

SPACES FOR CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION WITHIN AND ACROSS ORGANIZATIONAL BOUNDARIES: INTRODUCTION

Jörg Sydow^a, Amalya L. Oliver^b and Patrick Cohendet^c

^a*Department of Management, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany*

^b*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*

^c*Department of International Businesses, HEC Montréal, Canada*

INTRODUCTION

The need for novel and innovative solutions in society seems greater than ever before. Organizations and interorganizational arrangements such as networks, communities, platforms, and consortia have to organize creative processes in order to provide innovative products and services and/or excel with innovative structures and processes in more or less competitive environments. In particular, if so-called grand challenges or wicked problems are at stake, the production of new knowledge, products and services, or processes requires the crossing of organizational boundaries (Gray et al., 2022) into what is often termed “in-between spaces” (Yström & Agogué, 2020). These spaces are emerging in social interactions, potentially leading to creativity and innovation, and, at the same time, enabling the necessary interactions.

With this focus on spaces and social interactions, new organization-theoretical approaches and organizing-focused research questions emerge. Recent research in this area concentrated, for instance, on resources such as time, knowledge, and structure, and how they are enacted as enabling collaboration (Altman

Spaces for Creativity and Innovation Within and Across Organizational Boundaries



Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 91, 1–17

Copyright © 2025 by Jörg Sydow, Amalya L. Oliver and Patrick Cohendet. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this work (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>
ISSN: 0733-558X/doi:10.1108/S0733-558X20250000091014

et al., 2015; Kalish & Oliver, 2021). Other research discussed either the puzzling relevance of constraints in creative processes (April et al., 2019; Lampel et al., 2014; Ortman & Sydow, 2018) or explicitly focused on temporary or permanent experimental spaces for creating, for instance, new routines (Bucher & Langley, 2016). Another research stream centers on the social networks that are formed in such spaces within or across organizational boundaries (Amin & Cohendet, 2004; Cohendet & Simon, 2016; Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017). These networks can vary by type of collaboration, structure, and membership over time (Kalish & Oliver, 2021), or by the exchange processes and practices they capture (Bouncken & Aslam, 2019; Oliver, 2022).

For the creative process to unfold its dynamic and become institutionalized, another level of interactions needs to be considered. According to Cohendet and colleagues (Cohendet et al., 2010; Grandadam et al., 2013) or Lange and Schüßler (2018), creative processes critically rely not only on formal organizations and formal interorganizational arrangements from the “upperground” but also on the “underground” that brings together informal actors from creative, scientific, artistic, and cultural activities that take place outside any formal organization or institution, focused mostly on production, exploitation, or dissemination. The “middleground” often provides a link between the informal activities of the underground and the formal institutions and organizations of the upperground. This intermediate layer thus provides favorable conditions for creative ideas to move from the underground to the upperground and vice versa. Issues of intellectual capital and property rights are further elements to consider in creative processes within and across organizational boundaries (Konno & Schillaci, 2021), as well as lack of trust at different levels (Oliver et al., 2020) and tensions of competition within collaboration processes (Bullinger et al., 2010; Oliver, 2004).

Research on creativity and innovation within and across organizational boundaries has increasingly adopted process- or practice-based perspectives (Fortwengel et al., 2017). With their help, research has focused on how (inter)organizational activities are enabled and restrained by structure on the micro-level of groups, the meso-level of organizations and interorganizational arrangements, and/or the macro-level of fields or society. In turn, this research considers how this structure on one or more of these levels that are not identical with the upper-, middle-, and underground distinguished by Cohendet et al. (2010) but rather cut across them, is being reproduced or transformed by more or less creative and innovative practice.

This introduction and the whole volume on this particular topic intend to broaden and deepen research on managing and organizing creativity and innovation within and across organizational boundaries creating and making use of such spaces. In this introduction, we will pave the way by first clarifying what we mean by creativity and how it relates to innovation. Then we will give a short overview of how exactly research on creativity and innovation has not only considered spaces, but also in the sense of (physical) places. Thereby, we will review the manifold ways in how “space” in such studies has been addressed. Then, we will give a short overview of the papers of this volume and discuss to what

extent a “spatial turn” has already taken place in management and organization studies – or should be considered against the background of current process and practice theories that currently dominate this field of study.

PROCESSES AND PRACTICES OF CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

Creativity and innovation are often defined with regard to the outcome, that is, the generation and implementation of a new product or service or process. If the outcome is considered not only as novel but also as at least potentially useful or valuable (Amabile, 1996; Anderson et al., 2014) it is commonly understood as “creative” and, if actually implemented, as “innovative.” The minimum form of implementation is the use of the outcome within the organization or the interorganizational arrangement that has generated it. Despite the initial focus on outcomes, research on creativity and innovation has, during the last two decades or so, shifted more toward a better understanding of the process (e.g., Cohendet & Simon, 2016; DeFillippi et al., 2007; Hargadon & Bechky, 2006). One particularly and increasingly prominent process view focuses on creative or innovative ideas and related practices (cf., Fortwengel et al., 2017).

Many Process Views

Originally, creativity was considered as being the hard-to-understand front end of innovation processes. These processes were assumed to start with an idea that possibly leads to a scientifically or technically feasible invention and, finally, to a possibly economically viable innovation (Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Anderson et al., 2014). Over the years, process conceptualizations have moved from such a linear to a more complex and recursive understanding (Schübler et al., 2021). One example is the “idea journey” conceptualized by Perry-Smith and Mannucci (2017). With a focus on the role of social networks in creative processes, these authors distinguish, in addition to the phases of idea generation, implementation, and diffusion, two intermediate phases of idea elaboration and idea championing. Others like Coldevin et al. (2019) go one step further by relying on an entirely recursive conceptualizations in which not only interaction but also elements of chance, friction, play, serendipity, and uncertainty are accentuated in their relevance for processes of idea generation and evaluation (see also Hjorth et al., 2018; Ibert et al., 2021; Oliver, 2009). Such conceptualizations typically note the tension between freedom and constraint, either thought of as a “paradox of organizing” for creativity and innovation (DeFillippi et al., 2007) or as requiring a “dance in chains” (Ortmann & Sydow, 2018), in which chains – as constraints – may not only hinder but also stimulate creativity. This stimulation can also relate to the change of “chains” (e.g., in terms of postponed deadlines, more plastic objectives, or expanded resources) required in the creative process over time.

Fortwengel et al. (2017) distinguish, with regard to practices, between a “strong” and a “moderate” process view. While the former often builds on Schatzki (2002) and applies a flat ontology, the latter tends to build on Giddens (1984) and allows adhering to a tall ontology, a multi-level analysis that pleads to study creative practices on different levels: from the individual and (project) teams to organizations and interorganizational arrangements, organizational fields, and even whole societies. A study adhering to a strong process view would focus on interconnected events and the “becoming” of a creative practice. A study following a more moderate process view, by contrast, would investigate temporal work practices and explore the possibility of creativity in the light of spatial and temporal structures.

One Practice-based View

Following the “practice turn” in social sciences in general (Schatzki et al., 2001) and management and organization studies in particular (cf. Jarzabkowski et al., 2022), research on creativity and innovation has increasingly adopted a practice-based perspective as one particular process view that focuses on social practices and pays attention to the duality of structure and agency (Giddens, 1984). Like process views in general that do justice to the fact that “creativity is complex, elusive and multidimensional” (Schaefer, 2023, p. 9) a practice-based perspective requires to focus on situated practices as recurrent doings and sayings (Schatzki, 2002).

In their study of drug discovery processes with their extreme requirements for predictability (that result from the high investments involved), Otto et al. (2024) focus simultaneously on the need for entraining to and detrainning from certain *zeitgeber* (and sometimes entirely reframing clock-time structures) as well as on the temporal work practices to do so on the levels of projects as well as organizations. Such research applies what can be called a “creativity-as-practice” approach (Schaefer, 2023, p. 46) in which space and place in their different accentuations matter as much as time and temporality. Practices, including creative practices, are always either produced or reproduced or transformed in time *and* space (Giddens, 1984).

THE ROLE OF SPACE AND PLACE IN RESEARCH ON CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

Institutional economists, management scholars, and economic geographers have long emphasized that the forces of spatial and temporal context should be at the center of any theorization of knowledge formation that could serve as the basis for creativity and innovation. This would be very much in line with a theoretical perspective that emphasizes the fact that social practice plays out in time *and* space (Giddens, 1984). Space, however, appears in different forms, one of which being geographical, physical places, and others socially constructed spaces.

About Places

Scholars have insisted on the importance of place, understood as the realm of close, intimate, and bounded relationships (Amin & Cohendet, 2004), in the development of innovation. They view innovation and learning as a situated practice in distinctive local territories and emphasize the benefits of geographic embeddedness in fostering the increasing returns and competitive advantages associated with such localizations. Materiality matters here as much as meaning. For example, Brown and Duguid (2000) describe innovative places, such as local clusters in Silicon Valley, as “knowledge ecologies” that are fertile for knowledge growth because knowledge trapped within firms quickly finds ways to flow between them, particularly through the circulation of ideas and tacit knowledge among localized firms resulting from local product specialization. Another example is given by Grabher (2001) about Soho in London, which is a typical place where firms in this local media and advertising cluster provide their critical knowledge inputs through the local industrial atmosphere and clusters of related firms. In such places, the social and cultural dimensions of co-location and collaboration support micro-scale interactions that also depend on the type of proximity between actors (cognitive, organizational, social, institutional, and geographic proximity, according to Boschma, 2005).

In such representations, places are characterized by a unique geographic-physical location, often accompanied by a specific identity and a socially constructed set of meanings. Places appear as relatively stable locations conducive to social interaction, work, and organization. Cartel et al. (2022) distinguish two ontologies of place: (a) *place as an experience* through which people develop a sense of place: how they identify with or feel attached to a place and develop a strong or weak embodied, emotional attachment to the place (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977). A place is socially constructed insofar as it is “interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and imagined” by its inhabitants throughout history (Gieryn, 2000, p. 465); (b) *place as practice*, which captures how people, either self-consciously or not, make places and develop a socialized sense of place.

However, one of the limitations of this understanding of place is that while it explains how the nature of interactions between individuals and institutions in these localized milieus influences the nature, pace, and direction of innovation (how “institutions drive action”), it does not provide an adequate perspective for explaining how interactions among local actors lead to creativity and innovation, particularly how these social interactions enable the institutional design of contexts that foster creativity (how “action drives institutions”). For example, while it has been widely recognized since Marshall (2009 [1890]) that existing ideas circulate in localized clusters and contribute to creativity and innovation, there is no analytical tool in this understanding of place to explain how new ideas are generated, developed, or enriched in a given localized cluster. It is precisely this important nuance that the concept of space allows us to capture.

About Spaces

Holstein and Rantakari (2023, p. 57) define space as the location that “constitutively emerges from (inter)organizational activities, objects, arrangements, and

social practices.” Thus, space is now seen as both a social product and a generative force. In such a perspective, space emerges from a collaborative effort to socially construct a context that allows for the development of potentially innovative ideas. As [De Certeau \(1984, p. 117\)](#) pointed out, while “place is the stable, static, ideologically informed given, ... space as practiced place is about potentially anarchic movement.”

The difficulty with the concept of space, however, is its wide range of different meanings. For example, the literature refers to: relational spaces ([Grabher & Ibert, 2011](#)), constructed physical spaces ([Oliver & Rittblat, 2023](#)), esthetic spaces ([Sgourev et al., 2023](#)), reflective and experimental spaces ([Bucher & Langley, 2016](#)), open spaces/innovation spaces ([Maruani & Amit-Cohen, 2007](#)), creative spaces ([Gaim & Wählin, 2016](#)), collaborative spaces ([Cohendet, 2022](#); [Kalish & Oliver, 2021](#); [Montanari et al., 2020](#); [Schiemer et al., 2023](#)), co-working spaces ([Leforestier, 2009](#)), online spaces ([Hondros et al., 2023](#)), social media spaces ([Burke et al., 2023](#)), hybrid spaces ([Perkmann et al., 2019](#)), safe spaces ([Hondros et al., 2023](#); [Otto et al., 2020](#)), unitary spaces ([Cepa & Schildt, 2023](#)), social spaces ([Friedman, 2011](#)), temporary spaces ([Sydow & Windeler, 2020](#)), interstitial spaces ([Furnari, 2014](#); [Villani & Phillips, 2021](#)), intermediation spaces ([Gasparro et al., 2022](#)), network spaces ([Fortwengel, 2023](#)), lived spaces ([Lefebvre, 1991 \[1974\]](#); [Steigenberger & Lübcke, 2022](#)), provisional spaces ([Li & Khessina, 2024](#)), liminal spaces ([Shortt, 2015](#)), heterotopic spaces ([Topinka, 2010](#)), etc. In this inflation of space concepts, neither creative spaces ([Gaim & Wählin, 2016](#)) nor innovation spaces ([Caccamo, 2020](#)) are missing. Several of these types of spaces are explored in this volume. The different functions as well as modes and types of social interaction could explain this wide range of meanings, but we believe that the notion of “in-between spaces” proposed by [Yström and Agogué \(2020\)](#) captures the essence of such spaces: they are experimental constructs voluntarily designed out of traditional ways of organizing, they are generally located at the intersection of organizational boundaries, and they are characterized as places between organizational actors that are, as already stated above, not only emerging in social interactions, potentially leading to creativity and innovation, but at the same time enabling the necessary interactions.

To a large extent, these different constructs of experimentation can be interpreted in terms of innovation commons. Drawing on the concept of commons ([Ostrom, 1990](#)), [Allen and Potts \(2016\)](#) introduce the concept of innovation commons, as rule-governed spaces for solving the social dilemmas inherent in sharing knowledge, information, and other resource inputs for creativity and innovation. According to this theoretical perspective, this type of commons is an institution in which stakeholders (even if they are competitors) engage in collective action and even cooperation to foster innovation dynamics by developing rules for creating, sharing, and managing a pool of innovation resources. It is a community-level governance solution that emerges spontaneously from the mutual accommodation and agreements of communities of interacting agents in what is sometimes called the “middleground” ([Cohendet et al., 2010](#)). Innovation commons exist, for example, at the very beginning of the development of a new technology, at the point where a group of actors (often informal agents such as

technology enthusiasts) come together to explore knowledge bases and discover opportunities to use and develop the technology, and to bring it to the market (Cohendet, 2022; Potts, 2018). As history and theory show, technology development – from initial idea to widespread use – is fundamentally a collective process (Mondschein et al., 2021).

About the Ideation Process

The focus on “in-between spaces” allows for an in-depth study of the ideation process, which is inherently linked to the emergence and development of creativity, leading to a less linear, more recursive understanding of innovation processes (Coldevin et al., 2019; Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017).

On the one hand, a careful study of the conditions and modes of collaboration *within* the different forms of these reflective or experimental spaces offers new ways of understanding the conditions of idea generation and elaboration. A series of recent contributions to the literature have revealed how the constraints in these spaces can stimulate creativity (Ortmann & Sydow, 2018), how the combination of timing and spatial organization can trigger the formation of new ideas (Schübler et al., 2021), how the arrangement of material objects in these spaces can favor serendipity and unexpected ideas (Makri et al., 2014), and how they can lead to the creation of new routines (Bucher & Langley, 2016).

On the other hand, a number of works analyze how the ideation process is nurtured and enriched by the interactions *between* the specific in-between spaces and the entities beyond the boundaries of these experimental spaces. In such a perspective, the notion of “middleground” (Cohendet et al., 2010) refers to cases of in-between spaces that connect the informal communities of the “underground” with the formal institutions in the “upperground.” The enrichment of the ideation process through the circulation of ideas in the “middleground” resulting from bottom-up initiatives of the underground or from top-down impulses of the upperground could be associated to the dynamic between top-down plans, bottom-up experience, and the negotiation between them, which has been analyzed by Lefebvre (1991 [1974]) in his book *The Production of Space*. Lefebvre theorizes space as a trialectic (a triple dialectic) between three different forces. The first force is the “conceived space”: the power play of capital and state, that is, the investments of bankers, the rules of bureaucrats, and the blueprints of architects. The second force is “lived space”: the desires of the dwellers, their dreams, and memories. The third force, finally, is “perceived space”: the way in which these dwellers actually use space.

TOWARD A SPATIAL TURN IN RESEARCH ON CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION

In this section, we provide a short overview of the papers accepted for this volume and conclude with some thoughts about the role of space (and place) in research on creativity and innovation.

Short Overview of the Volume's Papers

In an effort to better understand the role of the spatial dimension in research on creativity and innovation, this volume brings together a wide range of empirical studies that examine different types and forms of spaces and places. The studies in this volume focus on multiple units of analyses, including teams, organizations, fields, as well as cities and regions, and their role in enhancing and facilitating creative and innovative products and services or processes (see Hedborg & Addyman, 2024, for a study focussing the level of projects). Creativity and innovation processes themselves are negotiated, defined, and co-constructed among and between different stakeholders, knowledge experts, creative and scientific professionals, and entrepreneurs. The studies extend our conceptualization and insights with regard to creativity and innovation embedded in spaces and places and are relevant for organizational scholars and policy-related spheres.

The papers in this volume focus on and contextualize social and organizational dynamics of creativity and innovation in three main conceptualizations of spaces and places. [Table 1](#) provides a “map” of the papers, describing the main phenomenon examined, the main theoretical lenses used, and the methods applied for data collection. In the last column, we describe the way by which each study approaches the concept of “spaces,” their meaning and contextualization, and the process they facilitate.

We organized the papers under three main themes related to spaces and places. The first theme describes different characterizations of spaces in which creative and innovative processes take place and are based on exchanges and negotiations between individuals. Here the respective studies examine the notion of in-between, safe, and relational spaces. These spaces allow for informal exchanges and disorder and ambiguity. They foster interactions, brainstorming, and experimentation and enable cognitive construction.

The second theme includes three studies that focus on nonstandard spaces and these include temporary, other, and digital spaces. Temporary settings offer spaces for bounded social actors in ways that are distinctive and allow for experimentation of novel ideas. “Other spaces” follow the concept of heterotopias and are outside and different from all other spaces. They foster creativity and innovation by allowing for escaping the routines and constraints of everyday life. Digital platforms create spaces for idea work and communication that is exposed to wide audiences and diverse users.

The third theme presents physical spaces, that is, places, on different levels. These include large peripheral geographic regions that allow for different and new opportunities for establishing innovative technology entrepreneurship; small places that have a distinctive physical form and identity and are advantageous for interactions and collaborations; and cities that adopt creative policies that allow for relational processes to be (re)produced continually.

Table 1. Summary of All Papers by Their Conceptualization of “Space” for Creativity and Innovation.

Authors	Title	Main Phenomenon	Main Theories	Method	Definition of Space
<i>A. Characterization of Spaces</i>					
Susanne Ollila and Anna Yström	“In-between Spaces” for Collaborative Innovation: Elucidating Interrelated Relational Spaces	The interactions with other collaborating organizational actors in in-between spaces: the member space, the learning space, and the delivery space	Triple Helix Interorganizational collaborations In-between spaces	Three case studies: interviews, participant observations, informal conversation and events	In-between spaces are relational spaces of becoming, embracing disorder and ambiguity, created through social relationships
Nadine Scholz, Marcella Miozzo, and Gabriela Gutierrez-Huertter O	The Collaborative Middleground: How Employees and Managers Co-create Novel Ideas	Collaborative middleground and safe spaces for collaborative creation of creative partnerships	Creativity Lefebvre’s theory: conceived, and perceived, and lived spaces Collaborations	Multiple case studies of six co-creative partnerships	Safe spaces ... enable individuals and groups to generate and experiment with novel ideas in a bounded environment ... and have the power to foster interactions that enable creative work for employees by providing different social support, feedback, and resources
Thomas Blonski, Thomas Paris, and Pierre Poinignon	Emergence and Organization of a Creative Place in the Middleground: Acceleration, Collateral Effect and Critical Mass	Exploring how the elements of a middleground are formed in creative places, and the nature of the links between underground and upperground as well as the mechanisms and dynamism within the territory	Middleground theory	Qualitative meetings with management and semi-directed interviews with 24 resident artists, supplemented with secondary sources	The emergence or existence of territories that seem to be conducive to creativity. These creative hubs or clusters are supported by formal or informal organizations that build and strengthen networks of players in a specific location

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued)

Authors	Title	Main Phenomenon	Main Theories	Method	Definition of Space
Thierry Houé	Effect of Proximity Relationships on Creativity and Innovation in an Interorganizational Complex Project	Inter-firm relationships and their effects on creativity and innovation focusing on client-logistics service provider interactions	Temporary organizations Supply chain management Proximity arrangements in in-between spaces	Case study of an inter-organizational construction project	Relational spaces have different purposes of creativity and innovation and are impacting diverse logistics activities. The relational space includes structured, agility, and learning spaces
Maura Soekijad, Natalja Laurey, Hans Berends, and Martleen Huysman	How Innovation Consultants Perform "Liminality Work" in Helping Others to be Creative	Development of a model of liminality work, through which innovation consultants help others to be creative by managing an in-between of freedom and structural constraints	Theories of creativity and liminality work	A qualitative study at an independent Dutch social innovation agency including interviews, documentations, and observations	Space is a constructed place where people can freely brainstorm, tinker, and experiment, be creative, and innovate
<i>B. Nonstandard Spaces</i> Birke D. Otto, Benjamin Schiemer, Harry Sminia, and Jörg Sydow	Failure as a Process: Shaping What Is Worth Doing in Creative Projects	Failure in creative processes and the role of evaluative spaces (pharmaceuticals and music)	Process approach to creativity and failure Role of expectations	112 interviews (36 music and 76 pharma), observations and field notes, 10 case description, and 2 case vignettes from both fields	"Evaluative spaces" are the spaces which determine what is worth pursuing or not in creative projects

<p>Martina Ukowitz and Markus Messerschmidt</p> <p>The Power of Heterotopias: Inter-organizational Cooperation as an Experimental Space</p>	<p>The forces in interorganizational initiatives with innovation focusing on the spatial dimension of experimental spaces in interorganizational initiatives and their impact on interorganizational acting</p>	<p>Foucault's concept of heterotopias</p>	<p>Case study Laboratory in a Science & Technology Park</p>	<p>Focus on "other spaces" – "heterotopias," that are real spaces embedded in society. They represent and deny other societal spaces; are outside of all spaces; and different from them. They provide the possibility to escape everyday life and to overcome institutional routines and foster creativity and innovation</p>
<p>Genjiro Kosaka, Yuki Tsuboyama, and Takahiro Endo</p> <p>Idea Work Beyond Organizational Boundaries: Framing and Reframing Projects on a Crowdfunding Platform</p>	<p>Idea work as a collective process with feedback and revisions in online crowdfunding</p>	<p>Process theory Creativity and paradox? On line spaces</p>	<p>Interviews of 36 participants</p>	<p>Digital platforms as spaces for idea work, where ideas are exposed to a wide audience and are reaching diverse user groups with heterogeneous evaluation criteria. In these spaces, creative outcomes are achieved through communicating ideas to the targeted</p>
<p>Anne Kurzmann, Christian Holzbach, and Anne-Katrin Neyer</p> <p>Switching Between Different Spaces of Stimulation and Focus: Steering Idea Work in Hybrid Work Settings</p>	<p>Switching between office and home leads to different use of creative spaces</p>	<p>Practice-based innovation and creative idea work Process theory</p>	<p>Qualitative interviews with 34 employees in a hybrid work setting</p>	<p>Space as a working arrangement where an employee divides their time between working at a traditional workplace and working remotely... which attempts to combine the best parts of both telework and office-based work ... Physical places and emerging spaces for work are different: "places should be considered as physically established spaces, on the contrary they appear as cognitive constructions."</p>

(Continued)

Authors	Title	Main Phenomenon	Main Theories	Method	Definition of Space
<i>C. Specific Localities</i>					
Étienne Capron and Elie Saoud	Place-based Affordances: Theorizing the Role of Places in Organizing Creativity	Affordance in organizations focusing on actors' relationship to their physical environments and the resulting possibilities for action	Material, social and institutional affordance Creativity Institutional logics	Vignettes' qualitative analysis from two organizations: cultural hub for electronic music and a nightclub with popular music. Examining projection and mapping field	Places are characterized by a unique geographical location, a distinctive physical form, and a specific identity, thus serving as relatively stable sites conducive for social interactions, work, and organizing collaborative and experimental spaces are within places
Efrat Asulin, Amalya L. Oliver, and Shai Harel	Possibilities for Technological Entrepreneurship in Peripheral Space: An Institutional Perspective	Different patterns of innovative technological entrepreneurship in two peripheral regions compared to the core	The three pillars of institutional theory Institutional theory of entrepreneurship	Firm level quantitative analyses of 15,499 technological start-ups (existing and closed) in the core and the periphery	Geographical space is the regional physical space in the core and the periphery. These spaces create different opportunities for establishing and managing innovative technological entrepreneurship
Rebecca Prescott, Ziyun Fan, Ziad Elsahn, and Tom Mordue	How Does a Public Policy Fail? Creative City Policy and the Tensional Space of Artist-led Organizations	Creative cities policy and its impact on artist-led organizations through the spatial articulation and implementation of policy rationalities organized under the creative city	Lefebvre's (1991 [1974]) spatial triad theory	Longitudinal qualitative study and ethnographic data from artist-led organizations in Newcastle	Following Lefebvre's (1991 [1974]) spatial triad, spaces are not a neutral container or pre-existent stage but something continually (re)produced through relational processes and practices

Concluding Remarks

We close this introduction by asking whether we are amid a spatial turn in research on creativity and innovation, a question approved for “place-sensitive organizational research” (Dacin, Zilber, Cartel, & Kibler, 2024) more generally already two decades ago (Sydow, 2004; Van Marrewijk & Yanow, 2010). As Blank and Rosen-Zvi (2010, p. 3) underlined:

for years now, spatial analysis is no longer confined to disciplines that deal directly with the physical dimensions of social existence, such as geography, architecture and urban planning. Over the past half a century, space has infiltrated most of the social sciences and the humanities: sociology, anthropology, philosophy, history, psychology and psychoanalysis, literary criticism, and legal studies.

This volume aims to contribute to highlighting that the “spatial turn” has not only taken place in management and organization studies in general (see also Wright, Irving, Zafar, & Reay, 2023), but has already significantly and more specifically enriched both the theoretical and practical basis for representing, analyzing, and managing creative and innovative processes.

More specifically, we claim that space should be considered as important as time and temporality in organization studies today. And this is particularly true for practice-based research on creativity and innovation where both seem to matter even more. Thereby, space should not only be understood in its social constitution but also in its material dimension. By this, we suggest that space should be regarded (also) as a place with the affordances it provides for organizing creative and innovative processes and practices. This, however, does not require a full-blown turn to spatial (and temporal) aspects of such processes and practices but “only” to pay the attention to them they deserve, theoretically and also with regard to methodology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The papers accepted for publication in this volume originated from one workshop and one conference. The workshop was organized as a German–Israeli Minerva School focused on “Creativity, Innovation and Inter-Organizational Collaboration – Process Views” and took place in the summer of 2023 at Freie Universität Berlin, Germany. The organizers were Carolin Auschra and Jörg Sydow (both Freie Universität Berlin) together with Amalya L. Oliver (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) and Adi Sapir (University of Haifa, Haifa). The conference was at the 39th EGOS Colloquium in Cagliari, Italy, July 2023, Sub-theme 72, titled “Spaces for Creativity and Innovation Within and Across Organizational Boundaries,” with Patrick Cohendet (HEC Montréal, Canada), Amalya Oliver (Hebrew University, Jerusalem), and Jörg Sydow (Freie Universität Berlin) as co-convenors.

We are grateful for the funding received from the German–Israeli Minerva School for the collaborative workshop, as well as to the EGOS Board for

approving our proposed sub-theme. We thank the participants in the Berlin workshop and the EGOS sub-theme for the enthusiastic brainstorming and shared learning spaces that led to this volume. Last, but not least, we extend our deep appreciation to Mike Lounsbury, Editor-in-Chief of the *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* series, who gave us the “green light” to move forward and edit this volume. Open access of this introductory paper has been made possible by a fund from the German Research Foundation (DFG).

REFERENCES

- Allen, D. W., & Potts, J. (2016). How innovation commons contribute to discovering and developing new technologies. *International Journal of the Commons*, 10(2), 1035–1054.
- Altman, E. J., Nagle, F., & Tushman, M. (2015). Innovating without information constraints: Organizations, communities, and innovation when information costs approach zero. In C. E. Shalley, M. A. Hitt, & J. Zhou (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship* (pp. 353–379). Oxford University Press.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Westview Press.
- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183.
- Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1297–1333.
- Amin, A., & Cohendet, P. (2004). *Architectures of knowledge: firms, capabilities, and communities*. Oxford University Press.
- April, S., Oliver, A. L., & Kalish, Y. (2019). Organizational creativity–innovation process and breakthrough under time constraints: Mid-point transformation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 28(3), 318–328.
- Blank, Y., & Rosen-Zvi, I. (2010). *The spatial turn in legal theory*. Hagar: Studies in Culture, Polity and Identity.
- Boschma, R. (2005). Proximity and innovation: A critical assessment. *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 61–74.
- Bouncken, R., & Aslam, M. M. (2019). Understanding knowledge exchange processes among diverse users of coworking-spaces. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(10), 2067–2085.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. In E. C. Nevis, A. J. Di Bella, J. M. Gould, R. L. Cross, J. Israelit, & S. B. Israelit (Eds.), *Strategic learning in a knowledge economy: Individual, collective and organizational learning process* (pp. 143–165). Routledge.
- Bucher, S., & Langley, A. (2016). The interplay of reflective and experimental spaces in interrupting and reorienting routine dynamics. *Organization Science*, 27, 594–613.
- Bullinger, A. C., Neyer, A. K., Rass, M., & Moeslein, K. M. (2010). Community-based innovation contests: Where competition meets cooperation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(3), 290–303.
- Burke, G. T., Omidvar, O., Spanellis, A., & Pyrko, I. (2023). Making space for garbage cans: How emergent groups organize social media spaces to orchestrate widescale helping in a crisis. *Organization Studies*, 44(4), 569–592.
- Caccamo, M. (2020). Leveraging innovation spaces to foster collaborative innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 29(1), 178–191.
- Cartel, M., Kibler, E., & Dacin, M. T. (2022). Unpacking “sense of place” and “place-making” in organization studies: A toolkit for place-sensitive research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 58(2), 350–363.
- Cepa, K., & Schildt, H. (2023). Data-induced rationality and unitary spaces in interfirm collaboration. *Organization Science*, 34(1), 129–155.

- Cohendet, P. (2022). Architectures of the commons: collaborative spaces and innovation. *ZFW—Advances in Economic Geography*, 66(1), 36–48.
- Cohendet, P., Grandadam, D., & Simon, L. (2010). The anatomy of the creative city. *Industry and Innovation*, 17(1), 91–111.
- Cohendet, P. S., & Simon, L. O. (2016). Always playable: Recombining routines for creative efficiency at Ubisoft Montreal's video game studio. *Organization Science*, 27, 614–632.
- Coldevin, G. H., Carlsen, A., Clegg, S., Pitsis, T. S., & Antonacopoulou, E. P. (2019). Organizational creativity as idea work: Intertextual placing and legitimating imaginings in media development and oil exploration. *Human Relations*, 72(8), 1369–1397.
- Dacin, M. T., Zilber, T. B., Cartel, M., & Kibler, E. (2024). Navigating place: Extending perspectives on place in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 45(8), 1191–1212.
- De Certeau M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.
- DeFillippi, R., Grabher, G., & Jones, C. (2007). Introduction to paradoxes of creativity: Managerial and organizational challenges in the cultural economy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 511–521.
- Fortwengel, J. (2023). Tracing the affective journey of an interorganizational network: Positive and negative cycles of relational energy in a network space. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 39(3), 101280.
- Fortwengel, J., Schübler, E., & Sydow, J. (2017). Studying organizational creativity as process: Fluidity or duality? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 26(1), 5–16.
- Friedman, V. J. (2011). Revising social space: Relational thinking about organizational change. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 19, 233–257.
- Furnari, S. (2014). Interstitial spaces: Microinteraction settings and the genesis of new practices between institutional fields. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 439–462.
- Gaim, M., & Wählin, N. (2016). In search of a creative space: A conceptual framework of synthesizing paradoxical tensions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 32(1), 33–44.
- Gasparro, K., Zerjav, V., Konstantinou, E., & Casady, C. B. (2022). Vanguard projects as intermeditation spaces in sustainability transitions. *Project Management Journal*, 53(2), 196–210.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity.
- Gieryn, T. F. A. (2000). Space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 463–496.
- Grandadam, D., Cohendet, P., & Simon, L. (2013). Places, spaces and the dynamics of creativity: The video game industry in Montreal. *Regional Studies*, 47(10), 1701–1714.
- Grabher, G. (2001). Ecologies of creativity: The Village, the Group, and the heterarchic organisation of the British advertising industry. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(2), 351–374.
- Grabher, G., & Ibert, O. (2011). Project ecologies: A contextual view on temporary organizations. In P. W. G. Morris, J. Pinto, & J. Söderlund (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of project management* (pp. 175–199). Oxford University Press.
- Gray, B., Purdy, J., & Ansari, S. (2022). Confronting power asymmetries in partnerships to address grand challenges. *Organization Theory*, 3(2), 26317877221098765.
- Hargadon, A. B., & Bechky, B. A. (2006). When collections of creatives become creative collectives: A field study of problem solving at work. *Organization Science*, 17(4), 484–500.
- Hedborg, S., & Addyman, S. (2024). Space in project organising: Insights from planning within and between construction projects. *Project Leadership and Society*, 5, 100159.
- Hjorth, D., Strati, A., Drakopoulou Dodd, S., & Weik, E. (2018). Organizational creativity, play and entrepreneurship: Introduction and framing. *Organization Studies*, 39(2–3), 155–168.
- Holstein, J., & Rantakari, A. (2023). Space and the dynamic between openness and closure: Open strategizing in the TV series *Borgen*. *Organization Studies*, 44(1), 53–75.
- Hondros, K., Schiemer, B., & Vogelgsang, L. (2023). Beyond personal safe spaces: Creating and maintaining collective environments for meaning and identity on digital platforms. *Organization*, 30(5), 809–829.
- Ibert, O., Jackson, G., Theel, T., & Vogelgsang, L. (2021). Organizing uncertainty as an asset in creative collaboration: A comparison of the music and pharmaceutical industries. *Research in the Sociology of Organization*, 75, 115–136.

- Jarzabkowski, P., Seidl, D., & Balogun, J. (2022). From germination to propagation: Two decades of strategy-as-practice research and potential future directions. *Human Relations*, 75(8), 1533–1559.
- Kalish, Y., & Oliver, A. L. (2021). Reducing the cost of knowledge exchange in consortia: Network analyses of multiple relations. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 47, 775–803.
- Konno, N., & Schillaci, C. E. (2021). Intellectual capital in Society 5.0 by the lens of the knowledge creation theory. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(3), 478–505.
- Lampel, J., Honig, B., & Drori, I. (2014). Organizational ingenuity: Concept, processes and strategies. *Organization Studies*, 35, 465–482.
- Lange, B., & Schübler, E. (2018). Unpacking the middleground of creative cities: Spatio temporal dynamics in the configuration of the Berlin design field. *Regional Studies*, 52(11), 1548–1558.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1974]). *The production of space*. Blackwell.
- Leforestier, A. (2009). *The co-working space concept. CINE term project* (pp. 1–19). Indian Institute of Management (IIMAHM), Ahmedabad.
- Li, Y., & Khessina, O. M. (2024). Before birth: How provisional spaces shape the localized emergence of new organizational forms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(2), 494–525.
- Makri, S., Blandford, A., Woods, M., Sharples, S., & Maxwell, D. (2014). “Making my own luck”: Serendipity strategies and how to support them in digital information environments. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(11), 2179–2194.
- Marshall, A. (2009 [1890]). *Principles of economics* (8th ed.). Cosimo.
- Maruani, T., & Amit-Cohen, I. (2007). Open space planning models: A review of approaches and methods. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 81(1–2), 1–13.
- Mondschein, J., Clark-Ginsberg, A., & Kuehn, A. (2021). Smart cities as large technological systems: Overcoming organizational challenges in smart cities through collective action. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 67, 102730.
- Montanari, F., Eikhof, D., Mattarelli, E., & Scapolan, A. C. (2020). Introduction: Collaborative spaces between current trends and future challenges. In F. Montanari, D. Eikhof, E. Mattarelli, & A. C. Scapolan (Eds.), *Collaborative spaces at work* (pp. 1–24). Routledge.
- Oliver, A. L. (2004). On the duality of competition and collaboration: Network-based knowledge relations in the biotechnology industry. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 20(1–2), 151–171.
- Oliver, A. L. (2009). *Networks for learning and knowledge creation in biotechnology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, A. L. (2022). Holistic ecosystems for enhancing innovative collaborations in university industry consortia. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 47(5), 1612–1628.
- Oliver, A. L., Montgomerly, K., & Barda, S. (2020). The multi-level process of trust and learning in university–industry innovation collaborations. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 45(3), 758–779.
- Oliver, A. L., & Rittblat, R. (2023). Facilitating innovation for complex societal challenges: Creating communities and innovation ecosystems for SDG goal of forming partnerships. *Sustainability*, 15(12), 9666.
- Ortmann, G., & Sydow, J. (2018). Dancing in chains: Creative practices in/of organizations. *Organization Studies*, 39(7), 899–921.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Otto, B., Schübler, E., Sydow, J., & Vogelgsang, L. (2024). Finding creativity in predictability: Seizing kairos in chronos through temporal work in complex innovation. *Organization Science*, 35(5), 1795–1822.
- Otto, B., Schübler, E., & Zangerle, K. (2020). Greenhouses are made of glass: Tensions in experimental spaces for creative collaboration in front-end pharmaceutical research. In F. Montanari, E. Mattarelli, & A. C. Scapolan (Eds.), *Collaborative spaces at work* (pp. 238–251). Routledge.
- Perkmann, M., McKelvey, M., & Phillips, N. (2019). Protecting scientists from Gordon Gekko: How organizations use hybrid spaces to engage with multiple institutional logics. *Organization Science*, 30(2), 298–318.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 53–79.

- Potts, J. (2018). Governing the innovation commons. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 14(6), 1025–1047.
- Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. Pion.
- Schaefer, S. M. (2023). *Organizing creativity: Context, process & practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R., Knorr Cetina, K., & von Savigny, E. (Eds.). (2001). *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. Routledge.
- Schiemer, B., Schüßler, E., & Theel, T. (2023). Regulating nimbus and focus: Organizing copresence for creative collaboration. *Organization Studies*, 44(4), 545–568.
- Schüßler, E., Svejnova, S., & Cohendet, P. (2021). Organizing creativity for innovation: Situated practices and process perspectives. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 75, 1–16.
- Sgourev, S. V., Aadland, E., & Formilan, G. (2023). Relations in aesthetic space: How color enables market positioning. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 68(1), 146–185.
- Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of ‘transitory dwelling places’ at work. *Human Relations*, 68(4), 633–658.
- Steigenberger, N., & Lübcke, T. (2022). Space and sensemaking in high-reliability task contexts: Insights from a maritime mass rescue exercise. *Organization Studies*, 43(5), 699–724.
- Sydow, J. (2004). *Towards a spatial turn in organization science? – A long wait*. Contribution to the Forum SECONDS at Bonn University. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1605173>
- Sydow, J., & Windeler, A. (2020). Temporary organizing and permanent contexts. *Current Sociology*, 68(4), 480–498.
- Topinka, R. J. (2010). Foucault, Borges, heterotopia: Producing knowledge in other spaces. *Foucault Studies* (9), 54–70.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Van Marrewijk, A., & Yanow, D. (2010). Introduction: The spatial turn in organizational studies. In A. Van Marrewijk, & D. Yanow (Eds.), *Organizational spaces* (pp. 1–16). Edward Elgar.
- Villani, E., & Phillips, N. (2021). Formal organizations and interstitial spaces: Catalysts, complexity, and the initiation of cross-field collaboration. *Strategic Organization*, 19(1), 5–36
- Wright, A. L., Irving, G., Zafar, A., & Reay, T. (2023). The role of space and place in organizational and institutional change: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 60(4), 991–1026.
- Yström, A., & Agogué, M. (2020). Exploring practices in collaborative innovation: Unpacking dynamics, relations, and enactment in in-between spaces. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 29(1), 141–145.