

# Cooperative Innovation, Coworking, and the Fluminense Craftbeer Market Beer

## Inovação Cooperativa, Coworking e o Mercado de Cerveja Artesanal Fluminense

Elisa Priori de Deus<sup>i</sup>

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1719-3959>

Carlyle Tadeu Falcão de Oliveira<sup>ii</sup>

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3603-1469>

### Resumo

Os sistemas de *coworking* são espaços que oferecem flexibilidade para seus usuários com relação aos custos, e, por isso, seus principais atores são *freelancers* ou/e *startups*. As cervejarias ciganas, cervejarias sem fábricas que produzem no espaço da outra cervejaria, podem ser consideradas um modelo *coworking*. Os *coworking* cervejeiros fluminenses criam relações de parceria para produzir sua cerveja artesanal. Este trabalho procurou identificar a contribuição das cervejarias artesanais para a teoria da inovação cooperativa e do mercado cervejeiro. Para isso, utilizaram-se pesquisas bibliográfica, documental, entrevistas em profundidade e uma *survey*, cujos resultados foram analisados qualitativamente e por meio de estatística descritiva. Foram pesquisadas 154 microcervejarias fluminenses, sendo coletadas 15 entrevistas e 37 questionários. Observou-se que a inovação cooperativa nos *coworking* cervejeiros possibilita que pequenas empresas desenvolvam seu produto e ingressem no mercado, assim como a introdução de novas parcerias promove o fortalecimento da disseminação das cervejas artesanais entre os consumidores do estado do Rio de Janeiro, ao mesmo tempo que expande esse mercado para investidores, distribuidores, promotores comerciais e outros produtores de cerveja.

**Palavras-chave:** inovação cooperativa; *coworking*; cerveja artesanal cigana.

### Abstract

Coworking systems are spaces that offer flexibility to their users concerning costs, and, therefore, their main actors are freelancers or/and startups. Gypsy breweries are breweries without factories that produce in the space of the other brewery, and it can be considered a coworking model. Coworking Fluminense brewers create partnership relationships to make their craft beer. This work sought to identify the contribution of craft breweries to the theory of collaborative innovation and the beer market, for this used bibliographic, documentary research and in-depth interviews, and a survey. We analyzed the results qualitatively and through descriptive statistics. 154 Fluminense microbreweries were researched, with 15 interviews and 37 questionnaires collected. It observed collaborative innovation in beer coworking allows small companies to develop their product and enter the market. As well as the introduction of new partnerships promotes the strengthening of the dissemination of craft beers among consumers in the state of Rio de Janeiro, at the same time, which expands this market to investors, distributors, commercial promoters, and other beer producers.

**Keywords:** cooperative innovation; coworking; gypsy craft beer.

<sup>i</sup> Universidade Federal Fluminense. E-mail: [elisa.priori@coppead.ufjf.br](mailto:elisa.priori@coppead.ufjf.br)

<sup>ii</sup> UERJ / PPGAd – UFF. E-mail: [carlyle.falcao@gmail.com](mailto:carlyle.falcao@gmail.com)

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The history of capitalism shows that the evolution occurs from the implantation of new processes in the production, commercialization, and financing systems. There is a continuous transformation of the old production models to create new factors. This process that Schumpeter names as creative destruction are essential for the development of capitalism since it is from it that organizations work to adapt to new elements and guarantee their survival (SCHUMPETER, 1912: 1997).

The Oslo Manual (OECD, 1997) states that innovation is much more than product development in an organization's research and development (R&D) center. Innovation comprises several phases: scientific, technological, organizational, financial, and commercial. These steps involve preparation to produce, production, preparation for the market, including new specific marketing techniques aimed to implement innovation or new organizational methods that do not necessarily involve product or process innovation.

Collaborative innovation requires active collaboration from companies involved in the innovation process. Knowledge and technology need to be shared by partner organizations to constantly exchange information that allows the development of all companies (OECD, 1997). Cooperation partnerships allow companies of different sizes to participate in developing new projects (TEECE, 1992).

The sharing of goods/services is not something 21st century. It is present throughout society's development. The exchange of products or services for others is one of the oldest forms of negotiation. The sharing economy is a phenomenon that facilitates commercial transactions by

enabling access to a good or service without purchase/possession and, often, even without monetary exchange. Coworking systems form the sharing economy linked to the service and product system and the collaborative lifestyle (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011).

Coworking is a place developed based on sustainability and the community. Professionals with flexible working hours and space come together in the same place to obtain better results - both personal and professional - than working in their own home offices. People looking for these spaces want the freedom to work in any environment at different times and establish relationships of trust while expanding their relationship networks (SPINUZZI, 2012).

Researchers have developed work relating open innovation to business models connected to the sharing economy. Crowdfunding contributes to product innovation processes by seeking external evaluation from the project's sponsors - people who invest in the business. They are the first to analyze the product and point out the needs for improvement (STANKO; HENARD, 2017).

Organizations use crowdsourcing platforms and collaborative social networks to find new solutions, develop new products, and undertake collaboratively in favor of innovation (PALACIOS; MARTINEZ-CORRAL; GRIJALVO, 2016; SERGIO; GONÇALVES, 2017).

However, we have not found studies on the role of coworking (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011; SPINUZZI, 2012) in the construction of innovation processes in companies. Thus, this research aims to contribute to the innovation and coworking literature by studying these two integrated concepts.

This work approaches coworking through the prism of craft beer production, a growing market in Brazil. In 2014, the

Union of Brewers Brazil surveyed the country's craft beer market and, as a result, found around 300 brewers registered that handled R\$ 2 billion. In the following year, there was an increase of 17% in microbreweries, reaching 372 registered with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Supply (MAPA).

MAPA released a survey that ended 2017 with the registration of 679 breweries that produced 7,500 different products. Gypsy breweries, a type of brewery, do not have their factory. They make it by renting brewery equipment and services that have idle space and are willing to share it. (SEBRAE, 2015). Many microbreweries are of this type. It is an emerging market that is booming and economically robust.

In addition, in the Capes Periodicals portal, around 1100 scientific articles deal with the sharing economy, 96 of which address coworking from the perspective of the sharing economy between January 2009 to 2019. However, none of these articles work with coworking under the gaze of the meeting of craft beer factories with gypsy craft beers.

Thus, the research question that guided the present investigation arose: what are the contributions of craft breweries to the Rio de Janeiro beer market and the theory of collaborative innovation?

Thus, the objective of this article was to identify the contribution of artisanal breweries to the theory of collaborative innovation and the beer market from the coworking Fluminense brewers. It was necessary to present the views of cooperative innovation and coworking, research and define the craft beer market, identify and analyze the productive processes of innovative cooperation in this sector. We studied the gypsy breweries in Rio de Janeiro in organizational terms, which are breweries without their facilities.

They need the space of traditional breweries with a factory for their artisanal production.

In addition to this introduction, this work showed a theoretical review, in which themes related to research: innovation, shared economy, coworking, craft beers, and gypsy breweries. The third section described the methodology. The fourth section brings the results and the discussion in the light of the theory raised. The article ends with the final remarks in the fifth section, followed by the bibliographic references.

## 2 THEORETICAL REFERENCE

### 2.1 Innovation

Multiple factors made up innovation, like organizational, economic, and environmental changes. Innovation is people searching for continuous improvement or exploring new forms of production, new raw materials, new technologies and suppliers, expanding markets, partnerships and commercial relationships, new pricing, management, and performance measurement strategies (MAYO, 2003). For Schumpeter (1997), innovations start in the organization's internal environment through transformations that allow new ideas and new knowledge.

What drives transformations in the capitalist system is innovation through new combinations, in organizational terms using the existing means of production differently. Such combinations come from developing a new product or service, a new production method, creating a new consumer market, a new source of raw materials, or simply a new way of organizing production (SCHUMPETER, 1912, 1997).

The capitalist system is sustained by imbalance, not equilibrium, as Schumpeter's contemporary economic thinkers believed. The transformation of economic activity occurs dynamically; consequently, the capitalist system is

developed. Innovation and the process of creative destruction are fundamental to the progress of capitalism. Through continuous instability, economic cycles are transformed, not restricted to the commercialization of goods or services, but their mode of production and financing (SCHUMPETER, 1997).

Today, the boundaries of firms are increasingly diffuse due to the ability to share productive responsibilities with partner companies. Because of this, there is a need for cooperation agreements between companies for them to create new products, processes, and markets together. This cooperation allows enterprises of different sizes and resources to work on new projects, enabling the innovative approach by using a network of partnerships to develop products and services (TEECE, 1992).

The company made up innovation by itself, showing that it can self-sustain through its financial capital, research, and development. Companies can develop innovations with their resources or cooperate with other companies or public research organizations. However, the cooperative process developed in the invention and innovation activities will depend on the relationships established to obtain information, knowledge, technology, practices, human and financial resources (OECD, 1997).

In the book *Business Model Generation*, Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010) present some business models linked to innovation cooperative and ways to seek it within organizations. Among these models, Chesbrough (2003) deals with open business and open innovation. For the authors, the available company produces innovation based on its business model that depends on organizations or external people to develop, create and capture value for its consumer (OSTERWALDER; PIGNEUR, 2010).

In open business, there is a need for cooperation between organizations for their development. If a company has idle products, services, technology, or

intellectual property, it can monetize it by building a new project with another organization. This innovation can happen from the inside out or outside; outside-in innovation occurs when the organization brings ideas, projects, and external resources to develop new products, services, or processes. Innovation from the inside out is the opposite; the organization checks idle resources and makes them available to other organizations and people, giving profitability to what is out of use (OSTERWALDER; PIGNEUR, 2010; VANHAVERBEKE; CHESBROUGH, 2014; BAGGIO; WEGNER; DALMARCO, 2018).

The open business model (OSTERWALDER; PIGNEUR, 2010) enhances innovation based on the ability to establish partnerships, find and develop opportunities not seen by others, in addition to knowing how to use these characteristics in a way that is advantageous for business (VIEIRA; VALE; MAY, 2018). It is not linked to the creation of new markets only, and it can reside in the transformation of the way to satisfy existing demands. The entrepreneur changes his perception about how the operation is taking place and modifies the production process—commercialization or logistics of a particular good or service (TIDD; BESSANT; PAVIT, 2008).

The search to increase its resources to improve the innovation processes makes companies of different sizes look for partners with similar profiles for the skills and capacities they lack. This way, investment is exchanged for something new and profit, providing access to new resources and innovations. Besides that, access to a differentiated market and increased production are also a division of risks and costs that innovation demands (FARIA; LIMA; SANTOS, 2010).

Tidd, Bessant, and Pavit (2008) affirm that innovation is sustained by establishing partnerships, finding and developing opportunities not seen by others, and knowing how to use these two

characteristics in an advantageous way for business. The emergence of the worldwide web allowed it to explore opportunities as an expanded range of options because it reaches consumers with different consumption profiles. The internet provided more excellent coverage of the consumer market through an interaction with its audience to contemplate a personalized and specialized experience for each segment of the public, changing and expanding the ways of innovating (TIDD; BESSANT; PAVIT, 2008).

## 2.2 Sharing Economy-Coworking

In 2012, it became the term sharing economy, and from that, there was an increase in the number of publications related to the subject (SILVEIRA, PETRINI, SANTOS, 2016). There is no established concept about sharing economy (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011), but a set of studies on the theme (HABIBI; DAVIDSON; LAROCHE, 2017; WILHELMS; MERFELD; HENKEL, 2017; MILANOVA; MAAS, 2017) makes it possible to understand its operation, its premises and some of its formats. Therefore, this research presents some of the most cited definitions on the topic by different authors.

Sharing takes place between people who have the same way of thinking about consumption, promoting the development of this exchange system, regardless of the good or service. The exchange can strengthen human relationships since to share, and it is necessary to trust. The consumer stops thinking individually to worry about the collective (LAMBERTON, 2016).

Sharing economy is a phenomenon that facilitates commercial transactions and allows access to a good and service, without purchase/possession and, many times, even without monetary exchange. It is a way to satisfy needs and desires more sustainably and attractively, with a low cost for the user. Such commercial activities include sharing,

loan, rent, donation, exchanges, and barter transactions (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011).

There are three forms of manifestation of the sharing economy: i) redistribution markets, when a transfer of ownership occurs, in which the asset is no longer helpful to the current owner and the latter transfers its possession to another person receiving money or another product in exchange, thus avoiding disposal and encouraging its reuse; ii) collaborative lifestyles, people sharing spaces, and intangible assets exchanged, such as time and skills; and iii) product and service systems, in which the user uses the asset without the need to acquire it, such as sharing bicycles, workspaces, cars - UBER, AIRBNB, and COWORKING integrate the last two forms (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011).

Coworking systems manifest collaborative lifestyles and designs of products and services (BOTSMAN; ROGERS, 2011). For this article, some definitions of coworking were listed, mainly by Spiniuzzi (2012), to apply them to analyze coworking Fluminense brewers.

Lumley (2014) highlights that coworking is a community in which creative and independent workers can work side-by-side, with this work being developed collaboratively or independently, according to their needs.

The coworking spaces are places that offer greater flexibility to their users about rental costs. Therefore, its primary workers are freelance professionals or small companies and startups (RESE; KOPPLIN; NIELEBOCK, 2020). Coworking attracts people who do not have high capital investment or whose work is still initially undergoing, which needs testing in the market. The coworkers seek contact and affinity with the other group members to join these systems, aiming to create partnerships and professional and social exchanges. They seek a style of horizontal organization. Everyone shares obligations and benefits, in addition to exchanging

experiences and creating a network that enables them to achieve innovative development for their business (SOARES E SALTORATO, 2015).

Due to the diversity in the construction of coworking spaces and the porous and unstable development of urban structures, such places may consist of areas, which will not necessarily have the appearance of offices, but environments in which good partners come together to carry out their activities. The definitions presented here leave a conceptual opening on coworking, which can cover physical spaces with different architectural projects, depending only on the desire and objectives of its users (SPINUZZI, 2012).

### 2.3 Craft Beer

Beer is one of the oldest drinks on record. It is the third most consumed drink in the world, second only to water and tea. In Brazil, the first brewing master arrived with the crew of Maurício de Nassau in 1637, and three years after his arrival, the first brewery in the Americas in Recife, La Fontaine (SILVA, 2017).

Brazil is the third-largest beer producer in the world, second only to China and the United States. Beer is the most consumed alcoholic beverage in the country. However, for SEBRAE (2015), there are even more spaces to be explored to expand and qualify this production. The beer market names the type of brewery according to the production capacity and tradition of each one. The commonly accepted division is that described by Carvalho (2015):

a) Commercial mega breweries: production of more than 10 billion liters of beer per year, concentrating most of the world market. Examples of this classification: ABInbev and Heineken;

b) Large and Traditional Breweries: production exceeds 1 billion liters per year and is highly representative in the market, such as Itaipava in Brazil;

c) Microcervejarias: produce up to 1.7 million liters per year, but their product has differentiated production characteristics, added by the quality and tradition of the place produced, for example, Noi de Niterói - RJ and Colorado de Ribeirão Preto - SP.

Craft beer brewer produces less beer volume than traditional industries and favors manufacturing through manual processes without preservatives. Its essential ingredients are water, yeast, hops, and malted barley. However, master brewers can use other ingredients to give a different flavor to their production. The diversity and the original flavor are the great attractions of craft beer and its differential to the brands sold on a large scale. In addition, Brazilian artisanal breweries are usually of family origin, and there is a predominance of the use of malt in their production. For this reason, this category of beer is classified as premium or unique beers that meet the demand of a public that is willing to spend more to drink a differentiated product (SEBRAE, 2016).

The production of craft beer is present in practically the entire territory, with a greater concentration of breweries in the southern (41%) and southeast (42%) regions, with emphasis on the states of Rio Grande do Sul (142), São Paulo (124), Minas Gerais (87), Santa Catarina (78) and Rio de Janeiro (57) (MAPA, 2018).

The craft beer market established a more expressive link with the South and Southeast regions, concentrating 80% of the breweries. The production style of premium beers is also linked to their geographic location. There is a concern for each region to produce craft beer with specific attributes, so brewers seek to create an identity in their beer linked to the characteristics of each area (SEBRAE, 2016; ALVARENGA, 2018).

The Brazilian Association of Craft Breweries (ABRACERVA) highlights that the number of breweries in the country (679 registered) is different from the number of existing labels (8,903); that is, there are a

more significant number of brands than breweries (ALVARENGA, 2018). Such phenomenon is due to the gypsy breweries that produce their brands in the idle spaces of other breweries, and despite being registered with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Supply (MAPA), they are not accounted for in the survey on the national beer market (ABRACERVA, 2017).

The Danish Mikkell created the gypsy model production and is also known as a gypsy, collaborative or associated brewery. The gypsy brewery model consists of the brewer which does not have a factory to produce its beer, so this brewer uses the space, the equipment of another brewery (traditionally a microbrewery) to create its recipe and sell it. There is an exchange of information between the brewer of the house and the contractor throughout this process. In addition, the microbrewery that receives the gypsy brewery assumes legal responsibilities with ANVISA and MAPA for each recipe produced for the gypsy brewer. (GRANDO, 2014).

The advantage of becoming a gypsy is that the initial investment is around ten times less than investing in a factory of its own. In this way, brewers can expand production, transforming homemade production into production with scale for sale and in a professional manner (RONCOLATO, 2016).

The period in which the "gypsy" stays in the contracted brewery is like incubation for developing the brand and the distribution channel. During this period, the gypsy brewer still does not have enough capital to take care of these two necessary items to grow its brewery. The partnership between gypsy brewer and brewery with the factory results from establishing trust and collaboration. The effect of this partnership is the search to minimize its costs, promote its brands and join forces so that the beer market grows in the country. Thus, the relationship between the two beer brands provides benefits for both (RONCOLATO, 2016). In other words, coworking works when a factory with space and idle time, because of low demand, makes this idle available for another company to promote work and profits to both.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

To answer the main objective of this research, that is, to verify what contributions the craft beer market brings innovation realized an exploratory investigation about the craft beer market Rio de Janeiro state. The main point was about gypsy breweries and their participation in the Fluminense market through their relationship with the breweries with factories.

Figure 1 - Methodological Path



The study was qualitative with the use of bibliographic, documentary, and field research. The qualitative perspective refers to an ontology and epistemology subjectivist to analyze the empirical data. Data from empirical research were analyzed

from an interpretive perspective, in which the researcher understood the social reality under the view of the actors who are engaged in it (BURREL & MORGAN, 1979).

The microbreweries were found in Rio de Janeiro through social networks through Facebook and Instagram pages. We discovered one hundred twenty-six gypsy microbreweries and 28 factories microbreweries.

We conducted 15 in-depth interviews with breweries: divided by 07 representatives of factory breweries and 08 gypsy breweries. We choose them using Vergara's criteria: 'accessibility,' prominence in the market, and receptivity to research (VERGARA, (1998, p. 49).

The exploratory interview was used to understand the research problem, allowing the creation of insights. The interview was face-to-face and semi-structured elaborated, and had some closed questions to identify the user profile of the beer coworking. It included other questions open to the interviewees to respond freely about the questions raised, such as the motivations and relevance of these places where they shared their experiences related to beer production spaces. The interview script was based on the theoretical framework studied, as well as the analysis categories developed. They took place in two phases: the first (pilot) on 09/24 and 10/04/2018 with two different subjects of the research - two partners of a gypsy brewery and one of the partners of a factory brewery. The second phase was held on 8/02 and 3/10/2019 when we interviewed the other craft beer leaders and factories with the s adjustments in the interview schedule due to the pilot interviews. The average interview time was 50 minutes.

After the interviews, we sent an online survey to all other microbreweries with factories and gypsies who did not participate. We received 37 answered

questionnaires: 33 from gypsy microbreweries and 04 from microbreweries with a factory.

The online questionnaire was based on the interview scripts, but with closed questions in which the respondent could choose only one option in some questions and check more than one option in others. There was also the "other" option in which the respondent could describe his response in the latter case.

Other sources contributed to the familiarization with the concept of gypsy breweries— some documents and reports as references that clarified the development of this market. In addition, the researchers observed some gypsy breweries in sales places, such as bars, gastronomy fairs, beer events, and other spaces in which gypsy breweries offered their products to the consumer.

Content analysis (BARDIN, 1977: 2010) was the basis for the analysis of the interviews. Vergara (2005) highlights that the content analysis has as main points: units of analysis, analysis grid, categories, frequency of the elements for quantitative research, the relevance of the factors, presence or absence of the details. We adjusted the interview script and the questionnaire after we tested ahead with the gypsy brewery and the factory breweries that opened their factory to the gypsies. The questionnaire was made available for responses from 11/03/2019 to 01/04/2019.

After developed data analysis, the researchers defined two categories defined a priori: craft beer from Rio de Janeiro and innovation. Table 01 depicts the categories and subcategories prepared, together with their objectives and references.



**Table 1** – Analysis Categories

| <i>Categories</i> | <i>Subcategories</i>  | <i>Objective</i>   | <i>References</i>   |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>Craft Beer</b> | - Gypsy and Factory Relationship<br>- Impacts for the Fluminense craft beer market.                                       | Understand how the relationship between Roma and factories works and the results for the Rio de Janeiro craft beer market.                             | Grando (2014); Sebrae (2016); Roncolato (2016); Martins (2016);   |
| <b>Innovation</b> | - New Combinations: product, production process, market, and source of raw material.<br>- Innovation through cooperation. | Innovate through cooperation to develop a new market, product, process, or raw material source, expanding the market for craft beer in Rio de Janeiro. | Schumpeter (1997), Tidd; Bessant; Pavit (2008), OECD (1997); Teece (1992); Prahalad e Krishiman (2008); Osterwalder E Pigneur (2010). |

Source: Elaborated by the authors, 2018.

The focus of data analysis was on the qualitative approach. The researcher presents existing relationships between the elements, highlighting the meanings and the degree of importance that the content manifests in the speeches and responses of each participant - interviewed or respondent. The interpretation of the data occurred through the interactive construction of explanation. We used the established categories to build a basis based on their relationships—the understanding used in exploratory research (LAVILLE and DIONNE, 1999; VERGARA, 2005).

The descriptive statistics presented the survey results. In the craft beer market in Rio de Janeiro, it was possible to characterize better some aspects of the relationships between the gypsy breweries and their recipients, though without pretending to make inferences or generalizations of this market in this work.

## 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Craft Beer

To understand the result of the factories' interaction with the gypsies and vice-versa, we first sought to know how their representatives got to know the gypsy

brewery business model. The research questions aimed to understand the relationship's impact on the market of craft beer in Rio de Janeiro. Considering this, we investigated the following: how many gypsy breweries do the factory currently receive simultaneously, how many factories do the gypsy use simultaneously, and the average volume of the production of gypsy breweries. It was investigated how many different labels, beer styles, and gypsies currently produce— transcripts of the interviewees' statements to exemplify each of the results.

#### 4.1.1 Gypsy Breweries

The research explored how the relationship between gypsies and factories to produce and commercialize craft beer started. In the interviews, three ways emerged that led the brewing entrepreneurs to get to know the gypsy production model.

- 1) By direct contact with other brewers:

I started with my first gypsy, with a guy I met in a course there in São Paulo, and talking to him. I said: I was setting up a factory; he wanted to set up a brand too. Then, I did two waves of mine and one (surge) of him, and in

fact, he is with me until today.  
(Factory Brewery 5 Representative).

- 2) Through market research to make a business opportunity feasible: "When I came back from the course I took, I started to pursue it, research and take brewery courses. I developed beers with Paulo [...]" (Gypsy Brewery Representative 8).
- 3) Due to the knowledge of the craft beer market and the desire to develop your product: "When you enter market craft beer, you already know there are two models of beer production: a) open a factory, or b) outsource production to another factory" (Factory Brewery Representative 7).

The answers about how Fluminense brewers got to know the gypsy model align with how Grando (2014) described the beginning of Mikkel's beer production. Fluminense's sought an alternative to produce their beer commercially without having the initial investment of building a factory and having all the resources and experiences of the brewers who have factories. Put up evidence that proves a relationship that constitutes the coworking brewers and does not demand.

#### **4.1.2 Impacts on the Fluminense Craft Beer Market**

After establishing the way they produce beer, we sought to understand how the union of gypsies and factories reflects the craft beer market in Rio de Janeiro. For this reason, the researchers questioned volume and different quantity styles produced, as well as how many factories the gypsy beer work with and how many gypsy beers the factories receive.

When dealing with the volume of production and quantity of labels produced, it is evident that the output of factories and gypsies are different since the factories have greater production capacity, being able to

receive gypsies and make their beer at the same time. The average monthly production volume of a gypsy brewery was 2 to 4 thousand liters/month, as informed by Gypsy brewery representative 7. In comparison, the production of the factories varied between 9 and 12 thousand liters according to the representative of Factory Brewery 3.

Even though it is a factory, monthly production volumes do not distinguish it from increase artisanal production. The production of artisanal beer has the exhibition on more minor scales and manual processes (SEBRAE, 2016).

In the interviews, in the observation of beer fairs and events, the researchers noted that gypsy breweries have a diverse style of beer production, with the diversification of labels produced by gypsies within the factories. The average output reported by the interviewed gypsies was seven different labels throughout its existence - "[...] we produce a fixed line in 6." (Gypsy Brewery Representative 3). Another finding is the fact that a factory can serve more than one gypsy at the same time. In other words, beer styles present different numbers for gypsies and factories because the scales are opposite despite working together. While gypsies produce various labels in smaller volumes, the factories remain with their brands seeking to scale their products.

The diversity of styles is a characteristic of craft beers presented by SEBRAE (2016). The gypsy brewery in Rio de Janeiro, in particular, is required by the market to launch new styles always, as highlighted by the owner of factory 5:

Gypsy, who already has a point of sale, who already has a bar, wants to have his beer. For example, the gypsies I work with from São Paulo usually produce the three recipes if they have three recipes. Now, a gypsy from RJ, every time is changing. So I think it is complicated. The market in RJ is different from the one in SP. In RJ, one is trying to make a novelty more impactful than the other. To give

you an idea, I have forty-two products registered at my brewery. It is too much for a factory. Many of these gypsies are the ones who don't repeat. (Factory Brewery 5 representative).

It is noticeable, from the speech of the representative of factory 5, that the Rio de Janeiro craft beer market has a particularity concerning the others: that of claiming new styles of beer from the gypsies. It is a market perceived differently from the others because, for a new brewer to enter the Rio de Janeiro market, he needs to be aware of this condition. This differentiation for investing in new products with diversified flavors and aromas is what SEBRAE (2016) portrayed as creating the regional identity. The identity of the Rio de Janeiro beer market put the gypsy breweries inventing new recipes, exploring all the creative potential of their master brewer.

Most factories can serve more than one gypsy simultaneously, but that does not mean that gypsies will use all their tanks. The average of simultaneous production is 3 or 4 gypsies per factory that work with their brands as well: "[...] I have seven fermentation tanks. Usually, of these seven, four are with gypsies, and three, with my beer" (Representative Factory 5).

Factories have a focus on working with gypsies, such as factories 3 and 4, the space for simultaneous production, as one of the respondents informed: "[...] we serve up to 9 simultaneously because it is the number of fermenters. A large part of our production, about 85% of our production, is from gypsy craft beer" (Factory Representative 3).

Related to gypsies, half of the interviewees (4 Roma) work with only two factories, contrary to what one might believe because of their denomination regarding not having a fixed place of residence. In the other half, we have three gypsies producing with a single brewery, and only one gypsy brewery stated that its concept is that of a nomadic gypsy, that is, that it makes its beer with as many factories as possible:

[...] 4 currently 4, but we are going to 5, 6, and 7 soon. Concept of a nomadic gypsy, I think that a cool thing to say that can add to your research there are two things, it is the gypsy who is the one who runs, and who does the outsourcing industry - contract brewery. It is something more frequent like that [...] we are gypsy, gypsy. We do not stop, and if we have the opportunity to go somewhere, we go. (Gypsy Brewery Representative 1).

The gypsy model is a phenomenon with heterogeneous characteristics. Its participants seek initial information from their peers and other sources. The production volumes and styles of beers vary according to the size of each brewery and the Gypsy relationship with the factories, which make up the coworking brewers. It seems to be essential for the Fluminense craft beer market. The number of gypsies is higher than the number of breweries with factories in the state, giving this market a unique feature about diversifying craft beer offerings.

The gypsy craft beer process in Rio de Janeiro is not a lease or outsourcing process, as those involved report an exchange of information and experiences during beer production. Fluminense beer coworking operates beyond the contractual process. Brewers who own the factories teach gypsy brewers how large-scale production works, about the sales process, and how the market works due to their more significant experience in the market. On the other hand, gypsy brewers employ the novelty of products and services in the Rio de Janeiro market and make brewers with factories want to develop new products and production processes.

## 4.2 Innovation

Observing the reference on the theme of innovation, we find two subcategories: the innovations that the Gypsy model proposes for the market of craft beer in Rio de Janeiro linked to the

Schumpeterian precepts of innovation. In the innovation category, the research focuses on the aspects of innovation through cooperation. The idea of working together stimulates the development of a new market, product, process, or source of raw material. Moreover, cooperation is to new ways of innovating with ideas, products, and technologies.

#### **4.2.1 The innovations that the gypsy model proposes for the craft beer market in Rio de Janeiro**

According to Schumpeter (1977), innovations result from new combinations that will result in new products, processes, markets, or sources of raw materials. This subcategory was one of the most found in the survey, with 13 responses related to new combinations. The most recurring answer presented the statement that gypsies allow consumers to have different products with a more significant and better variety and quality of beers on the market.

The representative of factory brewery 2 pointed out that:

I think they contribute mainly to one thing: creativity. Unfortunately, whoever has a factory cannot use creativity a lot in product creation because you are terrified of making mistakes. The gypsy is the bridge between a consumer who wants novelty and novelty. It is always the gypsy who comes up with something new, and the factory does it. Moreover, this novelty, most of the time, becomes a trend. (Factory Brewery 2 representative).

When inserting a new product, the gypsy creates trends in the craft beer market, making the sector more dynamic and transforming competition patterns within the sharing economy. Thus, it introduces an innovation for the craft beer market in the model of coworking brewers (BRAZIL, WALNUT, STRONG, 2011).

When the gypsy creates a new variety of lager or stout beer with diversified spices to differentiate among others, it enriches the consumer experience by expanding its tasting possibilities. At the same time, they extend the beer market by seeking to cater to the various existing tastes. "Ah, it is that with this there can be a varied amount of breweries, present more beers to the public and increase the number of consumers" (Gypsy Brewery 3 Representative); "Variety, novelty and today it is a wide market" (Gypsy Brewery 8 Representative).

The representative gypsy five speech reinforces the thinking of the gypsies 3 and 8, emphasizing that the gypsies launch a new beer in a short time. Thus, they manage to give consumers freedom of choice, facing a market that a few years ago was closed and restricted to large industries.

I think they bring new options and possibilities, especially here in Brazil. We ended up being dominated by the big brewing groups, in that old policy of being exclusive, wanting to have only their beer in the establishment, not having healthy competition, making local work difficult. I had a bar in which we had a contract with a giant company that would not let us sell anything else, and the customer wanted to take something different and could not [...] These are changing policies. So I think it is very positive. (Gypsy Brewery 5 Representative).

The representative of factory 6 attests to what the head of gypsy 5 said, adding the possibility that gypsy breweries create trends that factories and other gypsies can replicate.

As a gypsy customer, I know three different factories. I will know at least three different ways of doing the same thing, thus choosing the most efficient one and passing this on to others. Good ideas replicated by several producers [...] As the gypsy does not have much commitment to volume production, he does not need to be so committed to repeatability. Generally,

the fixed cost is less than a brewery manages to venture further. He can afford to produce new products in a shorter period. Indeed, gypsy craft beer brings vigor to a larger market than if factories dominated it. (Factory Brewery Representative 6).

Representatives of factory breweries emphasize that the gypsy craft breweries work to reinvent the beer. That is, the gypsy craft brewery position is linked to the product quality as differential related to the fact monthly production volumes:

Because it allows the creation of new brands and allows experimentation, the gypsy has this thing of risking more. For a factory, it is the risk to try new things all the time [...] I think the quality. As they have to compete with a factory with a better cost, they have to invest in quality. An evil gypsy does not survive. A factory with a lousy beer can survive. (Factory Brewery 5 Representative).

The production of beers singled out by the gypsies is only possible through the union with the factories. Otherwise, these beers would continue in homemade productions without being sold to the public. It is the factory's expertise that manages to increase the production volume of gypsy breweries. Tests with new ingredients are produced in small quantities when the gypsy firms a production partnership with the factory, the master brewer responsible makes salable production without losing the flavor originality, aroma, and other characteristics developed by a gypsy.

New operational combinations in the Fluminense beer market are also found in the arrangements to improve the distribution conditions of the products, in the contracting of a joint commercial, that is, in the collective production of marketing:

There are sales groups, so four breweries or six or more get together [...] and take the seller, make a table,

instruct him, give a tour [...]. Another thing that happens, outsourced distribution is complicated for a brewery to do. There is a player on the market that is a distributor. There are some you send, they accumulate from some breweries, and for you to go to the point of sale, there is no reason why I should go, Davi go, or something [...] Centralize with them there, and they deliver and we pay for them [...] (Gypsy Brewery 1 Representative).

The gypsy model drives changes in the craft beer market by using existing means of production differently. These combinations involve a salesperson who works for a group of gypsy breweries. The owners work together to enhance this player, and he acts in the sale to everyone, minimizing costs and expanding business potential.

In this sense, the gypsy model also improves the distribution in the craft beer market with the creation of professional distributors that meet Gypsy demands and that of factory beers. Thus, due to the needs of gypsy brewers, new actors appear or improve themselves in the craft beer market. According to Schumpeter's precepts, the arrangement of these new dynamics is specific innovations for the craft beer market (1977).

In addition to improving the players in the craft beer market, for almost all respondents (12), gypsies breweries promote and develop the Rio de Janeiro craft beer market with consumers. The gypsy craft breweries encourage the brewing culture by allowing themselves to take risks in their recipes. They are elaborating different flavors and aromas with a lower cost and volume of production, using the facilities and skills of people who have already left the gypsy moment and now produce in their factories.

Gypsy Craft breweries explore new ways of producing, new raw materials, and new recipes, which makes Gypsies expand the market, partnerships, and commercial relations, bringing new pricing strategies,

management, performance measures, and marketing tools (MAYO, 2003).

The response of the representative of the gypsy brewery 3 reinforces this idea:

With this, various breweries can monthly production volumes present more beers to the public and increase the number of consumers to show the beer to the public and grow the market. If it were not for this, several of us could not exist. (Gypsy Brewery 3 Representative).

The Gypsy production model also expands the number of brewers on the market, allowing new producers to launch and sell their products and leave home production. In this way, the market offers more possibilities for the consumer. Factory representatives reinforce the idea of access to craft beer markets in the state: 'It is popular; allows anyone to enter the market' (Factory Brewery Representative 5).

The main contribution of gypsy breweries to the craft beer market perceived by the two participants in this relationship is to develop craft beer culture. There are two reasons for that: the low cost of entering a call without needing to finance its facilities and the requirement of the Rio de Janeiro market, always eager for new labels.

The coworking period for Fluminense brewers is a transition for gypsy breweries to build their brand and develop their product to open their factories soon.

#### 4.2.2 Collaborate to Innovate

According to the interviewees, collaboration promotes innovation in the gypsy craft beer market in different ways. The gypsies join factories to achieve cost reductions in raw materials and production or obtain other advantages such as marketing and logistics. For example, the factories are looking to acquire knowledge when they open their doors to gypsies through a transparent and reliable relationship. The gypsies join factories to

achieve cost reductions in raw materials and production or obtain other advantages such as marketing and logistics.

The factory owner shares ideas, experiences, and space with the gypsies to produce and be another point of sale. Innovating under the understanding of cooperation is a dynamic process in which knowledge needs interaction (OECD, 1997).

Factory breweries and gypsy breweries are small or micro-enterprises, so innovating on their own is not feasible. When there is a cooperation between the parties, they can develop new products or services more sustainable for business (BAGGIO; WEGNER; DALMARCO, 2018).

The cooperation of two or more breweries in the production of a collaborative beer can be considered a new combination (SCHUMPETER, 1977) since the union of two organizations produces a new product by creating a new production process. There is a cooperation between competitors for the development of something new for the market, being it a process or product, as Bengtsson and Kock (1999) declare, or the development of a new marketing strategy (OECD, 1997), such as the use of networks of relationships organizations participating in coworking to launch products.

The owner of factory 7 reinforces the sense of collaboration by saying that she develops a healthy relationship with her gypsy customers, explaining the market to them. Is he prepared to sell the products he is requesting to produce at her factory? '[...] this is because I have no intention of producing at any cost. I want production to be healthy for both sides. Most factories do not think so. I do not think that a different relationship helps the market' (Factory Brewery 7 Representative).

The relationship established by the owner of factory 7 with the gypsies she receives is a sharing of information that enables the growth of both sides. This way, cooperation works in favor of innovation, as

there is no competition. However, sharing allows the improvement of the product, the production process, the distribution channel, the marketing strategy, or the creation of a new brewery (OECD, 1997).

The innovation process established between gypsy breweries and factories can be classified as integrated collaborators (LAZZAROTTI et al., 2011). The two parties share all the steps of the innovation process with specific partners that produced the beer. There is an exchange of knowledge that benefits both parties involved in innovation (CARVALHO; SUGANO, 2016).

The answers coming from the gypsy craft breweries aim to reduce their costs when they come together. One example is the purchase of inputs and participation in events. 'Several partnerships appear between gypsies and factories breweries, and sometimes there are factories that bring together several Gypsies, which reduces the cost [...]. This makes viable our desire to produce beer. Ours, for example, has four national awards, so we have a product of excellence, a product that can be distributed to Brazil' (Gypsy Brewery 6 Representative). In this way, the gypsy model innovates through cooperation when its relations are not vertical but horizontal (JORDE; TEECE, 1990; BEGSTON & KOCK, 1999).

Relationships are the basis for innovation in the artisanal beer sector in Rio de Janeiro. Horizontal relationships transform friendships into business partnerships and allow them to innovate, improve their skills and competencies, and improve their business models. Through collaboration between relationships, producers of artisanal beer from Rio de Janeiro exchange knowledge and produce innovation (VIEIRA; VALE; MAY, 2018).

Gypsy breweries, as an open business model, according to Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010), depend on factories to develop and create value for their brands. In open business, cooperation between organizations is necessary and can occur in

several ways: exchanging technologies, services or making a new beer.

Innovating in open businesses can be from the inside out. The factory verifies that it has idle resources and makes them available to the gypsy, giving profitability to unused. Alternatively, increase when the gypsy divides her creativity from the outside, and they develop a differentiated beer that may become a trend in the craft beer market (OSTERWALDER; PIGNEUR, 2010).

## 5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The question of which contributions does the craft beer market present for innovation in its production process, this work listed some definitions of gypsy craft beer, coworking, and cooperative innovation. The production process of gypsy breweries within the craft beer market, through coworking brewers, allows us to answer the contributions of collaborative innovation.

Collaborative innovation is in the research of craft beer production. The gypsy breweries depend on the consolidation of this way of relating so that they exist, consequently developing.

Gypsy breweries promote collaborative innovation within the craft beer market through coworking brewers, where gypsies and factories share spaces, equipment, and production inputs. In addition to the division of physical items, there is an exchange of knowledge, information, experiences, lifestyles, and values. There is collaboration to achieve the goals of all the partners involved.

Gypsy brewers establish initiatives that foster the market in which they operate in a way that is beneficial to producers (gypsies and factories) and consumers. When reporting the desire to build a sense of community or a partnership, they broaden the vision of the craft beer market by strengthening their business.

The coworking brewers resemble an incubator for the breweries. During the

gypsy period, brewers, as they are under no obligation to maintain a factory and its expenses and being legally responsible for revenues, better develop their marketing mix - product, brand, promotion, and distribution to markets. ,.

For the two participants in this cycle of the shared economy, factories, and gypsies, the most outstanding contribution of gypsies to the craft beer market in Rio de Janeiro is to foster the market. The gypsy breweries create new beers, seek new markets and partners to expand their range of sales, and show other homebrewers that it is possible to become a professional brewery and market the beer produced in their house.

Gypsy breweries act as actors that show that it is possible to have a business, but it is necessary to obtain networks of collaboration and cooperation for its development. During the interviews, what was perceived is the transience of the gypsy model, as most breweries work to be able to have their factory. Thus, the cycle of gypsy breweries in Rio de Janeiro is very dynamic, as there are always new entrants. The model of gypsy breweries is across the state, and the motivations may be different with opening a factory, moving the gypsy to another state, or closing the gypsy. However, there are always new gypsy breweries emerging and factories receiving gypsies. The cycle of the sharing economy remains in high activity, as there are always two participants in this market looking for the same objective, that of producing differentiated beers.

Thus, this research adds more knowledge to the thematic areas of coworking and shared innovation in a little-studied sector, which is the craft beer market. The study's management perspective contributes to show the gypsy craft breweries model for tastings, investors, distributors, commercial promoters, and beer producers.

We recognized this qualitative study could increase respondents in a larger sample of brewers by quantitative

techniques, which could increase the robustness of the results to expand it to the entire craft beer market in Rio de Janeiro. This quantitative research would be an interesting study to be carried out and better understand the artisanal production process of beer since it was not possible to carry it out in this study. Due to the diversity of the actors and their relationships around this business, research in the marketing area would be welcome to understand this promising and innovative beer market better.

## REFERENCES

ABRACERVA. **Com 91 novos registros no 1º semestre, o mercado das artesanais avança no Brasil e já tem 610 cervejarias.** 2017. Disponível em: <http://abracerva.com.br/com-91-novos-registros-no-1o-semester-mercado-das-artesanais-avanca-no-brasil-e-ja-tem-610-cervejarias>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018.

ALVARENGA, Darlan. **Número de Cervejas no Brasil quase dobra em 3 anos e o setor volta a criar empregos.** 2018. Publicada Por Portal G1. Disponível em: <https://g1.globo.com/economia/pme/noticia/numero-de-cervejarias-no-brasil-quase-dobra-em-3-anos-e-setor-volta-criar-empregos.ghtml>. Acesso em: 30 mar. 2018.

BAGGIO, Daniela; WEGNER, Douglas; DALMARCO, Gustavo. Coordination mechanisms of collaborative R&D projects in small and medium enterprises. **RAM.** Revista de Administração Mackenzie, v. 19, n. 2, 2018.

BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de conteúdo.** (1977). Lisboa (Portugal): Edições, v. 70, p. 225, 2010.

BENGTSSON, Maria; KOCK, Sören. Cooperation and competition in relationships between competitors in



business networks. **Journal of business & industrial marketing**, 1999.

BOTSMAN, R. ROGERS, R. **O que é meu é seu: como o consumo colaborativo vai mudar o nosso mundo**. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2011.

BRASIL, Marcus Vinicius de Oliveira; NOGUEIRA, Cláudio André Gondim; FORTE, Sérgio Henrique Arruda Cavalcante. Schumpeter e o desenvolvimento tecnológico: uma visão aplicada às pequenas e médias empresas. **Revista de Ciências da Administração**, v. 13, n. 29, p.38-62, 20 abr. 2011. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8077.2011v13n29p38>

BURREL, Gibson & MORGAN, Gareth. **Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis**. Heinemann: London, 1982.

CARVALHO, Naiara Barbosa. Cerveja Artesanal: pesquisa mercadológica e aceitabilidade sensorial. 136 f. 2015. **Tese** (Doutorado). Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, MG, 2015.

CARVALHO, Eduardo; SUGANO, Joel. Tipologias de inovação aberta em novas empresas de base tecnológica brasileiras. **Revista Portuguesa e Brasileira de Gestão**, v. 15, n. 2, p. 65-83, 2016.

CHESBROUGH, Henry William. **Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology**. Harvard Business Press, 2003.

CHESBROUGH, Henry; VANHAVERBEKE, Wim; WEST, Joel (Ed.). **New frontiers in open innovation**. Oup Oxford, 2014.

FARIA, Pedro de; LIMA, Francisco; SANTOS, Rui. Cooperation in innovation activities: The importance of partners. **Research Policy**, [s.l.], v. 39, n. 8, p.1082-

1092, out. 2010. Elsevier BV. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.05.003>. Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733310001277>>. Acesso em: 03 ago. 2018.

FREITAS, Henrique et al. O método de pesquisa survey. **Revista de Administração da Universidade de São Paulo**, v. 35, n. 3, 2000.

GIL, Antônio Carlos. **Métodos E Técnicas De Pesquisa Social** - 6. ed. - São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.

GRANDO, João Weber. **Dinamarquês cria cervejas de forma 'cigana' e com fábricas emprestadas**. 2014. Disponível em: <<http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/comida/2014/06/1468189-dinamarques-cria-cervejas-de-forma-cigana-e-com-fabricas-emprestadas.shtml>>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018.

HABIBI, Mohammad Reza; DAVIDSON, Alexander; LAROCHE, Michel. What managers should know about the sharing economy. **Business Horizons**, v. 60, n. 1, p. 113-121, 2017.

JORDE, Thomas M.; TEECE, David J.. Innovation and Cooperation: Implications for Competition and Antitrust. **The Journal of Economic Perspectives**, Berkeley, v. 4, n. 3, p.75-96, Jun. 1990. Disponível em: <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1942930>>. Acesso em: 03 ago. 2018.

LAMBERTON, Cait. Collaborative consumption: a goal-based framework. **Current Opinion In Psychology**, [s.l.], v. 10, p.55-59, ago. 2016. Elsevier BV. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.12.004>. Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352250X15003115?via=ihub>>. Acesso em: 11 Set. 2017.

LAVILLE, C.; DIONNE, J. **A construção do saber: manual de metodologia da pesquisa em ciências humanas**. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 1999.

LAZZAROTTI, Valentina; MANZINI, Raffaella; PELLEGRINI, Luisa. Firm-specific factors and the openness degree: a survey of Italian firms. **European Journal of Innovation Management**, v. 14, n. 4, p. 412-434, 2011.

LUMLEY, Risa M. A Coworking Project in the Campus Library: Supporting and Modeling Entrepreneurial Activity in the Academic Library. **New Review Of Academic Librarianship**, [s.l.], v. 20, n. 1, p.49-65, jan. 2014. Informa UK Limited. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2013.850101>. Acesso em: 10 Nov. 2017.

MARTINS, Eduardo da Silva. **Panorama Da Produção De Cerveja Em Porto Alegre E Sua Terceirização: As Relações Entre Microcervejarias E Cervejarias Contratantes**. 2016. 66 f. TCC (Graduação) - Curso de Administração de Empresa, Departamento de Ciências Administrativas, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, 2016. Disponível em: <<http://www.lume.ufrgs.br/handle/10183/158582>>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018.

MATTAR, F.N Pesquisa De Marketing. São Paulo: Atlas, 1994

MAYO, A. Inovação e aprendizagem. In: MAYO, Andrew. **O valor humano da empresa**. São Paulo: Prentice Hall, 2003. p. 150-171.

MILANOVA, Veselina; MAAS, Peter. Sharing intangibles: Uncovering individual motives for engagement in a sharing service setting. **Journal of Business Research**, v. 75, p. 159-171, 2017.

MINISTÉRIO DA AGRICULTURA, PECUÁRIA E ABASTECIMENTO

(MAPA). **Anuário da cerveja**. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/agricultura/pt-br/assuntos/noticias/a-cada-dois-dias-uma-nova-cervejaria-abre-as-portas-no-brasil>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018.

OECD. **Manual de Oslo: DIRETRIZES PARA COLETA E INTERPRETAÇÃO DE DADOS SOBRE INOVAÇÃO**. 3. ed. Oslo: Finep, 1997. 184 p. Traduzido sob a responsabilidade da FINEP.

OSTERWALDER, A.; PIGNEUR, Y. **Business Model Generation**. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

PALACIOS, Miguel et al. Crowdsourcing and organizational forms: Emerging trends and research implications. **Journal of Business Research**, v. 69, n. 5, p. 1834-1839, 2016.

PRAHALAD, C.k.; KRISHMAN, M.s. **A nova era da Inovação: Impulsionando a co-criação de valor ao longo das redes sociais**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2008. 242 p. Tradução Afonso Celso da Cunha Serra.

RESE, Alexandra; KOPPLIN, Christopher Siegfried; NIELEBOCK, Caren. Factors influencing members' knowledge sharing and creative performance in coworking spaces. **Journal of Knowledge Management**, 2020.

RISEN, C. **The Innovative 'Gypsy Brewers' Shaking Up the Beer World**. The Atlantic, 20 Oct 2010. Disponível em: <<http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archives/2010/10/theinnovative-gypsy-brewers-shaking-up-the-beer-world/64828/>>. Acesso em: 07 Jan 2019.

RONCOLATO, Murilo. **Cerveja artesanal avança no Brasil com pequenos e 'ciganos'**. 2016. Elaborado pelo jornal digital NEXO. Disponível em: <https://www.nexojornal.com.br/reportagem/2016/12/16/Cerveja-artesanal-avanca-no->

Brasil- com-pequenos-e-‘ciganos’. Acesso em: 15 jan. 2018.

SEBRAE. **Boletim- Potencial de consumo de cervejas no Brasil**. 2015. Disponível em: <<http://www.sebraemercados.com.br/boletim-potencial-de-consumo-de-cervejas-no-brasil/>>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018.

SEBRAE. **Microcervejarias**. 2016. Disponível em: <[http://www.bibliotecas.sebrae.com.br/chronus/ARQUIVOS\\_CHRONUS/bds/bds.nsf/8818d2954be64fcda8628defef1f70f8/\\$File/7503.pdf](http://www.bibliotecas.sebrae.com.br/chronus/ARQUIVOS_CHRONUS/bds/bds.nsf/8818d2954be64fcda8628defef1f70f8/$File/7503.pdf)>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2018

SCHUMPETER, Joseph. **A teoria do desenvolvimento econômico** (1912). São Paulo: Ed, 1997.

SERGIO, Marina Carradore;  
GONÇALVES, Alexandre Leopoldo. Inovação aberta: o potencial das redes sociais colaborativas na gestão de ideias. **Informação & Sociedade**, v. 27, n. 3, 2017.

SILVA, Eduardo. **Mercado de Cerveja Artesanal acompanha a evolução do shopper para inovar e crescer**. 2017. Clube do Trade. Disponível em: <<https://clubedotrade.com.br/blog/mercado-de-cerveja-artesanal/>>. Acesso em: 12 jan. 2017.

SILVEIRA, Lisilene Mello da; PETRINI, Maira; SANTOS, Ana Clarissa Matte Zanardo dos. Economia compartilhada e consumo colaborativo: o que estamos pesquisando? **Rege - Revista de Gestão**, [s.l.], v. 23, n. 4, p.298-305, out. 2016. Emerald.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rege.2016.09.005>. Disponível em: <<https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1809227616306063>>. Acesso em: 21 nov. 2017.

SOARES, Juliana Maria Moreira;  
SALTORATO, Patricia. Coworking, uma forma de organização de trabalho: conceitos e práticas na cidade de São Paulo. **Atoz: novas práticas em informação e conhecimento**, v. 4, n. 2, p.61-73, 2015.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/atoz.v4i2.42337>. Acesso em: 10 nov. 2017

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

STANKO, Michael A.; HENARD, David H. Toward a better understanding of crowdfunding, openness and the consequences for innovation. **Research Policy**, v. 46, n. 4, p. 784-798, 2017.

TEECE, David J.. Competition, cooperation, and innovation. **Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization**, [s.l.], v. 18, n. 1, p.1-25, Jun. 1992. Elsevier BV.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681\(92\)90050-l](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681(92)90050-l). Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/016726819290050L>>. Acesso em: 03 ago. 2018.

TIDD, Joe; BESSANT, John; PAVIT, Keith. **Gestão da Inovação**. 3. ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2008. 600 p. Tradução: Elizamari Rodrigues Becker, Gabriela Perizzolo, Patricia Lessa Flores Da Cunha, Sara Viola Rodrigues, Semframis Teixeira Bastos.

VERGARA, Sylvia Constant. **Projetos e Relatórios de Pesquisa em Administração**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora Atlas S.A, 1998. 87 p.

VERGARA, Sylvia Constant. **Métodos de Pesquisa em Administração**. São Paulo: Editora Atlas S.A., 2005. 269p.

VIEIRA, Filipe C.; VALE, HAMILCAR V.; MAY, Marcia R. Open Innovation And Business Model: Embrapa Forestry Case Study. RAM. **Revista de Administração Mackenzie**, v. 19, n. 4, 2018.

WILHELMS, Mark-Philipp; MERFELD, Katrin; HENKEL, Sven. Yours, mine, and ours: A user-centric analysis of opportunities and challenges in peer-to-peer asset sharing. **Business Horizons**, v. 60, n. 6, p. 771-781, 2017.

---

**<sup>i</sup> Elisa Priori de Deus**

Doutoranda em Administração na Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ).

Mestre em Administração na Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF), com financiamento da CAPES – Bolsista. Especialista em Negócios Digitais pela UNIRITTER. Graduada em Comunicação Social – Relações Públicas pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Tem como interesse de pesquisa os temas: economia compartilhada, sistemas de coworking, cerveja artesanal, cerveja artesanal cigana, inovação, redes de inovação, comportamento do consumidor, cultura e consumo, mídias e consumo, marketing de experiência.

**<sup>ii</sup> Carlyle Tadeu Falcão de Oliveira**

Doutor em Administração pela Escola de Administração Pública e de Empresas da Fundação Getúlio Vargas - EBAPE/FGV. Professor adjunto da Faculdade de Administração e Finanças da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro - UERJ e professor do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração da Universidade Federal Fluminense – UFF.