Guest, Friend, or Colleague? Unpacking Relationship Norms in Collaborative Workplaces

Adèle GRUEN

Laetitia MIMOUN

(authors presented in alphabetical order)

Author Note

Adèle Gruen is a Lecturer at the Institute of Management Studies, Goldsmiths, University of London, 8 Lewisham Way, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, United Kingdom, +44 20 7919 7171, a.gruen@gold.ac.uk. Laetitia Mimoun is a Lecturer at Cass Business School, 106 Bunhill Row, London EC1Y 8TZ, United Kingdom, +44 20 7040 5140, laetitia.mimoun.2@city.ac.uk. The authors are presented in alphabetical order.

Abstract

In this chapter, we study how collaborative workspaces influence work in the sharing economy. We compare two types of shared workspaces, coworking and cohoming, and ask how much "co-" is happening within them. Using ethnographic data, we develop a typology of co-activities within collaborative workplaces and expand on the nature of the activities in each space. We discuss the modes of exchange and the relationships emerging within both collaborative workplaces and show how the structures and norms of cohoming and coworking influence these relationships. Collaborative workplaces are increasingly popular; it is critical to understand how they impact work practices, productivity, and well-being. This chapter advances our conceptualization of workspaces within the sharing economy.

INTRODUCTION

The sharing economy is not restricted to consumption-centered activities such as accommodation (e.g., Airbnb) or transportation (e.g., ZipCar): it also affects how and where we work. Coworking spaces are an example of collaborative, access-based workplaces. Their number is fast growing, reaching over 13 000 spaces worldwide in 2017 (Deskmag 2017). In the U.S. and EU-15[1], between 20 and 30 percent of the working-age population works on flexible and independent jobs (McKinsey & Co 2016). Digital platforms such as Upwork (freelancing) or Etsy (craft ecommerce) accelerate this trend by offering large scale gig work opportunities. Collaborative workplaces answer the need of flexible workers for a place to work and socialize (Gandini 2015). These places signal creativity, innovation, and community and aim to free workers from traditional offices' constraints (Gandini 2015; Spinuzzi 2012). However, the name "collaborative" implies joint work, which enters in contradiction with the access-based model of these places where gig workers typically work on separate projects. Moreover, gig work has been criticized for being exploitative and illegal as companies deprived workers from all the employee associated benefits (Eisenbrey and Mishel 2016; Schor and Attwood-Charles 2017).

This chapter questions the legitimacy of the 'co-' designation and interrogates the nature of the exchanges and relationships occurring in different types of collaborative workplaces. We carried out ethnographic fieldwork in two types of collaborative spaces in Paris and London: coworking and cohoming. While coworking is organized by service providers in usually stable commercial settings, cohoming is organized by individuals in their private homes on a day-to-

[1] The EU-15 includes Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

day basis. Comparing the two spaces' structures, activities, and relationships, we find that cohoming does not foster deep relationships (i.e., strong links, intimacy, rich interactions) despite its embeddedness in the sphere of home and hospitality. Surprisingly, deep relationships emerge frequently in coworking, a more market-based workplace. While there has been an increasing interest in collaborative workplaces, existing research has tended to treat them as a homogeneous phenomenon, assuming collaboration and strong networks to be common within such places. We contribute to the existing literature on the sharing economy by clarifying the exchange and relationship dynamics which exist within different types of collaborative workplaces.

In the following chapter, we first review prior knowledge differentiating collaborative workplaces from traditional offices and compare market and social exchanges. Next, we introduce the cohoming and coworking contexts and present our methodology. Finally, we report our findings and discuss their implications for understanding work within the sharing economy.

Collaborative Workplaces

Work and work practices in the gig economy are more flexible and fluid than in the "traditional" economy. Organizations, often (digital) platforms, connect clients and consumers to freelance workers (Langley and Leyshon 2017), who rely on project-based and gig work (Friedman 2014) for income. Entrepreneurs and freelancers embrace flexible working conditions, taking advantage of their cultural capital and reputation to find short-term, project-based jobs (Gandini 2016). New ways of working often hide low-paid, sometimes illegal jobs that lack social security (Eisenbrey and Mishel 2016; Schor and Attwood-Charles 2017), despite a

celebratory discourse around entrepreneurship (for instance when the French president expressed his dream of France becoming a “start-up nation”).

Collaborative spaces are access-based workplaces used by entrepreneurs, freelancers, start-uppers, and, more recently, by larger organizations (RGCS 2017) as an alternative to renting offices and signing constraining long-term leases. They use the prefix co- to emphasize the social connections they provide. Co- comes from the Latin *cum* (with), which indicates an idea of support (Gaffiot 2000) and joined activity (Collins 1979/2012): collaborative means *co-labor*, working with. According to this view, consumers of collaborative spaces would not merely seek a place to work, but a place to *work with* others. Yet, users seem to seek the company of other independent workers: the top three motivations to join a collaborative space are “a social and enjoyable atmosphere,” (59% of users) “interactions with others,” (56%) and “a community” (55%) (Deskmag 2017). These spaces lessen the isolation of independent workers (King 2017), providing them with a sense of community and blurring the boundaries between work and home and between colleagues and friends (Merkel 2015). Collaborative spaces are usually designed in such a way as to facilitate social interactions (Gruen 2017). Yet, these are spaces where individuals work “alone, together” (Spinuzzi 2012): the comma emphasizes the divide between the will of being with others and the nature of independent work.

There is a plethora of collaborative spaces, such as coworking spaces, fablabs, makerspaces, cohomings, hackspaces, and colivings, which differ in their offering, location, and goals. In coworking, consumers (usually) pay a monthly fee and are provided with desks and office facilities (printers, coffee, etc.). Coworking spaces motivate their members to interact and provide a fertile ground for serendipitous connections (Moriset 2013). In cohoming, a homeowner opens her/his home to independent workers who, in exchange for a small fee, use it

as a workplace. Users are given a seat at the owner's table and access to basic amenities (i.e., electricity, Wi-Fi, coffee/tea, and bathroom/kitchen facilities). Cohoming is a rising phenomenon, with 8000 cohomers registered on Cohome in France[2] and recent platforms opening worldwide, such as Kitchin Table[3]. The cohoming movement emerged in France as a critique of coworking and was launched by independent workers who found coworking spaces expensive and overly commercial. They decided to open their homes to organize "pop-up" (i.e., temporary and somewhat spontaneous) collaborative spaces on a day-to-day basis. They did not want to bear the cost of coworking and needed an alternative to working alone at home. From these pop-up experiments arose a more structured organization.

The Dynamics of Market Versus Social Exchange

Prior literature on the sharing economy distinguishes market-mediated access-based consumption –a form of economic exchange embedded in utilitarian motivations and market norms– from non-market-mediated access-based consumption (or sharing, Belk 2010) –which is "embedded in social relationships and governed by community norms" (Eckhardt and Bardhi 2016, 221). In practice, the logics at play in the sharing economy are often overlapping and confusing, creating misunderstanding and conflicts among market actors (Arcidiacono, Gandini, and Pais 2018). The coexistence of contradictory market logics (dictated by profit-making and capitalism) and non-market logics (underlined by idealism and altruism) maintains the field's

[2] Reported on Cohome website in September 2017.
[3] https://www.kitchintable.com/, consulted on September 6th, 2018

flexibility, its fluid boundaries, and its inclusiveness to varied actors (Arvidsson 2018; Laurell and Sandström 2017).

Two other chapters within the present handbook also contribute to our understanding of how such paradoxical interactions of market and social logics shape the sharing economy. First, von Richtoven and Fischer explore how Airbnb manages to navigate the logics of competition and profitability while preserving the framing of hominess and hospitality. In a related conversation, Dalli and Fortezza illuminate the overlap of market and social exchange logics within online barter communities. Barter users motivated by the maximization of economic value intermingle with users inspired by norms of kindness and trust.

Actors of the sharing economy legitimate their choice of an alternative to classical market exchange by deploying discourses and motives embedded in the logics of social exchange (Arvidsson 2018). For instance, Ouishare, a sharing economy think-tank, epitomizes this approach in their mission statement: "Our mission is to build and nurture a collaborative society by connecting people, organizations and ideas around fairness, openness and trust"[4]. Behind this celebratory and idealistic discourse, instrumental motives are widespread among actors of the sharing economy. For instance, Zipcar's consumers seem to be driven by instrumental rationality and self-interest, rather than ideological beliefs (Bardhi and Eckhardt 2012). Eckhardt and Bardhi (2016) argue that the sharing economy might foster a "commodification of time and space," leading to a sense of alienation rather than of community. The sharing economy is increasingly becoming an arena of economic competition for companies in search of maximum profitability (Martin 2016). It has also been a source of polemics, protests, and lawsuits from

[4] https://www.ouishare.net/our-dna, consulted on April 18, 2018.

critics who believe that the sharing economy growth mostly relies on its lack of regulation and taxation (Hill 2015).

To summarize, sharing economy exchanges generally include a price (money, time, or data) despite being framed as a space for collaboration and social exchange. This contradiction is a source of heated political debates and misalignments among consumers and marketers. This chapter contributes to this discussion by showing how collaborative workplaces operationalize these contradicting logics and the implications this has on work practices.

METHOD

To answer our research question, we relied primarily on ethnographic fieldwork in cohoming and coworking spaces in Paris (France) and London (UK), where collaborative spaces are numerous, varied, and well-attended. We followed established ethnography guidelines in the field (Arnould and Price 1993; Arnould and Wallendorf 1994). Data collection extended between January 2015 and January 2018, with each researcher focusing on one type of collaborative space. We engaged in prolonged participant observation, documented with fieldnotes, interviews with users and managers, and photographs, respectively in 3 coworking spaces in Paris and 5 in London, as well as in 8 cohoming homes in Paris. This number allowed for a diversity of workplaces to be observed and for saturation to be reached. Access was gained through social media and personal connections. The researchers' identity was disclosed to participants. Overall, we collected 530 photographs and 172 double-spaced pages of fieldnotes. During observations, we paid attention to how work took place around us (recorded any meetings, phone calls,

business chitchat) as well as personal interactions and intimate connections (disclosure of personal information, non-work activities and discussion, activities outside of the workspace).

This dataset was complemented by social media and mainstream press data. Netnographic data from the social media communities surrounding our field sites (Facebook pages, YouTube channels, Twitter accounts of both cohoming and coworking communities) helped acquire a complete view of the sociocultural interactions occurring. We collected newsletters from both collaborative spaces, as well as newspaper and blog articles discussing collaborative spaces from French and British mainstream and specialized press (n=124). We used these articles to contextualize collaborative workplaces in marketplace and media discourses. We also familiarized ourselves with emic language and practices, thus enhancing our ability to relate to participants and to interpret their behavior and discourse. Interviews and media data helped the researchers overcome the problematic tendency to focus on what is easiest to observe.

The dataset was analyzed using the interpretive hermeneutical approach (Thompson 1997). We iteratively moved between the data, the literature, and our emerging framework to develop our interpretation (Miles and Huberman 1994; Spiggle 1994). As co-authors, we were both deeply involved in the data analysis. We came together to compare the two types of collaborative workplaces, informed by an initial individual analysis of our respective sites. We focused on structures (e.g., space design, organizational structures), relationships (e.g., host-guest, customers-company, guest-guest relationships), and activities (e.g., routines, disruptions) within the collaborative spaces. Through brainstorming and discussion, we iteratively developed an architecture of collaborative workplaces. As our research question focuses on the notion of

co-, we classified activities based on the amount of co- involved, designing a typology of co-activities.

FINDINGS

Our findings are divided into two parts and summarized at the end in Table 1. First, we develop a typology of co- activities within collaborative workplaces and expand on the nature of the work and leisure activities in each space. Next, we discuss the modes of exchange and the relationships emerging in both collaborative workplaces and show how the structures and norms of cohoming and coworking influence these relationships.

The Co- Spectrum of Activities

We derived a spectrum of co- activities from our analysis of workers' consumption and work practices in collaborative workplaces (Figure 1). Unlike in traditional offices, such co-activities take place between individuals who chose to share the same workplace but do not work for the same company. We classify activities into three categories: "beside" (carrying separate activities next to each other), "with or without" (can be carried out with others, but it is not a necessary condition) and "necessarily together" (must be carried out with others). Not all activities involving some co- are defined as collaborative. From the definition of collaboration as "the cooperative way that two or more entities work together toward a shared goal" (Frey, et al. 2006, 384), we identify collaboration in collaborative workplaces as "necessarily together" activities involving work.

Figure 1: The Co- Spectrum of Activities

In cohoming and coworking, we found the main "beside" activity to be similar: working on a laptop. It is a priority for collaborative workplaces to preserve productivity by giving users the possibility to focus on their own work without being distracted by others. Damini (early-thirties, freelanced wedding-planner) for example reviews: "Great cohoming with Thomas! A productive day punctuated by some very pleasant breaks" (netnographic data). Moreover, the coffee breaks are "with or without" activity in both collaborative workplaces. Chatting next to the coffee machine is a good way to meet other coworkers and hot desk neighbors (fieldnotes). In cohoming, sharing the break with others is optional. Yet, because the host suggests it, most cohomers will abandon their computers to share a hot drink or a snack.

There are striking differences between the two workplaces in terms of co- activities. Activities necessarily done with others are the lunch and morning arrival in cohoming and group work and events in coworking. Cohomers' arrival transforms strangers into guests via the introduction-morning-coffee ritual. Claude, a thirty-something cohomer, likes "not to be alone at home, to be able to share moments, especially at lunch and [in] the morning when people arrive, when we exchange a bit about our lives" (interview). Lunch is also compulsory: it requires the

host's impetus since cohoming occurs at his/her home. All cohomers are expected to share this moment of exchange and conviviality. Skipping lunch is frowned upon. It may happen, but advance notice and apologies are expected. On the opposite, lunch is a "with or without" activity in coworking: there is no obligation to join anyone for lunch. The most co- activities in cohoming are thus related to hospitality. These are activities where cohomers fall back in their respective roles of hosts and guests, sharing the conviviality of someone's intimate residence.

Group work and events are the main "necessarily together" activities in coworking. Work-related group activities encompass meetings and brainstorms, where sometimes coworkers get together to help a fellow coworker solve a challenge. Such (optional) supportive meetings are moments where coworkers are actually *co-working*, that is, working together. Other "necessarily together" co- activities are main events occurring in the auditorium or lobby: to celebrate a member's success, pitch new projects, or advertise new products (Figure 2). Leisure activities comprise of weekly members' breakfasts, drinks, and yoga classes, monthly movies, and occasional events like a "learn-to-make-a-cocktail" workshop (fieldnotes, interviews). Coworkers attend these leisure activities to learn about others' projects, get inspired, and network. These leisure activities, which are legion in coworking, are social but also instrumental:

> Everyone has a drink and it's a nice way to get people to chat. Because it's not always easy to go over and say hi to someone […] Knowing who else is in the building is quite good, just being able to know if there is a company who does this or that, and you never know what's going to happen in the future when you might need that. (Ian, business owner, London, interview).

Non-work activities, like the members' evening drinks, help coworkers know who's who in the space. Later, this information can be used for business purposes. In coworking, activities with the most co- are organized by the managers and directly or indirectly favor work (e.g., Figure 2: an evening party organized both for socialization but also to share entrepreneurial skills). Overall,

we observed that collaboration, that is, necessarily together activities involving work, take place in coworking but not in cohoming, where necessarily together activities involve norms of hospitality.

Figure 2: Organized Social Event, Coworking in Paris (netnographic data)

In this section, we review the types of relationships coworking and cohoming create. We unpack how friendly, hospitable, commercial, and professional relationship norms occur in both workplaces. The types of relationships taking place are heavily influenced by the dynamics of collaboration previously identified and by the workplace structure.

Cohoming Dynamics

In cohoming, hosts and guests work together in the host's living room for the day. This physical and spatial proximity led us to expect high levels of informality and intimacy. The home

is the canonical space for family and intimacy (Rybczynski 1986). Working on a dinner table, chatting with cohomers in the familial kitchen as the host prepares coffee, taking a call in a bedroom: cohoming seems to merge work and life. What struck us is that, despite the informal home setting, the relationships between cohomers remained relatively formal. Both professional and non-professional topics were discussed during breaks, but no intimacy, that is closeness and mutual confiding, seemed to build up.

No friendships developed, but neither were the relationships entirely transactional. Even though cohoming relies on a monetary exchange, the monetary element is perceived as a compensation for utilities rather than a remuneration. The price is low (averaging €4 per day, capped at €9) and rarely mentioned as it is distanced spatially (online, not in the home) and temporally (not during the cohoming session). In this section, we uncover how such an informal setting can lead to formal relationships.

The Role of Structural Elements. A first explanation can be derived from the structural elements which shape cohoming (Table 1). First, cohoming structures are unstable as cohomers meet within random and constantly changing environments. Cohoming structures are highly variable and spontaneous and most cohomers are independent workers with unpredictable schedules.

Moreover, in cohoming, the 9-6 working day is recreated following predetermined hours set by the host. This seemed to limit out-of-work interactions, development of intimacy and personal connections among cohomers. Yet, many participants reflect that such time limits – which might seem inflexible compared to the necessities of flexible work – tend to positively

affect their productivity. This is in contrast with the no-limit time they tend to waste away at home (fieldnotes).

Cohoming relies on an intrusion in private spheres as the home is transformed for a day. The home ceases to be a fully private space dedicated to intimacy and close connections: it welcomes foreigners and outsiders, becoming public by contamination (Figure 3). However, the workspace is turned back into a home at the end of the day and is, therefore, less adapted to the multiplicity of tasks related to entrepreneurship or project-based work. For instance, the living room was the main working space and the host's permission was asked to use bedrooms for phone calls and private moments (fieldnotes, Figure 4). The material organization of the space thus cannot be as flexible and suited to flexible working needs as at coworking. Despite the necessarily together lunch and coffee, the lack of shared leisure space also limits the development of spontaneous social bounds.

Figure 3: Opening the Home as a Workspace, Cohoming in Paris

The Role of Hospitality Norms. Furthermore, the structural elements (i.e., the existence of a host and guests, the monetary elements, the predetermined hours) and the structure of co-

activities (i.e., the necessarily together lunch; the beside work activities) of cohoming foster relationships based on hospitality norms, which are activated despite the latent business/commercial interactions. According to Grayson (1998), when service interactions take place in a home, three forces shape a consensus about which social rules should be deployed: what the marketer wants, what the customers want, and what the social world will allow. At cohoming, the 'real' marketer (the company Cohome) is absent and gives little guidance. Moreover, the home's environment is visible (sofa, kitchen appliances, family pictures, children's toys, etc.). Cohomers appreciate the warm and unique atmosphere produced by a home, which they distinguish from the supposedly contrived and uniform atmosphere of coworking spaces (netnographic notes). They are aware of the 'home' nature of their current work environment and, thus, rely on the social consensus of the home (cf., Grayson 1998).

The importance of the norms of hospitality over social and commercial rules is highly visible in the politeness and permission-asking characteristic of cohomers' interactions. For instance, one of the authors attended a cohoming session hosted by Damini with two other cohomers, Meena (mid-thirties, entrepreneur) and Tabitha (early-forties, freelanced wellness coach). While the three guests did not know each other, they had all already cohomed at least once at Damini's in the previous months. Nevertheless, Damini repeated all the usual invitations and permissions at the beginning of the day (e.g., where to find the bathroom, that the bedroom could be used for a call [Figure 4], etc.). Despite this, Tabitha asked for permission when she had to make a call or when she needed cutlery for lunch. Meena asked: "Your bathroom is there, right?" before using the bathroom (fieldnotes). The cohomers and their host were not interacting as customers who purchased a service from a provider, nor as friends comfortable with each other. Neither were they colleagues or co-workers: as our spectrum shows, no collaboration is

taking place. Rather, Damini remained the host and cared for the guests present in her home. She brought water and poured drinks and offered cookies for the break (fieldnotes). The cohomers remained guests, respecting Damini's control and not taking any initiative (Figure 4). Interestingly, cohomers did not seem bothered by having to ask for permission and being restricted in their use of the space (e.g., predetermined business hours). Conversely, this was perceived as fostering a respectful and familial atmosphere. According to participants, such an atmosphere is lacking from coworking spaces, which they find too "commercial" (netnographic notes, interviews). This homey atmosphere seemed to be an essential reason why cohomers continue to regularly use this type of workplace.

Figure 4: Taking a Professional Call in a Bedroom after Asking Permission, Cohoming in Paris

Despite the increasing commercialization of homes through services like Airbnb (home-based accommodation renting) and Eatwith (home-based restaurant service), the social consensus which naturally emerges in the home is one of hospitality rather than one of business exchange or friendship. Therefore, cohomers are bluntly conscious that the space they are using is not their office, nor *their* workspace. These are not spaces that facilitate flexible work

practices such as the need to create bonds with other independent workers, to conduct group meetings or phone calls, or to have adaptable working hours. Therefore, we expect the feeling of perceived ownership over the workspace to be lower than in coworking, which is more likely to be identified by users as "their" office space. Let's explore why.

Coworking Dynamics

A Home Without Hospitality Norms? Coworking spaces are not primarily governed by rules of hospitality. Rather, they are commercial spaces: coworkers pay a consequent fee (from €180 up to several hundred euros per month) and are customers of the workspace. They often go to the managers, who are salaried employees, to help them with the facilities, to learn about future events, to connect with other members and sometimes to lodge complaints. Interestingly, despite this customer/service provider relationship, we were surprised to see that the dominant discourse of both customers and managers regarding coworking is one of hominess and family (fieldnotes and interviews). Members often talk about managers as the "mums" and "dads" of the space(Merkel 2015). Both managers and members have referred to the coworking space as their homes (fieldnotes), like Mindy, a membership manager in a coworking space in London:

> Well it's like my home. And so I'm cleaning because, you know, I do not want guests to come in the space and see it's a mess. I want them to see it and think it's lovely and nice. And so I think I treat it like my home and I think that everyone who works here feels that way. (Mindy, coworking membership manager, interview)

Mindy refers to the coworking space as her home, believes that members feel the same, and refers to visitors as guests. One global coworking organization's tagline reads: "Welcome home. Oops… We meant welcome to work" (fieldnotes, London).

In addition, coworking spaces are designed to offer many different spaces, which are adapted to the needs of flexible work. This allows for "necessarily together" work (meeting rooms, phonebooths), "beside" work (hotdesking, working booth), "with or without", casual work conversations (large shared desks, sofa corner, library space, kitchen tables), and even "with or without" non-work, purely relaxing and playing activities (napping room, small garden, game room). Wooden materials, dim lights, and sofas are common, creating homeyness (cf., McCracken 1989). Coworkers report feeling at home because they are free to use the space in a flexible way and because they experience a sense of belonging to a community (interviews). As such, the relationships developed between coworking spaces' members, as well as between managers and members, tend to be embedded in intimacy: coworkers disclose personal information, make friends, and tend to see each other outside of the collaborative space (fieldnotes).

Three reasons seem to explain this. First, friendships develop during the numerous occasions when members can meet other members, do activities together, and help each other. The various leisure (e.g., yoga classes, creative workshops) and work (e.g., brainstorms, pitching days) "necessarily together" activities to which coworkers participate on a daily basis create a fun, informal atmosphere and foster interactions (fieldnotes). This is promoted by staff members who encourage collective routines, like weekly breakfasts (fieldnotes). Further, the extended working hours, often including 24/7 access, allow for more flexibility and encourage further social interactions (sharing late dinner, etc.). All these elements and co-activities create friendships or close bonds between coworkers. Coworking users explain how this flexibility contributes to their feeling that coworking has a dual functionality, part workspace, part living

quarters where coworkers organize parties and have casual drinks in the evening (user interviews).

The second reason that explains such high levels of informality in coworking is that coworkers, who are often start-uppers or freelancers, are eager to connect with other members to expand their professional network (Wittel 2001). Coworking organizations promote connections between members, often introducing potential business partners together and putting special networking events in place (fieldnotes and manager interviews).

Temporality appears to be the third reason why the bonds are more intimate than in cohoming. In coworking, members spend their days working side-by-side, sometimes together, in the same space. The staff and regular coworkers provide a core of users who engage in frequent, repeated interactions in the same physical space. As they work beside one another, they are not, like in cohoming, strangers in a public library. They chat, joke, and have a drink together. Many times, we encountered coworkers who were also flatmates or who went on holidays together. In most cases observed, there seem to be a deeper bond between coworking members than between cohomers. Of course, this does not hold for all coworkers, as some may only come to the coworking space for a day or a week.

Table 1: Comparing Coworking and Cohoming

	COWORKING	**COHOMING**
ACTIVITIES		
Work	Majority of work: Beside Group work and events: Necessarily together	Beside

Breaks and lunch	With or without	Breaks: With or without Lunch: Necessarily together
Social activities	Necessarily together	Limited
STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS		
Staff	Present; involved guidance	At-distance; lax guidance
Working hours	Up to 24/7; flexible	Business hours; predetermined
Material organization	Strategic, somewhat stable, and homey design	Variable and unpredictable design
Payment system	Daily or monthly; high fee (several hundred euros/pounds monthly)	Minimized; compensation (€3-9/day)
RELATIONSHIPS		
Hospitality	Only in discourse: not a home	Real home: hospitality norms
Friendship	Frequent friendships	Rarely beyond acquaintances
Commercial	Explicit service provider	Implicit service exchange
Professional	Moderate: support, help, and social networking	Minimal: not beyond some social networking

CONCLUSION

To sum up, coworking tends to foster more intimate, informal relationships thanks to organized “necessarily together” co- activities, which lead to friendships (co- leisure activities) and professional relationships (collaboration). These social relationships are embedded in

discourses on community, family and hominess. Cohoming fosters hospitality rules where the user is a guest in the host's home, as represented by the "necessarily together" lunch which is orchestrated by the host. Work relationships are more comparable to that of strangers or library users and restricted to "beside" activities. Thus, coworking, which is closer to an office in its nature, is more favorable to collaboration (i.e., "necessarily together" work activities) than cohoming. Cohoming, even if it opens the intimacy of the home and its associated hospitality and friendship norms, seems to be often restrained to more impersonal and formal relationships. The instability of the group and the unpredictability of cohoming, which is constantly redefined and reorganized at each cohoming session, seem to prevent the development of intimacy. It should be noted that coworkers and cohomers are generally satisfied with their respective workplace, finding the rigidity/flexibility of the experience to suit their needs.

We find that non-market logics do not always facilitate non-commercial and intimate relationships and collaborative activities. Counterintuitively, our data reveal that coworking, which resides further in the commercial sphere from a structural viewpoint, enables much more social-exchange relationships and friendships than cohoming, even if the latter is structurally inscribed in the spheres of intimacy and socialization. We observe that, in the absence of explicit norms, consumers in the sharing economy do not necessarily abide by the prototypical familial norms (cf., Belk 2010), but rather, in this case, on the much stricter norms of hospitality. It appears that hospitality rules, which dominate in the home, rigidify and constrain the social and work interactions taking place in cohoming. Therefore, friendships and "necessarily together" work activities rarely emerge in cohoming, which lacks the purposefulness and involvement of coworking's structural elements.

Collaborative workplaces often brand themselves with reference to a variety of alternative spheres, including the home, the family, and the playground, as they strive to differentiate from traditional offices and contractual exchanges. Our findings indicate that collaborative workplaces' managers must be careful in their structural and branding choices when using the home's imagery, as fostering hospitality and guest/host relationships might be counterproductive when collaborative work and social exchange are desired.

Moreover, our comparison of collaborative spaces reinforces the idea that very little co-labor (that is, co-work) happens in such workplaces (Spinuzzi 2012). These findings challenge the use of the label co- and the image it sends to users of collaborative spaces. In fact, accounting only for the amount of collaborative work, it is likely that traditional offices, where members of the same company work and mingle, are more collaborative. Nevertheless, co- workplaces are also collaborative in that they foster the blurring of boundaries between work and leisure, friends and colleagues, and production and consumption. We focused our study on commercial coworking spaces and cohoming, but other spaces, such as community centers and some hackerspaces, could be an avenue for future research as they might display higher levels of collaboration. Coworking and cohoming are labelled as co- because, at least for a day, strangers share a lunch and a workspace and work/consume together. The structural elements and the norms they foster encourage a form of intimacy and a type of social exchange which the independent workers of the gig economy otherwise miss. Consequently, collaborative workplaces have a degree of legitimacy in their co- labels and can benefit consumers' wellbeing in reducing the isolation and loneliness otherwise associated with such lifestyles (Petriglieri, Ashford and Wrzesniewski 2018).

REFERENCES

Arcidiacono, Davide, Alessandro Gandini, and Ivana Pais (2018), "Sharing What? The 'Sharing Economy' in the Sociological Debate," *The Sociological Review*, 66(2), 275–288.

Arnould, Eric J., and Melanie Wallendorf (1994), "Market-Oriented Ethnography: Interpretation Building and Marketing Strategy Formulation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4(Nov.), 484-504.

Arnould, Eric J., and Linda M. Price (1993), "River Magic: Extraordinary Experience and the Extended Service Encounter," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(1), 24-45.

Arvidsson, Adam (2018), "Value and Virtue in the Sharing Economy," *The Sociological Review*, 66(2), 289–301.

Bardhi, Fleura, and Giana M. Eckhardt (2012), "Access-Based Consumption," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(4), 881–98.

Belk, Russell W. (2010), "Sharing," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 715–734.

Collins, Williams (1979/2012), *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged*, Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Dalli, Daniele, and Fulvio Fortezza (2019), "From Market to Social Exchange Through Recirculation Markets. The Case of an Online Barter Community," in: Belk, Russell, Giana Eckhardt, and Fleura Bardhi (ed.), *Handbook of the Sharing Economy*.

Deskmag (2017), *The 2017 Global Coworking Survey*, available at: http://www.deskmag.com/en/background-of-the-2017-global-coworking-survey.

Eckhardt, Giana M., and Fleura Bardhi (2016), "The Relationship between Access Practices and Economic Systems," *Journal of the Association of Consumer Research*, 1(2), 210–25.

Eisenbrey, Ross, and Lawrence Mishel (2016), "Uber Business Model Does not Justify a new "Independent Worker Category," Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, http://www.epi.org/publication/uber-businessmodel-does-not-justify-a-new-independent-worker-category.

Frey, Bruce B., Jill H. Lohmeier, Stephen W. Lee, and Nona Tollefson (2006), "Measuring Collaboration Among Grant Partners," *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(3), 383-392.

Friedman, Gerald (2014), "Workers Without Employers: Shadow Corporations and the Rise of the Gigeconomy," *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 2(2), 171–88.

Gaffiot, Félix (2000), *Le Gaffiot Dictionnaire Latin-Français: Nouvelle Edition*, Paris: Hachette.

Gandini, Alessandro (2015), "The Rise of Coworking Spaces: A Literature Review," *Ephemera,* 15(1), 193.

Grayson, Kent (1998), "Commercial Activity at Home: Managing the Private Servicescape," in: John F. Sherry, Jr. (ed.), *Servicescapes: The Concept of Place in Contemporary Market*s, Chicago: NTC Business Books, 455–481.

Gruen, Adèle (2017), *Understanding Consumer Appropriation in Access-Based Consumption as the Creation of Meanings: An Investigation Through Design*, Doctoral dissertation, Paris Sciences et Lettres.

Hill, Steven (2015), *Raw Deal: How the "Uber Economy" and Runaway Capitalism Are Screwing American Workers*, New York: St. Martin's Press

King, Steve (2017), "Coworking is not About Workspace — It's About Feeling Less Lonely," *Harvard Business Review*, December 28, available at: https://hbr.org/2017/12/coworking-is-not-about-workspace-its-about-feeling-less-lonely.

Langley, Paul, and Andrew Leyshon (2017), "Platform Capitalism: The Intermediation and Capitalisation of Digital Economic Circulation," *Finance and Society., 3*(1), 11–31.

Laurell, Christofer, and Christian Sandström (2017), "The Sharing Economy in Social Media: Analyzing Tensions Between Market and Non-Market Logics," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 125, 58–65.

Martin, Chris J. (2016), "The Sharing Economy: A Pathway to Sustainability or a Nightmarish Form of Neoliberal Capitalism?" *Ecological Economics*, 121, 149–59.

McCracken, Grant (1989), ""Homeyness" a Cultural Account of one Constellation of Consumer Goods and Meanings," in *SV - Interpretive Consumer Research*, eds. Elizabeth C. Hirschman, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 168-183.

McKinsey & Co (2016), *Independent Work: Choice, Necessity, and the Gig Economy*, New York: McKinsey Global Institute.

Merkel, Janet (2015), "Coworking in the City," *Ephemera*, 15(1), 121.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Moriset, Bruno (2013), "Building New Places of the Creative Economy: The Rise of Coworking Spaces," *2nd Geography of Innovation International Conference*.

Petriglieri, Gianpiero, Susan J. Ashford, and Amy Wrzesniewski (2018), "Agony and Ecstasy in the Gig Economy: Cultivating Holding Environments for Precarious and Personalized Work Identities," *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*.

RGCS (Research Group on Collaborative Spaces) (2017), "Coworkers, Makers and Hackers in the City: Reinventing Policies, Corporate Strategies and Citizenship?" White Paper.

Rybczynski, Witold (1986), *Home: A Short Hof an Idea* (Vol. 10), New York: Viking.

Schor, Juliet B., and William Attwood-Charles (2017), "The "Sharing" Economy: Labor, Inequality, and Social Connection on For-Profit Platforms," *Sociology Compass*, 11(8).

Spiggle, Susan (1994), "Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(3), 491–503.

Spinuzzi, Clay (2012), "Working Alone Together: Coworking as Emergent Collaborative Activity," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(4), 399–441.

Thompson, Craig J. (1997), "Interpreting Consumers: A Hermeneutical Framework for Deriving Marketing Insights from the Texts of Consumers' Consumption Stories," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 438–455.

von Richtoven, Georg, and Eileen Fischer (2019), "Airbnb and the Attempt to Hybridize Logics of Commerce and Domestic Hospitality," in: Belk, Russell, Giana Eckhardt, and Fleura Bardhi (ed.), *Handbook of the Sharing Economy*.

Wittel, Andreas (2001), "Toward a Network Sociality," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(6), 51–76.