



This is a repository copy of *Rethinking the 'local state' and local capacity*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/215046/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Pill, M. orcid.org/0000-0002-9434-1425 (2024) Rethinking the 'local state' and local capacity. *Local Government Studies*, 50 (6). pp. 998-1007. ISSN 0300-3930

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2377224>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Rethinking the 'local state' and local capacity

Madeleine Pill

To cite this article: Madeleine Pill (08 Jul 2024): Rethinking the 'local state' and local capacity, Local Government Studies, DOI: [10.1080/03003930.2024.2377224](https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2377224)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2377224>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



[View supplementary material](#)



Published online: 08 Jul 2024.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 200



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Rethinking the 'local state' and local capacity

Madeleine Pill

Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

ABSTRACT

Considering the state-society relationships of local governance leads to conceptual and practical questions about local capacity to decide and pursue local priorities and meet local needs and the role of local government in these processes. In England's extremely centralised governmental system, debates about local capacity tend to be subsumed by the constraints to which it is subject. Combining scholarship on policy capacity, local governance conjunctures over time and local government's role within these informs conceptualisation of a plural, relational local state. This draws attention to local government's everyday, intra-locality relations with its constituent communities, broadening a vertical, reductive perspective to a horizontal, more generative understanding of local capacity to care for place through collective practices.

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 31 May 2024; Accepted 24 June 2024


KEYWORDS Local government; local capacity; everyday practices; relational local state; local governance

Introduction

Considering the state-society relationships of local governance leads to conceptual and practical questions about local capacity to decide and pursue local priorities and meet local needs, and the role of local government in these processes. A focus on English local government, informed by shifts in local governance conjunctures over the past 50 years as documented by the discipline of local government studies, informs a theoretical argument relevant to the present and future of local government in England and other centralised democracies.

In England's extremely centralised governmental system, debates about local capacity tend to be subsumed by the constraints to which it is subject. Local government, created by and subordinate to Parliament, lacks

CONTACT Madeleine Pill  m.c.pill@sheffield.ac.uk  Department of Urban Studies and Planning, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2377224>

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

constitutional protection and financial autonomy, creating a culture of dependency wherein local government is an agent of the centre and 'government arrangements' for citizen participation are consensus-seeking and exclusionary (Ansell and Gash 2008; Davies 2011; Swyngedouw 2010). Legislative shifts have accorded some power to local government without shifting its basis as a 'creature' of the central state. The 'well-being power' (Local Government Act 2000) enabled it 'to promote the economic, social and environmental well-being of their area', implying some agency regarding outcomes sought and ways of realising these. The 'general power of competence' (Localism Act 2011) accorded it 'power to do anything that individuals generally may do', meaning it no longer had to demonstrate the statutory basis for its actions. In the period since, scholarship has focused on how austerity localism's political devolution absent fiscal devolution has weakened local capacity (Featherstone et al. 2012). But, aligned with the new understandings of political practice and agency that Barnett acknowledges in this special issue, others bring attention to the agency of the local in identifying scope for more progressive localisms which highlight an ethos of care (Cooper 2020; Cooper and Herman 2020). Scholarship in *Local Government Studies* has sought to blur this binary between austere realism (Davies et al. 2020) and progressive potentialities by focusing on the 'actually existing' practices of local government that create agency and justify its value beyond being the local representation of 'the state' to a broader 'logic of the local' (Barnett 2020; Barnett, Griggs, and Sullivan 2020, 2022; Blanco, Griggs, and Sullivan 2014).

This paper draws from these debates to argue for a more plural, participatory conception of the local state founded in an (intra-) relational understanding of local capacity. Such a focus on local government's relationships with its constituent communities deepens understanding of what is actually existing and its potentialities in terms of local capacity to determine and enact goals to 'care for place' (Healey 2018), whilst reasserting local government's vital role in the processes of governing localities. Taking a pro-local government stance that draws attention to its everyday, intra-locality relations shifts a vertical, reductive perspective of local capacity to a horizontal and more generative understanding, aiding reconstruction of a normative grounding for local government for the future (as called for by Barnett in this issue).

Understanding local capacity

Policy capacity scholarship, focused on the capacity of national government and its agencies to develop and implement policy, ranges conceptually in definition and scope. Studies tend to share a focus on how to build capacity to make decisions or 'intelligent choices' (Painter and Pierre

2005) along with varying emphases on the capacity to assemble resources and co-ordinate implementation of policy decisions. In combination these aspects – analytical capacity to understand the policy actions needed; operational capacity to align resources with actions so they can be implemented; and political capacity to gain and sustain support for these actions – provide a broad definition of policy capacity as the set of resources and skills necessary to perform policy functions (Wu, Howlett, and Ramesh 2018). This wide definition goes beyond the typical governmental focus to encapsulate other actors' engagement in determining actions, assembling the resources to implement these, and garnering and retaining the support and legitimacy to do so.

The importance of considering capacity at sub-national levels is increasingly recognised in calls for the 'urbanisation' of political science and public policy scholarship (Kaufmann and Sidney 2020). But *urban* politics scholars have long considered local capacity in terms of the diversity of local actors and interests, the nature of alliances created, and their capacity to govern. Different approaches place different normative emphasis on local government's role and the inclusiveness and democratic quality of local governance arrangements. Stone's US-focused regime theory starts with city government, cast as the lead in forming coalitions and developing partnerships to increase 'capacity to act', defined in terms of the ability 'to make and carry out governing decisions' (Stone 1989, 6). In policy capacity terms, regime theory's 'iron law' that the regime 'must be able to mobilise resources commensurate with its main policy agenda' (Stone 1993, 21) centres operational rather than analytical or political capacity. Governance is dominated by the imperative of assembling private resource, lacking democratic decision-making to underpin the determination of local priorities (analytical capacity) and garner support and legitimacy for their realisation (political capacity).

In contrast, urban governance theorists sought to 'bring democracy back in' (Hendriks 2014) by asserting the political authority of local government and its ability to make decisions about collective goals and co-ordinate action to realise these. Accountability is envisaged through citizen voice via the ballot box but also through other methods of engaging citizens and partnering with intermediary groups and organisations. In policy capacity terms, local government is focused on analytical and political aspects whilst societal 'partners' are engaged in operational aspects, providing resources for collective projects and their implementation. But the extent to which formal local political institutions can and do engage in inclusive, accountable governance relationships that provide a democratic underpinning as part of the 'collaborative and participatory turn' (Dean 2018) in local governance has been widely questioned. Studies of arrangements for citizen participation have critiqued their use as a post-political, consensus-seeking strategy to legitimise public decisions whilst avoiding conflict and excluding dissenting voices

(Swyngedouw 2010), thus reducing local analytical and political capacity by excluding different forms of knowledge and denuding legitimacy.

More recent scholarship has sought to 'recentre the urban political' (Dikeç and Swyngedouw 2017) by challenging formal understandings of urban (post-)politics through enlarging the range of political actors, forms of and venues for participation identified particularly in 'everyday' living (Beveridge and Koch 2019; Newman 2014). The ambivalence of these forms, which may arise in reaction to or despite the constraints of post-political, consensual forms of rule, and may or may not be progressive (Bruzzone 2019), draws attention to the multiplicity of spaces within which different forms of agency can be assembled. Attempts at enacting broadened forms of everyday politics, most prominently via new municipalisms and specifically the use of citizen platforms, may be informed by a 'state phobia' with local government perceived as part of the problem (Barnett 2020). But practice experiences have invigorated debates about the need to as well as challenge of working 'in and against' the state (Blanco, Salazar, and Bianchi 2020), underlining the validity of understanding local capacity in relational terms that incorporate formal and informal, everyday politics and practices.

English conjunctures of local governance

In England, shifts in thinking about relational local capacity can be tracked against three different, albeit overlapping, conceptions of local government's role in local governance (which reflect the meta-narratives of centralisation, governance and crisis elaborated by Giovannini and Griggs 2024). These reflect different understandings of local capacity, from zero sum conceptualisations where capacity is about what is given or accorded centrally, to more generative conceptualisations which consider the capacity that inheres within local relations.

The first, 'central state-centric' view of local governance describes local government's transition to an agency doing the bidding of central government in the 1980s (John 2014), acting as service provider or overseer of service delivery via contractual relationships given the imposition of market discipline. Here local capacity is delimited by vertical relations. In the 1990s this was superseded by a second, 'state-supplemented' view of local governance in which local government engaged 'partners' in forms of community network governance. Plural, inclusive horizontal relations were recognised, thus forwarding a relational conception of local capacity that chimes with the 'capacity to act' garnered through alliance formation (Stone 1989). But in practice, ready critiques of how these arrangements maintained central state control affirmed the deficits of governance-beyond-the-state (Davies 2011) whilst also affirming local government's co-ordinating role in leading local networks (John 2014).

Since 2010 and the political project of austerity, a third, 'state-decentred' view of local governance has combined a reliance on and degradation of local relational capacity given expectations for everyday self-help as government has retrenched. At the outset Stoker (2011) bemoaned the marginalisation of English local government in its community governance role as it lacked the 'hard power' of adequate resource (operational capacity) to combine with its 'soft power' of convening and co-ordinating (political capacity), whilst others document a decline in local government's 'back office' analytical capacity (Eckersley and Tobin 2019). Austerity localism scholarship asserts that the downloading of costs and responsibilities, combined with increasing needs, has removed capacity to act (Davies et al. 2022; Lowndes and Pratchett 2012). Local government attempts to develop new participatory relationships with citizens have been interpreted as rendering austerity governable (Davies et al. 2020; Penny 2018), seeking to inculcate service self-provisioning in forms of unaccountable 'austerity co-production' (Habermehl and Perry 2021; Pill 2021). And as financial and in-kind resources to support partnership working have diminished, local government's intra-local relations with citizens, informal community groups and civil society organisations have been degraded (Pill and Guarneros-Meza 2020). Local government is thus seen as facing 'institutional incapacitation' in its ability to articulate and enact 'the collective needs and wants of its citizens' (Penny 2018, 163), whilst its political-bureaucratic core remains largely impervious to successive crises wrought upon its outer, more relational, aspects, enduring in retrenchment (John 2014).

But others point to how creative responses have been engendered, identifying forms of entrepreneurial or pragmatic municipalism beyond those envisaged in central state strategies (Barnett et al. 2022; Cooper 2020; Thompson et al. 2020). This positive, normative stance points to how local government can use 'ingenious strategies to forge some autonomy' (John 2014, 695), assembling agency from its local knowledge and professional expertise, relational networking and negotiating skills, and its position as the 'elected and concerned representative' of its communities (Wilson and Game 2011, 203). Stoker's conception of local government's 'soft power' is salient given emphasis on officers' ability to make links between formal and informal politics and practices, generating capacity through their skills and dispositions, including networking, negotiation and the ability to facilitate and shape collaborative arrangements (Williams 2019).

In a powerful guest editors' introduction in this journal, Barnett, Griggs and Sullivan (2020, 505) seek to move local government scholarship beyond the binary of current deficiencies of local capacity, at its zenith in austerity governance scholarship, and a capacity-deferred until realisation of an idealised 'council-to-come'. They call for an ethos of 'municipal pragmatism' focused on 'actually existing' practices and the agency of local government

grounded in its everyday work. In response to this call, a fourth conception is posited – that of a ‘state-repositioned’ form of local governance, wherein local government is not a mere agent of the centre as service deliverer or local co-ordinator, but is key to growing shared, democratic local capacity to care for place.

A plural, relational ‘local state’

Thinking about how to reposition local government within local governance is aided by a plural, relational conceptualisation of a (state and society) ‘local state’ that engenders local capacity to ‘care for place’ through its collective practices (Healey 2018). Envisaging this ‘local state’ entails broadening understanding to embrace the generative capacity of the relations that inhere within it. Davina Cooper usefully distinguishes ‘stateness’ from ‘statehood’ to characterise how local government is enmeshed in everyday, non-elite relations that extend beyond understandings of the state in terms of formal institutions and representative forms of democracy (Cooper 2020, 180). Others posit an everyday local state (Hilbrandt 2019; Pill and Guarneros-Meza 2020) in which everyday practices shape a local state that envelops the ‘formal’ local state. In thinking of actually existing local government as part of a relational, everyday local state, local government is not consigned to top-down, constrained conceptions of the capacity of the local in the vertical state hierarchy. Rather it can creatively use its powers to pay attention to local experiences and needs (Barnett et al. 2022; Cooper 2020) within a local state that is made up of specific practices of governance within the locality. In other words, the local state is constituted by the ‘logic of the local’ or the ‘amalgam of rules, norms and processes that constitute regimes of practice’ (Blanco, Griggs, and Sullivan 2014, 3131), thus bridging ‘the dichotomy of the local’ (Giovannini and Griggs 2024) as a space of government or of plurality.

A broadened conceptualisation of the local state brings to the fore local government’s relations with its constituent communities (of place, interest and identity) and their intermediaries, as well as practices of citizen participation and co-production (included in the myriad of ‘locals’ described by Giovannini and Griggs 2024). Cooper (2020, 179) draws inspiration from how British urban left councils of the 1980s incorporated community projects within local governance. Scholarship documenting pragmatic responses to austerity localism gives current examples of how local government can deploy its ‘hard power’ through use of material assets combined with its relational ‘soft power’ to support community practices. Whilst grounded inquiry highlights the need for a ‘realistic’ understanding of what can be achieved and the government supports entailed (Earley 2023; Pill and Guarneros-Meza 2020), the prototypical example of a public-commons partnership identified in Liverpool (Thompson et al. 2020), wherein public subsidy

secured property assets controlled by a community enterprise, provides a salutary example in the here and now. Other examples highlight local officers' 'daily creativity' in altering services and building from past activities (Barnett, Griggs, and Sullivan 2020, 2022).

A relational conception of the local state and its multiplicity of practices requires recognition of unequal power relations and the questions posed by post-political and austerity co-production critiques of previous conceptions of local governance, such as the dangers of marginalised self-help. Social innovation scholarship suggests that local government should enable and sustain community practices via a 'bottom-linked' approach which provides material and normative supports within a broader, co-constitutive rethinking of local governance – such as the plural, relational local state elaborated here – but that, importantly, is underpinned by democratic state-functioning (Bianchi 2023). Local government needs to be able to oversee and intervene, thus 'anchoring' an accountable, legitimate, practical 'doing' of politics (Barnett 2020). But this also means having to live with the ambivalence of the everyday that 'stateness' entails (Barnett, Giovannini, and Griggs 2024). Local government is 'the great survivor' as 'the main institution governing localities' (John 2014, 689) but it cannot ever realise full coordination of the provisional, partial and contested ensembles of governmental and non-governmental actors that make up the local state (Newman 2014).

Conclusion

Combining scholarship on policy capacity, local governance conjunctures over the past 50 years and local government's role within these has informed conceptualisation of a plural, relational local state that broadens understandings of local capacity to decide and pursue local priorities and meet local needs to care for place. The present can be regarded as a transitional period in which neither state-supplemented nor state-decentred approaches to local governance are working. Conceptualising a plural, relational and active local state helps to reposition local government in local governance in the here and now and for the future. The inclusion of diverse actors and communities, and diverse modes of everyday, lived and learned experience open out local capacity beyond reductive zero sum to generative understandings. We have many models of ways in which local government can seek to make local governance more participatory. But conceptualising a plural local state moves beyond to consider the ways in which everyday, community activities influence the local state. Thus we seek to hold onto the concept of the local state while reconceptualising 'what gathers in its name' (Cooper 2020, 186) in terms of its constitutive social relations and the pragmatic ways these are expressed in actual, everyday practice. This theorising, informed by the plurality of critical perspectives from other disciplines that have augmented

our understanding of 'the local', better equips the discipline of local government studies for the future.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Ansell, C., and A. Gash. 2008. "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 18 (4): 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>.
- Barnett, N. 2020. "English Local Government and the Local Trap." *Local Government Studies* 46 (4): 604–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1761336>.
- Barnett, N., A. Giovannini, and S. Griggs. 2024. "Serial Adapters? Local Government Chief Officers and the Navigation of Space and Time." *Environment & Planning C Politics & Space* 42 (2): 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544231223618>.
- Barnett, N., S. Griggs, S. Hall, and D. Howarth. 2022. "Local Agency for the Public Purpose? Dissecting and Evaluating the Emerging Discourses of Municipal Entrepreneurship in the UK." *Local Government Studies* 48 (5): 907–928. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2021.1988935>.
- Barnett, N., S. Griggs, and H. Sullivan. 2020. "Guest editors' Introduction: The Power of Now. Reimagining the Future of Local Government Through Studies of 'Actually existing' Practice." *Local Government Studies* 46 (4): 505–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2020.1783251>.
- Beveridge, R., and P. Koch. 2019. "Urban Everyday Politics: Politicising Practices and the Transformation of the Here and Now." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37 (1): 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818805487>.
- Bianchi, I. 2023. "Empowering Policies for Grassroots Welfare Initiatives: Blending Social Innovation and Commons Theory." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 30 (2): 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09697764221129532>.
- Blanco, I., S. Griggs, and H. Sullivan. 2014. "Situating the Local in the Neoliberalisation and Transformation of Urban Governance." *Urban Studies* 51 (15): 3129–3146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014549292>.
- Blanco, I., Y. Salazar, and I. Bianchi. 2020. "Urban Governance and Political Change Under a Radical Left Government: The Case of Barcelona." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 42 (1): 18–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1559648>.
- Bruzzone, V. 2019. "The Moral Limits of Autonomous Democracy for Planning Theory: A Critique of Purcell." *Planning Theory* 18 (1): 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095218776042>.
- Cooper, D. 2020. "Conceptual Prefiguration and Municipal Radicalism: Reimagining What it Could Mean to Be a State." In *Reimagining the State: Theoretical Challenges and Transformative Possibilities*, edited by D. Cooper, N. Dhawan, and J. Newman, 171–190. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cooper, D., and D. Herman. 2020. "Doing Activism Like a State: Progressive Municipal Government, Israel/Palestine and BDS." *Environment & Planning C Politics & Space* 38 (1): 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654419851187>.

- Davies, J. S. 2011. *Challenging Governance Theory: From Networks to Hegemony*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Davies, J. S. 2022. *New Developments in Urban Governance: Rethinking Collaboration in the Age of Austerity*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Davies, J. S., A. Bua, M. Cortina-Oriol, and E. Thompson. 2020. "Why Is Austerity Governable? A Gramscian Urban Regime Analysis of Leicester, UK." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 42 (1): 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1490152>.
- Dean, R. 2018. "Counter-Governance: Citizen Participation Beyond Collaboration *Politics and Governance* 6 (1): 180–188. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v6i1.1221>.
- Dikeç, M., and E. Swyngedouw. 2017. "Theorizing the Politicizing City." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 41 (1): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12388>.
- Earley, A. 2023. "Achieving Urban Regeneration without Gentrification? Community Enterprises and Community Assets in the UK." *Journal of Urban Affairs*: 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2023.2229459>.
- Eckersley, P., and P. Tobin. 2019. "The Impact of Austerity on Policy Capacity in Local Government." *Policy & Politics* 47 (3): 455–472. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557319X15613701303511>.
- Featherstone, D., A. Ince, D. Mackinnon, K. Strauss, and A. Cumbers. 2012. "Progressive Localism and the Construction of Political Alternatives." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (2): 177–182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00493.x>.
- Giovannini, A., and S. Griggs 2024. "Addressing the Elephant in the Room: What's the Local in Local Government Studies?" *Local Government Studies* 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2024.2359456>.
- Habermehl, V., and B. Perry. 2021. "The Risk of Austerity Co-Production in City-Regional Governance in England." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 45 (3): 555–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13010>.
- Healey, P. 2018. "Creating Public Value Through Caring for Place *Policy and Politics*." *Policy & Politics* 46 (1): 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557316X14817306640776>.
- Hendriks, F. 2014. "Understanding Good Urban Governance: Essentials, Shifts, and Values." *Urban Affairs Review* 50 (4): 553–576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087413511782>.
- Hilbrandt, H. 2019. "Everyday Urbanism and the Everyday State: Negotiating Habitat in Allotment Gardens in Berlin *Urban Studies*." *Urban Studies* 56 (2): 352–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017740304>.
- John, P. 2014. "The Great Survivor: The Persistence and Resilience of English Local Government." *Local Government Studies* 40 (5): 687–704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2014.891984>.
- Kaufmann, D., and M. Sidney. 2020. "Toward an Urban Policy Analysis: Incorporating Participation, Multilevel Governance, and "Seeing Like a City"." *PS, Political Science & Politics* 53 (1): 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519001380>.
- Lowndes, V., and L. Pratchett. 2012. "Local Governance Under the Coalition Government: Austerity, Localism and the Big Society." *Local Government Studies* 38 (1): 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2011.642949>.
- Newman, J. 2014. "Landscapes of Antagonism: Local Governance, Neoliberalism and Austerity *Urban Studies*." *Urban Studies* 51 (15): 3290–3305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013505159>.

- Painter, M., and J. Pierre. 2005. "Unpacking Policy Capacity: Issues and Themes." In *Challenges to State Policy Capacity*, edited by M. Painter and J. Pierre, 1–8. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Penny, J. 2018. "The 'Cooperative' or 'Cop-out' Council? Urban Politics at a Time of Austerity Localism in London." In *The Urban Political: Ambivalent Spaces of Late Neoliberalism*, edited by T. Enright and U. Rossi, 147–169. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pill, M. 2021. "Neighbourhood Collaboration in Co-Production: State-Resourced Responsiveness or State-Retrenched Responsibilisation?" *Policy Studies* 43 (5): 984–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2021.1892052>.
- Pill, M., and V. Guarneros-Meza. 2020. "The Everyday Local State? Opening Up and Closing Down Informality in Local Governance." *Local Government Studies* 46 (4): 542–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2019.1624256>.
- Stoker, G. 2011. "Was Local Governance Such a Good Idea? A Global Comparative Perspective *Public Administration*." *Public Administration* 89 (1): 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01900.x>.
- Stone, C. 1989. *Regime Politics: The Governing of Atlanta 1946-1988*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Stone, C. 1993. "Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 15 (1): 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9906.1993.tb00300.x>.
- Swyngedouw, E. 2010. "Apocalypse Forever?" *Theory, Culture & Society* 27 (2–3): 213–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409358728>.
- Thompson, M., V. Nowak, A. Southern, J. Davies, and P. Furmedge. 2020. "Re-grounding the City with Polanyi: From Urban Entrepreneurialism to Entrepreneurial Municipalism." *Environment & Planning A* 52 (6): 1171–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X19899698>.
- Williams, P. 2019. *Middle Managers As Agents of Collaboration*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Wilson, D., and C. Game. 2011. *Local Government in the UK*. 5th ed. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wu, X., M. Howlett, and M. Ramesh, Eds. 2018. *Policy Capacity and Governance: Assessing Governmental Competences and Capabilities in Theory and Practice*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.