'collaborative capacity builders' (Weber and Khademian, 2008), 'social entrepreneurs' (Waddock and Post, 1991; Noordegraaf et al., 1995; Leadbeater, 1997; Korosec and Berman, 2006; Certo & Miller, 2008; Alvord, Brown, and Letts, 2004; Irani and Eliman, 2008), 'institutional entrepreneurs'[i] (Garud, Hardy & McGuire, 2007; Henrekson and Sanandaji, 2010), 'street level policy entrepreneurs' (Arnold, 2015), 'dual intermediaries' (Munro, Roberts and Skelcher, 2008), 'everyday fixers' (Hendriks and Tops, 2005), 'civic entrepreneurs' (Leadbeater and Goss, 1998; Durose, 2011) and even 'distributed heroism' (Meijer, 2013). Others collectively reviewed the wide variety of types and grouped them as 'best persons' or 'exemplary practitioners' positioned in different typologies (Van Hulst et al., 2011; 2012; Van den Brink et al., 2012)[ii].

While these accounts contributed towards our conceptual understanding of the specificity of these practitioners, a lot of attention focussed on labelling, categorizing and typologizing the actors in the right pigeonholes. The above plethora of labels is only a part of categories active in the field to depict practitioners. For instance, Skelcher et al. (1996) classified people in urban regeneration networks as 'network enthusiasts', 'activists', 'pragmatists' and 'opponents', while community leaders are perceived as 'career activists' (Hastings et al. 1996) or community 'Godfathers'/'Godmothers' (Mayo 1997). Moreover, community participation has been termed a 'minority sport' (MacFarlane 1993). Already in early studies (Roberts and King, 1989; 1991) they stressed that 'the literature lacks consensus what a policy entrepreneurs is' (1991: 151). It displays a substantive research focus on particular individuals and the need to label their practices, skills and themselves. This variety of labels and pinpointing contributions also raises the issue how these studies can be taken one step further.

More generally, this emphasis on 'putting people back in networks' and emphasizing the 'role individuals play in governance processes' has fuelled research on individual actors and practitioners (Rhodes, 2002; Lowndes, 2005; Van Hulst et al., 2011; 2012; Escobar, 2015). Despite that most contributions acknowledge that 'they cannot do things on their own', the 'concept of action seems to have become individualized' (Cleaver, 1999). Such practitioners were sometimes depicted by a (slight) form of heroism or romanticism which exaggerated the agency of these practitioners (Williams, 2002; Hendriks and Tops, 2005). It was therefore criticized for a matter of 'methodological individualism' (Van Hulst et al., 2011; 2012), in overstating the individual importance while undervaluing the (institutional or cultural) structures of these practices. In that line of inquiry, others questioned to what extent practitioner work really matters (Munro et al., 2008). Thus, while an actor-oriented approach can lead to important insights and it *''may help us break out of the structuralist-functionalist strait-jacket,* but[…] *they also imprison us in a new one' (*Gledhill 1994: 134). Or as argued by Latour: 'using the word 'actor' means that it's never clear who and what is acting when we act since an actor on stage is never alone in acting' (Latour, 2005: 46).

Within so-called 'actor-network theory' (ANT) approaches, the concept of intermediaries includes not just individuals and groups, but includes a broad focus which also includes artefacts, texts and inscriptions (which 'embody and perform ordering arrangements'). And as argued by Meijer (2013), *if* we want to understand innovative public practices by individuals, a) we should not study them in isolation but as *collectives of individuals* or several individuals together contributing to a certain innovation and b) we should therefore not understand it as individual heroes but by *distributed* heroism, *embedded or situated agency*. This focus on 'embedded agency' (Garud et. al, 2007) gained relevance to understand the distributive *context* of collaborative acts (Sewell, 1992; see also: Henrekson and Sanandaji, 2010). This also substantiated the pilot research (Durose et al,. 2015) which emphasizes *situated agency* and the importance of context to understand practices. These are important stepping stones that inform our research project, to create the table below:

Aspect of analysis	Subject of analysis	Practice for analysis
Individual	Intermediary	Intermediating
Set of individuals (configuration, network)	Intermediaries working together (or 'against')	Intermediation and networking

Institutional context	Informal: networks, connections, relationships Formal: organisations	Networking Brokering
Geographical context	Neighbourhood Urban	Boundary spanning

The above table combines the different perspectives highlighted in the text above. So without choosing for or the individual, or configurations or context, it provides with an overview how they can be related to each other. In the Options section we will come back to this.

What is intermediation?

Studying intermediaries, also questions what we understand as intermediation. And importantly, in that regard, is the distinction between *intermediaries* **and** *mediators*. For instance, Latour (2005: 39) makes a distinction between intermediaries and mediators in which an *intermediary* is something what transports meaning or force *without* transformation. This is something that simply *replicates* its input, such as a camera (McKenzie, 1995). Instead, *mediation* is something what transports meaning or force *with* transformations. Consequentially, mediators transform, translate, distort, alter or modify the meaning or the elements they are supposed to carry. To compare both: *''no matter how complicated an intermediary is, it may count for just one, whereas no matter how apparently simple a mediator may look, it may become complex and lead to multiple directions, which will modify all the contradictory accounts attributed to its role''* (Latour, 2005: 39). Consequently, the effect of intermediaries can easily be predicted, whereas the effect of mediators is hard to predict. This also relates to literature on institutional entrepreneurs which focuses on the 'activities of actors who leverage resources to create new institutions or to *transform* existing ones' (Garud et. al, 2007; see also Henrekson and Sanandaji, 2010)[iii]. It refers to the practice of changing, modifying and reinterpreting. And this is not new, since it also refers to how Steadman (1992) already described boundary spanning, as a practice of changing, linking and transferring resources, relationships and people. It points at the relevance of adding and changing in interaction, the relevance of improvisation (Forrester and Laws, 2015).

Now, if we relate this back to our research objectives, and to the way we conceptualized urban intermediaries, this notion informs our subjects of research as actors that transform, translate or alter input in an *unpredictable* way. As such, we will probably study *mediators*. Moreover, this distinction of intermediaries and mediators is helpful, not only to create a more sophisticated conceptual approach of what we called 'smart urban intermediaries', but also because it directly links in with a growing body of

literature focussing on the 'unpredictable' elements of in-between practices as *practices of* transforming, translating, distorting, altering or modifying the meaning or the elements in an urban context. As such we could define (inter)mediation as *an in-between practice of transforming, translating or transcending knowledge*. Therefore, this is a proposal to understand (inter)mediation and focus on what intermediaries *do*. In the operationalizing section, we will build further on this definition.

One final note, since this definition could suggest a dominant focus solely on translations, while it can be argued that this is just one aspect of looking at practices. However, by the emphasis on *in-between practices of transforming, translating or transcending knowledge* this has a focus on practices of which social innovation, co-production or creativity can be the outcome. So this definition does not limit our focus on only translating, transforming or transcending knowledge practices across and between, but focuses on (inter)mediation as *actively generating practice* on things that were not there before.

How to identify urban intermediaries/ mediators?

There is no handbook on this procedure, fortunately, thus most depend on *who* we want to include in our study on the basis of *what*. Or as stated in our research project proposal:

> *''Urban intermediaries relate in diverse ways to social and governance structures. Intermediaries may be employed in public administration or in the delivery of public services, for example as front-line workers engaging daily with local communities and citizens; or in a non-profit, social enterprise, community or voluntary sector organization based in a neighborhood. They may also be from, or represent, civil society, for example as elected representatives, community leaders, activists, active citizens or residents. Urban intermediaries can work through existing modes of service delivery, collaborative or partnership structures or through leading and initiating innovative local projects''*

An important feature for the comparability of this project is the starting point in identifying and selecting intermediaries. What is distinctive is what they do and to what extent this is perceived by *significant others* as '*forging connections within and between actors, create new links where there were none before, and often transform those that already exist'* (van Hulst et al, project proposal).

Previous pilot research, such as the article of Durose et al. (2015), follows other researchers such as Lipsky (1980) and Maynard-Moody and Musheno (2003), since it identifies intermediaries by using the sensitizing concept of 'neighbourhood practitioners who are making a difference'. This is used without having a clearly defined or shared meaning, but it provides with a point of departure (Glaser 1978), a 'general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances' but avoid 'prescriptions of what to see' (Blumer 1969, 147–48). This is done in order to discover practitioners'

positioning, activities, and understandings, in a very broad domain of fields. However, while this pilot research had an open perspective on the 'ones who make a difference', there was a specific focus on *what they do* by including four analytic categories: the aims, commitments, activities and resources associated with practitioners in urban neighborhoods (Durose, et al., 2015).

1) **Aims**
   This ranges from aims on what is pragmatically attainable in the local environment while others aim for local action to build power and create wider change (Alinsky 1989). These aims may be influenced by the positioning of the practitioner in relation to the formal institutions of public administration as well as the extent to which they are informed, influenced, and disciplined by those in the neighborhood (Chapman and Lowndes 2014).
2) **Commitment**
   Practitioners are commited to their work, which is often perceived as more than 'just a job' (van Hulst, de Graaf, and van den Brink 2012) and as pledging to 'go the extra mile' (Maynard-Moody and Musheno 2003).
3) **Activities**
   Activities may follow a script (such as a policy text) but may offer new interpretations and translations, or may abandon the script altogether sometimes by 'pragmatic improvisation' (Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2012; Newman 2013). This perspective acknowledges that they create something different by negotiating between rationales and commitments (Newman 2013).
4) **Resources**
   One crucial resource for neighborhood practitioners is their ability to forge and sustain interpersonal networks (Williams 2002). Such networks can be the basis for building political resources (Alinsky 1989) or making visible hidden or neglected assets within communities (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993). This covers 'bonding', 'bridging' and 'linking' networks within and beyond the neighborhood (Agger and Jensen 2015). Moreover, they are resourced by their 'street' (Maynard-Moody and Musheno 2012) by which they gain 'political' and 'local knowledge' (Kingdon 1995; Yanow 2004). Moreover, one needs to be able to rely on experience acquired '*elsewhere'*: their added value lies in the sources and capital one can bring in from 'elsewhere' as a the transported source of knowledge to increase legitimacy

With this in mind, we can specify the initial sensitising concept of 'people who make a difference in neighbourhoods', by referring to common characteristics in terms of their aims, commitments, activities and resources. But while these aims, commitments, activities, and resources seem quite straightforward, there is large variety in the aims, commitments, activities, and resources of people who make a difference. This also speaks from the table in the pilot research done, below:

Table 4 Key Characteristics of Neighborhood Practitioners Who Are Perceived as Making a Difference

	Profile 1: Enduring	Profile 2: Struggling	Profile 3: Facilitating	Profile 4: Organizing	Profile 5: Trailblazing
Commitment	Strong commitment to place	Uncompromising commitment to a local cause	Commitment to enabling effective participative processes	Strong commitment to wider social change	Strong commitment to a results-driven approach
Aims	Working incrementally to improve life locally for family and neighbors	Improving life for the local community through campaigning	Improving life of the various communities connected to professionally	Contributing to broader social movements or political causes	Finding innovative solutions that enable local change
Activities	Volunteering for the long term on local issues	Striving persistently and energetically for a local cause	Building networks, managing processes, and facilitating deliberative consensus building	Mobilizing people by stimulating critical self-reflection for collective action	Forging wide-ranging alliances through collaborative innovation to find practical solutions
Resources	Live in the neighborhood	Live in the neighborhood	Do not live in the neighborhood	Do not live in the neighborhood	Do not necessarily live in the neighborhood
	No direct access to formal (political, organizational, or financial) resources	No direct access to formal (political, organizational, or financial) resources	Access to formal (political, organizational or financial) resources	No direct access to formal (political, organizational, or financial) resources	Access to formal (political, organizational, or financial) resources
	Draw on local knowledge, reputation, and integrity to build community networks over time	Draw on local knowledge to build tightly bonded networks of like-minded people	Adept at operating in a political environment and construct wide-ranging networks of local and formal support	Mobilize local assets by persuading people to build connections to foster social change	Building strategic alliances that blur established boundaries to support local networks in finding unforeseen solutions

The table from Durose et al. (2015) shows the wide variety in the aims, commitments, activities, and resources of people who make a difference.

How to select urban intermediaries?

It is an important question how we can select/ recruits the ones we will study. In some studies this is done by sampling, others by scouting, others by asking and snowballing stakeholders. In the paper on comparative methods this concern will also be included, as it also overlaps with the idea to have an anchor neighbourhood. However, as been raised before in Skype sessions we need to rely on a combination of statistical datasets about cities and neighbourhoods, local knowledge of practitioners and informal sensitizing interviews (combined with information from LLL) as a combination of sources to base our selection criteria. This paragraph will now zoom in on where to start and how to start searching for data.

Since we aim to study how people 'make a difference', significant in the selection process is *who* we consider here. This could bring forward a more peer-based, snowballing and social-constructivist approach on selecting our subjects of research. Because an important asset for the ones we want to include is to what extent *significant others* define them as 'making a difference' or 'intermediating' in their work. This snowballing process highlights and explicates the importance of peers in a peer-based approach. Because, who are the peers or significant others, that we attribute the ability to depict characteristics to the ones we are looking for? This is one of the central questions that informs our basic starting point for research.

How do we operationalize intermediation as practice?

How can we empirically study intermediation/ boundary work as practice? To paraphrase Latour (2000), the only way to understand *how* urban mediators and governance

processes work is to closely pay attention to what they do, follow them and study the details of their practices closely[iv]. Let us consider two approaches.

Firstly, one strand of literature on organisational practices focuses on the skills and *competences* evident to such practitioners to 'do their job'. Such studies focus for example on practices such as decisions, reports, negotiations and standard operating procedures. Based on daily routines, which can be full of changes (Feldman and Pentland, 2003), all kinds of structures, legal rules, lines of authority and accountability can be studied. But also, Vivian Lowndes' (2005) study on institutional entrepreneurs shows how they expand and recombine their institutional repertoires through strategies of institutional 'remembering', 'borrowing' and 'sharing'[v]. In so doing they create a contingent process of *institutional emergence*, which results in new forms of 'recombinant governance' (Crouch, 2005). Others have shown how practitioners share and access knowledge across boundaries through processes of *transferring, translating and transforming* (Carlile, 2003; Yanow, 2004), processes of *displaying, representing and assembling* (Kellogg et al., 2006) and processes of *reaching, enabling and fixing* (Durose, 2011).

As such, a range of studies focuses on the practicalities or problems, dilemmas and tensions of practitioners to improve their problem solving capacities. Van Hulst (et al., 2011; 2012) pointed out the *tensions* between professional and lay local knowledge and the *dilemmas* that occur when one is *caught* between different worldviews (system and lifeworld). Furthermore, studies highlight the need for 'entrepreneurialism, strategic networking and emphatic engagement' (Van Hulst et al., 2012), the importance of 'interpersonal co-productive relationships, administrative backing, pressures from below and room for manoeuvre' (Hendriks and Tops, 2005), 'everyday engagement and informal networking' (Bang and Sorensen, 1999), 'individual networks and shared beliefs' (Meijer, 2013), 'influencing, bargaining, negotiation, mediation, brokering and trust' (Williams, 2002; Purdue, 2001) 'commitment and resources' (Durose, Van Hulst, Jeffares, Escobar, Agger and de Graaf, 2015), trustworthiness (Van den Brink et al., 2012) and 'credibility' (Steadman, 1992).

Secondly, another strand of literature understands such dilemmas, tensions and competences as elements of *practices*. Practices can be defined here as 'recurrent, materially mediated, and situated social activities' (Schatzki et al. 2001). In the literature on practice theory (Shove, Pantsar and Watson, 2012), practices are understood as a combination of specific elements:

- Materials (including things, technologies, tangible physical entities)
- Competences (skills, know-how and technique)
- Meanings (symbolic meaning, ideas and aspirations)

Practices emerge when connections between elements of these three types are made and they disappear when connections are broken. As such we can enlist what has been found in some of the literature to the level of practice elements:

	Van Hulst et al (2011; 2012)	Durose (2011)	Kellogg et al	Durose et al (2015)	Forester (1989)	Alinsky 1989
Materials			Project E-mail (Outlook) Intranet, Extranets PowerPoint Word, Excel			
Competences	entrepreneurial ways of doing Networking (talking and connecting to people who do not talk to each other. Guinuine interest in people they work with face to face interactions	- reach out, connect and link with people - communicating with and sustain relationships - reinterpreting rules	Making work visible to others on the project Making schedules and plans available to others - Rendering work legible through use of project genres, Juxtaposing existing work through modification and recomposition Reusing prior work Aligning through provisional settlements	-negotiating generating links	- listening empathically, mediating conflict relationship building	Inspiring - motivating, mobilizing people to act together
Meanings	driven by a wish to move the local society in a certain direction			Long standing commitment		

As such, we grouped some level of activities known in the literature. This could provide alternatives for practices we want to study. It shows that operationalizing mediation or intermediation work as practices enables to include also previous mentioned competences, which can be related to materials and meanings. This could provide with a comprehensive approach.

Thirdly, based on the previous accounts, is a focus on translation. If we define *(inter)mediation as a practice of transforming, translating or transcending knowledge*

which consist of material, competent and meaningful elements, we could for instance focus on what intermediaries *do*. By the approach of it as *a practice of transforming, translating or transcending knowledge*, this enables to understand practices as acts in which actors keep something *constant* through a series of *transformations* (Serres, 1974; Healey, 1992; Latour, 2000; Yanow, 2004). This focus on practice as translations is not something new to administrative studies. Previous studies focussed on policy entrepreneurs as those who, 'as outside the formal position of government *translate* new ideas into public practice' (King, 1989; Roberts, 1991: 147; Steadman, 1992; Yanow, 2004). This is an important asset by which daily practices can be studied.

The concept of translation opens up avenues to operationalize daily practices as practices in which practitioners add and leave out elements, since 'with each step properties are lost and gained' (Latour, 2000: 71). This highlights the process or steps of how neighbourhood and local knowledge is interpreted, how it gets institutionalized and implemented for instance in policy documents or professional work. By such an approach, one follows the process how knowledge gets *transported.*

Let's consider one example of how such steps could be understood within the daily practices of a community worker. For instance, the community worker is asked to notice to what extent the neighbourhood she is active in, is still a 'safe' neighbourhood. There are multiple ways in which she can collect knowledge about 'safety', but she decides to gain information based on her local knowledge of the physical situation of that neighbourhood. Therefore, by daily walks she investigates and notes down all kinds of issues that could be interpreted as *unsafety signs*. As such, one could observe that she:

1) Translates *things* into *signs* (for instance a broken window as a sign of unsafety),
2) Transforming *signs* into *instruments* (a sign of unsafety into a surveillance camera)
3) Transcending *instruments* into *diagrams* (a surveillance camera which provides statistics and about street violence)

Local practitioners such as in this example mediate local knowledge. And studying such processes could pinpoint how and why they get some things done. Because the community worker is able to 'talk the language of the city council' (safety policies), while she also understands how people in the neighborhood perceive this (nuisance) and she is able to relate both to each other. By following such processes, is knowing how boundary spanners work, how people get things done, how certain policies get shape, how they are informed, whom are involved and how local knowledge is mediated (Yanow, 2004). This is a very relevant approach and could deliver some interesting stepping-stones to understand how intermediaries create meaning to the local environments in which they are active. To be crystal clear, a focus on translations does not exclude a focus on social innovation, co-production or social learning or considering processes of creativity and synergy. Instead it is especially equipped to focus on social innovation, co-production, creativity and synergy by focussing how intermediaries actively generate something that was not there before. A focus on practices as translations enables a focus on how new,

creative or innovative practices occur of which social innovation or co-production can be the effect.

Bibliography

Author / Content
Williams (2002) Competent boundary spanner
Steadman (1992) Boundary spanners
Meijer, A. J. (2014). From Hero-Innovators to Distributed Heroism: An in-depth analysis of the role of individuals in public sector innovation. *Public Management Review*, *16*(2), 199-216.
Bang and Sorensen (1999) the everyday maker
Hendriks, F., & Tops, P. (2005). Everyday fixers as local heroes: A case study of vital interaction in urban governance. *Local government studies*, *31*(4), 475-490.
Van Hulst, de Graaf en vd Brink (2011) Exemplary practitioners
vd Brink, Van Hulst, de Graaf en vd Pennen (2012) Best persons
Van Hulst, de Graaf en vd Brink (2012). The work of exemplary practitioners (CPS)
Durose, Van Hulst, Jeffares, Escobar, Agger and de Graaf (2015). Five ways to make a difference
Koster (2011) bridging the gap
Koster (2015) ERC proposal
Cleaver (1999) paradoxes of participation
Verloo (2016) learning from informality
Uitermark (2014) Longing for Wikitopia
Laws and Forester (2015) Conflict, improvisation, governance

References

Blokland, T. (2001). Bricks, mortar, memories: neighbourhood and networks in collective acts of remembering. *International journal of urban and regional research*, *25*(2), 268-283.
Certo & Miller, social entrepreneurship (2005)
Escobar (2015) scripting deliberative policymaking
A Planner's Day: Knowledge and Action in Communicative Practice Patsy Healey
HENREKSON and SANANDAJI The interaction of entrepreneurship and institutions
Irani, Z., & Elliman, T. (2008). Creating social entrepreneurship in local government. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *17*(4), 336-342.
Negotiating bureaucrats Vicki Johansson. Public administration 2012
Korosec and Berman, Municipal Support for Social entrepreneurship
Leadbeater and Goss Civic entrepreneurship
Lowndes. Something old… How institutions change (and stay the same) in local governance
Mintrom and Norman, 2009 Policy entrepreneur and policy change
Leadbeater Rise of the social entrepreneur
Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, *40*(3), 260-282.
Leadbeater, C. (1997). *The rise of the social entrepreneur* (No. 25). Demos.
Roberts, N. C., & King, P. J. (1991). Policy entrepreneurs: Their activity structure and function in the policy process. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *1*(2), 147-175.
Van Meerkerk, I., & Edelenbos, J. (2014). The effects of boundary spanners on trust and performance of urban governance networks: findings from survey research on urban development projects in the Netherlands. *Policy Sciences*, *47*(1), 3-24.
Weber, E. P., & Khademian, A. M. (2008). Wicked problems, knowledge challenges, and collaborative capacity builders in network settings. *Public administration review*, *68*(2), 334-349.
Korosec, R. L., & Berman, E. M. (2006). Municipal support for social entrepreneurship. *Public administration review*, *66*(3), 448-462.
Sullivan, H. (2007). Interpreting'community leadership'in English local government. *Policy & Politics*, *35*(1), 141-161.
Genieys, W., Ballart, X., & Valarié, P. (2004). From ‘great’leaders to building networks: The emergence of a new urban leadership in Southern Europe?. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *28*(1), 183-199.
Healey, P. (1992). A planner's day: knowledge and action in communicative practice. *Journal of the American planning association*, *58*(1), 9-20.
Purdue, D. (2005). Community leadership cycles and the consolidation of

neighbourhood coalitions in the new local governance. *Public Management Review*, *7*(2), 247-266.
Sehested, K. (2009). Urban planners as network managers and metagovernors. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *10*(2), 245-263.
Munro, H. A., Roberts, M., & Skelcher, C. (2008). Partnership governance and democratic effectiveness. *Public Policy and Administration*, *23*(1), 61-79.
Ellis, K., Davis, A., & Rummery, K. (1999). Needs assessment, street-level bureaucracy and the new community care. *Social Policy & Administration*, *33*(3), 262-280.
Leitch, C. M., Hill, F. M., & Harrison, R. T. (2010). The philosophy and practice of interpretivist research in entrepreneurship: Quality, validation, and trust. *Organizational Research Methods*, *13*(1), 67-84.
Certo, S. T., & Miller, T. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts. *Business horizons*, *51*(4), 267-271.
Mintrom, M., & Norman, P. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *Policy Studies Journal*, *37*(4), 649-667.
Lelieveldt, H., Dekker, K., Völker, B., & Torenvlied, R. (2009). Civic organizations as political actors: Mapping and predicting the involvement of civic organizations in neighborhood problem-solving and coproduction. *Urban Affairs Review*, *45*(1), 3-24.
Miller, P. M. (2008). Examining the work of boundary spanning leaders in community contexts. *International Journal of leadership in Education*, *11*(4), 353-377.
Blanco, I., Lowndes, V., & Pratchett, L. (2011). Policy networks and governance networks: Towards greater conceptual clarity. *Political Studies Review*, *9*(3), 297-308.
Lowndes, V., & Sullivan, H. (2008). How low can you go? Rationales and challenges for neighbourhood governance. *Public administration*, *86*(1), 53-74.
Kellogg, Orlikowski, Yates, Life in the trading zone, Organization Science
Street-level policy entrepreneurship, Arnold, Public management review
Blanco, I. (2013). Analysing urban governance networks: bringing regime theory back in. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, *31*(2), 276-291.
Coaffee, J., & Healey, P. (2003). 'My voice: My place': Tracking transformations in urban governance. *Urban studies*, *40*(10),

Endnotes

[i] 'activities of actors who have an interest in particular institutional arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones'

[ii] This has led to an over-signification of characteristics and an under-problematization of labels

[iii] To conclude, such an approach enables to see mediation and thus mediators not as people *outside* politics, governance or democracy, but as part of processes in which democracy, politics and governance gets substance. As an example, in their study on safety, Gherardi and Niccollini (2000) show how safety is the *result* of a set of practices, as a final result of a collective process of construction, 'a doing which involves people, technologies, assembled textual and symbolic forms'. This also reduces the need to select a governance domain on beforehand, by shadowing our subjects we can show how the governance of x/y is a result of the practices we study.

[iv] Generally, literature on intermediaries or best-persons, contains a dualism between the specificities of their locality, professional complexity, multilayerdness and particularity which contradicts with the need to bureaucratize, standardize, calculate and normalize that particular local (street-wise) knowledge (Yanow, 2004; Feldman & Khademian, 2007). This is a recurrent theme also in best-person and street-level bureaucrat studies, in which the tension between (Habermassian) system and life world, formal or informal or inside-bureaucratic and outside-substantial values is presented (Hupe & Hill, 2007; Verloo, 2017; Gilchrist and Fellow, 2016). While this could be helpful for previous studies, Latour shows that this dualism is not always contributing for our understanding of professional practices. He shows that contrasting real or natural (lifeworld) and cultural or superficial (system) worlds, obfuscates a focus on the transformative practices, which are key to what those practitioners do (see also: Healey, 1992).

[v] Institutional remembering is the activation of redundant institutional resources in the service of new objectives. Such dormant resources are 'potentially accessible to the agent capable of searching into her past repertoire' (Crouch & Farrell, 2004, p. 18).
Institutional borrowing involves the transfer of institutional resources from an adjacent 'action space' (Crouch & Farrell, 2004). The actors most able to exploit this strategy are those who play 'multiple games' or, in less technical terms, operate within more than one institutional environment.
Institutional sharing refers to what Crouch and Farrell (2004, p. 34) call the 'transfer of experience from other agents through networks of structured relationships'. While 'borrowing' involves the same actor transferring experience between the different arenas in which she acts, 'sharing' provides access to the institutional repertoires of other actors (who operate in different action spaces). If remembering is about looking backward and borrowing is about looking sideward, then sharing involves looking outward in the search to expand and recombine institutional resources.

URBAN EUROPE
Project no. 693443
E·S·R·C ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
Project no. ES/R002991/1
Innovation Fund Denmark
NWO Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
TILBURG UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
Roskilde University
THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH