**Appendix**

**Appendix A: Interviews**

**Table A1: Interviews**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***ID*** | ***Gender*** | ***Age group*** | ***Length*** | ***Role*** | ***Organisational affiliation*** | ***Case*** |
| I1 | m | 35-50 | 00:47 | Fellow | Federal Innovation Fellowship | F1 |
| I2 | f | 35-50 | 00:43 | Fellow | Federal Innovation Fellowship | F5 |
| I3 | f | 35-50 | 00:54 | Fellow | Federal Innovation Fellowship | F2 |
| I4 | f | 35-50 | 00:45 | Desk Officer | Ministry | F1 |
| I5 | m | 35-50 | 00:44 | Consultant | Consultancy | F6 |
| I6 | m | 35-50 | 00:55 | Consultant | Consultancy | F7 |
| I7 | f | 35-50 | 00:40 | Consultant | Consultancy | F8 |
| I8 | m | 25-35 | 01:05 | Researcher | Academia | S3 |
| I9 | m | 25-35 | 00:49 | Head of Unit | Ministry | F2 |
| I10 | f | 35-50 | 00:37 | Desk Officer | Ministry | F3 |
| I11 | f | 25-35 | 00:53 | Case Worker | Ministry | F4 |
| I12 | m | 50+ | 01:07 | Head of Division | Ministry | F3 |
| I13 | m | 35-50 | 01:04 | Desk Officer & Agile Coach | Ministry | F4 |
| I14 | f | 50+ | 00:35 | Head of Innovation Lab | Local Innovation Lab | L1 |
| I15 | m | 35-50 | 00:50 | Head of Innovation Lab | Local Innovation Lab | L2 |
| I16 | m | 25-35 | 00:37 | Project Manager | Local Innovation Lab | L3 |
| I17 | f | 50+ | 00:22 | Head of Innovation Lab | Local Innovation Lab | L4 |
| I18 | m | 35-50 | 00:45 | Project Manager | Local Innovation Lab | L5 |
| I19 | m | 35-50 | 00:40 | Head of Innovation Lab | Local Innovation Lab | L6 |
| I20 | m | 25-35 | 00:25 | Project Manager | Local Innovation Lab | L7 |
| I21 | m | 35-50 | 00:35 | Project Manager | Local Innovation Lab | L8 |
| I22 | f, f, m | 35-50 | 00:38 | Head of Innovation Lab & Project Manager (2x) | Local Innovation Lab | L9 |
| I23 | m | 25-35 | 00:27 | Head of Innovation Lab | Local Innovation Lab | L10 |
| I24 | m | 25-35 | 00:44 | Program Manager | Subsidiary of state-owned enterprise | E1.1 |
| I25 | m | 35-50 | 00:49 | Team Leader | Subsidiary of state-owned enterprise | E1.2 |
| I26 | m | 35-50 | 00:42 | Agility Master | Subsidiary of state-owned enterprise | E1.3 |
| I27 | f | 25-35 | 01:05 | Product Owner | Subsidiary of state-owned enterprise | E1.2 |
| I28 | f | 35-50 | 00:56 | Case Worker | State Authority | S1 |
| I29 | m | 25-35 | 00:51 | Legal Advisor | State Authority | S1 |
| I30 | f | 50+ | 01:12 | Team Leader | State Authority | S1 |
| I31 | f | 35-50 | 01:07 | Head of Department | State Authority | S1 |
| **n=*31*** | **m=*19*; f=*14*** |  | **total length = *24:23h*** |  |  |  |

**Appendix B: Guiding questions for interviews and open-ended survey**

1. ***Interview questionnaire***

* What is your understanding of agile?
* Do you perceive that others, such as colleagues or managers in your organisation, share this understanding?
* What might be the impact of agile in your organisation/on your team?
* What forms of agile practices are you currently implementing or have you experienced at work?
* How were they implemented? What is/was your role in the implementation process? What have you found to be helpful/hindering in this implementation process?
* Does implementation vary across your organisation?
* What changes have you noticed since (and if) you started using agile practices on a daily basis?
* Can you give examples and what impact have these practices had on the work of your team/organisation?
* Is there anything else you feel is important for us to discuss, or anything you feel we haven't covered that you'd like to bring up?

1. ***Semi-standardised open-ended questionnaire***

*Thematic section - management: Agile organisational structures*

* Using the sequence of an internal administrative work process as an example, please explain how hierarchies are organised in the district office. In doing so, please describe the cooperation and communication between the various departments.
* How does your authority deal with changes to processes and structures?

*Thematic section - management: Agile leadership*

* Please describe how different leadership tasks and leadership roles are distributed in your team.
* How and how often do you communicate information and feedback with your employees?

*Thematic section - management: Manager-employee relationship*

* Please describe the relationship with your employee in terms of regularity and intensity of the dialogue.
* What do you particularly value about the relationship with your employee?
* What would you like to see more of in the relationship with your employee?

*Thematic section - employees: Agile organisational structures*

* Please describe how the hierarchies in the district office are organised. In doing so, address the decision-making powers and the degree of self-organisation of the teams.
* In what form, when and how often do you reflect on your work processes as a team?

*Thematic section - employees: Agile leadership*

* Please describe what leadership skills your manager possesses and how your team is managed.
* What opportunities does your line manager give you to handle certain tasks and decisions independently?

*Thematic section - employees: Manager-employee relationship*

* Please describe the relationship with your superior in terms of the regularity and intensity of the exchange.
* What do you particularly appreciate about the relationship with your line manager?
* What would you like to see more of in your relationship with your line manager?

**Appendix C: Case descriptions**

1. ***Cases at the federal level***

Cases F1 to F4 cover four German federal ministries. On the one hand, we interviewed desk officers, their assistants and support officers as well as heads of division. On the other hand, we interviewed fellows of an innovation fellowship, in which external specialists from the private sector are given the opportunity to work as team-members within units in the ministries for a certain period of time. Fellows (mainly from IT backgrounds) are explicitly tasked with introducing and applying agile methods and techniques. Importantly, the unit has to explicitly apply for the fellowship indicating their openness for the process. Cases F5 to F8 relate to federal agencies, where we interviewed consultants and one fellow who were involved in or commissioned projects within the agencies.

In addition to central, organisational, and administrative tasks, the ministries are responsible for supervising the subordinate authorities and institutions within their portfolio and for supporting the minister in the fulfilment of his political duties. Interviewees mostly described the work in the federal authorities and ministries as highly formalized, slow and rule-based. Even if the ministries themselves are very large organisations, they are still organised into many small and micro units. Therefore, the atmosphere within the teams is often characterised as very trusting, while the interviewees stress that the hierarchy between the teams, within the department and across departments is very pronounced and is a means of coordinating and managing tasks.

While the fellows tend to be highly specialised (IT) experts, German civil servants are generalists and all-rounders, which is why they often reported to us that they have already held many positions within the ministry or federal authority. A particular feature of the German administrative landscape at federal level is the division of offices between the former capital Bonn and Berlin. In the interviews, employees therefore emphasised the importance of digitalisation and virtual working. Agile working methods are consequently introduced for IT-projects as well as accompanied by digitisation of tasks and procedures.

A common characteristic of all the cases at federal level is that there are no central, top-down initiatives for a comprehensive shift to agile methods or to being agile as an organisation. Instead, we have seen many individual initiatives in small teams that are usually tolerated, at best welcomed, and in some cases initiated by the introduction of the fellow programme. For example, in case 3, the organisational and human resources development unit started using agile methods. Agile was introduced as a project management method within their unit (for projects dealing with error culture, knowledge management, digitalisation, etc.) and then promoted to other units and departments.

Almost all interviews mention the use of so-called agile coaches to promote agile, act as a point of contact and initiate change initiatives. Agile methods are primarily described as those that involve collaborative (digital) working, which among others includes simple chat solutions. Iterative project management combined with weekly or daily structured meetings are particularly emphasised. However, it is also highlighted that these are not always carried out in a standardised way and are therefore more similar to classic jour fixe meetings. Project progress is tracked using the Kanban method and reviewed in evaluation meetings known as retrospectives. Sometimes it is simply a matter of loosening up meetings with warm-up methods or team-building exercises in connection with everything that is subsumed under the term ‘New Work’: Virtual working, desk-sharing, modern workplace equipment, etc.

In addition to the methodological orientation, (to be) ‘agile’ is also described as a certain mindset, especially by external consultants and fellows, which is either sought in the respective project or favoured by the methods. More often, however, it is said that it is simply lacking in public administration. This mindset includes a positive error culture, a general openness, a modern leadership culture and less hierarchy.

1. ***Cases at the state (‘Länder’) and local level***

On the subnational level, we included three different cases: One agency at the state (‘Länder’) level in the field of migration and immigration policies. Furthermore, we included a background interview with a researcher conducting a research project on the local level as well as answers to a semi-standardised survey in a local authority of a major German city.

While the agency at the state level is relatively new and was created through a reorganisation of tasks between local and state level, the other two authorities are entrusted with traditional tasks of local self-government. The young agency is responsible for all refugee-related tasks, from housing and inspection of their accommodation to legal assistance in asylum procedures and the granting of state benefits in a German state. In the course of the reorganisation, the agency piloted agile methods in a number of teams and departments. Here, a large number of people were trained as ‘Scrum Masters’ to drive the adoption of agile methods and Scrum and to act as change agents within the organisation. In addition, iterative project meetings and retrospectives were introduced, although some of these were implemented in a rather unstructured way. The Kanban method was also used by most of the agile teams. However, sometimes with improvised (digital) tools, as no corporate solution was available.

It was noticeable that employees had very different ideas about an agile organisation and agile methods. Virtual working was sometimes described as part of the agile transformation process initiated by top-management. This was supposed to lead to more user-centricity and to flatten hierarchies, although no concrete measures had yet been introduced.

The second case is based on an interview with a university researcher who was heavily involved in a pilot project funded by a federal ministry to introduce agile at the local level. Based on several workshops and training sessions conducted and moderated by our interviewee, the application and use cases of agile at the local level were to be tested and analysed in the aftermath of the project. The pilot municipalities are both West German cities. One can be described as medium-sized (approx. 1500 employees), while the other is rather large (approx. 10,000 employees). The agile methods used were very diverse, including among others Kanban, Retrospectives, Design Thinking and Scrum as “agile project consulting”. In the interview, conducted shortly before the end of the project, the researcher reflected on the process, on his own understanding of what agile meant for him and for the local authority, and shared the project team’s analysis. Although the interviewee is not an employee of the local government, he acknowledged his belief in agile as a management tool and provided his narrative towards local governments in this project, characterising his narrative as relevant for inclusion at the subnational level.

The third subnational case (on the local level) involves the local administration of a larger German city. Unfortunately, we were unable to conduct interviews here. Instead, we decided to use a semi-standardised open-ended questionnaire to interview individual employees and leaders from the human resources department, the social welfare office, and the public order office, i.e. central areas of local self-government. This means that the participants have either responsibility for administrative tasks or have classic street-level tasks such as granting social benefits or collecting fees on the other. In the questionnaire, participants were asked in open-ended questions to describe specifically how the goals of the agile transformation concept were supported by actions. In particular, they were asked about the opportunities for self-organisation, the hierarchical structure and the processes and tools used for reflection, communication and feedback. Participants were also asked to describe the skills and behaviours of their leaders or employees.

The authority’s management decided to become an agile organisation and commissioned an external consultancy to help them do so. An approach was chosen that focused primarily on (agile) leadership, i.e., from their point of view, a leadership culture that is mainly purpose driven and focuses on the common good and enhances a positive error culture, resembling other concepts, such as transformational leadership. Agile methods such as Kanban and iterative meetings (weekly/daily) were also tested and used in some pilot teams. It was also repeatedly emphasised that aspects of virtual working, such as remote working and desk-sharing, are part of New Work and agile.

1. ***Local innovation lab cases***

Innovation labs are facilities promoting and teaching the innovation process and prototyping products and processes. We analysed ten innovation labs at the local level in Germany, all of which use agile methods or describe themselves as agile organisations. The labs vary in structure, legal form, financial resources and size. Inevitably, the areas of activity also vary, as the labs are supposed to initiate new innovations on a permanent and flexible basis. However, the basic orientation, i.e. finding and evaluating ideas, prototyping and testing solutions, and collecting feedback, is common to all the labs. The interviewees therefore described a high level of project-related work and a low level of routine activities.

We interviewed lab managers, project staff and senior managers. Almost all interviewees had an IT background or were familiar with project management methods.

Most of the innovation labs are small and consist of 10 employees or less. The legal form and structure, however, differ strongly. Some of the labs are departments of the local government. Some are independent foundations or nonprofit organisations funded by local government. Yet, a few are also organised as private firms owned by the public. Despite these differences, the specific nature of their activities, their position in the organisational structure and the fact that their staff are mostly from different professional backgrounds than those typically working in the public sector, give them a high degree of autonomy from the traditional core administration. As a result, we were able to observe a high degree of coherence in the practical approaches of the innovation labs. All the case studies used ‘agile’ in the original sense of the Agile Manifesto. Namely, as a project management method that, in contrast to the waterfall method, relies on an iterative approach in loops and sprints. Design thinking methods are used to achieve a stronger focus on problems and customers. Agile frameworks such as Scrum as well as methods like Kanban are used in some cases, although a pragmatic rather than dogmatic approach to the principles and frameworks is often practised.

Overall, almost all interviewees described their working environment as similar to a start-up. Thus, the aim of the innovation labs is not to roll out projects on a larger scale. Rather, the aim is to provide their local government a creative and innovative space where projects can be tested, and prototypes developed. One key aspect of their approach is the pursuit of a flat hierarchy. The interviewees claim that they want to encourage a more open and collaborative working environment, explicitly in contrast to the bureaucratic structure of the public administration, those with whom they work with.

1. ***Subsidiaries of a state-owned enterprise***

Finally, we conducted four interviews with employees of a state-owned enterprise in the mobility and logistics sector. The employees belonged to three separate subsidiaries of this enterprise. The subsidiaries were described as pioneers of the enterprise’s ‘agile transformation’. This transformation was to be extended to other parts and subsidiaries of the enterprise. However, it was emphasised, that not all parts of the enterprise are suitable for a comprehensive agile transformation, but should remain bureaucratically organised.

Two interviews were conducted with employees of the HR development and training school, a subsidiary of the state-owned enterprise. The school organises trainings for employees and managers and is involved in the overall human resources development over the whole enterprise. It is characterised within the enterprise as a prime example of its agile transformation, i.e. the change from a bureaucratic organisation to one in which professional and managerial responsibilities are no longer distributed hierarchically. The agile framework Scrum and the principles and structures of holocracy have been introduced on a large scale. Consequently, a matrix-like organisation has been created in which management responsibility lies with an ‘agile’ leader and task responsibility with the (Scrum) product owner. In addition, the new organisation entails few hierarchical levels and leaders are appointed on the basis of employee nominations. Iterative meetings and retrospectives are used as part of the Scrum framework.

A third interview was conducted with an employee from the IT subsidiary of the enterprise. They as well apply agile as far-reaching transformation along the Scrum framework. The fourth interviewee is an employee from the subsidiary responsible for organisation development and change management all across the enterprise. In contrast, they do not apply Scrum as a framework, but use agile methods such as Kanban, daily and weekly meetings and retrospectives. But more than that, the interviewee emphasize that agile is seen by them as a way of thinking and mindset that focuses on the customer perspective.

In this vein, the subsidiaries using Holocracy and Scrum see agile as more than just a set of methods. They promote it as a way of enabling self-organisation and see agile as an attitude and mindset based on the principles found, e.g., in the Agile Manifesto, which are then reflected in the use of specific methods and structures. They explicitly differentiate themselves from the non-agile parts of the organisation and view themselves as ‘enlightened beings on agile islands’, where they work as agile experts in a way that they believe is better than on the ‘non-agile mainland’.

**Appendix D: List of codes**

|  |
| --- |
| ***List of Codes*** *- Story Fragments* |
| **Status quo agile** |
| Agile is just in the early stages |
| Agile has already been internalised |
| Frustration over lack of agile |
| Frustration over agile as a fashion |
| **Agile and bureaucracy** |
| Hierarchy hinders (agile) collaboration |
| Lack of conscientiousness inhibits agile |
| Silos hinder (agile) collaboration and communication |
| Risk aversion hinders agile |
| **What is agile?** |
| Agile is not rocket science |
| Agile as new ways of communication/collaborating |
| Agile as Swiss Army knife |
| Agile as a fashion / buzzword |
| Agile as fig leaf |
| Agile as something visible |
| Agile as flat hierarchy |
| Agile is a mindset |
| **Why agile?** |
| Agile as solution in the VUCA world |
| Agile as not suitable for crises and uncertainty |
| Agile to be more efficient and effective |
| Agile to be an attractive employer |
| Agile for higher customer-centricity |
| To be agile is more important than the outcomes |
| Agile is just nice to have |
| Agile is useless |
| **Who does agile?** |
| Change agents as catalysers |
| Consultants as agile teachers |
| Honest broker |
| Agile bubbles |
| Agile as external phenomenon |
| **How to do/be agile?** |
| Agile needs change management (capacity) |
| Agile has to be adapted to bureaucracy |
| Agile needs a goal / is not universal |
| Agile needs digitization / resources |
| Agile needs openness |
| Agile needs trust in people/methods |
| Agile methods need own rules and processes |

**Appendix E: Individual stories**

**Table E1: Individual stories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Case*** | ***Interview*** | ***Affiliation*** | ***Actors*** | ***Acts*** | ***Quest*** | ***Instruments*** | ***Context*** | ***Counternarrative  (if applicable)*** | ***Narrative affiliation*** |
| F1 | I1 | External | Consultants,   Public Manager,  Change Agents | Change management, convincing,  collaborating differently | Saving the world, changing values,  moving with the times | little steps, meetings, extinguishing forest fires with water pistols, workshops, training courses | Bureaucracy, VUCA, fellowship,  lack of digital equipment | Public administration is not a start-up and cannot simply go with the fashion; we do not allow anything to be imposed on us. | N2 |
| F5 | I2 | External | Consultants, Leader | Build trust, communicate, distribute responsibility more widely | Culture change | Intensive meetings and other forms of communication | Bureaucracy (especially in the sense of hierarchy), IT projects, fellowship | Agile becomes an end (end-means-twist) and agile as a game | N2 |
| F2 | I3 | External | Bureaucrat-preventers, allies, leaders, advisors | Change management, convincing, knowledge transfer, building networks | Fundamentally change administration | by guiding, demonstrating, exemplifying | Bureaucracy (silos and lone wolves; hierarchy), Fellowship, lack of digital equipment | Agile as a game from kindergarten; public administration is not a start-up | N2 |
| F1 | I4 | Internal | Policy makers, individual catalysts and enabling leaders (honest broker) with boundaries, tanker bureaucracy as adversary | Individually driven incremental change,  fetch and bring, networking | Structural break-up  (organisational units, project teams.) | Bringing colleagues along, creating a  digital basis, raising awareness | Overpowering bureaucracy, island of  the blessed (agile bubbles), lack of digitization | Agile is too second-rate and at the same time not necessary; agile is alien to authority | N1 |
| F6 | I5 | External | Administration as adversary, IT expert, incompetent employees | Agitate, frustrate, escalate, run IT projects | Drive IT projects  forward | Agile IT development | Security authority; IT context, consulting project, administration as (IT/resource) desert | Agile is nonsense, games and unnecessary | N2 |
| F7 | I6 | External | Consultants, agile bureaucrats as change agents, bureaucrats socialised into administration as obstacles | Set an example of agile, make agile suitable for public authorities, create agile partners in the organisation. | Establish citizen-centricity (whether agile new or not), sell service | Adapt agile language, train change agents, defend methods | Bureaucracy, consultation, agile breeding ground available | Agile is an external fad, leading to loss of control | N2 |
| F8 | I7 | External | Consultants, change agents | Knowledge transfer, communication, getting involved in the context of authorities | Culture change | Linguistic adaptation, workshops, training | Organisational development,  consultant projects | Agile as a game | N2 |
| F2 | I9 | Internal | Executives, top management, colleagues (open vs. negative) | Change management and working methods, critical questioning of individual methods | Implementing modern working methods | Active use of modern working methods, organising meetings | Characteristics of bureaucratic  socialisation (bureaucrats),  hierarchy, atmosphere  of cooperation | Agile is a fad from the outside | N1 |
| F3 | I10 | Internal | Honest brokers who train internal catalysts / top management | Change management, building knowledge, creating new structures | Build change capacity  to implement strategic goals and reduce  external dependency | Establish project management teams, adapt unit working methods, disseminate methods of new working methods | Low-resource authority in a changing environment | Agile is unnecessary and does not work anyway | N1 |
| F4 | I11 | Internal | Boomers, young people, executives, top management | Drive incremental change, build competence, use grey areas | Use generational change to install new working methods (pragmatic working) and digital working | Making suggestions, learning, sharing knowledge | Generational conflict | Boomer: "Leave me alone with this", indifference | N1 |
| F3 | I12 | Internal | Experimenter bubbles, preventers, supervisors | Change management, creating critical mass from catalysts | Enable modern working (“away from the lord of the manor”) | Learning by doing, training of coaches, pilot projects, acceptance of rejection | Old-fashioned bureaucracy | Changes not necessary, not worthy of a venerable ministry | N1 |
| F4 | I13 | Internal | Internal catalysts (agile coaches), colleagues  and supervisors | Making agile suitable for public authorities, creating critical mass | Solving complex problems with agile, more creative and communicative collaboration | Trying out methods, doing and offering training and coaching, demonstrating successes | Creating two contexts: risk-averse and hierarchy-driven team  in bureaucracy vs.  agile as a "winning theme" in agile bubble | Agile as a pointless game, useful for meeting structure otherwise it is just old wine in new bottles | N1 |
| S1 | I28 | Internal | Forerunners, old-established people, leaders | Exposing agile as a fig leaf, resignation | Enable pragmatic administrative action | Complain, act on your own responsibility | Naive agile promoters meet dysfunctional bureaucracy, leadership vacuum | Agile as New Work and new workplaces | N5 |
| S1 | I29 | Internal | Managers,  scrum masters, colleagues | Implementing the  mission statement, experimenting, simply doing things | Breaking down silos to  be able to act in times of crisis | Change management, promoting initiative | analogue structures and processes in a complex and chaotic environment, Scrum Master training | / | N4 |
| S1 | I30 | Internal | Lazy remote workers, managers (positive / negative) | Stimulate change management, develop, and correct understanding of agile, implement agile with new rules and regulations | Build project management and collaboration capacity for complex issues through joint purposeful collaboration. | Change management, creating/implementing agile rules, uncovering misunderstandings | Authority in a complex world with lack of knowledge about agile, hierarchy, and silos | Frustration about agile, agile = home office / new work (pushed by MAs and Orga) | N4 |
| S1 | I31 | Internal | Motivated team, colleagues | Use openness, trusting cooperation, clear divisions of operational areas/scenarios for agile | Institutionalise agile to be able to use it situationally | Bureaucracy | / | / | N4 |
| S1 | / | Internal | Leaders, inertia | Create an agile mindset | Diffuse | Scrum master training; change management | / | / | N4 |
| S1 | / | Internal | Top management,  change manager,  leaders, teams | Addressing the need for change, initiating a change in values, establishing a matrix organisation | Working in the VUCA world, customer-centred, resource-efficient, and effective | Change management, leadership training, formulating mission statements | Complex environment meets austerity and bureaucratic processes that are not up to the task | / | N3 |
| S2 | / | Internal | Colleagues, teams, leaders | Establishing a culture of error, modernising working methods, working together across teams and organisations | Break down silos and introduce modern ways of working | Setting an example, learning-by-doing, introducing meeting formats | Lack of error culture, bureaucracy, and dusty offices | / | N6 |
| S3 | I8 | External | Researchers, administrative staff from project authorities | Create knowledge, adapt methods to areas, get all actors on board (get critical mass of supporters) | Institutionalise agile mindset/methods to  make municipalities  more citizen-centred  and better at service delivery | Change management, low-threshold services, human resources development | Municipal bureaucracy with different areas and types of people | 1) Trivialising agile: "Yes, we already work agile"; 2) Why do we have to do this now? Insecurity and was everything bad until now? | N7 |
| L1 | I14 | Hybrid | Interdisciplinary,  diverse Innolab team  vs. bureaucratic, rigid administrative  employees | Create acceptance for structure, install pilot projects from outside in administration | Sustainability of the administration | Avoiding agile language, political communication, being close to the people and willing to experiment | Rigid, citizen-distant bureaucracy vs. citizen-oriented, flexible Innolabs | Lack of acceptance of novel terms, because of trend: What do you need such things for? | N8 |
| L2 | I15 | Hybrid | Lethargic administrative staff vs. agile, fast  Innolab team | Digitisation needs trial and error and trial and error is agile/ pragmatic/ thinking out of the box | Supporting the administration in digitalisation with new ideas | Organisational development, short joint project phases, own project development | Innovative, creative  team vs. walls of administration | Agile teams as service providers and task implementers for administration | N8 |
| L3 | I16 | Hybrid | Agile team at Innolab  vs. administrative staff travelling in a different reality | Pursue result orientation, maintain, and expand agile mindset, do translation work | Advancing the digitisation of the city with agile methods | Use agile methods, bring products into outside management, carry out joint projects (but do not get arrested) | Freely working in a start-up context on the edge of the rigid, administrative | / | N8 |
| L4 | I17 | Hybrid | Administration vs.  Start-Ups | Bringing the agile world and administration together | Showing the administration what is in store for them, and that innovation is needed. | Initiate projects | Rigid, siloed management in VUCA | / | N8 |
| L5 | I18 | Hybrid | Service providers, administrative staff, administrative managers | Build trust, understand where the needs of the administration are, ensure suitability for public authorities --> no advisor as teacher (eye level) | Digitise administration | Method building, prototyping, network building (but not getting stuck in long projects) | Mixed context with bureaucratic and agile elements | / | N8 |
| L6 | I19 | External | Administrative staff, managers, and volunteers | Give impetus to innovative capacity,  but make themselves unnecessary in the  long run | Making the city sustainable and digital | Giving workshops, imparting knowledge | Siloed bureaucracy | / | N8 |
| L7 | I20 | Internal | University administration, founders, Innolab staff | / | Driving start-ups forward | Methodological workshops, providing rooms | University | / | N8 |
| L8 | I21 | Hybrid | Administrators,  Smart City Unit | / | Designing Smart City | Advancing individual projects with offices | Bureaucracy, which is characterised by areas of responsibility | / | N8 |
| L9 | I22 | Hybrid | Digital lab staff and administrative staff | / | Communicating digitisation to citizens | Being a contact person in the pedestrian zone | Bureaucracy characterised by irresponsibility and lack of openness | / | N8 |
| L10 | I23 | Internal | Digital lab staff and administrative staff | Create acceptance for structure, create pilot projects | Communicating digitisation to citizens | / | / | / | N8 |
| E1.1 | I24 | Internal | Agile community,  lean community,  leaders | Formulate purpose, promote networking, demand self-organisation | Promote self-organisation (as a value in itself) and implement it organisation-wide | Formulate target image, organise multiplier meetings, network | Organisation that has different inertia and stages of development in terms of agile | Agile goes hand in hand with a loss of power for managers | N9 |
| E1.2 | I25 | Internal | Agile islands, team (with Scrum structure),  non-agile rest | Spreading and marketing agile, finding comrades-in-arms, setting up a self-organised team | Making the organisation resilient and crisis-proof | Team rules/ constitution, training  on agile methods, network meetings | Organisation with different stages of development in terms of agile, crises, and complex environment | Agile is a buzzword with no content | N9 |
| E1.3 | I26 | Internal | Sceptics, the ignorant,  the agile teams, executives, top management | Dispelling prejudices, promoting agile methods and mindset, exemplifying agile | Resistance to agile can be overcome through careful communication | Educate, set guidelines, listen | Organisation with different stages of development regarding agile, legal as well as factual resistance to agile | Agile and Scrum are equated, other aspects are left out; urban legends on agile | N9 |
| E1.2 | I27 | Internal | Agile teams, agile ninjas, agile ambassadors,  the non-agile | Be a pioneer | Enable and stimulate innovation, offer everyone opportunities for development | Multiple meetings, recruiting appropriate staff, training, networking, providing information. | Organisation with different stages of development in terms of agile, different employees with individual needs | / | N9 |

**Appendix F: Narrative description**

**Table F1: Narratives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Narrative N1**  Bureaucratic agile | **Narrative N2**  Agile as solution for VUCA | **Narrative N3**  Agile as a multifaceted  vision |
| *What is agile?* | Agile as New Work, meetings, digital workplace, feedback culture, and collaboration | Agile as mindset, iterative (project management) meetings, agile toolbox (collaboration methods) | Customer-centric mindset in a matrix organisation with project management methods |
| *Actors* | Change agents, middle management, anonymous masses | Consultants as agile teachers, resistant bureaucrats, internal agile followers, and partners (in bubbles) | Top management, change managers, public managers, teams |
| *Acts* | Initiating change in the work environment & translating it into the government context, workplace digitisation, initiating organisational change, creating critical mass to the tipping point | Recruiting internal agile partners, knowledge sharing and teaching in different (agile) collaboration and meeting methods, upscaling through change management | Addressing the need for change, initiating a change in values,  building a matrix organisation |
| *Quests* | Moving with the times, breaking down silos and implementing modern, digital working, suitable for public authorities | Empowering the bureaucracy to cope with the VUCA world through agile | Working in the VUCA world, customer-centric, resource-efficient, and effective |
| *Instruments* | Knowledge capacity building, translation of agile terminology, diverse change management measures, diverse (virtual) meeting formats, (digital) project management and collaboration tools | Knowledge capacity building, various (virtual) meeting formats, (digital) project management and collaboration tools, various change management measures | Formulating a vision, various change management measures, leadership training (in project management and collaboration methods) |
| *Context* | Slow bureaucracy, lack of digitalisation, characterised by silos and lack of communication, although necessary in certain situations | VUCA world, non-digital bureaucracy with old-fashioned hierarchies, consulting firm in an agile Elysium | Complex environment meets austerity measures and bureaucratic processes that are not up to the task |

**Table F2: Cont. narratives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Narrative N4**  Agile as digital workplace and project management | **Narrative N5**  Agile as buzzword  and fig leaf | **Narrative N6**  Agile as digital workplace and project management |
| *What is agile?* | Methods that enable me to work in modern spaces with little hierarchy, without constraints and freely, especially through project management | Remote working and methods of collaboration | Agile is a different error culture and different collaboration and communication |
| *Actors* | Public managers, scrum masters as change agents, resistant bureaucrats | Naive agile promoters, laissez-faire leaders, ordinary employees | Public managers, teams, public employees |
| *Acts* | Scrum Master training, change management in pilot departments, promotion and adaptation of agile methods and ways of thinking | Exposing agile as a buzzword and fig leaf | Establish error culture, modernise ways of working, collaborate across teams and organisations |
| *Quests* | Break down silos and improve cooperation to solve daily work tasks | Pragmatic work processes without much fuss | Breaking down silos and improving collaboration to solve daily work tasks |
| *Instruments* | Training, various change management measures, pilots | Complaining about agile (terminology), ignoring agile promotion | Lead by example, learning-by-doing, introduce meeting formats |
| *Context* | Young, non-digital agency in a volatile and complex policy field | Dysfunctional, non-digital bureaucracy with lack of leadership, naive fads | Dysfunctional, non-digital bureaucracy with lack of feedback and error culture |

**Table F3: Cont. narratives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Narrative N7**  Agile as a Swiss Army knife | **Narrative N8**  Agile as IT project and product development method | **Narrative N9**  Agile as workplace democratisation |
| *What is agile?* | Mindset, new work, meetings, digital workplace, feedback culture, communicating, collaborating | Frameworks for IT projects and product development | Agile as a framework, structures, methods, and mindset that aim at self-organisation, hierarchy reduction, and participatory rights for employees |
| *Actors* | Researchers, administrators from project authorities, public managers | Bureaucracy vs. innovation labs | Agile teams, non-agile teams and departments, public administrators |
| *Acts* | Creating knowledge, adapting methods to areas, getting all actors on board (getting critical mass of supporters) | Identify and initiate projects, create products through agile frameworks and methods, hand over product and move on | Acts are based on actions already taken (organisational restructuring etc.), campaigning for their agile framework, finding comrades-in-arms, building communities and agile grassroots movement |
| *Quests* | Institutionalise agile attitude/methods to make municipalities more citizen-centred and better at service delivery | Using agile methods to run digitisation projects in the public sector | Promoting self-efficacy, self-actualisation, and democracy in organisations through agile |
| *Instruments* | Change management, low-threshold services, staff development | Explain and support product pitch, technical development, public administration | Networking, agile trainings, recruiting employees with an agile mindset, multiplier meetings |
| *Context* | Municipal bureaucracy with different areas and types of people | Start-up mentality in InnoLabs vs. dysfunctional, non-digital bureaucracy | Parallel worlds of fully agile and non-agile departments |