

## The Smart City as Global Discourse: Storylines and Critical Junctures across 27 Cities

*Simon Joss<sup>1\*</sup>, Frans Sengers<sup>2</sup>, Daan Schraven<sup>3</sup>, Federico Caprotti<sup>4</sup>, and Youri Dayot<sup>5</sup>*

1 Urban Studies, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Glasgow, 25 Bute Gardens, UK-Glasgow G12, 8RT, Email: [simon.joss@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:simon.joss@glasgow.ac.uk)

2 Department of Structural Engineering, TU Delft, Stevinweg 1, NL-2628 CN Delft

3 Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, NL-3584 CS Utrecht

4 Department of Geography, University of Exeter, Rennes Drive, UK-Exeter EX4 4RJ

5 Sciences Po Grenoble, Université Grenoble Alpes, Temporary address: Dean Street, London W1D. Tel: +44 (0)775 9760 116. Email: [youri.dayot@sciencespo-grenoble.fr](mailto:youri.dayot@sciencespo-grenoble.fr)

\*Corresponding author

# The Smart City as Global Discourse: Storylines and Critical Junctures across 27 Cities

## Abstract

*Despite its growing ubiquitous presence, the smart city continues to struggle for definitional clarity and practical import. In response, this study interrogates the smart city as global discourse network by examining a collection of key texts associated with cities worldwide. Using a list of 5,553 cities, a systematic webometric exercise was conducted to measure hit counts produced by searching for ‘smart city’. Consequently, 27 cities with the highest validated hit counts were selected. Next, 346 online texts were collected from among the top 20 hits across each of the selected cities, and comprehensively analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively using AntConc software. The findings confirm, on one hand, the presence of a strong globalising narrative which emphasises world cities as ‘best practice’ models. On the other, they reveal the smart city’s association – beyond the quest for incremental, technical improvements of current urban systems and processes – with a pronounced transformative governance agenda. The article identifies five critical junctures (interlocking discourses) at the heart of the evolving smart city discourse regime; these shed light on the ongoing boundary work in which the smart city is engaged and which contain significant unresolved tensions. The paper concludes with a discussion of resulting implications for research, policy and practice.*

## Keywords

*Smart city; discourse; global; governance; webometrics*

## Introduction

Following in the footsteps of the sustainable (or eco) city, the smart city has turned ubiquitous, heralding an advanced global urban future. Within less than a decade it has become a major *leitmotif* in the discourse on urban development (Crivello 2013: 901). For Moir *et al.* (2014: 4), its global significance arises from ‘smart’ superseding ‘sustainability’ as main prism through which the future of cities is viewed. Its ubiquity manifests itself in the transnational circulation of smart city concepts and policies as well as the rapid proliferation of on-the-ground initiatives across regions in both the Global North and South (e.g. Caragliu *et al.* 2014; Datta 2015; Watson 2015; Karvonen *et al.*, 2018).

Within this context of a globally mobile phenomenon, an essential aspect of the smart city is its discourse: it shapes concepts and programmes, and is a key means by which ideas and practices are borrowed, transmitted and reproduced within different geographical, cultural and institutional settings. (As such, discourse relates to, and is co-constitutive of, the processes of urban policy mobilities; see e.g. McCann 2011; Baker and Temenos 2015; Crivello 2015; Wiig 2015.) The smart city can thus be considered a ‘global discourse network’ (derived from Khor, 2013): a collectivity of locally contextualised yet globally interconnected discourses. This perspective is useful for analysing both discourse structures and dynamics, and how this produces particular interlocking narratives and meaning. Consequently, this article interrogates the smart city, as global discourse network, starting with a comprehensive list of over 5,000 cities, which is used to run a semi-automated online search for harvesting smart city-related web addresses. Subsequently, 27 cities with the most online hits are selected; from these, 346 text files (in English) are collected and treated to detailed cross-comparative quantitative and qualitative analyses. Guiding this research are the following three central questions: (1) *Which cities worldwide are mainly associated with contemporary smart city discourses (in English language)?* (2) *What are key dimensions of this discourse, and how do they interrelate?* (3)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*How are particular narratives mobilised to legitimise the smart city, and what critical junctures reveal themselves?* The findings not least also aim to highlight opportunities for alternative scenarios on smart cities.

The webometric approach used in this study differs from other recent bibliometric analyses of the smart city (e.g. de Jong *et al.* 2015; Tregura 2015; Duran-Sánchez *et al.* 2017; Fu and Zhang 2017; Mora *et al.* 2017) as follows: the latter, by design, confine themselves to the scholarly literature (through Web of Science, Scopus, Science Citation Index etc.; n.b. Mora *et al.* 2017's additional inclusion of some grey literature databases) and principally focus on analysing the smart city as an emergent research agenda and evolving scientific knowledge domain. In contrast, the present webometric analysis (drawing on Almind and Ingwersen 1997, and Thelwall *et al.* 2005, among others) seeks to capture a broader online discourse which encompasses diverse policy and practice communications linked to actual cities worldwide. As such, it accesses global online sources that shed light on how the smart city is discursively constructed by a range of involved actors (municipal authorities, national agencies, international organisations, think tanks, consultants, etc.). Relatedly, the study pursues a particular angle of inquiry informed by critical discourse theory and based on corpus linguistic analysis; namely, how the smart city is constituted as a discourse regime (of which, more below) and what critical insights this can offer for future directions in smart city research, policy and practice.

The burgeoning academic literature on smart cities has identified a number of emergent themes and critical perspectives which help inform the present analysis. One such theme, reflecting a critique of neoliberal urban policy, concerns the relationship between smart city initiatives and the corporatisation of city management and, more broadly, new forms of technocratic governance (e.g. Allwinkle and Cruickshank 2011; Greenfield, 2013; Townsend, 2013; Söderström *et al.*, 2014; Vanolo, 2014; Angelidou, 2015; Calzada, 2015; Hollands, 2015;

1 Kitchin, 2015; Przybilovicz *et al.* 2018). Another theme relates to the smart city conceived of  
2 as experimental urbanism realised through new urban spaces and practices across multiple  
3 scales (e.g. Evans *et al.* 2016; Scholl and Kemp 2016; Caprotti and Cowley, 2017; Raven *et al.*  
4 2017). From yet another perspective, the smart city is interrogated in terms of its potential to  
5 recondition norms and practices of citizenship, the public sphere and social engagement (e.g.  
6 Linders, 2012; Gabrys 2014; Saunders and Baeck 2015; Cowley *et al.* 2017; Joss *et al.* 2017;  
7 Cardullo and Kitchin 2017; 2018). Finally, the relationship between smart city innovation and  
8 sustainable development has come in for critical examination (e.g. Gargiulo Morelli *et al.*,  
9 2013; Viitanen and Kingston, 2014; Haarstad 2017; Kudva and Ye 2017; Trindade *et al.* 2017;  
10 Chang *et al.* 2018). These and other scholarly discussion points, then, provide useful analytical  
11 orientation for the present examination of original source texts associated with the global smart  
12 city discourse.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
The rest of this paper is structured as follows: the next couple of sections expand on the  
study's conceptual framework as well as the methodological approach used; this is followed  
by the presentation and discussion of the findings, which in turn leads to the conclusions where  
implications for research, policy and practice are highlighted.

### **A global discourse network**

The smart city is more than 'mere' discourse.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, much of its critique centres upon the  
*problematique* of the 'place-less' corporate-governmental discourse (e.g. Hollands, 2008;  
Shelton *et al.* 2014; Söderström *et al.* 2014; Kitchin 2015). In response, recent research has  
inquired into how the smart city is constituted by, and situated within, particular settings (e.g.  
Karvonen *et al.* 2018: 1-12). This acknowledges the importance of the smart city, like other  
grand urban visions, having to "negotiate with the spatiality and the geography of place"  
(Harvey 2000: 179-180), through which the 'unbound' conceptual smart city becomes the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

‘bounded’ enacted smart city. However, contemporary research has shown that even within on-the-ground practice contexts, the discourse aspect remains salient: for example, Cowley *et al.* (2017) trace how smart city initiatives across six British cities were co-determined by a national discourse on ‘future cities’ instigated by the UK government. Moreover, they show that local smart city practices have a strong discursive component (pamphlets, websites etc.), while spatio-physical articulations may remain ephemeral. Hence, discourse is of central importance concerning both how it variously intervenes within particular local practice settings, as well as how it interacts across geographical and institutional boundaries.

Applying the perspective of global discourse network to the analysis of the smart city is useful in that it draws attention, on one hand, to the textual circulation and interaction across networks and, on the other, to the resulting globalisation of smart city discourse centred upon a series of distinctive narratives. The perspective is particularly apt, moreover, because it helps reveal – a key finding of this research – not just the emergent global discourse *about* smart cities, but also the significance of the ‘global’ as *a constitutive part of* what is posited as smart city. As one of the texts analysed encapsulates it: “the smart city will understand its global responsibility” (Los Angeles\_16<sup>2</sup>).

A global discourse network has several characteristics which render it potentially expansive (the following draws on Khor 2013; Phillips and Jorgensen 2004; Atkinson *et al.* 2010; Kitchin 2014). Substantively, discourse embodies a certain vision and normative stance. For the smart city, this normativity relates broadly to a commitment to urban development through technology-enabled ecological modernization.<sup>3</sup> The smart city thus espouses a certain ‘worldview’: the surrounding discourse serves to circulate and cement this within urban policy and practice. Discourse is globalising in a dual sense: in its aspiration to render the smart city a universal urban paradigm; and in its dynamic of propagating ideas and practices. This universalising force, however, need not result in homogeneity. Rather, it functions by

1 connecting diverse discourse acts and communities. Here, the notion of discourse *networks*  
2 becomes relevant, drawing attention to multiple contextualised discourses and their  
3 interconnectedness. On one hand, localised discourses absorb and re-work the circulating  
4 discourse into particular geographical, cultural and organisational settings; on the other, they  
5 feed the evolving global discourse as complimentary or contestatory variations. As such, a  
6 global discourse network has an inherently self-generative dynamic.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14  
15         Yet, it is important to note that not all acts of discourse are equal: discourse has agency;  
16 it is generated and promoted, with varying degrees of success, to articulate, steer and impose  
17 particular norms and practices (Weiss and Wodak 2003; Fairclough, 2013). It is likely, for  
18 example, that a smart city discourse promoted by a powerful coalition of actors, mediated  
19 through well-established transnational channels, and adopted by prominent local actors enjoys  
20 greater presence than a more limited discourse advanced on the fringe. Given such agency,  
21 discourse produces and transmits power; it is both an instrument and effect thereof. Discourse,  
22 then, is also a site of hegemonic struggle, where differing versions and interpretations of that  
23 discourse vie for recognition and influence. However, in the process of one specific articulation  
24 of discourse becoming dominant and standardized, there are typically concurrent alternative  
25 articulations emerging that seek to modify and challenge such standardization (Khor 2013: 23).  
26 A global discourse network, therefore, contains within it latent instability. Consequently, a key  
27 focus of discourse analysis should be on elucidating critical junctures where issues are subject  
28 to interrogation and debate.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50         At the textual level, these discourse characteristics can be analysed by examining how  
51 certain meanings are produced and for what purpose (Hoey 2013). Of particular interest are  
52 (competing) storylines and narratives, through which the smart city is (re-)presented in  
53 particular ways. Likewise, attention should be on exclusionary tendencies; what is left out or  
54 incomplete from particular storytelling. Importantly, such analysis requires probing  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 interpretation since, as Atkinson *et al.* (2010: 12) note, "...narratives are never 'innocent' nor  
2 are their underlying 'master codes' immediately accessible". Hence, the analyst is prompted to  
3 apply interpretative categories or codes, to makes sense of how different meanings and stances  
4 are deployed. Ultimately, the aim is to gain a critical theoretical understanding of how the smart  
5 city is constructed as a discourse regime, "a set of interlocking discourses that justifies and  
6 sustains new developments and naturalises and reproduces their use" (Kitchin, 2014: 113,  
7 drawing on Foucault, 1977). Here again, discourse is not a passive, innocent medium, but  
8 instead is deployed quite purposefully to "remake the world in a particular vision" in a way  
9 which makes it seem natural and desirable (Kitchin, 2014: 113). As such, the smart city as  
10 global discourse network rightly deserves close scrutiny.

## 27 **Methodology**

28 Establishing a suitable methodology is challenging, given the task of demarcating the  
29 expansive smart city discourse network and analysing the resulting large text corpus. Hence,  
30 significant effort was required to design a robust methodology consisting of two main parts:  
31 first, capturing the global discourse network using the logic of the online search engine<sup>4</sup>, to  
32 harvest a representative set of texts associated with cities worldwide; and second, treating the  
33 compiled corpus to a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses with the help of  
34 AntConc (Anthony, 2016), a freeware tool for corpus linguistic research, using custom-made  
35 coding categories. Figure 1 illustrates the overall research design, and Box 1 elaborates the  
36 step-by-step methodological procedure (with further technical information contained in the  
37 footnotes). As shown, much of the research is protocol-driven following systematic  
38 webometric and corpus linguistic methodology. At the same time, the research entails  
39 complementary interpretive analysis, an essential element of critical discourse analysis (e.g.  
40 Fairclough 1997, Gill 2000; Howarth 2000; Phillips and Jorgensen 2004). Several established  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 validation and triangulation techniques are applied to render the research both robust and  
2 meaningful. Concerning the choice of suitable Web search engines and the accuracy of search  
3 engine hit counts, as well as the need for data cleansing and validation techniques, the study  
4 draws on both published literature (e.g. Thelwall *et al.* 2005; Uyar 2009; Martínez-Sanahuja  
5 2016; Sánchez *et al.* 2018) and own practical testing (pilot runs). Concerning the use of large-  
6 scale corpus analysis ('distance reading' techniques), the paper draws i.a. on Stubbs (2007),  
7 Froehlich (2015) and Anthony (2016).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 [Figure 1]  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 [Box 1]  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 *Step 1: Webometric analysis of global smart city discourse*

30 Concerning research question (1) *Which cities worldwide are mainly associated with*  
31 *contemporary smart city discourses (in English language)?*, an online census was carried out  
32 of cities with  $\geq 100K$  inhabitants, with the information collected consisting of publicly available  
33 smart city documents. Linking the online documentary search to a global list of cities provides  
34 useful insight into the structural dimensions of the discourse network; furthermore, the  
35 harvested collection of documents represents an important interface between the smart city  
36 discourse oriented internally within cities and externally across the global network. The global  
37 list of cities is based on the open-access GeoNames (n.d.) database entailing 4,235 names of  
38 cities, to which 1,318 city names (with unusual spelling, or not recognised as having  $\geq 100K$   
39 inhabitants by GeoNames) were added, resulting in a total of 5,553 cities (step 1.1, Box 1). The  
40 online documentary search – using the search query *[city name] AND [smart city]* – was  
41 conducted on Yahoo (step 1.2, Box 1). Following testing, this search engine was selected as it  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 meets three concurrent criteria (unlike e.g. Google, and Bing) – namely, the ability to: use  
2 Booleans; apply semi-automated searches; and filter for PDF documents. Restricting online  
3 material to PDF has the dual benefit of returning not only more stable results (through reduced  
4 volatility of hit counts), but also more meaningful outputs: PDFs are more likely to entail  
5 relevant smart city texts (municipal documents, policy briefs, conference reports etc.) and less  
6 likely to yield arbitrary results owing to the ubiquitous linguistic use of ‘smart’ (e.g. ‘smart  
7 holiday’; ‘smart Christmas parties’). VBA Excel was used to run multiple online harvests over  
8 a 15-day period (see Uyar, 2009) and produce an aggregated dataset (August-September 2016).  
9 Two complementary validation techniques were applied to run checks on the raw data obtained.  
10 The resulting list of smart city hits (score value) for all 5,553 cities is available on the lead  
11 author’s ResearchGate profile.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 As a full analysis of URL scores across all 5,553 cities would have been too resource-  
28 intensive, only cities were selected in the 2,500-10,700 hit range (step 1.3, Box 1).<sup>5</sup> This  
29 selection process yielded 56 cities. For each of these, the URLs were checked for false results:  
30 for example, the hits harvested for ‘Mobile’ are unrelated to the city of Mobile (USA), instead  
31 referring mostly to ‘smart mobile’ phones; and the hits for the city of London (CA) actually all  
32 relate to London (UK). 24 cities were thus eliminated from the list. An additional five cities  
33 were removed because they yielded too few ( $\leq 4$ ) valid PDF documents from among their 20  
34 top URLs. The resulting final selection, therefore, includes 27 validated cities (see Table 1).  
35 For each of these, the 20 top URLs were considered for inclusion in the aggregated corpus,  
36 potentially yielding 540 PDF files. However, once invalid files are discarded<sup>6</sup>, the final  
37 aggregated corpus amounts to 346 validated files. While this selection of texts by no means  
38 encapsulates the smart city global discourse in its entirety – it is restricted to English language,  
39 excludes some discourse types (images etc.), and does not cover cities in the bottom quartile  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

(≤2,500 hits) – the methodical approach does produce a sufficiently robust sample suitable for analysis.

As such, the harvested texts capture the recent period of rapid rise of smart city discourse globally: the average year of publication is 2014, ranging from 1999 to 2016 but with only four texts from before 2009. Furthermore, in line with the webometric approach, the diverse origins of the texts confirm a distributed network of actors involved in promulgating the smart city: 78% of the documents are by organisations which are not themselves the initiators of the smart city initiatives being reported, whereas 22% are by initiators themselves. In terms of organisational types, 38% of documents were published by private sector organisations (including international consultancy firms), 27% by municipal authorities, 17% by research organisations, 12% by other governmental organisations, 3% by international organisations, and 2% by NGOs (and 1% classified ‘other’).

### *Step 2: Quantitative and interpretive-qualitative textual analyses*

The corpus of 346 files forms the basis of textual examination aimed at answering research questions (2) *What are key dimensions of this discourse, and how do they interrelate?*, and (3) *How are particular narratives mobilised to legitimise the smart city, and what critical junctures reveal themselves?* Following published guidance (Stubbs 2007; Froehlich 2015; Anthony, 2016), the first type of analysis using the AntConc software entailed a co-occurrence analysis based on measuring 20 collocates (words) each to the left and right of the node ‘smart’ (step 2.1.2, Box 1).<sup>7</sup> This frequency analysis produces a ranking of words associated with smart city. As recommended in the literature, the T-score<sup>8</sup> was used to establish the statistical likelihood of association between individual collocates and the node ‘smart’. Appendix 1

1 shows the 100 most associated collocates for the overall corpus. The same exercise was  
2 conducted for each individual city corpus.  
3  
4

5 In order to categorise and compare the findings of the co-occurrence analysis, all  
6 collocates were coded according to one of ten smart city dimensions (step 2.1.3, Box 1)<sup>9</sup>: (1)  
7 digital technology; (2) infrastructure; (3) governance; (4) economy; (5) society; (6) spatial  
8 planning/development; (7) environment; (8) sustainability; (9) experimentation/innovation;  
9 (10) international. Collocates that could not be unambiguously coded to any of these categories  
10 were designated ‘unclassified’. Figure 2 shows the related results for the overall corpus, while  
11 Figure 3 shows the comparative profile across the 27 cities.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Complementing this quantitative analysis, the AntConc concordance tool was used for  
24 additional qualitative analysis, whereby individual collocates are examined in relation to the  
25 contexts in which they are used across the corpus (step 2.2.1/2, Box 1).<sup>10</sup> As an essential part  
26 of critical discourse analysis, this interpretive-qualitative inquiry was accomplished for  
27 collocates across all ten smart city dimensions. In order to ensure robustness, the analysis was  
28 triangulated, with one researcher responsible for primary analysis, another researcher acting as  
29 reviewer, and the team as a whole interpreting the findings (presented further below in the  
30 ‘critical junctures’ section).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 **Findings**

### 47 ***Smart cities as world cities***

48  
49 *This section reports the webometric results from steps 1.1-1.3 (Box 1).* The 27 cities (and  
50 associated texts) identified through the online search process are evidently part of a much larger  
51 smart city discourse network, although they occupy a central place as measured by their URL  
52 scores. Ten of the cities are located across Australasia, nine in Europe, seven in North America,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 and one in the Middle East, with none from Africa or Latin America (see Table 1). What is  
2 particularly notable is the strong presence of world cities: 14 are national capitals, while 22 are  
3 ranked as ‘alpha’ world cities (GaWC, n.d.). The three exceptions (neither capital nor ‘alpha’  
4 ranking) are Portland (USA), San José (USA) and Vancouver (CA). Following the logic of the  
5 online search process, it may be unsurprising that world cities, which already enjoy a  
6 proportionally large online presence, should score high in terms of smart city online hits;  
7 conversely, it may be expected that cities with considerable on-the-ground smart city activity  
8 albeit limited international profile produce comparatively lower scores. However,  
9 notwithstanding the possibility of a certain inherent methodological bias, the results of this  
10 online search exercise are broadly in line with other international surveys. For example, all ‘top  
11 10’ smart cities (Vienna, Toronto, Paris, New York, London, Tokyo, Berlin, Copenhagen,  
12 Hong Kong, Barcelona) listed in an early survey by Cohen (2012; and also 2014) feature in the  
13 group of 27. More recently, seven of the ten top-ranking smart cities (New York, London,  
14 Paris, Boston, Amsterdam, Chicago, Seoul) in the 2016 IESE Cities in Motion Index (Forbes,  
15 2016) are among the group of 27. Elsewhere, 21 of the 27 cities appear in the survey by Gibson  
16 *et al.* (2015) on ‘cities as connectors’ (referring to digital-infrastructure connectivity).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 [Table 1]  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Furthermore, the harvested texts themselves make repeated cross-reference to fellow cities in  
50 the group of 27, positing them as part of a global network and as standard bearers of smart city  
51 innovation. For instance, one document references “developments in global cities at the  
52 forefront of the smart city agenda (e.g. Chicago, Boston, Barcelona and Stockholm)”  
53 (Stockholm\_9). Other texts simultaneously mobilise more regional, smaller cities into the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

global network: “Thus, it is not only major cities, such as Boston, Chicago, Stockholm, Barcelona, Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Berlin, London and Manchester which have benefitted from giving a focus to ‘smart’. Smaller communities, such as Friedrichshafen, Aarhus, Santander, Paredes, Peterborough and Bristol are attracting start-ups and generating growth on the back of a firm commitment to Smart City concepts” (Amsterdam\_8). Within this global network structure, then, world cities are typically seen as pioneers and ‘good practice’ models for others to follow, or as one document puts it: “Few cities can yet be called wholly ‘smart’, but some of the most advanced use global best practice that should be models to others” (New York\_5). In the case of London, its smart city ambition is unambiguously tied to the global network: “Leverage London’s global city role: working with other EU (such as Barcelona, Gothenburg, Copenhagen, and Amsterdam) and global cities (such as New York, Singapore and Tokyo) to share experience, and develop ‘lighthouse’ projects that will demonstrate new approaches at scale...” (London\_1). Altogether, then, a clear picture emerges of the group of 27 cities located at the heart of a global smart city network, where mostly capital or alpha-world cities are posited as models to be emulated by other, national and regional cities. The picture, moreover, shows that smart city innovation is essentially understood *in tandem* with cities’ global aspirations.

### ***Dimensions of the smart city discourse***

*This section reports the quantitative textual results from steps 2.1.1-2.1.3 (Box 1).* A key benefit of corpus analysis, using AntConc, is to enable textual analysis at large scale (so-called ‘distance reading’; Froehlich 2015); here, encompassing over 1.318 million words across 346 documents. By conducting a co-occurrence analysis of words surrounding the node ‘smart’, a robust measure is obtained of the most frequent word associations, which in turn provides insight into how the smart city is discursively defined. Appendix 1 shows the frequency table

1 (T-scores) of the 100 most associated collocates for the whole corpus. Considering the first ten  
2 collocates – which next to ‘city’ includes ‘energy’, ‘technology’, ‘development’, ‘data’,  
3  
4 ‘infrastructure’, ‘management’, ‘public’ and ‘new’ – the smart city is cast predominantly in  
5  
6 terms of the management of data-enabled (energy) technology and related infrastructures.  
7  
8 Enlarging the focus to the 100 most frequent collocates dilutes this perspective: on one hand,  
9  
10 ‘mobility’, ‘water’ and ‘transport’ now supplement the energy sector focus; on the other,  
11  
12 significantly, the technology-infrastructure perspective is adjoined with governance-related  
13  
14 (‘government’, ‘project’ etc.), societal (‘people’, ‘living’ etc.) and more marginally  
15  
16 environmental (‘green’) aspects, among others. Also notable is the significant presence of  
17  
18 collocates denoting the ‘international’ (‘world’, ‘global’, ‘European’ etc.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25           Next, each of the 100 collocates is assigned to one of ten smart city dimensions (or  
26  
27 otherwise labelled ‘unclassified’; see Appendix 1) derived from the literature as well as an  
28  
29 initial scoping of the corpus. The related findings are shown in Figure 2. Accordingly, across  
30  
31 all 100 collocates, governance (10.1%) is the most dominant dimension, whereas environment  
32  
33 (1.9%) and sustainability (0.9%) form the smallest categories. Interestingly, digital technology  
34  
35 (8.3%) is not the most dominant dimension as might be expected; instead, governance leads,  
36  
37 followed by infrastructure (9.5%) and international (8.9%).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 [Figure 2]  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 The centrality of governance is further revealed by the qualitative concordance analysis.<sup>11</sup>  
53  
54 According to one main storyline, governance is a key focus of attention since “governance  
55  
56 models remain in the 20<sup>th</sup> century...the smart city is so different in essence to the 20<sup>th</sup> century  
57  
58 city that the governance models and organisational frameworks themselves must evolve”  
59  
60  
61

1 (Melbourne\_1); and similarly, “systems are often siloed and not suitable for integration. This  
2 needs a whole new way of thinking” (Amsterdam\_8). Governance reform, however, is not  
3 limited to government, but extends to collaboration across wider society. Hence, smart city  
4 innovation is “all contingent on participatory governance based on whole-of-society  
5 collaboration and open innovation” (Singapore\_11), with reference elsewhere even to “the  
6 importance of ‘perpetual collaboration’” (Berlin\_9).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 A second, more ‘down-to-earth’ storyline emphasises the importance of governance for  
16 realising optimisation of existing structures and systems; e.g. “the smart city is to provide better  
17 management and planning of urban infrastructure” (Beijing\_12). Here, governance closely  
18 relates to specific infrastructure concerns, such as “implementation of smart waste disposal and  
19 management measures” (Hong Kong\_1), “promoting the concept of smart energy  
20 management” (Singapore\_2), and “investment in intelligent traffic management systems”  
21 (Boston\_7) – with mobility (including transport) receiving the most mentions across the entire  
22 corpus, followed by energy, water, and waste. The smart city, then, is seen as an opportunity  
23 to embark on fundamental infrastructure modernisation activities, for which appropriate  
24 governance mechanisms are called for.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Digital technology is pivotal for smart innovation, e.g. “the definition of smart cities is  
41 still being defined today, but its essence entails a network of data-enabled, connected  
42 technologies...” (San Jose\_10). While this serves to consolidate various infrastructure  
43 technologies (as above), there is a correlated storyline which places digital technology more  
44 fundamentally (as an end in itself) at the heart of the city, e.g. “a smart and connected city is  
45 increasingly a system of systems, or a network of networks, where the networks are composed  
46 of nodes of communication” (New York\_5), which “all connect us with the surrounding world  
47 and each other in a way never experienced before” (Copenhagen\_1). However, this emphasis  
48 is again frequently moderated by storylines bringing the social, economic and environmental  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61



1 dimensions to the fore. For example, one city defines its smart city engagement relating to its  
2 ‘community liaison role’ thus: “a significant proportion of the smart cities work in Chicago lies  
3 at the boundary between government, the community and private sector stakeholders”  
4 (Chicago\_12). Elsewhere, Singapore states about its ‘smart nation’ ambition: “there is a large  
5 potential to create economic value, but also to improve the living standards of citizens and  
6 create considerable social value” (Singapore\_8).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 Then again, some storylines foreground the smart city addressing global challenges  
16 relating to natural resource efficiency and environmental degradation. For example, one text  
17 argues that cities are “especially susceptible to the natural disasters and other long-term  
18 environmental concerns related to climate change. A smart city will understand its  
19 responsibility to adopt sustainable policies and make environmentally-friendly investments.”  
20 (Los Angeles\_16). On its part, Vienna claims that applying its ‘Smart City Wien’ framework  
21 “makes the city best suitable to act as an urban test site for future demonstrating sustainable  
22 and climate-friendly (urban) lifestyles” (Vienna\_5), with Berlin similarly echoing that “smart  
23 solutions in urban logistics are not only good for the global climate, but they also reduce the  
24 number of people who are affected locally by negative impacts” (Berlin\_1).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In summary, concerning the overall corpus, there is clear evidence of several specific  
41 storylines intermingling with one another, at times in a complementary and other times more  
42 contrasting fashion. The significance of the governance dimension, alongside that of  
43 infrastructure and digital technology, is particularly revealing. Furthermore, the prominence of  
44 the international dimension highlights the global as an integral element of the smart city. Social,  
45 economic and environmental aspects are variously discursively mobilised to contextualise and  
46 justify the smart city, albeit often in a more ancillary manner.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

[Figure 3]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 The overall corpus can also be compared with individual city-specific corpora (Figure 3). This  
7  
8 reveals relatively self-similar profiles across the 27 cities, a further indication of the circulating,  
9  
10 shared nature of current smart city discourse. (The corpus of Stockholm, SE, most closely  
11  
12 resembles that of the overall corpus profile.) At the same time, some notable variations are  
13  
14 apparent. For example, the corpora of Copenhagen (DK), Vancouver (CA), and Vienna (AT)  
15  
16 have a more pronounced environment component, in line with their reputation for sustainable  
17  
18 urbanism. Concerning Delhi and Mumbai, the spatial planning/development dimension is  
19  
20 elevated, which resonates with the area-based development focus of India's Smart Cities  
21  
22 Mission. For Los Angeles, Portland, New York and San José (all USA), the technology and  
23  
24 infrastructure dimensions are to the fore, reflecting the focus of the Smart City Challenge of  
25  
26 the US Department for Transportation and more generally the high standing of smart  
27  
28 technology innovation (e.g. Silicon Valley). Finally, Amsterdam (NL), Barcelona (ES) and  
29  
30 Paris (F) have a more pronounced international profile, while the opposite is the case for  
31  
32 Melbourne (AU), Mumbai (IN), San José (USA) and Portland (USA), the latter scoring 0%.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 The overall quantitative picture, however, is one of considerable self-similarity across the 27  
41  
42 corpora.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

### ***Emergent critical junctures***

49  
50  
51 *This section reports the interpretive-qualitative results from steps 2.2.1-2.2.2 (Box 1). Using*  
52  
53 *the concordance tool – first, to further analyse individual collocates relating to each of the ten*  
54  
55 *dimensions in terms of their contextual appearances across the corpus; and based on this,*  
56  
57 *second, to identify and characterise transversal themes – not only helps develop a more fine-*  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

grained picture of individual smart city dimensions, but also reveals original insight into how various discourse strands interact to forge particular narratives about what is essential about the smart city and why it is instrumental for (future) urban development. In situating key interlocking discourses, the norms, motives and justifications underpinning the smart city regime can be uncovered. At the same time, this helps reveal counter-narratives offering alternative interpretations. Consequently, five distinct, yet related critical junctures were identified through this in-depth qualitative analysis, as follows.

### Socio-technical bifurcation

A central, as yet unresolved, question emerging from recent discourse concerns the foregrounding of the smart city as either an essentially technological or a primarily social endeavour. Insofar as the city encompasses both infrastructure and the public sphere, the technological and the social must be expected to intertwine in any definition of smart city. However, the discourse exhibits more than that – a struggle over pre-eminence. One report, by the European Commission, readily declares its hand, citing Amsterdam as ‘good practice’ exemplar: “Without the engagement of stakeholders, a city can never be Smart, no matter how much ICT shapes its data.... The starting point of [Amsterdam Smart City] is not the (technical) solutions but the collaboration, co-creation and partnering of stakeholders within the city of Amsterdam” (Amsterdam\_17). Here is an example of a discourse asserting social primacy. That it does so boldly signals a deliberate effort to shift the dominant narrative of the smart city away from its technological premise.

As expected, other perspectives espouse a more technological orientation closer to the roots of the smart city concept; e.g. “since the advent of ICT in the mid-1990s...[the] Smart City concept has been revealed as a city development concept that uses ICT as the foundation of initiatives and programmes that facilitate social and economic activities within the city” (Seoul\_7). Similarly, “the *raison d’être* of IoT-powered smart cities is improving the quality

1 of life of citizens through a slew of technological solutions” (Mumbai\_17). Yet another text  
2 explains that “there is no single global level accepted definition of a ‘Smart City’ – but most  
3  
4 rely on the use of technology and evidence to improve cities or city inhabitant's  
5  
6 services....Smart Governance is basically about using technology to facilitate and support  
7  
8 better planning and decision making in the metropolitan or smart cities.” (Vancouver\_11).  
9  
10

11  
12 As a consequence of these differing articulations, there is frequently a palpable dualism  
13  
14 at work within individual texts, as aptly illustrated by one report discussing Singapore’s smart  
15  
16 city potential: “Engaging the public and creating a sense of co-ownership over the challenges  
17  
18 the country faces constitute the main challenges for Singapore. This is also a key component  
19  
20 in the conceptual framework of Smart City, which is ultimately about exploiting ICT for  
21  
22 transforming surpluses into resources, enhancing integration and multi-functionality of  
23  
24 solutions, and improving mobility and connectedness to create better lives and a greener planet.  
25  
26 Yet this is all contingent on participatory governance based on whole-of-society collaboration  
27  
28 and open innovation” (Singapore\_11). Of course, such articulations can be seen as harbouring  
29  
30 a creative, productive tension. More sceptically, it suggests an ongoing search for clarification  
31  
32 on whether the smart city is ‘ultimately about ICT’ or rather ‘all contingent on participatory  
33  
34 governance’.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

#### 42 Transformative change *versus* incremental optimisation

43  
44 Another bifurcation concerns the change effected by smart cities: on one hand, change is  
45  
46 posited as transformative, requiring “a whole new way of thinking – ‘Smart City’ thinking”  
47  
48 (Copenhagen\_1); on the other, it implies a more incremental approach to improve urban service  
49  
50 management. This difference may be partly explained by the discourse both projecting into the  
51  
52 long-term future with bold visions and addressing immediate issues and practical applications  
53  
54 in the present. This exposes an underlying tension about quite how fundamentally distinctive  
55  
56 ‘smart’ is.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

The language of radical innovation and transformative governance enabled by disruptive technologies is deployed to create urgency for the adoption of smart urbanism. This may be rationalised referring to the inevitability of the ‘big data revolution’: as one text proclaims, “the emergence of ICT and big data has been a wakeup call for cities that the smart cities wave is coming” and “we are only on the cusp of the explosion of big data and the IoT...Some cities find themselves needing to ‘catch up’ to...the bottom-up revolution of disruptive technologies” (Boston\_2). Relatedly, the demand for transformative change is rationalised referring to the outdateness of conventional governance. As one report forcefully puts it, “cities are realtime systems, but rarely run as such. Governance models remain in the 20<sup>th</sup> century....The implication here is that the smart city is so different in essence to the 20<sup>th</sup> century city that the governance models and organisational frameworks themselves must evolve”, before then elaborating “how the ‘smart city’ approach might fundamentally transform the way that cities are governed, operated, interacted with and experienced” (Melbourne\_1). In turn, this calls for the city to be considered afresh: “reimagine the city as a laboratory and platform for the most transformative technologies that will shape how we live and work in the future” (San Jose\_1). Here and elsewhere, the disruptive overtones are unmistakable: “smart cities of the future depend on radical catalyzers in order to integrate upcoming new technologies successfully” (Berlin\_15).

In contrast, the incremental change discourse serves to naturalise the smart city in a more immediately instrumental way: by demonstrating the practical applicability and related efficiency benefits of new technology to existing infrastructure systems and governance processes. Hence, “becoming a smart city starts with smart systems which work for the benefit of citizens and the environment. Electric grids, gas/heat/water distribution systems, public and private transportation systems, commercial buildings/hospitals/homes are the backbone of a city’s efficiency, liveability and sustainability. It is the improvement and the integration of

1 these critical city systems that will make smart city [*sic*] become a reality” (Singapore\_8).  
2 Similarly, smart city opportunities are described as “cover[ing] things such as improved  
3 building management, more efficient traffic flow, clever ways to provision basic  
4 services...water or waste management, and policing” (Chicago\_8). In making a business case  
5 for tangible returns on smart city investment, this discourse mode also acknowledges the –  
6 otherwise often glossed over – challenges of implementation; e.g. “Even when smart  
7 technology is developed and proven, significant obstacles remain to its implementation”  
8 (Brussels\_2), with the reasons quoted including the difficulty of scaling up from initial pilot  
9 projects, negative impacts from poorly managed rollouts, and lack of adequate governmental  
10 incentives. This, then, contains a much more sober assessment of the reality of smart city  
11 innovation, at distance from its more radical, transformative projections.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 A place, project or phase?

28 That the smart city deals with the urban goes without saying. Still, it can be difficult to discern  
29 where and how it intervenes and materialises. This is partly due to the innovation language  
30 used, such that ‘test’, ‘pilot’, ‘experiment’, ‘hub’, ‘laboratory’, ‘project’, ‘platform’ and similar  
31 metaphors serve as regular descriptors for smart city development.<sup>12</sup> However, while invoking  
32 innovation is a common strategy to render the smart city novel and attractive, the resulting  
33 discourse can leave more questions unanswered. In particular, the spatial context of ‘platforms’  
34 and the scalability of ‘pilots’ often remain unclear. ‘Test-bed’ may well be a frequent discursive  
35 accompaniment, but in itself this says little about how and where the smart city becomes  
36 embedded in the urban fabric.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Owing to its technological origins and inflection, the smart city is regularly discussed  
53 in terms of ‘tests’, ‘pilots’ etc. to be run and evaluated, and ‘projects’ and ‘phases’ to be rolled  
54 out and managed. For example, “for ICT investment in Chicago, pilots are seen as useful way  
55 to learn and test how to roll out a project at scale” (Chicago\_12); and “the more advanced smart  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 cities have taken the opportunity to test new business models in pilot projects, in order to assess  
2 scalability for full project implementation” (Shanghai\_5). At times, such pilots and projects are  
3 defined in purely technological terms – e.g. “those projects mainly focus on the construction  
4 of network layers, such as physical network backbone, optical fibre, WIFI...” (Barcelona\_7) –  
5 while at other times this is cast in collaborative terms, e.g. “define pilots, with the main  
6 objective being to collaborate in the process of integration of municipal networks”  
7 (Stockholm\_11).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Where spatial relationships are articulated, this raises the question whether the city as a whole, or specific places within it, act as ‘hub’ for innovation. In China, whole cities are given the smart city treatment: “MOHURD [Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development] has announced 193 cities to be pilot cities as ‘Smart City’ by now” (Beijing\_11). Similarly, “the pilot site Milan (Italy) aims to fully comprehend energy consumption across the city...” (Barcelona\_17); and, describing Barcelona’s smart city strategy, “one key element is the so-called ‘Smart City Campus’, which is meant to: transform the city into an experimentation and innovation laboratory...” (Barcelona\_17). Elsewhere, the smart city is associated with named districts, e.g. “use Kowloon East as a pilot area to explore the feasibility of developing a Smart City” (Hong Kong\_5); and “the Columbia Corridor and Powell/Division Corridor will be design labs for specific infrastructure implementation as well as for baselining, monitoring and reporting...” [Portland\_1]. Here at least, more concrete spatial and material connections are created.

A further layer of complexity arises from the scalability of projects.<sup>13</sup> It is often implied uncritically that initiatives can readily be replicated elsewhere: “the city then runs pilot projects to test the theories and optimize the engineering. Once the system is perfected, the pilot is up-scaled to the whole city” (Dubai\_9). On a larger scale still, one report boasts: “from Smart Cities to a Smarter Europe: replication, scaling and ecosystem seeding” (Barcelona\_17). More

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

tempered, realistic views exist though, too, e.g. “cities must be able to successfully bring projects from pilot to the city-wide scale in order to build long-term solutions. The ability to transition from pilot tests to larger scale is distinctly absent globally” (New York\_16). This rather aptly brings to the point the critical interaction between the smart city as a pilot/project and as place, which however most texts only fleetingly address.

#### Private-public partnership

Yet another tension becomes apparent between public and private interests driving the smart city. On one hand, the public (interest) is claimed to be a key motivation for, as well as main beneficiary of, smart city innovation; on the other, it is predominantly cast in terms of the logic of the private sector and, as such, arguably serves as an extension of it.

The pre-eminence of the market rationale manifests itself in two ways: first, repeated mention is made of the smart city’s sizeable market potential: e.g. “Arup estimates that the global market for smart urban systems for transport, energy, healthcare, water and waste will amount to around \$400 Billion p.a. by 2020” (London\_10); and “the [smart water] market will be in excess of \$22.2 billion by 2020, four times greater than its present value” (London\_2). In other words, the smart city is there for the taking by business vying for a share in this eagerly anticipated growth sector. Second, more profoundly, the smart city is presented as platform for economic renewal through cutting-edge innovation; e.g. “these markets also need the right conditions to emerge: a new innovation and entrepreneurial ecosystem where stakeholders interact effectively and where new business models and ways of working can be created so that new technologies can be adapted” (London\_6). Hence, “Smart City projects can be used to propel economic development of a region, which is what the city of Nice, France sought to do” (Barcelona\_12); and similarly, “Busan in South Korea and Helsinki in Finland are beginning to use smart city projects...to provide innovative new services, driving economic growth and making the city’s businesses more competitive” (Seoul\_6).



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Within this strong market orientation, the public (with sister terms ‘people’, ‘citizens’, ‘social’ etc.) prominently features as corresponding reference point. Indeed, in terms of frequency count (see Appendix 1), the ‘public’ is among the top ten collocates of ‘smart’ followed by ‘people’ (no 22), with ‘business’ (26) and ‘economy’ (43) further down the list. Seoul illustrates the eager embrace of the public (and it is worth noting the difference to Seoul\_6 above). Reflecting on the technology-centric approach of its earlier smart city initiative (‘u-Seoul’), the city more recently declared that: “Smart Seoul 2015 is a more people-oriented or human-centric project; and Seoul now aims to implement as many smart city technologies as possible, but also to create a more collaborative relationship between the city and its citizens” (Seoul\_1).

While, then, the public is keenly mobilised, the overarching market-oriented discourse nevertheless means that the characterisation of the public tends to be skewed in three particular ways: first, the private sector is posited as template to be emulated by both citizens and public authorities, thus underlining the primacy of the market: “As consumers of private goods and services, we have been empowered by the Web and, as citizens, we expect the same quality from our public services. In turn, public authorities are seeking to reduce costs and raise performance by adopting similar approaches in the delivery of public services” (Barcelona\_20). More succinctly, one document fashions the conjoined term “citizen-consumer” (Dubai\_9). Consequently, second the public’s engagement in the smart city is essentially in an individual capacity: “A Smart City should enable every citizen to engage with all the services on offer, public as well as private, in a way best suited to his or her needs” (Amsterdam\_8). As such, citizens are primarily cast as individuals accessing public services and information, with smart city intervention aimed at improving the user experience: “The User Interface will provide a dashboard for UB Mobile PDX participants to see their own

1 information presented against a backdrop of all users, thus creating an enhanced user  
2 experience” (Portland\_1).  
3

4  
5 Moreover, third, the issues to be engaged in – health, education, work etc. – are  
6 predominantly discussed in terms of enabling members of the public to be economically active  
7 and become entrepreneurially successful. For example, “Birmingham’s smart city ambition is  
8 to become the agile city where enterprise and social collaboration thrive – helping people to  
9 live, learn and work better by using leading technology” (London\_7). What is conspicuous by  
10 its absence in this three-fold articulation of the public is any real sense of collectivity, shared  
11 public discourse and active citizenship. Rather, public agency is mainly understood and  
12 exercised through entrepreneurial governance, such that: “cities...are developing new  
13 approaches to community involvement with an emphasis on the co-creation of services and on  
14 digital inclusion programmes for residents and small businesses” (London\_7).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 *Smart and sustainable?*

31  
32 If ‘smart’ is sometimes called ‘the new sustainable’ (see introduction), this draws attention to  
33 another key juncture. Certainly, concluding from this study, smart does not straightforwardly  
34 equal sustainable. In quantitative terms alone, the findings of the co-occurrence analysis  
35 confirm that ‘environment’ (1.9%) and ‘sustainability’ (0.9%) are small compared with  
36 ‘governance’, ‘infrastructure’ and ‘digital technology’. This suggests that the environment is  
37 afforded a rather more marginal role in the smart city than one would expect from comparable  
38 sustainable city concepts and initiatives.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Nevertheless, in a few notable cases, the ‘environment’ and ‘sustainability’ categories  
52 are more prominent – especially Vancouver (5.3%, combined), Copenhagen (4.1%), and  
53 Vienna (3.9%) – with an explicit ‘green’ agenda folded into the smart city mix. Thus, “Smart  
54 City Vienna... promote[s] the development of a city which is based on sustainability and the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 protection of resources. Through three key strategies – a vision of a sustainable future for  
2 Vienna in 2050, a roadmap for energy- efficient and climate-friendly urban development up to  
3  
4 2020 and an action plan for 2012–2015 – Smart City Vienna has developed a concept which  
5  
6 provides a vision for the city’s future” (Vienna\_20). Similarly, “[Copenhagen] has an  
7  
8 ambitious green vision and is a perfect setting for a green laboratory. The projects in and around  
9  
10 Copenhagen will serve as best practices bringing greater efficiency, cost savings and  
11  
12 sustainability that other cities in the world can reproduce.” (Copenhagen\_9). Such explicit  
13  
14 framing, however, is by no means the norm.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Frequently, ‘sustainable’, ‘environmental’ and similar adjectives are used across the  
21  
22 corpus as generic descriptors, to denote ‘good’ urban development. This may well reflect the  
23  
24 by now established status of (environmental) sustainability in urban policy which, therefore,  
25  
26 does not require spelling out in detail. More pessimistically, it may reflect a tokenistic  
27  
28 approach, whereby lip service is paid to environmental responsibility as part of the smart city’s  
29  
30 sale’s pitch. Here again, however, such generic use is at times complemented with more  
31  
32 specific descriptions, indicative of the pursuit of particular environmental ambitions and  
33  
34 targets; e.g. “Bornholm’s vision is to become a 100% sustainable and carbon-free community  
35  
36 by 2025” (Copenhagen\_18), and “The smart city is being built with the objective of reducing  
37  
38 carbon dioxide emissions by 70 percent and decreasing water consumption by 30 percent. The  
39  
40 smart city will meet over 30 percent of its energy needs through renewable energy sources,  
41  
42 with energy savings for up to 100 years” (Seoul\_20).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 It should come as no surprise that climate- and energy-related issues are to the fore  
51  
52 within the environmental dimension, given that the smart city’s ascent has coincided with the  
53  
54 dominance of climate change discourse. As a consequence, however, wider environmental and  
55  
56 sustainability concerns (biodiversity, climate justice, water poverty etc.), which under the  
57  
58 ‘sustainable city’ are typically actively addressed, barely get a mention. The focus on energy  
59  
60  
61

1 systems and other urban infrastructures can be further understood by the promise of  
2 technological solutions; e.g. “One of the greatest challenges facing the world today is climate  
3 change combined with a drastic reduction in the earth's natural resources, especially fossil  
4 fuels...Answers will have to be found in the form of smart technologies, systems and  
5 concepts.” (Vienna\_11). Similarly, “in view of the ever changing environment and global  
6 climate change, cities around the world are looking for the use of ICT to increase the resilience  
7 of their systems to enable cities to adapt” (Hong Kong\_5). Once again, the focus on technology-  
8 enabled adaptation and resilience strategies means that wider dimensions of sustainability  
9 recede into the background.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 This particular approach to (environmental) sustainability is reinforced by an  
23 overarching ecological modernization narrative at work (see above), which subsumes  
24 environmental and sustainability issues within an economic growth discourse. Thus, “[the  
25 smart city] advocates suggest the use of information technology to meet urban challenges in  
26 the new global economy“ (Boston\_7); and “by testing these solutions, the city hopes to attract  
27 innovative companies, which will in turn support the economy through the process of becoming  
28 greener and smarter” (Vienna\_20). Evidently, then, the smart city does strive for sustainability,  
29 but the particular approach pursued may well end up casting important environmental and other  
30 sustainability concerns aside.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 **Discussion: two key observations**

49 From its inception, the smart city has often struggled for definitional clarity and practical  
50 import, prompting Hollands (2008: 304) to ask “will the real smart city please stand up?”, and  
51 more recently Shelton *et al.* (2014: 13) to inquire into “the ‘actually existing smart city’”. These  
52 and other writings highlight apparent conceptual fuzziness (“the smart city, a somewhat  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 nebulous idea”; Shelton *et al.* 2014: 13), and the predilection for totemic ‘clean-slate’ projects  
2 (e.g. Masdar, Songdo). Together, this suggests a “disjuncture between image and reality”  
3 (Hollands 2008: 305) and a remoteness from grounded practice within ‘ordinary’ cities.  
4  
5 Consequently, analysts are urged to turn their attention to locating and scrutinising ‘real’ smart  
6  
7 cities.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 This study seeks to contribute to this ongoing endeavour, by identifying and  
13  
14 interrogating recent smart city discourses associated with cities from around the world. In  
15  
16 pursuing this approach, the study understands discourse to be an essential element of the smart  
17  
18 city, integral to its social practice. Furthermore, it understands discourse to be networked,  
19  
20 dynamically adapting global discourse into particular geographical, cultural and institutional  
21  
22 settings while feeding global discourse with local (complimentary or contestatory) variations.  
23  
24 This approach does not negate the need for research into the situated, material smart city  
25  
26 practice. Rather, it emphasises that the smart city’s materiality exists in close relationship with  
27  
28 its discourse, and its local grounding in close relationship with its global circulation. As such,  
29  
30 the smart city as powerful discourse regime merits critical analysis.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 The findings of this research, obtained through a systematic webometric exercise  
39  
40 combined with detailed textual analysis of smart city discourses related to cities worldwide,  
41  
42 prompt two main observations.  
43  
44

#### 45 Globalising smart city

46 The first concerns the smart city’s close conceptual alignment with a pronounced global  
47  
48 narrative. Repeated mention is made in the texts of ‘global best practice’ led by ‘advanced  
49  
50 cities’, which thereby act as ‘models to others’ (e.g. New York\_5). Time and again, the same  
51  
52 or similar groups of world cities are posited at the vanguard of smart city innovation.  
53  
54 Occasionally, talk is of ‘lighthouse cities’ to be emulated by ‘follower cities’. Altogether, this  
55  
56 narrative suggests that world or capital city status *de facto* confers model and best practice  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 standing. What, notably, this narrative fails to articulate is whether such presumed model status  
2 is necessarily justified on substantive ground and, moreover, how to account for likely  
3 differences between acclaimed smart cities. In short, in the search for the paradigmatic smart  
4 city, global or world city status appears to play an overriding factor, trumping other  
5 considerations.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 The significance of the global narrative extends further still. Not only are major cities  
12 touted as models to be emulated by others, but the smart city – *urbi et orbi* – is even more  
13 ambitiously posited as the hub for global smart society. The city thus acts as ‘test site’ for  
14 experimenting in smart innovations with a view well beyond the city itself. As one report puts  
15 it: “from smarter cities to a smarter Europe: replication, scaling and ecosystem seeding”  
16 (Barcelona\_17). Insofar as the smart city, then, is about lifestyles, knowledge production and  
17 markets, and insofar as the emphasis is on up-scaling and international circulation and even  
18 ‘global responsibility’, it is not surprising that there is an inherent tension between the smart  
19 city’s local, material grounding and its expansive, global reach.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 It is, furthermore, no coincidence that the 27 cities identified here form the core of the  
36 global discourse network. As (mostly) capital and world cities, backed by national governments  
37 and promoted by international organisations and business, they have evidently seized the  
38 opportunity to place themselves at the heart of the evolving smart city agenda, using it  
39 concurrently to promote urban renewal to their domestic audiences and to signal their global  
40 ambitions to foreign audiences, and in doing so frequently engaging in mutual cross-  
41 referencing. Needless to say, the smart city discourse is not limited to these 27 cities: there are  
42 significant discourses around many more cities (albeit with URL scores of <2,500 as measured  
43 in this study); and different methodological configurations (e.g. other language settings, or  
44 discourse genres) would likely produce some variations. It is important, therefore, that the  
45 discourse captured here is not taken to represent its entirety. Still, given that English acts as  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 *lingua franca* and a well-established search engine was used, it is safe to say that the 27 cities  
2 and their associated texts are central to the smart city global discourse network: what they have  
3 to say matters.  
4  
5

6  
7  
8 Transformative governance in and beyond the city

9 The second observation concerns the nature of the discourse regime revealed. The question  
10 arises whether the multiple dimensions and critical junctures identified here amount to anything  
11 like a coalescing discourse regime, or rather display signs of an incoherent, self-contradictory  
12 discourse at work. While the latter may be more tempting to conclude<sup>14</sup>, it is the former which  
13 deserves closer consideration. Some commentators have suggested that the smart city has  
14 transitioned from a mainly technology-focused to a more socially-oriented stage. Accordingly,  
15 the smart city is no longer predominantly driven by corporate interests on the lookout for new  
16 uses for technology, but rather guided by social concerns and the public interest for which  
17 appropriate technology is mobilised. At least, this is implied in such calls as “rethinking smart  
18 cities from the ground up” (Saunders and Baeck, 2015) and “cities for citizens; citizens  
19 changing cities” (the 2016 strapline of the Smart City Expo World Congress website; SCEWC,  
20 n.d.).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In contrast, this study exposes a more complex shift in discourse regime. For one thing,  
40 rather than a chronological transition from one stage to another, the findings show a persistent  
41 socio-technical bifurcation, with some texts (even recent ones) insisting on “a slew of  
42 technological solutions” (e.g. Mumbai\_17) while others alternatively counselling a socially  
43 driven approach. For another, where a shift is advocated this cannot be taken simplistically to  
44 mean a more socially conscious smart city. Rather, more problematically, it entails calls for a  
45 disruptive (seen as positive) change of society: references to outmoded 20<sup>th</sup> century governance  
46 models, the need for fundamental transformation, even a whole new way of thinking etc.,  
47 together make clear the smart city’s ambition to reach profoundly into the social realm. Herein  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

lies the significance of the emergent discourse regime. As a consequence, however, the discourse becomes more multifaceted, as it concurrently engages in multiple domains. In turn, this exposes several fault lines, laying bare tensions and contradictions as the smart city seeks to reconcile differing ambitions.

Together, the two overarching observations point to the smart city discourse presently being in flux, engaged in continuous boundary-work and evidently struggling on several fronts for clear perspectives. This is in no small part due to the scope of the smart city expanding considerably, from a pre-occupation with urban infrastructure and service issues to a far-reaching, transformative social governance project. In turn, this significantly extends the reach (both geographical and conceptual) of the smart city beyond the city itself. And while this is increasingly driven by, and happening in, ‘actually existing’ cities, it is not surprising that the resulting discourse frequently remains elusive and difficult to pin down in local, material form and practice. That, though, does not make it any less relevant.

### **Conclusions: implications for research, policy and practice**

This study has sought to answer three main questions, concerning: (1) the prevalence of smart city discourse among cities worldwide; (2) the key dimensions characterising recent discourse; and (3) the presence and significance of critical junctures. The analysis reveals an expansive discourse network involving 27 mostly capital or world cities in Asia, Europe and North America (and many more afar). The overall text corpus shows the smart city consisting of multiple dimensions beyond an infrastructure technology focus. Governance in particular acts as centralising theme. The texts, too, display a strong international narrative, which reinforces the smart city as globalising activity. In contrast, the environmental dimension is much less pronounced, calling into question whether smart is the new sustainable. Across the 27 cities,



1 the texts are largely similar in terms of the composition of the various dimensions, suggesting  
2 cross-fertilization and considerable commonality. The further qualitative analysis highlights  
3 the presence of several critical junctures: key thematic areas characterised by ongoing  
4 boundary-work and, consequently, harbouring unresolved tensions. These show that, despite  
5 reference to global models and best practice epitomised by advanced world cities, smart city  
6 discourse currently presents a multi-faceted picture in trying to forge a new discourse regime  
7 centred upon transformative governance.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The findings have prompted two key observations; one, regarding the distinctly global  
18 character of the smart city and, the other, regarding the transformative governance agenda that  
19 the smart city represents. These observations point to several directions for future research,  
20 policy and practice.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 First, the smart city is centrally defined in terms of global engagement, which invites  
28 research questions about the effects of the competitive dynamics created between world cities  
29 posited as ‘model’ smart cities and various second- and third-tier ‘follower’ cities. At the same  
30 time, within individual cities, the internal dynamics resulting from the concurrent discursive  
31 engagement with the smart city as a global undertaking *and* local practice merits closer  
32 analysis, for example how this is addressed by and calibrated with strategic planning. These  
33 same questions have implications for policy and practice, too: for one thing, the abstract notion  
34 of ‘global best practice’ should be considered with caution, since this could problematically  
35 assume the ready applicability of generic models while neglecting or even negating the need  
36 for locally grounded approaches to smart city innovation. For another, nurturing a quasi-  
37 competitive environment in which implicitly ‘lesser’ towns and cities are nudged if not  
38 compelled to follow superior ‘lighthouse’ cities may risk creating counterproductive  
39 hierarchies through which external practices are elevated and home-grown approaches  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

downplayed. Consequently, policies and practices promoting the globalising smart city should be tempered with due emphasis placed on local relevance and resonance.

Second, the smart city discourse more fundamentally advocates an ambitious transformative governance agenda beyond improving the efficiency and coordination of existing urban infrastructure systems and organisational processes. This argument has emerged from the detailed exploration of the ‘discourse regime’ forming around the smart city, which produces a more complex and multi-faceted picture than those frequently offered up by critics as well as proponents. Here, the application of systematic webometric analysis proved particularly useful for identifying and distilling an intricate network of storylines across large amounts of textual data. Further investigation into this emerging discourse regime could be carried out e.g. by including, beyond textual sources, visual representations as well as the scripting and staging of events (e.g. Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Hajer 2009; Easterling 2014). Moreover, future research should probe into how discursive narratives and storylines are deployed by, and exert influence on, various smart city ‘discourse coalitions’ (Hajer 1995), as a means of revealing interests and politics at work in particular networks of actors.

Concerning political conceptualisation, it also is important to acknowledge and **scrutinize** the inherent normativity of representing the smart city as an agent of transformation. The underlying assumptions about the obsolescence of existing governance modes, and the virtue of ‘disruptive’ innovation, need careful examination and warrant more open discussion. Here, the five junctures provide useful openings, since they lay bare some of the underlying issues and challenges involved. It would seem essential that related policy and practice work not be confined to ‘back office’ environments – where typically the smart city has been fashioned by various technical experts and professionals – but involve a broader set of actors and extend to the wider public sphere. If, as has been suggested, all towns and cities are seemingly on the path to becoming ‘smart’ (e.g. Karvonen et al. 2018: 1), and if this entails

1 (beyond incremental, technical upgrades) potentially profound socio-political transformations,  
2 then this deserves full and critical attention as part of wider public discourse. Finally, following  
3  
4 McFarlane and Söderström (2017), apart from offering up constructive critique, such broader  
5  
6 engagement should essentially also include the possibility of forging alternative ways of  
7  
8 thinking about, and putting into practice, the smart city.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **Acknowledgements**

20  
21  
22 [To follow]  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

## References

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 S. Allwinkle, and P Cruickshank, “Creating smart-er cities: an overview”, *Journal of Urban*  
6 *Technology* 18:2 (2011): 1-16  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 T. Almind, and P. Ingwersen, “Informetric analyses on the world wide web: methodological  
15 approaches to ‘webometrics’”, *Journal of Documentation* 53:4 (1997): 404-426.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 M. Angelidou, “Smart cities: a conjuncture of four forces”, *Cities* 47 (2015): 95-106.  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29 L. Anthony, AntConc (Version 3.4.4) [Windows] (Tokyo: Waseda University, 2016).  
30 <http://laurenceanthony.net/> Accessed August 1, 2016.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36 R. Atkinson, G. Held, and S. Jeffares, “Theories of Discourse and Narrative: What Do They  
37 Mean for Governance and Policy?”, in R. Atkinson, G. Terizakis, and K. Zimmermann, eds,  
38 *Sustainability in European Environmental Policy: Challenges of Governance and Knowledge*  
39 (London: Routledge, 2010): Chapter 6. [http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11394/1/Chapter\\_6 -](http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11394/1/Chapter_6_-_Final.pdf)  
40 [\\_Final.pdf](http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11394/1/Chapter_6_-_Final.pdf) Accessed August 15, 2017.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49  
50  
51 T. Baker, and C. Temenos, “Urban policy mobilities research: introduction to a debate”,  
52 *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39:4 (2015): 824-827.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 I. Calzada and C. Cobo, “Unplugging: deconstructing the smart city”, *Journal of Urban*  
2 *Technology*, 22: 1 (2015): 23-43.

3  
4  
5 F. Caprotti, and R. Cowley, “Interrogating Urban Experiments”, *Urban Geography* (2016): 1-  
6  
7 11. DOI:10.1080/02723638.2016.1265870  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 A. Caragliu, C. Del Bo, and P. Nijkamp, “Smart Cities in Europe”, *Journal of Urban*  
13 *Technology* 18 (2) (2011) 65-82.  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20 A. Caragliu, C. Del Bo, and P. Nijkamp, “Smart Cities in Europe”, in M. Deakin, ed, *Smart*  
21 *Cities: Governing, Modelling and Analysing the Transition* (London: Routledge, 2014):  
22 Chapter 10.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29  
30 P. Cardullo and R. Kitchin, “Being a ‘citizen’ in the smart city: up and down the scaffold of  
31 smart citizen participation”, *The Programmable City Working Paper 30* (Maynooth University,  
32 15 May 2017), <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/v24jn>  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38  
39  
40 P. Cardullo and R. Kitchin, “Smart urbanism and smart citizenship: the neoliberal logic of  
41 ‘citizen-focused’ smart cities in Europe”, *The Programmable City Working Paper 39*  
42 (Maynooth University, 9 March 2018), <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/xugb5>  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48  
49 D.L. Chang, J. Sabatine-Marques, E.M. da Costa, P.M. Selig, and T. Yigitcanlar, “Knowledge-  
50 based, smart and sustainable cities: a provocation for a conceptual framework”, *Journal of*  
51 *Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity* 4:5 (2018): pp17.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40852-018-0087-2>  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 B. Cohen, “The Top 10 Smart Cities On the Planet”, Co.Design Daily Newsletter (November 1,  
2 2012) <https://www.fastcodesign.com/1679127/the-top-10-smart-cities-on-the-planet>  
3  
4 Accessed August 22, 2017.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 B. Cohen, “The Smartest Cities In The World”, Fast Company Newsletter (November 20,  
10 2014), <https://www.fastcompany.com/3038765/the-smartest-cities-in-the-world> Accessed  
11  
12 January 10, 2017.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 R. Cowley, S. Joss and Y. Dayot, “The Smart city and Its Publics: Insights from across Six UK  
19  
20 Cities”, *Urban Research & Practice* (2017) DOI: 10.1080/17535069.2017  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 S. Crivello, “Urban Policy Mobilities: The Case of Turin as a Smart City”, *European Planning*  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*Creating Spaces for Technological, Social and Business Development* (Cham: Springer, 2017)  
159–181

EC, The European Partnership on Smart Cities and Communities,  
<http://ec.europa.eu/eip/smartcities/> Accessed August 22, 2017.

K. Easterling, *Extrastatecraft: The Power of Infrastructure Space* (London: Verso Books, 2014)

J. Evans, A. Karvonen and R. Raven (eds.), *The Experimental City*. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).

EU, EU-China Smartcities, <http://eu-chinasmartcities.eu/> Accessed August 22, 2017.

N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis* (London: Longman, 1995).

N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (New York & London: Routledge, 2013).

Forbes, “Ranking the World’s ‘Smartest’ Cities” (Forbes, July 6, 2016)

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/iese/2016/07/06/the-worlds-smartest-cities/#48f78d224ab9>

Accessed August 21, 2017.

1 H. Froehlich (2015), “Corpus Analysis with AntConc”, in Gibbs F. *The Programming*  
2 *Historian*. URL: <https://programminghistorian.org/lessons/corpus-analysis-with-antconc>  
3  
4 Accessed August 19, 2017.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Y. Fu, and X. Zhang, “Trajectory of Urban Sustainability Concepts: A 35-year Bibliometric  
11  
12 Analysis” *Cities* 60 (2017): 113-123.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 G. Gabrys, “Programming environments: environmentality and citizen sensing in the smart  
18  
19 city”, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32:1 (2014): 30–48.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 W. Gamson, and A. Modigliani, “Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A  
25  
26 constructionist approach”, *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1989): 1–37  
27  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34 V. Gargiulo Morelli, M. Weijnen, E. Van Bueren, I. Wenzler, L. Salvati and M. De Reuver,  
35  
36 “Towards Intelligently-Sustainable Cities?” *Journal of Land Use, Mobility and Environment* 1  
37  
38 (2013): 73-86.  
39  
40  
41

42  
43  
44 GaWC, Globalization and World Cities Research Network.  
45  
46 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization\\_and\\_World\\_Cities\\_Research\\_Network](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization_and_World_Cities_Research_Network) Accessed  
47  
48 August 21, 2017.  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 GeoNames (n.d.) <http://www.geonames.org/> Accessed August 1, 2016.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61



1 J. Gibson, M. Robinson, and Scott, C., *CITIE: City Initiatives for Technology, Innovation and*  
2 *Entrepreneurship. A Resource for City Leadership* (CITIE, 2015)  
3  
4 [http://citie.org/assets/uploads/2015/04/CITIE\\_Report\\_2015.pdf](http://citie.org/assets/uploads/2015/04/CITIE_Report_2015.pdf) Accessed August 21, 2017.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 R. Giffinger and H. Gudrun, “Smart Cities Ranking: An Effective Instrument for The  
10 Positioning of Cities?” *ACE: Architecture, City & Environ* 4(12) (2010): 7–25.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 R. Gill, “Discourse Analysis”, in M. Bauer and G. Gaskell, *Qualitative Researching with*  
19 *Text, Image and Sound* (London: Sage, 2000): 172-190.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 A. Greenfield, *Against the Smart City* (New York: Do, 2013).  
27  
28  
29

30 GrowSmarter, *Transforming Cities for A Smart, Sustainable Europe*. (Undated)  
31  
32 <http://www.grow-smarter.eu/home/> Accessed October 12, 2016.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 H. Haarstad, “Constructing the sustainable city: examining the role of sustainability in the  
38 ‘smart city’ discourse, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 19:4 (2017): 423-437.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 M. Hajer, *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy*  
45 *Process* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 M. Hajer, *Authoritative Governance: Policy Making in the Age of Mediatization* (Oxford:  
53 Oxford University Press, 2009)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 M. Hajer, and T. Dassen, *Smart about Cities: Visualising the Challenge for 21st Century*  
2 *Urbanism*, report 1473, PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (Rotterdam:  
3 Nai010 Publishers, 2014).  
4  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 D. Haworth, *Discourse* (Milton Keynes: Open Univeristy, 2000).  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 *M. Hoey, Textual Interaction* (London, Routledge, 2001)  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 R. Hollands. “Critical interventions into the corporate smart city”, *Cambridge Journal of*  
22 *Regions, Economy and Society*, 8:1 (2015): 61–77.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29 ISO, International Organisation for Standardization (n.d.), #mysmartcity,  
30 <http://www.iso.org/sites/mysmartcity/> Accessed August 24, 2017.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37 A. Karvonen, F. Cugurullo, and F. Caprotti, eds., *Inside Smart Cities: Place, Politics and*  
38 *Urban Innovation* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018)  
39  
40

41  
42  
43  
44 R. Kitchin, *The Data Revolution. Big Data, Open Data, Data Infrastructures & Their*  
45 *Consequences* (London: Sage, 2014): Chapter 7.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 R. Kitchin, “Making Sense of Smart Cities: Addressing Present Shortcomings,” *Cambridge*  
52 *Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 8: 1 (2015) 131–136.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 L. Kohr, *Human Rights Discourse in A Global Network*. Books beyond Borders series.  
2 (Routledge, 2013).  
3

4  
5  
6  
7 S. Kudva, and X. Ye, “Smart cities, big data, and sustainability union”, *Big Data and Cognitive*  
8  
9  
10 *Computing* 1:4 (2017): pp 13. Doi:10.3390/bdcc1010004  
11

12  
13  
14 J. H. Lee, R. Phaal, and S.H. Lee, “An Integrated Service-device-technology Roadmap for  
15  
16  
17 *Smart City Development*” *Technological Forecasting & Social Change* 80 (2013): 286-306.  
18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23 D. Linders, “From e-government to we-government: Defining a typology for citizen  
24  
25  
26 coproduction in the age of social media”, *Government Information Quarterly* 29:4 (2012):  
27  
28 446-454  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34 L. Martínez-Sanahuja, and D. Sánchez, “Evaluating the suitability of Web search engines as  
35  
36  
37 proxies for knowledge discovery from the Web”, *Procedia Computer Science* 96 (2016):  
38  
39 169-178.  
40

41  
42  
43  
44  
45 E. McCann, “Urban policy mobilities and global circuits of knowledge: toward a research  
46  
47  
48 agenda”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 101: 1 (2011): 107-130.  
49

50  
51  
52 C. McFarlane and O. Söderström, “On alternative smart cities”, *City* (2017) 1-17. DOI  
53  
54 10.100/13604813.2017.1327166  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1 A. Meijer, and M.P. Rodriguez Bolivar, “Governing The Smart City: A Review of The  
2 Literature on Smart Urban Governance”, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*  
3 (2015) 1-17. DOI 10.1177/0020852314564308  
4  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Ministry of Urban Development, *Smart Cities Mission*. (New Delhi: Government of India,  
10 undated) <<http://smartcities.gov.in/>> Accessed August 11, 2016.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 E. Moir, T. Moonen, and G. Clark, *What are Future Cities? Origins, Meanings, Uses* (London:  
17 Future Cities Catapult, 2014)  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/337549/14-](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/337549/14-820-what-are-future-cities.pdf)  
23  
24 820-what-are-future-cities.pdf Accessed January 5, 2015.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 A.P.J. Mol, *Globalization and Environmental Reform: The Ecological Modernization of the*  
30 *Global Economy* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001).  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 L. Mora, R. Bolici, and M. Deaking, “The First Two Decades of Smart-City Research: A  
37 Bibliometric Analysis” *Journal of Urban Technology* (2017) 24 (1): 3-27.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 L. Phillips, and M.W. Jorgensen, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London: Sage,  
44 2004): Ch.3.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 E. Przeybilovicz, M.A. Cunha, J.F.M Macaya, and J.P.D Albuquerque, “A tale of two ‘smart  
52 cities’: investigating the echoes of New Public Management and governance discourses in  
53 smart city projects in Brazil”, *Proceedings of the 51<sup>st</sup> Hawaii International conference on*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*System Sciences, Theme Smart Cities and Governance*, (2018). [https://aisel.aisnet.org/hicss-51/eg/smart\\_cities\\_smart\\_government/2/](https://aisel.aisnet.org/hicss-51/eg/smart_cities_smart_government/2/)

R. Raven, F. Sengers, P Spaeth, L. Xie, A. Cheshmehzangi, and M de Jong, “Urban Experimentation and Institutional Arrangements” *European Planning Studies* (2017) DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2017.1393047.

D. Sánchez, L. Martínez-Sanahuja, and M. Batet, “Survey and evaluation of web search engine hit counts as research tools in computational linguistics”, *Information Systems* 73 (2018): 50-60.

T. Saunders and P. Baeck. *Rethinking Smart Cities from the Ground up*. (London: NESTA, 2015).

SCEWC, Smart City Expo World Congress (n.d.) <http://www.smartcityexpo.com/en/>  
Accessed August 24, 2017.

C. Scholl and M. Kemp, “City Labs as Vehicles for Innovation in Urban Planning Processes”, *Urban Planning* 1:4 (2016): 89-102.

Smart Cities Council (n.d.) <http://smartcitiescouncil.com/> Accessed August 24, 2017.

O. Söderström, T. Paasche and F. Klauser, “Smart Cities as Corporate Storytelling”, *City* 18:3 (2014): 307-320.

1 M. Stubbs, “Collocations and Semantic Profiles: On The Cause of The Trouble with  
2 Quantitative Studies”, in W. Teubert and R. Krishnamurthy, eds, *Corpus Linguistics: Critical*  
3 *Concepts in Linguistics* (Routledge, 2007).

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 M. Thelwall, L. Vaughan, and L. Björneborn, “Webometrics”, *Annual Review of Information*  
10 *Science and Technology* 39:1 (2005): 81-135.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 E.P. Trindade, M.P.F. Hinnig, E. Moreira de Costa, J.S. Marques, R.C. Bastos, and T.  
17 Yigitcanlar, “Sustainable development of smart cities: a systematic review of the literature”,  
18 *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, Complexity* 3:11 (2017): pp14. DOI  
19 10.1186/s40852-017-0063-2  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 A. M. Townsend, *Smart Cities: Big Data, Civic Hackers, and the Quest for a New Utopia*  
30 (W.W. Norton & Company, 2013).

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 G. Trencher and A. Karvonen, “Stretching ‘Smart’: Advancing Health and Well-being through  
37 the Smart City Agenda”, *Local Environment* (2017): 1-18. DOI  
38 10.1080/13549839.2017.1360264  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 US Department of Transportation, *Smart City Challenge* (Washington DC: US Department of  
47 Transportation, undated) < <http://www.transportation.gov/smartycity> > Accessed October 12,  
48 2016.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 A. Uyar, “Investigation of the accuracy of search engine hit counts”, *Journal of Information*  
57 *Science* 35:4 (2009): 4690480.  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2 J. Viitanen and R. Kingston. “Smart cities and green growth: outsourcing democratic and  
3 environmental resilience to the global technology sector”, *Environment and Planning A* 46:  
4  
5 4(2014): 803–819.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 W. van Winden and D. van den Buuse, “Smart City Pilot Projects: Exploring the Dimensions  
12 and Conditions of Scaling Up”, *Journal of Urban Technology* (2017), 1-22. DOI  
13  
14 10.1080/10630732.2017.1348884  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 V. Watson, “The allure of ‘smart city’ rhetoric: India and Africa”, *Dialogues in Human  
22 Geography* 5:1 (2015) 36–39.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 G. Weiss, and R. Wodak, “Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse  
32 Analysis”, in G. Weiss and R. Wodak R. (eds) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. (London:  
33  
34 Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40  
41 A. Wiig, “IBM’s smart city as techno-utopian policy mobility”, *City* 9:2/3 (2015): 258-273.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 R. Wodak, “Dilemmas in Discourse Analysis”, *Language and Society* 35:4 (2006) 595-612.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 L. A. Wood, *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*  
54  
55 (London: Sage, 2000).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

---

<sup>1</sup> This approach understands discourse as distinct from institutions, in contrast to e.g. Laclau and Mouffe (1985) (cited in Atkinson *et al.* 2010), who argue that there is no distinction between the discursive and non-discursive. Furthermore, for pragmatic reasons, the present approach is focused on the texts themselves (as network of storylines). A discourse coalition approach (e.g. Hajer 1995), focusing on networks of actors (and their storylines) could be useful for follow-up research.

<sup>2</sup> 'Los Angeles\_16' refers to the PDF document found, through the online search process, in position 16 out of the first 20 PDF files for the city of Los Angeles (USA). *N.B. This, therefore, does not necessarily mean that the document is published by the city authorities themselves; its origin may be a third party discussing the city as exemplar of smart city. See also footnote 7.* Henceforth, the same nomenclature is used for all cited documents from the collated text corpus (346 files). For full references, see Appendix 2.

<sup>3</sup> According to Trencher and Karvonen (2017: 1), "the current smart city agenda has embraced th[e] ecological modernisation approach to urban development", explained as "the simultaneous pursuit of economic development and environmental protection". See also Hajer and Dassen (2014); and for a wider discussion of ecological modernization e.g. Mol (2001).

<sup>4</sup> The logic here refers to how the global discourse network is identified and captured. A search engine reveals texts in predefined digital format that contains the key content for which texts are generated and circulated over the Web. As such, the search engine 'infiltrates' the virtual space in which the global discourse is readily exposed to any contributor. It can therefore be considered a methodologically suitable tool for collecting texts in circulation.

<sup>5</sup> As the overall range in URL scores was found to be 0-10,700, the selected range of 2,500-10,700 represents the top, upper-middle, and lower-middle quartiles of measurement. Apart from pragmatic reasons (manageability of data), the chosen range is appropriate methodologically, as the cities in this range have a larger exposure to the global discourse in both size and visibility, which in turn helps identify core narratives and critical junctures of the discourse.

<sup>6</sup> A PDF document is considered valid if its contents explicitly – though not necessarily exclusively (e.g. in the case of comparative case studies) – relate to the corresponding city and related smart city activity. Furthermore, it is considered valid if authored either directly by city authorities (or smart city project initiators) or by third parties (including international organisations. Documents clearly not dealing with smart city per se (e.g. 'smart holidays') are excluded from the corpus.

<sup>7</sup> Within the category of 'smart city', the term 'smart' has multiple linguistic uses, including e.g. 'smart governance', 'smart mobility', 'smart grid'. Hence, to fully capture the various dimensions, 'smart' is used as node (rather than 'smart city'). 20 words is the maximum window setting in AntConc, and is recommended for enlarged textual analysis (rather than more narrow semantic examinations). So-called 'stopwords' ('the', 'that', 'of', 'and' etc.) are automatically excluded.

<sup>8</sup> The T-score (or T-value) is used to establish the statistical likelihood of association between a collocate and a node. Hence, the higher the T-score, the greater the likelihood of co-location. The literature recommends T-score over the alternative MI-score, given the small overall text corpus. The T-value measurement includes a built-in statistical adjustment, whereby if a given collocate (within the window; here 41 words) has a proportionally high frequency outside the window then a measured downward adjustment is made. See (Stubbs 2007; Anthony 2016)

<sup>9</sup> The dimensions were derived, on one hand, from the literature (e.g. de Jong *et al.* 2015: section 4.4; Caragliu *et al.* 2011; Giffinger and Gudrun 2010; Lee *et al.* 2013) and, on the other, from previous research on smart cities by the authors. The dimension 'international' was added following initial textual analysis, which indicated an explicit presence of international terms.

<sup>10</sup> For example, for the collocate 'stakeholder', all 1,433 instances of its in-text occurrence are comparatively shown, from which a qualitative picture can be developed of the particular meanings and significance of 'stakeholder' and how, in turn, this informs the discussion of smart city.

<sup>11</sup> These findings resonate with a growing discussion of the significance of governance in the literature. See for example the four perspectives on smart governance in Meijer and Bolivar (2015).

---

1 <sup>12</sup> The notion of experiment is increasingly recognised in the literature. See in particular the conceptualisation of ‘the  
2 experimental city’ by Evans *et al* (2016); also Scholl and Kemp (2016), Caprotti and Cowley (2017), and Raven *et al.* (2017)

3 <sup>13</sup> For a recent extended discussion, including a typology of scaling, relating to smart city pilot projects, see van Winden and  
4 van den Buuse (2017).  
5

6 <sup>14</sup> It is worth noting that in their bibliometric analysis of scholarly literature (which, however as noted in the  
7 above introduction section, differs from the present webometric analysis), Mora *et al.* (2017: 3) indeed  
8 conclude that smart city research is currently fragmented and lacks cohesion.  
9

## Box 1: Methodological Procedures

### Step 1: Webometric analysis of global smart city discourse & sampling of cities

#### 1.1) Compilation of global list of cities

- Use GeoNames database to compile list of cities with population  $\geq 100K$ : 4235 cities
- Crosscheck additional sources (UN Demographic Yearbook; population data etc.) to add missing cities and cities with alternative spelling (e.g. Köln/Cologne): 1318 cities
- **Result:** consolidated list of 5553 cities

#### 1.2) Webometric analysis of association of city names with 'smart city'

- Use Yahoo Advanced Search; choose settings 'language=English' and 'file-type=pdf'
- Measure hit counts with search string: "smart city" + <city name X> ; as proxy for extent to which city X is implicated in global smart city discourse
- Use VBA Excel to automate search process for all 5553 city names; 9 repeat search runs across 4 locations, different computers and different dates (within 15-day window) to increase accuracy and validity
- Calculate most robust hit count value for each city name using probability density test (most probable hit-count amongst retrieved counts per city) and mode test (which exact hit count retrieved most per city)
- **Result:** hit range of 0-10700, with 7 cities (no. 1-7) in top quartile ( $\geq 7500$  hits); 4 cities (no. 8-11) in upper middle quartile (5000-7499 hits); 45 cities (no. 12-56) in lower middle quartile (2500-4999 hits); and 5497 cities in bottom quartile ( $\leq 2500$  hits)

#### 1.3) Selection and validation of sample of cities

- Select cities no. 1-56 in the 2500-10700 hit range (excluding cities in bottom quartile); for each download all 20 PDF files listed on first search page using above search string (step 1.2)
- Check validity of PDF files for each city. This results in removal of 29 cities as follows.: (a) 12 duplicate city names, where PDFs refer to another same-named city (e.g. all PDFs listed under London/CA are the same as/refer to those listed under London/UK; ditto e.g. Barcelona/VE and Barcelona/ES); (b) 12 cases where PDFs refer to generic words contained in city names but bear no actual relation to cities (e.g. all PDFs listed under Mobile/USA only contain generic discourse on 'mobile'; ditto e.g. Enterprise/USA, Sale/MR); (c) 5 cities removed where no. of validated PDFs is  $\leq 4$  and thus deemed too small (Hamilton/NZ; Hamilton/USA; Reading/UK; Vancouver/USA; Washington/USA).
- For the remaining 27 cities, remove any duplicate or unrelated PDFs, resulting in varying numbers of PDFs harvested per city (18/20 each for Vienna and Copenhagen, to 8/20 each for Melbourne and Toronto)
- **Result:** sample of 27 cities, with total of 346 validated PDFs containing relevant 'smart city' discourse

### Step 2: Text corpus analyses (with AntConc software)

#### 2.1) Co-occurrence analysis (quantitative)

##### 2.1.1) Compilation of text corpus

- Convert 346 PDF files into text files and assemble into single text corpus; upload on AntConc software

##### 2.1.2) Calculation of 100 most frequent collocates of 'smart'

- Apply co-occurrence function to identify the 100 most frequent collocates of node 'smart'. 20 words to the left/right of 'smart' are measured, the maximum window setting in AntConc, recommended for enlarged textual analysis
- T-score is used to calculate statistical likelihood of association between individual collocates and the node 'smart' (literature recommends T-score over MI-score for smaller text corpus as used here). In AntConc, the T-score includes a built-in statistical adjustment, whereby a given collocate (within the window setting) with a proportionally high frequency outside the window receives a measured downward adjustment (see Stubbs 2007; Anthony 2016)

##### 2.1.3) Categorization of 100 collocates according to 10 smart city dimensions

- Define 10 broad smart city dimensions: digital technology; infrastructure; governance; economy; society; environment; sustainability; spatial development/planning; experimentation/innovation; international. Derived collectively by the research team drawing on (a) literature and (b) an initial scoping analysis of the corpus (viewing of text strings containing individual collocates)
- Assign each collocate to one of 10 dimensions; if needed, view associated text strings in corpus for cross-checking. Collocates without clear/unambiguous attribution (e.g. 'concept', 'future') are assigned to category 'unclassified'
- **Result:** 100 most frequent collocates (Appendix 1); categorization in terms of 10 'smart city' dimensions (Fig. 2; 3)

#### 2.2) Concordance analysis (interpretive-qualitative)

##### 2.2.1) Contextual analysis of 10 smart city dimensions

- Develop a contextual understanding of each dimension by analyzing corresponding collocates individually in relation to the discursive contexts in which they are used across the corpus. Apply the concordance function (and related sorting options) to obtain a complete set of text strings containing a given collocate; scan the set overall and subject multiple sub-sections to in-depth analysis to identify discursive themes and patterns. Repeat analysis with other collocates
- Use of a protocol to ensure systematic, consistent analysis of each dimension; as well as triangulation whereby each dimension is analyzed separately by two researchers and the combined results reviewed by the team overall

##### 2.2.2) Identification of overarching themes and critical junctures


- Interpret findings (2.2.1) collectively (full research team) to discern interlocking discourse narratives and counter-narratives across 10 smart city dimensions and thus elucidate critical junctures
- **Result:** Thematic discussion in terms of five critical junctures

**Table 1. 27 cities co-constituting the smart city global discourse network.**

City	Score value (rounded)*	Valid PDFs collected	Region	Capital City	World city ranking**
London	10700	17	Europe	x	Alpha++
Singapore	8968	15	Asia	x	Alpha+
Barcelona	5630	17	Europe		Alpha-
Amsterdam	5220	15	Europe	x	Alpha
Boston	4973	12	North America		Alpha-
New York City	4590	13	North America		Alpha++
Hong Kong	4430	16	Asia	x	Alpha+
Chicago	4330	13	North America		Alpha
Delhi	4330	10	Asia	x	Alpha-
Paris	4210	10	Europe	x	Alpha+
Berlin	4000	12	Europe	x	Beta+
Mumbai	3780	11	Asia		Alpha
Toronto	3530	8	Oceania		Alpha
Dubai	3480	14	Asia		Alpha+
Los Angeles	3220	11	North America		Alpha
Stockholm	3080	12	Europe	x	Alpha-
Melbourne	3010	8	Oceania		Alpha-
Tokyo	2960	9	Asia	x	Alpha+
Vancouver	2892	11	North America		Beta
Vienna	2855	18	Europe	x	Alpha-
Shanghai	2830	11	Asia		Alpha
Seoul	2715	11	Asia	x	Alpha-
Copenhagen	2680	18	Europe	x	Beta+
Beijing	2680	17	Asia	x	Alpha+
San Jose	2600	14	North America		Beta-
Portland	2530	14	North America		Gamma-
Brussels	2505	9	Europe	x	Alpha

\*The score value is an aggregated measure of the number of online hits

\*\*GaWC ranking ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization\\_and\\_World\\_Cities\\_Research\\_Network](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization_and_World_Cities_Research_Network))



**Figure 1. Research design: online search process & textual analyses.**




Figure 2. Distribution of 10 smart city dimensions (100 collocates) for overall corpus.\*




Figure 3. Smart city dimensions across 27 corpora

\*self-referenced city/country name (e.g. use of 'London' and 'UK' in London-related text) are excluded from the dimension 'International'

**Appendix1: List of the 100 most associated terms with 'smart' for the overall corpus (346 PDFs)**

Rank	Freq	T-Score	Collocate	Smart City Dimensions
1	47098	212.5048	smart	-
2	39893	192.7201	city	-
3	6515	77.9386	energy	Infrastructure
4	5252	68.7439	technology	Digital technology
5	5007	68.0468	development	Spatial planning/development
6	4620	63.5254	data	Digital technology
7	4066	61.4071	infrastructure	Infrastructure
8	3883	59.6391	management	Governance
9	3692	57.5334	public	Society
10	3304	57.4662	new	-
11	3265	54.2873	government	Governance
12	3269	52.4610	project	Governance
13	2883	51.2908	urban	Spatial planning/development
14	2745	51.2828	mobility	Infrastructure
15	2530	49.5327	governance	Governance
16	2469	48.5077	eu	International
17	2492	48.3770	ict	Digital technology
18	2441	48.3613	grid	Infrastructure
19	2592	47.8763	information	-
20	2392	47.2268	market	Economy
21	2359	46.5756	water	Infrastructure
22	2312	46.1072	people	Society
23	2567	45.8262	system	Digital technology
24	2257	45.3357	environment	Environment
25	2262	43.9960	transport	Infrastructure
26	2186	43.4104	business	Economy
27	1972	43.3672	europe	International
28	2101	42.7270	innovation	Experiment/Innovation
29	912	42.5265	uk	International
30	1892	42.2498	intelligent	Digital technology
31	816	42.0584	london	International
32	1891	41.6097	mobile	Digital technology
33	1929	41.4472	building	Spatial planning/development
34	1864	41.4065	research	Experiment/Innovation
35	1772	41.2467	living	Society
36	1790	41.1072	pilot	Experiment/Innovation
37	1776	40.6883	case	-
38	1771	40.6657	key	-
39	1801	40.4138	private	-
40	1615	40.1477	up	-
41	1702	40.1074	european	International
42	1087	40.0571	barcelona	International
43	1682	40.0150	economy	Economy
44	1711	39.7039	future	-
45	1647	39.1973	sustainable	Sustainability
46	1684	38.7849	digital	Digital technology
47	1662	38.7720	level	-
48	1122	38.5550	seoul	International
49	1749	38.5197	network	Governance
50	1520	36.9543	economic	Economy

Rank	Freq	T-Score	Collocate	Smart City Dimensions
51	1516	36.9332	policy	Governance
52	1505	36.6775	traffic	Infrastructure
53	1408	36.2990	vision	Governance
54	1446	35.6416	open	-
55	1376	35.5297	number	-
56	1803	35.5246	service	Economy
57	309	35.2644	china	International
58	1334	35.1579	green	Environment
59	1351	35.1285	global	International
60	1355	35.0705	source	-
61	1349	34.7720	world	International
62	1391	34.7331	support	-
63	1258	34.4459	framework	Governance
64	1277	34.3748	international	International
65	1305	34.2372	platform	Experiment/Innovation
66	1241	34.1590	security	Society
67	1288	34.1429	planning	Spatial planning/development
68	1245	33.9880	potential	-
69	1189	33.9861	example	-
70	1292	33.7675	work	Economy
71	1148	33.4774	need	-
72	1124	33.4399	page	-
73	1193	33.4087	stakeholders	Governance
74	1178	33.3537	figure	-
75	1272	33.0033	investment	Economy
76	1231	32.9875	local	-
77	1160	32.7852	life	Society
78	1172	32.6735	waste	Infrastructure
79	1210	32.3553	community	Society
80	1146	32.3240	study	-
81	1226	32.2967	sector	-
82	1187	32.0859	plan	-
83	1135	32.0583	efficiency	-
84	1124	32.0493	report	-
85	1200	31.8257	make	-
86	1106	31.7850	part	-
87	1197	31.2241	provide	-
88	1097	31.2162	approach	-
89	1085	31.0803	social	Society
90	1012	30.8023	implementation	Governance
91	1026	30.7928	education	Society
92	1031	30.7481	growth	Economy
93	1042	30.6254	power	-
94	1045	30.5739	quality	-
95	1005	30.3670	national	-
96	980	30.2058	concept	-
97	918	30.1311	value	-
98	934	29.8897	paper	-
99	930	29.8594	way	-
100	1003	29.7375	department	-

#Total No. of Collocate Types: 18507

#Total No. of Collocate Tokens: 1380343



Appendix 2

Appendix 2: Reference table for quoted documents (alphabetical order)

Document label	Reference
Amsterdam_4	Osborne Clarke. 2015. 'Smart cities in Europe Enabling innovation.' <a href="http://www.cleanenergypipeline.com/Resources/CE/ResearchReports/Smart%20cities%20in%20Europe.pdf">http://www.cleanenergypipeline.com/Resources/CE/ResearchReports/Smart%20cities%20in%20Europe.pdf</a>
Amsterdam_8	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'Smart cities Background paper.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf</a>
Amsterdam_17	European Parliament. 2014. 'Mapping Smart Cities in the EU.' <a href="http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf">http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf</a>
Amsterdam_20	Cisco. 2013. 'The Internet of Everything for Cities.' <a href="http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/industries/docs/gov/everything-for-cities.pdf">http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/industries/docs/gov/everything-for-cities.pdf</a>
Barcelona_7	Yongling Li, Yanliu Lin and Stan Geertman. 2015. 'The development of smart cities in China.' <a href="http://web.mit.edu/cron/project/CUPUM2015/proceedings/Content/pss/291_li_h.pdf">http://web.mit.edu/cron/project/CUPUM2015/proceedings/Content/pss/291_li_h.pdf</a>
Barcelona_12	Swisscom, IMD. 2016. 'Smart City Essentials for City Leaders.' <a href="https://www.imd.org/globalassets/dbt/docs/smart-city-en">https://www.imd.org/globalassets/dbt/docs/smart-city-en</a>
Barcelona_17	European Parliament. 2014. 'Mapping Smart Cities in the EU.' <a href="http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf">http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf</a>
Barcelona_20	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'Smart cities Background paper.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf</a>
Beijing_11	Europelectro (European Electrical and Electronics Industry). 2014. 'Smart Cities – Introduction.' <a href="http://www.europelectro.org/fileadmin/user_upload/library/EE-5009_-_Smart_Cities_in_China_introduction.pdf">http://www.europelectro.org/fileadmin/user_upload/library/EE-5009_-_Smart_Cities_in_China_introduction.pdf</a>
Beijing_12	ZTE. nd. 'ZTE Smart City White Paper.' <a href="http://enterprise.zte.com.cn/en/banner_management/banners/201404/P020140419657180221402.pdf">http://enterprise.zte.com.cn/en/banner_management/banners/201404/P020140419657180221402.pdf</a>
Berlin_1	Senate Department for Urban Development and the Environment. 2015. 'Smart City Strategy Berlin.' <a href="http://www.stadtenwicklung.berlin.de/planen/foren_initiativen/smart-city/download/Strategie_Smart_City_Berlin_en.pdf">http://www.stadtenwicklung.berlin.de/planen/foren_initiativen/smart-city/download/Strategie_Smart_City_Berlin_en.pdf</a>
Berlin_9	IBM Global Business Services. 2009. 'A vision of smarter cities.' <a href="http://www-03.ibm.com/press/attachments/IBV_Smarter_Cities_-_Final.pdf">http://www-03.ibm.com/press/attachments/IBV_Smarter_Cities_-_Final.pdf</a>
Berlin_15	Sanjay Malviya. 2015. 'Task : Smart City Bhopal.' <a href="https://www.mygov.in/sites/default/files/mygov_144762985046850.pdf">https://www.mygov.in/sites/default/files/mygov_144762985046850.pdf</a>
Boston_2	Urban Sustainability Directors Network. nd. 'Getting Smart About Smart Cities.' <a href="http://us.iscvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Smart-Cities-RG.pdf">http://us.iscvt.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Smart-Cities-RG.pdf</a>
Boston_7	US Department of Transportation. 2014. 'The Smart/Connected City and Its Implications for Connected Transportation.' <a href="https://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/Dec2014/Smart_Connected_City_FINAL_111314.pdf">https://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/Dec2014/Smart_Connected_City_FINAL_111314.pdf</a>
Brussels_2	Osborne Clarke. 2015. 'Smart cities in Europe Enabling innovation.' <a href="http://www.cleanenergypipeline.com/Resources/CE/ResearchReports/Smart%20cities%20in%20Europe.pdf">http://www.cleanenergypipeline.com/Resources/CE/ResearchReports/Smart%20cities%20in%20Europe.pdf</a>
Chicago_8	Cisco. 2013. 'The Internet of Everything for Cities.' <a href="http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/industries/docs/gov/everything-for-cities.pdf">http://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/solutions/industries/docs/gov/everything-for-cities.pdf</a>
Chicago_12	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'BIS Research Paper No. 135. Global Innovators: International Case Studies on Smart Cities.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249397/bis-13-1216-global-innovators-international-smart-cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249397/bis-13-1216-global-innovators-international-smart-cities.pdf</a>
Copenhagen_1	Copenhagen Cleantech Cluster. nd. 'Danish Smart Cities: sustainable living in an urban world An overview of Danish Smart City competencies.' <a href="http://www.dac.dk/media/37489/Danish%20smart%20cities_report.pdf">http://www.dac.dk/media/37489/Danish%20smart%20cities_report.pdf</a>
Copenhagen_9	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. nd. 'Denmark - Developing Opportunities for Smart City Solutions.' <a href="http://www.investindk.com/~media/Files/Sheets/ICT/Smart%20City.ashx">http://www.investindk.com/~media/Files/Sheets/ICT/Smart%20City.ashx</a>
Copenhagen_18	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. nd. 'Denmark - Developing Opportunities for Smart City Solutions.' <a href="http://www.investindk.com/~media/Files/Sheets/ICT/Smart%20City.ashx">http://www.investindk.com/~media/Files/Sheets/ICT/Smart%20City.ashx</a>
Dubai_9	Monitor Deloitte. nd. 'Smart cities... Not just the sum of its parts.' <a href="https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/xe/Documents/strategy/me_deloitte-monitor_smart-cities.pdf">https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/xe/Documents/strategy/me_deloitte-monitor_smart-cities.pdf</a>
Dubai_14	Expotrade. 2016. 'Dubai Silicon Oasis authority fostering smart city development through innovative strategies.' <a href="https://www.thebusinessyear.com/Content/events/pressrelease/fae85603-446a-4499-ae44-e73a7eb917ff.pdf">https://www.thebusinessyear.com/Content/events/pressrelease/fae85603-446a-4499-ae44-e73a7eb917ff.pdf</a>
Hong Kong_1	Central Policy Unit, The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. 2015. 'Research Report on Smart City.' <a href="http://www.cpu.gov.hk/doc/en/research_reports/CPU%20research%20report%20-%20Smart%20City(en).pdf">http://www.cpu.gov.hk/doc/en/research_reports/CPU%20research%20report%20-%20Smart%20City(en).pdf</a>
Hong Kong_5	Central Policy Unit, The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. 2015. 'Commission on Strategic Development Smart City.' <a href="http://eu-chinasmartcities.eu/sites/default/files/Smart_City_report_draft%20White%20Paper%20_%20March%202014.pdf">http://eu-chinasmartcities.eu/sites/default/files/Smart_City_report_draft%20White%20Paper%20_%20March%202014.pdf</a>
London_1	Smart London Board. nd. 'Smart London Plan.' <a href="https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/smart_london_plan.pdf">https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/smart_london_plan.pdf</a>
London_2	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'BIS Research Paper No. 135. Global Innovators: International Case Studies on Smart Cities.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249423/bis-13-1217-smart-city-market-opportunities-uk.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249423/bis-13-1217-smart-city-market-opportunities-uk.pdf</a>
London_6	Centre For Cities. 2014. 'Smart Cities.' <a href="http://www.centreforcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/14-05-29-Smart-Cities-briefing.pdf">http://www.centreforcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/14-05-29-Smart-Cities-briefing.pdf</a>
London_7	Commissioned by Huawei From Navigant Consulting, Inc. 2016. 'UK Smart Cities Index Assessment of Strategy and Execution of the UK's Leading Smart Cities.' <a href="http://www-file.huawei.com/~media/CORPORATE/PDF/News/Huawei_Smart_Cities_Report_FINAL.pdf?lang=en">http://www-file.huawei.com/~media/CORPORATE/PDF/News/Huawei_Smart_Cities_Report_FINAL.pdf?lang=en</a>
London_10	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'Smart Cities: Background paper.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf</a>
Los Angeles_16	Brookings, ESADE. 2014. 'Getting Smarter About Smart Cities.' <a href="https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/BMPP_SmartCities.pdf">https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/BMPP_SmartCities.pdf</a>
Melbourne_1	ARUP. 2010. 'Melbourne Smart City.' <a href="http://www.cityofsound.com/files/c40_melbourne_r_report_final_email.pdf">http://www.cityofsound.com/files/c40_melbourne_r_report_final_email.pdf</a>
Mumbai_17	National Institute of Urban Affairs, m2mpaper.com. nd. 'Smart Cities in India - the role of m2m + iot.' <a href="http://cidco-smartcity.niua.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/m2m_paper_NIUA.pdf">http://cidco-smartcity.niua.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/m2m_paper_NIUA.pdf</a>
New York_5	Oracle Public Sector. 2014. 'Oracle's Smart City Platform - Creating a Citywide Nervous System.' <a href="http://www.oracle.com/us/industries/public-sector/smart-city-nervous-system-wp-1950556.pdf">http://www.oracle.com/us/industries/public-sector/smart-city-nervous-system-wp-1950556.pdf</a>
New York_16	Monitor Deloitte. nd. 'Smart cities... Not just the sum of its parts.' <a href="https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/na/Documents/strategy/smart-cities.pdf">https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/na/Documents/strategy/smart-cities.pdf</a>
Portland_1	Portland Bureau of Transportation. 2016. 'Ubiquitous Mobility for Portland.' <a href="https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/Portland%20Vision%20Narrative.pdf">https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/Portland%20Vision%20Narrative.pdf</a>
San Jose_1	City of San Jose. nd. 'Smart City Vision: Making San José America's most innovative city by 2020.' <a href="http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/55021">http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/55021</a>
San Jose_10	Columbia University School of Continuing Education. nd. 'Master of Science in Sustainability Management.' <a href="http://sustainability.ei.columbia.edu/files/2015/02/SUMA-K4360-Sustainability-Technology-and-the-Evolution-of-Smart-Cities-Website.pdf">http://sustainability.ei.columbia.edu/files/2015/02/SUMA-K4360-Sustainability-Technology-and-the-Evolution-of-Smart-Cities-Website.pdf</a>
Seoul_1	ITU-T Technology Watch. 2013. 'Smart Cities Seoul: a case study.' <a href="https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-t/oth/23/01/T23010000190001PDFE.pdf">https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-t/oth/23/01/T23010000190001PDFE.pdf</a>
Seoul_6	GSMA Smart Cities. 2013. 'Guide to Smart Cities The Opportunity for Mobile Operators.' <a href="http://www.gsma.com/connectedliving/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/cj_sc_guide_wp_02_131.pdf">http://www.gsma.com/connectedliving/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/cj_sc_guide_wp_02_131.pdf</a>
Seoul_7	Yasmin Mohd Adnan et al. 2016. 'Comparative Overview of Smart Cities Initiatives: Singapore and Seoul.' <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Haniyati_Hamzah/publication/303288896_Comparative_Overview_of_Smart_Cities_Initiatives_Singapore_and_Seoul/links/573b395608ae9f741b2d7c0a.pdf?origin=publication_list">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Haniyati_Hamzah/publication/303288896_Comparative_Overview_of_Smart_Cities_Initiatives_Singapore_and_Seoul/links/573b395608ae9f741b2d7c0a.pdf?origin=publication_list</a>
Seoul_20	Madhya Pradesh Urban Infrastructure Investment Programme (MPUIIP). nd. 'Report on Case Studies of Smart Cities International Benchmark.' <a href="http://www.mpurban.gov.in/SmartCity/pdf/ReportonInternationalCaseStudies.pdf">http://www.mpurban.gov.in/SmartCity/pdf/ReportonInternationalCaseStudies.pdf</a>
Shanghai_5	Secretariat to the Commission on Strategic Development. 2015. 'Commission on Strategic Development Smart City.' <a href="http://www.cpu.gov.hk/doc/en/commission_strategic_development/csd_3_2015e.pdf">http://www.cpu.gov.hk/doc/en/commission_strategic_development/csd_3_2015e.pdf</a>
Singapore_2	Smart Grid Smart Cities Conference. 2012. 'Practical Integration & Application of Smart Energy in Grids & Cities.' <a href="http://www.iec.ch/meetings/events/pdf/SmartGridAsia2012%588pp%5D_SPEX.pdf">http://www.iec.ch/meetings/events/pdf/SmartGridAsia2012%588pp%5D_SPEX.pdf</a>
Singapore_8	IEC. nd. 'Orchestrating infrastructure for sustainable Smart Cities.' <a href="http://www.iec.ch/whitepaper/pdf/iecWP-smartcities-LR-en.pdf">http://www.iec.ch/whitepaper/pdf/iecWP-smartcities-LR-en.pdf</a>
Singapore_11	Royal Danish Embassy. 2015. 'Co-Creating the Cities of Tomorrow - Danish Smart City Competencies in the Singaporean Market.' <a href="http://singapore.um.dk/da/~media/Singapore/Documents/News/Co-creating%20the%20cities%20of%20tomorrow.pdf">http://singapore.um.dk/da/~media/Singapore/Documents/News/Co-creating%20the%20cities%20of%20tomorrow.pdf</a>
Stockholm_9	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'Smart Cities: Background paper.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/246019/bis-13-1209-smart-cities-background-paper-digital.pdf</a>
Stockholm_11	Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2013. 'BIS Research Paper No. 135. Global Innovators: International Case Studies on Smart Cities.' <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249397/bis-13-1216-global-innovators-international-smart-cities.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249397/bis-13-1216-global-innovators-international-smart-cities.pdf</a>
Vancouver_11	Somayya Madakam, Prof. R. Ramaswamy. 2014. 'Smart Cities - Six Dimensions.' <a href="http://seekdl.org/nm.php?id=2466">http://seekdl.org/nm.php?id=2466</a>
Vienna_5	Kurt Hofstetter, Alexandra Vogl. 2011. 'Smart City Wien'. Vienna's Stepping Stone into the European Future of Technology and Climate.' <a href="http://www.corp.at/archive/CORP2011_237.pdf">http://www.corp.at/archive/CORP2011_237.pdf</a>
Vienna_20	European Parliament. 2014. 'Mapping Smart Cities in the EU.' <a href="http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf">http://www.smartcities.at/assets/Publikationen/Weitere-Publikationen-zum-Thema/mappingsmartcities.pdf</a>