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Abstract

Regional development is indeed situational, available resources and experienced constraints here and now are the most basic pre-conditions. Thus this paper takes off from a time-geographical approach and aims to problematize actors as and structures in regional policies on development issues. The increased interest in political entrepreneurship has both analytical and practical grounds and implications. There are demands for approaching the new roles of entrepreneurial actors, which here will be approached in relation to their localization, how they act to expand action spaces for themselves as well as others in the local community.

The aim of this paper is to contribute to theories and methods for analysis of the role of policy entrepreneurs in relation to regional development from a policy analytical and time-spatial perspective by:

a) defining two types of policy entrepreneurs from the governance literature,
b) placing them in a time-spatial context to show how their expansion of time-space prisms and expanding opportunities for themselves and other actors,
c) summarising the conceptual model of policy entrepreneurs as issue entrepreneurs and political entrepreneurs.

There is an analytical progress in these dimensions of policy entrepreneurship. The conceptual development will be discussed both in terms of theories, methods and practices. The conclusions of the paper will provide analytical models for case studies as well as tools and ideas for policy entrepreneurs and structural changes of policy making on regional development.
Introduction

Regional development is indeed situational, available resources and experienced constraints here and now are the most basic pre-conditions. There is an interplay of structures, actors and networks forming what is experienced as regional development. Access to broadband and other infrastructures are indeed an aspect of development and it is regional, since it is about reach and capacities to act in the region (Palm & Wihlborg 2006; Wihlborg & Palm 2008). In the case of establishing broadband in the most remote and rural areas of northern Sweden, political entrepreneurs played a key role. They managed to piece together financing, technical solutions and get it done even in the most remote villages, far from the places where the market entrepreneurs would even have thought about it (Wihlborg 2003).

The increased interest in political entrepreneurship has both analytical and practical grounds and implications. There are demands for approaching the new roles of entrepreneurial actors, which here will be approached by an ideal typical conceptualisation and in relation to their localization, how they act to expand action spaces for themselves as well as others in the local community.

Regional development is much more than economic growth, there is cultural and social change not always measurable in economic terms (Gibson-Graham 2006). Regional development takes place in the interplay of structural changes and individuals' achievements. Thus both policy maker and analysts pay attention to how and why entrepreneurs can contribute to regional development and change. Policy makers are most often considered as actors promoting conditions for development and structures for change. But policy makers are also seen as entrepreneurial and making innovative change and finding creative solutions. When policy-making becomes more characterized by networked governance than strictly governmental steering (Peters 2007) there are new interface between politics and market opening for policy entrepreneurs. The concept of policy entrepreneur was identified by Kingdon (1995) as the ones coupling problems, politics and policies to find ways through. However, the roles of these entrepreneurial actors in the policy-making contexts are not highlighted as much as their market relatives. Regional development is so much more than pure economic development/growth and thus policy entrepreneurs makes a difference.
and regional settings there is a close interplay of these different types of entrepreneurs and the policy entrepreneurs act in close interplay with market and social entrepreneurs. The policy entrepreneurs are distinguished by their focus on the policies – issues or structures – on a more aggregated level. They do not have profit making nor individuals satisfaction as momentum.

If the policy entrepreneurs are here to stay as crucial actors in policy making and regional development we have to get to know them and no longer consider them as anomalies in the policy process and use them for improved regional development.

Aim of the paper

The aim of this paper is to contribute to theories and methods for analysis of the role of policy entrepreneurs in relation to regional development from a time-spatial and a policy network perspective by:

a) defining two types of policy entrepreneurs from the governance literature,
b) placing them in a time-spatial context to show how their expansion of time-space prisms and expanding opportunities for themselves and other actors,
c) summarising the conceptual model of policy entrepreneurs as issue entrepreneurs and political entrepreneurs,
d) and in the next version of the paper I will also apply this extended meaning of policy entrepreneurs on the critical interplay of structures and policy entrepreneurs in Ydre municipality.

There is an analytical progress in these approaches towards policy entrepreneurship. The conceptual development will be discussed both in terms of theories, methods and practices. This paper proceeds in three steps towards a concluding model on roles of policy entrepreneurs. First, the policy context of governance and policy networks will be discussed focusing on Kingdon’s (1995) analysis of policy entrepreneurs in the streams and the policy network approach by (Rhodes and Marsh 1992; Sörensen & Torfing 2008). This will form a two-folded definition of policy entrepreneurs. Secondly, I will add in the model of time-geography taking off from Torsten Hägerstrand’s work focusing on the prism of opportunities. These will then be taken together to show how policy entrepreneurs can take on
roles to develop action spaces for others in local/regional development by focusing on the issue or by focusing the structures. Thirdly\(^1\), this conceptualization will be further illustrated by cases from the Asby parish in Ydre municipality, Östergötland region, Sweden. Finally, the conclusions of the paper will provide analytical models as well as tools and ideas for policy entrepreneurs and structural changes of policy-making regarding regional development.

**Methods and material for this paper**

This paper is mainly conceptual but builds on several case studies, on regional development and broadband policies (Wihlborg 2000; 2003; Palm & Wihlborg 2006; Wihlborg & Palm 2008) and on local development in Ydre (Assmo and Wihlborg 2011; 2012) where policy entrepreneurs have appeared as crucial actors. A bottom-up approach focuses on the competing understandings of the policy problem and its consequences on the policy process (Pedersen, 2007). It is not purely inductive but moves beyond pre-defined categories and focus on how actors actively construct and re-construct meanings and may even open for new categories (Bogason, 2000:159). I have here worked from the empirical impressions and the constructed narratives of the regional development processes in a rural community in interlay with experiences from other case studies as well as theories in the policy field. The analysis is thus a construction of two categories of policy entrepreneurs based on bottom-up experiences. But the presentation here is more theoretical and argumentative based on models of policy networks and agenda setting combined with a time-geographical approach.

I argue that there is a need to further develops the conceptual understanding of policy entrepreneurs in relation to policy making in general and regional development in particular. These actors translate and form the institutional arrangement within the limits of structure. Thus this approach strives to bridge the actor-structure divide and focus on the actual processing of the policy process. In a recent Swedish textbook we have taken this approach one step further by inviting authors from several academic perspectives and including a broad understanding of policy entrepreneurs (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg 2011). This paper is a developed version of one of my chapters in that book.

\(^1\) This will be included in the next version of the paper, since it became long enough as it is ☺
Policy entrepreneurs crucial actors in Governance

Kingdon’s original definition described policy entrepreneurs as being "willing to invest their resources – time, energy, reputation, money – to promote a position in return for anticipated future gain in the form of material, purposive, solidary benefits” (Kingdon, 1995: 179). This broad idea focus on what they do and why, but not where, when and how in relation to the political arena and the structures.

The analysis of policy entrepreneur are contemporary to the shift from government focus to a governance understanding of public policy. Governance is a concept capturing the institutional change from "a government-centred model of governance to a market-based or network-based governance model” (Peters & Pierre 2006). Governance can be characterized by five common trends (Hedlund & Montin 2009). First, that states interact increasingly international as a consequence of globalization. But at the same time, or as a consequence of this, so strengthening the local and regional political context self-determination. Thirdly, they point out that public policy is increasingly no longer arranged as a system with one size fits all. Instead, it gives opportunity and flexibility, to create space for different actors and organizations to solve problems together in their own way. The fourth trend is the increased features of the market economic governance in the public sector - New Public Management. In practice, it is about procurement, contracts, choice and competition that lead to different stakeholders to interact and are governed by formal contracts and agreements. This in turn leads to the fifth and final trend identified by (Hedlund & Montin 2009), that citizens have other roles as users and almost becomes customers of public services. In that way the interest and forms of political engagement and democratic ideals are challenged when citizenship becomes mixed with market values of customer.

Governance takes place in cooperation between many different actors - state, municipal, private, individual and others (Sørensen & Gjelstrup 2007). Policy entrepreneurs are the one building and promoting the networks of governance and promoting the governance processes. There are several different definitions of policy entrepreneurs.

Definitions of policy entrepreneurs

Policies are the arena for the policy entrepreneurs. Policy translates values into manageable operations and it can take place in different structures (both public and private). The focus is
most often public policy referring to the system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives. But here we a broader approach public policy relating to the governance structure. Also Kingdon (1995) applies a broader and more open policy concept in his stream model including private, civil and all other areas as possible contexts for the streams of policies, problem and politics to take place. In this perspective the definitions and interpretations of policy entrepreneurs have to been formed.

Schnieder and Teske (1992:742) argue that ”entrepreneurs are more likely to emerge when there are factors that make entrepreneurial profits”. The local conditions at the specific time and the situation are crucial for the policy entrepreneurs. The policy entrepreneur identifies the collective action problem in the situation. The entrepreneurial profits are here seen in much wider terms then for the market entrepreneurs and include good-will, community trust, personal satisfaction and local development.

Policy entrepreneurs therefore emerge when there is a window of opportunity in which they, as individual policy actors benefit from the success of the innovative policies. They are most often seen as politicians or as members of a party, who’s benefits may include modifying the party system to their advantage. Such benefits can be to pushing through policies to benefit their strongest supporters, reaching out to new constituent groups, helping them to re-position the party in the public’s eyes, or producing a policy change that pushes government officials into the national or international policy spotlight (Schnieder and Teske 1992).

Wampler (2009) identifies three significant pay-offs for a policy entrepreneur at the local level: (a) the potential to reward the entrepreneur’s political base by crafting new rules and institutional arrangements that provide access points or direct benefits that were not previously available; (b) the opportunity to reach out to individuals who were not traditionally part of the governing coalition; and (c) the opportunity to re-brand the party as modern, inclusive, and innovative. All three of these factors directly affect a government’s re-election strategies and the last two factors can influence public opinion by inducing shifts in attitudes among individuals who were not previously supporters. Thus this focus is more narrow but point at how the concept of policy entrepreneur is and can be used within governmental
structures. It is similar to the party entrepreneurs that Erlingsson identified in a study of how new local political parties were formed and established (Erlingsson 2009).

To sum up the policy entrepreneurs expend considerable time, energy and resources to initiate policies because of the potential policy and political benefits engendered by redesigning the policy arena (Kingdon 1995, Mintrom 1997). Hereby they are similar to market entrepreneurs even if their benefits and profit making differs. They are entrepreneurs but in other structures than the market and they are the one that coordinates and forms the governance practice. They form policy networks.

**Policy Networks**

Policy networks can be viewed as context for both decision-making and implementation of policies in a governance context. Networking is an increasingly common form of organization for both businesses and political organizations. In policy-making context networks appear as important in all stages (ref?). They can contribute to agenda setting, decision-making, implementation as well as to evaluation. Policy networks are essential in governance settings and governance is sometimes translated with the concept of “network policies” or even to amplify the meaning “networked governance” (Sørensen & Torfing 2008).

In the complex situations of governance different types of networks occurs naturally. Network that aims to transform society through its political structures are called policy networks, in line with Kingdons (1995) broader understanding of policy. The most germinal classification of policy networks is Rhodes and Marsh (1992) ideal-typical division of "issue networks" and "policy communities". The ideal typical mean they have network is entirely one or the other, but it is a simple way to show the typical differences. I will below show how policy entrepreneurs takes on different entrepreneurial roles in these types of networks, therefore I have to describe the characteristics of the ideal typical networks.

**Issue networks**

Issue networks gather actors for having a certain opinion on a question of problems or an issue. The issue as such is in focus. It may be to build broadband in rural communities or to arrange a skiing World Championships in down hill skiing, a road tunnel for safer route to school or to stop the painful animal experiments. It is the issue and the ambition to change
what they consider to be a problem that unites those who participate in the issue networks. The issue network is kept together by the involved actors as long as they see the network as an opportunity to influence. This kind of network is very open but also instable, since there is no real control on who enters or exits the network. The issue networks are quickly formed a new factual issue pops up and open to all who wish to be admitted. Different people can participate and contribute in different ways, depending on what they want and can. It is also easy leave the issue network, since there are few obligations and commitments (Rhodes and Marsh 1992).

Actors who participate in an issue network have their own resources. Even if they contribute to the network they do not share the resources with others in the network. There might just be a small membership fee. But if individuals or organizations participating in the network would provide more resources, time or money, they do so independently and entirely on their own responsibility. Issue networks normally dissolve when the issue is handled. When the broadband has been polled out or the last gold medal at the down-hill skiing championship is given to the winner the issue network starts to dissolve if not even before (Nyhlén, 2011). The purpose of the network is no longer an issue. But as is often the case that those who have been engaged and acted as entrepreneurs in the network will find other issues to engage in. Why not the Olympics, when they managed the World Championship?

Policy entrepreneurs in issue networks run thus of the subject matter, they have their own resources and can easily move into or out of network. It is the issue or the policy that is the driving force of the engagement in the network. Thus we can call them *issue entrepreneurs*.

**Policy communities**

The other tighter ideal type of policy network is called policy communities (Rhodes & Marsh 1992). These networks build on long-term collaboration among actors with similar basic value-systems. They have common motive to create and participate in the network sustain it over time and care for their common values and norm on how policies develop in the political structure. These networks then becomes denser, more closed and survive over different policy issues.
In this type of network the participants can rely on each other over longer periods of time and they share and develop common values. Policy communities are long term and based on high trust between the participants. Trust between actors can be created in many different ways, but a common set of values is important (ref). The policy communities can be seen as shared value system that guides how the network relates to the various new issues that might arise. The political structure is in focus for the policy community.

In these networks actors share resources and that is why not just anyone can be included in a policy community. The high threshold of entry relates to the demand of sharing resources and contributing to the network. The actors in these networks can together even build up and apply for common resources shared within the network. Since a policy community is more stable over time actors cannot as easily leave it as an issue network. The participants in the policy community have made commitments to the network and the other members. Thus there is also a settled power balance among the actors in the policy community (Rhodes & Marsh 1992).

Policy entrepreneurs interact in the policy community network not just about a specific subject matter but also on common values to achieve a common larger goal. The values and norms are in focus and thus they continue to work together and promote the policy community. Thus they are entrepreneurs in political structural change, I will call them political entrepreneurs.

A conceptual division of policy networks

To summarize the discussion on policy networks above Rhodes and Marsh (1992) provided a table to conceptualize policy networks. I quote this table in total here since it further down in the paper will lay a ground for the definitions of policy entrepreneurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Issue networks</th>
<th>Policy community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Number of participants</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Very limited number, some groups consciously excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Type of interest</td>
<td>Encompasses range of affected interests</td>
<td>Economic and/or professional interest dominates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>Contacts fluctuate in frequency and</td>
<td>Frequent, high-quality interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Continuity
(c) Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of policy networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>intensity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access fluctuates significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A measure of agreement exists but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict is never present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of all groups on all matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships, values and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persists over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants share basic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and accept the legitimacy of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Distribution of Resources
(a) within network
(b) within participating organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of policy networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>with in network</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some participants may have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources, but they are limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and basic relationship is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied and variable distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and capacity to regulate members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants have resources,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic relationship is an exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical, leaders can deliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of policy networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unequal powers, reflects unequal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources and unequal access. It is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a zero-sum game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a balance of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between members. Although one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group may dominate, it must be a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive sum game if community is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to persist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Characteristics of policy networks
Source: Rhodes & Marsch 1992:187

Just as there are two types of policy networks emerge, it is also different ideal typical way that policy entrepreneurs can act upon. Based on this network division I will divide the policy entrepreneurs into the issue entrepreneur, who operates at a policy on a particular issue, and the political entrepreneurs, who like and learn to manoeuvre in the political structures regardless of the issue in question.

These types of policy entrepreneurs have different motivations and incentives to act entrepreneurially, just as the networks are held together by various structures and principles. Simply put, the issue entrepreneur is passionate about one particular thing - a question of problem. Political entrepreneurs are passionate about the political structures, they like the game and get things done regardless of the subject of study. They can be said to be contractors for a cause or a problem – issue entrepreneurs – or because they can and know the political structures – political entrepreneurs.

But before settling this definition I will also show how the policy entrepreneurs act differently in relation to Kingdon’s model of policy streams.
Entrepreneurs coupling streams

Kingdon (1995) places the policy entrepreneurs in relation to the three streams of agenda setting as he has identified as crucial for opening the policy window. A policy window is “an opportunity for advocates of proposals to put their pet solution, or to push attention to their special problems” (Kingdon 1995:165). The policy window is an opening in the policy stream to make changes and for new policies to be adopted.

The streams are: the problem stream, the policy stream and the politics stream. The problem stream is defined as public matters requiring attention, e.g. poor school results or increasing criminality. The policy stream is defined as proposals for change. The political stream is based on the constitutional setting, local political arrangement and conditions. The policy window is open for a short period of time when the problem, political and policy steams are coupled. Kingdon (1995) gives an impression that these streams seem to be at the same level, as important for the policy window and the changes in policies. But the policy stream is what is to be explained and as such not really part of the explanation and the political stream is more constitutional and as such more stable. Thus I agree to the model when the policy stream is made superior, when explaining the coupling of streams for policy change. The coupling is made by the policy entrepreneurs that Craig et. al. (2010:2048) place in between the policy window and the policy stream, as in the illustration below.

![Diagram of the policy streams and policy entrepreneurs](image-url)
The idea of Kingdon is that the policy entrepreneurs are the actors that have the competences to couple the political, problem and (or within) the policy stream to open the policy window for a new policy adoption. Here the problem (or in relation to the discussion above: issue) stream and the political stream become the ones leading to change and opening of the policy window.

My argument above on issue entrepreneurs and political entrepreneurs can hereby simply be translated. Policy entrepreneurs are active by either opening the policy window from a problem or a political stream perspective. The political entrepreneurs have their ground and focus in the political stream. The issue entrepreneur takes off from the problem stream with their clear focus on the issue or problem. This can be illustrated in a model similar to Craig et. al. (2010) as I provide by figure 2, below.

Figure 1: Kingdon’s model of Policy streams placing policy entrepreneurs in relation to the policy window.

Source: Craig et. al. (2010:2048)

Figure 2: Political entrepreneurs and issue entrepreneurs opening up the policy window.
In this perspective the different types of policy entrepreneurs are opening up the policy window from different streams. Even if I argue that they are grounded in one of the streams they do still have to couple all the three streams to make the policy window opens. But the entrepreneurs approach the policy window in different ways by acting entrepreneurial in relation to the stream that gives them driving force. The issue entrepreneur focus on and take off from the problem stream to open the policy window. The political entrepreneur focuses on the political stream and the constitutional setting to open the policy window.

All these streams have to be coupled – bound together and making the problem fit into political and policy streams – for the policy window to open and change to take place by a policy adoption. In this perspective one could possible argue that policy entrepreneurs of different types have to collaborate and agree on a policy adoption. The policy window was by Kingdon (1995:165) seen as opportunities to act differently and these opportunities are just open for a short period at the specific place/organisational setting by the policy entrepreneur. Policy windows are time-spatial specific and thus we can add a time-geographical perspective to the analysis of policy entrepreneurs.

**The time-geography of policy entrepreneurs**

To further explain and understand the time-dimension of policy entrepreneurs I will use Hägerstrand’s time-geographical framework. It builds on his in-depth study from the late 1940’s in the Asby parish (Hägerstrand 1953) that mirrored the shift from the agrarian into a more industrial society. This study has laid grounds for theories on diffusion of innovations and regional development but most basically it generated a visual language to capture and communicate processes in time and space, that has been called time-geography (Gregory & Walford 1989).

*Time-spatial prism*

Building on a geographical perspective it has a clear physical grounding. All processes takes time and place. Processes are time consuming and need a place – somewhere in the geography to take place. The connections of the time and place aspect of processes are the focus of time-geography. These processes can be schematic illustrated by combining time and physical
distance. In the classical text “What about people in regional Science?” from 1970 Hägerstrand provides this illustration.

![Prism Diagram](image)

**Figure 3: Daily prisms**
*Source: Extracts from fig 1 Hägerstrand 1970.*

This illustration shows how the reach over physical distances differs between the walker and driver, when they have the same time span to use. This illustration is called a ‘prism’ in the time-geographical framework. The prism illustrates the reach in time-space (Hägerstrand 1970). However, there are potentials to open the time-geographical approach and extended it to included non physical restriction of one’s prism. Simply, it means to have organizational or social reach on the horizontal axe instead of geographical distance. The prisms above show how a motor vehicle extends the prism for the individual but so can also other individuals do. For example parents often extends the prism of their children by carrying or driving them. But the distance of the horizontal axe do not have to be a physical spaces it can also be illustrating social spaces. Parents can extend the prism of children by introducing them to other space like
reading sagas, watching movies and promote their fantasies (extending their prisms of imagination). In line with this policy entrepreneurs can extend the prisms of other people. This is not at least the case in a region to promote regional development. By being entrepreneurial they will find the policy window opening for a wider prism then and there.

Policy entrepreneurs open prisms of opportunities for others. The issue entrepreneurs expands the prisms in relation to the problem, they open for new activities and make new resources available in the wider prism. The political entrepreneur, on the other hand, expands structural settings and structures others. This can schematically be illustrated as below. I do not close the prism here since we cannot argue that the actors have to return to the same point at the later time. Then it is not really a prism, but a cone of opportunities opened by the policy entrepreneur. The action spaces for other actors hereby become extended, and new forms of regional development can take place.

Figure 4: Policy entrepreneurs pressing the prism of opportunities
Everyone's behaviour is due to its time-spatial context. We eat breakfast at certain times and places that are different from those served and then we eat lunch, to take a trivial example. But the remarkable thing is that those who have an entrepreneurial role may also extend the time-spatial opportunities of others in that place at that time. To illustrate this principle, one can use the time-geographical concept prism.

Within the prism, and even with the cone of action spaces there are specific resources available and constraints limiting them. The policy entrepreneurs form new orders by pressing the prism/cone and extending the action spaces. In these processes they focus on constraints are managed and resources are made available. This is a specific order in the specific pocket of time-space that is called a pocket of local order.

**Pockets of Local Order**

Within the prism resources and constraints are arranged in relation to the objectives of the activities there and then. When the time-geographical approach was criticized for being to descriptive and lacking explanatory tools Hägerstrand (1985; 1993) launched the concept *Pocket of Local Order* to meet the critics.

An analysis of Pocket of Local Order opens for a deconstruction of the place specific resources and constraints to highlight specific aspects of the local order in relation to the actual analytical focus (Gregory & Walford, 1989; Wihlborg 2000; Palm & Wihlborg 2008). Hereby the geographical contextualisation becomes included into the policy analysis and spatial aspects can be used to explain different policy outcome. A pocket of local order can in relation to policies be defined as:

… a order in a limited part of time-space, formed by actors to carry through one or more projects. Hereby the actors use available resources and manage the constraints that they experience.

(Wihlborg 2000:27, own translation)

Hereby we can identify the limits of the pocket of local order as the spatial and temporal setting where the power of the order is in use. For example a classroom during a lesson is a pocket of local order. Thus the authority of the teacher is not in use after the lesson or outside the classroom or the school. If the teacher meets his students at the beach during the summer holiday s/he has no authority to force them to read, write or count a specific task as during the
lesson. When the limits of the pocket have been identified the resources available within the pocket can be analysed by relating to the constraints limiting the actors access to resources here and now.

**A Conceptualisation of Policy Entrepreneurs – outline of a model 😊**

Based on both the theories on policy streams and policy networks I have formed two ideal-types of policy entrepreneurs. Issue entrepreneurs that are driven by a particular issue based in their own interest in the issue. Their self-interest is in focus, but by focusing on their self-interest they can also expand the prism of opportunities for others. They know all about the “issue” from their perspective and all the details about it, but they are not the same interest in and understanding of the political structures.

Political entrepreneurs, on the other hand, want to change structures in society and build better conditions for different processes. They are driven by a common interest. The entrepreneurs in these networks have broader value based interests. They can structure resources and know how different issues can / should be managed for best results. They often seem to have a good network of actors in many different contexts that they can bring “home” to expand the prisms for others in the region/local community.

This distinction can be summarized in relation to the definition of policy networks, even if it here refers to the single actor in contrast to Rhodes and Marsh (1992) categorisation of networks similar aspects can be used. In table two below I referee to Rhodes and Marsh’s dimension as “R&M X”. This table (2) summaries the discussion of the characteristics of the policy entrepreneurs and political entrepreneurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Policy entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Type of interest (R&amp;M 1b)</td>
<td>The issue is in focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All issues can be in focus, but just one at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relations (R&amp;M 2)</td>
<td>Contacts with others fluctuate in relation to the development of the issue/policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A PE can act within a professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muddling through and adopting the formulation of the policy/issue to avoid conflicts | role or full time appointment to gain and arrange her relations

3. Resources (R&M 3) | The IE has good knowledge on the specific issue and competence to argue for it in different ways | Knowledge on processes and structures of policy making in the region/local community.
The IE makes time and money made available for the specific issue | Political and economic resources are made available on a structural level (like structural fund application etc)

4. Competences | Knows the issue | Knows the structures
Can persuade others on the “issue” | Can make structural changes
Finds ways for the issue to be realized | Translates norms into structural changes

5. Power (R&M 4) | Power in relation to other individuals regarding the specific issue | Power on structural level

6. Building networks mainly as… (R&M) | Issue networks | Policy communities

7. Opening policy windows based on / starting from … | Problem stream | Political stream

8. Expanding the prism through | The issue | The political structural changes
 | Opening for new ways of acting

9. Providing new opportunities in the other’s prim as | Regarding the issue/problem | Regarding the structures of the community

Table 2: Issue entrepreneurs and political entrepreneurs in relation to Rhodes and Marsh 1991 model and Kingdoms model of streams.

**Summarizing the concepts of policy entrepreneurs**

To sum up there are two types of policy entrepreneurs Issue Entrepreneurs and Political Entrepreneurs.
• The *issue entrepreneur* is driven by a specific issue, sometimes with a personal interest and they are based in the problem stream (Kingdon’s concept) and they are building and acting within issue networks (Rhodes & Marsh concept).

• On the other hand the *political entrepreneurs* are those who like the political game and find interest in forming and arranging structures thus they are based in and take off from the political stream (Kingdon’s concept) and they are building and acting within networks more like policy community (Rhodes & Marsh concept).

This general model of policy entrepreneurs has to be related to the specific and local setting of where changes take place. Changes also take time and have to be launched at the “right” time. Kingdon (1995) uses the concept of policy windows, to show that they are open and closed at specific times. But time and timing can be further elaborated on. It is about taking place and taking time. Thus I will also add a time-geographical perspective on to this model of policy entrepreneurship.

**Concluding remarks and implications**

This paper has focused on an extended conceptualisation of policy entrepreneurs in relation to regional development. Based in policy analytical theories (mainly Rhodes & Marsh 1992 and Kingdon 1995) and the field of governance I have distinguished two ideal-types of policy entrepreneurs. The *issue entrepreneur* has been defined as those who mainly are driven by the issue in a looser issue network. They focus on the specific problem and they have competences mainly regarding the specific issue. The issue entrepreneur is grounded in the problem stream focusing on the explicitly formulated problem or issue striving to transform policy. On the other hand the *political entrepreneur* focus on the political structure and are participating in more stable and dense policy communities. They take off from the political stream when opening the policy window for change in the structures.

Since the policy windows – opening opportunities for change as regional development – are time-spatial specific I have added the time-geographical model of prism of actions to the understanding of policy entrepreneurs. Hereby we can show that policy entrepreneurs are
those acting to expand action spaces for others in a local context to promote development (in all its meanings). The issue entrepreneur is opening opportunities relating to the issue and the political entrepreneurs are rather opening opportunities of more structural art.

There is a potential to take up of Hägerstrand’s model of time-spatial contextualization and not at least the responsibility of contemporary analysis to further develop and use classical interpretations and modelling. Especially the time-geographical approach is meaningful since Hägerstrand do not bridge the micro-macro or actor-structure divide, he do not notice it but instead he forms an approach including them all. There are potentials to include and develop the relationship between time-geography and policy analysis.

By considering the actors in their context there are also openings to understand there their setting and how they co-create the contextual setting that makes up a pre-condition for all other actors there and than. They expand the action space for other actors. By being entrepreneurial in political terms differs from the traditional market entrepreneurs since the primary benefits are mainly gained among others. There is not a primary self-interest but neither fully altruistic, but an interest of promoting and increasing opportunities for the collective that one is a part of.

For practice and even those who consider themselves as policy entrepreneurs this conceptualization and related illustrations may contribute to personal reflections or even new tools to reach one’s policy ambitions. It is also important that other actors in policy-making situation are open to entrepreneurial behaviour and have an open approach to differences. We have to be aware that policy entrepreneurs behave differently and have different ambitions. Thus the political system has to have more capacities to handle them differently and make structures more flexible.

This conceptualization has had a mainly inductive approach, even if it here is presented the other way around from a theoretical starting point. Thus there has to be more research based on the model attempting to deductively falsify the model. I look forward to more such studies challenging and contributing to the modelling of interpretations of the roles of policy entrepreneurs. Policy entrepreneurs are here and plays more and more roles in policy making thus we need a better understanding of them and their functions for regional development.
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