A TYPOLOGY OF EVENTS AND THEIR IMPACTS ON COWORKING SPACES

Naya Tselepi
Postdoctoral Researcher, Panteion University
naya.tselepi@gmail.com

Lefteris Gaitanidis
Doctoral Candidate, Panteion University
left.gaita@gmail.com

Antigoni Papageorgiou
Postdoctoral Researcher, Panteion University
antigoni.papageo@gmail.com

Vasilis Avdikos
Associate Professor, Panteion University
v.avdikos@gmail.com

Abstract
Coworking spaces (CS) have been under academic scrutiny as under certain conditions may function as vehicles for the construction of social and professional relationships. Coalescing the materiality of the office and the immateriality of a series of interactions, relations, and instances of human communication, we argue that coworking spaces fabricate a "collaborative atmosphere" (Merkel, 2015) through a series of welcoming, onboarding, and other sharing practices. In this paper, we provide a detailed categorization of the everyday events and possibilities of interaction between coworkers. We then explore how the different kinds of events we usually find in such spaces impact the professional life of coworkers and to what extent such spaces interact with their urban surroundings creating externalities in the neighbourhoods where the CS operate. Drawing upon a qualitative exploration of four CS in different urban settings, we enrich our understanding of the socio-spatial relations that are being created through events by analysing six types of events that create different kinds of impacts: i. spontaneous meet-ups, ii. regular informal meet ups, iii. physical activities, iv.(regular) formal small events, v. field configuring events (FCE) and vi. virtual events.

Key Words*: coworking, events, buzz, well-being, community, impacts*

Introduction

After the global financial and economic crisis of 2008, shared office facilities emerged in the advanced capitalist cities of the West. Coworking spaces, hubs, and other collaborative workspaces appeared as a response to the ingrowing flows of 'workplaceless' workers who are engaged in digitally mediated work and platform-based economy (Mitea, 2018). Coworking as a practice gave visibility to freelance labour and to the wider labour market flexibility and labour precarization that deepened during the crisis and accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic. As many studies have captured, CS provide flexible shared office space to a wide range of professionals that operate within the wider sectors of the 'creative

economy'. Creative professionals navigate at the intersection of precarity and compulsory entrepreneurialism as the nature of their work is often project-based, freelance, and entrepreneurial. CS exemplifies this short-termism which tends to be endemic in creative labour.

CS studies have certainly reached a point of maturity as scholars from different sectors have explored the subjectivity formation processes that take place within these spaces (Bandinelli, 2020), their links to entrepreneurship (Bouncken et al., 2018; Bouncken & Reuschl, 2018), innovation (Marchegiani & Arcese, 2018), and 'knowledge sharing' (Parrino, 2015), as well as its relationship with processes of gentrification, urban as well as rural revitalization (Bahr et al., 2021; Nakano et al., 2020). On a macro-scale, one of the biggest challenges of coworking research is the fact that CS have been developed as a very diverse and place-based phenomenon (Avdikos & Papageorgiou, 2022). Many studies have explored the everyday life at CS, pointing out that it is structured around the interplay of formal and informal interactions (Blagoev et al., 2019), positioning the role of community manager and host crucial for the engineering of relationships among coworkers (Brown, 2017; Merkel, 2019).

Considering coworking spaces as microclusters, Capdevila (2013) suggests that under specific conditions such as cognitive as well as physical proximity, relationships can be nurtured among professionals that work from a shared space. Informal as well as formal interactions that can occur in a wide range of spaces within and even outside of the CS can lead to the creation of urban buzzes, knowledge sharing, and socializing. The constant flow of professionals that are on the go and can work from anywhere fuels the creation of transnational networks that are territorialized in CS but do exist simultaneously on digital platforms such as social media, mailing lists, and other professional networks etc. Through the adoption of intense self-branding techniques (Gandini, 2016), professionals are engaged in formal and informal get-togethers with the aim to foster connections that could potentially lead to meaningful professional collaborations and interpersonal relationships. This coalescing is assumed to form 'communities' as described in popular coworking discourses that flood practitioners' marketing material as well as many academic coworking studies (Blagoev et al., 2019; Garrett et al., 2017; Spinuzzi et al., 2019). The mingling that might occur in CS under certain conditions has been in fact under scrutiny as testifies in favour of the perception of coworking spaces not as mere physical infrastructures but as vehicles for the construction of social and professional relationships. The flexible workplace arrangements that coworking spaces offer coalesces the materiality of the office and the immateriality of a series of interactions, relations, and instances of human communication.

We argue that this "collaborative atmosphere" (Merkel, 2015) is being fabricated through a series of sharing practices and thus the aim of this study is to provide a detailed categorization of the everyday events and possibilities of interaction between coworkers in CS. It, then, explores how the different kinds of events we usually find in CS can impact the professional life of coworkers offering them opportunities for knowledge exchange and networking, as well as their social life and well-being. Moreover, we would like to explore whether the different kinds of events have an impact on the neighborhoods where the CS operate. Data collected from these research questions is the basis for the current paper. Through a qualitative exploration that draws data from 55 semi-structured interviews and observation of CS' everyday life in different urban contexts, we aim to enrich our understanding of the socio-spatial relations that are being created through events.

1. Events and interactions; a literature review

The literature describing and analyzing events is unfolding in multiple fields, such as economic geography; management and organizational studies; describing, thus, the very many of their characteristics. According to Lampel and Meyer, there are six characteristics of 'events':

"i. pooling of diverse actors in one place; ii. bounded temporality (from hours to days); iii. spontaneous opportunities for direct social interaction; iv. symbolic (dramaturgical, ceremonial, performative) constituent parts; v. incidents for information exchange and collective sense-making and; vi. reservoirs for social resources and manifold utilizations." (2008, p.1027).

Spatial and temporal characteristics are focal in order to conceptualize events; on one hand, "there are multiple spatialities and geographies at issue" (Lange et al., 2014, p.197) and at the same time, the limited time (Bathelt and Schuldt, 2010) and the 'temporal complexity' (Lange et al., 2014, p.198) need to be taken into account. Power and Jansson provide a description that integrates clustering and temporality:

"Under the light of geography -and specifically economic geography- events have become a leading topic and well connected to cluster theory; described either as 'temporary clusters' (Maskell et al. 2006, p. 2) and/or 'cyclical clusters'." (2008, p. 426).

Related to the spatial and temporal characteristics, Lange characterizes a series of events, such as club events, galleries, exhibitions, staged office openings, etc., as "temporary place-makings resulting from social formation on the urban stage" (2011a, p.274).

The temporal co-presence and co-location of people and actors within the same place or region has also been described as a basic element in the production of buzzes; a central concept in the economic geography and further evolutionary geography literature over the last two decades. According to Bathelt and Schuldt (2010) and Maskell et al. (2006) temporary spatial proximity allows the interrelation of interaction and creates a specific atmosphere which is understood as 'buzz'. The physical spaces of temporary spatial proximity are also well scrutinized in Growe (2019) under two different types occurring during work processes; 'meet & mingle' and 'move & manage'; the first implies participants who are liberated from the daily work routines, thus, they are more open and accessible to contact each other (ibid., 437), whereas, the second implies "...bilateral and multilateral exchanges with predetermined stakeholders, targeting predetermined objectives" (ibid.).

According to Bathelt et al (2004; 38):

"...Buzz refers to the information and communication ecology created by face-to-face contacts, co-presence and co-location of people and firms within the same industry and place or region. This buzz consists of specific information and continuous updates of this information, intended and unanticipated learning processes in organised and accidental meetings, the application of the same interpretative schemes and mutual understanding of new knowledge and technologies, as well as shared cultural traditions and habits within a particular technology field, which stimulate the establishment of conventions and other institutional arrangements. Actors continuously contributing to and benefiting from the diffusion of information, gossip and news by just 'being there'" (2004, p.38).

Moreover, tacit knowledge is thought to be transferred only through face-to-face interactions between partners who already share some basic similarities, such as languages, codes, and personal knowledge (either formal or informal) (Nonaka in Wijngaarden et al., 2020, p.88).

The literature of events is also paying attention to lived and everyday practices and routines; it is also unveiling their symbolic meaning by focusing on the 'scene' -as social formation- which, according to Lange "it experiences itself and performs in its body-based

materiality and sociality" (ibid., p.275). The literature on events is recently exploring International Trade Fairs (ITF), which can be well connected to 'global buzzes' and their architecture (Bathelt and Schuldt, 2010; Schuldt and Bathelt, 2011). Last but not least, the virtual aspect of events is investigated also by the authors as an "attractive alternative to personal meetings if a quick response or feedback is needed, or if it is too complicated to organize a face-to-face meeting" (ibid, p.22). Virtual events have seen considerable growth during the Covid-19 pandemic, as quarantines and restricted measures prevented face-to-face interaction.

Furthermore, significant parts in the literature of events occupy what is called the 'Field Configuring Events (FCE)' (Scott 1999, 2006, 2010; Grabher, 2002, 2004; Power and Jansson, 2008; Lange, 2011; Lange et al. 2014, Suwala 2012). According to Lange et al., FCE are:

"events where actors from diverse professional, organizational, and geographical backgrounds assemble in and necessitate one location" (2014, p.192).

Meanwhile, Lampel and Meyer are providing a more explanatory description and typology:

"(FCE) are temporary social organizations such as tradeshows, professional gatherings, technology contests, and business ceremonies that encapsulate and shape the development of professions, technologies, markets, and industries" (2008, p.1026).

More explicitly in Lange et al. (2014) the FCE approach attempts to draw attention to the role of events in fields of economic and social action allocating meaning to previously unfamiliar circumstances. They suggest that events can be important to introducing, structuring, maintaining, and configuring new products, industrial standards, cultural artifacts, knowledge categories, and social networks.

2. Methodology and data

The paper draws from the research findings of four CS in Athens and Berlin, where qualitative methods have been used, such as participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. During fieldwork 55 personal semi-structured interviews were collected from hosts/founders (9) and coworkers (46), whereas the researchers engaged in the daily life of the CS and participated in various events. Most of the coworkers were 20-35 years old, well-educated, and highly qualified. As for the hosts/founders, we would rather say that, apart from being slightly older, they shared more or less the same profile with the tenants. In more detail, the researchers visited S1 for 33 days and collected 17 interviews, S2 for 35 days and collected 17 interviews, S3 for 14 days where 10 interviews were collected, and S4 for 14 days where 11 interviews were collected.

Interviewees were provided with information on the study, have been asked to consent on the corresponding form, and have been distributed an accreditation letter. Regarding privacy and confidentiality, the interviewees have been informed that the interview will take place on the assumption that all information provided can be released into the public domain, however, names of the interviewees and coworking spaces as well as specific descriptions for the latter have been cautiously omitted from all documents.

Presentation of the case studies

Space 1 (S1) is a coworking space that operates since 2014 in the commercial and business center of Athens; next to Exarcheia, one of the city's most emblematic neighbourhoods for its radical political and intellectual activism. S1 provides workspace, offices for rent and all the basic amenities for business owners, freelancers and startuppers. S1 hosts approximately 30 coworkers as well as approximately 5 start-ups. The majority of coworkers are remote

workers and digital nomads and the rest are local freelancers. Coworkers in S1 were varying in professional terms; engineers, lawyers, marketeers, journalists, curators etc. were some of the professions met there. S1 has shared and private offices, and a rooftop and garden where members can meet, relax and/or exercise. The first impression that someone gets fromS1 is of a friendly CS with a cosy feeling, where residents get to know each other and socialise through various kinds of encounters and events. This is supported by the instigators of the space, who believe that "it's always better to work, share and thrive together"; that is why one of their initial aims was to create a space that contributes to a strong bonding and relations among the users of the space.

Space 2 (S2) is located in an elegant neoclassical building in the neighborhood of Psyri in the city center and hosts approximately 50 coworkers; being mainly freelancers as well as start-up entrepreneurs. S2 consists of two separate buildings which are connected by a central inner courtyard. In one building, there is the open coworking space, which consists of a sufficient number of hot desks on the ground floor and in the loft, as well as a number of private offices that are used exclusively by specific coworkers. There is also a room for private meetings and calls and another one for recording podcasts. In the center of the open space, there are amenities providing space for taking a break or having a discussion. The second building is mostly used for closed meetings, presentations, and conferences and not for collaborative work, while on the ground floor of the building is the kitchen which, although not very spacious, can be easily used by coworkers. The courtyard is located in the middle of the two buildings and is essentially the friendliest part of the space.

Space3 (S3) is located at one of the most touristic and central locations in Berlin. S3 hosts hundreds of freelancers, remote workers, and start-up entrepreneurs. S3 is in a multi-level building that has been designed to host early-stage start-ups as well as more mature ones and freelancers. The first floors are mostly composed of common areas with private and shared desks, meeting rooms, and a large kitchen, while the rest of the floors are private offices not accessible to all. The terrace that exists at the building hosts multiple informal and formal events. Moreover, kitchen facilities do exist only in the first level which allows tenants to move around and mingle with the rest of the more flexible and ephemeral tenants.

Space 4 (S4) operates as a small CS in the trendy neighborhood of Neukölln in Berlin. Located in one of the busiest streets of the neighborhood, S4 can host up to 30 coworkers who can set-up their office desk in the floating member area. The apparent lack of office space in the city, its affordable price, as well as its location made S4's overall offering attractive to Berlin-based, EU, and international freelancers, remote and part-time remote workers. Professions were quite different in terms of discipline, such as designers, developers, marketeers, journalists, researchers, etc.
S4 floating member area is mostly composed of two main rooms which have shared desks, benches, and chairs. S4 has a tiny kitchen, an even smaller meeting room and a private room where the founding team of the space works. Motivated by the general instability of freelance working life and the current rent increase in Berlin, the initial tenants of the S4 decided to use their office space as a coworking space, renting out floating desk subscriptions to freelancers and small teams. That way they could sustain their flexible office working arrangements.

3. Analysis

In general, the analysis of the data revealed that CS can facilitate six types of events that create different kinds of buzzes and impacts: i. spontaneous meet-ups, ii. regular informal

meet-ups, iii. physical activities, iv.(regular) formal small events, v. FCE and vi. virtual events. However, this typology should be treated and used as an analytical tool and not as a stiff categorisation. In the following pages we analyse each type of event and later on we attempt to unpack their impacts and see whether they can spark networking opportunities for coworkers assisting them to advance their careers, whether and in what way they can impact coworkers social life and well-being and finally, whether they can affect the neighbourhoods' life where the CS is situated.

A parameter that affected the organization of events in each case study was Covid-19. The pandemic had a differentiated effect in each CS; in S1 and S2, it affected the conduct of events and generally the intention and mood for buzzing and mingling situations. In S3, even during the times of the pandemic, there was an oversupply of recurring events that tenants could attend physically and digitally. Finally, in S4 the organisation of events did not seem to be affected by the pandemic. However, during the time of our research (June-October 2021), the Covid-19 impact in events seemed to be noticeably restricted.

Spontaneous meet-ups

Interpersonal spontaneous meet-ups were an everyday phenomenon in all CS observed. They were happening in an 'impromptu' way. For instance, in S1 they were taking place mainly at the lounge and corridor (mostly standing), outside the community manager's office, nearby the shared board of information, in the kitchen as well as at the stairs to the rooftop when it was for a 'cigarette break'. The meet-ups were taking place on an everyday basis, peaking while entering or leaving the space and while there was an intentional movement and/or a random wandering from one place to another. In addition, this produced a 'mingling' type-of-connections that was an important factor in the S1's coworker relations; a significant number of newcomers were seeking for a 'light social bonding'[1], from sharing personal information to asking for more personal support, that was described as "life coaching":

"They miss a lot the social connection that; let's say, they will goof off; they will not talk about work. This is more than anything. (…) This need is very intense at this moment; it is asked for and it is met. The need for interpersonal communication in place of psychotherapy or life coaching."

In S2 meet-ups were taking place mainly in the courtyard and the kitchen, where the coworkers had informal discussions during coffee, smoking breaks and lunches. For some users, the space exuded a non-formal atmosphere in comparison with other experiences they used to have abroad, a fact that facilitated their daily use of the space.

[(…) I like that it is a very warm place… I have already met a lot of people, we say hello... we will sit down to eat with people I do not know…in the Netherlands, it was much harder to tell you the truth…The environment was definitely more formal, it was very startupish…]

In S4 we observed that, even though it was loosely regulated, there was a very clear and strict noise policy that prohibited speaking in the common areas. That limited socialization only in the kitchen area. The aforementioned policy shaped the interactions and the connections formed in the space among the coworkers and the founding team; that being said, interactions within the space tended to be quick and highly informative. As an interviewee who was part of the management team highlighted,

"[…] interactions were not again not necessarily aimed for… specifically for collaboration but just for building a little network but also more naturally".

---

[1]This is another reason for the coworkers movement from their countries' severe lockdowns to Athens, where the Covid restrictions were supposed to be lighter, this kind of movement has been characterised by the CM as 'pandemic nomadism'.

Overall, we could say that common spaces, such as kitchens, social rooms, terraces seem to facilitate informal interactions between coworkers. These kinds of very temporal encounters provide the opportunity for communication and information sharing; from local events in the neighboorhoods, such as book fairs and gallery tours to start-up pitches and the set up and overall amenities, rules and management of the case studies were designed in such a way to shape communication and information-sharing among participants according to the initial plannings and the overall character of each CS.

Regular informal meetups

Regular informal meetups, such as community breakfasts, coffee breaks were mostly happening in the CS' kitchens in a repeated performative way, and especially in an informal way. This interplay of formal and informal (Blagoev et al., 2019) seems to be positioned at the centre of coworking activities structuring opportunities for networking, knowledge exchange and even collaboration. It was not rare to observe coworkers exchanging mails, business cards, contact details or even sharing work in progress and concerns regarding clients and projects.Other meet-ups were the after-work drinks in nearby bars of the neighbourhood or guided tours around some specific spots of the city. Just a few of these encounters had an impromptu character; they were happening spontaneously without organisation and/or mediation, whereas most of them were curated by the community manager of the CS and they usually happened on a weekly basis. As such, the role of the community manager (CM) was very important in initiating and maintaining them; the S1's CM confesses that he was often preparing coffee and cookies in the kitchen as a "bribe" for the coworkers to gather during lunch time:

"I ask when most can, I put the coffee and the cookies in the kitchen and I see them around midday, when they have their break, they gather and talk and it is then when I also go out".

Drinks and beers inside the S1 was a very important factor of connection; a coworker alleged that during Covid lockdown, Fridays' beers around 5pm was a kind of ritual "in order to decompress".

In S2, some of the informal meet ups were the 'community lunches', conducted on a monthly basis, which were providing the opportunity for coworkers to take a break from their work routine, to get to know each other better, to talk about their experiences on a professional, social or personal level and in general to get closer.

In S4, the only time during the working day where coworkers met was during lunch time. As discovered, non-German coworkers had initiated an unofficial meeting every day where they could discuss, share their news, ask for advice regarding German bureaucracy, and socialize.

The neighbourhood was playing a role in the organisation of informal meetups. For S1 the nucleo were the 'bonding drinks' in the bars of Exarcheia, mostly organised by the CM with the help of some coworkers. Before the pandemic, it used to be repeated every week and organised mainly via the Slack digital platform, however, it seemed to lose ground while we were conducting the research. Another 'happening' that was taking place quite a few times before the drinks used to be a 'like a local' walk in the neighbourhood and a guided tour to some sights of central Athens. The meetups' importance in social bonding and the 'like a local' feeling are underlined in the following words of a coworker:

"I think that they are very important; because it's like your Friday work drinks with your colleagues or whatever; so I think that for those of us who are self-employed, who aren't locals in Athens I think it is a very good space and point of connection."

As observed in all cases, the role of the community manager, who acts as the curator of these kinds of events,is decisive for enabling and facilitating meaningful and constructive interactions among coworkers. In S1, the role of the CM was fundamental in initiating and

maintaining the regular informal meet ups within the CS; breakfasts, coffee breaks and lunches, as well as drinks and beers in the neighborhood of Exarcheia. The specific characteristics gathered by the S1's CM were, more than highly appreciated, confirming the coworkers' decision for the space as well as were 'making' the same space itself:

"He plays a fundamental role because he is the face, S1 is personalised (...) Yes, I think that it is one of the fundamental criteria of a space (...) it makes a coworking space to not want to leave from that".

In case S2, it can be argued that the CMs' and the hosts' presence was overall supportive in organising regular informal meetups. Their action, in the majority of cases, was following the planned context without having provided spontaneous initiatives for buzzing and mingling situations for the users of the space. In the same context, we have noticed a desire from part of the users for further promotion and support by the hosts of such initiatives under the goal of establishing a "solid coworking community" that the users could be organically part of it.

In S3, the community management team' s role was to curate (Merkel 2019; Brown 2017) the whole coworking experience of tenants, and that was organically linked with the overaching goal of S3 that is entrepreneurial activation, networking, and socializing:

we do weekly [name of recurring events], we do weekly 'coworker call', we call it,. These calls aim at facilitating the onboarding of the tenants. A google meet call for people to come in, ask questions and that kind of stuff. So the major tool is the events. So I have a keen eye on 'who can I bring for events?'; 'how can they benefit from each other?'; 'who could be an interesting speaker?'; 'who could help the community?'; 'who could be an interesting player?'

Formal events and physical activities

Regarding S1 and during the pandemic, formal events appeared to decrease in number and limited their extroversy, as access to events was limited strictly to members. In S2, these kinds of events were mostly planned in advance by the management team and they were addressed either to 'external actors' or to users of the CS. As for the first ones, they were usually organised in cooperation with these actors, in the frame of the S2's various projects, an example being the capacity-building training workshops. While conducting them, it was not clear whether users of the S2 could participate, as they were hardly invited to do so. In line with this ambiguity, the buzz created during the conduct of the events seemed to be cut off from the rest of the space's coworking community. While the Covid – 19 restrictions indeed prohibit large-scale events, we should punctuate the fact that formality is not considered equally appealing for coworkers as it seems to create high expectations in terms of the outcomes (connections with investors, potential clients) of a formal event and obligations regarding a specific format (for example the speed dating format, the pitch battle). In many instances, coworkers narrated to us how they liked the casual meetups and the informality of various activities. This fluidity is aligned to their working practices that do not conform the 0900 to 1700 model. Structural informality seems indeed to be more productive in terms of forming relationships that begin as personal and might be transformed to professional. As a coworker from S1 observes:

"When it comes to meeting people, doing business, I need to like them as persons first. We need to get along as friends otherwise it's not gonna work. In formal events, everybody is wearing their best smile but you cannot really meet the person."

As she points out above, the structural informality seems to produce tangible and intangible barriers building exclusive networks based in trust, mutuality, and intimacy. What perceived as "authenticity of informal meetups" seems to be more aligned to the coworking habitus.

Moreover, two out of the four case studies were organising physical events for their members, such as Yoga and Pilates classes. These activities aimed at providing the members with additional benefits targeting members' well-being. All these physical activities contributed to the widening of the spectrum of coworking services and transforming into a hub where work, socialization, and leisure activities mingle. At the same, it can be argued that CS include these activities aiming to become more competitive in a currently booming but crowded coworking market.

Field Configuring Events

In S3, large-scale branded events attract creative professionals from all around the world, acting as field-configuring events (FCE). Design-sprints like hackathons, international meet-ups and conferences benefit from "the physical co-presence of a multitude of agents of an industry, technology, or value chain originating from basically all parts of the world" (Bathelt and Schuldt 2010). Big scale events result in the territorialization of networks, crystallization of valuable knowledge, and creation of quality standards for the field – in our case the field of new media labour and the employment status of the freelancer. On top of that, the start-up related events such as the pitches and the hackathons organized by the S3 were aiming into the introduction, structuring, maintaining and even configuring new products and services. Berlin's position in the global urban hierarchy enables such connections and makes networks flourish (Lange 2011; Lange et al. 2008). The repetition of such events and the like "thickens" and establishes "a dense ecology of information and communication" (Schüßler, Grabher, and Müller-Seitz 2015). In the case of S3, buzzes can be both local and global and can be transmitted both face-to-face and virtually. The absence of buzz would signify the failure of a coworking space which is designed to function as a networking place for emerging freelancers and start-ups.

Virtual communication & events

In S1, digital platforms were commonly used to facilitate communication and the organisation of events, like meetups within the space as well as in the neighbourhood. Another observation made was that online and digital platforms took a significant place in the communication among S1's tenants during the pandemic.

In case S3, the digital platforms were serving as an unlimited source of continuous updates of information in regard to upcoming projects, events, and training sessions. Making use of [slack] and [coworking software], tenants of S3 were fostering a mutual understanding of how the latest trends from IT technology can help them stay connected, advance their career, and make them look professional. Either virtually or physically (Bathelt and Schuldt, 2010), S2 has constructed its identity as the place that "all happens" (Lavanga et al. 2020):

In the good old days before Covid, people were just queuing outside to attend [S2] events. [S2] is like a melting pot.

Matrix of results

The following table summarises the study's results organised in the aforementioned categories.

Table 1. Typology of events and their impacts in CS

Type of events	Basic Characteristics				Impact		
	What	Where	How and who	When	Networking, Professional development	Social, Well-being, Belonging	Urban externalities
Spontaneous meet-ups	"Standing" chats, coffee, lunches, breaks for smoking	Within the amenities of the CSs, (indoor-outdoor), ie. hall, corridor, lounge, kitchen, courtyard, rooftop, balcony, stairs etc	Coworkers and CM	Daily and mostly spontaneous	limited	Get to know each other, mingling, social bonding, basis for further relations and networking	None
Regular informal meet ups	Daily or weekly breakfasts/ lunches/ beers, quiz nights, meet-ups/drinks and guided tours in neighborhood, welcome & farewell community events	Common room/shared space, lounge, kitchen, courtyard, balcony, rooftop, neighborhood	Usually initiated and organised by the CM or coworkers	Many times per week	Medium	Social bonding, basis for further relations and networking, strong well being aspects and sense of belonging	Boosts urban consumption (bars, restaurants, galleries)
Regular physical activities	Yoga, pilates classes	Rooftop, common room	Organised by CM and/or external actors	Daily or weekly	Little	Physical wellness	None
Formal events	Info and pitching events, capacity building events, seminars, trainings/clas ses, workshops, presentations	Event, seminar and workshop rooms, rooftop	Organised by the CM/ hosts and/or external actors	A few times per week	High impact, motivation, new clients/subco ntracting, market trends	Some social characteristics are integrated	None, except if addressed to the neighborhoo d/city
FCE	Large events, conferences, hackathons	Conference rooms or outside the CS	Organised by the CM/hosts and/or external actors	Once or twice per year	Very high impact, motivation, new clients/subco ntracting, market trends	Little	A lot in the city Guided city experiences
Virtual communicatio n & events	Online communicati on & exchange of information	Mainly through social media/ Slack platform	Organised by the CM	Everyday	High	Little	None

4. Impacts on careers and well-being of coworkers and on the neighbourhood

The interviews with coworkers revealed that networking and information exchanges seem to be sparked by almost all types of events, but especially by the formal small events and the FCE organised by the CS. Usually these small events, such as pitching events or training events give the opportunity to coworkers to share information about their projects and work in a structured way. Coworkers usually choose to attend these kinds of events because they have an interest in the topic and they know that they will meet like-minded individuals that altogether will contribute to the creation of a local buzz with positive externalities for all. Moreover, FCE provide the platform for more exchanges with a wider spatial spectrum, as FCE usually attract a large number of corporations, freelancers and startuppers; in FCE people exchange information, find about new trends in their professional fields and they may extend their networks. As such, both formal small events and FCE produce large local buzzes that offer the opportunity for information exchange and the professional/career development of the coworkers.

Furthermore, the everyday spontaneous meet-ups, the regular informal meet-ups and even the yoga classes in the CS give the opportunity to coworkers to engage in a soft kind of networking. Apart from de-compressing them from their daily routines, these events create a social buzz, a more relaxed atmosphere where coworkers get to know each other, while they can later engage in more professional exchanges. As such these petty events that resemble more to informal encounterships can be used as an introductory phase to the local community of coworkers, or as Storper and Venables (2004; 364) emphasize, the buzz that is created by these kinds of everyday meet ups can be a key socialization element "that in turn allows people to be candidates for membership of 'in-groups' and to stay in such groups; and a direct source of psychological motivation". Usually, people in these kinds of events exchange business cards or share their social media profiles and as such they foster a shared professional identity that would give them access in return to multiple resources and networks that can be reached in other formal events.

From the above we can conclude that the more structured and curated are the events in CS, such as the formal events and FCE, the more impact they have in the professional development of coworkers. On the other hand, the unstructured and informal events seem to have a bigger impact on the well-being and the social life of coworkers, offering socialization opportunities and acting as gateways for more professional exchanges in a later stage. In other words, the formal events and FCE are closer to the "move and manage" type of buzz, whereas the informal social ones are closer to the "meet and mingle" type Growe (2019). Moreover, the majority of the interviewees alleged that informal events and the spontaneous meet-ups were widely contributing to what they were defining as a 'sense of community' and a community buzz that can spark relations of trust between the coworkers. As such, apart from spaces that connect and assist professionals in their career development, CS can also be regarded as social infrastructures that cultivate a sense of belonging in a currently fragmented occupational world where professionals tend to work remotely and independently, having acquired diverse skillsets.

The locationof the four case studies in the centers of the two citiesis playing an important role in the attraction of new members. CS can be regarded as urban gateways and a kind of hospitality service, as they inform the coworkers, especially those digital nomads and remote workers that visit the city of Athens or Berlin about the opportunities that the city offers, either in terms of professional networks or in terms of spaces of urban consumption (Avdikos et al, 2022). Coworkers suggest bars and restaurants to the newcomers, informal meet-ups are held at local pubs, while guided tours invite coworkers to explore in a nutshell the down-town city atmosphere. As such, events in CS, either intentionally or unintentionally, boost

consumption in the city. We hardly found other kinds of relations between the CS we visited and their neighboorhoods. Although a small number of coworkers engaged in solidarity activities, such as providing English language lessons to young refugees, we have not come across more structured connections between the CS and the city.

Conclusion

The paper analysed the different kinds of formal and informal events usually found in CS and provided an initial categorization of these events. While this typology should be treated and used as an analytical tool and not as a stiff categorisation, it testifies in favour of CS primarily as social infrastructures that combat the isolation of remote and digitally enabled work. The various events organised by the spaces impact the everyday life of coworkers who are thirsty for interaction and human connection. Taking into consideration the pandemic which has pushed professionals from different sectors of the economy to seek office space in a CS as formal workplaces closed down, we argue that these spaces played a crucial role in the overall well-being of the workers. Collaboration and knowledge transfer cannot be seen as the first and foremost outcome, as everyday life in CS is governed by a multitude of interactions that require a closer look at the variegated interactions through any kind of events and their impact on the professional and social lives of coworkers.

References
➢ Avdikos, V., & Papageorgiou, A. (2022). Public support for collaborative workspace: Dispersed help to a place-based phenomenon? *Local Economy*, *0*(0), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/02690942221074941
➢ Avdikos, V., Gaitanidis, L., Kalogeresis, Ath., Kostopoulou, E, Merkel, J., Michailidou, M., Papageorgiou, A., Pettas, D., Tselepi, N. (2022) *Policy Brief 1. Coworking trends in Athens and the impact on the city*, UrbanCoWork Project, Athens
➢ Bahr, U., Biemann, J., Lietzau, J., & Hentschel, P. (2021). *Rural Coworking: People, Models, Trends* [Bertelsmann Stiftung]. CoWorkLand.
➢ Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A., & Maskell, P. (2004). Clusters and knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in human geography*, *28*(1), 31-56.
➢ Bathelt, H. (2006). Geographies of production: growth regimes in spatial perspective 3- toward a relational view of economic action and policy. *Progress in human geography*, *30*(2), 223-236.
➢ Bathelt, H., & Schuldt, N. (2010). International trade fairs and global buzz, Part I: Ecology of global buzz. *European Planning Studies*, *18*(12), 1957-1974.
➢ Blagoev, B., Costas, J., & Karreman, D. (2019). 'We are all herd animals': Community and organizationality in coworking spaces. *Organization*, *26*(6), 894–916.
➢ Bouncken, R. B., Laudien M., S. M., Fredrich, V., & Gormar, L. (2018). Coopetition in coworking-spaces: Value creation and appropriation tensions in an entrepreneurial space. *Rev Manag Sci*, *12*, 385–410.
➢ Bouncken, R. B., & Reuschl, A. J. (2018). Coworking-spaces: How a phenomenon of the sharing economy builds a novel trend for the workplace and for entrepreneurship. *Rev Manag Sci*, *12*, 317–334.

➢ Brown, J. (2017). Curating the 'Third Place'? Coworking and the mediation of creativity. *Geoforum*, *82*, 112–126.

➢ Capdevila, I. (2013). *Knowledge Dynamics in Localized Communities: Coworking Spaces as Microclusters*. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2414121

➢ Gandini, A. (2016). *The Reputation Economy: Understanding Knowledge Work in Digital Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.

➢ Garrett, L., Spreitzer M., G., & Peter A., B. (2017). Co-constructing a Sense of Community at Work: The Emergence of Community in Coworking spaces. *Organization Studies*, *38*(6), 821–842.

➢ Growe, A. (2019). Buzz at workplaces in knowledge-intensive service production: Spatial settings of temporary spatial proximity. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, *26*(4), 434-448.

➢ Lampel, J., & Meyer, A. D. (2008). Field-configuring events as structuring mechanisms: How conferences, ceremonies, and trade shows constitute new technologies, industries, and markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(6), 1025-1035.

➢ Lange, B. (2011a). Professionalization in space: Social-spatial strategies of culturepreneurs in Berlin. *Entrepreneurship and regional development*, *23*(3-4), 259-279.

➢ Lange, B. (2011b). Re-scaling governance in Berlin's creative economy. *Culture Unbound*, *3*(2), 187-208.

➢ Lange, B., Power, D., & Suwala, L. (2014). Geographies of field-configuring events. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, *58*(4), 187-201.

➢ Lavanga, M., Loots, E., Konomi, A., Avdikos, V., & Iliopoulou, E. (2020). Creative entrepreneurship and urban space: Exploring the location preferences of creative professionals in Athens during the economic recession. *Greek Review of Social Research*, *2020*(153), 5-36.

➢ Marchegiani, L., & Arcese, G. (2018). Collaborative Spaces and Coworking as Hybrid Workspaces: Friends or Foes of Learning and Innovation? In P. Boccardelli, M. C. Annosi, F. Brunetta, & M. Magnusson (Eds.), *Learning and Innovation in Hybrid Organizations: Strategic and Organizational Insights* (pp. 51–71). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62467-9_4

➢ Maskell, P., Bathelt, H., & Malmberg, A. (2006). Building global knowledge pipelines: The role of temporary clusters. *European planning studies*, *14*(8), 997-1013.

➢ Merkel, J. (2015). Coworking in the city. *Ephemera*, *15*(1), 121–139.

➢ Merkel, J. (2019). Curating Strangers. In R. Gill, A. C. Pratt, & T. Virani (Eds.), *Creative Hubs in Question* (1st ed., pp. 51–68). Palgrave Macmillan.

➢ Mitea, D. R. E. (2018). The Expansion of Digitally Mediated Labor: Platform-Based Economy, Technology-Driven Shifts in Employment, and the Novel Modes of Service Work. *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics*, *6*(4), 7–13.

➢ Nakano, D., Shiach, M., Koria, M., Vasques, R., Gomes dos Santos, E., & Virani, T. (2020). Coworking spaces in urban settings: Prospective roles? *Geoforum*, *115*, 135–137.

➢ Nonaka I, Toyama R, Konno N, 2000, "SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation" *Long Range Planning* **33** 5-34

➢ Parrino, L. (2015). Coworking: Assessing the role of proximity in knowledge exchange. *Operational Research Society Ltd.*, *13*, 261–271.

➢ Power, D., & Jansson, J. (2008). Cyclical clusters in global circuits: Overlapping spaces in furniture trade fairs. *Economic Geography*, *84*(4), 423-448.

➢ Schuldt, N., & Bathelt, H. (2011). International trade fairs and global buzz. Part II: Practices of global buzz. *European Planning Studies*, *19*(1), 1-22.

➢ Scott, A. J. (2010). Cultural economy and the creative field of the city. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, 92 (2), pp. 115-130.

➢ Spinuzzi, C., Bodrožić, Z., Scaratti, G., & Ivaldi, S. (2019). "Coworking Is About Community": But What Is "Community" in Coworking? *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 33*(2), 112–140. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651918816357

➢ Storper, M., & Venables, A. J. (2004a). Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy. *Journal of economic geography, 4*(4), 351-370.

➢ Suwala, L. (2012). The Geography of Creativity. *Regional Studies - REG STUD, 46,* 1103–1105. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2012.709739