



LUND
UNIVERSITY

CIRCLE

**CENTRE FOR
INNOVATION RESEARCH**

**Agency and Structure in Regional Development:
In Search of a Social Science Research Programme**

Markus Grillitsch, Markku Sotarauta

Papers in Innovation Studies no. 2023/14

Want to stay informed about new working papers? Follow us on [LinkedIn](#) and Twitter http://twitter.com/circle_lu or visit us on <http://www.circle.lu.se/publications/>.

The Papers in Innovation Studies series is open to all researchers working on innovation. Interested in submitting a working paper? Contact the editor: torben.schubert@circle.lu.se.

The authors ensure that they own the copyrights of this material or have obtained the permission to publish it in this series from the copyright owners.

Agency and Structure in Regional Development: In Search of a Social Science Research Programme

Markus Grillitsch¹ and Markku Sotarauta²

Abstract

As a concept, agency stretches from philosophical and meta-theoretical elaborations to studies documenting largely idiosyncratic happenings in a particular empirical context, which could be dismissed as anecdotal. In between, and source for the recent revival of scholarly interest, lies the promise to explain transformation processes, multiplex governance, and varieties in wellbeing and development pathways, which are needed in a world overshadowed by crises. Have studies on agency and structure lived up to the promise? Only partly, we argue, and suggest that we need to develop a common ontological commitment as well as adequate mid-range theories and methods coherent with such a commitment. We suggest critical realism as backbone of such a common ontological commitment and discuss potential ways forward for a social science research programme with emancipatory potential, this is to say to contribute to our capabilities to make a difference in the world.

Keywords: Agency and structure, regional development, path development, critical realism, social science methodology

JEL codes: R00, R10, R50

[1] corresponding author, Department of Human Geography and CIRCLE – Centre for Innovation Research, Lund University; Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, markus.grillitsch@keg.lu.se

[2] Faculty of Management and Business, Tampere University, markku.sotarauta@tuni.fi

1 Introduction

The relation between agency and structure is one of the central and lasting theoretical debates in the social sciences (e.g. Archer, 1982; Giddens, 1984; Jessop, 2001) and has had a place also in the study of regional development and economic geography (e.g. Coe & Jordhus-Lier, 2011; Plummer & Sheppard, 2006; Sayer, 1982). However, there has also been a critique that human agency has received too little attention in contemporary literature on regional development (Asheim, Grillitsch, & Trippel, 2016; Boschma, 2017; Hassink, Isaksen, & Trippel, 2019; Uyarra et al., 2017). Responding to this critique, we find a resurgence of work on human agency in regional development studies and taking stock of the advancements in this recent literature is the purpose of this paper. Recent agency-oriented studies in regional development touch upon a surprising breath of topics, which have contributed to insights related to different theoretical framings and empirical contexts, including, among others:

1. **Industrial diversification, renewal and resilience** (e.g. Bækkelund, 2021; Baumgartinger-Seiringer, 2022; Beer, Barnes, & Horne, 2023; Benner, 2022; Doloreux & Turkina, 2021; Gherhes et al., 2022; Isaksen et al., 2019; Kurikka & Grillitsch, 2020; Stihl, 2022),
2. **Decarbonising of industry / green industry development** (e.g. Chaminade & Randelli, 2020; Jolly, Grillitsch, & Hansen, 2020; Sotarauta et al., 2020) and **regional energy transformations** (e.g. Chlebna & Mattes, 2020; Suitner, Haider, & Philipp, 2022),
3. **Governance and skewed power relations in regional development** (e.g. Döringer, 2020; Flanagan, Uyarra, & Wanzenböck, 2022; Görmar et al., 2022; Kristensen, Pugh, & Grillitsch, 2022; Weller & Beer, 2023),
4. **Strategic coupling, global network building and regional anchoring** (e.g. Gong, Hassink, & Wang, 2022; Henry, Angus, & Jenkins, 2021; MacKinnon et al., 2019; Wu, 2022),
5. **Inclusive and sustainable development in rural communities** (e.g. Eikeland, 2021; Pinzón-Camargo, Ordoñez-Matamoros, & Kuhlmann, 2022; Sotarauta, Kurikka, & Kolehmainen, 2022),
6. **Urban development** (e.g. Gunko et al., 2021; Herzog & Hamm, 2021; Sancino et al., 2022),
7. **Universities in regional development** (e.g. Eder & Döringer, 2022; Nieth & Radinger-Peer, 2022; Thomas, Faccin, & Asheim, 2020).

The resurgence of agency in regional development studies and economic geography reflects a growing appreciation that human agency is necessary for the reproduction and transformation of any socially produced structure. The papers cited above are part of a new stream of literature that have an interest in human agency, which refers to “intentional, purposeful, and meaningful actions

performed by human actors and the intended and unintended consequences of such actions” (Grillitsch & Sotarauta, 2020). In essence, these papers share a common interest to understand the necessary relation between human agency and socially produced structures rather than a particular mid-level theory or hypothesis to be rejected or corroborated empirically.

This focus on human agency is in contrast to theoretical perspectives such as actor-network theory (Murdoch, 1998; Müller, 2015), which pay greater attention to non-human agency and things, or the relation between non-human and human agency. Non-human things like the Covid-19 virus can have far-reaching and spatially varied economic effects, which makes investigating the impacts of Covid-19 a legitimate target for scholars in the fields of regional development studies, regional science, or economic geography. In addition, pre-existing structures, whether socially produced or natural, make specific human actions possible while hindering others. Importantly, a focus on human agency does not ignore non-human influences but shifts the attention to human actors’ engagement with e.g., the challenges and opportunities related to Covid-19, in the context of pre-existing structures and the outcomes of such engagement in terms of a change to structures over time. In a similar vein, Bristow and Healy (2014, p. 924f) foreground the importance of human agency for phenomena that fall into the social sciences domain:

“[T]his system and structure emphasis has resulted in much less attention being paid to understanding the role of human agency in the adaptation at the heart of regional economic resilience. In part this reflects the relative newness of the theorizing around regional resilience. However, it also reflects the inevitable degree of determinism evident in translating systems and resilience thinking from the natural and physical sciences to the social world where the ingenuity, foresight and anticipatory behaviour of human agency means, for example, adaptive cycles are capable of being overridden, broken or substantively changed”

Reflecting on the resurgence of scholarly interest, we ask in this paper: (1) *What is the promise of agency in and for regional development studies, and consequently, (2) has the emerging body of literature lived up to the promise?*

We examine the motivations for why authors have focused on agency in recent papers. We find the promise lies in a better understanding of change processes and transformations, power and multiplex governance, as well as varieties in wellbeing and development pathways. However, we argue that the many studies on agency have only partly lived up to their promise. Many contributions add on and complement structural approaches with insights about agency, instead of focusing on it explicitly. Indeed, adding agency as an additional layer to existing approaches has limitations. It may

result in complex conceptual frameworks disguising the agentic processes we want to study, conceptual drift, and mixing contextual with analytical concepts. Moreover, the limitations may result in a lack of coherence between ontological commitments and theorizing, poorly connected theory and method, or overly descriptive analyses.

The bottom of these problems is that current studies lack a common ontological commitment that would define a social science research for studies on regional development. Therefore, *we ask (3) what is needed to meet all the promises?* We highlight the need to construct and define a social-sciences research programme for regional development studies. We suggest *critical realism as an ontological backbone to the study of human agency and structure, and discuss the ways forward for studying agency in regional development studies*. We discuss the potential contours of a common ontological commitment, recognising that developing such a commitment needs to be a collective endeavour. We relate insights from the classic work on agency to the particularities of studying agency in regional development studies. Building on the suggested contours of a potentially joint ontological commitment, we elaborate theoretical and methodological reflections on ways forward for studying agency and structure in regional development studies.

2 What is the promise of the resurging work on human agency and structure?

The most common and prominent motivations for using a human agency perspective in these new works in regional development studies and economic geography relate to the promises of a better understanding why change happens (or fails to happen), how power and multiplex governance processes affect regional development outcomes, and why outcomes vary despite similar structural preconditions.

Promise 1: Gain knowledge about change processes and transformations

Change has been a core interest for regional development studies and economic geography for long as evidenced for instance in literature about path-dependency (e.g. Martin & Sunley, 2006), clusters and industry life cycles (e.g. Audretsch & Feldman, 1996), or the often used umbrella for these approaches, evolutionary economic geography (Boschma & Martin, 2010). Despite the interest in change, the literature until recently foregrounded industrial, knowledge and institutional structures, while the engagement of actors in change processes was largely ignored (Boschma, 2017; Gertler, 2010; Hassink, Isaksen, & Trippel, 2019). The revived interest in agency is aiming to fill this void.

“much can be learned about the creation and evolution of new growth paths through a broader perspective on the roles and types of social and institutional agency that are involved” (Dawley, 2014, p. 92)

“The lack of an adequate economic explanation of how new pathways are created in the first instance has led a number of scholars to turn to sociological approaches that focus on the activities of reflexive agents in new path creation” (Simmie, 2012, p. 756)

Moreover, researchers have increasingly shifted their attention to not only understand change and adaptability but also to identify the causal powers driving change, hence aiming to assist practitioners, policymakers, or stakeholders to facilitate and promote change. These efforts undoubtedly relate to the urgent need to address societal challenges, with global warming and inequalities being often referred to, as well as the need for all actors, regions, and nations to find their place in a world of technological change and globalisation (or nationalism in the future). In addition, a widespread acknowledgement has emerged that change and adaptability is a human endeavour and can thus not be understood without shedding light on what people do.

Promise 2: Gain knowledge about power and multiplex governance

In the context of regional development, human agency stands out as a distinct form of agency compared to many other disciplines (e.g. business and political studies). Instead of being primarily interested in single organisations, researchers studying regional development focus on multi-actor and multi-scalar forms of agency (Flanagan & Uyarra, 2016; Huggins & Thompson, 2023; Simmie, 2012; Sotarauta et al., 2020). This does not preclude the possibility that single individuals and single actions are of particular importance in the investigated change process, and identification of such may be part of finding the explanation for the observed outcome. However, individual agency always needs contextualisation concerning the conditions that made it possible, the engagement of other actors, and the interplay between actions and intervening conditions. The promise is that by investigating human agency at micro-levels, it might be possible to add analytical leverage in a study of constantly evolving regional development. However, regions easily escape exceedingly abstract efforts to open the black box of human agency, and related power relations. As Castells (2009, p. 13) puts it, regions are “contradictory social structures enacted in conflicts and negotiations among diverse and often opposing social actors”.

Consequently, many studies aim to investigate the interconnected intentions and actions of actors from business, the public sector, higher education institutions, and civil society in cities and regions and external to them. Researchers have attempted to explain and understand how governance arrangements impact regional development and how complex power relations shape governance

systems and economic development processes (Christopherson & Clark, 2007; Cooke & Morgan, 1998). Moreover, regional development researchers and economic geographers have taken pains to reveal how unequal power relations increase the gap between core and fallen-behind regions (Iammarino, Rodriguez-Pose, & Storper, 2019). It is of vital importance to examine power relations, as they are critical in defining the region and what is seen and not seen as desired development (Pike, 2007).

“In taking forward this more social conception of agency, recognizing the unequal sociospatial relations in geographical political economy imparted a more explicit grasp of the different kinds and degrees of power that shape evolution in economic geography.” (Pike et al., 2009, p. 180)

In general, studies focusing on human agency are based on the conviction that the discipline requires studies that aim to reveal the micro-level causal forces shaping meso-level development trajectories. Consequently, it is assumed to be necessary to provide detailed accounts of power relations and governance arrangements by investigating actors' power bases, influence, interests, and intentions on regional development, opening new views on known issues.

Promise 3: Gain knowledge about varieties of place and development pathways

The specificity of place and development pathways are of interest to human and economic geographers, as well as regional development policy makers. One important reference foregrounding place-specificity is the Barca (2009) report, which suggests that regional development policies need to be place-based taking into consideration local knowledge, opportunities and challenges. Also, the smart specialisation approach with its entrepreneurial discovery process calls for local actors to identify niches, allowing them to differentiate and specialise in a global economy (Foray, 2014). Agency-oriented studies contribute to place-based approaches investigating how actors perceive their opportunities for development focusing on technological, institutional and market changes inside and outside a region. They also deal with how actors mobilise local and non-local knowledge and resources in the pursuit of their goals. Agency-oriented studies take place-specific pre-conditions into account but do not search causal powers only from them.

Agency is thus viewed as a cause why regions with apparently similar preconditions may vary in their development.

“We think we know what a region needs to have, but we know far too little about how change processes to achieve these structural pre-conditions are initiated and implemented, and by whom. Why do some regions manage to change their development path, while others appear stuck in their story? There is a growing body

of literature suggesting that the role of agency might hold answers to these questions.” (Rekers & Stihl, 2021, p. 89)

In more general terms, studies on agency and structure are also about appreciating the context in which actions unfold, and how the interplay of contingent events produce outcomes. For instance, Giddens (1984) extensively discussed time geography of the Swedish geographer Hägerstrand (1970) suggesting that the journeys of individuals through time and space as well as the multi-scalar context in which individuals are embedded condition agency patterns and development outcomes. Hence, studies on agency are particularly suited to capture time and space context, which is fundamental in geography, as well as to understand the varieties of development paths and outcomes in concrete territories.

3 Has the emerging body of literature lived up to the promise?

The emerging body of work has created insights by often complementing structural approaches in regional development studies and economic geography with the largely missing agentic dimensions. The structures most studied in the literature are socially produced and include knowledge, institutions, built environment, organisations, industries, innovation systems, global production networks, or socio-technical systems. The agency dimension often introduces a reverse in the thinking about causality, namely studying intended and unintended consequences of human actions on socially produced structures (bottom-up causation). However, many studies on agency and structure in regional development add agency as an additional layer to existing theoretical frameworks. For instance, responding to the need to add a more dynamic and agentic perspective to studies of regional innovation systems (e.g., Asheim, Grillitsch, & Trippl, 2016), which typically differentiates between firms exploiting knowledge in a region and a knowledge and innovation support system, agency has been added by differentiating between firm-level and system-level agency (Blažek & Květoň, 2023; Isaksen et al., 2019). Or, in the evolutionary economic geography tradition, agency has been added by investigating which types of firm, incumbents or start-ups, local or non-local, tend to be associated with industrial diversification (Elekes, Boschma, & Lengyel, 2019; Neffke et al., 2018). Hence, agency is typically added as an additional layer to existing theories and concepts. While we should not ignore existing theoretical and empirical knowledge, layering theories and concepts may produce overly complicated frameworks that disguise the processes we aim to study, conceptual drift, a lack of coherence between ontology, theory, and empirics, inconsistent theorising, or excessively descriptive analyses.

These are important issues because studies on agency and structure aim to better theorise and empirically study effects between the micro-level (actions), the meso-level (socially produced

structures), and macro-level (aggregated outcomes), where the causation is both bottom-up and top-down. However, studies on agency and structure are not simply about recognising the two-way causality. The long-standing debate about the interplay between structure and agency (Archer, 1982; Bhaskar, 1998; Giddens, 1984; Jessop, 2001; Sayer, 1984) unveils meta-theoretical (philosophical), theoretical and methodological challenges, which go beyond adding an agentic dimension to existing layers of structural explanations. We argue that this is the core issue why the burgeoning work on agency only partly lives up to its promise. Living up to the promise requires a research framework that consistently binds together ontological commitments with adequate mid-range theories and empirical methodologies.

This point can be illustrated when studying agency and path dependency, and the conceptual layering and drift that is associated with it. The starting point for such studies may be the insight that self-reinforcing mechanisms (lock-ins) propel industrial development along particular trajectories (Grabher, 1993; Hassink, 2010). It is widely acknowledged, however, that these mechanisms do not lead to a deterministic outcome, and that we thus need to consider different forms of new path development (Martin & Sunley, 2006). Then, we find that structural preconditions may imply a tendency for certain forms of path development to be more likely than others (Grillitsch & Trippel, 2018), but we realise that outcomes of such development processes cannot be understood or explained without attention to the engagement of actors in such processes (Hassink, Isaksen, & Trippel, 2019; Uyarra et al., 2017). This statement has the underlying assumption that agency potentially affects the development of future paths and thus can reinforce or counteract structural tendencies. However, the more power we attribute to agency, the more the initial theorising about structural mechanisms leading to path dependency might be questioned.

The inclusion of the agency dimension might be interpreted as an incremental improvement of a path dependence theory. However, there may also come the point where theory turns out eclectic and inconsistent. This view is propagated by Garud, Kumaraswamy, and Karnøe (2010, p. 669f) who argue that their idea of path creation fundamentally differs from the evolutionary notion of path dependence. They maintain: “some may like to think that path dependence and path creation are complements of each other [...] to us this is mixing ontologies” and argue that mixing of ontologies needs to be avoided. They argue that agency is essential in constructing initial conditions and strategically manipulating self-reinforcing mechanisms, which could be considered as given in a path-dependency framework. Similarly, Chlebna and Mattes (2020) argue in a recent agency-oriented paper that regional energy transitions are fragile at any stage and that actors’ engagement is crucial for the outcome.

4 Critical realism as proposed ontological backbone of studying human agency and structure

While studying human agency and socially produced structures is an ontological commitment to the necessity of this relationship, it remains typically implicit what such ontological commitment entails. In regional development studies and economic geography, such a commitment is often underpinned by referencing structuration theory developed by Giddens (1984). At the heart of structuration is the duality of structure. As Giddens puts it, “the structural properties of social systems are both the medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organise” (p. 25). Giddens emphasises the continuity of practices: “in and through their activities agents reproduce the conditions that make these activities possible” (p. 3). Human actors are knowledgeable, and they reflexively monitor, rationalise, and motivate their actions in a continuous flow. Agency, according to Giddens, is mainly about doing and producing an effect and thus essentially depends upon “the capability of the individual to ‘make a difference’, that is, to exercise some sort of power” (p. 14). The consequences of the actions, however, are often unintended and researchers may then aim to trace (i) how an action triggers an unintended chain of events, (ii) how the interplay of individual actions produce an unintended pattern (e.g. segregation), and (iii) how the unintended consequences of action form the condition for further action in non-reflexive causal feedback loops (this is where actors are not aware of the consequences).

While Giddens’ contribution to the structure and agency debate is undisputed, his conceptualization of the duality of structure stands partly in contrast to how the agency structure relationship is conceptualized in critical realism, a theory of science perspective and methodological approach common in regional development studies and economic geography (e.g. Pratt, 1995; Sayer, 1984; Yeung, 1997). Accordingly, agency and structure should not be conceived as a duality but as analytically and theoretically distinct (Archer, 1982; Bhaskar, 1998). In addition to keeping agency and structure analytically distinct, Bhaskar (1998, p. 214f) argues that “People and society are not [...] related ‘dialectically’. They do not constitute two moments of the same process. Rather they refer to radically different kinds of things.” A thing for Bhaskar is defined through its properties, and “the properties possessed by social forms may be very different from those possessed by the individuals upon whose activity they depend.” As regards the relation between agency and structure, Bhaskar argues that “people, in their conscious activity, for the most part unconsciously reproduce (and occasionally transform) the structures governing their substantive activities of production. Thus, people do not marry to reproduce the nuclear family or work to sustain the capitalist economy. Yet, it is nevertheless the unintended consequence (and inexorable result) of, as it is also a necessary

condition for, their activity.” Understanding agency and structure as on the one hand related but on the other hand as theoretically and analytically distinct has a number of important implications.

First, Archer (1982) proposes that we should consider the relationship between structure and agency as structuring over time, which is characteristic of her morphogenetic approach. The morphogenetic argument that “structure and action operate over different time periods is based on two simple propositions: that structure logically predates the action(s) which transform it, that structural elaboration logically postdates those actions” (p. 468). This sequential perspective on structure and agency has advantages in assessing how, firstly, structure affects actions (top-down causation) and how, secondly, actions affect reproduction or transformation of structure (bottom-up causation). It also avoids Giddens’ methodological bracketing, which for instance Jessop (2001) criticises.

Bracketing is an implication of the duality of structure, where investigating agency would require structure as given and vice versa. The sequential, morphogenetic approach has for instance been recently applied by Grillitsch et al. (2023) in a study of agency and economic change in regions. The authors investigate the structures at the beginning of regional development phases, the actions and external events during the development phases, and how regional economic structures changed during the phases compared to how they were at the beginning, intending to identify causal links between structure and agency.

Second, critical realism describes structures (socially produced and natural things) with what they can do or allow human actors to do because of their properties; this is to say that structures come with certain causal powers. Human agency entails actions where people mobilise powers inherent to their embodied form (e.g., their creativity, intellect, muscles) and/or which are inherent to socially produced and natural structures. Acting will often reproduce structures but sometimes change them. Bhaskar (1998, p. 215) suggests an essentially Aristotelian conception of human action “that of a sculptress at work, fashioning a product out of the material and with the tools available to her. I shall call this the *transformational model of social activity*.” This perspective implies that human actors may transform structures by using causal powers but cannot be seen as “true” creators.

Third, having causal powers does not mean that they need to be used, or about how they are used, and to what consequence they are used. For instance, language is a structure (socially produced) that allows human actors to speak and communicate. However, language does not determine if people speak, what they are going to say, or what consequence their speaking has. Similarly, if, how and to what consequence knowledge is used is not predetermined by knowledge. In other words, pre-existing structures embody opportunities to act and opportunities for future development, which has been theorized about in recent studies on structure and agency in regional development and

economic geography (Grillitsch & Sotarauta, 2020; Steen, 2016). This is also why outcomes are not determined but depend on purposeful and meaningful actions of sets of actors and the intended and unintended consequences of these actions.

Fourth, studies on human agency focus the researcher's attention on concrete rather than abstract space (cf. Grillitsch, Asheim, & Tripl, 2018; Martin & Sunley, 2022). With concrete space, we understand the actual manifestation of structure, which is reflected in the contextualisation of agency in particular territories, knowledge and production networks, institutional architectures, industries, etc. The contextualisation of agency in concrete space is necessary to investigate the configurations that make agency possible, and the configurations of agency and other forces that produce certain outcomes. In contrast, abstract space refers to notions such as distance and density, which may be used in the formal and econometric models. Abstraction implies ignoring the particularities of concrete territories and is a simplification used in formal model building. Formal models are powerful for identifying general tendencies. An example is Krugman's (1991) model that explains the differentiation of space in urban industrial centres and agricultural peripheries with scale economies and transport costs. Yet, the downside of such models is that they cannot capture human engagement, which may aim at reinforcing, redirecting, or combating certain tendencies, in actual (observed) development processes.

Finally, a commitment to critical realism also entails that for work on agency (and structure) causation is more important than regularity. The theoretical starting point is that agency per se is necessary for the reproduction and transformation of socially produced things (such as regional economic structures, global production networks, knowledge, and institutions). As mentioned, this is an ontological commitment rather than a hypothesis to be rejected or corroborated through empirical testing. Some forms of agency, like Schumpeterian innovative entrepreneurship (Schumpeter, 1911) or scientific discovery (Bhaskar, 1997) are transformative in nature. Such types of agency may be highly irregular and exceptional, yet, they are key drivers of change. Studies on agency may then aim at comprehensive explanations of why transformative agency is possible (or not) in a certain time and spatial contexts and why it produces (or not) certain outcomes. However, the focus on causation implies that studies on agency also need to go beyond the particularities of a case, and aim to identify the (generic) causes for the outcome. Rutzou and Elder-Vass (2019) differentiate in formation and causation stories. Formation stories represent the emergence of certain agency patterns and outcomes in particular contexts, including details on actor compositions and facts that might be considered coincidental and largely idiosyncratic. Causation stories aim to go beyond the specific case and, through substantive interpretation of theoretical, empirical, and context knowledge, identify the causal mechanisms at work. In agency-oriented studies, a causal

explanation would typically be configurational (Furnari et al., 2020; Rutten, 2021). This means that (i) the origin of human agency would be traced to a combination of structural relations making agency possible, and (ii) the outcome would be seen as emerging through the intertwining of multiple actions and exogenous forces (these are intervening conditions outside the sphere of influence of the actors).

5 Conclusions: Ways forward?

In summary, the increasing interest in human agency in regional development studies and economic geography is about refocusing research on the relations and interplay between human actions and socially produced structures. Agency is not a particular feature of a specific mid-range theory in regional development studies and economic geography, or social sciences more broadly. Instead, work on the relationship between agency and structure refers to a distinct philosophical, theoretical, and methodological approach. Research on human agency, in our view, is about a social science research programme with a common ontological commitment to (i) the necessity of socially produced structures as pre-conditions for human action and to (ii) the necessity of human action for the reproduction and transformation of socially produced structures.

A social science research programme of this kind holds a promise for regional development studies and economic geography to develop knowledge about social and economic change and transformation processes, the role of power and multi-actor governance in such processes, and the varieties of social and economic development pathways resulting from them. It ultimately corresponds to what Bhaskar (1998) referred to as the emancipatory potential of social sciences – the enhancement of our capability to make a difference, which we may need more today than ever facing global challenges threatening modern civilisation.

We consider, however, that studies on agency in economic geography have only partly fulfilled its promise. On the one hand, agency-oriented work has provided complementary insights to existing research about, for instance, industrial path development, economic diversification, global production networks and strategic coupling, green transformations, and energy transitions. On the other hand, in most cases, scholars have treated agency as an additional layer to existing structural approaches. This theoretical and conceptual layering exposes some weaknesses in the form of overly complex conceptual frameworks, conceptual drift, lack of coherence between ontological commitments, theory and method, theoretical inconsistencies, or excessively descriptive analyses.

Developing a coherent agency-oriented social science research programme requires constructing a common ontological ground to build adequate mid-term theories and methodologies. We have

suggested critical realism as ontological backbone for studies on human agency and structure. The structure agency relationship has a particular temporality, in which structure embodies the powers that human actors can mobilise in realising their intentions, and where the emergence of agency and its intended and unintended consequences are contingent on a time-space context. It is an ontology that provides the foundations for explaining the formation stories of the varieties of development processes, including both continuation and transformation, as well as for identifying generic causes and lessons relevant beyond a particular case (Rutzou & Elder-Vass, 2019). An explicit discussion and consciousness about the philosophical or ontological commitment are essential to enhance agency-related work's rigour and consistency. A shared commitment will most likely transform how we study agency in economic geography and what knowledge our work produces.

A joint ontological commitment also calls for reflections on adequate methods. Studies on human agency call for methods, which are suitable for investigating change processes in various space-time contexts and involving multi-actor governance constellations. "Process methodologies are applied with the aim to understand sequences of events and their underlying complex patterns of causation as well as their potential effects in a specific time period. Therefore, process studies require to move from detailed empirical observations to more abstract models that capture the underlying generative mechanisms of a process" (Strambach & Pflitsch, 2020, p. 7). Sotarauta and Grillitsch (2023) suggest path tracing as a process methodology, attempting to coherently combine an ontological commitment to critical realism with insights from process tracing and structured narrative analysis.

In addition, it will be necessary to develop further (comparative) qualitative approaches. Identifying seven challenges to qualitative research on agency, Grillitsch, Rekers, and Sotarauta (2021) emphasise among others case selection and appropriately delineating the case in time and space as well as data collection and analysis covering structures and changes at multiple levels and the engagement of actors in change processes over time. Among the promising approaches are the selection of extreme cases (e.g. Morisson & Mayer, 2021), two cases with similar starting points but different outcomes (e.g. Blažek & Květoň, 2022; Fredin, Mörner, & Jogmark, 2019), cases with similar structural breaks but different agency patterns (e.g. MacKinnon et al., 2019), or identifying the causes for different agency patterns and outcomes within the same region (e.g. Rekers & Stihl, 2021). In addition, to capture the necessary and sufficient combinations of conditions for agency to emerge, or for agency to deliver certain outcomes, the work with larger sets of comparative cases through, for instance, qualitative comparative analysis is promising (e.g. Grillitsch et al., 2023; Rutten, 2021; Sotarauta et al., 2020). However, it also needs to be acknowledged that comparative qualitative approaches are risky and resource intensive, which does not fit all that well with paper-output-oriented incentives in our discipline.

We will also need to develop ways to combine data and methods, which may prove essential, as an agency-oriented social science research programme pays particular attention to the causation between levels, from macro- and meso-level structures on sets of actions, and from sets of actions to meso- and macro-level structures. For instance, Thomas, Faccin, and Asheim (2020) combine extensive participant observations with interviews and a comprehensive data inventory to study how universities engaged and orchestrated regional development work, changing the ecosystem for innovation and entrepreneurship.

In that regard, it will also be necessary to reflect on the role of quantitative approaches in studies on agency and structure. It is valuable to study how individual-level properties such as personality traits (Obschonka et al., 2013), firm-level properties such as incumbency or origin (Neffke et al., 2018), or meso-level properties such as culture (Fritsch, Obschonka, & Wyrwich, 2019; Huggins & Thompson, 2019) can explain tendencies of actors to behave in a certain way. Quantitative methods could also be used to complement qualitative approaches, for instance, to map and select cases (Grillitsch et al., 2021). Also, developing measures that proxy agency might complement qualitative approaches. For instance, events that necessarily require strong actor involvement, such as major applications for regional development funding, could be considered as proxies for agency, and studying how they potentially affect regional development could be a way forward. However, we also need to acknowledge the (unsurmountable?) limitations of such approaches to investigate if, how, why, and to what consequences actors engage in actual and observed change processes, including surprising agency, agency going against a tendency.

Overall, we find that studies on human agency and socially produced structures in regional development studies and economic geography refer to an exciting ontological, theoretical, and methodological approach in the making, a social science research programme that has emancipatory potential contributing to our capability to make a difference in the world. We have embarked on the journey, but we need to think deeper and see beyond the known shores of regional development studies and economic geography to live up to the promise.

References:

- Archer, M. S. (1982). Morphogenesis versus Structuration: On Combining Structure and Action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 33(4), 455-483. doi:10.2307/589357
- Asheim, B. T., Grillitsch, M., & Trippel, M. (2016). Regional innovation systems: past–present–future. In R. Shearmur, C. Carrincazeaux, & D. Doloreux (Eds.), *Handbook on the Geographies of Innovation* (pp. 45-62). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Audretsch, D., & Feldman, M. (1996). Innovative clusters and the industry life cycle. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 11(2), 253-273. doi:10.1007/bf00157670
- Bækkelund, N. G. (2021). Change agency and reproductive agency in the course of industrial path evolution. *Regional Studies*, 1-12. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.1893291
- Barca, F. (2009). *An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy*. Retrieved from Brussels:
- Baumgartinger-Seiringer, S. (2022). The role of powerful incumbent firms: shaping regional industrial path development through change and maintenance agency. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 9(1), 390-408. doi:10.1080/21681376.2022.2081597
- Beer, A., Barnes, T., & Horne, S. (2023). Place-based industrial strategy and economic trajectory: advancing agency-based approaches. *Regional Studies*, 57(6) 984-997. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.1947485
- Benner, M. (2022). Revisiting path-as-process: agency in a discontinuity-development model. *European Planning Studies*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/09654313.2022.2061309
- Bhaskar, R. (1997). *A realist theory of science*. London: Verso.
- Bhaskar, R. (1998). Societies. In M. S. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, & A. Norrie (Eds.), *Critical realism, essential readings* (pp. 206-257). London: Routledge.
- Blažek, J., & Květoň, V. (2023). Towards an integrated framework of agency in regional development: the case of old industrial regions. *Regional Studies*, 57(8) 1482-1497. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2054976
- Boschma, R. (2017). Relatedness as driver of regional diversification: a research agenda. *Regional Studies*, 51(3), 351-364. doi:10.1080/00343404.2016.1254767
- Boschma, R., & Martin, R. (Eds.). (2010). *The handbook of evolutionary economic geography*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bristow, G., & Healy, A. (2014). Regional Resilience: An Agency Perspective. *Regional Studies*, 48(5), 923-935. doi:10.1080/00343404.2013.854879
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chaminade, C., & Randelli, F. (2020). The Role of Territorially Embedded Innovation Ecosystems Accelerating Sustainability Transformations: A Case Study of the Transformation to Organic Wine Production in Tuscany (Italy). *Sustainability*, 12(11), 4621.
- Chlebna, C., & Mattes, J. (2020). The fragility of regional energy transitions. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 37, 66-78. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2020.07.009>
- Christopherson, S., & Clark, J. (2007). *Remaking Regional Economies: Power, labor, and firm strategies in the knowledge economy*. London: Routledge.
- Coe, N. M., & Jordhus-Lier, D. C. (2011). Constrained agency? Re-evaluating the geographies of labour. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(2), 211-233. doi:10.1177/0309132510366746
- Cooke, P., & Morgan, K. (1998). *The associational economy: Firms, regions and innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawley, S. (2014). Creating New Paths? Offshore Wind, Policy Activism, and Peripheral Region Development. *Economic Geography*, 90(1), 91-112. doi:10.1111/ecge.12028
- Doloreux, D., & Turkina, E. (2021). New path creation in the artificial intelligence industry: regional preconditions, new actors and their collective actions, and policies. *Regional Studies*, 55(10-11), 1751-1763. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.1919610
- Döringer, S. (2020). Individual agency and socio-spatial change in regional development: Conceptualizing governance entrepreneurship. *Geography Compass*, 14(5), e12486. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12486>

- Eder, J., & Döringer, S. (2022). The Limits of Change Agency: Establishing a Peripheral University Campus in East Tyrol. *Local Economy*, 1-20. doi:10.1177/02690942221122100
- Eikeland, S. (2021). Indigenous agency in global systems. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 82, 253-261. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.01.028>
- Elekes, Z., Boschma, R., & Lengyel, B. (2019). Foreign-owned firms as agents of structural change in regions. *Regional Studies*, 53(11), 1603-1613. doi:10.1080/00343404.2019.1596254
- Flanagan, K., & Uyarra, E. (2016). Four dangers in innovation policy studies – and how to avoid them. *Industry and Innovation*, 23(2), 177-188. doi:10.1080/13662716.2016.1146126
- Flanagan, K., Uyarra, E., & Wanzenböck, I. (2022). Towards a problem-oriented regional industrial policy: possibilities for public intervention in framing, valuation and market formation. *Regional Studies*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.2016680
- Foray, D. (2014). From smart specialisation to smart specialisation policy. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 17(4), 492-507. doi:10.1108/EJIM-09-2014-0096
- Fredin, S., Miörner, J., & Jogmark, M. (2019). Developing and sustaining new regional industrial paths: investigating the role of ‘outsiders’ and factors shaping long-term trajectories. *Industry and Innovation*, 26(7), 795-819. doi:10.1080/13662716.2018.1535429
- Fritsch, M., Obschonka, M., & Wyrwich, M. (2019). Historical roots of entrepreneurship-facilitating culture and innovation activity: an analysis for German regions. *Regional Studies*, 53(9), 1296-1307. doi:10.1080/00343404.2019.1580357
- Furnari, S., Crilly, D. C., Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Fiss, P. C., & Aguilera, R. (2020). Capturing Causal Complexity: Heuristics for Configurational Theorizing. *Academy of Management Review*, online first. doi:10.5465/amr.2019.0298
- Garud, R., Kumaraswamy, A., & Karnøe, P. (2010). Path Dependence or Path Creation? *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(4), 760-774. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00914.x
- Gertler, M. S. (2010). Rules of the Game: The Place of Institutions in Regional Economic Change. *Regional Studies*, 44(1), 1-15. doi:10.1080/00343400903389979
- Gherhes, C., Vorley, T., Vallance, P., & Brooks, C. (2022). The role of system-building agency in regional path creation: insights from the emergence of artificial intelligence in Montreal. *Regional Studies*, 56(4), 563-578. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.1886273
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gong, H., Hassink, R., & Wang, C. C. (2022). Strategic coupling and institutional innovation in times of upheavals: the industrial chain chief model in Zhejiang, China. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 1-25.
- Grabher, G. (1993). The weakness of strong ties; the lock-in of regional development in the Ruhr area. In G. Grabher (Ed.), *The Embedded Firm: On the Socioeconomics of Industrial Networks* (pp. 255-277). London & New York: Routledge.
- Grillitsch, M., Asheim, B. T., & Trippl, M. (2018). Unrelated knowledge combinations: the unexplored potential for regional industrial path development. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11(2), 257-274. doi:10.1093/cjres/rsy012
- Grillitsch, M., Martynovich, M., Fitjar, R. D., & Haus-Reve, S. (2021). The Black-Box of Regional Growth. *Journal of Geographical Systems*.
- Grillitsch, M., Rekers, J. V., & Sotarauta, M. (2021). Investigating agency: methodological and empirical challenges. In M. Sotarauta & A. Beer (Eds.), *Handbook on City and Regional Leadership* (pp. 302-323). London: Edward Elgar.
- Grillitsch, M., & Sotarauta, M. (2020). Trinity of change agency, regional development paths and opportunity spaces. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(4), 704-723. doi:10.1177/0309132519853870
- Grillitsch, M., Sotarauta, M., Asheim, B., Fitjar, R. D., Haus-Reve, S., Kolehmainen, J., . . . Stihl, L. (2023). Agency and economic change in regions: identifying routes to new path development using qualitative comparative analysis. *Regional Studies*, 1-16. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2053095

- Grillitsch, M., & Trippel, M. (2018). Innovation Policies and New Regional Growth Paths: A Place-Based System Failure Framework. In J. Niosi (Ed.), *Innovation Systems, Policy and Management* (pp. 329-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunko, M., Kinossian, N., Pivovarov, G., Averkieva, K., & Batunova, E. (2021). Exploring agency of change in small industrial towns through urban renewal initiatives. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 1-17. doi:10.1080/04353684.2020.1868947
- Görmar, F., Grillitsch, M., Hruška, V., Mihály, M., Nagy, E., Piša, J., & Stihl, L. (2022). Power relations and local agency: a comparative study of European mining towns. *Urban Research & Practice*, 1-24. doi:10.1080/17535069.2022.2051066
- Hassink, R. (2010). Locked in decline? On the role of regional lock-ins in old industrial areas. In R. Boschma & R. Martin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Evolutionary Economic Geography* (pp. 450-468). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hassink, R., Isaksen, A., & Trippel, M. (2019). Towards a comprehensive understanding of new regional industrial path development. *Regional Studies*, 53(11), 1636-1645. doi:10.1080/00343404.2019.1566704
- Henry, N., Angus, T., & Jenkins, M. (2021). Motorsport Valley revisited: Cluster evolution, strategic cluster coupling and resilience. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 28(4), 466-486. doi:10.1177/09697764211016039
- Herzog, A., & Hamm, R. (2021). A masterplan for urban resurgence: The case of Mönchengladbach, Germany (2008–2019). *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 13(3), 644-658. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12332>
- Huggins, R., & Thompson, P. (2019). The behavioural foundations of urban and regional development: culture, psychology and agency. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19(1), 121-146. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbx040 %J Journal of Economic Geography
- Huggins, R., & Thompson, P. (2023). Human agency, network dynamics and regional development: the behavioural principles of new path creation. *Regional Studies*, 57(8) 1669-1481. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2060958
- Hägerstrand, T. (1970). What about people in regional science? *Papers of Regional Science Association*, 24, 7-21.
- Iammarino, S., Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Storper, M. (2019). Regional inequality in Europe: evidence, theory and policy implications. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19(2), 273-298. doi:10.1093/jeg/lby021
- Isaksen, A., Jakobsen, S.-E., Njøs, R., & Normann, R. (2019). Regional industrial restructuring resulting from individual and system agency. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(1), 48-65. doi:10.1080/13511610.2018.1496322
- Jessop, B. (2001). Institutional Re(turns) and the Strategic – Relational Approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 33(7), 1213-1235. doi:10.1068/a32183
- Jolly, S., Grillitsch, M., & Hansen, T. (2020). Agency and actors in regional industrial path development. A framework and longitudinal analysis. *Geoforum*, 111, 176-188. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.02.013
- Kristensen, I. F., Pugh, R., & Grillitsch, M. (2022). Leadership and governance challenges in delivering place-based transformation through Smart Specialisation. *Regional Studies*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2090536
- Krugman, P. (1991). Increasing Returns and Economic Geography. *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(3), 483-499.
- Kurikka, H., & Grillitsch, M. (2020). Resilience in the periphery: What an agency perspective can bring to the table. *Papers in Innovation Studies*.
- MacKinnon, D., Dawley, S., Pike, A., & Cumbers, A. (2019). Rethinking Path Creation: A Geographical Political Economy Approach. *Economic Geography*, 95(2), 113-135. doi:10.1080/00130095.2018.1498294
- Martin, R., & Sunley, P. (2006). Path dependence and regional economic evolution. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(4), 395-437. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbl012

- Martin, R., & Sunley, P. (2022). Making history matter more in evolutionary economic geography. *ZFW – Advances in Economic Geography*. doi:doi:10.1515/zfw-2022-0014
- Morisson, A., & Mayer, H. (2021). An agent of change against all odds? The case of Ledger in Vierzon, France. *36(5)*, 430-447. doi:10.1177/02690942211052014
- Murdoch, J. (1998). The spaces of actor-network theory. *Geoforum*, *29(4)*, 357-374. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(98\)00011-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(98)00011-6)
- Müller, M. (2015). A half-hearted romance? A diagnosis and agenda for the relationship between economic geography and actor-network theory (ANT). *39(1)*, 65-86. doi:10.1177/0309132513518833
- Neffke, F., Hartog, M., Boschma, R., & Henning, M. (2018). Agents of Structural Change: The Role of Firms and Entrepreneurs in Regional Diversification. *Economic Geography*, *94(1)*, 23-48. doi:10.1080/00130095.2017.1391691
- Nieth, L., & Radinger-Peer, V. (2022). Universities as strategic agents in regional path development? A European comparison. *European Planning Studies*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/09654313.2022.2104604
- Obschonka, M., Schmitt-Rodermund, E., Silbereisen, R. K., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2013). The regional distribution and correlates of an entrepreneurship-prone personality profile in the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom: A socioecological perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105(1)*, 104-122. doi:10.1037/a0032275
- Pike, A. (2007). Editorial: Whither Regional Studies? *Regional Studies*, *41(9)*, 1143-1148. doi:10.1080/00343400701675587
- Pike, A., Birch, K., Cumbers, A., MacKinnon, D., & McMaster, R. (2009). A Geographical Political Economy of Evolution in Economic Geography. *Economic Geography*, *85(2)*, 175-182. doi:10.1111/j.1944-8287.2009.01021.x
- Pinzón-Camargo, M. A., Ordoñez-Matamoros, G., & Kuhlmann, S. (2022). Towards a path-transformative heuristic in inclusive innovation initiatives: an exploratory case in rural communities in Colombia. *Innovation and Development*, *12(1)*, 135-154. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2020.1832029
- Plummer, P., & Sheppard, E. (2006). Geography matters: agency, structures and dynamics at the intersection of economics and geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, *6(5)*, 619-637. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbl005
- Pratt, A. C. (1995). Putting critical realism to work: the practical implications for geographical research. *19(1)*, 61-74. doi:10.1177/030913259501900104
- Rekers, J. V., & Stihl, L. (2021). One crisis, one region, two municipalities: The geography of institutions and change agency in regional development paths. *Geoforum*, *124*, 89-98. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.05.012>
- Rutten, R. (2021). Uncertainty, Possibility, and Causal Power in QCA. *Sociological Methods & Research, online first*, 1-30. doi:10.1177/004912412111031268
- Rutzou, T., & Elder-Vass, D. (2019). On Assemblages and Things: Fluidity, Stability, Causation Stories, and Formation Stories. *37(4)*, 401-424. doi:10.1177/0735275119888250
- Sancino, A., Stafford, M., Braga, A., & Budd, L. (2022). What can city leaders do for climate change? Insights from the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group network. *Regional Studies*, *56(7)*, 1224-1233. doi:10.1080/00343404.2021.2005244
- Sayer, A. (1982). Explanation in economic geography: abstraction versus generalization. *Progress in Human Geography*, *6(1)*, 68-88. doi:10.1177/030913258200600103
- Sayer, A. (1984). *Method in social science: a realist approach* (2. ed.). London: Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1911). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humboldt.
- Simmie, J. (2012). Path Dependence and New Technological Path Creation in the Danish Wind Power Industry. *European Planning Studies*, *20(5)*, 753-772. doi:10.1080/09654313.2012.667924
- Sotarauta, M., & Grillitsch, M. (2023). Path tracing in the study of agency and structures: Methodological considerations. *Progress in Human Geography*, *47(1)*, 85-102. doi:10.1177/03091325221145590

- Sotarauta, M., Kurikka, H., & Kolehmainen, J. (2023). Change agency and path development in peripheral regions: from pulp production towards eco-industry in Lapland. *European Planning Studies*, 31(2) 348-371. doi:10.1080/09654313.2022.2054659
- Sotarauta, M., Suvinen, N., Jolly, S., & Hansen, T. (2020). The many roles of change agency in the game of green path development in the North. *European Urban and Regional Studies*. doi:10.1177/0969776420944995
- Steen, M. (2016). Reconsidering path creation in economic geography: aspects of agency, temporality and methods. *European Planning Studies*, 24(9), 1605-1622. doi:10.1080/09654313.2016.1204427
- Stihl, L. (2022). Challenging the set mining path: Agency and diversification in the case of Kiruna. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 11, 101064. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2022.101064>
- Strambach, S., & Pflitsch, G. (2020). Transition topology: Capturing institutional dynamics in regional development paths to sustainability. *Research Policy*, 49(7), 104006. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104006>
- Suitner, J., Haider, W., & Philipp, S. (2022). Social innovation for regional energy transition? An agency perspective on transformative change in non-core regions. *Regional Studies*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2053096
- Thomas, E., Faccin, K., & Asheim, B. T. (2020). Universities as orchestrators of the development of regional innovation ecosystems in emerging economies. *Growth and Change*, 10.1111/grow.12442, 1-20.
- Uyarra, E., Flanagan, K., Magro, E., Wilson, J. R., & Sotarauta, M. (2017). Understanding regional innovation policy dynamics: Actors, agency and learning. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(4), 559-568. doi:doi:10.1177/2399654417705914
- Weller, S., & Beer, A. (2023). State structures and the limits of agency: governing the transformation from coal in Australia. *Regional Studies*, 57(8) 1415-1427. doi:10.1080/00343404.2022.2047918
- Wu, D. (2022). Forging connections: The role of 'boundary spanners' in globalising clusters and shaping cluster evolution. *Progress in Human Geography*, 46(2), 484-506. doi:10.1177/03091325211038714
- Yeung, H. W.-c. (1997). Critical realism and realist research in human geography: a method or a philosophy in search of a method? , 21(1), 51-74. doi:10.1191/030913297668207944