



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Do makerspaces represent scalable production models of community based re-distributed manufacturing?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/123323/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Hennelly, PA, Srai, JS, Graham, G orcid.org/0000-0002-9908-4974 et al. (2 more authors) (2019) Do makerspaces represent scalable production models of community based re-distributed manufacturing? *Production Planning and Control*, 30 (7). pp. 540-554. ISSN 0953-7287

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2018.1540056>

© 2019 Informa UK Ltd, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Production, Planning & Control*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Do Makerspaces represent scalable production models of community based re-distributed manufacturing?

Journal:	<i>Production Planning & Control</i>
Manuscript ID	SI-TPPC-2017-0011.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research paper for Special Issue
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Oct-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Hennelly, Patrick; University of Cambridge Institute for Manufacturing, Srai, Jagjit ; University of Cambridge Institute for Manufacturing Graham, Gary; Leeds University, Business School Meriton, Royston; Loughborough University - London
Keywords:	Makerspace, Redistributed Manufacturing, Community Based Production, Operations Management, Supply Chain Management

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Do Makerspaces represent scalable production models of community based re-distributed**
5 **manufacturing?**
6
7
8

9 **ABSTRACT**
10

11 This research explores the development of local community-based “*makerspaces*” as potential
12 scalable forms of redistributed manufacturing (RDM). Makerspaces are rapidly emerging in
13 post-industrial economies and have been identified as a catalyst of local regeneration in urban
14 areas. However, their role in local production systems is limited. There is a gap in the literature,
15 with respect to the evolution of makerspaces and their productive contribution. The purpose of
16 this paper therefore is to identify, classify and examine the different types of makerspaces. Our
17 focus is on the implementation characteristics that enable industrial production activity to take
18 place. First, we used Leximancer (to identify from the literature) three types of makerspace.
19 Second, we then identify five RDM implementation characteristics. The characteristics were
20 integrated together to form the RDM-makerspace implementation model. Third, case studies
21 were purposively selected to test and advance this model. They were subsequently classified as a
22 Type 1 (educational), Type 2 (design) or Type 3 (production) makerspace. Only one of the case
23 studies was classified as a fully evolved Type 3 production space. The findings concur with the
24 literature that makerspaces tend to be primarily Type 1 or Type 2. Finally, the contribution to
25 local production theory is emphasised.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Keywords:** Makerspaces, Redistributed Manufacturing, Community based Production
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Do Makerspaces represent scalable production models of community based re-distributed manufacturing?

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a great deal of academic interest in makerspaces. However much of the debate has been focused on education, learning and design. Space accessibility to communities through libraries, schools and community centres is promoted by researchers as a way of engaging more local people in using the available tool and hardware in the community to develop and prototype new ideas (Barrett et al., 2015). In this article, we define makerspaces as a place in which people with shared interests, especially in crafts, technology, design and product development can gather to work on projects while sharing ideas, equipment and knowledge.

There has been a significant rise in makerspaces worldwide over the past ten years (see Figure 1 below). There is evidence (i.e. TechShop, MakerBot and ATX Hackerspace) of commercial makerspace success where prototype manufacturing and small-scale production takes place (Hirshberg et al., 2016). Though in the UK, a recent report by NESTA suggests that out of a sample of 157 makerspaces the majority have a predominant educational role. There are some notable examples of both prototype production (i.e. Camden Makerspace (bicycle helmets) and final product manufacture (i.e. Eagle House Makerspace, Bristol (furniture)). Although there are many reported makerspace facilities, there is much variety in terms of the scope of activity with respect to: education/awareness of modern




Figure 1: Number of Makerspaces Worldwide
(Source: Lou & Peek, 2016, p. 1)

manufacturing technologies; conceptual design utilising these emerging technologies; prototype production; and indeed, full production capability for the target market. Other than anonymised data sets (i.e. NESTA) there is a distinct lack of in-depth, case study work that: 1) categorises the different types of makerspaces; 2) explores their role in building local productive capacity; 3) identifies the characteristics for implementing RDM.

The subject of the “*last mile*”¹ is coming to the forefront of the field of supply chain planning. It is in this city mile context that re-distributed (RDM) has emerged as a significant component of the industry 4.0 vision. We use the Srari et al., (2016) definition of RDM as: “... *the ability to personalise product manufacturing at multiple scales and locations, be it at the point of consumption, sale, or within production sites that exploit local resources, this is exemplified by*

¹ Last mile is a term used in supply chain planning to describe the movement of people and goods from a transportation hub to a final destination in the city (Mikkola and Skjott-Larsen, 2004).

1
2
3
4 *enhanced user participation across product design, fabrication and supply, and typically*
5
6 *enabled by digitalisation and new production technologies” (p.5).* The proposition outlined by
7
8 Kumar et al., (2016) is that the enhanced data intelligence in the last mile (being provided by
9
10 industry 4.0, big data and smart city infrastructure) will encourage more designers and new
11
12 innovative suppliers, consumers and hobbyists to enter into local production through
13
14 makerspaces.
15
16

17
18
19
20 Stewart and Tooze (2015) suggest that we are at the beginning of a fourth industrial revolution.
21
22 However, clearly there is a need for understanding the extent to which production in
23
24 makerspaces is rhetoric or reality. Is there indeed any actual evidence of full-scale RDM being
25
26 implemented in these spaces? This paper therefore aims to better understand the context,
27
28 enablers and scope of makerspace facilities in developing scalable forms of redistributed
29
30 manufacturing. To achieve our aims, first, we identify and categorise the different types of
31
32 makerspaces. Second, we classify five makerspace cases and examine their RDM
33
34 implementation characteristics. We sought to answer the following research question: *What are*
35
36 *the industrial contexts (i.e. product, technology), types of business model and local enablers (i.e.*
37
38 *infrastructure, institutions and actor transformation) impacting on the evolution of makerspaces*
39
40 *turning into scalable forms of RDM?* Our findings provide insights on the strategic role that
41
42 RDM makerspaces could play in the establishment of local production activity¹.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ¹ Local production systems are defined as a concentration of production activities in a given territorial area in which
56 several participating organisations, most of them small and medium-sized firms work together (Lombardi, 2003).

1
2
3
4 Our paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we analyse the literature on makerspaces and
5
6 RDM, using visualisation techniques and text analysis to identify three main types of
7
8 makerspaces and five implementation characteristics. These characteristics are integrated
9
10 together through content analysis into an RDM makerspace implementation model. This will be
11
12 used to classify five case studies. In section 3 the research design and methods are outlined. Case
13
14 study findings with their respective classification are presented in section 4. The cross-case
15
16 analysis and discussion is presented in section 5. In section 6 the conclusions are presented
17
18 together with the implications for practice and research.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

26
27 Using the text analysis procedure of Roberts (2000) and Mayring (2014) we conducted a two-
28
29 step literature review. The first step focused on the analysis of key RDM and makerspace topics.
30
31 Leximancer software was employed to identify the key types of makerspace. Whilst the second
32
33 step involved the identification of key implementation characteristics from their sub-topic
34
35 associations. These characteristics were integrated into an implementation model.
36
37
38
39
40

41 Using the Scopus database and using the “*RDM*” and “*makerspace*” search terms we located 142
42
43 academic journals, conference articles and book chapters¹. The raw source files are presented in
44
45 an online appendix (attached with the paper). All the chosen articles had to have business and
46
47 management as part of their subject field (i.e. they were rejected if they focused solely on
48
49 “*engineering*” or solely “*educational*”).
50
51
52
53

54
55 ¹ Please note only authors cited in the main text appear in the references section. For details of those authors that
56
57 only appear in the author map (presented in Appendix 1) please refer to the online appendix source files.

2.1 Classification of combined RDM-Makerspace types

The Leximancer software generated a RDM-makerspace concept map. This is presented in Figure 2. The software identified three types of makerspace (each made up of distinguishable




Figure 2 RDM-Makerspace topics

key topics). The three types of makerspace it identified included: Type 1 – educational and concept design; Type 2 – design and prototyping and Type 3 – prototyping and production. We sought (as advised by Mayring, 2014) not to rely solely on the use of a software algorithm to

1
2
3 classify the makerspaces. Using content analysis techniques (Seuring, 2012) we used traditional
4 content analysis to manually validate each of the Type 1, 2 and 3 classifications.
5
6
7
8
9

10 The authors of the literature from which the concept map was derived are presented in Appendix
11 1. The author map (generated by Leximancer) shows there are three distinct clusters. The more
12 central the author is in a cluster the more productive their work is in that field (i.e. the more they
13 have been cited by the other cluster authors). Whilst the bigger the circle, the higher is the
14 academic impact of that article.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 From the left-hand map, we can see close connections between Srari et al., (2016) and Rogers et
25 al., (2016) and Wagner and Walton (2016). They all tend to be speculative in that they present
26 future scenarios of alternative production systems and industrial networks based on RDM. In the
27 lower (green) right hand cluster the central work is that of Nagel et al., (2016). The authors
28 writing in the lower green cluster explore RDM makerspaces from an education and training
29 perspective. The role of “libraries”, “universities” and “schools” in makerspace development is a
30 recurring theme in this cluster. Whilst in the upper (red) cluster the most productive work is that
31 of Jariwala et al. (2016). This cluster explores the themes of makerspace “design”, “innovation”
32 and “production”.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 These author maps although generated by Leximancer have been interpreted by manual content
50 analysis as we cross-checked the topic focus of the articles. Whether that is educational; design
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or production. The content of these articles provided additional validation for the identification
4
5 of makerspace types.
6
7
8
9

10 **2.2 Identifying Implementation Characteristics**

11
12
13
14 The next step required a more detailed and in-depth investigation. Unlike the previous step and
15 its focus on key topics this step involved a focus on the sub topics identified in the concept map
16 (Figure 2). Leximancer was used to identify from the sub-topics the latent characteristic which
17 associated them together. From all the presented sub-topics, it reduced these down to five latent
18 characteristics. These are presented in Table 1 (with literature validations). Following Mayring
19 (2014) we again conducted content analysis, but this time our focus was on the sub-topics. This
20 was designed to ensure that each implementation characteristic (identified) was indeed a latent
21 factor cross-cutting the associated topic sub-set¹. These characteristics will each be discussed in
22 turn.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *RDM Product Requirements*

39
40 RDM requires the manufacturing of products in which the customer is much more involved and
41 participative in their development. Users are assumed in RDM to be strong co-creators in the
42 design and production process, this leads to unprecedented levels of co-creation and
43
44
45
46
47

48 ¹ For further information on the data reduction process the interested reader is recommended to contact
49 Roberts (2000) or Mayring (2014) who discuss the process of building theoretical models from latent
50 factors identified by text analysis. As an analogy, basically we have performed a qualitative version of
51 factor analysis (data reduction) whereby the latent factor causing most variance in the independent
52 variables has been identified. However, this has been done through a qualitative interpretation of the
53 Leximancer software algorithm. This software algorithm identified the latent characteristic linking topics
54 together (from the literature) but content analysis of the literature was needed to support the
55 corresponding identification and association of topics and sub-topics.
56
57
58
59
60

personalization. The product is unique to an individual's requirements, furthermore, it is vital that makerspace production is conducted close to the point of consumption if it is capture rapidly emerging but “*transient*” source of local value.

Implementation characteristics	Concept map sub topics	Authors
Product/ Service Requirements	Proximity Customisation Real-time Innovation Environment/ Circular economy Digital User-participation	Anderson (2012) Eyers and Potter (2015) Mikkola & Skjøtt-Larsen (2004) Coronado et al., (2004) Barrett et al., (2015)
Enabling Technologies	Capability Maturity Capacity 3DP Big Data IT hardware and software	Jariwala et al., (2016) Emelogu (2016) Rogers et al., (2016) Wagner & Walton (2016) Thomas (2016) WEF (2015) Liu et al., (2014)
Business Model	RDM product design and materials RDM cost model Product ownership/ IP Alternative finance Commercialisation	Rogers et al., (2016) Srai et al., (2016) Brennan et al., (2015) Kuehnle (2010) Saenz de Ugarte, et al., (2009)
Local Enablement	Institutional support Local networks Social/ Communities Rebalancing Research Students/ Experts Schools/ Libraries/ Labs	Laplume et al., (2016) Holmström et al., (2016) Srai et al (2016) Tatham et al., (2015) Prendeville et al., (2016) Rauch et al., (2015) Nagel et al., (2016)
Actor Transformation	Culture Leaders Education Multidisciplinary	Romero-Torres & Viera (2016) Fawcett & Waller (2014) Leonardi (2012)

	Communication	Sheridan et al., (2014)
--	---------------	-------------------------

Table 1 Key RDM-makerspace characteristics

The MIT concept of “*millions of markets*” supplied by “*millions of manufacturers*” drives the production function (Khajavi et al., 2014). There is high but very diverse demand and the lead time to get the product to market is extremely short. With such a fragmented market, the producer needs to create a “*lean*” and “*agile*” operations model. This synchronously serves the rapidly emerging demand. This model is characterised by high coupling points, it is market driven and close to demand (Srai et al., 2017). Design and supplier relations are organised on a temporary project by project basis as the flexible supply chain dissolves once demand has been satisfied.

RDM makerspaces are an exemplar model of short run “*flexible capacity*” in which no long run fixed logistic structures need to be created. This model is characterised by the manufacture of highly innovative, creative “*real time*” products, which have a high level of customisation (for instance, the installation of an automotive makerspace close to Ford in Detroit which is solely dedicated to prototyping parts for future connected cars and electric vehicles).

RDM Enabling Technologies

Rapid advances in digital design and fabrication technologies are creating radical new possibilities for innovations in production and consumption. Makerspaces provide a suite of digital design and manufacturing technologies, including 3D printers, open source and web-based design tools, electronic kits, vacuum formers, computer controlled milling machines,

1
2
3 welding, equipment, sewing machines, and laser cutters. The variety of materials and complexity
4 of fabrication expands and knowledge systems and digital interfaces are easing user engagement
5 (Jariwala et al., 2016). Makerspaces are networked through online social media (connecting them
6 to designs, tutorials, debates and the movement of makerspaces globally), and through national,
7 regional and international events (i.e. Maker Fares and Open Hardware Summits).
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 *Actor Transformation*

19 RDM makerspaces requires a transformative culture change in existing supply chain governance.
20 Current models of centralization and hierarchical management of actors (i.e. suppliers) need to
21 be reconfigured towards greater actor decentralisation and innovation driven supply chain
22 design. There is a need to harness the creativity and innovation potential of the emerging
23 makerspace start-ups. For instance, Ford in Detroit are in a strategic alliance with TechShop (a
24 local makerspace specializing in automotive parts innovation) with the aim to cut their
25 development costs and improve prototyping efficiency (Jariwala et al., 2016). There is a need to
26 build not only design and innovation competencies within makerspaces, but also their
27 manufacturing capability. This will require a concerted and long run transformational change in
28 operations model and makerspace actor strategy (Thomas, 2016).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 *Local Enablement*

47 The role of universities, schools and libraries as well as creating their own makerspaces provide
48 vital seed corn funding for the development of commercial makerspaces (Nagel et al., 2016). In
49 theory, Jariwala et al., (2016) suggests education and local council institutions will provide vital
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 links for the local community to engage and develop their design and production expertise. They
4
5 provide initial makerspace education and access to local production networks and manufacturing
6
7 facilities.
8
9

10
11
12 In this RDM production model paradigm, we might envisage factories in local communities,
13
14 meeting the needs for employment and wealth generation. In addition, to public investment and
15
16 the expansion of educational makerspaces; this would be made possible by investment from
17
18 traditional manufacturers, using their R&D and technology base to remove any issues of physical
19
20 location.
21
22
23

24
25
26 Small-scale local manufacturing means that a high level of customisation of products is possible
27
28 – with autonomous systems able to anticipate needs as much as respond to them – and create
29
30 direct relationships between customer and factory (Srai et al., 2016). In the context of the
31
32 importance of sustainability and limited resources, localisation means far less need for costly
33
34 international supply chains, low energy use and carbon footprint, and more reliance on domestic
35
36 materials that come from recycling processes or are grown or produced in the community
37
38 (Holmström et al., 2016).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Srai et al., (2016) suggests that local sourcing and the use of nearby material and energy flows
47
48 for production drawing on enterprise can deliver a range of sustainability benefits. Localization
49
50 can facilitate the internalisation of externalities. It is aspired that RDM factories could lead to the
51
52 enrichment of the community that they are in (Khajavi et al., 2014). Since proximity to market
53
54

1
2
3 will dictate materials chosen, many RDM manufacturing attributes get shaped and sized to their
4
5 city or region. The city serves as a material boundary for the manufacturing arrangement
6
7 (Tatham et al., 2015). There is also closer feedback between production and consumption.
8
9

10 11 12 *Business model*

13
14 The different business models link the unique contexts and enablers for a given sector and/or
15
16 region for effective implementation. Processes and supply chain activity need to be organised to
17
18 create and sustain value in the supply chain. Theoretically the business model implies that local
19
20 material resources are used locally to locally produce goods for local consumption and disposal.
21
22 The production activity is supported by a global flow of non-material resources such as capital,
23
24 technical expertise, patents, data analytics and business planning (Thomas, 2016). The flow of
25
26 both material and non-material resources is managed locally by either the global firm or local
27
28 organisation (Srai et al., 2016). A RDM-makerspace business model links the drivers and
29
30 operational implementation categories together. RDM needs to be considered as an operational
31
32 form of competitive advantage (Rogers et al., 2016). Processes and supply chain activity need to
33
34 be organised to create and sustain value in the supply chain. Our focus is on identifying how the
35
36 drivers lead to its operational implementation but from the perspective on the value it will create
37
38 through the resources it brings to the organisation and the capabilities needed within the space to
39
40 fully implement RDM to create competitive advantage (Thomas, 2016).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **2.3 An Integrative RDM-makerspace implementation model**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

These characteristics have been conceptually integrated together into a model. This is presented in Figure 3. The characteristics of product/service requirements and enabling technology are interrelated with local enablement and actor transformation through the business model characteristic.




Figure 3 RDM-makerspace implementation model

There are many hybrid forms of makerspace RDM business models that emerge from the three types identified earlier, namely: Type 1 – RDM enablers focused on education and concept design; Type 2– RDM enablers focused on design and initial prototyping and; Type 3 – RDM enablers focused on final prototype and production. The literature suggests that most makerspaces tend to be Type 1 or Type 2 (Jariwala et al., 2016; Nagel et al., 2016 and Prendeville et al., 2016). This paper is particularly interested in exploring the development of Type 3.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Since the majority of literature has covered makerspaces from an educational and design
7 perspective (namely what we refer to as a Type 1 or 2 makerspaces). We have developed the
8 RDM-makerspace implementation model to test against real-life case studies in order to
9 distinguish whether some makerspaces represent Type 3 makerspaces, demonstrating scalable
10 forms of RDM production (Putnik et al., 2013).
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **3. METHODOLOGY**

18
19
20 The methodology adopted in this study followed the procedure of previous RDM studies (Srai et
21 al., 2016). It aimed to capture the critical categories of a business model, namely, the context,
22 resources, activities, processes, actors and interdependencies that support the creation and
23 delivery of products and services. Therefore, five cases were purposively selected (Eisenhardt,
24 1989) to cover the full range of makerspace strategies, from Type 1 (educational) through Type 2
25 (design and prototype) and finally Type 3 (production). Whilst some of the makers could be
26 clearly identified as having strategies of design and education others were combining different
27 activities together. A judgement had to be made by the researchers as to where their strategic
28 emphasis resided, education, design or production.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 The research objective here was to explore whether emerging RDM makerspace application
45 case-studies might provide further insights into implementation contexts and drivers. As this
46 work was intellectually positioned to advance the emerging corpus of conceptual work into
47 actual practice, we adopted an exploratory approach as the cases were more towards the
48 descriptive end of the spectrum.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The case selection criteria required cases from the real-world where makerspaces were
7 operational and had a decentralised arrangement. Five cases were chosen as they included a mix
8 of the three different types of makerspace facility. From a purely educational and learning driven
9 facility, through to design and finally those RDM spaces which had a production focus. Two
10 cases were considered to be Type 1; one a Type 2 makerspace; one a Type 2/3 makerspace; and
11 one a Type 3 makerspace. The case companies verified their makerspace categorisation as part of
12 this study
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 In terms of a local production context, the categorisation approach incorporates institutional
26 actors (including government bodies, regulators, research bodies, demonstrator facilities) and
27 specialist industrial actors that do not normally form part of the supply chain design agenda, such
28 as local authorities, community groups and universities, sector specific finance and venture
29 capitalists. Finally, thematic categorisation enables connections and interdependencies between
30 business model actors by capturing value flows (transactions), and the flow of information and
31 materials and production capacity (Srai et al., 2016)
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Our primary case study data collection instrument was that of the semi structured interview. A
45 total of 18 interviewees were conducted. These interviewees were selected based on their level of
46 expertise on the topic and their previous experience of setting up and running makerspaces. A
47 summary of the interviewees who participated in the investigation is presented in Appendix 2.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Our review of leading makerspaces from the many thousands of registered sites making up the
5
6 maker population in the UK and US (NESTA (2015)) revealed that very few had implemented
7
8 anything markedly different to our cases (with respect to their commercial scalability). So, the
9
10 extent of these differences we believe to be marginal. Furthermore, we are confident that the
11
12 choice of our case studies is well justified and that they cover the full range of educational,
13
14 design and industrial strategies being implemented. They also provided enough access and a
15
16 wide breadth of data to inform meaningful representation, comparisons and contrasts to be made
17
18 that could be fed directly into the theoretical advancement of the model.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **3.1 Qualitative data analysis procedure**

25
26
27 The final stage of the case analysis involved cross-case data presentation and synthesis involving
28
29 cross-sector comparison and analysis. As mentioned the primary cases were conducted with semi
30
31 structured interviews, passive and participative observations at makerspace meetings and site
32
33 visits. Internal documentation was also analysed with one of the case studies. Multiple
34
35 informants and interviewees participated in each of the case studies. The data analysis was
36
37 structured around the key implementation characteristics identified by the text analytics.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 All the primary evidence including the answers and comments to each thematic characteristic
45
46 were grouped by company according to the level of agreement/disagreement of identified
47
48 response patterns. Excel spreadsheets were then used as response matrices to identify patterns of
49
50 consensus and disagreement, and then to determine similar patterns between the different maker
51
52 facilities (Molleda & Moreno, 2008). As the goal of this study is to detect cross-maker
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 similarities, we focused on the main items of consensus in every organisation to compare them
4
5
6 all together (Roberts, 2000; Poindexter & McCombs, 2000).
7
8
9

10 We aimed to advance our knowledge of the RDM makerspace constructs outlined in the
11 classification stage, through their thematic extension with primary data (Eisenhardt, 1989).
12
13 Through the thematic interplay of data with theory we could now confirm, modify or reject parts
14
15 or the whole classification. Together, the five cases purposively represented the sampling
16
17 diversity required to meet the study aims across the three types of makerspace.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 **4. FINDINGS**

26
27 The case studies have been organised in accordance with the categories of the “2:1:2”
28
29 implementation model (presented in section 2.3). Each case will be discussed in turn before a
30
31 cross case comparison is completed to highlight key similarities and differences.
32
33
34
35

36 37 **4.1 Results from the Case Studies**

38
39 The results from each of the five case studies will be presented on an individual case by case
40
41 basis.
42
43
44
45

46 47 **4.1.1 Case One - Ravenswood Makerspace Collaborative, East Palo Alto, California, USA**

48 Ravenswood Makerspace provide students with opportunities to learn and explore STEAM
49
50 subjects through technology and tools. Ravenswood is one of seven schools with inbuilt
51
52 makerspaces in their district. At present, six of the seven sites are open, equipped and staffed, for
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 use by students aged 4-14 years old. Their objective is to stimulate creativity and entrepreneurial
4
5 thinking amongst young and disadvantaged groups.
6
7
8
9

10
11 • *Product Requirements*

12
13 There is a need for proximity of materials and equipment where Ravenswood can share its
14
15 technology capacity across its local network of seven schools. The organisation is a supplier of
16
17 educational services and it raises funds to buy new equipment and provide new programmes to
18
19 as many school children and disadvantaged groups in their local community. Ravenswood is
20
21 strategically positioned to build maker culture, and stimulate creativity and entrepreneurial
22
23 thinking amongst young and disadvantaged groupings. They are measured on their capability to
24
25 reach as many young and disadvantaged people in their local area as possible.
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 • *Enabling Technology*

33
34 Through their Stanford grant Ravenswood have bought desktop CNC mills, however, they have
35
36 had several issues in trying to use the technology. Other technologies in the makerspace include
37
38 laser cutters, 3DP, iPads, humming bird robotics kits, Arduinos and Lego robotics kits. They
39
40 encourage school children of all levels — groups of 25-30 at a time with mentor's present — to
41
42 learn about robotics through Dash and Dot coding robots, and computer science and coding
43
44 through Code.org². Typically, a learn through play philosophy is adopted in workshops and there
45
46 is very much a discovery and problem-solving ethos. For instance, rather than trying to learn
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 ² Technology start up Wonder Workshop created robots Dash & Dot to teach kids to code while they play. Using
54 free apps and a compatible tablet or smartphone, kids learn to code while they make Dash sing, dance and navigate
55 all around house. Sensors on the robot mean that they react to the environment, including children. Further details
56 can be found at: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/sep/07/robots-teach-kids-to-code-dot-dash>

1
2
3
4 basic programming or algorithm skills, the ethos is trying to solve problems through games or
5
6 puzzles.

7
8
9
10
11 • *Local Enablement*

12
13 Apart from its government links, Ravenswood have developed several partnerships with external
14
15 institutions such as the University of Stanford where they receive support to develop new
16
17 education programmes based on STEAM subjects. Google and Facebook donate equipment and
18
19 staff to work in the makerspace. The aim and focus of the makerspace typically revolves around
20
21 building social networks to target community problems, for example, students are tasked to
22
23 identify local environmental problems and then engineer solutions to those problems within the
24
25 makerspace.
26
27

28
29
30
31
32 • *Actor Transformation*

33
34 Ravenswood have monthly “Cafecitos”, where parents come in and have coffee with the
35
36 principal, and they are offered the opportunity to volunteer to work at the makerspace. Finding
37
38 local based leaders with an educational background is vital for Ravenswood, they rely on
39
40 recruiting volunteers to support different projects, help small groups, or bring in a technology to
41
42 share with school children, getting parents in the community involved is a long-term goal they
43
44 are working towards. However, an issue raised when hiring volunteers was the bureaucracy in
45
46 place that made deploying staff a very long process. The cultural focus is to foster creativity and
47
48 inquiry based learning where students can apply their STEM knowledge, develop entrepreneurial
49
50 skills and gain experience working with emerging technologies.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- *Business Model*

The strategic objective is to encourage practical skills, creativity and entrepreneurial thinking through the development of maker spaces and activities in schools and communities. Ravenswood is funded solely by the State government and through external grants from technology companies to buy equipment such as 3DP and laptops. They have a research partnership with the University of Stanford's Transformative Technologies Lab. Another way Ravenswood generate income is by tapping into the local business community, for example, they received a \$2000 donation from a local women owned and run technology company. Ravenswood's success is measured on their capability to reach as many young and disadvantaged people as possible. This case is positioned on the makerspace continuum as a type 1 makerspace which aims to build a long run educational culture of production amongst its users, indirectly. This is through creative learning programmes linked to STEAM education.

4.1.2 Case two – Fab Lab, Devon, UK

FabLab Devon, was the first makerspace of the FabLab UK network to be built in a library. The makerspace was created as part of a three-million-pound library upgrade. It is a small-scale workshop that is open-access, not-for-profit and considered a community resource (https://librariesunlimited.org.uk/services_2017).

- *Product Requirements*

There is a lot of local interest from the public in terms of personalisation of products, "... occasionally we have people come in here who are from a business, perhaps they want to make a

1
2
3
4 *prototype and we charge them what we call a bureau charge for making something which is*
5
6 *more than members would pay if they were producing a prototype” (Volunteer).*
7

8
9
10

- *Enabling Technology*

11
12 *“We’ve got the following advanced technologies: electronics equipment, PCB manufacturing,*
13
14 *computers free to use for anybody who comes in, running Linux, laser cutters and 3D printers.*
15
16 *On the lower technology side, we own a sewing machine, woodworking equipment in the form of*
17
18 *circular saws and finally, the space owns a 7-foot pattern making lathe” (Member).*
19

20
21

- *Local Enablement*

22
23 The FabLab relies on local networks in the community to run programming code clubs and some
24
25 of their volunteers run courses for adults and children for programming. The public can become
26
27 members for a year and be trained on machinery. These training sessions are delivered by its
28
29 volunteers: *“... we are very welcoming of the general public to actually come in to our*
30
31 *makerspace and manufacture things” (Volunteer).*
32
33

34
35
36 FabLab is associated with the rebalancing of community resources where it has very strong links
37
38 with Exeter’s local schools: *“We have found that schools are very keen to bring their children to*
39
40 *have courses here and find out about modern technology. The primary schools don’t have the*
41
42 *resources to do this and we believe that making should be an important part of their education.”*
43
44
45 (Founder).
46
47

48
49

- *Actor Transformation*

50
51 Currently the FabLab hires an administrator who is paid by the County Council, however, they
52
53 also have a pool of volunteers co-supporting the initiative. There are two volunteers on any shift
54
55

1
2
3 (usually three hours). Many of the volunteers use the FabLab to design their own products and
4
5 occasionally develop prototypes. The FabLab take demonstrations outside to other libraries, to
6
7 schools and run courses. They usually have a lot of commercial enquiries to use their facilities:
8
9
10 “... we had an architect in a few weeks back. He wanted to use our printers to 3D print models
11
12 of buildings” (Volunteer).

- 13 • *Business model*

14
15
16
17
18 This Makerspace was funded through three main sources. These were Devon County Council,
19
20 NESTA (the technology charity) and the Real Ideas Organisation (RIO). There are also revenues
21
22 raised through membership subscription fees. “We are not in the business of competing with
23
24 businesses for production artefacts or finished products. Our position is that we are too small
25
26 and we are funded by charities and Devon County Council. So it would not be good if Devon
27
28 County Council were seen to be competing with and taking business away from the local
29
30 businesses in the county” (Member). We classify FabLab as a type 1 makerspace, where it has a
31
32 primarily educational and skills development role, they offer training and practical skill
33
34 development not only to school children but to the wider local community and business
35
36 community. Some examples include welding, blacksmith skills and fabrication.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 4.1.3 Case three – Sheffield Hackspace, UK

44
45 Sheffield hackspace is a non-profit makerspace run by its members who pay a monthly
46
47 subscription fee. Their aim is to build a community within central Sheffield to get people
48
49 involved and support them in creating and developing their own hobby-scale projects.
50
51
52
53
54

- 55 • *Product Requirements*

1
2
3 FabLab Sheffield collaborate with Pimoroni (a local company of makers and educators).
4
5 Pimoroni supply 3D printers. The makerspace has a lot of local business connections with small
6
7 to medium-sized ICT, electronics and steel manufacturers. In the words of one trustee: “... *so in*
8
9 *effect our 3D printers are operating as self-replicating machines*”. The founder of the
10
11 makerspace revealed that about 70% of machine capacity is directed towards spare parts whilst
12
13 the other 30% of users are working with the technology to make a wide range of items from
14
15 brackets to jewellery.
16
17

18
19
20 • *Enabling Technology*
21

22 The core technology in this space was electronics (Arduino and Raspberry Pi), 3DP, CNC
23
24 machining, textiles, woodwork, metalwork.
25
26

27
28
29 • *Actor Transformation*
30

31 Sheffield Hackerspace focuses on supporting the local community. “*Skills and knowledge which*
32
33 *is what I think this is for, rather than, you know, manufacturing*” (Trustee 1). The facility is
34
35 aimed at community users who want to come in and get on with making things on their own.
36
37 The focus of many users was having access to tools and machinery that were not freely available
38
39 to them in their homes. “*Previously we were – we met up with a – it’s a place called Access*
40
41 *Space and they’re what you call more of a fab lab where it’s staffed*” (Member).
42
43
44
45
46

47 • *Local Enablement*
48

49 A makerspace network was emerging in Yorkshire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire and they
50
51 were beginning to share resources, expertise, knowledge and capabilities.
52
53
54
55
56

1
2
3
4 “We’ve got quite a few contacts with other makerspaces around, so we’ve done visits to Leeds,
5
6 Nottingham Hackspace and Derby Makers. We have worked with a couple of other organisations
7
8 such as Code>Make>Win which is an event for young people with start-up ideas.” (Trustee 3).
9

10
11
12
13 ● *Business Model*

14
15 This makerspace is entirely funded by members. Their model was confirmed by the trustee: “...
16
17 we are pretty much entirely funded through a combination of donations and subscriptions from
18
19 members. We’ve had some funding come in recently from Sheffield Soup, which is a colloquial
20
21 crowd funding thing”.
22
23

24
25
26
27 Many constraints existed that were preventing the growth of the makerspace facility in Sheffield.
28
29 In particular, finding a large enough central space: “... given that we don’t want to end up taking
30
31 out business loans and our rent is a kind of a catch-22: we need lots of members to afford a big
32
33 space. It’s difficult to get lots of members without a big space” (Founder). The hackspace is
34
35 considered to be a type 2 makerspace. This is because it is a non-profit, member-run organisation
36
37 which does not focus on formal education and is not supported financially by a local council,
38
39 school or university educational body. Instead, it focuses on supporting its paying members
40
41 (local Sheffield community) to develop hobby-scale projects, fostering new product designs and
42
43 converting them into prototypes through the creative use of technology and tools. For example,
44
45 electronic key entry systems, kit knives, clock stands, book cases, electronic textiles and
46
47 furniture.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.1.4 Case four – FIX makerspace, Trondheim Norway

FIX is a makerspace collaboration between DIGS, an innovation platform, built on exchanges between members and partners who unite entrepreneurs, “makers” and “doers” from varied sectors, (www.digs.no), Norwegian Creations, a private company offering “makers as a service”, and keen individuals from Trondheim’s maker community. FIX’s main objective is to stimulate the maker culture in Trondheim.

- *Product Requirements*

We design and build everything from custom PCBs to complete interactive installations to industrial products. “We design and develop prototypes for other businesses as well as develop our own products. We use the Makerspace (technologies) to actively to realize our ideas” – (Norwegian Creations and FIX Makerspace Interviewees.

- *Enabling Technology*

The FIX facility is equipped with a soldering station, 3DP, vinyl cutter with dedicated computer, mechanical tools, woodworking tools, drill press 4’ x 8’ CNC router (for wood and plastic) with dedicated computer, power tools such as saw, drills, angle grinder and belt grinder.

- *Local Enablement*

FIX participate in entrepreneur/ maker networks across Norway, Europe and internationally and aim to strengthen ties, stimulate the local community and increase economic generation in and around the region of Trondheim.

- *Actor Transformation*

FIX aims to stimulate the maker culture in Trondheim: “... we want to attract a diversity of makers, beyond just Trondheim’s microcontroller community. We want to reach out to product designers and those working with textiles, wearables, woodworking and metalworking” (Trustee). They offer entrepreneurs, SMEs and independent workers access to the makerspace, meeting rooms, internet, printers as well as access to lawyers, accountants and business developers. “I hope to see a 50/50 split between small businesses and start-ups that work on prototypes during the day, and hobbyists and makers in the evening” (Trustee).

- *Business Model*

They are open 24/7 to members, FIX makerspace is funded solely by membership fees and donations. We classify Fix Makerspace as a type 2/3 makerspace. It is not only involved in developing hobby-scale projects with its members but it also aims to have a 50/50 mix of start-ups and small businesses that can develop prototypes and produce them, though at a low production (i.e. boutique) capacity, for example, electronic lighting kits, displays and walking robot gaming kits (i.e. programming skills).

4.1.5 Case 5 – Leeds Hackspace

Leeds hackspace is based around a community group of hackers and makers, the hackspace is not-for-profit and is both run and funded by its members.

- *RDM Product Requirements*

Many of the hackspace's members are involved in prototype design and manufacture with intentions to commercialise: "... *there's several people who have designed products who use the makerspace. Not necessarily design them at the makerspace, but they do sometimes. One guy works for a start-up that's got a home intrusion burglar alarm-type system that's sort of similar to a Nest. There's another guy who's creating a system for brewing beer*" (Volunteer). Other examples of prototypes manufactured by members include customised raspberry pi cases, DC motor drive for a go-kart, jigs.

Despite designing and manufacturing prototypes and one-offs, there is interest from members in scaling up production; "*On open nights, people have said, "Oh, can I make sort of a batch of these, a few of these?"*" (Director).

- *Enabling Technology*

The facility has a 3DP, laser cutter, vinyl cutters, t-shirt presses, lathe, CNC machine. "*The 3D printer facilities we've got here are very sort of rustic, very much 3D printers that you fiddle with. We do have a commercial one, which is actually mine but I leave it here. The print quality can be variant and 3D printers that are filament based have a tendency to jam and constantly need unblocking. There are powder printers available, which are really nice; they're also really bloody expensive. So those machines are much more targeted at the sort of medium to large scale production*" (Management Committee).

- *Actor Transformation*

Most of the users are students, existing designers or working in the engineering sector.

1
2
3
4 “Well, I design product myself. A lot of people here design products. We're a group of
5
6 designers. Every cut with a laser, every build with a 3D printer, or every textile using the sewing
7
8 machines inside is a design process, is part of the design process” (Member).
9

10
11
12
13 ● *Local Enablement*

14
15 The hackspace has numerous informal connections with the local council and the city library,
16
17 other informal links have been made with the local University via hackspace members who are
18
19 university employees. Awareness of the hackspace has been problematic: “... one of the areas
20
21 that we struggle with, is getting the Leeds Hackspace name out into the community” (Director).
22
23

24
25
26 ● *Business Model*

27
28 The primary source of income for the hackspace comes from membership fees, there are also
29
30 occasional donations. Running the space as a commercial venture is questionable; “It's a lot
31
32 easier for UK makerspaces to be limited companies that are run not-for-profit. Being a charity
33
34 puts extra onus on the space. You can't sell items at workshops. You can't make things, per se,
35
36 for sale. So, we opted for limited company and we sort of share the responsibility of being
37
38 directors of that limited company” (Director).
39
40
41

42
43 “We don't have any funding, mostly because we didn't want to rely on it as much as anything
44
45 else. , we wanted to aim towards autonomy based on the group's income as compared to
46
47 actually relying on grants, then they disappear” (Volunteer).
48
49

50
51 We classify this Leeds hackspace as a type 3 makerspace. Despite the makerspace being not-for-
52
53 profit, it encourages users to take on their entrepreneurial ideas to develop new products that can
54
55

1
2
3
4 be taken from design prototype to actual product to be considered for commercialisation, via
5
6 links with external manufacturing facilities.
7
8

9
10 Their focus is on building member's capabilities to run a local production model with RDM
11 characteristics. Some successful products developed include medical devices, clothing, footwear,
12 jewellery, replacement car parts, toys and bicycle (high performance) equipment. It links closely
13 with the Leeds Enterprise partnership and manufacturing advisory service which provides
14 members with access to finance to start up and expand their manufacturing business.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **5. CROSS CASE ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION** 23

24 Figure 4 (the spectrum) summarises the observations at a cross-case level and this section will
25 utilise this schematic to initiate a discussion on these findings. First, we observe that there are
26 very distinctive characteristics between Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 makerspaces, with the most
27 marked differences being in the actors involved in setting up, running and using the facilities.
28 For instance, the social benefits in Type 1 (Ravenswood, Devon FabLab) are somewhat at odds
29 with the commercial orientation with Type 2 (Sheffield Hackspace) Type 2/3 (Fix) and Type 3
30 (Leeds Hackspace). Type 3 makerspaces provide more opportunities for local economic
31 development through the full implementation of RDM characteristics.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The makerspace brand is thus somewhat misleading in that it is in the minority of cases that we
47 observe Type 3 implementations (FIX, Leeds Hackspace). Furthermore, Type 3 implementations
48 have significant industrial involvement – both in kind and financial – and this invariably leads to
49 product/sector specialisation.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Further, where Type 3 implementations are observed there are very specific market drivers,
5
6 industrial contexts and technologies that have allowed them to flourish; these present constraints
7
8 also need to be understood at the outset of any public or private makerspace investments. Good
9
10 examples where this evolution pathway is possible include music labs migrating to production
11
12 houses, lighting technologies leading to servitised product centres (FIX Makerspace), and
13
14 medical devices where prototype manufacture can lead to personalised products for patients
15
16 (Leeds Hackspace).
17
18
19
20
21

22 Other observations on the potential transition pathways include where there are appropriate
23
24 conditions (i.e. industrial contexts) and no impediments (i.e. no product/technology constraints)
25
26 there are still challenges in that Type 1 (free to use) facilities have very different revenue models
27
28 than Type 2 (membership fees) and Type 3 (contract), different capacity considerations (i.e.
29
30 space) and specialist skills requirements.
31
32
33
34
35

36 As expected, we can see that Type 1 facilities (Ravenswood, Devon FabLab) constitute
37
38 equipment that is amenable for generic and multi product use, and therefore have significant
39
40 adaptability and agility to changing educational needs. Type 2 (Sheffield Hackspace) extends
41
42 this capability for prototype manufacturing. However, Type 3 implementations are increasingly
43
44 specialised with unique equipment investments that whilst de-risking product supply chains are
45
46 vulnerable to low utilisation and market uncertainty. Notable exceptions however are in IT and
47
48 other platform technologies that can have multi-sector relevance.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Type 3 RDM makerspaces are particularly attractive in that they involve relational investments
5
6 where there is a degree of both financial and social capital working together to create local
7
8 capability (FIX). This development can lead to a more sustainable business model and engines
9
10 for future economic growth. It presents a genuine RDM production model and further research
11
12 on what are the contextual, technological conditions and constraints that might facilitate
13
14 successful implementation may provide insights as to how significant this manufacturing model
15
16 can become.
17
18
19

20
21
22 We also can observe that with the right conditions makerspaces in all categories can flourish in
23
24 both developed and developing world contexts. We can observe this in all three categories of
25
26 makerspace. Of particular interest are the characteristics of the entrepreneurial leaders, where in
27
28 Type 3 models we observe commercially aware technology savvy individuals (Leeds Hackspace)
29
30 that can manage the uncertainties of new technologies and the development of new products and
31
32 market opportunities.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Finally, in applying the RDM implementation model to the makerspace context it has proven
40
41 insightful and suggests broader application to other RDM paradigms. A potential enhancement to
42
43 the implementation model could be to consider potential transition pathways between alternative
44
45 RDM executions. Further, whether there might be emerging archetypes that capture constraints
46
47 to specific implementation options by introducing a dynamic environmental dimension, which
48
49 might capture changing contexts, capability and technology developments (Teece et al., 1997,
50
51 2007) and policy environments.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Even though we classify the Leeds hackspace as one of the more advanced spaces in the
6
7 production continuum, it still contains elements of Type 1 and Type 2 activity. Therefore, the
8
9 empirical work extends the original static analysis to more of a life-cycle continuum in which
10
11 different activities such as education are found in Type 3 but they not as dominant or as common
12
13 as they in Type 1 maker classifications. It is only the level of significance (weight) of each
14
15 activity whether that be education, design or production, which determines both our and their
16
17 classification of space strategy, culture, capabilities and resources.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	<p>national school/ networks (Case 1,2)</p> <p>anchoring community resources (1, 2)</p> <p>University staff, parents, skilled teachers, university educators</p> <p>aligned mentoring community culture</p> <p>Generic technologies. data specific resources that enable embedded, curriculum learning</p> <p>prototypes/ external technology (Case 1-5)</p> <p>responsibility</p> <p>ment/ external technology (Case 1,2)</p> <p>tionally driven membership</p>	<p>Regional library collaboration</p> <p>Institutional support (Case 1, 2, 3)</p> <p>Volunteer specialists (Case 1-5)</p> <p>Education (Case 1,2)</p> <p>General staff (Case 1-5)</p> <p>Students, teachers (1,2)</p> <p>Generic assets for multi-use</p> <p>Flexible, low capacity</p> <p>Distributed resources</p> <p>Prototype development (Case 1-5)</p> <p>Costs covered through membership fees (Case 2-5)</p>	<p>Crowd funding (Case 2-5)</p> <p>University research partnerships (Case 2,3,5)</p> <p>Semi-skilled operators</p> <p>Open network of users</p> <p>Non-contractual (Case 1-3)</p> <p>Manual production</p> <p>Capacity sharing across makerspace networks (Case 1-3,5)</p> <p>Prototype</p> <p>High material variety</p> <p>New materials testing and development (Case 2-4)</p> <p>Product co-design (Case 2-5)</p> <p>Not for profit limited company (Case 3)</p> <p>Local value capture</p>	<p>Co-location with specialist, research centres</p> <p>Technology Entrepreneurs (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Training (Case 2, 4, 5)</p> <p>Technology experts (3-5)</p> <p>Production close to market (Case 4,5)</p> <p>Mature and nascent technology</p> <p>Prototype/ small-scale production (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Cycle time optimisation</p> <p>Product innovations</p> <p>National centres of excellence (e.g. graphene centre)</p> <p>Product/ design ownership agreements</p> <p>Leveraging new capabilities</p>	<p>Co-location with service centres</p> <p>Local production networks with SMEs and start-ups (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Specialised actors with specific product/ technology focus (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Entrepreneurial culture</p> <p>Change agents</p> <p>Specific assets for specific use (Case 4,5)</p> <p>High capability, low capacity production</p> <p>Product/ sector specialisation (e.g. music, IT, healthcare) (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Novel materials</p> <p>Fast design process</p> <p>Reduced supply chain complexity</p> <p>Alternative finance/ industrial sponsorship (Case 1,4,5)</p> <p>University spin-out (Case 3,4)</p> <p>Product commercialisation</p>	<p>Industry/ specialist, research centres</p> <p>Local production networks with SMEs and start-ups (Case 3-5)</p> <p>Venture capitalists</p> <p>Paid specialists</p> <p>Contractual</p> <p>Multidisciplinary expertise</p> <p>Technology specialisation</p> <p>Nascent technologies</p> <p>Real-time, production</p> <p>Product/ sector specialisation</p> <p>High customer service</p> <p>Commercial</p> <p>Limited capacity</p> <p>Capacity based</p> <p>IP agreements</p> <p>New RDM service</p>
		Local Enablement				
		Actor Transformation				
		RDM Enabling Technologies				
		RDM Product Requirements				
		Business Model				

Figure 4: DM Makerspace Implementation Spectrum

6. MAKERSPACE DIFFUSION IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

At this stage of our research programme we have found a number of examples where several industries are leveraging, cooperating or setting up a makerspace. These examples are presented in Appendix 3. There are certain types of industrial activity which could in the long run, we believe be under threat from makerspace activity. For example, industries, or industry segments, where customisation and quick responsiveness to fast-changing consumer preferences and market conditions are important rather than in commodity production based on economies of scale. This echoes the heralding of new, flexible production paradigms coined as mass customisation (Pine 1993), delayed product differentiation (Lee & Tang, 1997), and reconfigurable manufacturing systems (Mehrabi, Ulsoy, & Koren, 2000).

Whilst in contrast there are other industries, including the manufacture of basic metals and chemicals that are unlikely to be affected in any foreseeable future. It seems unlikely that makerspaces will take root in industries or industry segments characterised by long production runs and/or industry segments where manufacturing is already highly automated. There is evidence of capacity leveraging by manufacturing firms of makerspaces now and potentially into the future. For instance, in textiles, leather products, PCBs (printed circuit board) fabrication, robotics and electronics. Industrial diffusion is also evident in the automotive sector, where Ford Motor Company and TechShop Detroit have created a joint makerspace (http://www.techshop.ws/ts_detroit.html).

7. CONCLUSION

1
2
3 Makerspaces have a vital role to play in changing local culture towards innovation and making.
4
5
6 Therefore, our assertion in this paper is that makerspaces are a fundamental foundation to the
7
8 spread of RDM. They could facilitate a growth in local innovation, product development and
9
10 market niche identification. Local production models and supply chains need development and
11
12 re-establishing and their needs to be actor transformation and public/private sector subsidization
13
14 and the stimulation of such activity. The Type 3 spaces we have identified are rare and we
15
16 advocate that policy makers need to work with Type 2's to develop their productive and
17
18 competitive capacity in the short run. Type 1's need long run investment and incentives built into
19
20 to their education focus so that they are rewarded for projects designed to build local social and
21
22 economic impact (i.e. job creation, new industrial start-ups, making skills and qualifications). As
23
24 they are primarily dealing with school children they are vital in changing perceptions of
25
26 manufacturing as a career or entrepreneurial opportunity for creating new industrial activities.
27
28 They certainly need to be made more commercially aware and focused on market as well as
29
30 purely education output. A more targeted and strategic educational agenda needs to be put in
31
32 place for users in these spaces, as well as having fun or being a hobby.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Our theoretical contribution to local production theory (Lombardi, 2003) comes from filling the
42
43 existing gap in the role of makerspaces in stimulating RDM activity. To date most studies of
44
45 makerspaces have focused on their educational and design role in local production contexts. Our
46
47 work makes a vital contribution by identifying how spaces can start making and manufacturing
48
49 products for local consumers. Local production theory stresses the traditional role of SME's in
50
51 this space which is to act purely as assemblers, maintenance facilities or distribution actors for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 global corporations. This study presents future organisational forms emerging from RDM
4
5 makerspaces as potential disruptive innovators, making customised products for highly localised
6
7 niches.
8
9

10
11
12 The RDM implementation model suggests that as well as limiting constraints related to product
13
14 characteristics and technology maturity, there are also significant local enablement constraints to
15
16 its full-scale adoption in makerspaces. Therefore, local authority and university investments in
17
18 platform technologies, such as 3DP and continuous manufacturing can lower barriers to entry.
19
20 Further, investment in local capacity and capability are necessary conditions that may benefit
21
22 from policy interventions. Finally, the model provides a theoretical and empirical explanation of
23
24 some of the challenges as to why RDM uniquely requires the interplay between product design,
25
26 enabling technology, dissolvable capacity, and transformational actors.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The implementation approach tries to classify spaces into three distinctive types. However, it is
35
36 important to recognise that spaces themselves could classify themselves using the model
37
38 characteristics. Though they did point out that they could combine multiple agendas/models
39
40 cutting across the three different types and that they were not mutually exclusive. Therefore,
41
42 makerspaces are ambidextrous in their strategy and move between types depending on project
43
44 specifics, and what is made and produced (knowledge, culture, products, innovations. Interesting
45
46 none of our spaces self-identified themselves entirely as “*Type 2 spaces*” and usually combined
47
48 this with other types of activity.
49
50
51
52

53 **7.1 Implications for future research and practice**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

Going forward, four types of research are urgently needed. First, given the growing importance of local production for economic regeneration and last-city mile logistics, new analytic frameworks, tools and techniques need to be developed to systematically capture relevant data and generate reliable insights to inform the operational and strategic decision making of operations managers working in RDM enabled makerspaces. Some existing frameworks and tools can be adapted for local production, but new ones need to be developed to address emerging opportunities.

Second, it is necessary for more research to be undertaken on industries likely to be affected by makerspaces, for example, (1) industries with no, or low, current or future adoption of makerspaces, (2) industries currently being affected by maker capacity, and (3) industries into which makers are likely to diffuse in the future.

Third, intensive case studies of the transformation of maker space models and the development of new production models in different urban regeneration contexts, such as smart cities need to be identified and documented.

Fourth, and perhaps the most important, is new theoretical and empirical research about the transformation of traditional production models and the emergence of makerspace RDM models. RDM will significantly extend the scope for the digital transformation of local production models across different sectors, from personal, domestic and community services, to a wide range of new products and services that demand close geographic proximity between providers

1
2
3 and consumers. In terms of practice we hope that our classification of makerspaces provides a
4
5 means for the spaces themselves to identify their industrial strategies as well as being useful
6
7 academic categorisations.
8
9

10 11 12 13 REFERENCES

14
15 Anderson, C. (2012) 'Makers: The New Industrial Revolution'. Random House. London.
16

17
18 Barrett, T., Pizzico, M., Levy, B.D., Nagel, R.L., Linsey, J.S., Talley, K.G., Forest, C.R. and
19
20 Newstetter, W.C., (2015) 'A review of university maker spaces.' Georgia Institute of
21
22 Technology.

23
24 BIS. (2014) 'Exploring UK-India partnerships in distributed manufacturing.' Retrieved from
25
26 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/351109/Consolidated_Delegate_reports_Distributed_Manufacturing.pdf
27

28
29 Brennan, L., Ferdows, K., Godsell, J., Golini, R., Keegan, R., Kinkel, S., Srari, J.S. and Taylor,
30
31 M., (2015) 'Manufacturing in the world: where next?', *International Journal of Operations &*
32
33 *Production Management*, 35(9), pp.1253-1274.

34
35 Coronado, A.E., Lyons, A.C. Kehoe, D.F. and J. Coleman. (2004) 'Enabling mass customization:
36
37 extending build-to-order concepts to supply chains'. *Production Planning & Control* 15(4): 398-
38
39 411

40
41 Eisenhardt, K. (1989) 'Building Theories from Case Study Research.' *The Academy of*
42
43 *Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.

44
45 Emelogu, A., Marufuzzaman, M., Thompson, S.M., Shamsaei, N., Bian, L. (2016) 'Additive
46
47 manufacturing of biomedical implants: A feasibility assessment via supply-chain cost analysis',
48
49 *Additive Manufacturing*, 85, 633-642.

50
51 EPSRC. (2014) 'Re-distributed manufacturing: call for networks.' Retrieved from
52
53 <https://www.epsrc.ac.uk/files/funding/calls/2014/re-distributed-manufacturing-call-for-networks/>
54

55
56
57
58
59
60
Eyers, D.R., Potter, A.T. (2015) 'E-commerce channels for additive manufacturing: An
exploratory study', *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 21 (5), 535-555.

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

Fawcett S.E., Waller M.A. (2014) ‘Supply chain game changers-mega, nano, and virtual trends-and forces that impede supply chain design (i.e., Building a Winning Team).’ *Journal of Business Logistics*, 35, 3, 157-164.

Hirshberg, P., Dougherty, D., and Kadanoff, M. (2016) ‘Maker City a Practical Guide to Reinvention in American Cities.’ Retrieved from: <https://makercitybook.com>

Holmström J., Holweg M., Khajavi S.H., Partanen J. (2016) ‘The direct digital manufacturing (r)evolution: definition of a research agenda’, *Operations Management Research*, 9, 1, pp. 1-10.

Jariwala, A. S., Telenko, C., Saldana, C., Sulchek, T., Yee, S. K., Newstetter, W. C., Kurfess, T. (2016) ‘Examples of Synergies between Research and Hands-on Design-Based Learning’, Paper presented at 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana. 10.18260/p.2679

Khajavi, S.H., Partanen, J., Holmström, J. (2014) ‘Additive manufacturing in the spare parts supply chain’, *Computers in Industry*, 33, (4), 604-612.

Kuehnle, H. (2010) ‘Distributed Manufacturing – Paradigms, Concepts, Solutions and Examples’, London: Springer.

Kumar, M., Graham, G., Hennelly, P. and Srari, J., (2016) ‘How will smart city production systems transform supply chain design: a product-level investigation’, *International Journal of Production Research*, 54(23), pp.7181-7192.

Laplume, A., Anzalone, G.C., Pearce, J.M. (2016) ‘Open-source, self-replicating 3-D printer factory for small-business manufacturing’, *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 9, (2), 633-642.

Lee, H., & Tang, C. (1997) ‘Modelling the costs and benefits of delayed product differentiation’. *Management Science*, 43(1): 40–53.

Leonardi, P. M. (2012) ‘Materiality, Sociomateriality, and Socio-Technical Systems: What Do These Terms Mean? How Are They Related? Do We Need Them?’. In Leonardi, P. M., Nardi, B. A., & J. Kallinikos (Eds.), *Materiality and Organizing: Social Interaction in a Technological World* (pp. 25-48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liu, P., S. H. Huang, A. Mokasdar, H. Zhou, and L. Hou. (2014) ‘The Impact of Additive Manufacturing in the Aircraft Spare Parts Supply Chain: Supply Chain Operation Reference (Scor) Model Based Analysis.’ *Production Planning & Control* 25 (13–14).

1
2
3
4 Lombardi, M. (2003) 'The evolution of local production systems: the emergence of the "invisible
5 mind" and the evolutionary pressures towards more visible minds', *Research Policy*, 32 (8),
6 1443-1462.
7

8
9 Lou, N. and Peek, K., (2016) 'By the numbers: The rise of the makerspace'. Popular Science.
10 Retrieved from <http://www.popsci.com/rise-makerspace-by-numbers>.
11

12
13 Mayring, P. (2014) 'Qualitative content analysis – Theoretical foundation and basic procedures'.
14 www.qualitative-content-analysis.aau.at
15

16
17 Lee, H., & Tang, C. (1997) 'Modelling the costs and benefits of delayed product
18 differentiation'. *Management Science*, 43(1): 40–53.
19

20
21 Mikkola, J. H. & Skjøtt-Larsen, T. (2004) 'Supply-chain integration: implications for mass
22 customization, modularization and postponement strategies'. *Production Planning & Control*
23 15(4): 352-361
24

25
26 Molleda, J.C. and Moreno, Á., (2008) 'Balancing public relations with socioeconomic and
27 political environments in transition: Comparative, contextualized research in Colombia, Mexico,
28 and Venezuela'. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, 10(2), pp.115-174.
29

30
31 Nagel, R. L., Levy, B., Morocz, R. J., Forest, C., Newstetter, W. C., Talley, K. G., Smith, S. F.,
32 & Linsey, J. S. (2016) 'MAKER: How to Make a University Maker Space' Paper presented at
33 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana. 10.18260/p.25623
34

35
36 Nesta (2015) 'UK Makerspace Dataset, Accessed: 03/04/17,
37 (https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/open_dataset_of_uk_makerspaces_users_guide.pdf)
38

39
40 Poindexter, P.M. and McCombs, M.E., (2000) 'Research in mass communication: A practical
41 guide'. Macmillan, New York.
42

43
44 Prendeville, S., Hartung, G., Purvis, E., Brass, C. and Hall, A., (2016) 'Makespaces: From
45 Redistributed Manufacturing to a Circular Economy'. In *Sustainable Design and Manufacturing*
46 (pp. 577-588). Springer International Publishing.
47

48
49 Pine, B. J. (1993) 'Mass customization – The new frontier in business competition'. Harvard
50 Business School Press, Boston, MA.
51

52
53 Putnik G., Sluga, A., El Maraghy, H., Teti, R., Koren, Y., Tolio, T. and Hon, B., (2013)
54

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

‘Scalability in manufacturing systems design and operation: State-of-the-art and future developments roadmap’. *CIRP Annals – Manufacturing Technology*, 62, 751-774

Rauch M., M Dallinger, P. Dallasega, & D. T. Matt (2015) ‘Sustainability in Manufacturing through Distributed Manufacturing Systems (DMS)’, *Procedia CIRP* 29, 544-549.

Roberts, C. W. (2000) ‘A conceptual framework for quantitative text analysis’. *Quality and Quantity*, 34(3), 259-274.

Rogers, H Boricz N and Pauer K S (2016) ‘3D Printing Services: Classification, supply chain implications and research directions’. *International journal of physical distribution*. 46(10),

Romero-Torres, A., Vieira, D.R. (2016) ‘Is 3D printing transforming the project management function in the aerospace industry?’ *Journal of Modern Project Management*, 22, (2), 383-402.

Saenz de Ugarte, B., A. Artiba, and R. Pellerin. (2009) ‘Manufacturing Execution System – a Literature Review.’ *Production Planning & Control* 20 (6), 525–39

Seuring, S., Gold, S. (2012) ‘Conducting content analysis based literature reviews in supply chain management’, *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 17 Issue: 5, pp.544-555, <https://doi.org/10.1108/13598541211258609>

Sheridan, K., Halverson, E.R., Litts, B., Brahms, L., Jacobs-Priebe, L. and Owens, T., (2014) ‘Learning in the making: A comparative case study of three makerspaces’. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(4), pp.505-531.

Srai, J. S., Kumar, M., Graham, G., Phillips, W., Tooze, J., Tiwari, A., Ford, S., Beecher, P., Raj, B., Gregory, M., Tiwari, M., Ravi, B., Neely, A. and Shankar, R. (2016) ‘Distributed manufacturing: Scope, challenges and opportunities’. *International Journal of Production Research*, 54 (23). pp. 6917-6935.

Stewart, H. and Tooze, J., (2015) ‘Future Makespaces and redistributed manufacturing’. *Making Futures*, 4, pp.1-9.

Tatham, P., Loy, J., Peretti, U. (2015) ‘Three-dimensional printing – a key tool for the humanitarian logistician?’, *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*, 2 (2), 65-77.

Teece, D.J., (2007) ‘Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic management journal*, 28(13), pp.1319-1350.



1
2
3
4
5 Teece, D.J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A., (1997) 'Dynamic capabilities and strategic management.'
6 *Strategic management journal*, pp.509-533.
7

8
9 Thomas, D. (2016) 'Costs, benefits, and adoption of additive manufacturing: a supply chain
10 perspective', *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 11, 97-113.
11

12
13 Wagner, S. and Walton, R. (2016) 'Additive manufacturing's impact and future in the aviation
14 industry.' *Production Planning & Control*, 27, 13, 1124-1130.
15

16
17 World Economic Forum. (2015) 'Emerging tech 2015: distributed manufacturing'. Retrieved
18 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/03/emerging-tech-2015-distributed-manufacturing/>
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 1: Leading RDM-makerspace authors



Appendix 2: Case Study data sources

Case study ID	Makerspace interviewee role
Ravenswood Makerspace Collaborative (East Palo Alto, California, USA)	1. Volunteer Staff / coordinator
Fab Lab Devon (England)	1. Volunteer staff member 2. Member/ Customer
Sheffield Hackspace (England)	1. Trustee 2. Member/ technical staff 3. Member 4. Trustee 5. Trustee
FIX Makerspace (Trondheim, Norway)	1. Owner (2) 2. Makers (2) 3. Users and volunteer staff (3)
Leeds Hackspace (England)	1. Director 2. Management committee 3. Volunteer staff 4. Member

Note: Additional data was collected from documents, websites and observations

Appendix 3: Examples of Makerspace Industrial Activity

Manufacturing industries (ISIC)	Products	Makerspace/Industry collaborations
22 – Textile mill products	Knitting and textiles Leather products	Berlin Fab Lab (https://fablab.berlin/en/) MakeSouthBend (Indiana, US) (https://www.makesouthbend.com/makerspace-features.html)
25 – Furniture and fixtures	Architectural products Props and theatre set design	Space10 (https://space10.io/) FIX Makerspace Barcelona Fab Lab (http://fablabbcn.org/) Building Bloqs London (http://www.buildingbloqs.com/blog)
26 - Computer, electronic products	PCB Fabrication Drones Privacy, Security and Connected Devices	Origin Base (Dubai, UAE) (https://www.originbase.com/pcb) Build Brighton (http://www.buildbrighton.com/) Sheffield Hackspace Leeds Hackspace DAI Makerlab (https://www.dai.com/our-work/solutions/dai-maker-lab) Machines Room (https://machinesroom.co.uk/) Foxconn Makerspace
29 – Motor vehicles	Automotive spare parts and components	TechShop (http://www.techshop.ws/)
32 – Stone, Clay, Glass, and Concrete Products	Pottery, Glassware, Stone products,	The Waiting Room (http://st-botolphs.org/)
34 – Fabricated metal products	Metal castings	Autodesk Pier 9 (https://www.autodesk.com/pier-9) FIX Makerspace
36 – Electronic and other electrical equipment and components	Robotics Sensors, Modules	DFRobots (https://www.dfrobot.com/) Tiree Tech Wave (http://tireetechwave.org/)
37 – Transportation Equipment	Bicycles, Motorcycle parts,	Chaihuo Makerspace (www.chaihuo.org) Staten Island Makerspace https://www.makerspace.nyc/copy-of-digital-fabrication
39 – Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries	Toys, Jewellery	Gearbox (http://www.gearbox.co.ke/) Nanjing Makerspace (www.do-idea.org)

1
2
3 Reviewer: 2
4

5 Recommendation: Minor revisions
6
7

8 Comments:

9 I would like to understand more from the paper what RDM makespaces would be producing and what
10 industries this paper would be relevant. From your research can you give more concrete examples of
11 the types of product or general characteristics of products that RDM makespaces might fulfil.
12

13 Additional Questions:

14 Does the motivation for the work originate from industry's current problems? Is the need for the work
15 demonstrated?: Yes, RDM has been identified by the EPSRC as being an important area of research.
16 This study will be relevant to some sections of some industries, however it is not clear from this paper
17 what industries. I would like understand what insights the authors have as to what types of industry
18 would benefit from either leveraging, cooperating with or setting up a makerspace. As well as what
19 might be disrupted if many type 3 makerspaces were to operate at scale.
20
21
22

23 Many thanks for this excellent suggestion and we think this improves the paper and sets out the
24 beginnings of an important agenda for future research. In order to answer your question we have
25 created an additional section. This is Section 6 and is entitled: "Makerspace diffusion in
26 manufacturing industries". We have provided a table in Appendix 3 that illustrates examples of
27 makerspace products and their diffusion into different manufacturing industries. We have also
28 identified what industries might be disrupted if type 3 makerspaces were to operate at scale.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In response to your comment, we believe that makerspaces should be viewed in the light of industry
36 diffusion rather than disruption.
37
38
39

40 Does the paper describe and evaluate previous literature on the subject?: Yes.
41
42

43 Do the authors show awareness of work that has been published recently in PPC?: To some degree.
44 The literature review makes no mention of PPC but there are 3 citations, 2 dated 2004 and the one
45 that can be classed as recent, 2016. This is not an issue for me but may well be for the publisher.
46
47
48

49 The following PPC references have been added:
50

51 Saenz de Ugarte, B., A. Artiba, and R. Pellerin. 2009. "Manufacturing Execution System – a Literature
52 Review." Production Planning & Control 20 (6). Taylor & Francis Group : 525–39
53

54 Liu, P., S. H. Huang, A. Mokasdar, H. Zhou, and L. Hou. 2014. "The Impact of Additive Manufacturing in
55 the Aircraft Spare Parts Supply Chain: Supply Chain Operation Reference (Scor) Model Based Analysis."
56 Production Planning & Control 25 (13–14)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Does the paper describe the use of an appropriate research method?: Yes. For what the authors set
5 out to do their method was appropriate.
6

7
8 Does the paper provide useful new knowledge about the application of the work in practice or to
9 provide directions for future research?: Yes.
10

11 Do you think the paper has sufficient promise to make revisions worthwhile?: Yes.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60