coral Innovative Training Network

NOVEMBER 2023

GLOSSARY

CORAL ESRs developed a web-based Glossary about key – terms and concepts of the project. The glossary marks the end of the theoretical phase of the PhDs. From social innovation, rural creative class, hybrid CWS to social entrepreneurship, precariousness, and remote work in rural areas, the glossary aspires to help scholars navigate coworking studies that cut across a wide variety of disciplines and sources.

Helyaneh Aboutalebi Tabrizi
ESR1

Typologies of Collaborative Workspaces

Typology or classification is important because, without it, there would be no advanced conceptualization, reasoning, language, or data analysis in any kind of research in the social sciences (Bailey, 1994). There are two ways to classify things: 'unidimensional, or multidimensional' (Ibid). A typology is generally 'multidimensional and conceptual' (Ibid). Taxonomy, on the other hand, can refer to both the process and the final result (Ibid). Simpson's (1961) definition of taxonomy also refers to the "process" including its 'bases, principles, procedures, and rules'. In the end, a taxonomy and a typology are very similar. Many people use the two terms the same way; however, a typology is conceptual while a taxonomy is empirical, hierarchical, and evolutionary (Bailey, 1994).

There are studies with a generic view of the typologies of Collaborative Workspaces (hereafter CWS). For instance, Capdevila (2017) proposes four typologies for CWS such as coworking spaces, fablabs, maker/hackerspaces, living labs and corporate labs based on innovative approaches (explorative practices and exploitative goals). Montanari (2020) concludes with six different typologies under the terminology of 'Collaborative Spaces' such as corporate collaborative spaces, coworking spaces, creative or cultural hubs, fablabs and makerspaces, incubators and accelerators, social spaces (cafes, libraries, etc.) by defining four common features for them including variety, flexibility, autonomy, and collaborative ethos. Mariotti et al., (2021) propose four types under the umbrella of 'New Working Spaces' namely collaborative and creative working spaces (coworking spaces and smart work centers), makerspaces and other technical spaces (fablabs, open workshops), other new working spaces (hackerspaces, living lab, and corporate labs), informal new working spaces (cafes and libraries).

On the other hand, there are classifications for specific types such as 'innovation and creativity labs' into grassroots labs, coworking labs, firm-driven innovation labs, academic-driven innovation labs, incubators and accelerators differentiated based on their spatiality, organizational settings, and objectives (Schmidt, Brinks, & Brinkhoff, 2014). In the same manner, experimentation labs, working labs, open innovation labs, and entrepreneurial labs are among the typologies for 'open creative labs' (Schmidt, 2019). There are also classifications mainly for coworking spaces such as entrepreneurial-led and community-led (based on their organizational layer) (Avdikos & Iliopoulou, 2019) and individual-proposed (traditional model), creation-proposed, group-proposed and startup-proposed (based on what do people do) (Orel & Bennis, 2021). Most of the mentioned studies regarding typologies for CWS focus on the urban context. However, CoWorkLand project, named Rural Coworking (2020) classifies coworking spaces in rural Germany into, coworking classic (the most successful one), commuter port, bottom hub, retreat, workation, new village center, housing and work projects according to the users, founders, and business models of the spaces.

Overall, sharing (e.g., knowledge, equipment), collaboration, a place for social interactions/curation, learning, autonomy, openness, flexibility, and variety are among the common similarities for most of identified CWS types (Capdevila, 2017; Schmidt & Brinks, 2017; Avdikos & Iliopoulou, 2019; Montanari et al., 2020). On the other hand, classifying and differentiating the CWS varies based on the studies' discipline and the given basic criterion(s) or approach. Avdikos & Merkel (2020) propose generic dimensions for classifying coworking spaces namely, scope (e.g., ownership, business model, management, governance) and functions (from spaces to more services). In addition, 'spatiality' plays an important role to define the functions and open spaces, since the community-led coworking spaces provide more services and they are more open to social innovation activities (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020).

References

Avdikos, V., & Iliopoulou, E. (2019). Community-led Coworking spaces: From co-location to collaboration and collectivization. In Creative Hubs in Question (pp. 111–129). Springer.

Avdikos, V., & Merkel, J. (2020). Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: Recent transformations and policy implications. Urban Research and Practice, 13(3), 348–357. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501

Bähr, U., Biemann, J., Hentschel, P., & Lietzau, J. (2021). Rural Coworking. People, Models, Trends. Bertelsmann Foundation. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/de/publikationen/publikation/did/rural-coworking-en#detail-content-7302-4

Capdevila, I. (2017). A typology of localized spaces of collaborative innovation. In Entrepreneurial neighbourhoods (pp. 80-97). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mariotti, I., Di Vita, S., & Akhavan, M. (2021). New Workplaces--Location Patterns, Urban Effects and Development Trajectories. Springer International Publishing.

Montanari, F., Mattarelli, E., & Scapolan, A. C. (Eds.). (2020). Collaborative Spaces at Work: Innovation, Creativity and Relations. Routledge.

Orel, M., & Bennis, W. M. (2021). Classifying changes. A taxonomy of contemporary coworking spaces. Journal of Corporate Real Estate.

Schmidt, S. (2019). In the making: Open Creative Labs as an emerging topic in economic geography? Geography Compass, 13(9). https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12463

Schmidt, S., Brinks, V., & Brinkhoff, S. (2014). Innovation and creativity labs in Berlin. Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie, 58(1), 232-247.

Helyaneh Aboutalebi Tabrizi
ESR1

Hybrid Collaborative Workspaces

When defining hybridization or hybridity, it is possible to take into consideration the combination of two or more components or aspects that could describe a specific phenomenon from a particular perspective. In general, the concept originating from cultural and political backgrounds has undergone research from numerous disciplines. Thus, it contains several interpretations (Di Marino et al., 2022).

In planning and architecture disciplines, the notion has been explored chiefly in the urban context and the research related to the term in rural settings is scant. Usually, the term 'hybrid space' is used in the mentioned disciplines. In cities and urban areas, 'spatiality', and 'mixedfunctions' (e.g., 'living' and 'working' and in some cases 'leisure') within a building (microscale) or a neighborhood/ district (meso /macro-scale) play key roles in defining the phenomenon (Cho et al., 2015; Uyttebrouck & Teller, 2017; Khatibi, 2022). In addition, the blurring separation between the public and private access/use of space or the interaction of social and functional aspects (Krasilnikova and Klimov, 2016) are contributing characteristics of hybrid spaces. In physical workplaces (also evident in certain types of Collaborative Workspaces (CWS)) where growing socio-spatial interactions happen, new types of 'multifunctionality and flexibility' are emerging which are increasingly influenced by a significant level of digitalization, especially with the evolution of 'hybrid work' practices in the postpandemic world (Di Marino et al., 2022).

Considering the different typologies of CWS such as coworking spaces or makerspaces, there are also hybrid spaces where creative and cultural productions happen together, often found in present-day abandoned industrial or public buildings with large premises and diverse communities (Pacchi, 2017). Waters-Lynch et al. (2016) by introducing the coworking phenomenon as a comprehensive social experience (since it has been placed under the idea of

Oldenburg's (1999) 'third place'), firstly situate coworking spaces in the middle of 'work, learn, play -discovery' activity spectrum and secondly, highlights that the activities of 'other spaces' (later recalling them as categories/typologies) can be frequently 'blended' and 'difficult to distinguish which can lead them to be in 'hybrid categories'. This fact is also relevant for places that are initially devoted to collaborative work in which the living or/and leisure/social conditions were added as an extended or new facility. For instance, among the categories listed by Waters-Lynch et al. (2016), 'coliving space' also exists, and its hybrid category can attach 'living' to the 'work, learn, play' pillars. Morisson's (2018) concept of 'fourth place' on the micro-scale also applies here, since it refers to the combination of first place (home), second place (work), and Oldenburg's (1999) third place (places for social gatherings). Overall, hybridization processes in CWS (micro-scale phenomenon) as potential physical spaces for socializing, usually equipped with digital features, and in their location (neighborhood, municipality scales in rural context) can be understood through the interplay of their 'physical, social and digital' dimensions (see e.g., Di Marino et al., 2022; Paay et al., 2007).

References

Cho, I. S., Heng, C.-K., & Trivic, Z. (2015). Re-framing urban space: Urban design for emerging hybrid and high-density conditions.

Routledge.

Di Marino, M., Tabrizi, H. A., Chavoshi, S. H., & Sinitsyna, A. (2022). Hybrid cities and new working spaces – The case of Oslo. Progress in Planning, 100712. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2022.100712

Khatibi, M. (2022). A socio-spatial approach to the first legal hall dwelling setting in Switzerland: The case study of Hallenwohnen in

Zurich. Journal of Housing and the Built Environment. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-022-09980-y

Krasilnikova, E., & Klimov, D. (2020). Design principles of hybrid spaces in terms of urban planning regeneration. Global Dwelling:

Approaches to Sustainability, Design and Participation, 193, 89.

Morisson, A. (2018). A Typology of Places in the Knowledge Economy: Towards the Fourth Place. 8.

Oldenburg, R. (1999). The great good place: Cafes, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community. Da Capo Press. http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=903814

Paay, J., Dave, B., & Howard, S. (2007). Understanding and representing the social prospects of hybrid urban spaces. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 34(3), 446–465.

Pacchi, C. (n.d.). Makerspaces, co-working spaces, hybrid workplaces, and new social practices. 11.

Uyttebrouck, C., & Teller, J. (2017). Spatial hybridization and its implications on housing in Brussels and Amsterdam. In ENHR Conference, Location: Tirana.

Waters-Lynch, J. M., Potts, J., Butcher, T., Dodson, J., & Hurley, J. (2016). Coworking: A Transdisciplinary Overview. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2712217

Colm Stockdale
ESR2

Social Infrastructure

When we speak of infrastructure, we normally think of roads, buildings, etc., however, there has been an 'infrastructure turn' (Amin, 2014) where infrastructures are instead understood as sociotechnical tools and systems that shape urban social life when sociality is 'never reducible to the purely human alone (Amin, 2014: 138). Infrastructure, therefore, is 'a fundamentally relational concept, becoming real infrastructure in relation to organized practices' (Star, 1999: 380). In this new infrastructural perspective:

"..infrastructure is defined by the movement or patterning of social form. It is the living mediation of what organizes life: the lifeworld of structure. Roads, bridges, schools, food chains, finance systems, prisons, families, districts, norms, all the systems that link ongoing proximity to being in a world-sustaining relation." (Berlant, 2016: 393)

Regarding this new thinking surrounding infrastructure, the concept of social infrastructure was introduced by sociologist Eric Klinenberg. In his book "Palaces for the People" he characterizes physical places and organisations that shape the ways people interact as social infrastructures. Klinenberg draws on other concepts such as the 'third place' of Oldenberg (1989), who speaks of 'inclusively social' spaces (like bars, cafes and hair salons, etc.), and Putnam's (2000) 'civic infrastructure'. Klinenerg claims social infrastructure is important for maintaining and improving public life because of its practical utility for society, but also for building relationships among people, establishing trust, and creating community.

What Klinenberg describes as social infrastructure is quite broad:

Public institutions, such as libraries, schools, playgrounds, parks, athletic fields, and swimming pools, are vital parts of the social infrastructure. So too are sidewalks, courtyards, community gardens, and other spaces that invite people into the public realm. Community organizations, including churches and civic associations, act as social infrastructures when they have an established physical space where people can assemble, as do regularly scheduled markets for food, furniture, clothing, art, and other consumer goods. Commercial establishments can also be important parts of the social infrastructure.

Klinenberg (2018: 17)

Latham & Layton (2019) divide social infrastructure into a non-exhaustive list to highlight its diversity: public institutions (e.g. libraries, art galleries, plazas), commercial (e.g. cafes), recreation (e.g. Sports fields, swimming pools), religious (e.g. churches, mosques) and transit (e.g. Buses, bike lanes):

"In short, social infrastructure refers to the networks of spaces, facilities, institutions, and groups that create affordances for social connection." (Latham & Layton, 2019: 3)

The importance of social infrastructure for public life, therefore, is to develop relationships, build social capital, and enable assembly and interaction. CWS have been touted as being potential social infrastructures for rural areas (e.g. Avdikos & Papageorgiou, 2021; Avdikos & Merkel, 2021; Gomer, 2021 - 'social spaces'). However, for CWS to be considered as social infrastructure, it should pertain to the dimensions Latham & Layton (P. 8) set out for successful social infrastructure, whereby it must be easily located and convey a sense of functionality, be multifunctional, well maintained, accessible to all, responsive to the needs and wants of people, and have an ethos of citizens as equals in a shared space.

CWS may function as social infrastructure to benefit two main groups, namely its users and the local surrounding community. Users may benefit from the perspective of alleviation of the precarity that may come from being a freelancer, for example through increased social interaction or access to services. Moreover, rural CWS have been exhibited as offering additional services, such as a post office, cafe, event locations for social and/or cultural events, and are embedded within the community (Bähr et al., 2020). This is of great importance to people living in marginalized rural areas, which may suffer from insufficient infrastructure, social isolation, and geographical remoteness (Bock, 2016; Kelly et al., 2019).

References

Amin, A. (2014) Lively infrastructure, Theory, Culture & Society 31(7–8), pp. 137–161.

Avdikos, V. and Merkel, J. (2020) 'Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: recent transformations and policy implications', Urban Research & Practice, 13(3), pp. 348–357. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501.

Avdikos, V. and Papageorgiou, A. (2022) 'Public support for collaborative workspaces: Dispersed help to a place-based phenomenon?', Local Economy, p. 02690942221074941. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/02690942221074941.

Bähr, U. et al. (2021) Rural Coworking. People, Models, Trends. Bertelsmann Foundation. Available at: https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/de/publikationen/publikation/did/rural-coworking-en#detail-content-7302-4.

Bock, B.B. (2016) 'Rural Marginalisation and the Role of Social Innovation; A Turn Towards Nexogenous Development and Rural Reconnection: Rural marginalisation and the role of social innovation', Sociologia Ruralis, 56(4), pp. 552–573. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12119.

Görmar, F. (2021) 'Collaborative workspaces in small towns and rural areas. The COVID-19 crisis as driver of new work models and an opportunity for sustainable regional development?', p. 26.

Kelly, D. et al. (2019) 'Filling a void? The role of social enterprise in addressing social isolation and loneliness in rural communities', Journal of Rural Studies, 70, pp. 225–236. doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.01.024.

Klinenberg, E. (2018). Palaces for the people: How social infrastructure can help fight inequality, polarization, and the decline of civic life. London: Penguin.

Oldenburg, R. (1989) The great good place: cafés, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community. New York: Paragon House.

Star, S. L. (1999) The ethnography of infrastructure, American Behavioral Scientist 43(3), pp. 377–391

Wilson, A., 2016. The infrastructure of intimacy. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 41(2), pp.247-280.

Colm Stockdale
ESR2

Social Innovation

Social innovation (SI) is a contested term and has many connotations, interpretations, and implications – from domains such as innovation studies, management studies, workplace well-being, and sustainable and territorial development to name a few. The 'fuzziness' of the term has been described as both a help and a hindrance to understanding the concept (Bock, 2012; Moulaert & MacCallum, 2019).

Interpretations can vary from organizational and ethical economic innovations to social movements initiated by civil society, while the variety of actors involved in a SI initiative meanders between the market, civil society, and the state, which can lead to some confusion regarding what *is* SI (Moulaert & MacCallum, 2019). Despite this wide range of applications, most SI's share the characteristic of being a critique of existing systems and their inherent failures, in terms of serving society and addressing social justice and the public good (Bock, 2012).

Interpretations of SI vary, however, Moulaert & MacCallum (2019) divide the literature into two sides on a continuum. One side represents a 'practical organizational' stream, where social entrepreneurship is prioritized as a driver of innovation and value creation, while the other, 'critical' stream is rooted in territorial development, and regards SI as a concept to meet human needs and aspirations, but also as a means of political mobilization among vulnerable and marginalized communities. Moreover, Moulaert & MacCallum (2019) pertain SI has three central and interlinked features - addressing social needs, changing social relations, and the collective empowerment of individuals and groups. Thus, SI is both a practice (collective satisfaction of human needs) and a process (changes in social relations, empowering governance relations) (Moulaert and Mehmood 2019). We may define SI as '*innovation in social relations*' (Moulaert et al., 2013).

Many references are made throughout the literature regarding CWS on the potential of CWS to promote and engage in SI but little is said about how this actually occurs. On one hand, regarding the practical stream, CWS may involve themselves in SI by acting as incubators for social entrepreneurs by aiding them through the SI process, in a very similar fashion to other business incubators by offering them not just space to operate, but networking opportunities, mentoring and access to finance. This is quite apparent in the ***Impact Hub*** network. In contrast, aspects of the critical stream are reflected in the 'resilient', or 'third wave' of coworking identified by Gandini & Cossu (2019), such spaces differ from the 'neo-corporate' CWS through a greater connection to the social economy and offering more of a community-based approach with a focus on improving social relations and collective empowerment often within its local context. Such SI is demonstrated by Dias & Smith (2018), who present a makerspace in an impoverished neighbourhood of Brazil, which offers space for social inclusion where community groups can use the space for DIY solutions to the local infrastructure - from urban gardening to devices that can collect rainwater to store for drinking water. Another example is provided regarding the 'Social Streets' movement in Italy (Akhavan et al., 2018). Within our network, ***Otelo*** may be considered within this interpretation of SI.

Moreover, in rural areas it is this SI that is more apparent, the main reason being the lack of agglomeration economies that rural and peripheral areas possess to have a critical mass of social entrepreneurs. Rural areas also face different social challenges to urban areas, meaning we find quite different SI initiatives. Such challenges include geographical remoteness, insufficient infrastructure, economic and demographic transition, rising unemployment, and out-migration of economically active groups) which feeds into a 'vicious circle of decline' (Bock, 2016). Despite such difficulties, however, rural areas often have greater social cohesion than urban areas (Bosworth et al., 2016) which makes them more favourable environments for SI and SI governance to occur (Chatzikristos & Hennebry, 2021). Vercher et al. (2021) suggest that rural marginalization, the natural environment, and community activation are central concepts in SI initiatives in rural areas.

SI relates to the social and solidarity economy by assisting its growth and development in response to the failures of the many crises of the 'capitalist' economy, and in the proliferation of bottom-up, community-based approaches to creating resilient and diverse communities (Gibson-Graham & Roelvink, 2016).

References:

Akhavan, M., Mariotti, I., Astolfi, L. and Canevari, A., 2018. Coworking spaces and new social relations: A focus on the social streets in Italy. Urban Science, 3(1), p.2.

Bock, B. (2012) 'Social innovation and sustainability; how to disentangle the buzzword and its application in the field of agriculture and rural development', Studies in Agricultural Economics, 114(2), pp. 57–63.

Bosworth, G., Rizzo, F., Marquardt, D., Strijker, D., Haartsen, T. and Aagaard Thuesen, A., 2016. Identifying social innovations in European local rural development initiatives. Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 29(4), pp.442-461.

Chatzichristos, Georgios and Hennebry, Barraí. (2021) 'Social innovation in rural governance: A comparative case study across the marginalised rural EU', Journal of Rural Studies [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.06.004.

Dias, R. and Smith, A. (2018) 'Making in Brazil: can we make it work for social inclusion?' Available at: https://core.ac.uk/reader/160276300 (Accessed: 24 January 2022).

Gandini, A. and Cossu, A. (2021) 'The third wave of coworking: "Neo-corporate" model versus "resilient" practice', European Journal of Cultural Studies, 24(2), pp. 430–447. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549419886060.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. and Roelvink, G., 2016. Social innovation for community economies. In Social innovation and territorial development (pp. 41-54). Routledge.

Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005) 'Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present', *Urban Studies*, 42(11), pp. 2037–2053. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500279794.

Moulaert, F. and MacCallum, D. (2019) *Advanced Introduction to Social Innovation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Moulaert, F. and Mehmood, A. (2020) 'Towards a social innovation (SI) based epistemology in local development analysis: lessons from twenty years of EU research', *European Planning Studies*, 28(3), pp. 434–453. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1639401.

Vercher, N., Barlagne, C., Hewitt, R., Nijnik, M. and Esparcia, J., 2021. Whose Narrative is it Anyway? Narratives of Social Innovation in Rural Areas–A Comparative Analysis of Community-Led Initiatives in Scotland and Spain. Sociologia Ruralis, 61(1), pp.163-189.

Juan
Diaz
ESR3

Resilience

Over the past decade, the concept of *resilience* has become a mainstream *buzzword* employed in different contexts, and it is commonly associated with the capacity to restore processes and functions during episodes of adversity that require the ability to transform and adapt. With its beginnings in the field of psychology (Werner, 1993), research in resilience has been conducted over a wide array of disciplines following a trajectory of systems preservation and continuity. For instance, some of the most notable resilience studies have been predominant in the field of social-ecology with a distinct evolution which has influenced research across disciplines. For example, the progression of resilience in social-ecological studies can be summarized as follows: resilience adaptation, transformability and the dynamics of the system (Walker et al., 2004); resilience as a complex adaptive system that can solve wicked problems (Fisher-Kowalski and Rotmans, 2009); resilience thinking framework (Folke et al., 2010); resilience adaptation, transformability and innovation (Olsson et al., 2014); resilience as a context based emergent property (Quinlan et al., 2016); resilience as part of systems thinking (Williams et al., 2017); and resilience as a dynamic capability and adaptive capacity (Wiig and Fahlbruch eds., 2019). Nevertheless, in spite of the vast number of publications addressing the subject across fields, resilience remains a malleable term amongst the scientific community, and its application and meaning is largely context based. Still, there are common characteristics and definitions that have dominated the work of scholars over time. For example, Walker et al. (2004), classify *resilience* as the ability of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change in which, *adaptability* is the capacity of actors in a system to influence resilience, whereas *transformability* is the capability to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic, or social (including political) conditions make the existing system untenable.

Williams et al., 2017, call for specific attention to *systems thinking* in organizational and management studies seeking to explore sustainability and resilience. Their specific recommendation is for future studies to explicitly recognize social-ecological embeddedness beyond the boundaries of the firm, industry, and product/process level, as well as the interconnections across multi-level, nested social-ecological systems. Also, with the understanding about the impossibility of establishing a unified concept of resilience across fields, Wiig & Fahlbruch, (2019), highlight as one of the key challenges in the body of knowledge of resilience studies, the fact that is too generalized and abstract. A recent systematic review demonstrates that some scientific efforts have been made to develop constructs and models that present relationships; however, these cannot be characterized as sufficient for theory building (ibid). Within the context rural and peripheral Collaborative Working Spaces (CWS), the theoretical conceptualization of resilience can be supported by the existing literature in the fields of organizational (Kahn et al., 2018; Linnenluecke, 2015) and territorial (Morrison et al., 2017; Bristow, 2010) resilience. Recent publications of organizational and territorial resilience advocate for models of adaptation that are not only proactive but can also foster innovation stemming from collective knowledge sharing and strategic capacity building (Gilly et al., 2014; De Oliveira

& Werther, 2013; Sabatino 2015). This is a noteworthy turn from earlier works on resilience that categorized it as a reactive state or process aimed at restoring prior functioning conditions. As an example, Williams et al.,(2017), offer a model to integrate important aspects of both crisis and resilience outlining the mechanisms through which organizations anticipate, prepare for, and respond to adversity.

Moreover, Morais-Storz et al., (2018), describe strategic resilience as an emergent and dynamic characteristic of organizations that can be defined in terms of the rate and consistency in which innovation leads to (value creating) strategic metamorphoses. Other scholars (Lengnick-Hall and Beck, 2016) view resilience as a capacity which can be managed and developed. Lengnick-Hall and Beck, (2016), describe resilience as an antecedent to strategic agility and the organization's ability to respond to disruptions by developing the three dimensions of resilience: cognitive, behavioral and contextual. This approach is a contribution to the earlier theory formulated by Sutcliffe and Vogus, (2003), which called for the utilization of accumulated cognitive, emotional and relational resources instead of conserving them (threat-rigidity) to foster effectiveness. By using the perspective of organizational resilience, research can explore the factors within collaborative spaces that can help build resilient CWS. Whereas the perspective of territorial resilience can provide an understanding about the impact of CWS on regional development.

Resilience Sources

-Bristow, G. (2010). Resilient regions: re-'place'ing regional competitiveness. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 3(1), 153-167.

-De Oliveira Teixeira, E., & Werther Jr, W. B. (2013). Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages. Business Horizons, 56(3), 333-342.

-Fischer-Kowalski, M., and Rotmans, J. (2009). Conceptualizing, Observing, and Influencing Socialecological Transitions. Ecology and Society, 14(2), 3.

-Folke, C., Carpenter, R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockstrom, J. (2010). Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability. Ecology and Society, 15 (4):20.

-Gilly, J. P., Kechidi, M., & Talbot, D. (2014). Resilience of organisations and territories: The role of pivot firms. European Management Journal, 32(4), 596-602.

-Kahn, W. A., Barton, M. A., Fisher, C. M., Heaphy, E. D., Reid, E. M., & Rouse, E. D. (2018). The geography of strain: Organizational resilience as a function of intergroup relations. Academy of Management Review, 43(3), 509-529.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Beck, T. E. (2016). Resilience capacity and strategic agility: Prerequisites for thriving in a dynamic environment. In Resilience Engineering Perspectives, Volume 2 (pp. 61-92). CRC Press.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. Human resource management review, 21(3), 243-255.

-Linnenluecke, Martina K. (2015). Resilience in Business and Management Research: A Review of Influential Publications and a Research Agenda. International Journal of Management Reviews

-Morais-Storz, M., Platou, R. S., & Norheim, K. B. (2018). Innovation and metamorphosis towards strategic resilience. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research.

-Morrison, C., Ramsey, E., & Bond, D. (2017). The role of social entrepreneurs in developing community resilience in remote areas. Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy.

-Olsson, P., Galaz, V., & Boonstra, W. (2014). Sustainability transformations: a resilience perspective. Ecology and Society, 19(4).

-Quinlan, A., Berbes-Blazquez, M., Jamila Haider, L., & Peterson, G. (2016). Measuring and assessing resilience: broadening understanding through multidisciplinary perspectives. Journal of Applied Ecology, 53, pp. 677-687

-Sabatino, M. (2016). Economic crisis and resilience: Resilient capacity and competitiveness of the enterprises. Journal of Business Research, 69(5), 1924-1927.

-Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. 2003. Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline: 94110. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

-Walker, B., Holling, C.S., Carpenter, S., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. Ecology and Society, 9(2), 5.

-Werner, E. E. (1993). Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai Longitudinal Study. Development and psychopathology, 5(4), 503-515.

-Wiig, S., & Fahlbruch, B. (2019). Exploring resilience: a scientific journey from practice to theory (p. 128). Springer Nature.

-Williams, A., Kennedy, S., Philipp, F., & Whiteman, G. (2017). Systems thinking: A review of sustainability management research. Journal of Cleaner Production, 148, 866-881.

Juan
Diaz
ESR3

Business Models

Despite a noticeable lack of consensus regarding definition or taxonomy, the business model is a useful conceptual and communicative device for both research and practice, and can even serve as a new unit of analysis (Zott et al., 2011). According to Holm et al. (2013), a business model is understood as a conceptual device that helps articulate which business processes account for actual value creation and capture. For example, new innovative business models are often considered a competitive advantage, since competitors will likely find it more difficult to imitate or replicate an entirely new business model than an innovative product or service (Amit and Zott, 2012). Similar to the concept of resilience, business model innovation is context dependent and requires a certain degree of adaptation and constant learning and discovery in a particular environment. A business model cannot be assessed in the abstract; its suitability can only be determined against a particular business environment or context (Teece, 2010). In addition, research in business model innovation is not without its challenges. Given the increasing interest in business model innovation, it is not surprising that the concept has become ubiquitous over the past decade. Both academics and practitioners use it, and it would be hard to find a startup that has not made a "revolutionary" (or "disruptive") business model the crux of its elevator pitch (Rayna & Striukova, 2016). Research on business model innovation has primarily focused on Fab Labs, but it can be applicable to Collaborative Working Spaces (CWS) and other third places.

Nevertheless, according to Rayna & Striukova (2016), since researchers use different frameworks, finding a consensus or a measurable approach to key drivers is difficult. Consequently, academic researchers face a more complex landscape. Partly because each study has a different focus, researchers often consider only some aspects of business models (typically value creation and value capture), while leaving out others that are not relevant to their work but are nonetheless essential. There is also a lack of consensus in academic literature around the primary components of a business model (ibid). As a response, Rayna & Striukova (2016), developed the concept of '360° Business Model Framework' to provide a standard measure of business model innovation key components: value creation; value proposition; value capture; value delivery; and value communication. This framework could result useful to assess the business models of CWS in rural and peripheral areas.

Business Models Sources

-Amit, R. and Zott, C. (2012) 'Creating value through business model innovation', MIT Sloan Management Review, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp.40–49

-Arend, R. J. (2013). The business model: Present and future—beyond a skeumorph. Strategic Organization, 11(4), 390-402.

-Bacq, S., & Aguilera, R. V. (2022). Stakeholder governance for responsible innovation: A theory of value creation, appropriation, and distribution. Journal of management studies, 59(1), 29-60.

-Bigelow, L. S., & Barney, J. B. (2021). What can strategy learn from the business model approach?. Journal of Management Studies, 58(2), 528-539.

-Bridoux, F., Coeurderoy, R., & Durand, R. (2011). Heterogeneous motives and the collective creation of value. Academy of Management Review, 36(4), 711-730.

-Chesbrough, H. (2007). Business model innovation: it's not just about technology anymore. Strategy & leadership.

-Eldor, L. (2020). How collective engagement creates competitive advantage for organizations:

A business-level model of shared vision, competitive intensity, and service performance. Journal of Management Studies, 57(2), 177-209

-Holm, A. B., Günzel, F., & Ulhøi, J. P. (2013). Openness in innovation and business models: Lessons from the newspaper industry. International journal of technology management, 61(3/4), 324-348.

-Markman, G. D., Lieberman, M., Leiblein, M., Wei, L. Q., & Wang, Y. (2021). The distinctive domain of the sharing economy: Definitions, value creation, and implications for research. Journal of management studies, 58(4), 927-948.

-Moore, E. M., Dau, L. A., & Doh, J. (2020). Does monetary aid catalyse new business creation?

Analysing the impact of global aid flows on formal and informal entrepreneurship. Journal of Management Studies, 57(3), 438-469.

-Parmar, B. B. L., Wicks, A. C., & Freeman, R. E. (2022). Stakeholder Management & The Value of Human-Centered Corporate Objectives. Journal of Management Studies, 59(2), 569582.

-Pisano, V., Ferrari, E. R., & Fasone, V. (2016). The orchestration of business models for territorial development. Measuring Business Excellence.

-Rayna, T., & Striukova, L. (2016). 360° Business Model Innovation: Toward an Integrated View of Business Model Innovation: An integrated, value-based view of a business model can provide insight into potential areas for business model innovation. Research-Technology Management, 59(3), 21-28.

-Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. Long range planning, 43(2-3), 172-194.

-Zott, C., Amit, R. and Massa, L. (2011) 'The business model: recent developments and future research', Journal of Management, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp.1019–1042

Yue
Mao
ESR4

Community of practice

Community of practice is initially proposed by Lave & Wenger in Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and expanded in Wenger's later book Communities of Practice (Wenger, 2011). In short, it refers to "groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly"(Wenger, 2011, p. 1). The domain of shared interest, the community, and the practice compose three crucial characteristics of communities of practice. The concept is applied to several fields, such as organizations, associations, governments, and the web (Wenger, 2011)

Communities of practice exist in any situation where human beings are learning together. The novelty of this concept is that it questions the master-student relationship as the premise of learning. Instead, it emphasizes apprenticeship studies and the complex set of social relationships that unfold. Therefore, firstly, it focuses on work practice from the learners, especially how new-comers become old-timers. This aspect is further elaborated in the invisible concept of "legitimate peripheral participation" in Situated Learning, stressing the social dynamics of learning, the new-comers' access to physical and social resources, and their possibilities to contribute and grow (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Community of practice does not refer to neither entities, nor places. It is instead an "intrinsic condition for the existence of knowledge" (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schmidt & Brinks, 2017) and the condition refers to "sites of conflict, difference, and change in ways that still seem sensible" (Amin & Roberts, 2008, p. 307). However, a community of practice is too often read as a closed, conflict-free, homogenous social life. This view of the concept limits the research in the managerial precept and fails to understand the core of learning through engagement in practice. Another consequence is that the research remains silent in conflictual aspects such as social and ethnicity in shaping a community of practice, and in later development, associates it with creativity and innovation in a somewhat optimistic manner (Amin & Roberts, 2008; Brinks, 2016)

It is essential to focus on the heterogeneity, complexity, and conflicts in communities of practice, especially when applying this concept in contexts pre-conditioned with inequality. For example, coworking spaces in rural and peripheral areas inherently embody the urban-rural relationship in urbanization and the mobilization of urban practices to non-urban areas. Different spaces are equipped with various social and material resources from the region and the stakeholders; within one space there are different forms and levels of participation. Therefore, they are never conflict-free, and the choices under conflicts – sensible or not, reflect the "conditions for the existence of knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98)".

References

Amin, A., & Roberts, J. (2008). Community, economic creativity, and organization. OUP Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199545490.001.0001

Brinks, V. (2016). On the shoulders of dwarfs: The geography of community-driven user innovation. Institute of Geographical Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin (unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge university press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Schmidt, S., & Brinks, V. (2017). Open creative labs: Spatial settings at the intersection of communities and organizations. Creativity and Innovation Management, 26(3), 291–299. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12220

Wenger, E. (2011). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. National Science Foundation (U.S.).

Yue
Mao
ESR4

Habitual urbanity

Habitual urbanity is derived from Bourdieu's term of habitus, which refers to "products of the social conditioning associated with the corresponding conditions" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 14), retranslating "the intrinsic and relational characteristics of a position into a unitary life-style" (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 15), namely dispositions. It is represented by structured structures, generative principles of and through practices. Butler and Robson firstly applied this framework to understand the middle class in global cities, their sense of nuance and diversity constructed by their lifestyles, dispositions and educational practices (Butler & Robson, 2003). Urbanity is therefore defined as the contingencies of a city, manifested by dwellers' "cognitive ability to cope with contingency" brought up by urbanization and gentrification in rural regions, especially the ability to perceive "strangeness" as "potentiality" (Dirksmeier, 2006, 2012).

Reading urbanity beyond locality into certain abilities characterized by dwellers provides an opportunity to apply and investigate such concept in the transformational processes in non-urban regions. Urbanity can be further understood through the concept of planetary urbanization by Brenner and Schmidt, defining three stages of urbanization: concentrated urbanization in metropolitan areas, extended urbanization outsides of concentrated agglomerations, and differential urbanization, referring to creative destruction of socio spatial configurations in relation to the development of modern capitalism (Brenner & Schmid, 2011, 2015). The stage of differential urbanization can, therefore, be investigated through the practices of dwellers, via the potential of them to adapt to changing social and economic conditions of the inhabited contexts. Such adaptation does not guarantee only positive outcomes, such as social cohesion, economic dynamics, or sense of community, as people would often expect. It could also induce conflicts and lengthy negotiation that further challenges the cognitive abilities of practitioners, making visible what is potentially inherited from the "structured structure" – in this case, the persisting rural and urban division, often sustained by existing power relations.

To contextualize this discussion on coworking spaces in non-urban areas, although many coworking spaces advertise themselves with an idyllic "rural" life, what coworkers with alternative work and life concepts yearn for is access to both cosmopolitan and idyllic rural life. It is to practice a dreamed urban communal life in the vastness of the "rural" (CoWorkLand, 2020). Not all coworkers have the necessity and motivation to connect locally, and it remains vague how local environment interact with the coworking practices. At this stage, what we can witness is that the motivation for coworking in non-urban still fundamentally consists of access to urban resources that have become scarce in large agglomerations and the collective power to produce and transform them (Brenner & Schmid, 2015). However, to answer to whether coworking spaces in non-urban spaces would bring out more socially equitable, democratically managed and environmentally sane forms of urbanization (Brenner & Schmid, 2015), we need to invite more critical observation on them.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1996). Physical space, social space and habitus. Vilhelm Aubert Memorial Lecture, Report, 10, 87–101.

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2011). Planetary urbanisation. In Urban constellations (pp. 10–13). Jovis. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783868598933-012

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a new epistemology of the urban? City, 19(2–3), 151–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1014712

Butler, T., & Robson, G. (2003). London calling: The middle classes and the re-making of inner London. New York. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2006.00704_6.x

CoWorkLand. (2020). Rural Coworking: People, Models, Trends. Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Dirksmeier, P. (2006). Habituelle Urbanität (Habitual Urbanity). Erdkunde 60(3), 221–230. https://10.3112/erdkunde.2006.03.02

Dirksmeier, P. (2012). The wish to live in areas with 'people like us': Metropolitan habitus, habitual urbanity and the visibility of urban-rural differences in South Bavaria, Germany. Visual Studies, 27(1), 76–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/1472586X.2012.642959

Mikel Oleaga
ESR5

Community management

Community management refers to the set of activities and resources oriented towards facilitating the interactions and the transmission of knowledge among the members of a CWS.

The simultaneous physical proximity of coworkers by itself is not enough to build a sense of community and a trust-based environment and may just result in community members working alone alongside each other without much interaction or cross-fertilisation (Spinuzzi, 2012). Therefore, facilitation tools (Cabral, 2021), hosting (Merkel, 2015) or community facilitation (Füzi, 2015) have proved to be of key importance for CWSs, characterized not only by the existence of a shared working space but also a community of members.

Hosting the community of a CWS includes the provision of attendant services that facilitate a good work environment and a comfortable use of the premises, but more importantly, it encompasses the "visionary" approach, which is concerned with the generation of a nurturing environment for the community. Community management activities comprise social events and meetings to introduce members of a CWS to one another, including physical or virtual interventions such as member boards or newsletters profiling new members, although they might also involve people that are not regular users of the space (expanded community). Other types of facilitative events and activities might include educational events such as courses or peer-to-peer learning groups catering to coworkers' interests and needs, or professional networking events to generate connections among members and with other relevant stakeholders from outside the space.

Depending on the size and characteristics of the CWS, the organization of these activities and the more informal approach of talking, connecting, recommending, and caring in their daily work for the community, is taken by CWS managers or founders themselves, or by a dedicated member (or members) of the staff. In some cases, it can also be assumed by a coworker as part of an agreement, collectively by the members of the CWS in the case of bottom-up CWS, or by a volunteer.

Community management generates positive outcomes for the community at different levels (Brown, 2017; Capdevila, 2015; Cowie et al., 2013; Füzi, 2015; Mariotti and Akhavan, 2020; Parrino, 2015). It increases the levels of organizational and social proximity, which facilitate the transmission of knowledge and interactive learning among members, strengthening innovation dynamics. By helping to identify potential partnerships and complementary resources, community managers can generate new client relationships or business partnerships. Furthermore, the positive effects on trust levels among coworkers have enabled new forms of solidarity and cooperation and positively affect their well-being (see well-being entry).

However, the community management of a CWS also poses a series of challenges. Spaces need to find time and resources to dedicate to these functions and they are not always available. People in charge of this activity are often responsible for many other tasks or might lack the personal skills, motivation or adequate training and knowledge to perform adequately these functions. Conversely, very close-knit communities may need to actively implement strategies to ensure the circulation of new workers and knowledge flows. In these cases, altering community dynamics without jeopardizing a favourable environment for coworker interactions is potentially challenging.

References

Brown, J., 2017. Curating the "Third Place"? Coworking and the mediation of creativity. Geoforum 82, 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.04.006

Cabral, V., 2021. Coworking spaces: places that stimulate social capital for entrepreneurs. IJEV 13, 404. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEV.2021.117886

Capdevila, I., 2015. Coworking spaces and the localized dynamics of innovation in Barcelona. International Journal of Innovation Management 19, 25.

Cowie, P., Thompson, N., Rowe, F., 2013. Honey Pots and Hives: Maximising the potential of rural enterprise hubs. North East Farming and Rural Advisory Network.

Füzi, A., 2015. Co-working spaces for promoting entrepreneurship in sparse regions: the case of South Wales. Regional Studies, Regional Science 2, 462–469. https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2015.1072053

Mariotti, I., Akhavan, M., 2020. Exploring Proximities in Coworking Spaces: Evidence from Italy. ESR&P 27, 37–52. https://doi.org/10.18778/1231-1952.27.1.02

Merkel, J., 2015. Coworking in the city. Ephemera 15, 121–139.

Parrino, L., 2015. Coworking: assessing the role of proximity in knowledge exchange. Knowledge Management Research & Practice 13, 261–271. https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2013.47

Spinuzzi, C., 2012. Working Alone Together: Coworking as Emergent Collaborative Activity. Journal of Business and Technical Communication 26, 399–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912444070

Mikel Oleaga
ESR5

Counter-urban migration:

Counter-urban migration refers to the demographic and social process whereby people move from urban to rural areas. This phenomenon is also known as counterurbanization or deurbanization.

These practices take place in rural and peripheral areas in parallel to out-migration processes towards urban centres, particularly of the young population looking for qualified jobs and economic opportunities. Counter-urban migration can also mitigate the adverse effects of rural depopulation, particularly if incoming migrants are economically active individuals moving with their families.

New diverse forms of work organisation and flexibilization driven by changes in ICTs, and the digitalization of the economy, have facilitated the relocation of workers and entrepreneurs outside large urban centres. Lifestyle motivations and the search for the "rural idyll" (Thrift, 1987) lay behind the decision of the majority of people to relocate to rural and peripheral areas. It often responds to a combination of push and pull factors such as high housing prices, higher levels of stress related to urban life, family needs or a desire to be closer to nature. The recent COVID-19 pandemic has also accelerated this transformation by mainstreaming mobile working, making companies more prone to higher levels of remote working for their employees.

CWS in rural and peripheral areas may offer a range of services that incoming migrants often demand, generating positive effects that contribute to attracting and retaining them. On one hand, many employed workers are moving into the peripheries of urban centres, driving the emergence of CWS in these suburban areas (Mariotti et al., 2021). On the other hand, a new rural creative class (Herslund, 2012) often demands the services of a CS, not only to have access to a good technical infrastructure but also in the hope of finding a community of like-minded people, inspiration, networking and a sense of "rurbanity", that is, a cosmopolitan urban flavour within the rural context (innovative, multicultural, alternative, etc.).

Indeed, self-employment is often the most effective available mechanism for supporting the lifestyle objectives of this group of people and many migrants decide to start a business or a freelancing activity when relocating to rural areas. As lifestyle entrepreneurs, their main driver to start up a business is not their financial gain, but rather the satisfaction of creating a specific business that guarantees the entrepreneurs' livelihood and aligns with their views about the world around them, namely, hobbies, family time, art, nature and/or personal passions.

Counter-urban migrants can become a pillar of regional development in rural and peripheral areas. They tend to have a higher average income than the native population and contribute to the local economy through their consumption of local products and services. Moreover, counter-urban migrants represent for the region an important influx of human capital. Migrants tend to have higher education and skill levels and more managerial experience than the native populations, characteristics often lacking in rural areas (Kalantaridis and Bika, 2006). More importantly, their higher level of entrepreneurship compared to the native population has many positive effects. New enterprises generate jobs for the local population, particularly in innovative sectors where young people tend to have more difficulty finding opportunities and contribute to expanding the national and international orientation of the economy. Entrepreneurs relocating to rural areas provide new connections to knowledge networks in urban areas, helping peripheral areas to bridge structural holes and build their social capital, an aspect particularly important in these areas, characterised by strong ties and tight social networks, which limit the capacity for innovation and a new path development for the economy.

CS, by acting as an 'anchor' that helps increase the local embeddedness and regional orientation of these businesses, may serve as an infrastructure for entrepreneurship that contributes to localising the positive effects of the entrepreneurial activity of migrants. Moreover, they are spaces where local and migrant workers and entrepreneurs can meet, share knowledge and generate serendipities.

However, counter-urban demographic flows present also certain potential challenges. An increase in housing demand from migrants with higher incomes can lead to an increase in housing prices and a displacement of the locally-born population outside their settlements. Moreover, the changes in the population have a risk of dividing the local society and weakening social cohesion, and unfulfilled dreams of counter-urban migrants can generate new conflicts.

References

Herslund, L. (2012). The Rural Creative Class: Counterurbanisation and Entrepreneurship in the Danish Countryside: Knowledge workers in the rural ourskirts. Sociologia Ruralis, 52(2), 235–255. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00560.x

Kalantaridis, C., & Bika, Z. (2006). In-migrant entrepreneurship in rural England: Beyond local embeddedness. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 18(2), 109–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985620500510174

Mariotti, I., Akhavan, M., & Rossi, F. (2021). The preferred location of coworking spaces in Italy: An empirical investigation in urban and peripheral areas. European Planning Studies, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2021.1895080

Thrift, N. (1987). Manufacturing Rural Geography? Journal of Rural Studies, 3(1), 77–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-0167(87)90011-8

Alexandra Wrbka
ESR6

Gender dynamics in CWS

Research on gender dynamics in collaborative workspaces (henceforth CWS) is extremely scarce, and a lack of empirical, ethnographic studies can be identified. Quantitative data from surveys such as the global coworking survey (Deskmag, 2018) shows an increase of women in CWS but a leadership gap can be identified.

Qualitative studies reveal that despite being considered open and egalitarian workplaces, gender inequalities persist in CWS. Researchers observed gendered undertones of workplace practices such as encouraging traditional masculine norms of entrepreneurial behaviour (e.g. Wright et al. 2021; Papageorgiou 2018) and forms of gendered exclusions in male-dominated teams (e.g. Gill 2002, 2007; Harrison et al. 2020; Wright et al. 2021). Some studies also report gendered experience of space at the workplace (e.g. Wasserman 2012, Tyler & Cohen 2010). Although the open-space plan of most CWS suggests a flat organizational hierarchy (de Peuter et al. 2017) and is intended to enhance communication and create closeness (Wasserman 2012), this spatial arrangement often exacerbates, rather than mitigates gendered experience of space. Moreover, female entrepreneurs encounter access difficulties to more competitive and prominent CWS that require a selection procedure; are not being treated as decision-makers but as if needing help with their businesses, resulting in segregation and othering of female entrepreneurship; and instances of sexual harassment (Luo & Chan 2021).

The occurrence of feminist hackerspaces and more recently, female-centred or womenonly CWS can be seen as a response to above mentioned gender inequalities at the workplace. Feminist hackerspaces emerged because online and offline communities of hackers, makers and geeks identified issues of sexism in the tech world and saw a need for a physical space where they would not encounter patriarchal behaviours and focus on feminist projects and ideas without distraction (Toupin 2014). Female-centred and women-only CWS first occurred in the USA and are now experiencing increased popularity in Europe. Poussier (2020) identified six types of European women-focussed CWS in Europe: parent friendly, clubs, women-first, women-only, work collectives, and diversity promoters. Both country-specific welfare policies and cultural backgrounds regarding gender roles are crucial factors determining the type of female-oriented CWS, such as whether it offers childcare service (Akhavan et al. 2022). According to one study, female-oriented CWS "attract female workers and entrepreneurs because of their flexibility, professional environment, and support provided" and most CWS managers are optimistic about the post-pandemic future of and need for such spaces (Akhavan et al. 2022: 236). When it comes to gender inequality at the workplace, while women-only initiatives are important and can provide support for female entrepreneurship as well as help empower women to enter the world of business, CWS should above all be inclusive workspaces (Akhavan et al. 2022, my emphasis).

Increasingly, initiatives, NGOs and networks within the CWS movement (e.g. Coworking Idea Project) have formed to tackle issues of inclusivity, diversity and access within CWS. They organize (online) events informing and educating, as well as inviting owners, founders and managers of CWS in particular, to assess the inclusivity of their space, and provide resources for improvement.

References

Akhavan M., Fuzi A., Calogero V. (2022). Women empowering Women? Challenges and opportunities of women-focused new workplaces in the post-pandemic era. In: Mariotti I., Bednar P., Di Marino M. (Eds). COVID-19 pandemic and the Future of Working Spaces.

Routledge-RSA Regions & Cities Book Series – Regions, Cities and Covid-19.

Coworking Idea Project (2021). Retrieved from https://coworkingidea.org/

Deskmag (2018) '2017 Global Coworking Survey'. Retrieved from https://coworking-stats.com

Gill, R. (2002). Cool, creative and egalitarian? Exploring gender in project-based new media work in Europe. Information, Communication and Society. 5(1): 70–89.

Gill, R. (2007). Technobohemians or the new Cybertariat? New media work in Amsterdam a decade after the Web [Report prepared by Rosalind Gill for the Institute of Network Cultures]. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.

Harrison, R., Leitch, C., Mcadam, M. (2020). Woman's entrepreneurship as a gendered niche: the implications for regional development policy. Journal of Economic Geography. 20(4): 10411067.

Papageorgiou, A. (2018). 'Let's Talk about the Elephant in the Room: An Ethnographic Exploration of Gender Inequalities in the Contemporary Start-up World of Athens'. International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics. 14(1): 95–102. doi: 10.1386/macp.14.1.95_7.

Peuter, G. de, Cohen, N. S., Saraco, F. (2017). The ambivalence of coworking: On the politics of an emerging work practice. European Journal of Cultural Studies. 20(6): 687–706.

Poussier, I. (2020). Sisters in Arms: Women in Search of Inclusive Coworking.

Toupin, S. (2014). Feminist Hackerspaces: The Synthesis of Feminist and Hacker Cultures. Journal of Peer Production. 5.

Tyler, M., & Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that Matter: Gender Performativity and Organizational Space. Organization Studies. 31(2): 175–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840609357381

Wasserman, V. (2012). 'Open spaces, closed boundaries: transparent workspaces as clerical female ghettos'. Int. J. Work Organisation and Emotion. 5(1): 6–25.

Wright, A., Marsh, D., Wibberley, G. (2021). Favours within 'the tribe': Social support in coworking spaces. New Technology, Work and Employment. 00: 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12214

Alexandra Wrbka
ESR6

Rural Creative Class

A growing body of literature on creative work in the rural context has developed over the past decade. Summarizing this debate, Duxbury (2021) states that culture-based and creative work in rural and remote areas has been studied through three lenses: Through the first, creative and cultural work is seen as a resource for community development and for cultural vitality in the area. In the second stream, scholars argue for a "Rural Creative Class" (Herslund 2012) in reference to Richard Florida's (2002) urban-centric Creative Class theory[1], which has recently also been linked to rural innovation. Finally, a number of scholars have examined rural creative economies and creative entrepreneurship in rural and remote areas (e.g. Bell & Jayne 2010).

While creative work has previously mostly been studied in an urban context, scholars argue that a rising number of creative workers are moving outside cities, establishing ruralbased "creative clusters" (Harvey et al. 2012). The Rural Creative Class is said to be made up of knowledge workers and creatives who are settling and establishing businesses in the countryside, become self-employed and work from their country homes, or are commuting to larger cities in the vicinity (Herslund 2012). They are fleeing high rents in urban settings in the hope of finding small rural communities offering a higher quality of life. Several media reports and public polls indicate that the Covid-19 pandemic might have inspired more people to follow this example (Duxbury 2021). Scholars also highlight the importance of broadband internet availability and capability (e.g. Roberts & Townsend 2016).

1 According to Florida, the Creative Class "consists of people who add economic value through their creativity" and who share similar social and cultural preferences as well as buying and consumption habits (2002: 68). It is made up of two components: the Creative Core, consisting of scientists and engineers, but also artists and the thought leadership such as writers; and creative professionals, who are knowledge workers, professional and technical workers (ibid. 68-9).

Using the term "creative ruralities", Woods (2012) contests that research needs to move beyond the urban-centric understanding of creativity and the creative city model. Whereas the Creative Class in cities is seen as a catalyst for economic development, rural creativity contributes less to wealth creation. Woods maintains that what distinguishes urban creativity from its rural counterpart is that the first is collective and the latter is individual. However, feminist scholars in particular have called this into question and argue that an individualized working culture prevails in the Cultural and Creative Industries in general, and previous studies on urban collaborative workspaces (CWS), despite using labels such as "collective", "collaborative" or "communal", have proven this criticism as justified. It could be argued that CWS make good gathering spots for creatives in rural areas, but those spaces would be less profit-driven than such in urban areas. Creative and cultural entrepreneurs as well as artists living in rural areas are said to be focussing more on providing a livelihood for themselves (Bell & Jayne 2010, Herslund 2012). Nevertheless, an economic potential in creative ruralities lies for instance in converting old local heritage sites into tourist attractions, offering specialized services such as writer's retreats or experimenting with new agri-food products such as micro-brewing or artisan cheese-making (Woods 2012). The increased occurrence of CWS, co-living spaces and "workation" retreats in rural and peripheral areas over the past few years is an example thereof.

References

Bell, D., & Jayne, M. (2010). The creative countryside: Policy and practice in the UK rural cultural economy. Journal of Rural Studies. 26(3): 209–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2010.01.001

Duxbury, N. (2021). Cultural and creative work in rural and remote areas: An emerging international conversation. International Journal of Cultural Policy. 27(6): 753–767. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2020.1837788

Florida, R. (2002) The Rise of the Creative Class and how it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community & Everyday Life. New York: Basic Books.

Harvey, D., Hawkins, H., Thomas, N. (2012). Thinking creative clusters beyond the city: People, places and networks. Geoforum. 43. 529–539. 10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.11.010.

Herslund, L. (2012). The Rural Creative Class: Counterurbanisation and Entrepreneurship in the Danish Countryside: Knowledge workers in the rural ourskirts. Sociologia Ruralis. 52(2): 235– 255. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2011.00560.x

Roberts, E., & Townsend, L. (2016). The Contribution of the Creative Economy to the Resilience of Rural Communities: Exploring Cultural and Digital Capital. Sociologia Ruralis. 56(2): 197– 219. https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12075

Woods, M. n.d. 'Paper Presented to the "Creativity on the Edge" Symposium, Moore Institute, National University of Ireland Galway, June 2012.' 14.

Francesca Ciccarelli
ESR7

Wellbeing at work

Wellbeing is a widely debated concept in the literature as it can refer to different units of analysis, such as the individual and the collective (Atkinson et al., 2020), and has been studied for its objective or subjective aspects. While the objective version corresponds more or less to health, the subjective one refers more specifically to the feelings and perceptions of an individual and is usually operationalised into satisfaction. Subjective wellbeing has been classically framed as hedonic or eudemonic. The first refers to short-term enjoyment while, in contrast, the eudemonic version looks at wellbeing as a long-term goal, translating into a search for meaning (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Finally, wellbeing can be examined in the context of different domains (Taris & Schaufeli, 2018), one of which is work.

Wellbeing at work can be thought of as a comprehensive concept referring to the quality of the working life of individuals. This includes health and safety aspects connected to the work environment and to the organisation of work, but also how people feel about their work (Schulte & Vainio, 2010). Workers' wellbeing – or better ill-being – has been studied especially in terms of stress and mental strain. One of the most used analytical frameworks is the job demand and control model by Karasek (1979), which links the level of mental strain with the interaction between the level of external demands at work and the job decision latitude; the latter referring to how much control and decisional power workers have over their work. Since then, there have been further elaborations of the model, including the job-demand-control-support model (Johnson & Hall, 1988) which focuses on the positive role of social support at work in alleviating mental strain; the job demands and resources model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) that also takes into account psychosocial, physical and organisational aspects related to the job in defining mental strain; the effort–reward imbalance model by Siegrist (1996) which considers both job-related efforts and rewards to predict workers' stress.

Workers' wellbeing has also been the focus of more sociological approaches studying job quality, as well as of the quality of working life. Indeed, the definition of quality of working life is based on the effects that certain working conditions have on workers' wellbeing (Lawler, 1982). Thus, work is considered bad when it undermines workers' wellbeing (Warhurst & Knox, 2022). The debate around wellbeing at work, especially from the 90s onwards, has been pervaded by the idea of productivity, considering that healthy and happy workers are also more productive (Schulte & Vainio, 2010; Sointu, 2005). In contrast to this instrumentalist view of wellbeing, the quality of working life movement of the late 60s pushed to consider workers' wellbeing as an important goal in itself (Grote & Guest, 2017). Post-90s discourses of wellbeing suggest also that workers' wellbeing is conceived increasingly as an individual responsibility, in contrast to the 60s, when the focus was on collective measures to reach collective, rather than isolated, wellbeing (Grote & Guest, 2017; Sointu, 2005). This shift appears to be in line with the rise in relevance and complexity of non-standard employment forms (Stanford, 2017), and the concomitant individualisation of risk in the work sphere and beyond (Beck, 2000). In this sense, an interesting and recent proposal comes from Grote and Guest (2017) who suggest to mix these approaches, evidencing the importance of both individual and collective actions for emancipation and increased wellbeing. In line with Grote and Guest's suggestions, researchers and policymakers in this field should therefore be committed to understand and identify ways to enhance workers' wellbeing, rather than considering it as a mere side-effect of interventions to improve companies and organisations' performance. Moreover, these ways forward workers' emancipation should not just take into account what the individual worker could and should do to feel better, but also, and possibly more prominently, the role that organisations and governments can play to systematically improve workers' lives.

References

Atkinson, S., Bagnall, A.M., Corcoran, R., South, J., Curtis, S. (2020) Being Well Together: Individual Subjective and Community Wellbeing. Journal of Happiness Studies, 21(5), 1903–21.

Beck, U. (2000). The Brave New World of Work. John Wiley & Sons.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., Schaufeli, W.B. (2001) The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512.

Grote, G., & Guest, D. (2017). The case for reinvigorating quality of working life research. Human Relations, 70(2), 149–167.

Johnson, J.V., & Hall, E.M. (1988) Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: a cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. American Journal of Public Health, 78(10), 1336–42.

Karasek, R.A. (1979) Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(2), 285–308.

Lawler, E.E. (1982). Strategies for improving the quality of work life. American Psychologist, 37(5), 486–493.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001) On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. Annual Review of Psychology 52, 141–66.

Schulte, P., & Vainio, H. (2010). Well-being at work—Overview and perspective. Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment & Health, 36(5), 422–429.

Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology 1(1), 27–41.

Sointu, E. (2005). The rise of an ideal: Tracing changing discourses of wellbeing. The Sociological Review, 53(2), 255–274.

Stanford, J. (2017). The resurgence of gig work: Historical and theoretical perspectives. The Economic and Labour Relations Review, 28(3), 382–401.

Taris, T.W., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2018) Individual Well-Being and Performance at Work. In Current Issues in Work and Organizational Psychology, Cooper, C. (ed.), 189–204. Routledge.

Warhurst, C., & Knox, A. (2022). Manifesto for a new Quality of Working Life. Human Relations, 75(2), 304–321.

Francesca Ciccarelli
ESR7

Remote work in rural areas

The introduction of widespread use of digital technologies brought to long-lasting changes in the world of work, including the virtualisation of work processes and workplaces, with a consequent rise in portions of work that can be conducted anytime, anywhere (Eurofound & International Labour Office, 2017). In general, when work is conducted outside of the default place of work, we can talk of remote work (ILO, 2020), which includes both standard and non-standard forms of employment. The prevalent sectors in teleworkable jobs are financial services, information and communication, real estate, professional, scientific and technical activities, education, and public administration (Sostero et al., 2020). Organisations in these sectors tend to be located in areas where they can profit from agglomeration benefits, namely large urban centres. At the moment, available data does not seem to suggest this is going to change significantly any time soon (Braesemann et al., 2022) in favour of more peripheral areas. However, the progressive detachment of work from location may still increase opportunities, compared to decades ago, for digital work to be carried out, at least partly, also in rural and more remote areas.

The attractiveness of rural areas as working sites can be linked to improved access to green space and therapeutic landscapes that seem to have positive effects on individual wellbeing (Finlay et al., 2015; Merrell et al., 2022). Moreover, a reduced living cost, and the presence of touristic amenities may also play a role in the choice of a rural or more remote area as a place of work. Nevertheless, the presence of fast broadband, which is an important prerequisite to enable remote work, is not equally distributed across rural and peripheral areas and may make the adoption of this work modality quite challenging.

In the last years, remote work and the establishment of remote working hubs has been considered by different local and wider policy strategies among the possible means to bridge the urban-rural gap by revitalising and favouring the repopulation of shrinking regions (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020; Loi 2021). The implementation of remote work in rural areas may have different territorial impacts based on the different categories of workers involved. Indeed, besides being already resident in the area, remote workers may be just passing by, as in the case of workation and digital nomadism; they may establish their residence or they may have been already resident in the area, as in the case of return migrations and amenity migration; or they may live or work from these areas only for a limited period per week, month or year, as in the case of multi-local workers.

Counter-urban migration may have different rationales (see also counterurban migration). In particular, for returnees, a greater proximity to family and other social networks (Baylina et al., 2017) and a feeling of place attachment and territorial belonging (Gustafson, 2009) are among the most discussed pull factors. As for new incomers, counter-urban migration may be motivated by lifestyle-related reasons (Benson & O'Reilly, 2009). Other movements are more temporary in nature, and, for this reason, are framed as mobilities rather than migrations. Digital nomadism can be understood as a form of lifestyle mobility (Cohen et al., 2015). At the basis of this type of mobility there is the desire to escape the 9-5 office routine, by visiting places for several days, weeks or months, that are able to offer amenities, outdoor activities, and, at the same time, a good internet connection and possibly a community of like-minded travellers, often embodied in collaborative workspaces (Thompson, 2019; Mancinelli, 2020; Chevtaeva & Denizci-Guillet, 2021).

Surely, remote work in rural and remote areas carries potential for these places' development. The possibility of working remotely in rural areas may enable incoming migration but also, to some extent, prevent brain drain from these areas. However, this is unlikely to happen without more consistent investments in terms of essential services, such as education, which would allow to build human capital at the local level. Alternatively, the relation of these workers with the hosting community and environment may simply take the shape of temporary consumption and exploitation. In particular, a potentially higher purchasing power of these knowledge workers may actually contribute to gentrification processes (McElroy, 2020) – see also rural gentrification. As for temporary work-related mobilities, these could foster the deseasonalisation and a diversification of the touristic offer, especially in mountain and seaside locations where the tourist flows are highly dependent on the period of the year. In addition, these mobilities may contribute to the reactivation of local economies and may represent an opportunity especially for local accommodation, retailing and food services. Naturally, a risk could be to increase tourism in already over-touristified areas and to contribute to the promotion of a commodified, and somewhat idealised, view of rural and remote areas (i.e. in the form of rural idyll, see Bell, 2006). In conclusion, to understand if remote work in rural areas can contribute and in which ways to local development, more research is needed. In-depth longitudinal approaches may help to investigate the processes and changes - even if minor - that the presence of remote workers, possibly encouraged by a specific policy or intervention, may activate at the local level.

References

Avdikos, V., & Merkel, J. (2020). Supporting Open, Shared and Collaborative Workspaces and Hubs: Recent Transformations and Policy Implications. Urban Research & Practice, 13(3), 348–57.

Baylina, M., Garcia-Ramon, M.D., Porto, A.M., Rodó-de-Zárate, M., Salamaña, I., Villarino, M. (2017) Work–Life Balance of Professional Women in Rural Spain. Gender, Place & Culture, 24(1), 72–84.

Bell, D. (2006). Variations on the Rural Idyll. In The Handbook of Rural Studies, Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. (eds.), 149–60. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Benson, M., & O'Reilly, K. (2009). Migration and the Search for a Better Way of Life: A Critical Exploration of Lifestyle Migration. The Sociological Review, 57(4), 608–625.

Braesemann, F., Stephany, F., Teutloff, O., Kässi, O., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V. (2022). The global polarisation of remote work. PloS one, 17(10), e0274630.

Chevtaeva, E., & Denizci-Guillet, B. (2021). Digital nomads' lifestyles and coworkation. Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, 21.

Cohen, S. A., Duncan, T., & Thulemark, M. (2015). Lifestyle Mobilities: The Crossroads of Travel, Leisure and Migration. Mobilities, 10(1), 155–172.

Eurofound, & International Labour Office (2017). Working anytime, anywhere: The effects on the world of work. Publications Office of the European Union; International Labour Office.

Finlay, J., Franke, T., McKay, H., & Sims-Gould, J. (2015). Therapeutic landscapes and wellbeing in later life: Impacts of blue and green spaces for older adults. Health & Place, 34, 97–106.

Gustafson, P. (2009). Mobility and Territorial Belonging. Environment and Behavior, 41(4), 490–508.

ILO (2020). COVID-19: Guidance for Labour Statistics Data Collection [Technical note]. Available at: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_747075.pdf

Loi, D. (2021). The Impact of Teleworking and Digital Work on Workers and Society - Case Study on Italy (Annex VI). European Parliament's committee on Employment and Social Affairs, 2021. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/662904/IPOL_STU(2021)662904(ANN04)_EN.pdf.

Mancinelli, F. (2020). Digital nomads: Freedom, responsibility and the neoliberal order. Information Technology & Tourism, 22(3), 417–437.

McElroy, E. (2020). Digital nomads in siliconising Cluj: Material and allegorical double dispossession. Urban Studies, 57(15), 3078–3094.

Merrell, I., Füzi, A., Russell, E., & Bosworth, G. (2022). How rural coworking hubs can facilitate well-being through the satisfaction of key psychological needs. Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit, 0(0), 1-21.

Sostero, M., Milasi, S., Hurley, J., Fernández-Macías, E., Bisello, M. (2020). Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: a new digital divide? Seville: European Commission Joint Research Centre.

Thompson, B. Y. (2019). The Digital Nomad Lifestyle: (Remote) Work/Leisure Balance, Privilege, and Constructed Community. International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure, 2(1), 27–42.

Nikos Gatsinos
ESR8

Rural Gentrification

Early studies of gentrification described the phenomenon in question as merely an influx of middle-class workers in working-class residential areas (e.g., Hamnett, 1973), which in turn led to an increased value of the built environment as a capital asset. Even though such approaches are still predominant, already by the early 1990's it was suggested that processes of gentrification are performed in a social milieu beyond this class polarisation, on basis of the rather intra- than inter-class characteristics of social antagonisms taking place within both the urban and the rural (Phillips, 1993). First works on gentrification had the urban environment as their starting point of inquiry, whereas research on gentrification in the rural followed. Despite that, rural gentrification should not be seen either as a condition mirroring its urban counterpart processes or as a uniform process that encompasses the same characteristics in all rural areas (Phillips, 1993).

Gentrification is driven by several factors, both in the urban and the rural. Through a productionist approach, rural gentrification is understood as driven by the uneven circulation of capital, where the built environment is seen as an opportunity for capital investment. In that sense, 'occupier developers' are considered embodiments of capital (Smith, 1985). In rural areas, the gentrifiers may be i) people coming from both lower- and middle-income social groups, who invest capital and/or labour on their properties, and ii) firms identifying exploitable rent gaps in former areas of production now characterised by disinvestment (Nelson & Hines, 2018). A second driver refers to the consumption of a certain desired lifestyle, which commodifies the rural under the 'rural idyll' (rural leisure activities, rural tourism, sense of community, etc.) and renders it a 'positional good'. In this second case, gentrification is seen as a phenomenon driven merely by a lifestyle consumption associated with the 'middle class', which though ignores the possibilities of becoming a gentrifier out of need ('marginal gentrifiers', Rose, 1984). Another noteworthy driver is the gendered class asymmetry: whereas class symmetry (households consisted of two working members) is considered a factor for urban gentrification, asymmetrical positions within the household (persistence of patriarchal relations) may stimulate gentrification in the rural, where it is partly based on the upbringing of families, which in turn is based on non-remunerated care work undertaken by females (Phillips, 1993).

Rural gentrification is closely associated with counterurbanisation (see also Counter-urban migration). As a term and an area of study though, rural gentrification is considered more critical and politically charged than counterurbanisation (Phillips, 2010), in that it also refers to the deprivation and exclusion of actors within the rural, may it be exclusion from employment, service provision and/or from affective relations (Phillips et al., 2021). Already existing counter-urban migration processes are further stimulated by the Covid-19 pandemic and the subsequent rise in telework; middle-class households increasingly move from the urban to the rural in search for a more attractive residential milieu, which in turn raises rental prices, gentrifying the rural (Mießner & Naumann, 2021). The spread of collaborative workspaces in the rural are not irrelevant. These spaces accommodate the so-called 'creative workers' who seek opportunities for a better living practicing telework on the parallel. Workers of this type retain an urban salary that renders rental prices in rural areas affordable for them, while a lack of social diversity among like-minded CWS' users stimulates social segregation (Flipo et al., 2022). Both the influx of middle-class creative workers and the investment in CWS' infrastructure are expected to raise rental prices and augment marginalisation under the 'rural renewal dynamic'.

References

Flipo, A., Lejoux, P., & Ovtracht, N. (2022). Remote and connected. Region (Louvain-La-Neuve), 9(2). https://doi.org/10.18335/region.v9i2.405

Hamnett, C. (1973). Improvement Grants as an Indicator of Gentrification in Inner London. Area, 5(4), 252–261. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20000773

Mießner, M., & Naumann, M. (2021). Ländliche Gentrifizierung. Aufwertung und Verdrängung jenseits der Großstädte - Vorschlag für ein Forschungsprogramm. Geographica Helvetica, 76(2), 193–204. https://doi.org/10.5194/gh-76-193-2021

Nelson, P. B., & Hines, J. D. (2018). Rural gentrification and networks of capital accumulation—A case study of Jackson, Wyoming. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 50(7), 1473–1495. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X18778595

Phillips, M. (1993). Rural gentrification and the processes of class colonisation. Journal of Rural Studies, 9(2), 123–140. doi:10.1016/0743-0167(93)90026-g

Phillips, M. (2010). Counterurbanisation and rural gentrification: an exploration of the terms. Population Space and Place, 16(6), 539–558. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.570

Phillips, M., Smith, D., Brooking, H., & Duer, M. (2021). Re-placing displacement in gentrification studies: Temporality and multi-dimensionality in rural gentrification displacement. Geoforum, 118, 66–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.12.003

Rose, D. (1984). Rethinking Gentrification: Beyond the Uneven Development of Marxist Urban Theory. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 2(1), 47–74. https://doi.org/10.1068/d020047

Smith, N. (1985). Gentrification and Capital: Practice and Ideology in Society Hill. Antipode, 17, 163-173. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8330.1985.tb00346.x

Nikos Gatsinos
ESR8

Rural Precariousness

Precariousness draws increasing attention in scholarly, political, and social movements' debates. Its definitions vary; it originally gained attention within discourses initiated by the ILO describing the structural rise of insecure forms of employment (e.g., part-time work, zero-hours contracts, fixed-term employment) (Frade & Darmon, 2005). This approach, which contains the phenomenon to a neoliberal economy, has been extended by critical voices which drew on the work of Judith Butler (2004) bringing the ontological and subjective dimensions of the phenomenon to the fore (e.g., feelings of meaninglessness and/or disdain, the inability to plan and predict one's life). Standing's (2011) influential approach identified precarious workers as lacking seven forms of labour security (namely: labour market, employment, job, work, skill, income, and representation security). Others enriched the debate applying an intersectional approach (Clement et al., 2009), raising, among others, the gendered aspects of precariousness (Fantone, 2007), its unequal distribution in space (Bhattacharya & Kesar, 2020) and the consequences that the experience of precariousness has for human agency (Strauss, 2020). These critical voices, instead of considering precariousness as limited to a neoliberal, flexible labour market, argue that precariousness has always been the norm while (security under) Fordism has been the exception (Neilson & Rossiter, 2008). Considering the social wage (which encompasses access to low or zero cost, public services for example) rather than containing the analysis to job characteristics, was suggested as a better tool for assessing precariousness (MacDonald, 2009).

Rural precariousness is an ever more recent term in literature. It points to the spatial distribution of precariousness at the intra-national and the rural/urban levels of analysis. The rural/urban divide is also characteristic of the uneven distribution of precariousness: in rural areas, entitlements to income security protection seem to be less safeguarded, upward income mobility is less probable, occupational health risks and the need for spatial mobility in search for a better job might be higher (MacDonald, 2009). Both labour mobility and immobility are decisive factors for rural precariousness. Immobile workers may be tied to rural precarious jobs, while mobile workers may increase the labour supply, fostering further flexibility in local labour markets and thus increasing precarious jobs. Moreover, precariousness is gendered, something also reflected in space: precariousness as a 'choice' for female creative workers in a developed urban milieu radically differs to precariousness as 'the only possibility' for (less mobile) women in a provincial context (Fantone, 2007). What is more, rural precariousness offers a re-examination of what counts as 'precarious' between the urban and the rural, uncovering an urban bias in the construction of the term. For example, while seasonality is considered a core indicator of precarious employment in general, seasonal work in the rural areas tends to be continuous and predictable, offering security to seasonal workers (e.g., unionisation, social benefits) (MacDonald, 2009). Beyond the downsides of precariousness in rural areas, the term opens the discussion about the capacities of the rural areas; research uncovered that networks of support (family, community, etc.) which cushion precariousness are prominent in these areas (MacDonald, 2009; Reynès, 2018).

Collaborative Workspaces (CWS) in rural and peripheral areas play a role in empowering their users against precariousness. These spaces function as 'mutual survival platforms for precarious employment' (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020, p. 349), facilitating trial-and-error procedures that are generally absent in these areas (COWORKMed, 2018, p. 30), thus enhancing the employability of the spaces' users. Moreover, rural and peripheral CWS may function as community hubs which foster the development and the regeneration of the social fabric (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020), enhancing the relations between actors partaking in grassroots movements and the local communities (Gandini & Cossu, 2021), allegedly providing the locals with affordable access to services.

References

Avdikos, & Merkel, J. (2020). Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: recent transformations and policy implications. Urban Research & Practice, 13(3), 348–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501

Bhattacharya, S., & Kesar, S. (2020). Precarity and Development: Production and Labor Processes in the Informal Economy in India. Review of Radical Political Economics, 52(3), 387–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613419884150

Butler, J. (2004). Precarious life: the powers of mourning and violence. London: Verso.

Clement, W., Mathieu, S., Prus, S., & Uckardesler, E. (2009). Precarious lives in the new economy: Comparative intersectional analysis. In L. Vosko, M. MacDonald & I. Campbell (Eds.), Gender and the Contours of Precarious Employment. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874424

COWORKMed. (2018). Territorial Study on Coworking Assets for Urban and Rural Areas (deliverable 3.7.1). Interreg Mediterranean. COWORKMed. https://coworkmed.interregmed.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Sites/Social_and_Creative/Projects/COWORKMED/Library/3.7.1_Territorial_study_final.pdf

Fantone, L. (2007). Precarious Changes: Gender and Generational Politics in Contemporary Italy. Feminist Review, 87(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400357

Frade, C., & Darmon, I. (2005). New modes of business organization and precarious employment: towards the recommodification of labour? Journal of European Social Policy, 15(2), 107–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928705051509

Gandini, A., & Cossu, A. (2021). The third wave of coworking: 'Neo-corporate' model versus 'resilient' practice. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 24(2), 430–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549419886060

MacDonald, M. (2009). Spatial dimensions of gendered precariousness. Challenges for comparative analysis. In L. Vosko, M. MacDonald & I. Campbell (Eds.), Gender and the Contours of Precarious Employment. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874424

Neilson, B., & Rossiter, N. (2008). Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception. Theory, Culture & Society, 25(7–8), 51–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276408097796

Reynès, J. (2018). Géographie de la pauvreté et de la précarité dans les zones rurales de moyenne montagne. L'Espace géographique, 47, 71-81. https://doi.org/10.3917/eg.471.0071

Standing, G. (2011). The precariat: the new dangerous class. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Strauss, K. (2020). Labour geography II: Being, knowledge and agency. Progress in Human Geography, 44(1), 150–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518803420

Chen Gao
ESR9

Rural Social Entrepreneurship

In rural areas, entrepreneurial development within a community may require social entrepreneurship since it has community-related missions (Roundy, 2017). Social entrepreneurship that emphasises the social attributes of an enterprise can better embed the local entrepreneurial ecosystem, meet the local need and contribute to the local community (Budd, 2003).

Social entrepreneurship is a process of forming a formal organisation that sees solving social problems with entrepreneurial approaches as missions, and the social impact of activities is prioritised to an equal or greater extent than making a profit (Vincze et al., 2014). Social entrepreneurship mixes and overlaps the 'hard' business and 'softer' social interests and builds social capital with local communities (Huggins, 2000). It runs activities to provide services or goods, employs workers and takes economic risks (Defourny & Nyssens, 2008). The social mission includes an explicit normative aim to benefit the community and serve social responsibility, a collective initiative launched by a group of people or a community, and a limited profit distribution (Defourny & Nyssens, 2012).

Some social entrepreneurship is merged into the socially-oriented collaborative working spaces trend in rural regions since these spaces are naturally linked to social and community practices regarding the unmet local needs and community solidary (Kojo & Nenonen, 2017). These spaces see social entrepreneurship as an integrated local development tool (Barraket et al., 2019). Collaborative working spaces make local and trans-local resources more visible and accessible for social entrepreneurs. The emergence of collaborative working spaces could better promote social entrepreneurship to offer public and commercial services and strengthen the vibrant and development potential of the rural regions.

References

Avdikos, & Merkel, J. (2020). Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: recent transformations and policy implications. Urban Research & Practice, 13(3), 348–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501

Bhattacharya, S., & Kesar, S. (2020). Precarity and Development: Production and Labor Processes in the Informal Economy in India. Review of Radical Political Economics, 52(3), 387–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613419884150

Butler, J. (2004). Precarious life: the powers of mourning and violence. London: Verso.

Clement, W., Mathieu, S., Prus, S., & Uckardesler, E. (2009). Precarious lives in the new economy: Comparative intersectional analysis. In L. Vosko, M. MacDonald & I. Campbell (Eds.), Gender and the Contours of Precarious Employment. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874424

COWORKMed. (2018). Territorial Study on Coworking Assets for Urban and Rural Areas (deliverable 3.7.1). Interreg Mediterranean. COWORKMed. https://coworkmed.interregmed.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Sites/Social_and_Creative/Projects/COWORKMED/Library/3._7.1_Territorial_study_final.pdf

Fantone, L. (2007). Precarious Changes: Gender and Generational Politics in Contemporary Italy. Feminist Review, 87(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400357

Frade, C., & Darmon, I. (2005). New modes of business organization and precarious employment: towards the recommodification of labour? Journal of European Social Policy, 15(2), 107–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928705051509

Gandini, A., & Cossu, A. (2021). The third wave of coworking: 'Neo-corporate' model versus 'resilient' practice. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 24(2), 430–447. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549419886060

MacDonald, M. (2009). Spatial dimensions of gendered precariousness. Challenges for comparative analysis. In L. Vosko, M. MacDonald & I. Campbell (Eds.), Gender and the Contours of Precarious Employment. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874424

Neilson, B., & Rossiter, N. (2008). Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception. Theory, Culture & Society, 25(7–8), 51–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276408097796

Reynès, J. (2018). Géographie de la pauvreté et de la précarité dans les zones rurales de moyenne montagne. L'Espace géographique, 47, 71-81. https://doi.org/10.3917/eg.471.0071

Standing, G. (2011). The precariat: the new dangerous class. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Strauss, K. (2020). Labour geography II: Being, knowledge and agency. Progress in Human Geography, 44(1), 150–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518803420

Chen Gao
ESR9

Entrepreneurial Ecosystems in Rural Areas

Entrepreneurial ecosystems can be defined as combinations of social, political, economic and cultural elements of a territory, interconnected sets of actors that combine formally and informally to support entrepreneurs in the development and growth of startups; entrepreneurial ecosystems also moderate the impact of entrepreneurial activities on economic growth (Bruns et al., 2017; Cohen, 2006; Mason & Brown, 2014; Spigel, 2017). The key aspects are the supportive actors' systems, new business ventures and territory.

An entrepreneurial ecosystem contains two bodies of knowledge (Kuebart & Ibert, 2019). (1) The first part of the main elements includes a culture that supports entrepreneurship (including role models), social components (investment, employees, policies, and mutual learning between companies) and material components (universities, incubators, and other infrastructure such as telecommunications; Spigel & Harrison, 2018). (2) The interactions between these elements are the base of bottom-up entrepreneurship and sources of entrepreneurial chances, and the tasks for entrepreneurs are to seize these opportunities (Isenberg, 2011; Malecki, 2018; Spigel & Harrison, 2018).

Social entrepreneurial ecosystems are the interacted social, political, economic, and cultural elements that support social startups and the local economy. More special components and interactions are prominent. Capacity to self-organize, visibility and recognition are essential to the rural social entrepreneurial ecosystem (Borzaga et al., 2020), as well as openness and porosity since it assumes social responsibility and pays attention to the characteristics of community microeconomic initiatives (Avdikos & Pettas, 2021). The rural social entrepreneurial ecosystem cares about the social service field outside urban agglomeration and a community logic that focuses on community needs, development, prosperity, trust and cooperation (Marquis et al., 2011; Thornton et al., 2012). Besides, entrepreneurs locate in a community with identifiable cohesion that holds a territorial border based on the personal connections of the entrepreneurs. This border defines the translocality of social entrepreneurial ecosystems. The dynamic components' interactions in entrepreneurship combine commercial and social aspects under external social movement connections and local and trans-local environments (Avdikos & Pettas, 2021; Lange & Bürkner, 2018).

References

Avdikos, V., & Pettas, D. (2021). The new topologies of collaborative workspace assemblages between the market and the commons. Geoforum, 121, 44–52.

Borzaga, C., Galera, G., Franchini, B., Chiomento, S., Nogales, R., & Carini, C. (2020). Social enterprises and their ecosystems in Europe. Comparative Synthesis Report. Luxembourg, LU: Publications Office of the European Union.

Bruns, K., Bosma, N., Sanders, M., & Schramm, M. (2017). Searching for the existence of entrepreneurial ecosystems: a regional cross-section growth regression approach. Small Business Economics, 49(1), 31–54.

Cohen, B. (2006). Sustainable valley entrepreneurial ecosystems. Business Strategy and the Environment, 15(1), 1–14.

Isenberg, D. J. (2011). The entrepreneurship ecosystem strategy as a new paradigm for economic policy: Principles for cultivating entrepreneurship. Presentation at the Institute of International and European Affairs, 1(781), 1–13.

Kuebart, A., & Ibert, O. (2019). Beyond territorial conceptions of entrepreneurial ecosystems: The dynamic spatiality of knowledge brokering in seed accelerators. Zeitschrift Für Wirtschaftsgeographie, 63(2–4), 118–133.

Lange, B., & Bürkner, H.-J. (2018). Open workshops as sites of innovative socio-economic practices: approaching urban post-growth by assemblage theory. Local Environment, 23(7), 680–696.

Malecki, E. J. (2018). Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Geography Compass, 12(3), e12359.

Marquis, C., Lounsbury, M., & Greenwood, R. (2011). Introduction: Community as an institutional order and a type of organizing. In Communities and organizations. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Mason, C., & Brown, R. (2014). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and growth oriented entrepreneurship. Final Report to OECD, Paris, 30(1), 77–102.

Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41(1), 49–72.

Spigel, B., & Harrison, R. (2018). Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12(1), 151–168.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process. OUP Oxford.

Danai Liodaki
ESR11

Buen Vivir

The recent rise of collaborative workspaces in urban and non- urban areas, has attracted the interest of researchers from a wide range of disciplines and from different perspectives. A lot of research has been emphasizing in the ways collaborative workspaces can be beneficial for their users by improving their well- being (e.g. Mariotti and Akhavan 2020). There is a strong emphasis on the ways the users of collaborative workspaces can improve their quality of life (e.g. Lee 2019) and create a social, welcoming, collaborative atmosphere (Waters-Lynch and Duff 2019). Usually the improvement of well-being though the use of collaborative workspaces is connected with issues as the community (de Peuter et al. 2017), the communal atmosphere (Waters-Lynch and Duff 2019) and social belonging (Merkel 2019). Nevertheless, there are also critical perspectives that highlight the possible negative psychological effects that the use of collaborative workspaces may have on the individuals, when the personal wellbeing is so much celebrated that it does not allow failure, critique or lack of confidence (Lee 2019, p. 78). As a result, it is beneficial for the collaborative workspace research to reflect on what well-being is and the ways it can be connected to issues as the community and social belonging. For that purpose, an introduction to the concept of Buen Vivir, as a different cultural perspective to well-being, could be beneficial.

Buen Vivir is a notion discussed broadly in Ecuador and Bolivia the last decades. After a period of criticizing the dominant western developmental model which was followed by progressive governments in both countries, the idea of Buen Vivir as the foundation of a new developmental model was incorporated in the constitutions of the countries (Gudynas 2011, p. 442). The new constitutions, approved in 2008 in Ecuador and 2009 in Bolivia (Gudynas 2011, p. 442) have raised a lot of interest from academics and activists. As Fatheuer writes paraphrasing Beau Breslin, "they are documents that create new worlds with words" (Fatheuer 2011, p. 15), as they acknowledge the importance of "good life" but in a very different way than the concept of western prosperity. Both the constitutions are extensive and go in depth in describing what good life is and how it can be a practically implemented concept policy wise. The notion of Buen Vivir describes the citizens' rights and is based in concrete principles inspired by the indigenous traditions of Latin America. More specifically, article 275 states: "Buen Vivir requires that individuals, communities, peoples and nations are in actual possession of their rights and exercise their responsibilities in the context of interculturalism, respect for diversity and of harmonious coexistence with nature." (Fatheuer 2011, p. 16). As it seems, the principle of Buen Vivir is not targeting prosperity, growth and having more, but is rather attempting to promote a "state of equilibrium", a harmonious cohabitation, based on the concept of community and the respect of nature (Fatheuer 2011, p. 16). Buen Vivir is social and ecological, but has also a strong affective character (Gudynas 2011, p. 445-446).

As a result, Buen Vivir can be described through the experience of people, their feelings and the ways they share them. The concept is based on the cohabitation of people and nature, which means that is a plural concept, it can take "many different interpretations depending on cultural, historical and ecological setting" (Gudynas 2011, p. 441). According to Gudynas it is vain to try to apply the concept as it is to other regions and cultures, as they have to "explore and build their own Buen Vivir" (Gudynas 2011, p. 444). Nevertheless, Fischer argues that although such concepts as the "good life" are culturally specific, there is a common core in different cultures and historical moments. This is, as he argues, the "concern with values (what is really important in life) and an orientation toward the future that is not necessarily, or at least not easily, quantifiable" (Fischer 2014, p. 12). This openness to the future is a basic element of the "good life" as the concept is genuinely plural and "under construction" (Gudynas 2011, Fatheuer 2011).

References

De Peuter, G., Cohen, NS., Saraco, F. (2017) The ambivalence of coworking: On the politics of an emerging work practice. European Journal of Cultural Studies. 20(6):687-706. doi:10.1177/1367549417732997.

Gudynas, E. (2011): Buen vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo, América Latina en movimiento 462, 1-20.

Fatheuer, T, (2011) Buen Vivir: A Brief Introduction to Latin America's New Concepts for the Good Life and the Rights of Nature. Berlin: Heinrich Böll Stiftung.

Fischer, E. (2014) The Good Life: Aspiration, Dignity, and the Anthropology of Wellbeing. Stanford University Press.

Lee, D. (2019) Creative hubs, cultural work and affective economies: Exploring 'unspeakable' experiences for young cultural workers. In: Gill, R, Pratt, AC, Virani, TE (eds) Creative Hubs in Question. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 69–88.

Mariotti, I., Akhavan, M. (2020). Exploring proximities in coworking spaces: The evidence from Italy.European Spatial Research and Policy, 20(1),37-52. https://czasopisma.uni.lodz.pl/esrap/issue/view/427.

Merkel, J., (2019) 'Freelance isn't free'. Co-working as a critical urban practice to cope with informality in creative labour markets. Urban Studies 56 (3), 526–547.

Waters-Lynch J, Duff C (2019) The affective commons of Coworking. Human Relations. 2021;74(3):383404. doi:10.1177/0018726719894633.

Danai Liodaki
ESR11

Post-development

The diverse research on the rise and the dynamics of collaborative workspaces has analyzed a lot of the dimensions of the phenomenon from various disciplines and perspectives. Among the lines of thought, many scholars have focused on the ways collaborative workspaces can contribute to a region's development (e.g. Capdevila 2013). Researchers as well as policy makers have considered collaborative workspaces as an important "subject of local and regional economic development policies" (Avdikos and Merkel 2019, p. 1) and have discussed the ways they can change the dynamics in a place. Especially in rural and peripheral areas that are often depicted as lacking of social networks' linkages in comparison to the "center" (Murdoch 2006, p. 172), collaborative workspaces are considered to be able to contribute to a "polycentric spatial development" logic (Avdikos and Merkel 2019, p. 5). Nevertheless, there is also a growing literature attempting to question the kind of development collaborative workspaces aim to foster. In that line of thought, scholars have been connecting collaborative workspaces with the challenging of "neoliberal politics of individualization" (Merkel 2019, p. 531), the encouragement of "sustainable livelihoods and alternative economies" (de Peuter et al. 2017, p. 17), the commons and the commoning practices (e.g. Avdikos and Iliopoulou 2019, Merkel 2015, WatersLynch and Duff 2019, Avdikos and Pettas 2021), and the fostering of "new economy", and diverse economic activities that can challenge capitalocentrism – as Gibson- Graham (2006) describes it (Vidaillet and Bousalham 2018). Following this line of thought, engaging with literatures that question traditional development and its goals, can be beneficial in rethinking in which ways collaborative workspaces can – and aim to - change the dynamics of a place. For this purpose, hereby follows an introduction to the concept of post-development.

The concept of post development, has its background in poststructuralist thinking, and starts from the deconstruction of the concept of 'development'. Based on the acknowledgment of the Eurocentric character of development, the post-development scholars imagine an era "in which development would no longer be the central organizing principle of social life" (Escobar 2007, p. 20), or development would not be implemented only "under Western eyes" (Mohanty 1991 in Escobar 2007, p. 20). Escobar – as one of the most important representatives of the post development concept – is highlighting its strong connections with other concepts, such as post-capitalism and post-growth, or degrowth (Escobar 2014, p. 29). Post-capitalism is an alternative approach to the economy which challenges its capitalocentric perspective and unravels all the diverse and invisible economic practices that support contemporary societies and prove that capitalism is not the only practice implemented. Degrowth and post-growth are centered on the challenge of growth as the main objective of contemporary societies, and they call for a restructuring of economic and political relationships on a different basis. These concepts were mainly developed in the Global North, while on the other hand, post-development is mainly developed by scholars in the Global South.

Post-development scholars claim that development has been used in order to label Western countries as "developed" and Africa, Asia and Latin America as "underdeveloped" and in that way promote one society as "constituting an ideal norm", while the others are "imperfect deviations from this norm, as inferior versions of the self, which are, however, in the process of approaching the norm – although they will never reach it" (Ziai 2007). They unravel that development and its objectives fail due to the ways in which "development practice and ideology are embedded in a western neo-colonial discourse perpetuating unequal power relations between the North and South" (Lie 2007, p. 53). Escobar describes the main elements of the post-development school of thought, among which are the need to reimagine development outside its current ideological construct, enhance knowledge production in the South, so that the "objects" of development can become "subjects", and learn from local cultures but also grassroots movements from all over the world (Escobar 2007, p. 20-21, Ziai 2007). As Ziai (2007) argues, the post development scholars find the alternatives to development in those localized grassroots movements, as well as in the communities and the informal sector. They describe an era that traditional development is not dominant anymore, by unraveling those radical initiatives and by "generating new and experimental discourses and practices of development" (GibsonGraham 2010, p. 1).

References

Avdikos, V., Iliopoulou, E. (2019) Community-led coworking spaces: From co-location to collaboration and collectivization. In: In Creative Hubs in Question. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 111–129.

Avdikos, V., Merkel, J., (2019) Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: recent transformations and policy implications. Urban Res. Practice 1–10.

Avdikos, V., Pettas, D. (2021) The new topologies of collaborative workspace assemblages between the market and the commons. Geoforum (121):44-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.02.012.

Capdevila, I. (2013) Knowledge Dynamics in Localized Communities: Coworking Spaces as Microclusters. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2414121.

De Peuter, G., Cohen, NS., Saraco, F. (2017) The ambivalence of coworking: On the politics of an emerging work practice. European Journal of Cultural Studies. 20(6):687-706. doi:10.1177/1367549417732997.

Escobar, A. (2007). "'Post-Development' as Concept and Social Practice" in Ziai, A. (ed) Exploring post development: theory and practice, problems and perspectives. London: Routledge.

Escobar, A. (2014). "Development, Critiques of" in D'Alisa, G., Demaria, F., Kallis, G. (eds) Degrowth. London: Routledge.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2010). "Post-development possibilities for local and regional development" in Pike, A., Rodriguez-Pose, A., Tomaney, J., (eds) Handbook of Local and Regional Development. London: Routledge.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) A postcapitalist politics. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lie, J. H. S. (2007). "Post-development and the discourse–agency interface" in Ziai, A. (ed) Exploring post-development: theory and practice, problems and perspectives. London: Routledge.

Merkel, J. (2015) Coworking in the city. Ephemera 15(2): 121–139.

Merkel, J., (2019) 'Freelance isn't free'. Co-working as a critical urban practice to cope with informality in creative labour markets. Urban Studies 56 (3), 526–547.

Murdoch, J. (2006) "Networking rurality: emergent complexity in the countryside" chapter in Handbook of Rural Studies edited by Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. SAGE Publications.

Vidaillet, B., Bousalham, Y. (2020) Coworking spaces as places where economic diversity can be articulated: Towards a theory of syntopia. Organization. 2020;27(1):60-87. doi:10.1177/1350508418794003.

Waters-Lynch J, Duff C (2019) The affective commons of Coworking. Human Relations. 2021;74(3):383404. doi:10.1177/0018726719894633.

Ziai, A. (2007). "The ambivalence of post-development: between reactionary populism and radical democracy" in Ziai, A. (ed) Exploring post-development: theory and practice, problems and perspectives. London: Routledge.

Costantino Romeo
ESR12

Infrastructuring

Whereas the common sense defines infrastructures as «essentially any important, widely shared, human-constructed resource» (Edwards 2003: 187), the concept 'infrastructuring' highlights those socioeconomic groups that shape their relations with their environments implying those «activities of organizing, managing, and knowing heterogeneous relations, at once natural and cultural, material and social, and scientific and political» (Blok et al. 2016: 3);

'Infrastructuring' regards collaborative spaces to the extent that the latter ones are phenomena related to emerging organisations of work (Merkel 2015) combined with the innovations of information and communication technologies (Gandini 2015). In other words, collaborative spaces, especially those in peripheral areas, raise new challenges regarding the tension between mobility (Mariotti et al. 2017) and connectivity (Williams et al. 2016)). Given those venues are also attributable to the broad paradigm of the knowledge-based economy, collaborative spaces have been infrastructures to produce and distribute information within a so-called 'space of flows'(Castells 2000). Therefore, collaborative spaces highlight thecomplex relationships between those visible andinvisible infrastructuresthat create simultaneous connections among people without any (theoretical) spatial or organisational limit (Larkin 2013; Orel 2019; Sutherland and Jarrahi 2017)

Scholars have previously linked the concept of collaborative spaces with the notion of infrastructure (Bouncken et al. 2021; Gerdenitsch et al. 2016; Merkel 2015) as «platforms' for action and coordination, describing them as 'complex combinations of objects, spaces, persons, and practices» (Simone 2004: 408). Therefore, through the extension of the concept of infrastructure, here conceived also a condition for activity, the process of infrastructuring becomes relevant to understand how organisations improve based on the participation of the actors involved, such as stakeholders of collaborative spaces (Karasti 2014).

Since social groups locate where the infrastructural resources are available, extant literature focusing on infrastructuring also highlights the «work of creating socio-technical resources that intentionally enable adoption and appropriation beyond the initial scope of the design, a process that might include participants not present during the initial design» (Le Dantec and DiSalvo 2013: 247). In doing so, Pipek and Wulf (2009) refers to "the points of infrastructure" when the users become aware of the existing resources to make improvements. Lastly, given the availability of infrastructures (such as transportation nodes and ICTs, in the case of collaborative spaces) infrastructuring may emerge as a way to «advance the overarching community interests and integrate with local communities' ongoing activities» (Karasti 2014: 3)

References

Blok, A., M. Nakazora and B. R. Winthereik (2016), 'Infrastructuring Environments', Science as Culture, 25 (1), 1–22.

Bouncken, R. B., M. M. Aslam and Y. Qiu (2021), 'Coworking Spaces: Understanding, Using, and Managing Sociomateriality', Business Horizons, 64 (1), 119–30.

Castells, M. (2000), The Rise of the Network Society, 2nd ed, Oxford ; Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Edwards, P. N. (2003), 'Infrastructure and modernity: force, time and social organization in the history of sociotechnical systems', in T. J. Misa, P. Brey, and A. Feenberg (eds), Modernity and Technology, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, pp. 185–225.

Gandini, A. (2015), 'The Rise of Coworking Spaces: A Literature Review', Ephemera : Theory and Politics in Organization, 15 (1), 193–205.

Gerdenitsch, C., T. E. Scheel, J. Andorfer and C. Korunka (2016), 'Coworking Spaces: A Source of Social Support for Independent Professionals', Frontiers in Psychology, 7, accessed at https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00581.

Karasti, H. (2014), 'Infrastructuring in participatory design', in Proceedings of the 13th Participatory Design Conference on Research Papers - PDC '14, Windhoek, Namibia: ACM Press, pp. 141–50.

Larkin, B. (2013), 'The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure', Annual Review of Anthropology, 42 (1), 327–43.

Le Dantec, C. A. and C. DiSalvo (2013), 'Infrastructuring and the formation of publics in participatory design', Social Studies of Science, 43 (2), 241–64.

Mariotti, I., C. Pacchi and S. Di Vita (2017), 'Co-working Spaces in Milan: Location Patterns and Urban Effects', Journal of Urban Technology, 24 (3), 47–66.

Merkel, J. (2015), 'Coworking in the City', Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization, 15 (1), 121–39.

Orel, M. (2019), 'Coworking environments and digital nomadism: balancing work and leisure whilst on the move', World Leisure Journal, 61 (3), 215–27.

Pipek, V. and V. Wulf (2009), 'Infrastructuring: Toward an Integrated Perspective on the Design and Use of Information Technology', Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 10 (5), 447–73.

Simone, A. (2004), 'People as Infrastructure: Intersecting Fragments in Johannesburg', Public Culture, 16 (3), 407–29.

Sutherland, W. and M. H. Jarrahi (2017), 'The Gig Economy and Information Infrastructure: The Case of the Digital Nomad Community', Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 1 (CSCW), 1–24.

Williams, F., L. Philip, J. Farrington and G. Fairhurst (2016), '"Digital by Default" and the "hard to reach": Exploring solutions to digital exclusion in remote rural areas', Local Economy, 31 (7), 757–77.

Costantino Romeo
ESR12

Meta-organisation

The concept of meta-organisation describes relationships among independent organisations or individuals to collaborate on complex problems while keeping their autonomy. .

there is no shared agreement about the definition of meta-organisation among scholars. From one side, the "European School" of meta-organisations (Berkowitz and Bor 2018) takes inspiration from the pioneering works of Ahrne and Brunsson (2005, 2008) who defined the phenomenon of meta-organisations as «formal organisations organising other formal organisations» (Berkowitz et al., 2022, p. 1) Moreover, there is another school of thought following Gulati's interpretation (Gulati et al. 2012) that introduced meta-organisations as collective actions – taken not only by organisations themselves but also by individuals – without any formal authority aiming to a system-level goals. Put simply, whereas the European School define meta-organisations as organisations coming together to create new formal decision-making structures; the other scholars do not necessitate structures to define meta-organisation because only the collective action is crucial.

Even if the extant literature regarding meta-organisations is relatively recent, they are not a new phenomenon as they also include renowned examples such as transnational governmental organisations (such as the European Union), industrial or trade associations, labour unions, and so on. By applying the loose definition based on collective action, meta-organisations would also encompass platforms, entrepreneurial ecosystems, or inter-organisational relations (Kretschmer et al. 2022; Roundy and Bayer 2019)

Regarding the role third spaces can play for the constitution of organizations, «different spaces can "belong" more or less to an organization, representing a gradient of organizational property (Wilhoit Larson 2020: 3). Moreover, those micro-clusters (Capdevila 2013) «are increasingly perceived as "managed" entities or "meta-organisations" representing a new form of a "decided social order"» (Lupova-Henry et al. 2021: 90). Since collaborative spaces can be understood as results of «conscious efforts of the key innovation actors, rather than spontaneous agglomerations of organisations» (ibid. : 89), coworking managers play as architects (Gulati et al. 2012) or powerful members (Ahrne and Brunsson 2005) who coordinate the relationships among the members involved.

Framing collaborative spaces as meta-organisations raises questions regarding their selection processes and engagement of participants (Bosch-Sijtsema and Bosch 2015). The aggregation of such heterogeneous stakeholders around collaborative spaces lead to decision-making processes that highlight hierarchies, bargaining powers, and criteria for membership that may conflict with the ideal alignment among members of the same meta-organisation (Berkowitz et al. 2022).

Alike members of meta-organisation, stakeholders of collaborative spaces balance between their autonomy and delegation (Gay and L. Szostak 2020) while being part of the same association voluntarily (Gulati et al. 2012). In other words, members of collaborative spaces may be involved into the organisational ecosystem orchestrated by the managers (Bosch-Sijtsema and Bosch 2015; Bouncken et al. 2020) as well as part of broader ways of aggregation such as firms or their own networks (Bosch-Sijtsema and Bosch 2015; Jakonen et al. 2017).

Lastly, collaborative can also be meta-organisation may be applied to the extent that those venues are organisational spaces for their participants: in other words, not all the shared workspaces can be associated to organisations (Wilhoit Larson 2020) but only those that clearly aggregate different members around a systm level goal (Gulati et al. 2012).

References

Ahrne, G. and N. Brunsson (2005), 'Organizations and meta-organizations', Scandinavian Journal of Management, 21 (4), 429–49.

Ahrne, G. and N. Brunsson (2008), Meta-Organizations.

Berkowitz, H. and S. Bor (2018), 'Why Meta-Organizations Matter: A Response to Lawton et al. and Spillman', Journal of Management Inquiry, 27 (2), 204–11.

Berkowitz, H., N. Brunsson, M. Grothe-Hammer, M. Sundberg and B. Valiorgue (2022), 'Meta-Organizations: A Clarification and a Way Forward', Management (France), 25 (2), 1–9.

Bosch-Sijtsema, P. M. and J. Bosch (2015), 'Plays nice with others? Multiple ecosystems, various roles and divergent engagement models', Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, 27 (8), 960–74.

Bouncken, R. B., Y. Qiu and T. Clauss (2020), 'Coworking-Space Business Models: Micro-Ecosystems and Platforms — Insights from China', International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, 2050044.

Capdevila, I. (2013), 'Knowledge Dynamics in Localized Communities: Coworking Spaces as Microclusters', SSRN Electronic Journal, accessed at https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2414121.

Gay, C. and B. L. Szostak (2020), 'From Territorialised Innovation to Collaborative Innovation Space: What Are the Issues for Contemporary Organisations?', Journal of Innovation Economics & Management, n° 32 (2), 135–58.

Gulati, R., P. Puranam and M. Tushman (2012), 'Meta-organization design: Rethinking design in interorganizational and community contexts', Strategic Management Journal, 33 (6), 571–86.

Jakonen, M., N. Kivinen, P. Salovaara and P. Hirkman (2017), 'Towards an Economy of Encounters? A critical study of affectual assemblages in coworking', Scandinavian Journal of Management, 33 (4), 235–42.

Kretschmer, T., A. Leiponen, M. Schilling and G. Vasudeva (2022), 'Platform ecosystems as meta-organizations: Implications for platform strategies', Strategic Management Journal, 43 (3), 405–24.

Lupova-Henry, E., S. Blili and C. Dal Zotto (2021), 'Innovation-centric cluster business model: Findings from a design-oriented literature review', Triple Helix, 84 (2), 1–48.

Roundy, P. T. and M. A. Bayer (2019), 'To bridge or buffer? A resource dependence theory of nascent entrepreneurial ecosystems', Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 11 (4), 550–75.

Wilhoit Larson, E. (2020), 'Where is an Organization? How Workspaces Are Appropriated to Become (Partial and Temporary) Organizational Spaces', Management Communication Quarterly, 34 (3), 299–327.

Lorenzo Marmo
ESR13

Impact of CWS

The term ‘impact’ has been extensively applied by institutions, agencies and organisations from both the private and public sphere to describe the ultimate higher-level changes and effects resulting from their activities (Alomoto et al., 2022). It can be distinguished from the terms ‘Output’ and ‘Outcome’. The former indicates all tangible and intangible products and services created, offered or facilitated by an institution, agency or organisation; while the latter describes all short-medium term effects and changes derived from their activities (Parsons et al., 2013). These actors usually set beforehand the desired strategic goals they wish to attain through their actions and interventions. Nevertheless, as suggested by the Organization for Economic Co operation and Development (2010, p.24), ‘impact’ is an umbrella term which includes: “Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”. Therefore, parts of the impacts that result from a certain intervention are beyond the control of the implementers. It is thus fundamental to consider all the lasting and significant consequences and changes resulting from a specific treatment or intervention on the surrounding local context and beyond.

The concept of impact has also been applied to account for the changes and effects resulting from the presence of Collaborative Workspaces (CWS). For instance, two studies describe and determine consequences on the urban environment, economy and planning (Yu et al., 2019), as well as on the regional and socio-cultural factors, and the effects on the users (Vogl & Akhavan, 2022). In this respect, job satisfaction, productivity, reduced fixed costs and enhanced well-being, due to proximity to nature and a better work-life balance, are identified as amongst the main direct effects of CWS on its users. From a socio-economic perspective, CWS facilitate social interaction and knowledge exchange, creating the ideal conditions for collaboration and innovation to unfold. Whilst indirectly, especially in rural and peripheral areas, CWS may increase regional job offers, support and incentivise entrepreneurship, and lead to a higher demand for product and services offered by local businesses. Thus, CWS have the potential to contribute to socially and economically revitalise peripheral areas. Furthermore, CWS are influencing public transportation and urban infrastructure planning. Many studies include pollution reduction among the environmental impacts of CWS, resulting from reduced traffic and commuting time, as well as lower office energy consumption. Finally, it is worth mentioning some potential risks and negative effects due to the presence of CWS, such as gentrification dynamics in urban contexts, and failure due to the lack of demand for space and lack of coworker networks in peripheral areas.

Current literature on the impact of CWS in rural areas is still limited and there is a need for further investigation on the matter. Future studies should attempt to shed light on the environmental, economic and social impacts using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, as well as accounting for geographical differences with respect to the urban counterparts.

References

1. Alomoto, W., Niñerola, A., & Pié, L. (2021). Social Impact Assessment: A Systematic Review of Literature. Social Indicators Research, 1-26.

2. Parsons, J., Gokey, C., & Thornton, M. (2013). Indicators of inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts in security and justice programming. Vera Institute of Justice.

3. OECD (2010). Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluations and Results Based Management. OECD, 2002, re-printed in 2010.

4. Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. (2009). Handbook on impact evaluation: quantitative methods and practices. World Bank Publications.

5. Yu, R., Burke, M., & Raad, N. (2019). Exploring impact of future flexible working model evolution on urban environment, economy and planning. Journal of Urban Management, 8(3), 447-457.

6. Vogl, T., & Akhavan, M. (2022). A systematic literature review of the effects of coworking spaces on the socio-cultural and economic conditions in peripheral and rural areas. Journal of Property Investment & Finance, (ahead-of-print).

Vera Fabinyi
ESR14

EU policies and CWS

The EU Cohesion Policy aims to prevail imbalances between countries and regions and strengthening economic, social, and territorial cohesion in the EU. Under the 2021-2027 period key priorities are focusing on a more competitive, smarter, greener, more connected, and more social Europe. Means to achieve this are innovation and support to small and medium sized businesses (SMEs) as well as digitalization and digital connectivity. Furthermore, mobility should be enhanced, and effective and inclusive employment supported as well as education skills, social inclusion, equal access to healthcare and enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism. It also aims to be closer to citizens by supporting locally led development and sustainable urban development across the EU. Additionally, with the NextGeneration EU the Recovery Plan aims to contribute to bring regions back on track while avoiding uneven recovery between regions. To achieve these goals specific funds are used. The funds can be divided into European Social Fund+ (ESF+), European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF), as well as Just Transition Fund (JTF) and in respect to the Next Generation EU Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF). These funds are managed between the Member States (MS) and EU Commission (EC) in shared management. Together they agree upon specific key priorities for the respective MS that are in line with the overall EU CP aims. The final partnership agreements and each operational program are negotiated between the EC and each MS. While operational programs must meet the objectives of the EU CP, national plans under the Recovery and Resilience must at least meet climate and digital targets to receive payments (European Commission n.d.; n.d.; n.d.).

Within this many CWS in non-core areas and their needs seem not be directly approached, but rather diffusely funded under the existing EU CP thereby focusing on the thematic concentration by the EU and the respective operational programs outlined and agreed between MS and EC. Especially as CWS consist of and often combine different attributes in respect to the 'field of work, business model, services, hosted community, nature and mode of operation ' (Fuzi 2015, 464), diverse objectives are targeted by using CWS as means. For example they can range from being spaces for CCI, makers, tinkers, start-uppers, freelancers and more, serve as a socio-economic infrastructure in non-core areas (Avdikos and Merkel 2020), range from entrepreneurial to community based spaces (Avdikos and Iliopoulou 2019), contribute to collective learning and knowledge sharing (Capdevila 2018; Bednář, Danko, and Smékalová 2021) and can have the tendency in mid-sized cities to regenerate places in downtown (Jamal 2018). Nevertheless, the phenomenon does not seem to be fully unpacked so far, but rather single aspects are used to achieve specific objectives. Also other sources come to a similar conclusion on the local and regional level. CWS seem to be only indirectly supported through local development policies targeting topics like youth, entrepreneurship, urban regeneration, and social cohesion (Avdikos and Papageorgiou 2021; Pacchi, Dotti, and Barzotto 2021). Through the Recovery plan CWS do also not seem to be considered neither in general nor through approaching new forms of working spaces (Pacchi, Dotti, and Barzotto 2021). These circumstances on an EU level seem to be especially important for CWS in non-core areas function rather hybrid and deliver multiple services (Avdikos and Merkel 2020; Bähr et al. 2021). As the EU currently only funds them indirectly, other networks – even though currently only sparsely existent on a European level – try to connect existing CWS all over Europe. Here the NPO coworking assembly can be mentioned as one example a¬¬¬¬¬s it promotes and supports coworking, its values and its benefits across the continent. Building upon membership in each has a say in deciding the direction to invest in the sector is horizontally decided, whereas every type of CWS is welcomed, if they actively participate in creating and developing the coworking assembly. While acknowledging CWS as contributing to the improvement of Europe in an open, collaborative, and horizontal way, they also try to relate individual entrepreneurs with an ecosystem in which it finds itself, by using technology to support projects, forming partnerships and alliances based on their goals and values, arranging communication, and exploring best business form in which to achieve their common goals (European Coworking Assembly n.d.). Hence CWS so far still rely on diffused help from different sites rather than coherent streams or have to find help in self-created networks.

References

Avdikos, Vasilis, and Eirini Iliopoulou. 2019. "Community-Led Coworking Spaces: From Co-Location to Collaboration and Collectivization." In Creative Hubs in Question, edited by Rosalind Gill, Andy C. Pratt, and Tarek E. Virani, 111–29. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10653-9_6.

Avdikos, Vasilis, and Janet Merkel. 2020. "Supporting Open, Shared and Collaborative Workspaces and Hubs: Recent Transformations and Policy Implications." Urban Research & Practice 13 (3): 348–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501.

Avdikos, Vasilis, and Antigoni Papageorgiou. 2021. "Public Support for Collaborative Workspaces: Dispersed Help to a Place-Based Phenomenon?" Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit 36 (7–8): 669–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/02690942221074941.

Bähr, Ulrich, Juli Biermann, Jule Lietzau, and Philipp Hentschel. 2021. "Rural Coworking People, Models, Trends." Bertelsmann Stiftung. https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BS_Coworking_im_laendlichen_Raum_ENG_v04_RZ_Einzelseiten.pdf.

Bednář, Pavel, Lukáš Danko, and Lenka Smékalová. 2021. "Coworking Spaces and Creative Communities: Making Resilient Coworking Spaces through Knowledge Sharing and Collective Learning." European Planning Studies.

Capdevila, Ignasi. 2018. "Knowing Communities and the Innovative Capacity of Cities." City, Culture and Society 13: 8–12.

European Commission. n.d. "Cohesion Policy 2021-2027." Cohesion Policy 2021-2027. Accessed November 11, 2022a. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/2021_2027/.

———. n.d. "Common Provisions Regulation." https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/find-funding/funding-management-mode/common-provisions-regulation_en.

———. n.d. "Recovery Plan for Europe." Recovery Plan for Europe. Accessed November 11, 2022b. https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/recovery-plan-europe_en.

European Coworking Assembly. n.d. "European Coworking Assembly." Accessed November 11, 2022. https://www.coworkingassembly.eu/.

Fuzi, Anita. 2015. "Co-Working Spaces for Promoting Entrepreneurship in Sparse Regions: The Case of South Wales." Regional Studies, Regional Science 2 (1): 462–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2015.1072053.

Jamal, Audrey. 2018. "Coworking Spaces in Mid-Sized Cities: A Partner in Downtown Economic Development." Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 50 (4): 773–88.

Pacchi, Carolina, Nicola Francesco Dotti, and Mariachiara Barzotto. 2021. "New Working Spaces Policy Perspectives before and after the COVID-19 Pandemic." In The COVID-19 Pandemic and the Future of Working Spaces, 83–94. Routledge.

Vera Fabinyi
ESR14

Place-based approach

Under the revision of European Cohesion Policy (CP) in 2009 a place-based approach to regional policies was introduced by the Barca report (2009) to overcome the perceived ineffectiveness of the CP (Bock, Jongerden, and Roep 2022). It was argued that existing inequalities between region are inefficient as first resources in certain regions are not idly utilized, second migration and depopulation of places of origin is stimulated and third populism is fertilized which has negative effects for nations and the EU (Rodriguez-Pose 2020; Petrakos et al. 2021). Hence it was proposed to tackle social exclusion and achieve overall national economic growth by leveraging underutilized potential in regions through external interventions and multilevel governance (Barca 2009, vii). Within this a place-based approach was proposed in order to overcome a people-based approach to regional policies that led to agglomerations in core areas. The effectiveness of Top-down strategies to address local specificities and challenges adequately is perceived as limited and it is argued that development should be led by local stakeholders as they can mobilize local resources from below through coalition building (Barca, McCann, and Rodriguez-Pose 2012). Likewise the state will support local development by providing incentives through funding and establishing a flexible framework (Bentley and Pugalis 2014). A place-based approach thus combines the local development and community empowerment paradigm from the early 2000s with external state interventions in order to promote citizens' right of equal access to opportunities regardless of their place of origin (Bock, Jongerden, and Roep 2022). This is operationalized in Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI) and community-led local Development (CLLD) programs.

This becomes important when thinking about collaborative workspaces (CWS) in non-core areas as they seem to act as such a place-based actor. These spaces have been recently associated with contributing to developing non-core areas thereby differentiating themselves from their urban kinsmen. They have been characterized so far as a socio-economic infrastructure (Avdikos and Merkel 2020) as they blend entrepreneurial thinking with social and political participation by offering social and cultural programming (Gandini and Cossu 2021). Even more they have been considered as a relational space or middle ground that interacts between 'global power structures, regional settings and local cultural contexts and daily lived experiences of communities and individuals' (Jiménez and Zheng 2021, 173). Within these first findings regarding their characteristics and functions, CWS seem to hold an active stake in contributing to regional development of non-core areas. Nevertheless current policies seem to not fully delineate the CWS phenomenon in non-core areas and thus only indirectly approach them as a place-based actor (Avdikos and Papageorgiou 2021).

This finding can also be linked to the concerns about how current policies under the place-based approach is practiced. Here it was pointed out that place-based policies are based on a rational, place bounded definition rather than a relational space thinking. Thus, they define scale solely in a territorial sense which misfits the approach to relational collaborative governance scales. Furthermore often due to pragmatic factors such as time limitations regional development projects are delegated to technocratic experts and to professionals rather than dealing with processes of enabling knowledge and expertise of place-based actors such as CWS as it seems to be more time consuming and diffuse (Pugalis and Gray 2016). In addition, place-based policies remain to be informed by three economic streams of thought, namely new economic geography, endogenous growth and institutional economies (European Committee of the Regions 2019). Local knowledge, innovation and learning, flexible systems of industrial organizations, local clustering and global networking and facilitating strong institutions are highlighted (Petrakos et al. 2021). It also builds upon non-economic factors such as trust and a cooperative culture (Barca, McCann, and Rodriguez-Pose 2012). It hence lacks a wider perspective as it ignores uneven relations among successful and unsuccessful places, power relations and class structure of societies as well as the influence of interregional flows and networks of production and exchange on the development of regions (Petrakos et al. 2021). State structure, degrees of bureaucratization, centralization and clientelism that regulate local actions are not considered instead only the enabling moment of the state is highlighted (Keller and Virag 2021). It thus remains a contested approach that can lead in practice to similar negative effects for weaker regions than spatially blind policies and hence it remains a question in how far CWS as locally embedded actors are adequately approached under the current policy practices.

References

Avdikos, Vasilis, and Janet Merkel. 2020. "Supporting Open, Shared and Collaborative Workspaces and Hubs: Recent Transformations and Policy Implications." Urban Research & Practice 13 (3): 348–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501.

Avdikos, Vasilis, and Antigoni Papageorgiou. 2021. "Public Support for Collaborative Workspaces: Dispersed Help to a Place-Based Phenomenon?" Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit 36 (7–8): 669–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/02690942221074941.

Barca, Fabrizio. 2009. "AN AGENDA FOR A REFORMED COHESION POLICY A Place-Based Approach to Meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations." Independent Report.

Barca, Fabrizio, Philip McCann, and Andrés Rodriguez-Pose. 2012. "The Case for Regional Development Intervention: Place-Based versus Place-Neutral Approaches." Journal of Regional Science 52 (1): 134–52.

Bentley, Gill, and Lee Pugalis. 2014. "Shifting Paradigms: People-Centred Models, Active Regional Development, Space-Blind Policies and Place-Based Approaches." Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit 29 (4–5): 283–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094214541355.

Bock, Bettina, Joost Jongerden, and Dirk Roep. 2022. "A Relational Approach to Rural Development." In On Meaningful Diversity: Past, Present and Future of Wageningen Rural Sociology, 115–25. Rural Sociology Group, Wageningen University.

European Committee of the Regions. 2019. "Implementing a Place-Based Approach to EU Industrial Policy Strategy." European Union.

Gandini, Alessandro, and Alberto Cossu. 2021. "The Third Wave of Coworking: 'Neo-Corporate' Model versus 'Resilient' Practice." European Journal of Cultural Studies 24 (2): 430–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549419886060.

Jiménez, Andrea, and Yingqin Zheng. 2021. "Unpacking the Multiple Spaces of Innovation Hubs." The Information Society 37 (3): 163–76.

Keller, Judit, and Tuende Virag. 2021. "A Drop in the Sea or Catalyst for Change: Diverse Effects of the Place-Based Approach in Europe." European Planning Studies, 1–19.

Petrakos, George, Lefteris Topaloglou, Ageliki Anagnostou, and Victor Cupcea. 2021. "Geographies of (in)Justice and the (in)Effectiveness of Place-Based Policies in Greece." European Planning Studies.

Pugalis, Lee, and Nick Gray. 2016. "New Regional Development Paradigms: An Exposition of Place-Based Modalities" 22 (1): 181–203.

Rodriguez-Pose, Andrés. 2020. "The Rise of Populism and the Revenge of the Places That Don't Matter." LSE Public Policy Review 1 (1): 1–9.

Federica Ammaturo
ESR15

Situated learning

The concept of situated learning originates from the definition given by Lave and Wenger in 1991, and it has been researched and understood in opposition to cognitive learning. The latter was based on notions and knowledge acquired by traditional education models, while the concept of situated learning introduced a novel approach that is more inductive, starting from the idea of legitimate peripheral participation. This kind of learning, also described by the phrase "learning by doing" has been used to describe, for example, the learning process happening in communities of practice (Amin & Roberts, 2008) and it has also moved to different aspects of civil society participation in public activities, as well as to all the education and research environments.

In the perspective of situated learning, social proximity plays an important role, especially in enhancing interactive processes and allowing knowledge exchange, collective learning and innovation (Bassett et al., 2002; Malmberg et al., 2005 in Wijngaarden et al., 2020). Moreover, knowledge exchanged is not normative and cognitive, but also tacit and codified (ibid.). The setting is hence the environment where local and traditional knowledge is exchanged and transferred through passive or active participation and presence in a real (and not simulated) environment.

With the growth of trans-local relations, the discourse around learning englobes also the need for connection and networking among people and places: a research stream introduced also networked learning as a subgroup of situated learning (Carvalho et al., 2017). In another case, the term "knowing in action" wants to overcome the "limits" of learning happening through spatial proximity, introducing relational proximity (Amin & Roberts, 2008).

Collaborative Working Spaces (CWS) are embedded in this discussion, for their capacity of providing a space for fertile and innovative exchange, that can produce learning as an indirect outcome of physical proximity and collaboration (Wijngaarden et al., 2020). In particular, spaces such as Makerspaces and FabLabs are good examples of places for situated learning, where the role of the community of practice has been already researched and their positive externalities highlighted (Carvalho et al., 2017; d'Ovidio, 2021). The so-called Living Lab, is rather a (commonly) temporary space of encounter to address some local issues through discussions and collaborative work. It is also used as a tool for collaborative planning and implies learning based on an exchange of facts, stories, and challenges related to a community or a territory in order to find common solutions (Mahmoud & Morello 2021). Living Labs are defined as "enabling environments" whereas the participation focuses on including diverse forms of knowledge generation, which is also called co-design. Some scholars particularly grasp ULLs (urban Living Labs) as "spatially embedded sites for co-creation of knowledge and solutions by conducting local experiments" (Puerari et al. 2018: 2 in Mahmoud, Morello 2021). Another interesting type is the incubator, as it may be hosting start-ups or rural enterprises that have a direct relationship to the region, and they are meanwhile embedded in a training program that draws from practitioners' experience and real situations. FabLabs and makers spaces, are characterized by sharing of information, open knowledge and mutual help and are a driver of innovation related to production and interaction (d'Ovidio, 2021).

The perspective of situated learning becomes relevant considering the need for education and technological innovation in rural areas and the potential capacity of CWS to act as a middleground between the CWS users (creative class, innovators, entrepreneurs) and the local communities. As of now, CWS were mainly looked at as intermediaries between creative individuals and innovative firms, playing a role in the localized dynamics of innovation (Capdevila, 2015) within certain professional communities. The same result is yet to be achieved if we consider CWS as middleground between the CWS community and the local communities as these exchange dynamic and engagement has to be pro-actively developed and it is not happening by chance (Brown, 2017). Building on the learning dynamics potentially produced by the internal and external exchange occurring between CWS users and local stakeholders, through activities that prompt situated learning, could be a way to enhance their cooperation and act as a driver for the local and regional development processes.

References

Amin, A., & Roberts, J. (2008). Knowing in action: Beyond communities of practice. Research Policy, 37(2), 353–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2007.11.003

Brown, J. (2017). Curating the "Third Place"? Coworking and the mediation of creativity. Geoforum, 82, 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.04.006

Capdevila, I. (2015). Co-Working Spaces and the Localised Dynamics of Innovation in Barcelona. International Journal of Innovation Management, 19(03), 1540004. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919615400046

Carvalho, L., Goodyear, P., & de Laat, M. (2017). Place-based spaces for networked learning (1st ed.). Routledge.

D'Ovidio, M. (n.d.). (Social) Innovation in Makerspaces: Re-embeddedness of Physical Production? In New Workplaces—Location Patterns, Urban Effects and Development Trajectories. A Worldwide Investigation. (pp. 65–80). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63443-8_5

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

Wijngaarden, Y., Hitters, E., & Bhansing, P. V. (2020). Cultivating fertile learning grounds: Collegiality, tacit knowledge and innovation in creative co-working spaces. Geoforum, 109, 86–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.01.005

Federica Ammaturo
ESR15

Collaborative Working Practices (CWP)

The practice of coworking, associated with the rise of coworking spaces (CWS) has emerged in multiple academic works (Brown, 2017; Cossu, Gandini, Merkel, 2019; Schmidt, 2019).

Nevertheless, the concept of collaborative working practice as a dynamic independent from the physical configuration of a CWS has not been broadly researched in the field of CWS research. Only some works explore collaborative spaces as an urban (Merkel, 2019) or a creative (Schmidt, 2019) practice and these mainly refer to the practices happening in a defined, and designed environment (the CWS), built to enhance and promote collaboration as a practice (Gandini, 2015). This process does not happen without contradictory results, for example promoting collaborative individualism (Bandinelli & Gandini, 2019) or the practice of working together alone (Spinuzzi, 2012). In fact, CWS, especially those that work with a variety of actors engaged in different projects, tend to perpetuate this kind of dynamic and the collaboration is curated by a "community manager" (Brown, 2017) rather than spontaneously produced. Some CWS are more inclined in fostering Collaborative Working Practices (CWP). Taking as an example an evidently collaborative environment such as FabLabs, they are defined as places for learning and innovation and their ideology is based on the practice of making tailored objects, with hands and the use of technology, in a common environment that provides a fertile ground for collaboration. Even if they are places of production and interaction (with the exchange of ideas mixed with the building of social cohesion) "prevailing norms of competition and individualism within the makers' practices" (Johns and Hall, 2020 in d'Ovidio, 2021) are observed. These examples describe some practices happening in certain CWS, underlying that the close correlation between "coworking" and collaboration is not by default. For this reason, it is academically relevant to abstract the CWP from the CWS and to go to the root of these Practices, to understand their multiple spatial forms and their role for (rural) development. Moreover, this is relevant for finding the correct role to CWS depending on their capacity to enhance collaboration.

In rural areas, CWP are visible traditionally in different agricultural, gastronomic and artisanship working activities. It can be also said that in rural areas a collaborative model prevails over a competitive one, and it is rooted in the unity and interconnections among people and with their environment (Cloke 2006). Rural dwellers' way of life is characterized by a "cohesive identity based on respect for the environmental and behavioural qualities of living as part of an extensive landscape" (ibid.). Especially in rural areas but in general, for long-lasting and place-based economic sectors (primary sector, creative industries, craft, and tourism) the tension between tradition and innovation and between individual and collaborative practices could be seen as a source of value (Rykkja & Hauge, 2022).) and its effect can be found in organisations or activities that are based on Collaborative Working Practices. Collaboration dynamics are for a long time present in marginal, rural, fragile areas as a way to overcome the lack of economic resources or institutional presence, for example. Practices of "commoning" in agricultural traditions (like the share of machinery, see the Scottish Machinery Rings) but also other kinds of exchange (barter, exchange of goods) also relate to collaborative practices that are based not only on market relations but also on producing social values and social capital. A contemporary CWP could be crowdfunding, as a way in which consumers become creators of symbolic values (ibid.). This (digital) collaborative practice has the potential to create value and a symbiotic relationship between the user and the producer: this type of co-creation of value could be also applied to some collaborative practices performed in agriculture, such as the GAS (Gruppi di Acquisto Solidale) in Italy or the CSA (Community Supported Agriculture).

Collaboration has hence a big role in value creation and sharing of resources and this value has been captured by CWS, and before them by a variety of organisations. In work environments, this interactive practice of collaboration has been studied and often defined as "a community of practice" to describe an action taken by a group of people working together toward common purposes or similar interests (Wegner et al., 2002). A community of practice can increase the level of innovation in a company and bring positive values such as effectiveness, and cooperation among disciplines and at the forefront of different working sectors (ibid.). This is not the only field where Collaborative Practices are investigated. In academic literature, they are present in disciplines that explore the role of collaboration in education, especially for particular needs (deaf education, child with language difficulties) or higher education and organizations (teamwork). Moreover, CWP are at the basis of many activities promoted by civil society to address spatial and environmental needs through co-creation, collaboration pacts and other local actions that build bridges between the communities and their institutions, like Pacts of collaboration (Caridi, 2018) or more broadly collaborative planning (Haley, 1998).

To promote the role of CWS beyond their capacity of boosting workers´ individual well-being, growth of economic activities and other individuals' or niches' demands will be central to look at CWS as containers that have the capacity to host multiple activities that promote collaboration and build upon a variety of CWP. In those circumstances, they could contribute to value creation at the local and regional level, also providing agency for new CWP to thrive.

References

Bandinelli, C. and Gandini, A. (2019) 'Hubs vs Networks in the Creative Economy: Towards a "Collaborative Individualism"', in Gill, R., Pratt, A.C., and Virani, T.E. (eds) Creative Hubs in Question: Place, Space and Work in the Creative Economy. Cham: Springer International Publishing (Dynamics of Virtual Work), pp. 89–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10653-9_5

Brown, J. (2017). Curating the "Third Place"? Coworking and the mediation of creativity. Geoforum, 82, 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.04.006

Caridi, G. (2018). Politiche della collaborazione e processi di commoning: Recenti forme d'amministrazione condivisa [Application/pdf]. Scienze del Territorio, 258-263 Pages, 108 kB. https://doi.org/10.13128/SCIENZE_TERRITORIO-24390

Cloke, P. (2006). Conceptualizing Rurality. In: Cloke, P.; Marsden, T.; Mooney, P. H. (Eds.): Handbook of Rural Studies. (pp. 18–28). London et al.: Sage

D'Ovidio, Marianna. (2021). (Social) Innovation in Makerspaces: Re-embeddedness of Physical Production?. 10.1007/978-3-030-63443-8_5

Gandini, A. (2015). The rise of coworking spaces: A literature review. In Saving the city. Collective low-budget organising and urban practice. Ephemera.

Healey, P. (1998). Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society. Town Planning Review, 69(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.69.1.h651u2327m86326p

Merkel, J. (2019) 'Freelance isn't free:' Co-Working as a critical urban practice to cope with informality in creative labour markets. Urban Studies, 56, 526–547. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420 98018 782374

Rykkja, A., & Hauge, A. (2022). Crowdfunding and co-creation of value The case of the fashion brand Linjer. In Culture, Creativity and Economy Collaborative Practices, Value Creation and Spaces of Creativity. Routledge.

Schmidt, S. (2019). In the making: Open Creative Labs as an emerging topic in economic geography? Geography Compass, 13(9). https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12463

Spinuzzi, C. (2012). Working Alone Together: Coworking as Emergent Collaborative Activity. Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 26(4), 399–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912444070

Wegner, E., Mcdermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002). Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

https://coral-itn.eu/

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 955907.