



INTERNATIONAL
INSTITUTE FOR
CRITICAL STUDIES IN
IMPROVISATION

Everyday Improvisation in Public Space: A Literature Review

Chris Worden

January 2020

Introduction

Everyday improvisation in public space is an extremely broad topic, and the structure of this literature review speaks to that. Rather than providing a cohesive overview, I have instead opted to focus on a few select areas and examples of how this phenomenon is discussed in social theory and social science research (particularly sociology and human geography), as well as providing some examples that may be of interest to IICSI in terms of philosophy of improvisation or applications for improvisation. As this is primarily intended to be an internal document for IICSI, I have omitted most of the literature from the field of improvisation studies, since it is already well-known in the organization (most of it having been produced by research associates or staff).

The first section of this literature review deals with embodied actors encountering each other in public space, and how improvisation can be understood to play a constant part in this process. It also raises some questions about public art interventions and the ethics of civil inattention. The second section deals with how human interaction shapes public space itself, and how public space is created out of the contingencies of that interaction. The third section functions as a catch-all section for material that didn't quite fit in the first two sections. Under subheadings, I briefly address the use of improvisation in military studies, how augmented reality games (ARGs) may allow for smartphones to promote rather than inhibit innovative engagement between people in public spaces, and the role of improvisation and social critique in maintaining the neoliberal social order.

Embodied Social Relations and Improvisation in Public

Even in public social situations that require no apparent special attention on the part of the actor, one still continuously adjusts to mitigate against disrupting the flow of interaction (Goffman 1959,

1966, 1971). Improvisational skill and on-the-fly correction are a necessary part of maintaining this public sociability (Goffman 1959, 1966, 1971). As in jazz, one must be able to accompany another player, even (or *especially*) through their errors, if one wants to come off as an ethical and competent player oneself (Goffman 1959; Tomlinson and Lipsitz 2019). As in jazz, part of the smooth navigation of interactions in public space is the ability not to overthink it—to have a practical ease that facilitates these interactions without needing to think of each part of the act, analogous to how playing in an ensemble involves not overthinking so that things may “flow” (Crossley 2007). For practice theorists, this practical ease is social structure trained into the body (Bourdieu 1977; 2000), forming a part of our stock of bodily knowledge. The social structures we embody exist in a state of interplay with our improvisations, and in our interactions, we are never entirely free of our social constraints (Goffman 1959; Bourdieu 1977; Emirbayer and Mische 1998).

In arts-based writing on the socialized basis of improvisation, examples of this line of thought are apparent in Goldman (2010), who discusses the embodied social structures that inform dance improvisation, addresses the importance of constraint as a basis for improvisation, and posits that broadly emancipatory discourses around improvisation tend towards somewhat fantastical narratives of free expression of an authentic self. Vijay Iyer (2019) draws on practice theory while addressing the importance of social positionality, and problematizes discourses of freedom in improvisation studies by highlighting racialized differences in what the meaning of “freedom” entails. In an issue of *Critical Studies in Improvisation*, Coessens (2013, 8) outlines an understanding of everyday improvisation that pulls together similar threads from social theory, discussing improvised responses to the unexpected in everyday life, varying in degree of improvisation along a continuum from “expected unexpectedness” to “unexpected unexpectedness.”

Drawing on a music metaphor themselves, the sociologists Emirbayer and Mische (1998) theorize a “chordal triad” of agency that moves between iterative (drawing on past experience), projective (aiming at producing a given change or other effects), and practical-evaluative (assessing how things are playing out in the here-and-now) registers. The notes in this triad form the basis for the reflexive assessment of our actions and circumstances in the sense deployed by practice theorists (Giddens 1984; Bourdieu 1977). This capacity for reflexive assessment and adjustment is also the basis for institutional critique, allowing actors on the ground to either confirm or contest institutional definitions of reality (Boltanski 2011). All three are always in play to some extent, though different contexts require different emphasis (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). Emirbayer and Mische (1998) thus encourage a pragmatic understanding of agency, always involving the interplay of reiteration and improvisation, or constraint and flexibility.

The expression of an authentic/individualized self that Goldman (2010) identifies in some literature on improvisation does not relate easily to the foundational work of urban sociologist Georg Simmel (1971), for whom selves are the ever-shifting manifestations of relational contexts, fragmentarily constructed from social interactions and positions. Contemporary relational social theories and robust theorizations of intersectionality align well with the Simmelian approach, emphasizing the contingent nature of the self as anchored in social circumstance and structure (Emirbayer 1997; Glenn 2004; Nash 2008). By this logic, improvisation could still be the expression of a “self,” but this self remains the contextual product of shifting social relations.

Members of marginalized groups can have extremely divergent experiences of the world from that which is hegemonically presented as a for-granted reality, and may be inclined to withdraw from the public sphere writ large in order to form subaltern counterpublics for themselves, as in the case of the feminist counterpublics identified by Fraser (1990), or the spaces

created by people with learning disabilities to mitigate against their lived marginalisation (Hall 2004). It is apparent from these necessities that conditions of access to public space (and the ways of improvising within it) cannot be equivalent, and Iyer (2019) notes this explicitly, drawing on examples of police shootings of black men as an example of the racialized power differential that forms the backdrop against which improvisation in public space takes place. Per Goffman (1963), those who are stigmatized can expect to meet with difficulty in public space and public interaction. Disability, racialization, and criminalization are among stigmas that impinge on the experience of one's humanity in public interaction (Goffman 1963). The improvisations that stigmatized people may undertake, and which others make in response to them, can either challenge or reconfirm the social order, and Goffman notes that the hegemonic value set that excludes the stigmatized from equal standing in public life can be upheld by the stigmatized themselves, having internalized those same values (1963).

Many disciplines and much literature discuss the effect of Otherness on agency (of which, as above, improvisation is a critical part) and public interaction. Some examples will be provided here for context. Work in the phenomenology of disability has addressed the disruption of the body and for-granted spatial, social, and temporal relations (Toombs 1995), and the idea that a world that is not amenable to the contributions of people with disabilities is a world that has no logic for their inclusion or presence, and which presents them with barriers that create the "dys-appearance" of their bodies (Paterson and Hughes 1999). Hill Collins (2009) discusses the embodied effects of oppression, and how shifting relationships enact different dimensions of oppression in different public contexts. For Fanon (1967) and Ahmed (2007), whiteness is the dominant metric for bodily interpretation, against which non-white persons are judged, noticed, and ascribed various traits derived from white imaginings of the racialized Other. For Du Bois (1994), the felt scrutiny of a

society configured by whiteness creates a “double consciousness” that carries over into public life and acts as a limit on the horizons of being in public for Black Americans. Beverly Skeggs (1997) has found a similar effect in her study of working-class women in England, whose public subjectivity is moderated by their orientation towards a perceived superior in the position to judge them, a critical voice that is an internalized and ever-present manifestation of the logic of the hierarchy of tastes. As such, they must improvise their presentation of self around this, and their subjectivity is extremely relational—it is not reconcilable to individualized notions of the privileged subject (Skeggs 1997). These versions of deindividualized subjectivity also underpin differences in the understanding of humanity between Western liberal ideas of what a person is versus ontological conceptions from some Global South societies (Menon 2015; Simone 2018).

Part of a privileged existence in public space is a sense of entitlement to what might be called respectful distance and indifference, or what Goffman calls “civil inattention” (Goffman 1966; Hirschauer 2005). People whose categorizations are stigmatized are often seen as fair game to have their presence marked in public space, whether for well-intentioned or ill-intentioned reasons (Goffman 1963). In what appears to be a closely-related vein, Goffman introduces the idea of “open persons” (1966, 126). These are those members of society whose statuses are “considered so meager in sacred value that it may be thought their members have nothing to lose through face engagement, and hence can be engaged at will. None of these persons, it may be noted, has the kind of uniform that can be taken off; none can be off duty during part of the day” (Goffman 1966; 126). Members of stigmatized groups can be said to have some reduced sacred value. There may thus be cause for ethical concern around public art interventions that seek to “disrupt” relations in public space by attempting to include marked others who are merely trying to exist in public without scrutiny. It may also be worth asking how this top-down imposition of a Western, liberal,

public art tradition will fit with a vision of a public sphere that is ideally amenable to decolonizing efforts or the welcoming of migrants from societies that have a different understanding of social ontology, as described above. The question of whom public art is for and how it can best serve an expansive notion of the public is a pressing one (Sharp et al. 2005).

Participatory public art interventions such as those carried out by the group “Improv Everywhere,” which engage in playful disruptions of the flow of public space (Foster 2015), may also run the risk of reinforcing the existing capitalist hierarchy. In its efforts to “challenge capitalism,” Improv Everywhere generally seems to be inconveniencing or otherwise annoying low-level workers—examples include floor staff at a Best Buy location, or a custodian attempting to move garbage through Grand Central Station who needed to radio for help because of the difficulty of continuing with his job during an Improv Everywhere flash mob (Foster 2015).

Taken together, these last two points may form an important future area of investigation for IICSI. Relevant research questions would ask a) whether or not members of marginalized groups are disproportionately targeted as participants in the course of public art interventions, b) what the meaning of such interventions is for people who are targeted by these interventions, and c) what gaps may exist between the interventions as designed versus the desire for public art held by those outside the privileged sector of society that designs and implements them.

The Improvisation of Public Space and Social Relations

Lefebvre (2011) sees space as socially produced, but also necessary to the production of society itself—it is produced through social relations and contributes to producing these relations. He identifies capitalist relations of production as the most dominant factor in the production of public space, and critiques this capitalist domination as eroding its best elements—severely limiting equitable access to the city (Lefebvre 2011). This concern is central in contemporary critical

literature on urban public space, but this literature also reveals how room remains for disruption and contestation from the bottom-up (De Certeau 1984; Franck and Stevens 2006; Hou 2010; Chen 2010; Rojas 2010; Tonkiss 2013; Vium 2016), and Lefebvre (2011) acknowledges that there is always room for subversion and a reciprocal making of space. Even the most seemingly hopeless circumstances allow some room for creative action (Giddens 1984; Fischlin et al. 2013). Various strains of human geography, urban theory, and urban sociology note how space partly emerges from a complex process of constant contestation, contingent, shifting, and improvised practices, with the demarcations and uses of public space being amenable to further modification by these practices (De Certeau 1984; Jacobs 1993; Franck and Stevens 2006; Hou 2010; Tonkiss 2013; Simone 2018).

The uses and movements through space of individuals can lay the groundwork for ongoing uses of these spaces, either formally or informally (De Certeau 1984; Franck and Stevens 2006; Hou 2010; Chen 2010; Tonkiss 2013). Slums and illegal structures may become more or less permanent fixtures in their urban landscapes, despite their provisional nature and precarious position, and appeals to squatters' rights laws can further provide for their preservation (Tonkiss 2013). These informal districts and structures may be fleeting, or extremely durable (Tonkiss 2013; Simone 2018).

Franck and Stevens (2006) refer to the use of public space beyond its intended purpose as the "loosening" of public space. What makes a space "loose" is its capacity for persons within it to broaden the horizon of its acceptable uses (Franck and Stevens 2006), a usage similar to Goldman's (2010) understanding of dance improvisation as a social activity that allows an increased measure of freedom within the social constraints that she calls "tight spaces." For Franck and Stevens (2006), however, these loosening of space can be either impromptu or carefully planned; regularly scheduled or one-offs; disruptive or not. What they have in common are their fixed durations (be

these long or short) (Franck and Stevens 2006). They are temporary in nature, because they take place outside the more secure framework of officially-sanctioned use (Franck and Stevens 2006). Social relations in these spaces have a significant part to play in their loosening, too, and the authors mention the role of those individuals Goffman (1963) calls “open persons”—children and the elderly among them—in “provid[ing] a catalyst for the loosening of space” (Franck and Stevens 2006, 6).

The degree of pliability of a given public space determines its potential for the improvised meeting of needs (Chen 2010). Appropriations of public space allow for marginalized persons who are underserved by public space to modify it to their ends (De Certeau 1984; Hou 2010; Chen 2010; Rojas 2010). Examples in literature on the appropriation of pliable public space exist across various academic disciplines and are far too numerous to survey here comprehensively, but I provide some below.

In examining the appropriation of public space by the practitioners of the more traditional of two forms of *yangge* dance in Beijing, Chen (2010) notes that the vulnerable population of elderly women who are the primary practitioners of the original form of *yangge* cannot easily access the specific kinds of space that are needed to stage it—it requires open space for live drummers, rather than the recorded music associated with the newer form. These open spaces are inaccessible to these dancers due to geographic distance from their neighbourhoods. The results of this accessibility issue are smaller, improvised gatherings that are closer to their homes, but which also generate noise complaints (Chen 2010). However, despite whatever deficiencies the spaces they are appropriating hold, they are functional enough for the improvised making-do that lets the dancers keep dancing (Chen 2010). In so doing, they loosen the contextual understanding of the spaces in which they dance. Buskers looking for a place to make a living also broaden the context of

public spaces by turning them into informal music venues, a tactical move for their urban survival in the De Certeauian sense, but which also has the added benefit of creating playful emotional exchange between performers and people using the space as intended, as studies on Toronto's (Smith 1996) and Montreal's (Wees 2017) busking scenes have shown. Rojas (2010) discusses how members of Latinx communities in Los Angeles, who are relatively less likely to own cars, appropriate public space towards temporary pedestrianization of streets, and the central importance of public transit and cycling in everyday life. In the process, they build strong community ties and assert a claim to public space (Rojas 2010). He points to this appropriation process as a model for a more sustainable understanding and use of public space and urban design (Rojas 2010). In her piece on theatre occupation movements in *Critical Studies in Improvisation*, Agryopoulou (2017) also discusses how improvised relations, uses, and production of public space can arise to fill these bottom-up needs.

The infrastructure that maintains urban space itself frequently depends on improvisation to remain operable (Tonkiss 2013; Rai 2018; Simone 2018). In assessing the politics of urban design, Tonkiss (2013) illustrates the improvised nature of much urban infrastructure, the informal processes that are always essential to urban life, and the diverse set of barely-perceptible relationships between people and things (Amin 2008; Tonkiss 2013). As in jazz, improvisation in public space is generally ensemble work, but the relationships are loosely bounded in space, time, and social dynamics (Lefebvre 2011; Amin 2008; Simone 2018). The improvised nature of infrastructure in poor neighbourhoods in the global South also gives rise to an improvised set of capitalist relations that carry with them their own sets of freedoms and constraints as small-time project entrepreneurs patch gaps in state-provided services (Degani 2018; Simone 2018). These kinds of improvisations and workarounds are often associated with a sort of masculinized notion of

jovial-yet-daring self-reliance, as in the “cowboy” attitudes of unlicensed urban electricians in Dar es Salaam, who operate without the blessings of the official service provider and play a sort of cat-and-mouse game with its regulators (Degani 2018). However, as with other forms of improvisation, this freedom has its costs—the circumstances that necessitate the improvisation speak to the constraints on the actors (Degani 2018; Simone 2018). With this in mind, Rai (2018) points out the incompleteness of the playful, daring, and masculinized image of the contemporary *jugaadu* in India, highlighting the *jugaad* practices of lower-class Indian women, who are no less inventive in their enterprises to work around both the accepted framework of mobile telecommunications and patriarchal structure, or to splice together a cable connection from their neighbour’s feed. These infrastructural components of public-spatial assemblages function as sites for the relational working out of identity, and in this regard, are not dissimilar to the digital overlay on public space that features in the next small section of this lit review.

A future realm of investigation for IICSI that would lend itself well to a pragmatic, critical, empirically-grounded, and bottom-up understanding of how public space can be reimagined would be identifying local “loosenings” of public space that fit with IICSI’s political-ethical orientation, and assessing their practices and meanings in collaboration with the people doing the loosening, in order to determine what these already-existing practices can tell us about missing needs in a given local context. Such an approach could provide a firm grounding for policy intervention, advocacy, and activism.

This sort of bottom-up approach is a component of the overarching orientation towards academic “accompaniment” for social movements suggested by Tomlinson and Lipsitz (2019) and aligns well with Boltanski’s (2011) pragmatic sociology of critique or sociology of emancipation. Such a bottom-up approach to understanding the immediate contingencies of social problems may

pair well with an overarching critical position (Boltanski 2011), without having academics apply an unreasonable amount of pressure to the interpretation of the situations in which social justice movements work (Tomlinson and Lipsitz 2019; Boltanski 2011). This places academics in a support role to the people for whom they wish to advocate, rather than at the forefront—the use of “accompaniment” here coming being derived explicitly from the jazz metaphor (Tomlinson and Lipsitz 2019).

Additional Considerations Around Improvisation in Public Space

This section of the literature review is home to a set of small asides that are worth additional investigation or contemplation, but which did not sit easily within other sections of this paper. Here, I briefly discuss three other ways of thinking through improvisation and the construction of public space—the first is a brief discussion of improvisation as it appears in military studies, while the second briefly discusses an example of digital overlays on public space, mediated by smartphones, and using geographic information service (GIS)-based augmented reality games (ARGs) as an example. The third concerns how improvisation can serve as a means of upholding, rather than undermining, the neoliberal order.

Military Applications of Improvisation in the (Literal) Contestation and Construction of Public Space

While much of the literature that specifically addresses improvisation in public space would appear to treat it as inherently “good,” it is worth noting that even organizations like the Israeli Defense Force engage in skillful improvisation as they work to define the socio-spatial parameters of public space in occupied Palestinian territory (Marcus 2019). For residents of occupied Palestine, everyday improvisation in public space of course often involves reckoning with these improvisational

capacities of the IDF. It is worth considering what everyday interaction in public space looks like in different circumstances, and how improvisation as a means of conducting action in that space can be divorced from the value sets of improvisation studies.

The above example of improvisation by the IDF is representative of a tradition of military studies literature that engages specifically with improvisation in the context of small-unit tactics. Another example of this would be studies on combat improvisations by soldiers of the Red Army as they repelled Hitler's forces at Stalingrad (Stone 2009; Brady 2011). These studies may also seek to provide a context for their adoption from the improvised small-unit level into a codified military doctrine within the overarching command-and-control structure (Brady 2011).

Such blending of military studies (as well as management studies) to discuss the organizational capacity for improvisation spans a much longer history than this, however—Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*, written roughly 2500 years ago, has provided a military and business management scholars with a philosophy of navigating conflict via flexibility, adaptability, and unpredictability (Lee et al. 1998; Watson 2007). This extends from small unit tactics to general strategy, as well as an overall orientation towards goal attainment, which is meant to follow (in part) from a general capacity for improvisation.

Augmented Reality Games and the Digital Overlay on Public Space

In 2016, Pokémon GO became an immensely successful ARG, reaching prominence in the mainstream consciousness. At its peak, 45 million people played this game per day, which involves moving through physical (and mostly public) space in search of GIS-mapped CGI creatures that are overlaid in physical space as captured on via the cameras and screens of their smartphones (Feldman 2018). The developers of the game explicitly invited new ways of seeing and moving

through public space, and encouraged exploration, some of which ran afoul of authorities, as the game did not tend to differentiate between public and restricted areas (Feldman 2018).

While social commentators lamented what they saw as a further excuse to retreat from public interaction and into the distraction provided by a smartphone, there were also ways in which the game functioned as a “social catalyst” (Humphreys 2017). By providing a specific, goal-oriented, gamified task that required individual action, players were encouraged to take new approaches to—and interest in—navigating and interacting with their neighbourhoods (Humphreys 2017).

A dominant understanding of smartphones appears to be that they provide an updated version of an “involvement shield” (Goffman 1963), though this involves extending the use of this term from Goffman’s original meaning (Ayaß 2014; Humphreys 2017). In this sense, the mobile involvement shield provided by a smartphone allows people to be present in public while also signaling that they are occupied, and thus not interested in or available for interaction (Ayaß 2014). Humphreys (2017) suggests that it matters what is being done with the phone—playing a GIS-based ARG like Pokémon GO can also facilitate human interaction (as when friends play together or strangers communicate about where to find particular creatures) and greater engagement with public space, which necessarily entails at least some form of engagement with people in public, for better or worse (Humphreys 2017; Feldman 2018). The capacity of such technologies to encourage new orientations towards being in public may be worth examining in the context of IICSI, particularly where explicitly cooperative games that may facilitate strangers voluntarily meeting and interacting in public space could be concerned.

Improvisation and the Maintenance of the Neoliberal Order

Much of the literature on improvisational pedagogy which transposes the logic of musical ensemble work and accompaniment to the realm of public (or quasi-public) interaction is oriented towards

precisely the sort of predictability-in-unpredictable-circumstances that helps to maintain order. Some of this is geared expressly towards neoliberal managerial ends (or military studies, as seen above), and a special issue of *Critical Studies in Improvisation* problematized the appropriation of the jazz metaphor to these ends (Laver 2013; Laver et al. 2013). The foundational literature in this realm is not addressed in this literature review, due to the fact that it does not constitute a “public space” orientation in and of itself (mostly being concerned with internal corporate doctrine and training programs), as well as its having already been addressed by the special issue of *Critical Studies in Improvisation*. Here, I only wish to very briefly summarize what makes neoliberal managerialism amenable to (and, in fact, able to thrive from) incorporation of concepts associated with improvisation.

Boltanski and Chiapello (2018) have illustrated the extent to which critiques of capitalism from the 60s onwards, often rooted in arts-critical traditions, have resulted in the neoliberal model handily absorbing these critiques in order to further legitimate itself. In so doing, it adopts flexibility and creativity as values, humanizes capitalist production, and becomes a more loosely-networked, elastic phenomenon (Boltanski and Chiapello 2018). *Jugaad*, a term commonly used in India to refer to improvisational workarounds, “hacks,” or “provisional agency,” and often associated with subaltern practices (Rai 2015; 2018), is an example of an improvisatory orientation that has been co-opted swiftly by the growth- and innovation-oriented logic of neoliberalism in the Indian context (Prabhu and Jain 2015; Rai 2018), and even by police officers in Uttar Pradesh to justify their corrupt practices in the interest of expediting their various job-related tasks (Jauregui 2014). Rai (2015; 2018) demonstrates how mobile phone companies deploy jugaad towards their ends, even as their end users make use of jugaad practices to wring more value for their money from those same companies. The assumption should be made that forms of improvisation, unable to be

divorced from action in general, will inevitably transcend value sets, even (or, in the current late capitalist context, especially) as they come from the bottom up.

Conclusion

As discussed above, much of contemporary social theory around agency and practice holds that improvisation always plays a part in any action. I subscribe to this view. As such, it appears to me that nearly any discussion of any behaviour in public can be taken as a discussion of improvisation in public space, whether “improvisation” is used as an explicit term or not. I have tried to address a range of topics within the constraints of this literature review—some in greater depth than others—in order to illustrate just a few examples of how we can think about everyday improvisation in public space, and to provide a jumping-off point for further examination of some topics that may be of philosophical or applied interest to IICSI. Some key areas of investigation for anyone wishing to read further would be in the areas of practice theory, urban sociology, phenomenological sociology, human geography, digital humanities, management studies, military studies, and cognitive neuroscience. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but the literature contained in this review spans these fields and more.

References

- Ahmed, Sara. 2007. "A Phenomenology of Whiteness." *Journal of Feminist Theory* 8 (2): 149–168.
- Argyropoulou, Gigi. 2017. "Destituent Spaces, Fugitive Practices and Improvised Institutions between Collectivity and Critique: Searching for the Threshold of Articulability." *Journal for Research Cultures* 1 (2).
- Ayaß, Ruth. 2014. "Using Media as Involvement Shields." *Journal of Pragmatics, Participation framework revisited: (new) media and their audiences/users*, 72 (October): 5–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.003>.
- Amin, Ash. 2008. "Collective Culture and Urban Public Space." *City* 12 (1): 5–24.
- Boltanski, Luc. 2011. *On Critique: A Sociology of Emancipation*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Eve Chiapello. 2018. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- . 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Brady, Malcolm. 2011. "Improvisation versus Rigid Command and Control at Stalingrad." *Journal of Management History* 17 (1): 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17511341111099565>.
- Chen, Caroline. 2010. "Dancing in the streets of Beijing: improvised uses within the urban system." In *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. Edited by Jeffrey Hou. New York: Routledge.
- Coessens, Kathleen. 2013. "Humans, Heroes and Artists: (Re)Creating the Unexpected Situation." *Critical Studies in Improvisation / Études Critiques En Improvisation* 8 (2).
<https://doi.org/10.21083/csieci.v8i2.2140>.
- Crossley, Nick. 2007. "Researching Embodiment by Way of 'Body Techniques.'" *The Sociological Review* 55: 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00694.x>.

- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Degani, Michael. 2018. "SHOCK HUMOR: Zaniness and the Freedom of Permanent Improvisation in Urban Tanzania." *Cultural Anthropology* 33 (3): 473–98.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1994. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Dover.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1997. "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology." *The American Journal of Sociology* 103 (2): 281–317.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Ann Mische. 1998. "What is Agency?" *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (4): 962–1023.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feldman, Benjamin. 2018. "Agency and Governance: Pokémon-Go and Contested Fun in Public Space." *Geoforum* 96: 289–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.08.025>.
- Fischlin, Daniel, Ajay Heble, and George Lipsitz. 2013. *The Fierce Urgency of Now: Improvisation, Rights, and the Ethics of Cocreation*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. 2015. "Why Not 'Improv Everywhere'?" *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Theater*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199917495.013.10>.
- Franck, Karen A., and Quentin Stevens. 2006. *Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text* 25/26: 56–80. <https://doi.org/10.2307/466240>.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2004. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1966. *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.
- . 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- . 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goldman, Danielle. 2010. *I Want to Be Ready: Improvised Dance As a Practice of Freedom*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P.
- Hall, Edward. 2004. "Social Geographies of Learning Disability: Narratives of Exclusion and Inclusion." *Area* 36 (3): 298–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0004-0894.2004.00227.x>.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. 2009. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirschauer, Stefan. 2005. "On Doing Being a Stranger: The Practical Constitution of Civil Inattention." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 35 (1): 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8308.2005.00263.x>.
- Hou, Jeffrey. 2010. "(Not) Your Everyday Public Space." In *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. Edited by Jeffrey Hou. New York: Routledge.
- Humphreys, Lee. 2017. "Involvement Shield or Social Catalyst: Thoughts on Sociospatial Practice of Pokémon GO." *Mobile Media & Communication* 5 (1): 15–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157916677864>.

- Iyer, Vijay. 2019. "Beneath Improvisation." *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Concepts in Music Theory*. Edited by Alexander Rehding and Steven Rings. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1993. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Modern Library.
- Jauregui, Beatrice. 2014. "Provisional Agency in India: Jugaad and Legitimation of Corruption." *American Ethnologist* 41 (1): 76–91
- Laver, Mark. 2013. "Improvise!™: Jazz Consultancy and the Aesthetics of Neoliberalism." *Critical Studies in Improvisation / Études critiques en improvisation* 9 (1).
- Laver, Mark, Ajay Heble, and Tina Piper. 2013. "Ethics and the Improvising Business." *Critical Studies in Improvisation / Études critiques en improvisation* 9(1).
- Lee, S., Roberts, P., Lau, W., & Bhattacharyya, S. 1998. "Sun Tzu's The Art of War as business and management strategies for world class business excellence evaluation under QFD methodology." *Business Process Management Journal* 4 (2): 96–113.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14637159810212299>.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2011. *The Production of Space*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Marcus, Raphael D. 2019. "Learning 'Under Fire': Israel's Improvised Military Adaptation to Hamas Tunnel Warfare." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 42 (3–4): 344–70.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2017.1307744>.
- Menon, Nivedita. 2015. "Is Feminism about 'Women?'" *Economic and Political Weekly* 50 (17): 37–44.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-Thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89: 1–15.
- Paterson, Kevin, and Bill Hughes. 1999. "Disability Studies and Phenomenology: The Carnal Politics of Everyday Life." *Disability & Society* 14 (5): 597–610.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599925966>.

- Prabhu, Jaideep, and Sanjay Jain. 2015. "Innovation and Entrepreneurship in India: Understanding Jugaad." *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 32 (4): 843–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-015-9445-9>.
- Rai, Amit. 2018. *Jugaad Time: Ecologies of Everyday Hacking in India*. Durham: Duke UP.
- . 2015. "The Affect of Jugaad: Frugal Innovation and Postcolonial Practice in India's Mobile Phone Ecology." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 33 (6): 985–1002.
- Rojas, James. 2010. "Latino urbanism in Los Angeles: a model for urban improvisation and reinvention." In *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. Edited by Jeffrey Hou. New York: Routledge.
- Sharp, Joanne, Venda Pollock, and Ronan Paddison. 2005. "Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration." *Urban Studies* 42 (5–6): 1001–23.
- Simmel, Georg. 1971. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Edited by Donald N. Levine. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Simone, AbdouMaliq. 2018. *Improvised Lives: Rhythms of Endurance in an Urban South*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Skeggs, Beverley. 1997. *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable*. London: SAGE.
- Smith, Murray. 1996. "Traditions, Stereotypes, and Tactics: A History of Musical Buskers in Toronto." *Canadian Journal for Traditional Music* 24: 6–22.
- Stone, David R. 2009. "Stalingrad and the Evolution of Soviet Urban Warfare." *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 22 (2): 195–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13518040902918089>.
- Tomlinson, Barbara, and George Lipsitz. 2019. *Insubordinate Spaces: Improvisation and Accompaniment for Social Justice*. Philadelphia: Temple UP.
- Tonkiss, Fran. 2013. *Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Toombs, S. Kay. 1995. "The Lived Experience of Disability." *Human Studies* 18 (1): 9–23.
- Vium, Christian. 2016. "Enacting Immanent Potentialities: Tchib-tchib Strategies at the Centre of the Urban Fringe in Nouakchott, Mauritania." *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 37 (3): 343–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12158>.
- Watson, Scott A. 2007. *The Art of War for Security Managers: 10 Steps to Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Wees, Nick. 2017. "Improvised Performances: Urban Ethnography and the Creative Tactics of Montreal's Metro Buskers." *Humanities* 6 (3): 67.