M@n@gement

All for One, One for All! From Events to Organizational Dynamics in Fluid Organization

Anthony Hussenot*

Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS-GREDEG, UMR

Abstract

This article examines the emergence of organizational dynamics in the context of fluid organizational phenomena. To do so, three organizational dynamics are studied: (1) identity, (2) actorhood, and (3) interconnected instances of decision-making. To study how these three organizational dynamics take shape in the context of fluid organizational phenomena, I rely on the events-based approach and a case study of makers operating in a makerspace in the Paris region. The results show, on the one hand, that the collective of makers enacts a structure of past, present, and future events that participates in the definition of a common frame of reference and, on the other hand, that this common frame of reference plays a role in the emergence of organizational dynamics. On the basis of this result, my main contribution is to show the role of the eventalization – that is, the definition, configuration and narration by the actors of past, present, and future events – in the definition of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena. This article contributes on the one hand to the literature on fluid organizational phenomena, and on the other hand to the literature on makers working in makerspaces.

'We're all self-employed, but we feel like we're in the same firm'

(Informal conversation with a maker at ICI Montreuil, November 2014).

'Everyone has different objectives, but we are all together'

(Semi-directive interview with the person in charge of the ICI Montreuil workshops, December 2014).

The classical conception of organization is nowadays shaken by the liquefaction of society and work (Bauman, 2000; Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2014, 2018) and the projectification of work and life (Jensen et al., 2016; Lundin et al., 2015). This leads to the emergence of organizational phenomena that can be described as fluid (Schreyögg & Sydow, 2010) and open (Dobusch et al., 2019),[1] in which activities and relationships are constantly changing, members are not clearly identified, and boundaries are permeable (Blagoev et al., 2019; Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015). Examples are collectives of self-employed workers (Burke, 2015; Hussenot & Sergi, 2018),[2] such as freelancers (Burke, 2015), coworkers (Spinuzzi, 2012), and makers (Anderson, 2012) whose activities are based solely on various projects, while business relationships are temporary and constantly renewed. In this context, the organizational dynamics that enable workers to collaborate do not derive from modalities imposed on the actors but are situated. As a result, the organization is usually informal – that is, there are no predefined rules or governance imposed on the actors – or semi-informal, especially when autonomous and independent actors collectively define the rules, such as working hours for people working in a coworking space (Blagoev et al., 2019).

[1.] I propose to retain only the expression 'fluid organizational phenomenon' in the remainder of this article in order to emphasize the evolving and constantly changing nature of the organizational phenomena I propose to study. On the other hand, the expression 'open organization' seems more ambiguous, as it sometimes refers to phenomena with predefined boundaries in which there may be a certain openness to the outside (business networks, ecosystems, etc.) and/or in the internal decision-making processes.

[2.] That is, workers who have a legal status of self-employment, resulting in the absence of superiors or subordinates. There is therefore no legal relationship of subordination between these workers and their coworkers.

*Corresponding author: Anthony Hussenot, Email: anthony.hussenot@univ-cotedazur.fr

Thus, despite the fact that formal coordination modalities are not being imposed on the actors, the literature shows that some workers – and in particular self-employed workers working in shared workspaces – can develop organizational dynamics that allow a sense of community to emerge and collective action modalities to be defined (Garrett et al., 2017; Mitev et al., 2019). In order to understand how organizational dynamics can manifest themselves in fluid organizational phenomena, the notion of 'organizationality' was suggested by Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015). Based on this notion, the organization can be considered as an adverb (Schoeneborn et al., 2019). This means that the organization is what specified the organizing process (just as it is the adverb that specifies the verb). In other words, the organization is neither an entity nor simply an activity but is what qualifies the activities. This approach recognizes the existence of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena, but emphasizes their emergent, situated, and in-becoming nature. Taking the notion of organizationality as the starting point, the authors invite us to rethink three classical organizational dynamics[3] that are, according to them, constitutive of any organizational phenomenon (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015): (1) identity, (2) actorhood, and (3) interconnected instances of decision-making. Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015) thus propose an interesting approach, as they invite us to study how organizational dynamics are produced and reproduced by actors, despite the permanent evolution of members, activities, and relationships.

This work also highlights the need for a common frame of reference for the emergence and maintenance of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena (Blagoev et al., 2019; Schreyögg & Sydow, 2010). Of course, this frame of reference is not the one classically found in companies and administrations, because in fluid organizational phenomena there is no common legal entity nor link through subordination. Furthermore, collaborations between workers are often informal and temporary. In this sense, the classical literature on organization theory[4] – which is based on the hypothesis that the organization is largely a product of the decisions of its leaders in terms of organizational design around major factors that are imposed on the actors (definition, division, and then coordination of work, number of hierarchical levels, etc.) – seems

irrelevant to the study of the nature of the common frame of reference in fluid organizational phenomena.

In short, the notion of organizationality makes an important contribution to the understanding of fluid organizational phenomena, and it opens on the unresolved question of the nature of the frame of reference that allows actors to define the organizational dynamics necessary for their collective activities. In order to deepen our understanding of fluid organizational phenomena, this article therefore proposes to address the nature and originality of the frame of reference that is defined by the actors in fluid organizational phenomena and that allows the emergence of organizational dynamics, including identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making.

To carry out this research, I have drawn on the literature that has emphasized the importance of temporality in the formation of societies (Adam, 1990; Bluedorn, 2002; Sorokin & Merton, 1937; Zerubavel, 1981) and organizational phenomena (Chia, 2002; Hernes et al., 2013; Reinecke & Ansari, 2017). I take this literature on board, in considering that temporality is what allows a form of social coordination and regulation to emerge, despite the fluidity of the organizational phenomenon. For Bergson (2009[1907]), for example, temporality is what makes any collective experience intelligible. Sorokin and Merton (1937), for their part, showed that temporality is what makes the coordination and regulation of social life possible. More generally, Moore (1963) showed that all activity requires the definition of a temporality, because the meaning of what happens emerges from the construction of a temporality specific to the moment experienced (Mead, 1932).

Based on this positioning in the literature on temporality (Hernes et al., 2013; Reinecke & Ansari, 2017), the theoretical framework used in this article is the events-based approach, which was developed to understand how actors collectively define a temporality, that is, a narrative of past, present, and future events that participate in the definition of the organizational phenomenon (Danner-Schröder, 2018; Hernes, 2014a, 2014b, 2017; Hussenot, 2019; Hussenot et al., 2021; Hussenot & Missonier, 2016). In this research, therefore, I rely on the events-based approach and, in particular, on the idea that organizational phenomena take shape in structures of past, present, and future events that are enacted by the actors (Hernes, 2014a; Hussenot & Missonier, 2016).

In addition, this research is based on data from a case study of makers operating in a makerspace in France. The makers are self-employed workers engaged in the development of innovative products and services, residing in a shared workspace called a makerspace where they have access to the resources they need to carry out their projects (Dougherty, 2012; Hatch, 2013). Not only do these self-employed workers enjoy a great deal of freedom in their modes of collaboration, but they also

---

[3.] I will use the notion of organizational dynamics to underline the permanent effort that must be made by the actors to produce and maintain them, especially in the context of fluid organizational phenomena. By contrast, the notion of organizational characteristics that is sometimes found in the literature on organization theory may refer to the hypothesis that the organization is endowed with intrinsic properties.

[4.] I refer here to the theoretical corpus based on the hypothesis that the organization is an economic or social entity with its own structure that forces the actors to conform to it. For a critical analysis of this conception of organization, see, for example, the work of Chia (1995, 2003).

work in business sectors that sometimes differ greatly and participate in various projects with stakeholders who may or may not be members of the makerspace.

The main result of this research is to show that, on the one hand, the collective of makers enacts a structure of past, present, and future events that participates in the definition of a common frame of reference and, on the other hand, that this common frame of reference plays a role in the emergence of organizational dynamics (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making). The results thus show that the enacted structure of events guides the re/production of organizational dynamics, which in turn reinforces the enactment of the structure of events.

Based on this result, the main contribution consists in suggesting the notion of eventalization[5] and showing its role in the definition of organizational dynamics specific to fluid organizational phenomena. Eventalization here means the collective endeavor to define, configure, and narrate past, present, and future events. I thus highlight the sometimes deliberate attempt of the actors to define such a narrative, out of which a definition of the modalities of collaboration can emerge. On the one hand, this article contributes to the literature on fluid organizational phenomena by showing how eventalization contributes to the production of a common frame of reference from which various organizational dynamics can emerge. On the other hand, this research contributes to the literature on makers working in makerspaces by showing the role of the founders and staff of these spaces in defining the structure of events and, ultimately, organizational dynamics.

The article is structured as follows: the first part introduces the notion of the fluid organizational phenomenon and presents the three organizational dynamics associated with it (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making). The second part presents the events-based approach that I employ to study the formation of the three organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena. The third part introduces the case study. This part presents the maker movement, as well as the data collection and process of analysis. The fourth part presents the structure of past, present, and future events enacted by the actors and analyzes the relationship between this structure of events and the three organizational dynamics (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making). The last part discusses the

contributions and limitations of this research. In particular, I discuss the role and importance of eventalization in the definition of organizational dynamics in the particular context of fluid organizational phenomena.

Studying organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena

The notion of organization has been undergoing a conceptual renewal in recent years. Long defined as a social or economic entity (Chia, 2003; March & Simon, 1958) – mainly inspired by the iron cage metaphor proposed by Weber (1978[1922]) – the advent of a so-called liquid society (Bauman, 2000; Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2014, 2018) and the emergence of fluid (Schreyögg & Sydow, 2010) and open (Dobusch et al., 2019) organizational phenomena have led researchers in organization theory to question this idea of organization. Using the notion of organizing, Weick (1979) was probably among the first to challenge the idea that the organization is simply an entity in which rationalized and mechanized activities take place. By making organization a verb and not a noun – which is translated by the suffix 'ing' in the word 'organizing' – Weick (1979) was trying to show that an organization is not a given thing, but a phenomenon that is continually re-produced in practice. In this sense, the notion of organizing highlights the organizing process specific to each activity. However, the criticism that can be made of Karl E. Weick is that he seems to consider organizing as an internal process within companies and administrations. In short, for Weick (1979), an organization remains an entity within which it is possible to observe organizing processes. Actually, the development of the notion of organizing is mainly based on the example of the Ford Motor Company as an organization, while the author often uses the idea of organizations and members of organizations as if they were predefined entities.

With the notion of organizationality, Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015), Schoeneborn et al. (2019), and Blagoev et al. (2019) propose going further and invite us to understand organization not as a noun or a verb, but as the process of qualifying the organizing, that is, the qualification of what emerges from activities and allows them to be realized. By proposing this notion for the study of fluid organizational phenomena, the authors aim to study how organizational phenomena can emerge when there are no formal coordination methods, no clear definition of members, no boundaries, and a weak attachment of actors to the collective (Blagoev et al., 2019; Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; Schoeneborn et al., 2019). More specifically, Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015) invite us to look at fluid organizational phenomena based on the study of three interrelated organizational dynamics that are specific to all organizational phenomena: (1) identity, (2) actorhood, and (3) interconnected instances of

---

[5.] The notion of eventalization was first suggested by Foucault (2000[1978] p. 226). For the philosopher, the eventalization is a methodological approach consisting in 'making visible a *singularity* at places where there is a temptation to invoke a historical constant, an immediate anthropological trait or an obviousness that imposes itself uniformly on all.' Following the events-based approach, the notion of eventalization is here used as a way to focus on how actors re/define and narrate past, present, and future events that help them to define and legitimate who they are, their purpose, and what they do.

decision-making.[6] The objective is to understand how these dynamics emerge and qualify the organizational phenomenon, despite its fluidity.

Of course, the study of these organizational dynamics leads us to take certain precautions, as these have traditionally been approached within the conceptual framework of formal organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011), that is, according to an approach that defines the organization as a social or economic entity governed by predefined coordination modalities. However, this approach of the organization is not relevant to the study of fluid organizational phenomena, as we are dealing here with situated coordination modalities that emerge in the context of constantly evolving activities and relationships. In short, it is a question of studying organizational dynamics in phenomena that do not conform to the criteria of the so-called formal organization (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011), but which, on the contrary, are characterized by their openness and permanent evolution. This, therefore, requires a redefinition of these three dynamics, in order to take into consideration the fact that organizational dynamics are always situated and in a constant state of becoming.

First, identity – that is, organizational identity – is an organizational dynamic that was re-examined some time ago, notably by anchoring the debate in the processual approach (Schultz et al., 2012). Specifically, it is this organizational dynamic that was chosen by Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015) to develop the notion of organizationality. From this perspective, identity is the process by which actors define who they collectively are and how they are individuated (Hatch & Schultz, 2017; Hernes & Schultz, 2017). This definition is quite far from the early works on organizational identity, which favored a static approach that consisted of hypothesizing lasting characteristics of the organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Deephouse, 1999, Whetten & Mackey, 2002). With the processual approach, identity is considered to be continually re/produced in practice (Schultz et al., 2012). Organizational identity is thus an ongoing collective accomplishment (Schultz & Hernes, 2013) that is partly, a linguistic object produced in conversations and other textual forms (Hardy et al., 2005, p. 62). In this approach, organizational identity is defined through personal and shared narratives, but also through the narratives that others may create (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). In this sense, identity is the continually reproduced result of narratives that are negotiated and shared in interactions.

Next, actorhood can be understood to be the qualities attributed to a phenomenon that participate in its identification. These are the attributions that define and qualify a phenomenon and that, ultimately, contribute to its reification. In the case of organizational phenomena, this allows the collective to speak with a single voice and/or to be recognized as a whole. For other people, the definition of an actorhood makes it possible to address this whole directly (Drepper, 2005). Traditionally, the organization has been defined as a social actor recognized as such by society (King et al., 2010). However, this approach to the notion of the social actor is problematic because it assumes that there is no distinction between the organization and its actorhood. While this approach may seem relevant when talking about companies or administrations – in this case the social actor is most often equated with the name of the company or administration – the study of fluid organizational phenomena presupposes a disconnection between the organizational phenomenon and its actorhood, because the organizational phenomenon is constantly in motion; whereas its actorhood is relatively stable. This is the case, for example, with social movements (the yellow vest movement, the Arab Spring, etc.) which are referred to by a name as if they were a whole, whereas sometimes there is no stable leader, no stable structure, and the people adhering to the movement and its demands are constantly changing. In this, we can recognize the need for actors to build stable images of a world in constant motion, as the philosopher Bergson (2010[1896]) reminds us. Moreover, although it is difficult to circumscribe the organizational phenomenon, the resulting actorhood may have an active role that sometimes escapes its members. In this sense, it is an actor in the sense given by Latour (2006), that is, a non-human actor that gains a form of autonomy, because actors act according to characteristics attributed to the social actor. For example, a government may take specific decisions to counter a social movement, based on the enduring characteristics attributed to that social movement, despite the permanent evolution of demands and the fact that there may not be a spokesman. For Latour (2009), it is a question of understanding how we create these non-human creatures that gradually escape from their creators to the point of appearing autonomous and endowed with will. In organization theory, this idea is partly found in the Constitutive Communication of Organization (Cooren et al., 2011) – which inspired the notion of organizationality (Schoeneborn et al., 2019) – according to which the organization can seem to be an entity that emerges from the human collective, because it itself becomes a non-human that seems to have a capacity for action (Nicotera, 2013).

---

6. It is important to note that for Dobusch and Schoeneborn (2015, p. 1006), these three dynamics are interconnected: 'Our notion of organizationality draws on the idea that social collectives are 'organizational' on the basis of three criteria: first, they are characterized by interconnected instances of decision-making (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011); second, these instances of decision-making are attributed to a collective entity or actor (King et al., 2010); third, collective identity is accomplished through speech acts that aim to delineate what the entity or actor is or does ('identity claims'; see Bartel & Dutton, 2001).' I will follow this approach, but in this article, I will carry out an analytical dissection that will allow us to study the formation of these various dynamics.

Finally, the organizational dynamic named 'interconnected instances of decision-making' refers to the emergence of collective decisions regarding the activities and/or coordination modalities of the actors, despite the independence of each and the absence of governance. Once again, we need to take certain precautions in defining this organizational dynamic, because according to the classical conception of the organization, organizations are defined social orders (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011). This definition has its origin in the seminal works of March and Simon (1958) and Simon (1975). Here again, the notion of organizationality invites us not to reduce the organization to this, but to recognize that individuals can make collective decisions, without those decisions being backed by formal systems of coordination. In this context, collective decisions are not first defined and then imposed on actors, but emerge through practices and are made explicit, justified, and legitimated by actors in order to encourage other actors to make the same choices. To this, it should be added that collective choices are related to collective identity and are partly defined by it as much as they participate in its definition (Bartel & Dutton, 2001). This dynamic can be observed in particular in a community of practices in which collective choices can emerge, despite the absence of formal coordination systems. Clothing, cultural, and political choices can be made collectively, encouraging all stakeholders to comply with them. Respecting these choices makes it possible both to carry out collective activities and to maintain a common identity. Collective choices are thus understood as communication to the actors about what is expected of them (Ahrne et al., 2016). This research is thus concerned with understanding the forms taken by these communications about what is expected by actors and how this contributes to the emergence of collective incentives.

In short, these three organizational dynamics are concerned with the way in which actors define who they are, the role they wish to play as social actors, and the way in which certain collective choices are made, despite the fluidity of organizational phenomena. However, the empirical application of these three organizational dynamics presents a major difficulty, which is the emergent and non-binding nature of the coordination systems. More precisely, the difficulty lies in identifying the common frame of reference that allows the emergence of organizational dynamics, despite the absence of formal coordination systems. Since this reference framework is not defined by coordination modalities, I propose to apprehend it via the temporality produced by the actors, that is, the past, present, and future events collectively enacted by them (see next section), which contributes to defining a common narrative. In short, I adhere to the idea that a frame of reference is necessary for the emergence of fluid organizational phenomena, but I propose, following the work in organization studies that has given primacy to temporality in

the analysis of organizational phenomena (Hernes, 2014a; Reinecke & Ansari, 2017), to focus on how the collective definition of a temporality contributes to the emergence and evolution of the three organizational dynamics presented in this section. To this end, I use the events-based approach, which aims to study the formation of structures of past, present, and future events participating in the formation of organizational phenomena (Danner-Schröder, 2018; Hernes, 2014a, 2014b, 2017; Hussenot, 2019; Hussenot et al., 2021; Hussenot & Missonier, 2016).

Transcribing the emergence of organizational dynamics with the events-based approach

The events-based approach has its origins in the process view in organization theory (Hussenot, 2016; Langley & Tsoukas, 2010, 2017) and in various works that use the notion of an event to analyze organizational phenomena (Chia, 1999; Cobb, 2007; Cooper, 2014; Deroy, 2009; Deroy & Clegg, 2011). Generally speaking, this approach considers that a lived moment only has meaning if the actors are capable of situating it within a temporality, that is, a definition and an arrangement of past, present, and future events (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). Temporality is therefore the social construct from which the actors define the history, the present, and the anticipated future of their lived moment. More precisely, temporality is what creates a form of continuity in activities. By continuity, I mean that the lived moment can be experienced by actors as being part of a past, a present, and a future (Hussenot et al., 2021). However, continuity does not necessarily mean stability. Changes, ruptures, and novelties also help to define a form of continuity, as they allow actors to inscribe their lived moment within a coherent narrative, even though it may be punctuated by changes.

The notion of event is therefore central to the events-based approach. It can be defined as a moment during which the world occurs (Whitehead, 1978[1929]). The nature, duration, and meaning of events are therefore not predefined, but depend on what the actors are experiencing. This means that there is no *a priori* categorization of events. Actors define the events that are important to them on the basis of facts and experiences, whether or not they are directly experienced. The events enacted can relate, for example, to distant historical facts that have not been experienced by the actors, or to an imagined future. The notion of enactment thus expresses the way in which events are defined/redefined and configured/reconfigured to define a temporality. Etymologically, the idea of the event comes both from the Latin word *eventum*, that is, that which is taking place, and from the word *eventus*, that is, that which has happened and/or is expected (Deroy, 2009). The *eventum* is thus the lived moment, while the *eventus* refers to

past, present, and future events that are considered to be outside the lived moment.[7]

Although the enactment of events is most often a personal and implicit experience – which is partly the intellectual project of the phenomenological philosophy of Heidegger (1990[1927]) and Husserl (1964[1928]) – the events-based approach presented here is concerned with the collective dynamics of enactment. This means that the events-based approach is concerned with the way actors collectively and explicitly define, configure, and negotiate past, present, and future events that contribute to defining the organizational phenomenon. Thus, this approach does not consider the internal dialogue that everyone can maintain with past, present, and future events that form temporality – although this is important, as it is the modality of being, or rather of *Dassein*, to use Heidegger's concept (1990[1927]) – but focuses on the tangible traces that are created along the way by the actors and that show the collective dynamics of definition and configuration of past, present, and future events.

Several authors have also shown the importance of events and temporality in the emergence and maintenance of organizational dynamics. The role of the history of the firm (Schultz & Hernes, 2013) or the society (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004; Rowlinson et al., 2010), the role of the present context (Weick, 1995), and the role of the anticipated future (Kaplan & Orlikowski, 2013) have already been the subject of research in organization theory. Generally speaking, the authors have emphasized the role of temporality in the construction of a narrative (Boje, 2001; Dawson & Sykes, 2018) that allows actors to create meaning (Gabriel, 2000). This is what Cunliffe, Luhman, and Boje (2004) have called 'narrative temporality.' This view suggests that 'stories are not just chronologies (a sequence of events) but situated, responsive performances' that create current experience and a sense of reality as they are told (Cunliffe et al., 2004, p. 273). In such a perspective, the meaning of the lived moment emerges from the way in which actors tell and configure events. More specifically, the events that are enacted by the actors become reference points (Cunliffe et al., 2004) that help to define a meaning of what the actors are and do (Dawson & Sykes, 2018).

In this, the events-based approach may seem close to other theoretical frameworks based on the importance of a shared culture, a shared narrative, or a collective construction of meaning. The events-based approach does not reject these theoretical frameworks and draw, in part, on some of these approaches, notably narrative approaches (Rantakari

& Vaara, 2017) with which it shares the importance of narrative in the emergence and maintenance of organizational phenomena. However, the events-based approach also differs from these other theoretical frameworks in that it proposes an original approach that consists of understanding the ontology of organizational phenomena, based on events. Specifically, the events-based approach postulates that the singularity of phenomena emerges from events. In other words, the reality on which we act is a manifestation of events and not the other way around. In this sense, the event is not a simple representation of a lived reality, but the ontological category from which it is possible to define a tangible reality for the actors (Hussenot, 2019). This postulate finds its inspiration in part in Whitehead's philosophy (1920, 1978[1929], 1938). Temporality, on the other hand, is not an external dimension on which phenomena and things are arranged but is the ontological dimension from which the definition of a reality is possible (Hussenot, 2019). Relying in part on Bergson's philosophy and vocabulary (2013[1889], 2010[1896], 2009[1907]), we can define temporality as the passage from the indivisible movement of lived experience to the materiality of our reality, that is, its definition in past, present, and future events.

In short, the events-based approach invites us to see the organizational phenomenon as a temporality, that is, a permanent effort to define reality through the definition/re-definition and configuration/re-configuration of past, present, and future events that give meaning to the lived moment and, in so doing, enable the actors to act. Organization is here defined as a structure of events (Hernes, 2014b), that is, a common narrative that participates in defining organizational dynamics and makes collective action possible. From this perspective, then, this study consists of understanding how past, present, and future events are enacted by actors to form a structure of events from which an identity, actorhood and collective choices can emerge. The following section presents a case study about makers residing in a makerspace. It presents the maker movement, the ICI Montreuil makerspace, and describes the data collection and the data analysis process, showing how the events-based approach was applied in order to transcribe the organizational dynamics.

A case study of the makers of ICI Montreuil

In order to understand how organizational dynamics and specifically (1) identity, (2) actorhood, and (3) interconnected instances of decision-making can be formed in fluid organizational phenomena, I rely on the case study conducted between October 2014 and June 2015 with the makers of ICI Montreuil, a makerspace located in the city of Montreuil in the Paris region (France).

---

7. A distinction is made between the present and the lived moment because, in order to define a lived moment, actors can enact various present events that are taking place simultaneously, for example, in different places and with different people (Hussenot, 2019).

Presentation of the maker movement

The makers (Anderson, 2012; Dougherty, 2012; Hatch, 2013) are usually self-employed workers, whose activity consists of developing objects and services at the frontiers of design, engineering and craftsmanship (Anderson, 2012; Antonioli et al., 2015) and who often work in makerspaces or fab labs (Dougherty & Conrad, 2016). The makerspaces and fab labs are collaborative spaces in which makers have access to tools and machines, but also to other makers with whom they can exchange ideas and collaborate (Berrebi-Hoffmann, et al., 2018; Bosqué et al., 2014; Lallement, 2015). These spaces may be classed as a company, an association, or a cooperative and as such they may have founders, employees, and/or volunteers. On the other hand, the makers are not paid employees of these spaces, but members paying a subscription to have access to the resources (Eychenne, 2012). The makers are therefore not subordinate to each other and enjoy a great deal of freedom in their activities. Each maker is *a priori* free to work on the projects and with the people that he/she wants. However, several empirical research about makers working in fab labs, including the Labfab in Rennes (Rumpala, 2014), a fab lab in Amsterdam (Maldini, 2013), the MIT-FabLab Norway in Lyngen, the Vygian Ashram in Pabal, India, and the South End Technology Center in Boston (Bosqué, 2015), have shown that organizational dynamics emerge and are maintained. Thus, despite individual independence and the involvement of the makers in various projects, a sense of the collective emerges. In this respect, the maker movement can therefore be considered as an exemplar of fluid organizational phenomena and, more importantly, an interesting case for studying organizational dynamics in this particular context.

Overview of the ICI Montreuil makerspace, the makers, and external actors

Created in 2013 in a former 1750 m² factory, the ICI Montreuil makerspace is a co-operative (*Société Coopérative à Intérêt Collectif* [SCIC]). The founders of ICI Montreuil are Nicolas Bard and Christine Bard, while the staff is composed of a fab lab manager, a workshop manager, a communication manager and a trainee for the fab lab.[8] The founders conceived ICI Montreuil as a shared workspace for makers. The makerspace provides members with various tools and spaces, such as digital tools (laser cutting machine, 3D printer, etc.), traditional tools for working with wood, iron, and fabrics, coworking areas, a fab lab, a catering area, an exhibition area, and meeting rooms. In addition, makers can benefit from the support of the makerspace staff in the development of their projects. The

objective is to provide all the resources needed to design any product or service.

There have been approximately 160 residents in ICI Montreuil since 2015. However, this number may change significantly depending on new registrations or the departure of certain makers. Behind the notion of maker, there are people with backgrounds in very different fields such as art, crafts, engineering, design, architecture, marketing, computer programming, etc. Each maker has his/her own speciality, even if most of them develop various skills from contact with other makers. In addition, ICI Montreuil's makers cooperate with a large network of people who may or may not be members of ICI Montreuil. The ICI Montreuil's makers are involved in various projects, such as the development of mobile applications for virtual reality headset, the making of designer furniture, street-art works, etc. However, the residents differ in the frequency of their visits to the makerspace. Although an accurate count was difficult because I was not present in the makerspace every day, it can be estimated that about 30 residents come 4 to 5 days a week; while the majority spend 2 to 3 days a week in the makerspace. Finally, there are also about 30 residents who chose to come to ICI Montreuil once a week or less. These are mostly residents who have another workspace outside of ICI Montreuil (home, shared workshop, office, etc.), but who nevertheless wish to come regularly to stay in touch with the other makers. Furthermore, the makers have different levels of involvement in the makerspace, which may change over time. Finally, not all residents define themselves as makers when they arrive at ICI Montreuil. Some discover the maker movement through their contact with other ICI Montreuil residents: 'I didn't know what the maker movement was. I discovered it when I became a resident' (Maker, leather specialist, informal conversation, March 2015). Moreover, they do not necessarily live in the city of Montreuil and not all of them know its history. The fact that there are always members leaving and others joining, or members who are not frequently present in ICI Montreuil is an important element in people's involvement. While some residents are particularly involved in the life and development of ICI Montreuil, others are more detached.

Finally, certain external actors also play an important role in the definition of ICI Montreuil. On the one hand, there are the journalists who quickly became interested in this place. Most of the major French media (Le Monde, BFM, Les Echos, France Inter, le Parisien, etc.) have covered the makerspace news since it opened. Many blogs or more specialized news sites such as Etsi, Makery, and Citizencar have also published articles or videos on ICI Montreuil. On the other hand, ICI Montreuil's growing fame has aroused the curiosity of many politicians seeking to understand and be inspired by this place. Ministers, members of parliament, and local elected officials came to visit the space and talk to the founders, staff, and residents.

[8.] ICI Montreuil's staff evolves according to need. This is the description of the makerspace staff between 2014 and 2015, the period during which I was making my observations.

For example, Axel Lemaire, Secretary of State for Digital (*Secrétaire d'Etat chargée du numérique*), launched his government action plan 'Development and Digital' at ICI Montreuil in June 2015; while Emmanuel Macron, then Minister of Economy, Industry and Digital, organized a meeting there in June 2016. All of these external actors thus contributed to defining ICI Montreuil and raising its profile.

Data collection

The data collection combined a variety of methods that include observation, conversation, and a careful reading of the available documents. In the context of this study of the makers resident at ICI Montreuil, the data were obtained from non-participant observations, semi-directive interviews, and also from collected documents (photographs, online documents, and social networks). In October 2014, I conducted a first visit to ICI Montreuil. During this first visit, I was surprised by the diversity of projects and actors. It was following this first visit that I suggested to the founders of the makerspace to study the space, the staff, and the makers. We reached an agreement allowing me to observe, to interview, and to collect documents freely, without restriction and without offering any recompense.

From October 2014 to June 2015, I spent one half day a week at ICI Montreuil with the makers, staff, and founders (25 half days). Non-participant observations were made in the coworking areas, in the workshops, and the ICI Montreuil fab lab. In this case, non-participant observation meant that I did not participate directly in the makers' projects, but rather that I shared the actors' daily life for a few hours a week. I followed the founders, staff, and residents, particularly by spending time in the coworking areas and workshops. Each half day was spent making observations in the coworking areas, the fab lab and the workshops, as dictated by the residents' projects. Specifically, I took care to visit these different spaces during each observation session. This allowed me to appreciate the diversity of the members, to follow certain projects and to create the conditions to be able to talk freely with the members, the staff and the founders at each of my visits. I also took care to talk with the actors by regularly joining them for lunch and/or inviting them for a coffee in the kitchen area located at the center of the makerspace. These informal discussions allowed me to understand the activities of the members and staff, but also their relationship with the makerspace, the city of Montreuil, and the maker movement. These observations were written up in a research journal that extends to about 65 pages.

In addition, during this period, I conducted 25 semi-structured interviews (Fontana & Frey, 2005). In particular, I interviewed 19 makers, the two founders of the makerspace, the fab lab manager, the workshop manager, the trainee shadowing the fab lab manager, and the communication manager.

The aim of these interviews was to understand, first, the past, current, and future activities of the actors; and second, their relationships and collaborations with the other residents, staff members, and founders of ICI Montreuil. Finally, the interviews focused on the maker movement, in order to understand the relationship that the actors had with it. Each interview lasted about an hour and most of them were held in a meeting room in the makerspace. Twenty interviews were recorded and transcribed, and for the five remaining interviews notes were taken. The interviews were therefore a way to get to know the actors better, that is, their history and projects, but also a way to understand what they had in common. The interviews were conducted throughout my period in the field, according to the availability of residents, staff, and founders.

Finally, I also collected internal and external documents, such as articles on the ICI Montreuil website, content from Twitter and Instagram accounts, press articles, and videos introducing the makerspace. I systematically collected all press articles and videos about ICI Montreuil published between the opening of the makerspace and the end of my observation period. For Instagram and Twitter, I systematically tracked the posts on these two social networks, but without undertaking a precise analysis. This can be described as a floating observation. Moreover, internal documents were collected only during my time in the field, while external documents (press articles, social network posts, and online videos) were collected during my time in the field and beyond, as they allowed me to follow the evolution of activities and discourses. As such, the press articles and videos produced by the staff and founders of ICI Montreuil are particularly important, as they highlight the historical events, the current context, and the anticipated future in which the makers are invited to participate. These documents have therefore allowed me to understand and familiarize myself with the past, present, and future events enacted by the founders, staff, and makers. Table 1 summarizes the data collection process.

Data analysis

The analysis of data from qualitative research that uses an events-based approach requires a method that makes it

Table 1. Data collection

Data collection tools	Data collected
Non-participatory observation	Twenty-five half-days of observations from October 2014 to June 2015
Interviews	Twenty-five interviews: 2 co-founders, 4 staff, 19 residents
Documents	About 5,000 tweets on Twitter About 400 posts on Instagram Twenty-five articles on the ICI Montreuil website Twenty videos Nineteen press articles about ICI Montreuil

possible to follow the way the events are enacted by the actors (Hussenot et al., 2019). For this, the approach proposed by Jarzabowski, Lê & Spee (2017) was used. This analytical approach can be justified by the fact that it is also rooted in processual thinking (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010, 2017) and allows us to highlight past, present, and future events. Specifically, Jarzabowski et al.'s (2017) analytical approach is based on four tasks.

First, researchers must build up patterns specific to the actors' activities both as we go and retrospectively (Jarzabowski et al., 2017). This first task means that the patterns are not given to the researchers but are a construct that emerges as soon as the data are collected and continues during the recording process. In the context of my study, pattern construction means the identification of past, present, and future events recurring in discourses. The choice of events is therefore an important point in the data analysis. This consisted in identifying the moments that become particular events (Cunliffe et al., 2004). This means that I retained only past, present, and future events explicitly referenced by the actors in their discourse. More precisely, I retained three criteria for each selected event: (1) the collective enactment of the event, that is, an event cited by several of the actors I interviewed or met or in the documents collected; (2) the recurrence of the event, that is, an event cited regularly by the actors or in the documentation; and (3) the performativity of the event, that is, the link between the event and action, and more exactly, the emergence of organizational dynamics. On the basis of these three criteria, I selected four events for the analysis of organizational dynamics:

- Past event: the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil.
- Present events: the 'creative revolution' of Montreuil; the development of the maker movement.
- Future event: the revival of industry in France.

As a result, certain events are not included in the analysis, in particular events relating to the individual projects of the makers. Their non-collective and often non-recurring nature means that they do not participate, or only very indirectly, in the production of a shared past, present, and future for the makers and the makerspace staff.

The second task was to define the scope of the research. Here again, this boundary setting was done throughout the research and was not given *a priori* to the researcher (Jarzabowski et al., 2017). In particular this consisted in identifying the actors who participated the most in defining the structure of events. In the field, I quickly noticed that the development of ICI Montreuil was led by a group of people – mainly the two founders, the staff members, especially the fab lab manager and a trainee who quickly managed to play a

prescriptive role in the makerspace, and a dozen or so makers who were convinced that they were living an adventure that went beyond their professional activity (including a maker specializing in leather work, a marketing maker, a maker specializing in audio gaming, an industrial designer maker, a maker who set up a website to connect local craftsmen with clients, a cabinet maker, a jewelry maker, a painter maker, a maker representing luxury brands, and a maker who founded a circular economy consulting firm). In the transcription of the results, I therefore gave a prominent place to these actors, as they were the ones who explicitly expressed past, present, and future events that participated in the definition of organizational dynamics. That being said, I also took care to listen to those who were generally more discreet to ensure that what was said by the most active players represented the thoughts of those who had chosen to be less actively involved in the development of the makers' collective.

The third step consisted of transcribing the flow of experiences (Jarzabowski et al., 2017), in particular by putting forward quotations to support the description of the production of a structure of events participating in the definition of organizational dynamics. This task is largely conflated with the work of collecting data and transcribing them in the research journal. The live and *a posteriori* transcription of past, present, and future events enacted by the actors in the field is therefore a key element in the construction of the results because the aim here is to produce a plausible account of the field experience, by emphasizing both the events experienced by the actors and the events referred to by the actors in their discourse. In this research, the transcription of the flow of experiences thus corresponds to the recounting of events enacted by the actors, either from interactions with the actors (observations and interviews), or from the traces produced by the actors (artefacts, paper documents, online documents, etc.).

Fourth, the analysis consisted of a continuous iteration between the theoretical framework and the data collected in order to generate results and contributions (Jarzabowski et al., 2017). In this case, the iteration consisted of a dialogue between the events-based approach and the data collected from the founders, makers, and staff of ICI Montreuil in order to understand how identity, actorhood, and the interconnected instances of decision-making manifest through the enactment of a structure of past, present, and future events. This led to concurrent work on the articulation and definition of the theoretical framework, the results, and the contributions. Specifically, this iteration led us, on the one hand, to transcribe past, present, and future events participating in the definition of a temporality and, on the other hand, to carry out a second-order analysis that highlights the construction of the three organizational dynamics.

Table 2 presents the data analysis process. This process should be understood not as a succession of steps, but rather

Table 2. Data analysis

Data analysis method (based on Jarzabowski et al., 2017)	Application of the analytical method to the case of ICI Montreuil's makers
Construction of the actors' activity patterns	Identification of the structure of past, present, and future events enacted by the actors
Defining the scope of the research	Identification of the actors involved in the construction of the structure of events
Transcript of the flow of experiences	Transcript of the verbatim relating to past, present, and future events enacted by the actors
Iteration between theory and data	Dialogue between the events-based approach and the data collected, in order to transcribe past, present, and future events and to highlight the emergence of the three organizational dynamics (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making)

as an analytical presentation of data processing organized around four tasks (Jarzabowski et al., 2017).

Results

In this section, the structure of the four past, present, and future events selected for analysis is introduced, and then, I analyze the relationship between this structure of events and the three organizational dynamics studied: identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making.

Structure of past, present, and future events enacted by the actors

In this first section, I present the four past, present, and future events that were selected for the analysis of the three organizational dynamics. These four events form a structure of events that is enacted by the actors (Hernes, 2014b). This means that these four events are often redefined and reconfigured by the stakeholders in order to explain, justify, and legitimize their actions. In this sense, the proposed breakdown has only an analytical value, making the relationship between the different events and the formation of organizational dynamics intelligible. Table 3 presents the four past, present, and future events, which are then described in detail in the following paragraphs.

Past event enacted by the actors

Generally speaking, the creation of the ICI Montreuil maker-space is closely connected to the city of Montreuil, especially to its past. On the one hand, the city of Montreuil has a long artistic and industrial history: 'At the beginning, what inspired us in our approach was the fact that there are many artists and, more generally, creative people in Montreuil. It's a long

Table 3. Structure of events enacted by ICI Montreuil's actors in 2014–2015

Past events	Present events	Future events
Industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil	Montreuil's 'Creative Revolution' and revival of the local economy Development of the maker movement	Relaunch of industry in France 'Made in France'

tradition in Montreuil and we were sensitive to that' (Christine Bard, founder of ICI Montreuil, semi-directive interview, October 2014); 'In Montreuil there is this whole creative industry in which the maker movement is involved. It's not completely random. In fact, even if the maker movement has its specificities, we are inspired both by the history of the city of Montreuil, and also by its current events' (Maker specialized in leather work, informal conversation, November 2014). The articles posted on the ICI Montreuil website often refer to the history of cinema and the industry in Montreuil: 'The film industry is long gone, but the spirits of Méliès and Reynaud are still present' (article on the ICI Montreuil website, posted on 10/08/2012: http://www.ICI Montreuil.com/blog/2012/8).

More precisely, the long artistic and industrial history of the city of Montreuil allows the actors to draw a direct line between their activities and the history of the city: 'Montreuil has taken full advantage of the industrial revolutions of the late 19th and early 20th centuries to become one of the most creative places in the world thanks to the thousands of creators living and/or working in Montreuil (about 17% of its active population)' (article on the ICI Montreuil website, posted on 10/08/2012: http://www.ICI Montreuil.com/blog/2012/8). Moreover, the desire to create this connection is present in daily conversations, in documents and in public speaking: '[…] in this city that has been home to craftsmen, artists and high-level industrialists for 150 years, we wondered if we couldn't do something here. In fact, after some research, we realized that Méliès had shot his 500 films and that at the same time Montreuil was home to the world's number one woodworker' (Speech by Nicolas Bard at the 'Osons la France' conference. Video posted on March 08, 2015: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t6Ll2ZDMMMo). More precisely, by setting up ICI Montreuil in a disused factory (the former Dufour electrical equipment manufacturing plant, closed in 1981), the city's industrial past also becomes part of the actors' daily lives because, despite the renovations, it is the feeling of being in an old industrial building that predominates: 'Here we are in an old industrial building in the city of Montreuil, with large windows and a heavy iron door. Inside, the exposed iron framework gives the building a very industrial character. However, the renovation of the building

was intended to give it a more modern and warm character' (Christine Bard, founder of ICI Montreuil, semi-directive interview, October 2014).

The artistic and industrial history of Montreuil is therefore important to the actors. The name of the makerspace, ICI Montreuil, is a direct reference to the city of Montreuil. The makers' link with the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil is illustrated in the title of a video promoting the project: 'ICI Montreuil: from industrial heritage to creative revolution' (ICI Montreuil promotional video: https://vimeo.com/43717878). By making a link between Montreuil's past – the 'industrial heritage' – and the present – the 'creative revolution' – the founders make explicit the past which is enacted to define ICI Montreuil.

Present events enacted by the actors

The present of the city of Montreuil is also an important source of inspiration for the actors of ICI Montreuil. By speaking of a 'creative revolution' to qualify this enacted present, the actors refer to the evolutions underway in the city of Montreuil. With more than 800 artists, 166 art workshops, and numerous video-game publishers,[9] these creative activities symbolize the renewal of the city and in particular its gentrification (Collet, 2015). The city is often portrayed by journalists and businesses as the 'Brooklyn' of Paris, that is, a city singled out by the presence of many creative people. One could, for example, see posts on social networks and press articles promoting events in Montreuil such as: '@WeAreMontreuil from June 11 to 28, discover Montreuil, the French Brooklyn!' (post on the Twitter account of We Demain @WeDemain) or titles of promotional articles such as 'Montreuil, the Parisian Brooklyn' (press article, June 2013: https://www.villaschweppes.com/article/montreuil-le-brooklyn-parisien_a1757/1). The ICI Montreuil makerspace is therefore part of these new shared work spaces that have developed in the particular context of the Montreuil 'creative revolution'; while the ICI Montreuil makers are representative of this new population of workers working in Montreuil: 'We like the fact that it is a city of artists, craftsmen, social workers. It's a city where people don't do the same things as elsewhere' (A marketing maker, semi-directive interview, June 2015); 'Montreuil is a good example of those cities that have suffered the decline of industry and the consequent appearance of mass unemployment. Yet things are changing, especially with the arrival of many creative people. Economic dynamism is a reality in this city' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, November 2014).

[9.] Figures collected on the city's website: www.montreuil.fr (accessed in December 2016).

The development of the maker movement was also a present event enacted by the actors. Although the definition was imprecise, founders, staff, and residents often mentioned the development of this movement: 'To come back to the third reason why we are at ICI Montreuil, it is precisely this culture of doing, of making. Today, some people talk about a new industrial revolution. In fact, everything that affects industry affects us' (Maker specialized in audio gaming, semi-directive interview, June 2015). For the actors, the development of the maker movement was thus a major source of inspiration in their activity: 'We are makers, not craftsmen or artists. In my opinion, being a maker is above all a mindset and not a profession or doing particular things. More precisely, this mindset consists in giving priority to innovation and to doing. In other words, we want to innovate and change things by doing, even if we have neither the skills nor the resources. The most important thing is to do while finding solutions to our problems' (Maker, industrial designer, informal conversation, June 2015); 'Finally, the maker movement is still for the time being something reserved for a fairly well educated elite. My friends don't know what it is about. This notion of maker is still vague, but for me it's a way of appropriating ideas from various counter-cultures such as hackers or geeks and transposing them to the world of entrepreneurship. Perhaps this will help to develop more engaged activities in society' (Maker, founder of a website to connect local craftsmen with customers, informal conversation, March 2015).

Future event enacted by the actors

The future also plays a role in defining the collective of makers, as the founders aim to use ICI Montreuil to experiment with new ways of boosting the local economy and, more widely, industry in France. More specifically, as ICI Montreuil's reputation grew, the founders were increasingly questioned on issues relating to the revival of French industry, since ICI Montreuil was seen as a credible solution for reviving industry, especially by some media and political leaders: 'Axelle Lemaire [Secretary of State for Digital] invited me to come and have breakfast at her ministry. She is convinced that projects like ICI Montreuil are the future of the industry' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, May 2015). As a result, from 2015, the founders changed the way they spoke about ICI Montreuil, no longer presenting as just a local initiative to revive the economy, but as an experiment aimed at reviving French industry: 'I'm not obsessed with setting up a makerspace, I'm obsessed with reviving 'made in France', reviving French industry. ICI Montreuil is just a way of testing things' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, May 2015). The ICI Montreuil's makers were no longer presented simply as creative people, but also as forerunners of the industry of the future. 'I think there is

great potential, because what we do here is really different from what I could do elsewhere. You can see the craze for the place. Some media think that places like ICI Montreuil are the future of the industry' (Maker, cabinetmaker, informal conversation, March 2015). In fact, many makers have embraced the idea of relaunching 'made in France' based on the principles of the maker movement: 'This kind of collaboration is the future of work, because it is richer than subordination. What we are doing at ICI Montreuil not only reinvents our way of working, but could serve as a seed to relaunch a form of industry in France, especially one based on craftsmanship and innovation' (Maker, jewelry designer, informal conversation, March 2015).

From events to the structure of events

This presentation of past, present, and future events makes the account intelligible, but as indicated above, the events-based approach invites us to understand these different events as a whole that is constantly re-enacted by the actors. This means that their separations are most often analytical. If the actors can sometimes speak of an event separately from the others, the common narrative is based on the articulation of past, present, and future events: 'as you know, Montreuil has always been a city that welcomes craftsmen, industrialists and artists. What is new, by contrast, is this population of creative people who do not really fit into these categories and who are developing new activities. We are part of this movement and it is an opportunity for us, but also for the city, because it is from this trend that we will be able to revitalize a local economy' (Maker, founder of a marketing agency, informal conversation, October 2014); 'ICI Montreuil is also a communication medium for craftsmen. We like to bring our clients here. Here they find the atmosphere of Montreuil, its historical links with crafts and industry, but presented in a positive way, because it is related to today's creative activities and not to economic problems. This reassures them and they are even surprised by the potential of the site. The entrance to the building is a bit austere, but once inside, they realize that very innovative and creative things are being done here and that the future of crafts and of industry is probably to be found in places like this' (Maker specializing in carpentry, informal conversation, March 2015).

The temporality that emerges from the structure of events makes it possible to define a sense of continuity and thus gives meaning to the current moment. In other words, it is based on this temporality that the actors can collectively define what they are, their social role, and their activities. In the following sections, I describe this relationship between the structure of past, present, and future events and organizational dynamics (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making).

Being a maker: From the structure of events to the emergence of identity

Identity is the organizational dynamic in which actors collectively define who they are and how they are identified. The members of ICI Montreuil, mainly define themselves as a maker. Of course, this refers to practices related to the maker movement (Lallement, 2015), such as the development of products and services at the frontier of crafts, high tech and art, or practices of mutual aid between members. This is partly embodied by a wooden sign at the entrance of the maker-space indicating that the projects are at the frontiers of 'Art(isanship), design and high tech.' However, this collective identity as a maker is also anchored in the history, the present and the future of the city of Montreuil. Below I examine in detail the relationship between the structure of events and the identity of the actors of ICI Montreuil as makers.

From the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil to the identity of maker

First, the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil – such as the development of cinema, for example – is an important source of inspiration that helps define what the makers of ICI Montreuil are. By claiming affiliation with this past, the actors create a common past that is not relative to each other's background or to their recent activities but is much more inclusive and much older: 'Montreuil is an inspiring city for us. We are not at the beginning of the 20th century anymore, but we feel a bit like the heirs of the artists and entrepreneurs of Montreuil. At first, I didn't realize it, but now it's pretty obvious to me. Even if we are different from each other, we are all part of this history' (Maker, painter, informal conversation, March 2015). In this way, the actors create a common memory, regardless of their origins and past experiences (Foster et al., 2011): 'I am not from Montreuil and I didn't know much about the history of this city when I arrived. That said, I find it inspiring. We all want to believe that we are the heirs of Montreuil's famous artists and industrialists' (Maker, circular economy engineer, informal conversation, March 2015). By enacting the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil, the actors define an origin for their activities which plays the role of an anchor from which they will be able to define and federate themselves.

The history of Montreuil was, therefore, a fairly common topic of conversation among the makers. For example, some famous names, such as the designer Philippe Starck (who is said to have worked in Montreuil when he started his career), are mentioned in the conversations, to illustrate what the makers are and what are the references they use to define their activity. Thus, on several occasions, the designer's name was mentioned in conversations, because his career and

his supposed relationship with the city of Montreuil could be sources of inspiration for the makers: 'to make a comparison, what we are doing here is somewhat similar to the work of Philippe Starck. We try to be creative using different techniques, technologies and materials' (Maker, woodworking specialist, informal conversation, October 2014). By explicitly mentioning these historical references, the aim is to create a direct link between these people, the places, and the makers of ICI Montreuil. This defining of a shared memory was an activity endorsed by one of the founders of ICI Montreuil, who was well aware that collective success required a collective history: 'It is on the basis of a common history that we all create together, this is really what unites the makers of ICI Montreuil' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, June 2015).

Development of the maker movement and being a maker

The collective identity is also nourished by present events, the most important of which was the development of the maker movement. Although the maker movement was a trend that was difficult to define for many residents of ICI Montreuil, it was becoming more and more inescapable in conversations. It was not uncommon for actors to refer to it to justify who they were: 'it may be a fad to say that we are makers, but it has the advantage of defining a common identity, even if we actually do very different jobs from one another' (Maker, founder of a circular economy consulting agency, informal conversation, April 2015). The reference to this movement allowed certain makers to distinguish themselves from artisans or artists. This was an important element, because the makers of ICI Montreuil wanted to be seen as innovators. As an aside, 'Make' – the magazine dedicated to makers – was always present in Montreuil. On several occasions I saw the person in charge of the fab lab or the fab lab trainee with this magazine in their hands or leafing through it. The magazine was even sometimes used as a reference in the making of an object. The articles could be the subject of conversations between makers, the person in charge of the fab lab and/or the trainee in order to learn how to make an object. This attachment to the maker movement therefore was a way for each person to distinguish themself from the others and at the same time to group together actors with very different activities within the same category: 'the maker's movement is a trend that has been imported. We didn't present ourselves like that at the beginning but, in the end, it's an identity that suits everyone' (Maker, founder of a site that brings together artisans and customers, informal conversation, February 2015). In short, the collective 'makers' identity makes it possible to go beyond the profession of each person (craftsmen, engineers, artists, etc.) and the variety of projects on which the makers work.

From Montreuil's 'Creative Revolution' to the identity of makers

Montreuil's present is also an important element in the emergence of the collective identity. Being in Montreuil in the 2010s is not insignificant, as it is a city that is known for its creative renewal. The creative dimension is ever-present in the activities and conversations of the makers. The makers therefore define themselves on the basis of this creative present in Montreuil and even want to participate in the renewal of this city: 'ICI Montreuil is a kind of beehive, but it is also a project that is very much in tune with its time and its city. Things are moving in Montreuil. The population is changing and we, the residents of ICI Montreuil, are also actors of this change' (Maker, representative of luxury brands, informal conversation, April 2015). Working at ICI Montreuil is therefore for many makers a way to be actors in this 'creative revolution.' In doing so, this creative present gives meaning to various activities for all the makers (Dawson & Sykes, 2018): 'This place is a good illustration of the evolution of this city. There are a lot of creative people here doing different things, as can be seen everywhere in Montreuil. There is a profound change taking place here and the residents are part of this dynamic' (Maker, leather specialist, informal conversation, November 2014). In this way, the creative present of the city of Montreuil allows the creation of a form of authenticity that makes the activities of the makers legitimate and relevant to themselves and others (Hatch & Schultz, 2017): 'Our activity leads people working in other cities to come to Montreuil, therefore spending money in Montreuil. By doing so, we are creating an economy and relaunching a manufacturing sector in Montreuil' (Nicolas Bard, interview conducted by Est Ensemble: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uv_y1jZP_TM, video posted on November 20, 2014).

The revival of the industry and being a maker

For the residents of ICI Montreuil being a maker often means making a social and economic commitment alongside their professional activity. More specifically, it means, on the one hand, boosting the economy by 'doing,' that is, by developing and producing innovative objects and services: 'there are probably not enough makers in France, that is to say people who actually do things. At ICI Montreuil, we have to be doers, in other words residents must propose innovations that create economic activity' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, February 2015). This involvement often indicates a desire to revive the industry: 'being a maker means being an actor in society, it means taking a concrete part in the revival of an industry that has been in decline for several decades in France' (Maker, founder of a marketing agency, informal conversation, November 2014). This might involve very

concrete actions such as working in partnership with an association to fight long-term unemployment: 'We welcome long-term unemployed people to ICI Montreuil. I'm in the process of mentoring someone myself. They are not residents, but we do this because our role as a maker is also to solve the social and economic problems around us' (Nicolas Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation, April 2015). More generally, the residents, staff, and founders were involved in the creation of training courses either for young people in difficulty or for people wishing to retrain: 'The aim is to develop a kind of university for makers where everyone can learn a trade. This university would be aimed above all at young people and the unemployed, and at those who wish to retrain' (Maker, leather specialist, informal conversation, November 2014).

ICI Montreuil as a social actor in the economic recovery: From the structure of events to the emergence of actorhood

The organizational dynamic of actorhood invites us to understand how an organizational phenomenon is objectified in order to gain in autonomy and intentionality. Of course, this organizational dynamic is concomitant with the definition of collective identity, because by defining their identity, the actors partly assert their role in the public space as a collective. However, the literature has also emphasized the role of external actors in defining organization as a social actor (King et al., 2010). Thus, we will see how internal actors (makers, staff, and co-founders of ICI Montreuil) and external actors (journalists and politicians) have made ICI Montreuil a social actor, whose main role is to participate in the revival of industry. This means that ICI Montreuil has become a non-human actor who is made to play a role in society. In order to understand the formation of this organizational dynamic, I focus in the following paragraphs on the relationship between the structure of the four past, present, and future events and the definition of actorhood.

From the legacy of the industrial and artistic past to economic recovery

ICI Montreuil was quickly seen as the heir to the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil. For example, references to famous artists such as Georges Méliès and Charles and Emile Pathé were numerous on the ICI Montreuil website. Thus, from the very beginning of the creation of ICI Montreuil, the co-founders wanted to give ICI Montreuil the role of heir to the industrial and artistic past of the city of Montreuil: 'We are not a simple resource center. ICI Montreuil is part of the history of the city of Montreuil and we want to play a unique role in Montreuil, in particular by building on these artistic and creative roots and offering an innovative service that

promotes the city's economic development' (Christine Bard, co-founder of ICI Montreuil, informal conversation during the first visit of ICI Montreuil, September 2014). The title of ICI Montreuil's promotional film 'From the Industrial Era to the Creative Revolution' illustrates this heritage that makes up what ICI Montreuil is all about. Thus, for some residents, this heritage is what gives ICI Montreuil a unique role: 'ICI Montreuil is anchored in the history of Montreuil. It continues this heritage. That being said, ICI Montreuil also participates in local development. ICI Montreuil thus plays a dual role: contributing to the local economy while keeping the history of this city alive' (Makers, creator of a universal hook, informal conversation, July 2015); 'ICI Montreuil has not come from nowhere. It is a place that has roots, but also knows how to project itself into the future. Perhaps this is what gives it a special social and economic role' (Maker, founder of a circular economy consulting firm, informal conversation, May 2015).

The role of external actors in defining the role of ICI Montreuil

Many external actors have also participated in defining ICI Montreuil as a social actor, notably by emphasizing its role in the city's economic development. Journalists praised the role of ICI Montreuil in the economic transformation of the area, notably as '[...] a territorial brand that promotes local economic actors in an innovative economic space' (article: ICI Montreuil, a place for creative cooperation, rtes.fr, January 17, 2014); 'A 'Factory for Creators', a 'Creative Space' for artists, craftsmen, entrepreneurs and creative start-ups' (Source: Fab Labs, digital manufacturing workshops, places of innovation; http://www.campusfonderiedelimage.org/, June 2015). The makerspace has thus rapidly aroused the curiosity of the media. Many journalists interviewed the founders, and several features were made for the press, radio, and television. Generally speaking, the journalists highlighted the innovative character of the place and its potential for the future: 'ICI Montreuil, the creative space made in Montreuil' (source: http://revolution.cityzencar.com, May 2013); 'Made In Montreuil brings out new ways of doing business' (source: http://montreuil-vraiment.fr, March 2013).[10] ICI Montreuil was quickly recognized as an important actor in the maker movement in France: 'ICI Montreuil: the largest coworking space in France' (source: http://www.bibamagazine.fr, January 16, 2014). In fact, it is partly this external recognition as a social actor that influenced the founders and residents to define the place as a makerspace: 'In the beginning, we defined ourselves as a local production organization. At first, we didn't

---

[10.] There is a hesitation between the notions of coworking, makerspace, creative space, etc. At that time, the vocabulary to designate these new phenomena had not yet stabilized.

know that what we were doing could be assimilated in the maker movement' (Nicolas Bard, founder of ICI Montreuil, remarks made at a round table organized by GE and the newspaper Usbek et Rica, February 11, 2015). Thus, ICI Montreuil was quickly presented by its residents as the 'largest and most influential makerspace in France': 'there are many fab labs in France, but ICI Montreuil is the largest makerspace. ICI Montreuil has a special place in the development of the maker movement in France, because we are inspired by what is happening in the United States, but we are also developing our own approach' (Maker, audio gaming specialist, informal conversation, June 2015).

To be an actor of the 'creative revolution' of Montreuil and to participate in the economic revival

This success was also confirmed by the fact that many political figures chose to visit. Several secretaries of state, ministers, and members of parliament came to visit the site and meet the makers. I saw, for example, the impromptu visit of Razzi Hammadi MP, who seemed to know the makerspace and the founders well. The MP had come to ICI Montreuil to show a colleague around the site, because this makerspace was a good example of how it might be possible to revive the economy: 'This place plays an important role in Montreuil. This place is a key actor in the local economy' (Razzi Hammadi, remarks made during this visit, June 2015). The visit of Bruno Lemaire in June 2015, member of parliament and candidate for representing his political party at the presidential election, is another example of the role of political figures in defining the social and economic role of ICI Montreuil. Clearly then, the media and politicians define ICI Montreuil as a project that helps to energize the local economy. More generally, this discourse is taken up by some makers who feel they are living an adventure that goes beyond their professional activity and participates in the local economy: 'To be honest, my main motive for joining ICI Montreuil was economic. A subscription to ICI Montreuil is much cheaper than renting a workshop. That said, I can't say that I stay at ICI Montreuil purely for economic reasons. I have met people there who inspire me and above all, many people feel that ICI Montreuil is playing an increasingly important role in Montreuil' (Maker specializing in carpentry, informal conversation, Friday, February 06, 2015); 'I often work in the showroom during exhibitions. Of course, I'm not paid for that, but it's to help Christine, because I think ICI Montreuil only works if we stick together. Beyond our professional success, what counts for me is also this collective project that gives meaning to our professional activity, because we participate directly in the development of the city of Montreuil' (Maker specialized in leather work, informal conversation, January 26, 2015).

The revival of the industry in France as a purpose for ICI Montreuil

In light of the success of ICI Montreuil, the founders revised their ambitions upwards and, starting in 2015, saw ICI Montreuil's role as participating in the revival of French industry. From then on, the founders gave a national dimension to the makerspace: 'We do politics, but not like a political party. Our role is to create activity and revitalize neighbourhoods that are in decline. What we are doing today in Montreuil, we will do tomorrow in other cities in France. In some ways it is a form of public service, because makerspaces develop territories' (Interview with Nicolas Bard at a conference on November 02, 2015). This ambition resulted in part from the attention that journalists and politicians gave to ICI Montreuil by presenting it as an important actor in economic recovery. Bruno Le Maire's visit in May 2015 was part of this approach. According to those who were there at the time, the MP repeatedly praised ICI Montreuil and 'its role as a local economic actor' and the importance of this place in 'thinking about the future of industry and creation in France.' This visit was also seen as a form of recognition by some residents and an encouragement to continue their efforts: 'Bruno Le Maire's visit shows that we at ICI Montreuil are playing an important role that inspires policy' (Maker specializing in the development of applications for 3D headsets, informal conversation, June 2015); 'I don't think he [Bruno Lemaire] understood everything we do here, but we showed him that spaces like ICI Montreuil represent the future' (Maker specializing in the creation of sounds for video games, informal conversation, June 2015).

To sum up, the emergence of ICI Montreuil as a social actor is the result of the discourse carried by various stakeholders, leading to the definition of ICI Montreuil as an entity whose aim is to revitalize the local economy and, in the near future, industry throughout France. The definition of ICI Montreuil as a social actor in this case is connected to the way the founders, the media, and politicians enact past, present, and future events, from which they give ICI Montreuil an important local and national role to play.

Conducting projects combining art, crafts, and high tech: From the structure of events to the emergence of interconnected instances of decision-making

The emergence of interconnected instances of decision-making is the organizational dynamic about the collective choices made by actors. It relates to the capacity of actors to generate collective incentives that can influence the actors, despite their autonomy and the absence of formal power. In the case of the ICI Montreuil's makers, these collective choices essentially

concerned the actors' choice to carry out projects at the crossroads of three types of know-how: crafts, art, and high-tech. This was no coincidence, as this was the stated strategy of the founders. Of course, it is not a question of forcing the actors to undertake these kinds of projects, nor of making a selection among the projects, because each one is free to work on whatever projects he/she wishes. Rather, it is a question of creating a collective incentive put forward by the founders, the staff, and the makers that is justified and legitimized in the eyes of the identity of the actors, which itself takes shape in a common narrative, that is, a structure of past, present, and future events. The following paragraphs describe the relationship between this structure of events and the way in which certain projects are put forward as 'good examples' of the kind of projects appropriate to the makerspace.

From Montreuil's industrial and artistic past to collective choices

The emergence of a collective choice of conducting projects combining craftsmanship, art, and high-tech is legitimized and justified in part by the fact that these projects resonate with Montreuil's industrial and artistic past: 'Here we work on very creative projects, as has always been the case in Montreuil. We're here to invent new things' (Maker, founder of a start-up specialized in photo booths, informal conversation, April 2015). For example, in October 2014, a start-up based in ICI Montreuil won a contract to create a robot capable of playing with a video game using remote commands sent by on-line users. This project was inspired by the success of online gaming communities and was intended to promote a new video games console to be launched during the Christmas holidays. This project may seem far removed from Montreuil's industrial and artistic past. However, this project is justified in part by links to the history of cinema in Montreuil: 'The project [client's name] was the trigger for this dynamic. It's a bit our turn to do what people like Méliès [Georges Méliès] did a century ago' (Fab lab manager, informal conversation, May 2015). In this way, the artistic past of the city of Montreuil partly characterizes the importance of this project. This is in line with the words of the leader of this robot creation project who said that this was 'the opportunity to get very different people working together, as has always been the case in the craft industry in Montreuil or elsewhere' (Project manager, maker specialized in marketing, informal conversation, May 2015). Ultimately, this example of a project tells us that Montreuil's history contributes to the creation of shared roots inciting the actors to get involved in certain types of projects: 'in the beginning everyone came with their own projects and each resident had their own clients. Things are changing, because there are more and more collaborations and, above all, we now share shared roots that lead us to work on projects

that are more in line with them' (Maker, freelance graphic designer, informal conversation, February 2015).

From the 'creative revolution' to collective choices

The present context of the city of Montreuil in which the actors are evolving is also a way to encourage them to engage in projects combining craftsmanship, art, and high-tech. For example, the robot project that we outlined above also finds its justification in the fact that it is part of the present context of Montreuil: 'Working in the video-game sector is an obvious choice for us, because Montreuil is the video games city in France. Ubisoft and other developers have their offices in Montreuil. It's a way of participating in this trend' (Project manager, semi-directive interview, April 2015). To create this robot, the startup managers collaborated with other makers resident at ICI Montreuil and relied on the skills of ICI Montreuil's fab lab manager, in particular for the development of the design and the technological part: 'Did we have the skills to do this project? No, but it was a match with other residents, and then later when we had the concept we could see who could manage the development. And there was also the fab lab. In the end, there were four different entities internal to ICI Montreuil that collaborated on this project' (Project manager, semi-directive interview, April 2015). The project manager therefore surrounded himself with a team of makers from different disciplines: a designer who was appointed artistic director for the project; two software developers from a resident start-up and the ICI Montreuil fab lab manager, who supports the residents in the realization of their projects: 'It seems to me that this was the first project that articulated the main skills of ICI Montreuil, because there was a craft part in the physical design of the robot, an artistic part, and a high-tech part. That being said, the video game sector lends itself well to this type of project' (Maker specialized in the development of sounds for video games, informal conversation, June 2015). More generally, this Montreuil's present allows the makers to make choices about the projects to be developed: 'Our activities must echo what is being done in Montreuil. Montreuil is a creative city. We can't afford to carry out classical projects in the craft industry. We have to innovate by combining the different skills in art, design and high tech' (Maker, founder of a site to bring together craftsmen and clients, informal conversation, February 2015).

The maker movement and collective choices

This collective choice – to undertake projects combining art, craft, and high tech – also comes from the way in which the actors define themselves as makers. An example of this was given through the creation of animated sculptures for a museum in June 2015, as this project was both a concrete

example of production that could be promoted at ICI Montreuil, and a way for actors define themselves as maker: 'Several skills are therefore necessary for the realization of the sculptures. This is an important project. First of all, it symbolizes the spirit of the place, that of creating innovations at the frontiers of art, crafts and electronics [...] And finally, it is a good illustration of what one can do as a maker at ICI Montreuil' (Intern, informal conversation, June 8, 2015). This project was also promoted by some of the makers involved in the creation of the sculptures: 'this project is a good opportunity for us. It shows both externally and internally what the ICI Montreuil makers can do' (Maker, ironwork specialist, informal conversation, June 2015). So, all in all, this project was a good example of the type of project the makers were encouraged to undertake at ICI Montreuil: 'With the sculpture project, we have started something very interesting for the future of the residents. With, no doubt, a forthcoming project with [client's name], this is a new collective strategy that we will be able to test and that should allow the residents of Montreuil to develop their activity locally' (Fab lab manager, informal conversation, June 26, 2015).

Industrial recovery and collective choices

Finally, the collective incentive to undertake projects combining craftsmanship, art, and high-tech also finds its justification in the fact that the actors want to participate actively in the renewal of industry in France: 'With this sculpture project, we have embarked on something new, more collaborative and also more technical. I believe that there is this desire to make ICI Montreuil an example for French industry, and the founders and staff of ICI Montreuil are encouraging us to be the spearhead of this new industry. It is also very motivating for us. It makes us feel that we are playing an important part' (Maker, engineer, informal conversation, June 2015). The project to create animated sculptures for a museum was considered to be strategic for some actors, as it was a good example of what could revive the 'made in France' in the more or less near future. The aim of reviving industry in France by undertaking projects at the crossroads of 'crafts, art and high tech' then became an aim shared by the actors, thus influencing their project choices: 'If we want to think big, we have to get our act together. Even though we are all independent, we need to have a collective strategy that is visible to the outside world, and this means promoting projects that are consistent with what ICI Montreuil is' (Maker, industrial designer, June 2015).

The common past, present, and future thus contribute to defining a certain type of project within ICI Montreuil. The enacted structure of events makes it possible to indicate to the actors what is expected (Luhmann, 2005). The following section addresses the contributions of these results by discussing both the role played by the eventalization in the formation of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena; and the role of the founders and staff in this eventalization.

Discussion: Eventalization and fluid organizational phenomena

The aim of this article was to address the issue of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena and, more specifically, in the context of makers operating in makerspaces. To this end, I used an events-based approach and a case study about the makers at ICI Montreuil to understand how three organizational dynamics (identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making) can emerge, despite the absence of formal rules of coordination and the independence of the actors. The results show that the enactment of a structure of past, present, and future events contributes to the definition of a common frame of reference from which organizational dynamics can emerge. On the basis of these results, the main contribution of this research is to show the role of the eventalization in the formation of organizational dynamics, that is, the definition, configuration, and narration by the actors of events in order to form a shared past, present, and future. The results show in particular that the eventalization is sometimes an intentional activity and that some actors can play a more important part than others. Based on these results, two contributions can be offered: first, the notion of eventalization that allows us to deepen our understanding of organizational dynamics specific to fluid organizational phenomena and second, this research contributes to the literature on makers and makerspaces by deepening our understanding of the role of founders and staff in the formation of organizational dynamics in maker collectives.

Eventalization and organizational dynamics

The notion of eventalization is here understood as the definition, configuration, and narration of past, present, and future events that are constantly re/enacted by actors. By defining organization as an adverb (Schoeneborn et al., 2019), it would be tempting to believe that the qualification of the organizing process that constitutes organizational dynamics emerges directly from the activities of the actors (projects, production, etc.). The results seem to show that a focus on the constantly enacted events makes it possible to understand, perhaps in greater detail, how the actors re/define a common frame of reference allowing the identity, actorhood, and collective choices to manifest themselves. This is in line with work that insists on the role of temporality in the emergence of any organizational dynamic, such as the work of Hatch and Schultz (2017) and Schultz and Hernes (2013) on organizational identity. The analysis from the eventalization thus makes it possible to apply these developments to other dynamics, such as emergence of the social actor

and collective choices, and above all to extend them to fluid organizational phenomena, given that previous work has focused solely on the internal dynamics of firms. Of course, other elements also play an important role, and the complexity of fluid organizational phenomena cannot be reduced simply to the activity of eventalization. For example, the ideas specific to the maker movement contribute to the socialization of the ICI Montreuil's makers and the emergence of a common culture (Lallement, 2015).

This being the case, the research field seems to indicate that the structure of events plays a significant role in the emergence and maintenance of a fluid organizational phenomenon. This is therefore a contribution to our understanding of fluid organizational phenomena, as the results show how the structure of events participates in the creation of a shared frame of reference, despite the permanent evolution of activities and relationships and the absence of a formal system of coordination. This shared frame of reference helps to qualify the organizational phenomenon, in particular by participating in the definition of organizational dynamics. In the end, by qualifying the organizational phenomenon, it is the activities of the actors that are made possible, in part thanks to the structure of events. This means that the fluidity of the organizational phenomenon can never be total, because any collective action supposes the emergence of a frame of reference and collective dynamics which, in part, annihilates the fluidity of the organizational phenomenon, even if the frame of reference and the dynamics are never entirely stable and are subject to continuous redefinition by the actors. Thus, the qualification of the fluid organizational phenomenon paradoxically contributes to a 'loss' of fluidity of the organizational phenomenon. The reproduction in time of the dynamics, such as the identity, actorhood, and the collective decisions, can undoubtedly lead to an evolution of the fluid organizational phenomenon towards a more structured and reified organizational phenomenon, in that rules, a culture, a history, etc. can partly impose themselves on the actors. As such, the case study shows how the founders, the staff, and a number of makers defined an initial form of organizational structure, which seemed to grow stronger throughout my presence in the field. The definition of a collective identity and of a social role, and the collective incentive to favor certain kinds of project is constitutive of this first form of organizational structure. While the definition of this structure has contributed to the success of the makerspace and of the makers, it has also helped to 'solidify' the organizational phenomenon.

This also leads us to pursue the idea developed in the literature on organization, according to which acts of communication are constitutive of the organizational phenomenon (Blagoev et al., 2019; Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; Schoeneborn et al., 2019), and the results support this idea. In line with certain works in the field of narrative approaches

(Cunliffe et al., 2004; Rantakari & Vaara, 2017), the results seem to indicate that the acts of communication involved in defining and mobilizing past, present, and future events play a significant role in the definition of organizational phenomena. More precisely, these events can be related to experiences lived by the actors or related to a past, a present, and a future that are not directly experienced by the actors. This is the case, for example, for the artistic and industrial past of the city of Montreuil, which the actors did not experience, and also the development of the maker movement, which arose essentially in the United States and therefore far from the actors' daily lives. Thus, despite the apparent remoteness of these events, they do clearly contribute to the definition of a common frame of reference for the actors. This is the result of a melting pot of events, that is, an articulation of several events that contribute to creating meaning. Nevertheless, not all experiences are necessarily the subject of an eventalization. It seems that only those experiences that define the lived moment are the object of an eventalization, because, as mentioned previously, eventalization leads to the definition of the structure of events, which is the temporality that gives meaning to the current moment (Hussenot & Missonier, 2016).

Eventalization and management in makers' collectives

The notion of eventalization can also contribute to improving our understanding of the roles that the staff and founders of makerspaces can play. Indeed, the results show that the staff and founders of ICI Montreuil participated in defining the organizational phenomenon, notably by helping to define and mobilize past, present, and future events in their discussions and conversations. More specifically, the staff and founders of ICI Montreuil are those who have played the biggest part in the construction of a common narrative that carries a shared meaning about the collective and its activities (Gabriel, 2000; Weick, 1995). This was the case, for example, when the founders and staff endeavored to articulate the makers' projects with their desire to revive industry in France. The redefinition by the staff and the founders of the ICI Montreuil objective thus helped to define a new ambitious common objective for all the makers, enabling them to unite around a common cause: the revival of industry in France. Ultimately, this also strengthened their identity as a maker. On this point, it should be noted that not all the players have the same involvement in defining past, present, and future common events. The staff, co-founders, and some makers play an important role, while others (who represent the majority of residents) play a lesser role.

The literature had already shown that the staff and founders of shared workspaces can be connectors, mediators, referrers, janitors (Burret, 2015) who facilitate innovation (Fabbri &

Charrue-Duboc, 2016), knowledge exchange (Butcher, 2018; Parrino, 2015), and the development of new work practices (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte & Isaac, 2016). To this, these results make an additional contribution by highlighting the active role of staff and founders of shared workspaces in defining a common narrative. Of course, this contribution is drawn from the particular context of ICI Montreuil's makers. On the one hand, the founders have a relatively precise vision of their project, which is partly portrayed through their website and press articles (interviews, portraits, documentaries, etc.). This undoubtedly plays an important role in the ability of the founders to propose a common narrative to which the makers adhere. On the other hand, the makers residing in ICI Montreuil all have a particular appetite for alternative work practices, although they have very different initial training (architecture, engineering, crafts, art, etc.) and varied professional backgrounds (young active worker, former employee, etc.). More specifically, not all residents define themselves as makers simply because they have become a member of ICI Montreuil. Rather, an appropriation of this movement takes place over time and through contact with other makers. Moreover, they do not all know the history of the city of Montreuil and do not necessarily live there. That being said, the common narrative resulting from the history of Montreuil and the movement of the makers is often in tune with their own professional project. This common narrative thus legitimizes and justifies the projects of each maker. This is perhaps why the buy-in to this common narrative presents no difficulty.

Specifically, I observed a form of 'events-driven management' that relies on the active participation of staff and founders in defining the common narrative. These results show how the staff and founders of ICI Montreuil participated in the formation of organizational dynamics by defining and narrating past, present, and future events from which, on the one hand, they justified and legitimized the creation of ICI Montreuil and, on the other hand, brought the collective of makers to life. This tells us how the actors manage to define a form of management in fluid organizational phenomena that is not coercive, but which consists more in creating (1) a common origin despite the singular paths of each; (2) a form of authenticity, despite the diversity of the productions (Foster et al., 2011; Hatch & Schultz, 2017); (3) a shared identity that allows actors collectively to define who they are and to individuate themselves (Hernes & Schultz, 2017); and (4) a desirable future and common goals (Danner-Schröder, 2018; Gephart et al., 2010; Kaplan & Orlikowski, 2013), despite the diversity of each person's ambitions. This events-driven management thus creates a sense of the collective and can orient the activities of independent workers with a more global strategy, despite the fluidity of the phenomenon. Here again, this result is in line with work that has highlighted the importance of narratives in the development and maintenance of organizational phenomena (Cunliffe et al., 2004; Rantakari & Vaara, 2017). More specifically,

the eventalization can be considered important in the case of fluid organizational phenomena, because the temporality that emerges from this allows a form of management without resorting to relationships of subordination.

Openings and limitations

The objective of this research was to show how organizational dynamics emerge from the definition of a structure of past, present, and future events in fluid organizational phenomena. Following these results and contributions, three consubstantial limits and openings to this research can be highlighted.

Firstly, further work could extend the developments on the link between eventalization and organizational dynamics. Actually, more research is needed to understand how the work of eventalization is produced and reproduced over time. In this article, my work has been to show the relationship between organizational dynamics and events, but the question of their evolution has not been addressed. It seems to me that other work could address this question by transcribing in time the formation and evolution of organizational dynamics. In addition, other work could extend the study of the dynamic of eventalization itself. While it may not have been possible in the fieldwork to observe oppositions or forms of negotiation in the definition of events between actors, other empirical research could enrich our understanding of eventalization by looking, for example, at conflicting cases of events' definition. Furthermore, this research emphasizes the relationship between past, present, and future events and organizational dynamics, but does not focus on the co-definition of events. This work of mutual definition of events has been excluded from the results in order to make them intelligible. Following on from the research of Schultz and Hernes (2013) and Hussenot and Missonier (2016), other research could transcribe and analyze this co-definition, in particular, to shed light on the formation of structure of events in the context of fluid organizational phenomena.

Secondly, this research focused on a fluid organizational phenomenon, which can be considered to be semi-informal (Blagoev et al., 2019) because it involved studying makers resident in a makerspace. A possible outcome for this research would consist in applying the proposed approach to fluid and 'informal' organizational phenomena, that is, for which there is no shared space and membership, such as digital nomad collectives (Wood, 2005), hacker collectives (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015), biker communities (Wilhoit & Kisselburgh, 2015), online communities (O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007), social movements (Haug, 2013), etc. An openness to such phenomena would perhaps force us to consider the role of shared spaces and membership in fluid organizational phenomena, particularly in the formation of organizational dynamics.

Finally, the application of the notion of eventalization to open organizational phenomena that are not necessarily fluid, that is,

organizational phenomena that are open but governed by pre-defined modalities of belonging and coordination, would be a way to pursue the conceptual development of this notion and would perhaps strengthen our understanding of these organizational phenomena. This could apply, for example, to corporate ecosystems or meta-organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011; Berkowitz & Bor, 2018; Gulati et al., 2012) and, more generally, all studies looking at companies, administrations, and/or their relationships that are constantly evolving and in which the actors are neither autonomous nor independent, but constrained by relationships of subordination. In this respect, the notion of eventalization can contribute to understanding, for example, the tension between the opening and closing of the organizational phenomenon (Armbrüster & Gebert, 2002; Dobusch et al., 2019), the opening of the organizational phenomenon and control (Clegg & Courpasson, 2004; Grey & Garsten, 2001), or between the opening of the organizational phenomenon and the hierarchical structure (Oberg & Walgenbach, 2008).

Conclusion

In this article, I set out to understand how organizational dynamics can emerge in fluid organizational phenomena, despite the absence of formal modalities of coordination and the independence of the actors. I relied on a case study conducted among the makers of ICI Montreuil to show that the enactment of a structure of past, present, and future events helps to create a common frame of reference from which the formation of organizational dynamics is possible. I have shown that this structure of events does not exist *a priori*, but is produced in discourses, both by the makers, the staff, and founders of the makerspace and by some external actors. This has led us to emphasize the role of eventalization, that is, the definition of past, present, and future events that participate in creating a common narrative, and in the definition of organizational dynamics such as identity, actorhood, and interconnected instances of decision-making. In particular, I have shown that this can be similar to a management activity in makerspaces. This research has addressed the question of organization in a context of the liquefaction of society, in order to propose a reading specific to fluid organizational phenomena. In this respect, this article can be considered as an invitation to think about organizational phenomena in a context of continuous evolution of work practices.

Acknowledgments

References

Adam, B. (1990). *Time and social theory*. Temple University Press.

Ahrne, G. & Brunsson, N. (2011). Organization outside organizations: The significance of partial organization. *Organization, 18*(1), 83–104. doi: 10.1177/1350508410376256

Ahrne, G., Brunsson, N. & Seidl, D. (2016). Resurrecting organization by going beyond organizations. *European Management Journal, 34*, 93–101. doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2016.02.003

Albert, S. & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behaviors, 7*, 263–295.

Anderson, C. (2012). *Makers: The new industrial revolution*. Random House.

Antonioli, M., Bureau, M. & Rouxel, S. (2015). Tiers-lieux, communautés à l'œuvre: Bricolage et nouvelle 'écologie du faire'. *Chimères, 87*(3), 129–137. doi: 10.3917/chime.087.0129

Armbrüster, T. & Gebert, D. (2002). Uncharted territories of organizational research: The case of Karl Popper's open society and its enemies. *Organization Studies, 23*(2), 169–188. doi: 10.1177/017084060 2232001

Bartel, C. & Dutton, J. (2001). Ambiguous organizational memberships: Constructing organizational identities. In M. A. Hogg & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 115–130). Psychology Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.

Bergson, H. (2013[1889]). *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Bergson, H. (2010[1896]). *Matière et mémoire*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Bergson, H. (2009[1907]). *L'évolution créative*. Presses Universitaires de France.

Berkowitz, H. & Bor, S. (2018). Why meta-organizations matter: A response to Lawton et al. and Spillman. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 27*(2), 204–211. doi: 10.1177/1056492617712895

Berrebi-Hoffmann, I., Bureau M. C. & Lallement, M. (2018). *Makers: enquête sur les laboratoires du changement social*. Seuil.

Blagoev, B., Costas, J. & Kärreman, D. (2019). 'We are all herd animals': Community and organizationality in coworking spaces. *Organization, First Published, 31st January 2019*. doi: 10.1177/1350508418821008

Bluedorn, A. C. (2002). *The human organization of time: Temporal realities and experience*. Stanford University Press.

Boje, D. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*. Sage.

Bosqué, C. (2015). Des fabLabs dans les marges: détournements et appropriations. *Journal des Anthropologues, 142–143*(3–4), 49–76. doi: 10.4000/jda.6207

Bosqué, C., Ricard, L. & Noor, O. (2014). *FabLabs, etc.: Les nouveaux lieux de fabrication numérique*. Eyrolles.

Burke, A. (Ed.). (2015). *The handbook of research on freelancing and self-employment*. Senate Hall Academic Publishing.

Burret, A. (2015). *Tiers-lieux et plus si affinités*. FYP Editions.

Butcher, T. (2018). Learning everyday entrepreneurial practices through coworking. *Management Learning, 49*(3), 327–345. doi: 10.1177/1350507618757088.

Chia, R. (1995). From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization Studies, 16*(4), 579–604. doi: 10.1177/017084069501600406

Chia, R. (1999). A 'rhizomic' model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change. *British Journal of Management, 10*(3), 209–227. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.00128

Chia, R. (2002). Essai: Time, duration and simultaneity: Rethinking process and change in organizational analysis. *Organization Studies, 23*(6), 863–868. doi: 10.1177/0170840602236007

Chia, R. (2003). Ontology: Organization as 'world-making'. In R. Weestwood & S. Clegg (Eds.), *Debating organization* (pp. 98–113). Blackwell.

Clark, P. & Rowlinson, M. (2004). The treatment of history in organization studies: Towards an 'historic turn?' *Business History, 46*(3), 331–352. doi: 10.1080/0007679042000219175

Clegg, S. & Baumeler, C. (2010). Essai: From iron cages to liquid modernity in organization analysis. *Organization Studies, 31*(12), 1713–1733. doi: 10.1177/0170840610387240

Clegg, S. & Courpasson, D. (2004). Political hybrids: Tocquevillean views on project organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 41*(4), 525–547. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00443.x

Cobb, J. B. (2007). Person-in-community: Whiteheadian insights into community and institution. *Organization Studies, 28*(4), 567–588. doi: 10.1177/0170840607075268

Collet, A. (2015). *Rester bourgeois. Les quartiers populaires, nouveaux chantiers de la distinction*. La Découverte.

Cooper, R. (2014). Process and reality. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjorth & R. Holt (Eds.), *Process philosophy and organization studies* (pp. 585–604). Oxford University Press.

Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P. & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies, 32*(9), 1149–1170. doi: 10.1177/0170840611410836

Cunliffe, A. L., Luhman, J. T. & Boje, D. M. (2004). Narrative temporality: Implications for organizational research. *Organization Studies, 25*(2), 261–286. doi: 10.1177/0170840604040038

Danner-Schröder, A. (2018). Focusing on and backgrounding events simultaneously: The past–present–future relationship of the great East Japan earthquake. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 29*(1). doi: 10.1177/1056492618774848.

Dawson, P. & Sykes, C. (2018). Concepts of time and temporality in the storytelling and sensemaking literatures: A review and critique. *International Journal of Management Review, 21*(1), 97–114. doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12178

Deephouse, D. L. (1999). To be different or to be the same? It's a question (and theory) of strategic balance. Strategic Management, 20, 147–166.

Deroy, X. (2009). Qui contrôle l'éthique des affaires dans les situations d'évènement? *Management International, 13*(2), 11–22.

Deroy, X. & Clegg, S. (2011). When events interact with business ethics. *Organization, 18*(5), 637–653. doi: 10.1177/1350508410393773

Dobusch, L., Dobusch, L. & Müller-Seitz, G. (2019). Closing for the benefit of openness? The case of Wikimedia's open strategy process. *Organization Studies, 40*(3), 343–370. doi: 10.1177/0170840617736930

Dobusch, L. & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). Fluidity, identity, and organizationality: The communicative constitution of anonymous. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(8), 1005–1035. doi.org/10.1111/joms.12139

Dougherty, D. (2012). The maker movement. *Innovations, 7*(3), 11–14.

Dougherty, D. & Conrad, A. (2016). *Free to make: How the maker movement is changing our schools, our jobs, and our minds*. North Atlantic Books.

Drepper, T. (2005). Organization and society. In D. Seidl & K. H. Becker (Eds.), *Niklas Luhmann and organization studies* (pp. 171–190). Copenhagen Business School Press.

Emirbayer, M. & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology, 103*(4), 962–1023. doi: 10.1086/231294

Eychenne, F. (2012). *Fab lab: L'avant-garde de la nouvelle révolution industrielle*. FYP Editions.

Fabbri, J. & Charue-Duboc, F. (2016). Les espaces de coworking: nouveaux intermédiaires d'innovation ouverte? *Revue Française de Gestion, 42*(254), 164–180. doi: 10.3166/rfg.2016.00007

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 695–727). Sage.

Foster, W. M., Suddaby, R., Minkus, A. & Wiebe, E. (2011). History as social memory assets: The example of Tim Hortons. *Management & Organizational History, 6*(1), 101–120. doi: 10.1177/1744935910387027

Foucault, M. (2000[1978]). Questions of method. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power: Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984, Volume 3* (pp. 223–238). The New-York Press.

Gabriel, Y. (2000). *Storytelling in organizations. Facts, fictions, and fantasies*. Oxford University Press.

Garrett, L. E., Spreitzer, G. M. & Bacevice, P. A. (2017). Co-constructing a sense of community at work: The emergence of community in coworking spaces. *Organization Studies, 38*(6), 821–842. doi: 10.1177/0170840616685354

Gephart, R. P., Topal, C. & Zhang, Z. (2010). Future-oriented sensemaking: temporalities and insitutional legitimation. In T. Hernes & S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking, & organizing* (pp. 275–312). Oxford University Press.

Grey, C. & Garsten, C. (2001). Trust, control and post-bureaucracy. *Organization Studies, 22*(2), 229–250. doi: 10.1177/0170840601222003

Gulati, R., Puranam, P. & Tushman, M. (2012). Meta-organization design: Rethinking design in interorganizational and community contexts. *Strategic Management Journal, 33*(6), 571–586. doi: 10.1002/smj.1975

Hardy, C., Lawrence, T. & Grant, D. (2005). Discourse and collaboration: The role of conversations and collective identity. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(1), 58–77. doi: 10.5465/amr.2005.15281426

Hatch, M. (2013). *The maker movement manifesto: Rules for innovation in the new world of crafters, hackers, and tinkerers*. McGraw-Hill Professional.

Hatch, M. J. & Schultz, M. (2017). Toward a theory of using history authentically: Historicizing in the Carlsberg group. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 62*(4), 657–697. doi: 10.1177/0001839217692535

Haug, C. (2013). Organizing spaces: Meeting arenas as a social movement infrastructure between organization, network, and institution. *Organization Studies, 34*(5–6), 705–732. doi: 10.1177/0170840613479232

Heidegger, M. (1990[1927]). *Etre et temps*. NRF – Editions Gallimard.

Hernes, T. (2014a). *A process theory of organization*. Oxford University Press.

Hernes, T. (2014b). Alfred North Whitehead. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjort & R. Holt (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of process philosophy and organization studies* (pp. 255–271). Oxford University Press.

Hernes, T. (2017). Process as the becoming of temporal trajectory. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization studies* (pp. 601–607). Sage.

Hernes, T. & Schultz, M. (2017). A temporal understanding of the connections between organizational culture and identity. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization studies* (pp. 356–371). Sage.

Hernes, T., Simpson, B. & Soderlund, J. (2013). Introduction: Managing and temporality. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 29*, 1–6. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2012.11.008

Humphreys, M. & Brown, A. D. (2002). Narratives of organizational identity and identification: A case study of hegemony and resistance. *Organization Studies, 23*(3), 421–447. doi: 10.1177/0170840602233005

Hussenot, A. (2016). Introduction au tournant processuel. In F. X. De Vaujany, A. Hussenot & J. F. Chanlat (Eds.), *Théories des organisations: Nouveaux courants* (pp. 261–278). Economica.

Hussenot, A. (2019). *L'organisation à l'épreuve des makers. Propositions pour une approche par les événements*. Presses Universitaires de Laval.

Hussenot, A., Bouty, I. & Hernes, T. (2019). Suivre et retranscrire l'organisation à partir des approches processuelles. In L. Garreau & P. Romelaer (Eds.), *Méthodes de recherche qualitatives innovantes* (pp. 127–147). Economica.

Hussenot, A., Hernes, T. & Bouty, I. (2021). Studying organization from the perspective of the ontology of temporality: Introducing the events-based approach. In J. Reinecke, R. Suddaby, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *Time, temporality, and history in process organization studies* (pp. 50–68). Oxford University Press.

Hussenot, A. & Missonier, S. (2016). Encompassing stability and novelty in organization studies: An events-based approach. *Organization Studies, 37*(4), 523–546. doi: 10.1177/0170840615604497

Hussenot, A. & Sergi, V. (2018). Collaborating without (formal) organization: How do independent workers call into question the matter of organization? In C. Cézanne & L. Saglietto (Eds.), *Human capital intensive firms* (pp. 53–71). IGI Global Edition.

Husserl, E. (1964[1928]). *Leçons pour une phénoménologie de la conscience intime du temps*. PUF.

Jarzabkowski, P., Lê, J. & Spee, P. (2017). Taking a strong process approach to analyzing qualitative process data. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization studies* (pp. 237–253). Sage.

Jensen, A., Thuesen, C. & Geraldi, J. (2016). The projectification of everything: Projects as a human condition. *Project Management Journal, 47*(3), 21–34. doi: 10.1177/875697281604700303

Kaplan, S. & Orlikowski, W. (2013). Temporal work in strategy making. *Organization Science, 24*(4), 965–995. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1120.0792

King, B. G., Felin, T. & Whetten, D. A. (2010). Finding the organization in organization theory: A meta-theory of the organization as a social actor. *Organization Science, 21*(1), 290–305. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1090.0443

Kociatkiewicz, J. & Kostera, M. (2014). *Liquid organization: Zygmunt Bauman and organization theory*. Routledge.

Kociatkiewicz, J. & Kostera, M. (2018). After retrotopia? The future of organizing and the thought of Zygmunt Bauman. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 34*, 335–342. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2018.05.003

Lallement, M. (2015). *L'âge du faire. Hacking, travail, anarchie*. Le Seuil.

Langley, A. & Tsoukas, H. (2010). Introducing: Perspectives on process organization studies. In T. Hernes & S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking and organizing* (pp. 1–26). Oxford University Press.

Langley, A. & Tsoukas, H. (2017). Introduction: Process thinking, process theorizing and process researching. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of process organization studies*. Sage.

Latour, B. (2006). *Changer de société, Refaire de la sociologie*. La Découverte.

Latour, B. (2009). *Sur le culte moderne des dieux fétiches, suivi de Iconoclash*. La Découverte.

Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A. & Isaac, H. (2016). The new office: How coworking changes the work concept. *Journal of Business Strategy, 37*(6), 3–9. doi: 10.1108/JBS-10-2015-0105

Luhmann, N. (2005). The paradox of decision making. In D. Seidl & K. H. Becker (Eds.), *Niklas Luhmann and organization studies* (pp. 85–106). Copenhagen Business School Press.

Lundin, R. A., Arvidsson, N., Brady, T., Ekstedt, E. & Midler, C. (2015). *Managing and working in project society*. Cambridge University Press.

Maldini I. (2013). *The fablab Amsterdam user: A survey on their profile and activity (study within « object user relationships in open design dynamics » project)*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Waag Society.

March, J. & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. John Wiley and Sons.

Mead, G. H. (1932). *The philosophy of the present*. Open Court Company.

Mitev, N., de Vaujany, F. X., Laniray, P., Bohas, A. & Fabbri, J. (2019). Coworking spaces, collaborative practices and entrepreneurship. In K. Riemer, S. Schellhammer & M. Meinert (Eds.), *Collaboration in the digital age* (pp. 14–44). Springer.

Moore, W. E. (1963). *Man, time and society*. Wiley.

Nicotera, A. M. (2013). Organizations as entitative beings: Some ontological implications of communicative constitution. In F. Cooren & D. Robichaud (Eds.), *What is an organization? Materiality, agency, and discourse* (pp. 90–113). Routledge.

Oberg, A. & Walgenbach, P. (2008). Hierarchical structures of communication in a network organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 24*(3), 183–198. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2008.03.011

O'Mahony, S. & Ferraro, F. (2007). The emergence of governance in an open source community. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1079–1106. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2007.27169153

Parrino, L. (2015). Coworking: Assessing the role of proximity in knowledge exchange. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 13*(3), 261–271. doi: 10.1057/kmrp.2013.47

Rantakari, A. & Vaara E. (2017). Narratives and processuality. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization studies* (pp. 271–285). Sage.

Reinecke, J. & Ansari, S. (2017). Time, temporality, and process studies. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization Studies* (pp. 402–416). Sage.

Rowlinson, M., Booth, C. & Clark, P. (2010). Social remembering and organizational memory. *Organization Studies, 31*(1), 69–87. doi: 10.1177/0170840609347056

Rumpala, Y. (2014). 'Fab labs', 'makerspaces': Entre innovation et émancipation? *Revue Internationale de l'Economie Sociale (Recma), 334*, 85–97. doi: 10.7202/1027278ar

Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T. R. & Kärreman, D. (2019). The communicative constitution of organization, organizing, and organizationality. *Organization Studies, 40*(4), 475–496. doi: 10.1177/0170840618782284.

Schreyögg, G. & Sydow, J. (2010). Organizing for fluidity? Dilemmas of new organizational forms. *Organization Science, 21*(10), 1251–1262. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0561

Schultz, M. & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity. *Organization Science, 24*(1), 1–21. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1110.0731

Schultz, M., Maguire, S., Langley, A. & Tsoukas, H. (2012). *Constructing identity in and around organizations*. Oxford University Press.

Simon, H. (1975). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations*. The Free Press.

Sorokin, P. A., & Merton, R. K. (1937). Social time: A methodological and functional analysis. *American Journal of Sociology, 42*(5), 615–629.

Spinuzzi, C. (2012). Working alone together coworking as emergent collaborative activity. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 26*(4), 399–441. doi: 10.1177/1050651912444070

Weber, M. (1978[1922]). *Economy and society*. University of California Press.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Addison-Wesley.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.

Whetten, D. A. & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business and Society, 44*(1), 393–414. doi: 10.1177/0007650302238775

Whitehead, A. N. (1920). *Concept of nature*. Cambridge University Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1978 [1929]). *Process and reality*. The Free Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1938). *Modes of thought*. The Free Press.

Wilhoit, E. D. & Kisselburgh, L. G. (2015). Collective action without organization: The material constitution of bike commuters as collective. *Organization Studies, 36*(5), 573–592. doi: 10.1177/0170840614556916

Wood, M. (2005). Nomad aesthetics and the global knowledge economy. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 3*(4), 50–64.

Zerubavel, E. (1981). *Hidden rhythms: Schedules and calendars in social life*. University of Chicago Press.