



HAL
open science

“ A diachronic view of the role of collaborative spaces in the creative industries: The singular case of the French “ atelier Nawak ” ”

Pierre Poinson, Thomas Paris

► **To cite this version:**

Pierre Poinson, Thomas Paris. “ A diachronic view of the role of collaborative spaces in the creative industries: The singular case of the French “ atelier Nawak ” ”. Collaborative Spaces at Work Innovation, Creativity and Relations, 2020. hal-03097441

HAL Id: hal-03097441

<https://hal.science/hal-03097441>

Submitted on 27 Aug 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

A diachronic view of the role of collaborative spaces in the creative industries
The singular case of the French “atelier Nawak”

Pierre Poinignon (1)
Thomas Paris (2)

(1) i3-CRG, École polytechnique, CNRS, IP Paris
(2) GREG HEC, CNRS & HEC Paris

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Abstract:

The role of collaborative spaces in creativity has mostly been studied from a *hic et nunc* perspective. The literature focuses on the role of collaborative spaces in the way they encourage the production of new and valuable ideas. Studies focus on the effects on creativity, considered as an immediate artistic creation, at a given time and place. Based on a study of Atelier Nawak, a workshop that has hosted authors who initiated the revival of the French comics industry, we will shed new light on the role that these spaces may have on the creative process. We introduce a diachronic perspective: creativity is not assessed at the moment, but over time, at the meeting of the artistic creations with the art world in which it takes place.

Keywords:

collaborative spaces, creativity, creative industries, comics industry, Nawak, France

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Introduction

There is growing interest in collaborative spaces. They are defined as spaces where different actors meet and interact in order to boost creativity and may include co-working spaces, fablabs, social hubs, etc. Because employee creativity is vital to the growth and competitiveness of many organizations (Tushman & Moore, 1988), researchers have studied the factors that can increase individual creativity (Amabile, 1996; Zhou & George, 2001). Today, most of the research on collaborative spaces focuses on their influence on creativity at a given time and place.

This chapter aims to contribute to this stream of research by focusing on the outcomes of collaborative spaces in a broader perspective. Though research generally considers the immediate products of creativity, this chapter proposes to consider the ability of the collaborative space to alter an individual's trajectory and focus not on his/her artistic output but on the socially constructed value of his/her production.

This proposal is based on the unique case of an original collaborative space in the French comic book industry: the “Atelier Nawak”¹ workshop. Over time, this workshop has acquired an extraordinary reputation in the world of comics, owing to the creativity of the authors who worked there. Nevertheless, it is not possible to explain this case using the theoretical frameworks employed by existing research on collaborative spaces. Indeed, at first glance, this workshop seemed to have no particular characteristics that distinguished it from other workshops.

The originality of this case is that it brings out the possible impacts of a collaborative space on creativity, not “here and now”, but on a broader scale of time and space. This chapter's contribution is to propose a diachronic perspective of the role of collaborative spaces in the creative industries.

Theoretical background

As defined by Amabile (1983), creativity is the ability to conceive an idea or to make a prediction that is both new and adapted to its context. Creative industries (Caves, 2000) are those industries whose organization is structured around creativity. This implies specific ways of functioning (Caves, 2000). And, far from the image of the solitary creative artist that this may evoke, the creative industries have a collective dimension (Becker, 1982). Collaborative spaces, given that they promote interactions and collaboration, are considered supportive of individual or collective creativity (Capdevila, 2015).

The role of spaces in the creative industries has been studied for a long time, at different scales (Scott, 2005), from the smallest to the largest. On the smallest scale, that of collaborative spaces, the literature has focused on three major impacts of spaces on creativity.

These spaces facilitate collaboration between individuals by offering the proximity needed for day-to-day interactions, and such collaboration enhances their creativity. Research has highlighted the importance of interactions (Perry-Smith & Shalley 2003; Cattani & Ferriani, 2008; Montanari, Scapolan, and Giannecchini, 2016) and networking (Cooke & Leydesdorff, 2006; Hekkert & Negro, 2009) for innovation and creativity. It mostly explores how the physical proximity of individuals may prompt interactions that stimulate innovation or creativity (Oksanen & Stahle, 2013).

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

They are also seen as a locus for new discourses and new practices. Collaborative spaces can host communities, which makes possible the institutionalization of such new discourses and practices. Collaborative communities are groups of individuals who can work together on common projects, not only pursuing their own interests (Frieling, Lindenberg, and Stokman, 2014; Garret, Spreitzer, and Bacevice, 2017). Sometimes creative people have to create their own institutions in order to impose their own aesthetic conventions (Moulin & Costa, 1992). New discourses and new practices emerge from a community and lead to the creation of new conventions (Rao, Monin, and Durand, 2003). On many different scales, the space may act as a catalyst for the dynamic emergence of new discourses and new practices: Paris for cubism (Sgourev, 2013), Vienna for sciences and arts (Andersson, 1985), New York, Liverpool or Nashville for music (Power & Hallencreutz, 2007).

Finally, collaborative spaces may provide tools and materials for innovative activities. The literature has highlighted the relation between the physical characteristics of the environment on the creativity of knowledge workers (Dul, Ceylan, and Jaspers, 2011). Since the creative industries are often project-based, the availability of resources in a given location facilitates their use. This makes even more sense in sectors where the irregular activity of companies does not allow them to support high fixed costs (Benghozi, 1989).

<TABLE 1 HERE>

These different streams focus on the role of collaborative spaces in stimulating the production of new and valuable ideas. They focus on the immediate effects on creativity: creative outputs at a given time and space.

None of these explanations help us to understand the singular case of Nawak. In this workshop, interactions between individuals were rather unremarkable (nothing different than any other workshop). The workshop was not rooted in any institutional discourse (no manifesto was written). The place itself did not have any resources necessary for the authors' work (they did not need a lot of materials for drawing). We therefore suggest considering creativity in a broader perspective and integrating dimensions that are exogenous to prior research streams.

This chapter raises the question: To what extent can the influence of a collaborative space on creativity go beyond its *hic et nunc* context? We propose to shine a new light on the influence of a collaborative space on the creative abilities of a group of individuals.

Methodology and data

The singular case of the French "atelier Nawak" & "atelier des Vosges"

At the beginning of the 1990s, the publisher Guy Delcourt left his premises at 44 rue Quincampoix in Paris. He proposed to Thierry Robin, a French comics author, to turn it into a workshop for comics authors. Robin found five people with whom to share the rent and formed the workshop's first generation of occupants. Soon, some of the authors left and, in order to continue paying the rent, they were replaced by new ones. Henceforth, the workshop's existence was punctuated by departures and arrivals of new people.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

During the summer of 1995, David B. found a new place in the prestigious Place des Vosges, a very chic address in Paris. Frédéric Boilet decided to name this new workshop “Atelier des Vosges”. The entire group moved in summer 1995. The atmosphere changed somewhat: from the dark workshop of Quincampoix street, they found themselves in the very chic Place des Vosges, in a much bigger and brighter workshop.

Later, the Nawak workshop and Les Vosges workshop would become mythical in the world of French comics: the industry, the readership and even the non-specialized press spoke of this place where a few dozen genius authors had been able to restore the grandeur of French comics.²

Gradually, the authors began to experience some small successes. Eventually, television, radio and newspapers started to pay attention to these strange little workshops where something seemed to be happening. A young author who arrived in the 2000s described his first steps in the workshop:

One day I saw France Inter³ at the workshop. I did not know why they were there, it was very, very weird. One day Christophe received the prize for the best first album at Angoulême [International Comics Festival]. I think it was just when I arrived at the workshop. The next year he got the prize for the best album. I started to understand what was going on... Oh damn, something was happening.⁴

In 2000, a Nawak author, Marjane Satrapi, released *Persepolis*. It was a huge success: more than ten million copies were sold worldwide to an audience that went beyond the usual comics readership, thus pushing the boundaries and popularizing this genre.

And that was a fantastic achievement. Marjane had been published. *Persepolis* sold well, but not a hundred thousand copies like *Largo Winch*. It reached a wider audience than the traditional comics readership. That’s what we all seek. We wanted to get out of this ghetto of comics readership and open up to everyone. And it worked. *Persepolis* has sold ten million copies worldwide, including in circles where they had never heard of comics. And they said to themselves: so, this is what comics are. It was at this point that publishers began to create their collections, somewhat alternative, and to pay attention to people who hadn’t been interested in traditional comics. And that was a great achievement for us. What we were doing could become the locomotive of comics. It was a big step forward in this environment, I think.

Following the success of Marjane Satrapi, most of the Nawak authors had successful careers, such as Joann Sfar, who went on to make several movies. Moreover, Christophe Blain, Emmanuel Guibert, Marjane Satrapi, Joann Sfar and Lewis Trondheim were all awarded the French Order of Arts and Letters.

The traditional publishing houses took notice of this new wave and tried to catch it, each in their own way, for example, the Poisson Pilote collection from Dargaud or the great French publishing house, Gallimard, who put Joann Sfar in charge of a new collection. Nowadays the comics industry is much less dichotomized (mainstream/independent) than in the early 90s and diversity is reaching an unparalleled level.

The Nawak & Les Vosges workshops were a key player in this renewal.

Data collection

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

The origin of this research was an exploratory study to understand the groupings (on various scales and in various forms) in the creative industries. This phase led us to discover Nawak and its mythical dimension. We met one of the authors, who highlighted a contradiction between the successful careers of its members that can be observed years afterward, and the banality of what they had experienced there. This contradiction convinced us of the uniqueness of the workshop and the utility of studying it to develop a new perspective to understand collaborative spaces.

Because we were not testing new propositions but trying to understand a new phenomenon, we determined that a comprehensive and qualitative approach (Dumez, 2016) through a single case study (Yin, 2012) was the most appropriate way to understand the impact of the workshop on creativity. Indeed, our intuition after that first interview was that this case might call into question some of the existing theory. Described as a “workshop like any other”, even though the writers who worked there went on to have remarkable careers, the conventional explanations of a collaborative space’s influence on creativity did not seem to explain what had happened there.

More than just a gathering of artists, the workshop was a locus of many and diverse interactions and housed an *ad hoc* community that evolved over time. In addition, this space differed from the types of spaces often studied in management sciences: the people who belonged to it acted in complete autonomy.

We faced a methodological difficulty. This case took place 20 years ago and the actors had since become stars in their field. As a result, they were difficult to access. And when we did manage to interview them, we were asking them to make a significant effort to remember. A series of semi-structured interviews was conducted with past authors. We interviewed 17 authors.⁵ In addition, we analyzed a series of documents on the history of the workshop and the history of the comics industry in France.⁶

This heterogeneous material was coded using a combination of findings from the data (grounded theory) and from existing theory (Ayache & Dumez, 2011) in order to avoid any risk of circularity (Dumez, 2016).

Data analysis

We approached the authors fairly openly, only specifying that we were doing a case study on the Nawak and Les Vosges workshops. We began with open-ended questions and focused on factual information (careers, motivations for joining the workshop or leaving it) to avoid any risk of circularity. Nevertheless, very broad theoretical frameworks were also invoked: the impact of third places or collaborative spaces on creativity. The interviews were transcribed and coded using categories that had emerged from the field or were provided by the literature.⁷ We put all these categories in an Excel sheet that we filled in gradually.

As the interviews were unstructured, the duration varied depending on the people interviewed, lasting between 30 minutes and two hours.⁸ The first few questions were factual: “Could you describe your career before your arrival in the workshop?”; “Why and how did you join the workshop?”; “Why did you leave the workshop?”; “How do you work nowadays?”. Asking such factual questions allowed us to evaluate the role of the workshop as a collaborative space for these authors while protecting us from confirmation bias.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Two of the seventeen interviews were conducted by both authors, and fifteen were conducted by one. This allowed us both to converge on the questioning, and to keep some distance with the material. The data collection work was spread over two years from January 2016 to December 2018. We alternated phases of data analysis using the floating attention method with phases of coding. Repeated readings of the interview transcripts led to the emergence of new ideas that sharpened our understanding of the material and were then incorporated into the following interviews (Dumez, 2016). This abductive method allowed us to develop a new understanding of our object within a theoretical framework.

Moreover, in order to mitigate the effect of biases from the interviewees and to correct for the natural approximations due to recollection of events that took place more than twenty years ago, we triangulated our data collected in the various interviews with the data from our secondary sources.

Findings

Nawak or Les Vosges

Nawak and Les Vosges can be considered as a single entity. All the authors interviewed who made the move from one location to the other confirmed this same impression: according to them, it made no difference.

I was very happy to move to Les Vosges. The neighborhood was prettier, there were beautiful girls everywhere. But from the workshop point of view, apart from the fact that it was brighter, it made no difference.

Moreover, our analysis of the answers from authors who only knew Nawak and those who only knew Les Vosges did not reveal any influence of this variable. The workshop evolved depending on the people who were part of it. "The real change was when people arrived or left. That could create a truly new atmosphere." Consequently, we analyzed the two workshops as a single collaborative space and call it Nawak, as that is the most commonly used name.

Reasons for joining the workshop

Getting a creative boost does not appear to have been a motivation for joining the workshop. The main reasons evoked are: seeking a stimulating work environment where artists motivate and encourage each other (50% of the interviewees); having a place to work other than home (35%); by accident (10%); for a lifestyle change (one of the interviewees).

They helped me out at first. Then I wanted to try it. It gave me a boost at the beginning. I had trouble concentrating alone at my desk.

I was very lonely. (...) I tried to make sure not to get up after nine, to get to work at ten o'clock and then try things, even when I did not have any order. And then one day, I totally cracked, I thought: what's going on? I cannot stand being here anymore. I need a workshop.

I arrived in Paris and I was living in an apartment that was quite small. I had already heard about the workshop, which had existed for some time, and so the idea was to have a place to work outside of my home.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

I did not go there voluntarily. I did not know who was working there at that time. I had a confused impression. (...) I joined because a friend suggested I join the workshop. It was a bit by chance.

I had a home where I could work. I could have done without them materially. (...) When I joined, I was looking for a break with my previous life.

This shows that the main motivation to join the workshop was not to be part of an artistic movement. Indeed, although recruitment was done naturally by affinity and with the same desire to change the world of comics, the workshop did not espouse an institutional discourse. Everyone freely expressed their art.

This means that the authors did not perceive the workshop as something that could increase their creativity, at least before they joined. Those who sought a stimulating work environment believed in the potential of the place to improve the quantity or quality of work done, but none thought it would influence their creativity.

Reasons for leaving the workshop

Similarly, the motivations to leave had nothing to do with their creations. The main reasons evoked are: they just stopped going there or stopped working in the workshop (30% of the interviewees); not for rational issues (25%); because it was the end of a cycle (25%), because the ambiance in the workshop had changed (20%).

I went there to drink, to see people. I felt that I was paying rent for nothing.

One day, I realized that I was paying but not going. So I told them that I was leaving.

I started to meet somebody for work outside Paris, so I went less and less, until one day I decided to leave the workshop.

And then there's alchemy. A place... with artists... you may feel bad. Sometimes we may want to leave.

I don't know. I needed a change.

I left because I wanted a change. There were no problems. But I really needed a change, to talk about other things, with other people.

I left Paris so I had to leave the workshop.

I had a job opportunity in Angouleme, so I left.

As often happens, after two years, disagreements occurred. And then I was fed up. So, I left.

Again, none of the authors evoke the influence of the workshop on their creativity to justify their leaving.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Impact on artists

We then try to understand what they got from it: 90% of them knew stimulating work environment, a motivation to get to work; all of them talk about the artistic freedom they enjoyed there; 35% benefited from opportunities to find odd jobs more or less related to comics; 50% appreciated the social life.

It was especially interesting and important for mutual motivation. We showed everyone what we were doing. We gave each other advice on our work.

We supported each other. We could ask our peers for their point of view. When we were embarking on a project, we showed it to each other. We watched their reactions.

We motivated each other. A year later I met Joann. We immediately became very good friends. With Emmanuel too. It was a very stimulating environment. I had a great desire to write. I saw the freedom Joann had when he wrote. It made me want to do the same. I became my own scriptwriter. I always had them read my albums.

The place absolutely did not create constraints for our work.

We were young and looking for money, for jobs. We circulated offers for odd jobs.

From time to time we organized parties, for example to celebrate Beaujolais. It fostered ties between us.

The effects can be divided into two categories. As far as their work is concerned, the authors do indeed acknowledge having found a stimulating work environment, by which they mean that the workshop helped them to get down to work, without necessarily making them more creative. In parallel, the workshop brought other effects that did not have a direct influence on their work.

Short-term effects

The workshop seems very ordinary from the authors' point of view:

Sure, the idea of the studio is a complete fantasy, like people imagine that it will smell of linseed oil, that there will be easels or a naked woman posing. We do not know what people imagine, what a workshop is. And no, no, you're not coming to see my studio, I'm just going to work, so it's not going to be interesting.

However, the workshop allowed the authors to take their work even further. By allowing them to express themselves as they wished, to dare to do things, the authors were able to push back the barriers.

They made me understand that one should not hesitate to try things. They helped me become self-confident. I know for a fact that if I had been alone at home, I would never have looked for other possibilities. But with their comments... Sometimes just a comment: you could try something here. Ah yes. Why not? I'll try— it's not bad.

Nevertheless, even this stimulating work environment does not explain the great creativity that inspired the Nawak myth. Indeed, such an environment may be provided by any workshop.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Long-term effects

The ability of places or spaces to stimulate interactions has often been studied. We focus on the role of collaborations between individuals who belonged to the workshop. In this paper, a collaboration is defined as a joint artistic project between at least two individuals from the workshop. This definition therefore excludes even frequent and regular assistance that one individual may provide to another if the individuals do not sign the work together. While interactions may have a positive impact on the motivation to get to work, here we are interested in joint collaborations.

We found three main types of collaboration in our data.

One-shot collaboration: two individuals decided to work on a joint project when they were in the workshop. This collaboration was not pursued afterward.

Continuous collaboration: the collaboration was initiated in the workshop and continued when the authors left.

Postponed collaboration: the collaboration began when the authors were no longer at the workshop.

<TABLE 2 HERE>

These findings show that interactions between individuals also have an impact in that they lead to long-term collaborations. Such interactions are the source of successful projects.

Recognition of success

Based on the data collected, we propose a new reading of collaborative spaces in the creative industries and how they can be seen as a quality label.

Something happened with the workshop. It's very strange. The workshop became a label in the eyes of publishers. We must put ourselves in their place: all at once, Guibert, Blain, Sfar, Satrapi, Bravo were in the same place. Of course, the publishers wondered what was going on there.

A virtuous circle was created: the successes of some authors attracted the attention of publishers, who conferred value on the workshop and thus made it easier for its authors to find their market.

Discussion

This paper aims to contribute to the field of research on collaborative spaces, which is currently being structured, by offering a new perspective on their impacts on creativity.

A collaborative space that challenges the literature

Beginning with third places (Oldenburg, 1989), then collaborative spaces, the research mainly focuses on what spaces may offer to the actors they host. Regarding creativity, the research has identified three kinds of mechanisms: the interactions between individuals and their role in fostering new valuable ideas, the role of the space as a locus for a manifesto, and the gathering of specific resources.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

As a collaborative space, Nawak facilitated the day-to-day interactions between authors, though in a very ordinary way, which corresponds to the role of a workshop but does not account for the particular creativity that Nawak authors experienced. No manifesto was written. There has never been a Nawak style. The authors were free to practice their art as they wanted. Finally, the authors did not need to go there to use tools or equipment. Indeed, a cartoonist needs very few materials: pencils, paper and a drawing board. Short of money at the time, some of them had little room to work at home, but the place offered no particular advantage in their work.

In the unique case of Atelier Nawak we find a contrast between the banality of an ordinary workshop with the recognition by the industry of a place that produced extraordinary creativity. The inability of the literature to explain such a case prompts us to investigate it.

<TABLE 3 HERE>

Impact on creativity: beyond a hic et nunc perspective

The effects of the Atelier Nawak in terms of creativity are not exceptional if one considers creativity in its general definition. These effects occur in two different ways after the authors' time at the workshop and in the way their work is perceived by external actors. In order to grasp this impact on creativity, we need to move beyond the *hinc et nunc* perspective used by most research on collaborative spaces. The space has no effect on the actual production of ideas but rather on the valuation of these ideas by the industry.

To understand how a collaborative space becomes a quality label, we define what we call a "lighting effect": when an artist and their work achieves critical and public visibility, all eyes turn towards the place where it was produced. For example, the success of one of Marjane Satrapi's works, *Persepolis*, or the successes of authors like Lewis Trondheim, Christophe Blain, Joan Sfar or Emmanuel Guibert made publishers feel there was a new market, that of adult comics, which drew their attention to the place from which it emerged.

The discovery of this new market coincided with the emergence of authors who could supply it and the promotion of their work by publishing houses. In this explanatory model, the success of one individual from the collaborative space attracts attention, which in turn facilitates market access for all the individuals from that space and consequently leads to its success *a posteriori*. The main role played by the space was becoming a quality label in the eyes of publishing houses. The fact that the authors gathered in the workshop did not produce more creative ideas, but it led to their ideas being valued externally.

This perspective is consistent with the literature on the creative industries, and specifically Howard Becker's work on art worlds (Becker, 1982) and Lucien Karpik's work on the economics of singularities (2007). Becker emphasizes conventional value, which is socially constructed. In this view, a creation or an idea has no intrinsic value; its value is constructed by the art worlds in which it evolves. Karpik (2007) focuses on industries that produce singular goods or services. In these industries, consumers refer to rankings or labels to choose a good or service (a work of art, a movie, a restaurant, etc.) These "judgment devices" participate in the construction of value.

By reintroducing this dimension – the process of value creation – we can understand the creativity paradox in the Nawak case.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Creativity in collaborative spaces: a diachronic perspective

The development of long-term relationships between authors is another effect highlighted by our research. The workshop can therefore be considered also as a hub where several individual dynamics intersect.

Research on collaborative spaces has analyzed the effect of such spaces on creativity in the framework of Amabile's definition of creativity. In those studies, creativity is examined from a synchronic perspective. However, the Nawak workshop had no specific effect on creativity, considered from a synchronic viewpoint.

Each author was able to benefit from advice and a stimulating work environment. Nevertheless, all this is quite common for a workshop and does not explain the great creativity attributed to its authors. The most important effects are to be found beyond the workshop: in the collaborations that occurred later in time and broader in space (some of them occurred several years afterward and outside the place). The workshop was a place where, at a given time, the artists' careers intersected. At this intersection, lasting bonds were created, the effects of which would be reflected in the creativity of the individuals. One may think that this is true for any workshop and that there is nothing unique about Nawak. We have no data to confirm or refute this assertion. Nevertheless, the collaborative space had this effect on creativity, which emerges when studied from a diachronic perspective. Whether this is specific to Nawak or not, this case allowed us to highlight this new dimension. And we can assume that the authors were more eager to engage in such collaborations, having observed each other's creativity. This long-term effect would play an amplifying role for the initial lighting effect. The lighting effect made the authors more visible and increased the value of their creations. This made them more desirable for collaborations. And these collaborations, initiated in the workshop, amplified their creativity.

Conclusion and implications

Collaborative spaces: a diachronic perspective

This chapter is based on the observation of a case in the creative industries that was poorly explained by the existing research on the effects of collaborative spaces on creativity. This observation led us to study the case from a different perspective. Amabile's definition of creativity is synchronic (*hic et nunc*), as it considers the immediate production of a creation and its intrinsic value. Becker (1982), on the other hand, looks at creativity in terms of the value creation process. Creativity is not assessed at a single moment, but over time, when the work meets the art world in which it is produced. We have therefore introduced a diachronic perspective, which helps to explain why the perception of creativity in the Nawak workshop was forged afterwards and not at the moment. This perspective allows us to resolve the Nawak paradox.

Managerial implications

This study examines the effects of collaborative spaces over the long term and with a scope that exceeds the physical boundaries of the place. The creation of a quality label, whether spontaneously or proactively, can facilitate the generation of these effects.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

The main implication of this research is that collaborative spaces' managers (or people working in this collaborative space if it's not managed) should not focus on the sole creativity dimension, but they should also take into account the whole environment. In order to make this process fertile, one should try to act on this environment. Supporting the lighting effect may be a useful strategy to make the ideas produced valuable. And collaborative spaces, in their ability to become quality labels, may help in this dimension.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Notes

¹ Nawak comes from French expression “*n’importe quoi*”, which means “whatever”.

² Our research has allowed us to draw up the following list of Nawak authors (by arrival date), which is quite exhaustive even though some people may have been omitted, especially those who were only there for a short time.

<TABLE 4 HERE>

³ One of the biggest French radio channels.

⁴ This quote and all the following come from the interviews we conducted.

⁵ We interviewed the following authors (in alphabetical order): Christophe Blain (author), Frédéric Boilet (author), Matthieu Bonhomme (author), Marc Boutavant (illustrator & author), Émile Bravo (author), Nicolas de Crécy (illustrator & author), Gwen de Bonneval (author); Jean-Pierre Duffour (author), Jean-Yves Duhoo (author), Brigitte Findalky (colorist), Emmanuel Guibert (author), Dominique Hérody (author & teacher), Jean-Christophe Menu (author & co-founder of L’Association), Hélène Micou (illustrator), Thierry Robin (author), Fabrice Tarrin (author), Lewis Trondheim (author & co-founder of L’Association).

⁶ Secondary sources:

Bravo, E. 2016. *La mystérieuse alchimie de l’Atelier Nawak*. École de Paris du management
Dayez, H., Blain, C. 2002. *La nouvelle bande dessinée: Blain, Blutch, David B., de Crécy, Dupuy-Berberian, Guibert, Rabaté, Sfar*. Niffle.
Hérody, D. 2003. “En Atelier” in *9e Art : Les Cahiers du Musée de la Bande Dessinée*. Éditions de l’An 2.

⁷ Categories we used:

Job
Arrival date
Departure date
Nawak or Les Vosges workshop
Common projects with other Nawak authors
Has worked with “L’Association”?
Main motivation to join
Time spent in the workshop
Reason for leaving
What did he or she get out of it?
Had a particular role
Prizes & rewards

⁸ Interviews

<TABLE 5 HERE>

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 45(2), 357.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity In Context: Update To The Social Psychology Of Creativity*. Hachette UK.
- Andersson, Å. (1985, December). Creativity and regional development. In *Papers of the Regional Science Association* (Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 5-20). Springer-Verlag.
- Ayache, M., & Dumez, H. (2011). Le codage dans la recherche qualitative une nouvelle perspective?.
- Becker, H. S., (1982). *Art Worlds*, Berkeley.
- Benghozi, P. J. (1989). *Le cinéma: entre l'art et l'argent*. Editions L'Harmattan.
- Cattani, G., & Ferriani, S. (2008). A core/periphery perspective on individual creative performance: Social networks and cinematic achievements in the Hollywood film industry. *Organization science*, 19(6), 824-844.
- Capdevila, I. (2015). Co-working spaces and the localised dynamics of innovation in Barcelona. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 19(03), 1540004.
- Caves, R. E. (2000). *Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce* (No. 20). Harvard University Press.
- Cooke, P., & Leydesdorff, L. (2006). Regional development in the knowledge-based economy: The construction of advantage. *The journal of technology Transfer*, 31(1), 5-15.
- Dul, J., Ceylan, C., & Jaspers, F. (2011). Knowledge workers' creativity and the role of the physical work environment. *Human resource management*, 50(6), 715-734.
- Dumez, H. (2016). Comprehensive research. *A methodological and epistemological introduction to qualitative research*.
- Frieling, M. A., Lindenberg, S. M., & Stokman, F. N. (2014). Collaborative communities through coproduction: Two case studies. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 44(1), 35-58.
- 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): pp. 821-842.
- Karpik, L. (2007). *L'économie des singularités* (pp. 12-13). Paris: Gallimard.
- Hekkert, M. P., & Negro, S. O. 2009. "Functions of innovation systems as a framework to understand sustainable technological change: Empirical evidence for earlier claims." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 76(4), 584-594.

NAWAK: A DIACHRONIC VIEW OF THE ROLE OF COLLABORATIVE SPACES

Montanari, F., Scapolan, A., & Gianecchini, M. (2016). 'Absolutely free'? The role of relational work in sustaining artistic innovation. *Organization Studies*, 37(6), 797-821.

Moulin, R., & Costa, P. (1992). *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché* (Vol. 1997). Paris: Flammarion.

Oksanen, K., & Ståhle, P. (2013). Physical environment as a source for innovation: investigating the attributes of innovative space. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17(6), 815-827.

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place: Café, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. Paragon House Publishers.

Perry-Smith, J. E., & Shalley, C. E. (2003). The social side of creativity: A static and dynamic social network perspective. *Academy of management review*, 28(1), 89-106.

Power And, D., & Hallencreutz, D. (2007). Competitiveness, local production systems and global commodity chains in the music industry: entering the US market. *Regional Studies*, 41(3), 377-389.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. *American journal of sociology*, 108(4), 795-843.

Scott, A. J. (2005). *On Hollywood: The place, the industry*. Princeton University Press.

Sgourev, S. V. (2013). How Paris gave rise to Cubism (and Picasso): Ambiguity and fragmentation in radical innovation. *Organization Science*, 24(6), 1601-1617.

Tushman, M. L., & Moore, W. L. (1998). *Readings in the management of technological innovation*. New York: Harper Collins.

Yin, Robert K. (2012). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 682-696.