



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

From global ideas to local action

Building capacity to reshape urban transport policy

Glaser, M.A.

Publication date

2021

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Glaser, M. A. (2021). *From global ideas to local action: Building capacity to reshape urban transport policy*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



Appendices

CHAPTER 2 APPENDIX

Appendix A. Articles included in the analysis

- Alavi, S., & Gill, C. (2017). Leading Change Authentically: How Authentic Leaders Influence Follower Responses to Complex Change. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 24(2), 157–171.
- Baumgartner, E., Bell, P., Brophy, S., Hoadley, C., Hsi, S., Joseph, D., ... Tabak, I. (2003). Design-Based Research: An Emerging Paradigm for Educational Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1).
- Beckmann, E. (2017). Leadership through fellowship: distributed leadership in a professional recognition scheme for university educators. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39(2), 155–168.
- Bougrain, F., & Haudeville, B. (2002). Innovation, collaboration and SMEs internal research capacities. *Research Policy*, 31, 735–747.
- Brown, R. (2007). Local Institutional Development and Organizational Change for Advancing Sustainable Urban Water Futures. *Environmental Management*, 41, 221–233.
- Bruyat, C., Julien, P., & Chair, B. (2000). Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 165–180.
- Capello, R., & Faggian, A. (2005). Collective Learning and Relational Capital in Local Innovation Processes. *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 75–87.
- Chen, S., Wu, S., Mao, C., & Li, B. (2017). Strategic Adjustment Capacity, Sustained Competitive Advantage, and Firm Performance: An Evolutionary Perspective on Bird Flocking and Firm Competition. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2017, 1–14.
- Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 947–967.
- Damsa, C., Kirschner, P., Andriessen, J., Erkens, G., & Sins, P. (2010). Shared Epistemic Agency: An Empirical Study of an Emergent Construct. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 19, 143–186.
- Duysters, G., & Lokshin, B. (2011). Determinants of alliance portfolio complexity and its effect on innovative performance of companies. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 28(4), 570–585.
- Farhad, S., Gual, M., & Ruiz-Ballesteros, E. (2017). How does adaptive co-management relate to specified and general resilience? An approach from Isla Mayor, Andalusia, Spain. *Land Use Policy*, 67, 268–276.
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16, 253–267.
- Gentner, D. (2016). Language as Cognitive Tool Kit : How Language Supports Relational Thought. *American Psychologist*, 71(8), 650–657.
- Hairon, S., Goh, J., Chua, C., & Wang, L. (2017). A research agenda for professional learning communities: moving forward. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(1), 72–86.
- Hopkins, D. (2016). Can environmental awareness explain declining preference for car-based mobility amongst generation Y? A qualitative examination of learn to drive behaviours. *Transportation Research Part A*, 94, 149–163.
- Hu, Y., Mcnamara, P., & McLoughlin, D. (2014). Outbound open innovation in bio-pharmaceutical out-licensing. *Technovation*, 35, 46–58.
- Hurley, R., Tomas, G., & Hult, M. (1998). Innovation, Market Orientation, and Organizational Learning: An Integration and Empirical. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 42–54. Retrieved from
- Jones, S., Harvey, M., Hamilton, J., Bevacqua, J., Egea, K., & Mckenzie, J. (2017). Demonstrating the impact of a distributed leadership approach in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39(2), 197–211.
- Kameda, T., & Nakanishi, D. (2003). Does social/cultural learning increase human adaptability? Rogers's question revisited. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 242–260.
- Koop, S., Koetsier, L., Doornhof, A., Reinstra, O., Van Leeuwen, C., Brouwer, S., ... Driessen, P. (2017). Assessing the Governance Capacity of Cities to Address Challenges of Water, Waste, and Climate Change. *Water Resource Management*, 31, 3427–3443.

- Lawrence, A. (2017). Adapting through practice: Silviculture, innovation and forest governance for the age of extreme uncertainty ☆. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 79, 50–60.
- Lee, J. (2017). Why Have Policies Often Remained Symbolic? Understanding the Reasons for Decoupling between Policy and Practice. *Review of Policy Research*, 34(5), 617–635.
- Liu, Y., Van Nederveen, S., & Hertogh, M. (2017). Understanding effects of BIM on collaborative design and construction: An empirical study in China. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35, 686–698.
- Lyles, M., & Salk, J. (1996). Knowledge Acquisition from Foreign Parents in International Joint Ventures: An Empirical Examination in the Hungarian Context. *Journal of International Business Studies Global Perspectives on Cooperative Strategies*, 27(5), 877–903.
- Mackinnon, D., Cumbers, A., & Chapman, K. (2002). Learning, innovation and regional development: a critical appraisal of recent debates. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(3), 291–311.
- Macpherson, A., & Holt, R. (2007). Knowledge, learning and small firm growth: A systematic review of the evidence. *Research Policy*, 36, 172–192.
- Manley, K., & Chen, L. (2015). Collaborative learning model of infrastructure construction: A capability perspective. *Construction Innovation*, 15(3), 355–377.
- Marina Apgar, J., Allen, W., Albert, J., Douthwaite, B., Ybarnegaray, R., & Lunda, J. (2017). Getting beneath the surface in program planning, monitoring and evaluation: Learning from use of participatory action research and theory of change in the CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems. *Action Research*, 15(1), 15–34.
- Mirimoghadam, M., & Ghazinoory, S. (2017). An institutional analysis of technological learning in Iran's oil and gas industry: Case study of south Pars gas field development. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 122, 262–274.
- Montes, L., Moreno, A., & Morales, V. (2005). Influence of support leadership and teamwork cohesion on organizational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination. *Technovation*, 25, 1159–1172.
- Nafukho, F., Alfred, M., Chakraborty, M., Johnson, M., & Cherrstrom, C. (2017). Predicting workplace transfer of learning: A study of adult learners enrolled in a continuing professional education training program. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 41(8), 327–353.
- Owusu, F., Kalipeni, E., Awortwi, N., Mueni, J., & Kiiru, M. (2017). Building research capacity for African institutions: confronting the research leadership gap and lessons from African research leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(2), 220–245.
- Pahl-Wostl, C. (2009). A conceptual framework for analysing adaptive capacity and multi-level learning processes in resource governance regimes. *Global Environmental Change*, 19, 354–365.
- Pahl-Wostl, C., Craps, M., Dewulf, A., Mostert, E., Tabara, D., & Taillieu, T. (2010). Social Learning and Water Resources Management. *Ecology and Society*, 12(2).
- Park, S., Marshall, N., Jakku, E., Dowd, A., Howden, S., Mendham, E., & Fleming, A. (2011). Informing adaptation responses to climate change through theories of transformation. *Global Environmental Change*, 22, 115–126.
- Pedler, M., & Brook, C. (2017). The innovation paradox: a selective review of the literature on action learning and innovation. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, 14(3), 216–229.
- Pelling, M., High, C., Dearing, J., & Smith, D. (2007). Shadow spaces for social learning: a relational understanding of adaptive capacity to climate change within organisations. *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 867–884.
- Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 443–459.
- Rhodes, J., Lok, P., Hung, R., & Fang, S. (2008). An integrative model of organizational learning and social capital on effective knowledge transfer and perceived organizational performance. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 20(4), 245–258.
- Ritala, P., & Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P. (2013). Incremental and radical innovation in co-competition—the role of absorptive capacity and appropriability. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(1), 154–169.

- Rohrbeck, R., & Schwarz, J. (2013). The value contribution of strategic foresight: Insights from an empirical study of large European companies. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 80, 1593–1606.
- Schmid, J., Knierim, A., & Knuth, U. (2016). Policy-induced innovations networks on climate change adaptation – An ex-post analysis of collaboration success and its influencing factors. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 56, 67–79.
- Seashore Louis, K., & Murphy, J. (2017). Trust, caring and organizational learning: the leader's role. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 103–126.
- Sengupta-Irving, T., & Agarwal, P. (2017). Conceptualizing Perseverance in Problem Solving as Collective Enterprise. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 19(2), 115–138.
- Shiel, C., Filho, W., Do Paço, A., & Brandli, L. (2016). Evaluating the engagement of universities in capacity building for sustainable development in local communities. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 54, 123–134.
- Simonin, B. (2004). An Empirical Investigation of the Process of Knowledge Transfer in International. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(5), 407–427.
- Swann, W. L. (2017). Examining the Impact of Local Collaborative Tools on Urban Sustainability Efforts: Does the Managerial Environment Matter? *American Review of Public Administration*, 47(4), 455–468.
- Tsekoura, M. (2016). Spaces for Youth Participation and Youth Empowerment: Case Studies from the UK and Greece. *Young*, 24(4), 326–341.
- Tu, Q., Vonderembse, M., Ragu-Nathan, T., & Sharkey, T. (2006). Absorptive capacity: Enhancing the assimilation of time-based manufacturing practices. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24, 692–710.

CHAPTER 3 APPENDIX

Appendix A. Codebook¹

#	Coding fields	Coding guidance	Entry type
1	Author(s)		Text
2	Title		Text
3	Year published		Text
4a	Journal		Text
4b	Volume		Text
4c	Issue		Text
5	Main transport topic under investigation	(i.e., BRT, cycling, etc.)	Text
6a	Research question or goal around learning stated in paper?	Direct evidence of objective around learning	Yes/No
6b	If yes, quotation and page number		Text
7	Does 'learning' appear in the paper?		Yes/No
8	Is learning central to the paper?	Learning must be an outcome, independent variable, dependent variable)	Yes/No
9	Which theory is predominately used to frame 'learning from elsewhere'?	Theory can be non-learning related (i.e., Dolowitz & Marsh). Theory must guide paper.	Text
10a	Does the framework/theory used intend to empirically examine learning?	What literature is discussed and used to identify major learning concepts?	Yes/No
10b	If yes, quote theory/framework and page number		Text
10c	If no, how is learning discussed?	Assessment and interpretation by coder. If not discussed: 'none'	Text
11a	Is learning defined?	Explicit language used	Yes/No
11b	If yes, quote definition and page number	Text	Text
12a	Are there specific types of learning the author(s) refer to?		Yes/No
12b	Types of learning: 1 = social, 2 = policy/political, 3 = organizational/loop (single, double, triple), 4 = experiential/ learning by doing/participatory action/ action/simple action/problem-based learning, 5 = transformative/reflexive, 6 = collaborative/cooperative/collective/ joint/mutual/group/shared, 7 = instrumental/ scientific and technical, 8 = other, 0 = NA	Designate using typology.	Typology
15	Is it the author's intention to empirically measure and demonstrate what leads to learning?	Must be a primary goal of the paper.	Yes/No
16a	Do the authors explicitly tease out specific phases or sub-processes of learning?		Yes/No
16b	If yes, how are phases discussed?		Text

¹ Codebook adapted from: Gerlak, A. K., Heikkila, T., Smolinski, S. L., Huitema, D., & Armitage, D. (2018). Learning our way out of environmental policy problems: a review of the scholarship. *Policy Sciences*, 51(3), 335–371.

#	Coding fields	Coding guidance	Entry type
17a	Are critical drivers or barriers to a process of learning discussed?	Factors that explicitly enable/hamper learning according to the study results.	Yes/No
17b	Drivers of learning: 1 = (discourse) framing, 2 = group activities, 3= group travel, 4=actor cooperation, 5= organizational structure & resources, 6=legal technical frameworks, 7 = leadership, 8 = endogenous motivation	Based on text, classify as specific type. Typology	
17c	Barrier to learning: 1 = culture, 2 = geography, 3= language, 4=actor cooperation, 5= organizational structure & resources, 6=legal technical frameworks, 7=leadership	Based on text, classify as specific type. Typology	
17d	Group activity codes: 1 = Study tour/study visit, 2 = Multi-region/nation project (i.e. EU project), 3 = Conference/workshop, 4 = Report/document/publication, 5 = non-state actors, 6 = network; 0 = N/A	Based on text, classify as specific group activity type.	Typology
18	What is the primary unit of analysis at which the authors are trying to draw conclusions? 1 = Individual, 2 = Site/Building/Project, 3 = City/Cities/Region, 4 = Nation state(s), 5 = Supranational government (i.e., EU), 6 = Other	Indicated in the research question or research design.	Typology
19	What continent does the unit of analysis belong to?	More than one continent = Global/Transcontinental	Text
20	Does the paper focus on a case of policy transfer/learning from one jurisdiction/authority/nation to another?		Yes/No
20a	If yes, what was the transfer between?		Text
21a	Is there a clear outcome of the transfer process?		Yes/No
21b	If yes, what was it?		Text
21c	If no, why?	If not discussed: 'none'	Text
22	Is the case studied ex-post or ex-ante/hypothetical	Indicated in the research question or research design.	Text
23a	Are data collected from oral interviews?		Yes/No
23b	Are data collected from written surveys?		Yes/No
23c	Are data collected from content analysis of documents?		Yes/No
23d	Are data collected from focus groups/workshops?		Yes/No
24d	Are descriptive statistics used for analysis?		Yes/No
25d	Are advanced statistical techniques used for analysis (for example, regression)?		Yes/No
26d	If qualitative methods are used, does the author describe them?		Yes/No
27d	Any other method used?		Text
28	What are the conclusions/main discussion points from the article?	What are the conclusions from the article, drawn from the discussion and conclusion sections	Text

Source: compiled by author

Appendix B. Summary statistics for coded items

Field	Frequency (%)
Journal Topic: Transportation	21 (60.0)
Journal Topic: Environment and Planning	13 (24.5)
Journal Topic: Urban Studies	11 (20.7)
Journal Topic: Policy/Politics	5 (9.0)
Journal Topic: Other	3 (5.6)
Transport Topic: Policy – Land Use Integration	8 (15.0)
Transport Topic: Active Travel	8 (15.0)
Transport Topic: Bus Rapid Transit	7 (13.2)
Transport Topic: Policy – General	8 (15.0)
Transport Topic: Urban Planning	5 (9.0)
Transport Topic: GHG Emissions	4 (7.5)
Transport Topic: Road Pricing/Congestion Charging	4 (7.5)
Transport Topic: Freight and Logistics	5 (9.0)
Transport Topic: Transport Site/Project	3 (5.6)
Transport Topic: Policy – Funding	1 (1.8)
Theory used to frame “learning from elsewhere”:	
Theory used: Policy transfer	25 (47.1)
Theory used: Policy learning	10 (18.8)
Theory used: Policy mobilities	12 (22.6)
Theory used: Other	12 (22.6)
Theory used: None	3 (5.6)
Research question or goal around learning	17 (32.0)
Learning a central concept	21 (60.0)
Learning is defined	1 (1.8)
Authors intention to measure learning and demonstrate what it leads to	4 (7.5)
Authors explicitly tease out specific phases or sub-processes of learning	0 (0)
Type of Learning referred to	35 (66.0)
Type of Learning ² : Policy learning	32 (91.4)
Type of Learning: Organizational/Loop learning	6 (17.4)
Type of Learning: Social learning	4 (11.4)
Type of Learning: Other	9 (25.7)
Unit of Analysis: City/Cities/Region	27 (50.9)
Unit of Analysis: Nation state(s)	11 (20.8)
Unit of Analysis: Supranational government (i.e., EU)	6 (11.3)
Unit of Analysis: Individual(s)	5 (9.0)
Unit of Analysis: Site/Building/Project	2 (3.7)
Unit of Analysis: Other	2 (3.7)
Location of Case Studied: Europe	23 (43.4)
Location of Case Studied: Global/Transcontinental	12 (22.6)
Location of Case Studied: North America	4 (7.5)
Location of Case Studied: Asia	5 (9.0)
Location of Case Studied: Africa	3 (5.6)

Field	Frequency (%)
Location of Case Studied: Australia	3 (5.6)
Location of Case Studied: South America	3 (5.6)
Nature of case studied: Ex-post	39 (73.9)
Nature of case studied: Ex-ante/hypothetical	11 (20.8)
Drivers and/or barriers of learning discussed	43 (81.1)
Drivers of learning discussed	43 (81.1)
Barriers of learning discussed	27 (50.9)
Drivers of Learning³	
Driver of Learning: Group activities	33 (76.7)
Driver of Learning: Networks (of actors)	28 (65.1)
Driver of Learning: Group travel (visits, study tours)	13 (30.2)
Driver of Learning: Meetings, workshops, conferences	10 (23.2)
Driver of Learning: Actor cooperation	17 (39.5)
Driver of Learning: Leadership	8 (18.6)
Driver of Learning: Framing (of problems)	6 (13.9)
Driver of Learning: Document or report	4 (9.3)
Driver of Learning: Organizational structure & resources	3 (7.0)
Driver of Learning: Endogenous motivation	2 (4.7)
Driver of Learning: Legal, technical framework	0 (0)
Barriers to Learning⁴	
Barrier to Learning: Organizational structure & resources	12 (44.4)
Barrier to Learning: Culture & language	13 (48.1)
Barrier to Learning: Actor cooperation	11 (40.7)
Barrier to Learning: Legal, technical frameworks	4 (14.8)
Barrier to Learning: Leadership	5 (18.5)
Barrier to Learning: Geography	5 (18.5)
Methods⁵	
Methods: Qualitative	47 (89)
Methods: Interviews	36 (68.0)
Methods: Document analysis	30 (57)
Methods: Focus groups/Workshops	7 (13.2)
Methods: Quantitative	8 (15.1)
Methods: Surveys	5 (9.4)
Methods: Descriptive statistics	5 (9.4)
Methods: Advanced statistics	3 (5.7)

Source: compiled by author

² Individual articles contained multiple types of learning. Percentage totals show 52 appearances of learning types across 35 articles.

³ Individual articles contained multiple drivers of learning. Percentage totals show 96 appearances of drivers of learning across 43 articles.

⁴ Individual articles contained multiple barriers to learning. Percentage totals show 50 appearances of barrier of learning across 27 articles.

⁵ 25 papers used one method or more.

Appendix C. List of articles

- Anderton, K., & Palmer, J. R. (2015). Evidence-based policy as iterative learning: the case of EU biofuels targets. *Contemporary Social Science*, 10(2), 138–147.
- Arbolino, R., Carlucci, F., Cirà, A., Ioppolo, G., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2017). Efficiency of the EU regulation on greenhouse gas emissions in Italy: The hierarchical cluster analysis approach. *Ecological Indicators*, 81(June), 115–123.
- Arbolino, R., Carlucci, F., Cirà, A., De Simone, L., Ioppolo, G., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2018). Factors affecting transport privatization: An empirical analysis of the EU. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 110(December 2017), 149–160.
- Ashmore, D. P., Pojani, D., Thoreau, R., Christie, N., & Tyler, N. A. (2018). The symbolism of ‘eco cars’ across national cultures: Potential implications for policy formulation and transfer. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 63(June), 560–575.
- Attard, M., & Enoch, M. (2011). Policy transfer and the introduction of road pricing in Valletta, Malta. *Transport Policy*, 18(3), 544–553.
- Ben-Zadok, E. (2018). Understanding policy learning and change through policy beliefs: Florida smart growth. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 10(2), 123–138.
- Bok, R. (2015). Airports on the move? The policy mobilities of Singapore Changi Airport at home and abroad. *Article Urban Studies*, 52(14), 2724–2740.
- Börjesson, M., Brundell-Freij, K., & Eliasson, J. (2014). Not invented here: Transferability of congestion charges effects. *Transport Policy*, 36, 263–271.
- Boussauw, K., & Vanin, F. (2018). Constrained sustainable urban mobility: the possible contribution of research by design in two Palestinian cities. *Urban Design International*, 23(3), 182–199.
- Bray, D. J., Taylor, M. A. P., & Scrafton, D. (2011). Transport policy in Australia—Evolution, learning and policy transfer. *Transport Policy*, 18(3), 522–532.
- Duffhues, J., Mayer, I. S., Nefs, M., & Van Der Vliet, M. (2014). Breaking barriers to Transit-Oriented development: Insights from the serious game SPRINTCITY. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 41(5), 770–791.
- Fink, J. H. (2019). Contrasting governance learning processes of climate-leading and -lagging cities: Portland, Oregon, and Phoenix, Arizona, USA. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 21(1), 16–29.
- Glavic, D., Milos, M., Luttinen, T., Cicevic, S., & Trifunovic, A. (2017). Road to price: User perspectives on road pricing in transition country. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 105(June 2016), 79–94.
- Gray, D., Laing, R., & Docherty, I. (2017). Delivering lower carbon urban transport choices: European ambition meets the reality of institutional (mis)alignment. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(1), 226–242.
- Haughton, G., & Mcmanus, P. (2012). Neoliberal Experiments with Urban Infrastructure: The Cross City Tunnel, Sydney. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(1), 90–105.
- Hysing, E., & Isaksson, K. (2015). Building acceptance for congestion charges - the Swedish experiences compared. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 49, 52–60.
- Ibsen, M. E., & Olesen, K. (2018). Bicycle urbanism as a competitive advantage in the neoliberal age: the case of bicycle promotion in Portland. *International Planning Studies*, 23(2), 210–224.
- Kaszubowski, D., Pawłowska, A., & Marszałkowska, K. (2018). Adapting new tools of urban freight management based on Gdynia’s dedicated delivery bays example - An analysis of the process. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 30, 265–274.
- Keil, R., & Addie, J. P. D. (2015). “It’s Not Going to be Suburban, It’s Going to be All Urban”: Assembling Post-suburbia in the Toronto and Chicago Regions. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(5), 892–911.
- Lawer, E. T., Herbeck, J., & Flitner, M. (2019a). Selective adoption: How port authorities in Europe and West Africa engage with the globalizing “green port” idea. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(18).
- Lawer, E. T. (2019b). Transnational networks for the ‘greening’ of ports: learning from best practice? *GeoJournal*, 0.

- Lucas, K., & Currie, G. (2012). Developing socially inclusive transportation policy: Transferring the United Kingdom policy approach to the State of Victoria? *Transportation*, 39(1), 151–173.
- Ma, L. (2017). Site Visits, Policy Learning, and the Diffusion of Policy Innovation: Evidence from Public Bicycle Programs in China. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 22(4), 581–599.
- Macmillen, J., & Stead, D. (2014). Learning heuristic or political rhetoric? Sustainable mobility and the functions of “best practice.” *Transport Policy*, 35, 79–87.
- Marsden, G., Frick, K.T., & May, A.D. (2011). How do cities approach policy innovation and policy learning? A study of 30 policies in Northern Europe and North America. *Transport Policy*.
- Marsden, G., Frick, K., May, A., & Deakin, E. (2012). Bounded rationality in policy learning amongst cities: lessons from the transport sector. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 905–920.
- May, A. D. (2015). Encouraging good practice in the development of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 3(1), 3–11.
- Montero, S. (2017a). Persuasive Practitioners and the Art of Simplification: Mobilizing the "Bogota Model" through storytelling, *Novos Estudos*, 59–75.
- Montero, S. (2017b). Study tours and inter-city policy learning: Mobilizing Bogotá’s transportation policies in Guadalajara. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(2), 332–350.
- Newman, J., & Bird, M. G. (2017). Sydney’s, British Columbia’s fast ferries and Airport Link: partisan barriers to learning from policy failure. *Policy and Politics*, 45(1), 71–85.
- O’Dolan, C., & Rye, T. (2012). An insight into policy transfer processes within an EU project and implications for future project design. *Transport Policy*, 24, 273–283.
- Olsen, S., & Fearnley, N. (2014). Policy transfer of public transport funding schemes – The case of Norway. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 48, 429–433.
- Parkes, S.D., Marsden, G., Shaheen, S.A., & Cohen, A. (2013). Understanding the diffusion of public bikesharing systems: Evidence from Europe and North America. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 31, 94– 103.
- Pojani, D., Bakija, D., Shkreli, E., Corcoran, J., & Mateo-Babiano, I. (2017). Do northwestern and southeastern Europe share a common “cycling mindset”? Comparative analysis of beliefs toward cycling in the Netherlands and the Balkans. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, 17(1), 25–45.
- Pojani, D., & Stead, D. (2014). Dutch planning policy: The resurgence of TOD. *Land Use Policy*, 41, 357–367.
- Pojani, D., & Stead, D. (2015). Going Dutch? The export of sustainable land-use and transport planning concepts from the Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 52(9), 1558–1576.
- Rye, T., Welsch, J., Plevnik, A., & de Tommasi, R. (2011). First steps towards cross-national transfer in integrating mobility management and land use planning in the EU and Switzerland. *Transport Policy*, 18(3), 533–543.
- Sengers, F., & Raven, R. (2015). Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions Toward a spatial perspective on niche development: The case of Bus Rapid Transit. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 17, 166–182.
- Sheldon, T. (2004). Learning from abroad of policy tourism?. *British Journal of General Practice*, 54(503), 410–411.
- Shefer, I. (2019). Policy transfer in city-to-city cooperation: implications for urban climate governance learning. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 21(1), 61–75.
- Sheldrick, A., Evans, J., & Schliwa, G. (2017). Policy learning and sustainable urban transitions: Mobilising Berlin’s cycling renaissance. *Urban Studies*, 54(12), 2739–2762.
- Thomas, A., & Deakin, E. (2017). Managing partnerships for sustainable development: The Berkeley—China sustainable transportation program. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 5(1), 45–54.
- Thomas, R., & Bertolini, L. (2015a). Defining critical success factors in TOD implementation using rough set analysis. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 139–154.
- Thomas, R., & Bertolini, L. (2015b). Policy transfer among planners in transit-oriented development. *Town Planning Review*, 86(5), 537–560.

- Thomas, R., Pojani, D., Lenferink, S., Bertolini, L., Stead, D., & van der Krabben, E. (2018). Is transit-oriented development (TOD) an internationally transferable policy concept? *Regional Studies*, 52(9), 1201–1213.
- Timms, P. (2011). Urban transport policy transfer: “bottom-up” and “top-down” perspectives. *Transport Policy*, 18(3), 513–521.
- Timms, P. (2014). Transferability of urban freight transport measures: A case study of Cariacica (Brazil). *Research in Transportation Business and Management*, 11, 63–74.
- Walker, C. K. (2019). Policy transfer in a corporatist context: Agents, adjustments and continued innovation. *Public Policy and Administration*, 34(3), 308–328.
- Wang, H., Chen, B., Xiong, W., Yang, L., & Zhu, D. (2019). Multiple Pathways to Public-Private Partnerships for Urban Public Service Delivery: A Cross-City Comparison of Bicycle-Sharing Service in China. *Urban Policy and Research*, 37(4), 474–488.
- Wood, A. (2014a). Learning through policy tourism: circulating bus rapid transit from South America to South Africa. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(11), 2654–2669.
- Wood, A. (2014b). Moving policy: Global and local characters circulating bus rapid transit through South African cities. *Urban Geography*, 35(8), 1238–1254.
- Wood, A. (2015a). Competing for Knowledge: Leaders and Laggards of Bus Rapid Transit in South Africa. *Urban Forum*, 26, 203–221.
- Wood, A. (2015b). Multiple Temporalities of Policy Circulation: Gradual, Repetitive and Delayed Processes of BRT Adoption in South African Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(3), 568–580.
- Wood, A. (2015c). The Politics of Policy Circulation: Unpacking the Relationship Between South African and South American Cities in the Adoption of Bus Rapid Transit. *Antipode*, 47(4), 1062–1079.

CHAPTER 4 APPENDIX

Appendix A. Conference evaluation question selected for analysis

On average, how many indoor sessions per day did you attend:

- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- More than 10

On average, how insightful were the indoor sessions?

- Not at all insightful
- Somewhat insightful
- Very insightful

How many total guided bike tours (Saturday - Friday) did you participate in?

- None
- 1-2 tours
- 3-5 tours
- More than 5

On average, how insightful were the bike tours?

- Not at all insightful
- Somewhat insightful
- Very insightful

How well did the following session formats match your expectations:

	Greatly Exceeded Expectations	Exceeded Expectations	Matched Expectations	Less than Expected	Much less than Expected	Did not Participate
Lectures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Round Table Discussions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Panel discussions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speed Dating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pecha Kucha	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Master Classes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outdoor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the conference, on average, about how many minutes per day did you:

	Never	Less than 15 minutes	15-30 minutes	35-55 minutes	More than 55 minutes
Walk	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Ride a bicycle - with others (incl. A tour)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Ride a bicycle - alone	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Drive or ride in a car	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Take public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>				

In the last year, how often have you used any of the below to learn more about cycling:

	Weekly or more often	Monthly basis	A couple of times in the year	Once in the last year	Not in the last year, but previously	NEVER IN MY CAREER
Professional courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Professional manuals/books	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Masterclasses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Articles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Study tours/visits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences (other than Velocity 2017)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Webinars	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Network groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online sources (blogs, websites)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Audiovisual material (videos)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Before this conference, what were you most excited about?

With 1 being the most excited, please rank your top 3:

- Specific indoor session topic(s)
- Specific speaker(s)
- Indoor sessions (in general)
- Outdoor sessions/excursions
- Visiting the Netherlands
- Hands-on experience
- Feedback on my work
- Presenting my own work
- Meeting new contacts in my network
- Catching up with existing contacts
- Other:

Source: compiled by author

Appendix B. Fieldwork protocol outline

1. Data collection procedures and schedule of observations
 - a. Sites to be visited
 - b. Schedule of observations
2. Case study questions, for reference during each observation session:
 - a. Describe setting and atmosphere of the session, including the lay-out of the room or location, number of participants, speakers or guides present, equipment present or used
 - b. How does the session begin?
3. What activities take place during the session?
 - a. What happens during the session and how do participants respond?
 - b. How many of the participants are (not) actively engaged?
 - c. What participant behaviors are observed? Include gestures, movements, expressions, emotions.
4. What interactions take place during the session?
 - a. Who is (not) interacting?
 - b. How do they interact?
 - c. What objects are used for interactions? How?
5. How is the space or site(s) used during the session?
 - a. What kinds of space is it?
 - b. How do participants engage with the space?
6. What communication is relayed?
 - a. What kinds of questions are asked?
 - b. What non-verbal communication is observed (gestures, expressions, emotions)?
7. How does the session end?
 - a. What social interactions take place? Include gestures, movements, expressions, emotions.

Source: compiled by author

CHAPTER 5 APPENDIX

Appendix A. List of Interviewees

Sector	Department/ Sector	Job category	Position level*	Scale	Study tours	Code
Public sector (City of Denver)	Health and Environment	Civil Servant	Middle	Municipal/ local	-	P1
	Mayor's Office	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	The Netherlands 2015	P3
	Mayor's Office	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	Spain 2018 The Netherlands 2015	P7
	Mayor's Office	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	-	P8
	Public Works	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	The Netherlands 2015	P12
	Public Works	Civil Servant	Middle	Municipal/ local	-	P15
	Public Works	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	Spain 2018 The Netherlands 2015	P4
	Public Works	Civil Servant	Middle	Municipal/ local	-	P5
	Public Works	Civil Servant	High	Municipal/ local	The Netherlands 2015	P6
	City Council	Elected Official	High	Municipal/ local	Spain 2018 The Netherlands 2015	P10
Private sector	Commerce	Private Sector	High	Municipal/ local	The Netherlands 2015	P2
	Research	Private Sector	High	Local/ regional	-	P11
	Marketing	Private Sector	High	Local/ regional	Denmark 2016	P14
Non-profit organizations	Walking/Cycling Advocacy 1	Advocate	High	Local/ regional	-	P9
	Walking/Cycling Advocacy 2	Advocate	High	Regional/ State	-	P13

**High* indicates senior leadership roles, such as Director, Deputy Director or Senior Manager; *Middle* indicates technical or programmatic roles, such as Engineer or Program Manager.

Appendix B. Interview Guide

- Can you tell me about the City's main transportation policy objectives and goals?
- How have these goals changed over the years (or compared to previous administrations)?
- How does your organization contribute to this goal?
- Has your organization needed to learn or develop more capacity to meet this goal?
- How have you gone about learning? (How) does your organization support this learning?
- In the last 5 years or so, what would you see as the biggest achievement or milestone in reaching this goal?
- What do you attribute the success/outcome of this achievement to?
- Who are the key stakeholders you work with to achieve this goal?
- Was a particular partner missing, or one you wished you had more support from?
- In your mind, what does the future hold for Denver?

(For study tour participants)

- Thinking back to the study tour(s), can you tell me about your experience on the study tour?
- What was your main goal for participating in the study tour?
- Do you think it was achieved?
- Do you think these types of trips play a role in making actual change happen?
- Can you share any examples where you think the study tour influenced on actual change?

(For non-participants)

- Other city staff (or some of your colleagues) have gone on study tours to learn about transportation policies – (what) have you heard about these trips?
- What do you think about these types of trips?
- What role do you think these types of trips play for making change happen?

Source: compiled by author

Appendix C. Respondent geographical distribution

Place of U.S. residence at time of response	Percentage (N)
Portland (OR)	16.5 (18)
Denver (CO)	7.5 (8)
Memphis (TN)	7.5 (8)
Seattle (WA)	6.5 (7)
Madison (WI)	4.5 (5)
San Francisco (CA)	4.5 (5)
Indianapolis (IN)	3.5 (4)
New York (NY)	3.5 (4)
Boston (MA)	3 (3)
Fayetteville (AR)	3 (3)
Los Angeles (CA)	3 (3)
Pittsburgh (PA)	3 (3)
Washington, D.C.	3 (3)
Chicago (IL)	2 (2)
Miami (FL)	2 (2)
Minneapolis (MN)	2 (2)
Richmond (VA)	2 (2)
Springfield (OR)	2 (2)
Other*	24 (22)
N = 108	

Source: compiled by author

*One respondent from each of the following: Alameda (CA), Alexandria (VA), Ann Arbor (MI), Arlington (VA), Atlanta (GA), Aurora (CO), Austin (TX), Berkeley (CA), Boulder (CO), College Station (TX), Davis (CA), Eugene (OR), Fort Collins (CO), Kapaa (HI), Longmont (CO), Nashville (TN), New Orleans (LA), Newport (RI), Oakland (CA), Roslindale (MA), San Jose (CA), Sheboygan (WI), Springdale (AR), and Verona (WI).

CHAPTER 6 APPENDIX

Appendix A. Interviewees & Study tours included in analysis

New Orleans (n=10)

Code	Type	# inter-views	Interview 2018	Study tour (6-2018)	Interview 2019A	Study tour (3-2019)	Interview 2019B	Interview 2020
NT1	Engineer/Technical	3	3-29-18	Yes	2-19-19	Yes		1-17-20
NM1	Manager/Technical	1			3-11-19	Yes		
NT3	Planner/Technical	2			3-19-19	Yes		1-27-20
NA1	Advocacy	1			2-26-19	Yes		
NA2	Advocacy	4	3-28-18	Yes	2-25-19	Yes	11-12-19	12-3-2019
NO1	Official/Policy	3			3-20-19	Yes	11-13-19	1-14-20
NO2	Mayor staff	1				Yes	11-14-19	
NO3	Official/Policy	1			3-27-19			
NS1	Stakeholder	3			3-14-19	Yes	11-13-19	1-17-20
NC1	Council member	3			3-20-19	Yes	11-13-19	1-27-20

Austin (n = 11)

Code	Type	# inter-views	Interview 2018	Study tour (6-2018)	Interview 2019A	Study tour (10-2019)	Interview 2019B	Interview 2020
AT1	Planner/Technical	4	3-28-18	Yes	11-21-18	Yes	8-7-19	8-26-20
AT2	Planner/Technical	2	3-28-18	Yes	8-17-19			
AT3	Planner/Technical	1			8-15-19			
AT4	Engineer/Technical	1		Yes	8-16-19			
AT5	Engineer/Technical	2			10-20-19	Yes		9-17-20
AS1	Stakeholder	1			10-8-19	Yes		
AC1	Council member	2			10-7-19	Yes		8-31-20
AC2	Council member	2			10-10-19	Yes		8-31-20
AA1	Advocacy	2			9-26-19	Yes		8-28-20
AM2	Manager/Technical	2			10-10-19	Yes		9-16-20
AM1	Manager/Technical	3		Yes	8-17-19	& Yes		9-16-20

Source: compiled by author

Appendix B: Sample interview schedule (before and after study tours)

Before study tour

- Can you tell me a little about yourself and how you got to being (position)?
- To you, what are (city) most urgent transportation issues?
- What would you say is the vision for transportation or mobility in (city)?
- What do you think the city needs to get to that vision?
- Where in your mind does bicycling come in?
- Do you ride a bike regularly in [city]?
- Can you tell me about the structure of [organization] and which other [divisions/organizations] you work closely with?
- Are there activities you do to stay updated about transportation policies or projects?
- Are there alliances or relationships you wish were stronger or that you'd like to forge?
- [transition to study tour]
- Have you been to [destination] before?
- Have you participated in a study tour about transportation or bicycling before?
- Can you describe what you're thinking about this trip?
- Are you planning to prepare for the trip in any way?
- Have you discussed the trip with colleagues, or other people? What has been discussed?
- How well do you know the other delegates? Are there certain people you are looking forward to meeting or talking to?
- Have you thought about any possible outcomes from this study tour? What would you consider to be the best possible outcome from the study tour?

After study tour

- What stands out to you most as you look back on the study tour?
- Was there anything that surprised you?
- Can you tell me about your experiences with the other [city] delegates?
- How often do you see or work with the other delegates?
- When you think about these experiences, is there anyone in particular you think really benefitted from the study tour? What makes you think this?
- Have you ridden a bicycle since the study tour?
- Can you tell me about any major milestones around bicycling or transport in general in the last few months?
- What was the biggest challenge you faced with [milestone]?
- How did you go about solving that?
- If an official or planner from another city were to come to you to saying they wanted to [milestone], what would you tell them do?

Source: compiled by author

Appendix C: Fieldwork protocol outline (during study tours)

1. Data collection procedures and schedule of observations
 - a. Sites to be visited, aligned with study tour agenda
 - b. Schedule of observations, aligned with study tour agenda
2. Case study questions, for reference during each observation session:
 - a. Describe setting and atmosphere of the session, including the lay-out of the room or location, speakers or guides present, equipment present or used
 - b. How does the session begin?
3. What activities take place during the session?
 - a. What happens during the session and how do participants respond?
 - b. Which participants are (not) actively engaged?
 - c. What participant behaviors are observed? Include gestures, movements, expressions, emotions.
4. What interactions take place during the session?
 - a. Who is (not) interacting?
 - b. How do they interact?
 - c. What is discussed and between who?
 - d. What objects are used for interactions? How?
5. How is the space or site(s) used during the session?
 - a. What kinds of space is it?
 - b. How do participants engage with the space?
6. What communication is relayed?
 - a. What kinds of questions are asked (to the guide, host, moderator)?
 - b. What non-verbal communication is observed (gestures, expressions, emotions)?
7. How does the session end?
 - a. What social interactions take place? Include gestures, movements, expressions, emotions.

Source: compiled by author

Appendix D: Example of joint attention and co-presence during guided bike tour on a study tour

[Entire group has just cycled about 5 minutes in the city center of Utrecht, led by a guide. The group stops at a busy intersection.]

Guide: Ok! How'd that feel?

AM1: Calm. Easy ride.

AC2: So quiet! But the motorbikes are noisy.

Guide: So, here is a typical protected intersection. You can see the traffic signals for cars and the ones here are for bikes (points). There are also triangles on the road; that means yield. Our instinct as Americans, is to stop, but by Thursday we'll be rolling through them like the Dutch do.

[Most of the group watch an older woman elegantly dismount her bicycle at the stop light, and another woman on a bicycle with two small children on the front and back carriers.]

AC2: How old do kids have to be to ride a bike here?

Guide: The Dutch don't really have rules about that.

AT5: No one wears helmets!

AT1: That's because the infrastructure provides best for safety. Helmets are the last resort.

Guide: And remember, we're going really slow here.

Appendix E. Excerpt from New Orleans' programmed group reflection

New Orleans Debrief (Seville, Day 1)

[Entire group is in a casual meeting space, the basement of a community bicycle center. Everyone is seated around a large table. Drinks and snacks are served.]

Moderator: So we'd like to start with an open question, keeping it simple: What did you like about today?

Participant A: We don't think enough about the user experience with bicycle infrastructure. It was great to see the homogeneity in the infrastructure. The green paint is the same everywhere and it really guides you through the system.

NM1: The separation is consistent, easy to follow.

NT3: That also resonated with me. The separation between the bikes and pedestrian traffic was so key. You never had to stop and think. Sometimes the intersections are tricky though.

Participant B: For me what's amazing to see is that this is just the way it is. It's just a natural state of being, being on a bike.

NA2: And it's so recent. Such a recent change.

Participant B: Yeah, and like, there was this girl with a red sweater [turning to neighbor] - did you see her? She was just in the middle of our group, riding along.

NO2: We don't have to wear biking gear - just people in everyday clothes.

Participant B: Exactly!

NC1: Yes, I love that. I agree with [NM1], I feel so much safer on wider infrastructure. Design really matters.

Participant C: And doing it all at one time. Having that complete system so that people aren't worried about safety. Infrastructure is like saying we care about you, we care about the vulnerable community members.

NA1: And there are a lot of students here, just like we do. We have so many universities. Connecting this with them will make the transition easier.

NC1: And with transit. Integration with transit is really important for us. The rate of public transit use will increase with bike paths.

[About 7 minutes later into discussion]

Moderator: So we haven't yet heard from [NO1], what stuck with you today that you feel is important to discuss relative to New Orleans?

NO1: I'm just trying to reconcile the practicality of what to actually bring back to New Orleans. I mean, an entire city of bike lanes - I just can't imagine that being practical in New Orleans; audacious, yes, great, wonderful - but I just don't see how that's practical.

NA2: What do you see as the biggest hang-up, in terms of what we have to invest?

NO1: Well for me, I would imagine it would be hard for a policymaker to champion, you know, brand new bike lanes everywhere, when we have a whole city with, you know, craters in front of people's homes, right? We have to be cautious and make sure we're getting back what we're investing in...maybe this is just my own perception that I have no data to support, but it's just my thoughts right here.

NA1: To me, it speaks to the communication and education component. Preparing the public for what's going to happen and getting them excited about it. But I understand your point.

NO1: And I think there is a way to make it a win-win in New Orleans, because some of the bones I actually do see. I think we'll have a much better opportunity, if we make it a win-win situation...

NT1: I'll just add...how I think about this program is that we're not just putting bike facilities out there on pothole ridden streets - we're fixing those streets, and then adding more into the roadway. So we're actually delivering a layered approach, fixing the roadway and then saying, what mobility needs can this roadway deliver? So I'm thinking like a package deal. So drivers get a smoother roadway, bicyclists get something, pedestrians too. You get better transit. All those things come out of that process. But it'd be hard to do it with just this budget that we have set up, we're going to have to leverage other budgets. We're going to have to

think ahead to, what are those needs.

NC1: And just to add here, since Katrina, I have been seeing an increase in biking, and an increase in bike culture that we never had before. I see it is constantly gaining ground. I think we have a unique opportunity because of our limited transportation options. And I think we're in a really sweet space to take advantage of it. And I really, I mean, I really believe the public is going to be behind this. I mean, we need obviously the data to verify, which will make all of our jobs easier, but I just believe in my heart that it is there. I mean, I've seen it.

Excerpt from Austin's programmed group reflection

Austin Debrief (The Netherlands, Day 4)

[In a meeting room, the entire group is seated in chairs forming a circle. The moderator has asked everyone to share what has been their most important takeaway from the study tour. The entire session lasted 57 minutes.]

AM1: So I think it's really instructive that [moderator] talked about how the culture is already partly there in Austin...I think that can be really important in socializing that sort of knowledge, bicycling as the cultural norm.

Participant (Elected official): I've realized, we have an opportunity to, kind of, be this cultural shift - and seeing this casual bicycling as a mode of transportation has been eye-opening. You can get in your clothes for the day and go about your life. Seeing this really good blend of all these different options together, that's been something that I didn't really expect coming into this.

Participant (Stakeholder): Probably one of the best ways to change people, is to change the people [laughs from the group]. That data showed that, what, 43 or 46 percent of people [in Austin] will never ride a bike - I was one of those people. And now, I just can't wait to get home and get a bike. Seeing people riding bikes and taking advantage of the infrastructure really works. You really gotta see it to believe it. [sounds of verbal agreement among the group]

AC1: I think my biggest takeaway was that we're not going to copy-paste what happened here, but do it in our own way. I love what you said about offering options. It's not about cycling, it's about offering options.

EPILOGUE APPENDIX

Additional publications & abstracts

Glaser, M., & Krizek, K. J. (2021). Can street-focused emergency response measures trigger a transition to new transport systems? Exploring evidence and lessons from 55 US cities. *Transport Policy*, 103(146–155). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.01.015>

Abstract | Transport planning and policy is increasingly being called to action in ways that differ from practices of yesteryear. Varied segments of society are increasingly looking to city streets—the workhorse of a city's transport system—as places to enact change. Namely, to change their character away from the type of streets pervasive in auto-oriented urban environments. Acutely experienced during the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic, emergency response measures from many cities across the world abruptly altered the nature and purpose of street space. These “street experiments” fueled an opportunity, in part, to explore a transition to practices prioritizing forms of sustainable mobility such as walking and bicycling. This research inventories street-focused emergency response measures from the 55 largest cities in the US. We devise a rubric to systematically assess and locate characteristics of these measures that enable a transition. Results show that five “innovator” and several “early adopter” cities are using COVID conditions to test new forms of streets and in some cases, street networks. These cities excelled in conveying a vision for alternative future, articulating implementation pathways, leveraging political capacity, and circulating information. After six months, half of the cities continue their efforts, including only six which have expanded. The few showing continued strength demonstrate endeavors to evaluate the experiments, validate their feasibility, and embed the experiments into existing sustainability policy. These components, when leveraged together, could seed innovative breakthroughs in how city streets are used, designed, and standardized. The paper establishes baseline evidence on which future research efforts can build and provides empirical evidence on early stages of the experimentation and transition processes of urban mobility systems.

Glaser, M., Krizek, K. J., & King, D. A. (2020). Viewpoint: Accelerating reform to govern streets in support of human-scaled accessibility (viewpoint). *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 7, 100199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2020.100199>

Abstract | A longstanding mantra is that city governments lack capacities for agile, nimble change; such lack of capacity is starkly realized in how streets are governed. Exhaustive layers of codes, regulations and guidelines support a single objective: moving automobiles. The networks of streets themselves, together with the legislative and institutional networks that guide their character, are in dire need of being modernized. This viewpoint recounts a current perspective of city street governance, formulated by antiquated legislation and procedures; it points to an automobile-dominated regime that restricts innovation. We propose and describe three principles to support innovation and accelerate transformation in how streets are managed: (1) a focus on accessibility, (2) the power of local government, and (3) reflexive learning that draws on strategic experiments with city streets.

Blake, O., Glaser, M., Bertolini, L., & te Brömmelstroet, M. (2020). How policies become best practices: A case study of best practice making in an EU knowledge sharing project. *European Planning Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2020.1840523>

Abstract | Best practices are prevalent in all fields of planning and act to highlight effective and implementable examples, set standards, and generally assist ‘evidence-based’ policy-making. In doing so, they frame what futures are desirable and play a role in shaping the planned environment. Despite this power, little is known about how certain policies come to be considered best practices. This article takes a case of best practice making in an EU INTERREG project and illuminates the processes and justifications used to select and formulate best practices. Reviewing project documents and interviewing those involved in selecting possible best practices, demonstrates who decides what should be exemplified, how the decisions are taken, and on what grounds choices are made. The varied and subjective reasonings we find to justify best practices calls into question their perceived neutrality and sturdiness as policy-making instruments. However, selecting best practices, as a process itself, is not without benefits for participants as the reflective element enabled unique forms of learning, opening up wider questions about what function best practices have in making policy.