

Coworking vs Corpoworking: Realistic Perspective



Monika Golonka

Abstract The number of freelancers and self-employed has risen steadily. These individuals can use a range of coworking spaces in which they can work, use shared facilities, and collaborate. A number of studies explored coworking and its rapid expansion from various perspectives. However, most studies use coworking and corpoworking interchangeably. The purpose of this paper is to understand various types of coworking and corpoworking practices and to clarify differences between them by considering realistic intellectual tradition, especially Aristotelian discoveries on a human nature. This study also explains the origins of corpoworking, based on analysis of the existing literature, and shows meaning of aim in both individual and organizational work, by incorporating the examples from entrepreneurial and organizational practice. The findings provide a foundation for future works as well as might inspire entrepreneurs, freelancers, employees, and managers.

Keywords Coworking · Corpoworking · Realistic intellectual tradition · Personal agency · Creative work

Introduction

With the growing number of freelancers and solo self-employed (e.g., Boeri et al. 2020), as well as practices of working and cooperating like coworking spaces and flexible working spaces, the literature studies on this topic have become increasingly common in recent years.

Coworking has been analyzed from the perspective of economy (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte and Isaac 2016; Clifton et al. 2019; Mayerhoffer 2020), sociology (Tanaka et al. 2017; Bandinelli 2020; Spinuzzi et al. 2019), psychology (Gerdenitsch et al. 2016; Robelski et al. 2019), organization (Gandini 2015; Garrett et al. 2017; Blagoev et al. 2019; Gandini and Cossu 2019), as well as knowledge and learning (Parrino 2015; Butcher 2018), innovation (Cabral and van Winden 2016; Bouncken

M. Golonka (✉)

Management Department, Kozminski University, Warsaw, Poland

e-mail: monikagolonka@kozminski.edu.pl

et al. 2020), productivity (Bueno et al. 2018; Bouncken and Reuschl 2016), urban architecture (Merkel 2015; Grazian 2019), and real estate (Green 2014; Yang et al. 2019; Zhou 2019).

In several papers, the term *coworking* has been used to describe both the working practice of independent individuals, especially sole entrepreneurs, and the *corpoworking* (collaboration of employees within company office spaces offered by the companies or institutions to their employees and freelancers, etc.).

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the idea and practice of coworking as well as corpoworking in the light of realistic intellectual tradition. Realistic perspective allows to recognize and to explain the differences between coworking and corpoworking. It also helps to clarify the distinction between these two. This is to be achieved by considering the major discoveries of realistic philosophers on the human nature.

Based on the real-life examples from organizational and entrepreneurial practice, issues such as personal agency in man's cognitive and creative work, as well as meaning of an aim, and community in organizing and cooperating are explained.

In this theoretical, explanatory work, analysis of the relevant literature is incorporated. The analysis consists of three elements. First is the analysis of recent studies on corpoworking, and corpoworking, namely, peer-reviewed academic journal articles available in the scientific databases.¹ The articles were selected using keywords, *coworking* and *corpoworking*, and categorized by the disciplines (economy, sociology, etc.). Second is the analysis of origins of the concepts, based on the archival papers derived from the very first journal on management, *Harvard Business Review* (from 1921 onward). The papers were selected by keywords, defined after the initial analysis of titles and abstracts.² The final pool (903 articles) consists of all of the papers concerning people in organizations. The articles were categorized by decades (the 1920s, 1930s, etc.). The major part of the analysis consists of the papers published in 1921–1950, describing the very first ideas on managing the relationships between managers and employees. Third, the research covers analysis of both the coworking and corpoworking from realistic perspective, incorporating discoveries of philosophers, especially Aristotle, on the human nature.

In the first part of this paper, the term coworking is explained based on literature as well as management and entrepreneurship practice. In the next part, explanation of the origins of ideas related to corpoworking is provided. In the third part, from the perspective of realistic intellectual tradition is explained, and from that point, the distinguished types of coworking are explained. Finally, the conclusions are drawn based on the research results, and issues requiring future research are indicated. Both researchers and entrepreneurs might find this study inspiring for their further works.

¹EBSCO, HeinOnline, ProQuest, SAGE, ScienceDirect, Springer, Wiley-Blackwell.

²E.g. *manager, leadership, supervisor, employee, worker, foreman, psychology, staff, team.*

What Does *Coworking* Mean?

The term coworking is used for a certain type of physical spaces. “Coworking spaces are workplaces shared by workers who are not members of the same organisation” (Bueno et al. 2018, p. 452, see also Gerdenitsch et al. 2016; Šviráková et al. 2015; Jylhä et al. 2015; Pohler 2012; Spinuzzi 2012, 2015).

As a Physical Space (Shared Workspaces)

Usually in such a space, working infrastructure is offered to the customers (desk, Internet connection, Wi-Fi, physical address of a firm, conference rooms, conference and business meetings facilities, IT equipment etc.). One of the first among such spaces was “c-Base,” launched by a dozen of IT engineers in the 1990s in Germany (hackerspace c-Base). C-Base was from its very beginning a nonprofit venture ran by volunteers associated for the purpose of making computers available for anyone interested in the IT. Similarly, just like on other similar spaces (e.g., Metalab in Austria), operating expenses were paid by members—daily, weekly, monthly fee. Hackerspaces are open to any, mostly independent entrepreneurs, IT professionals, as well as nerds and computer/digital enthusiasts.

Another version of these spaces is places ran and operated by entrepreneurs offering similar facilities in the majority of largest cities around the world. Usually, the customers of such spaces are freelancers and sole entrepreneurs, especially IT professionals, architects, designers, and artists.

Coworking as a Way of Working (and Cooperating)

The term coworking has also been used to describe a way of working. DeKoven (2013) proposed that coworking may also mean people working together as equals but working on their own projects, pursuing their own separate business interests, and often using technology to support collaborative work. This is also the way it is described by Castilho and Quandt (2017), Blagoev et al. (2019), Spinuzzi et al. (2019), Garrett et al. (2017), and Spinuzzi (2012, 2015).

Such working practice is possible in most companies offering coworking spaces to their individual customers (sole entrepreneurs, freelancers, artists, designers, etc.) in numerous cities. Individuals might work on their own projects or customers’ orders while cooperating with other individuals on realizing particular aim if needed. As DeKoven (2013) described, in coworking, people are free to help each other, and as a result, he noted that they show “surprisingly often, deeply shared fun” (ibidem, p.1).

It should be noted, however, that in some coworking spaces, the owners have an ambition to *build a community* of individuals where people work on a regular basis.

Coworking as Community

One of the first “collective workplaces” was created by Neuberg (2005) in San Francisco. “He wanted to find a way to combine the feeling of independence and freedom of working by himself with the community feel and structure of working with others” (DiRiso 2019, p.1). Another example is “Schraubefabrik” operated by Stefan Leitner-Sidl and Michael Pöll Gründer in Vienna who introduced their place, as it might be seen on Schraubefabrik’ website, as “a place where we could meet like-minded people who not only wanted to be entrepreneurial, but also wanted to live comfortably.” Entrepreneurs aiming in building such “community” offer working spaces equipped with additional facilities (e.g., possibility to prepare/eat meals, rest, and organize various workshops) in order to distinguish this kind of coworking spaces aiming at developing community.

Furthermore, the term coworking is being used to describe places available for both employees and independent individuals offered by existing organizations.

Coworking as Corpworking

Corpworking covers coworking initiatives within an organization (Dardori 2018; Keogh 2019). Numerous contemporary organizations, especially large high-tech companies, offer flexible working conditions to their employees, potential employees, and other individuals (freelancers, start-ups, newbie enterprises), mostly potential employees or collaborators. Also, in this group, the technology parks, technology campuses, hubs, or various types of science parks (often in cooperation with universities and institutions like city councils, etc., e.g., Lindholmen in Sweden,³ Google campuses in number of countries, etc.⁴) might be considered here as well as coworking-like spaces in the offices offered by the companies for their employees.

The major purpose of creating such working environments is *enhancing innovation* (e.g., Cabral and van Winden 2016) as well as *increasing productivity* (e.g., Bueno et al. 2018), sometimes through enhancing *digital transformation* (Josef 2017).

One of the first attempts to create the environment for entrepreneurial creative work in order to *boost innovation* inside a large company was the “stress incubator”

³ See, e.g., Lindholmen in Sweden (Innovative Power for Sweden).

⁴ The company signed lease with IWG company, a large serviced office provider (including coworking and flexible working spaces), to establish their new offices in Toronto (Wong 2019).

ran by IT engineer Lars Rasmussen in Google during the early 2000s. The idea of this particular venture was to “recreate the situation” (Sutter 2009) from previous years, when he was still an independent entrepreneur working together with his brother and two other engineers on an application for Internet users—Maps online. Their enterprise, Where2 Technologies, was acquired by Google, and in this way, Google Maps was introduced by Google to users. Lars became one of Google’s employees. He himself explained the decision to join Google in these words: “Of all the investors and companies we had talked to, Google was the only place seemingly disinterested in how to make money from our maps. At the time it cared solely about making users happy, and argued that business models were much better determined after a product had become successful with users” (Rasmussen 2009, p.1).

However, soon after Lars realized that the creation of an innovative product inside the company was somehow difficult, his idea then was to “create special environment” in order to work on his next project, Google Wave, *as if* the 60-person team *was working as independent entrepreneurs*, a start-up within the Google company.

They had moved far away from the Google company headquarters to Sydney, Australia. Additionally, trying to “recreate” risk taken by the real entrepreneurs, “Google employees who wanted to work on Wave would have to take a risk to join the brothers [Rasmussens; Lars and his brother], a diluted version of what the Rasmussens faced when they started Google Maps. The team took cuts to their bonus pay, with the hopes of a big payout if Wave were to succeed” (Sutter 2009, p.1). And the project was a secret; even the software codes were not available to the rest of Google employees.

A few years later, Google Wave project was declined by Google managers. From Rasmussen’s point, the decision to shut down the project was premature. He decided to quit Google. As he said, “We were not quite the success that Google was hoping for, and trying to persuade them not to pull the plug and ultimately failing was obviously a little stressful” (Hutcheon 2010, p.1).

Then he joined Facebook hoping that he would be able to create innovative products in a smaller company. However, 5 years later, Lars quit Facebook⁵ and decided to run his own enterprise (Weav⁶).

Lars Rasmussen was not the only person who decided to quit innovative high-tech companies in order to be able to create innovative products for the sake of Internet users. Facing the growing rotation of talented employees, managers started to take “aggressive steps to stop to retain employees, particularly those with start-up ambitions” (Miller 2010a, b, p.1). One of such steps is to create “incubator-like” working environment inside of a company including coworking or flexible working, namely, *corpworking*. Several companies followed Google’s example.

⁵Lars Rasmussen explained: “I kept myself a little in the startup world by doing some advising, and I felt myself a little bit envious when I talked to those guys. So, it was a tough decision to leave Facebook, but it was definitely the right decision. I haven’t regretted it at all.” (D’Onfro 2015).

⁶<https://www.weav.io>

The Origins of *Corpworking*

The idea of employees working *as if* they are not “regular” employees but rather independent entrepreneurs in the organization is not new. Tracking back the *Harvard Business Review* (HBR) archives and analyzing the content of the HBR papers published in this leading management and organization journal, it might be recognized that the very essence of the proposed theories by the authors and methods of managing was to dissuade employees from the idea of becoming independent and possibly quitting the company to run their own ventures (see Snider 1946). From the 1930s of the last century, both scholars and management consultants were offering ideas of “boosting” the entrepreneurial actions of the employees *as if* they were independent entrepreneurs, while working toward *the aims predefined by the managers*, from the very start aiming at increasing *innovativeness*, as well as *productivity*, understood more and more broader as *effectiveness*, which means incorporating all the abilities and capabilities for the interest of the employer (Golonka 2020; Riegel 1923).

Among the ideas proposed by the HBR authors, the most significant one of them evolves around convincing members of organizations, that *aims predefined* by managers (e.g., increasing effectiveness of the production) are also *the aims of the employees* (see Zaleznik et al. 1960); that both managers and employees *should cooperate with each other toward achieving them* (e.g., the concept of “participation” Mayo 2003; Given 1946; Jennings and Jennings 1951; “cooperative enterprise” Robbins 1943); that the members of organization are *tied by family-like relationships* with the company (the concept of organization as a “community” and even “a great happy family,” see, e.g., Robbins 1943; Selekman 1947; or the concept of “work as a way of life,” see Selekman 1947; Schoen 1957; Argyris 1958); and that people are *a part of the organization* and they are unable to realize their development potential outside of the company (e.g., Whyte 1956).

The implementation of these ideas in the companies was possible because of the active participation of employees themselves; they often willingly accepted them and gave up more and more of their autonomy, as well as their dreams to “become self-dependent” in exchange for the “guarantee” of employment⁷ (Snider 1946), as well as various, increasingly sophisticated benefits (e.g., Sabsay 1947),⁸ including more and more attractive working environment, currently also flexible working conditions, and coworking spaces, as it is seen currently in most of the high-tech companies. At present, numerous organizations also offer “family-like” working environment (e.g., Larry Page of Google literally said he wants to build family-like

⁷More and more companies, starting from Procter&Gamble (1940s), offered a “guarantee” of employment instead of hourly rates, in exchange for acceptance of very unfavorable conditions for employees, including the possibility of termination of the contract by the employer, at any time (Snider 1946).

⁸For example, when office workers did not receive the expected promotions and “higher” status than workers, unhappy fed the “white-collar” trade unions, with more “glamor” than “blue-collar” unions (Strauss 1954).

organization: “Google should be like a family” (Lashinsky 2012)), “flat” structures, “flexible working,” etc.

Such practices have been perceived both by managers and employees as a solution to the problem of “hierarchy” in organization, raised also by the creator of the *coworking* idea, DeKoven (2013). He sees *hierarchy* of the organization as a source of the employees’ problems, namely, lack of “well-being,” “happiness,” or just a personal agency of individuals, and in his opinion the solution is “working *as equal*.” “For the most part, people do not work together as equals, especially not in the business world where they are graded and isolated, categorized and shuffled into a hierarchy that separates them by rank and salary level” (DeKoven 2013).

There is actually no evidence on the effects of such efforts, since there is a very limited research on the connection between *coworking* spaces and collaboration, well-being, and creativity (Yang et al. 2019). However, taking into account the effects based on the described example of Lars Rasmussen, as well as a number of other individuals who left the companies offering such working environments, and the growing number of acts of dissatisfaction of employees,⁹ it can be said that, as observed by one of the former Google employees, “you are given everything you could ever want, but it costs you the only things that actually matter in the end” (Edwards 2016, p.1, cf. Lashinsky 2012).

In order to understand what exactly “actually matters in the end” in humans’ creative, entrepreneurial work, firstly it would be helpful to explore the very *human nature*. Thus, the discoveries of realistic philosophers, especially Aristotle, on human nature are to be incorporated in order to explain the described issues.

Realistic Perspective

Human Nature

Sensual Faculties

Two of the concepts described above—*coworking as a community* and *corpworking*—are based on the underlying assumption of *sensual nature* of human being. In some coworking locations, as well as in a number of companies offering coworking to their employees, the owners state that they want to offer a kind of “home of working and well-being” (e.g., Neuberger’s Spiral Muse, Schraubenfabrik). Here, as well as in corpworking practices, *well-being* is understood as fulfillment of people’s *sensual* needs such as being together (physically) with “alike people” in one physical place, living comfortably, eating together, and using additional services (e.g., body relaxation, massages, resting spaces, playing facilities, etc.).

⁹See, e.g., high turnover of employees (e.g., published by Payscale), protests of thousands of Google’ employees, etc. (e.g., Campbell 2018; Elias 2019; Popper 2010; Fung 2019).

It can be observed that there are attempts to build a community based on sensual appetites, including *feelings* and *physical presence*: “*feeling* of independence and freedom of working by himself with the *community feel* and structure of working with others” (DiRiso 2019). It might be also noticed that coworking is perceived by some scholars as a remedy for *physical* isolation observed in telework (e.g., Bueno et al. 2018). Telework refers to workers who “work in locations, remote from their central offices or production facilities, with no personal contact with coworkers, but the ability to communicate with coworkers using ICT” (Bueno et al. 2018, Di Martino and Wirth 1990, p. 530). While the results of several studies show that “telework can reduce satisfaction and well-being” (Bueno et al. 2018; cf. Bertschek and Niebel 2016; Bentley et al. 2016; Anderson et al. 2015; Morganson et al. 2010), in the scholars’ opinion, this results in “a *feeling* of not belonging to a community,” and *coworking as community* is seen as an alternative option, a remedy for such *feeling of isolation* (Bueno et al. 2018; Lumley 2014).

Beliefs of dominant role of feelings, emotions, and broader *sensual needs* of human being in their work are derived from theories of modern philosophers (Dansiger 1997), namely, their assumption that a human’s reason (intellect) relates to operational processes, while sensual (including emotional) faculties relate to *motivation* and *aspirations*. One of the consequences of such assumption is that a human being can be seen as an *object of influence* from the outside, and their internal faculties might be controlled from the outside (Dansiger 1996). The theories of needs, as well as motivation theories, developed in the twentieth century in the academia, were indeed developed based on such an assumption (Dansiger 1996; Golonka 2019, 2020).

Moreover, the very term *motivation*, as well as motivational methods and techniques from the very beginning, related to the sales and marketing techniques, aims to attempt to influence the buying decisions of the customers (see, e.g., Perrin 1923; Troland 1928; Young 1936; Dansiger 1996). Thus, in companies, all of the facilities and benefits, including working environment, can be perceived as the means to employees’ *happiness* (e.g., Google’s promise of making employees “happy inside and outside” (Google Careers 2018)).

Rational Human Being

Considering realistic intellectual tradition, it might be recognized that human nature is not only sensual, but it is first of all *rational*.¹⁰ From this perspective, human’s sensual faculties cover physiological functions and feelings/emotions, while reason and aspirations (meaning *volition* or *rational desire*¹¹; cf. Aristotle, Krapiec 1998)

¹⁰ Human being as a *rational animal*; Aristotle, *Met.* VII.11. (cf. Code 1986), see Aristotle (1924).

¹¹ Rational desire is a part of the desiderative faculty (Woźniak 2020). “Although it is a desire, it is different from the sensual desire. Sensual appetite is ‘for present pleasure mistaken for absolute pleasure and good’ (Ross 1923, 145), while rational desire is for future good. The former has as its object an ‘apparent good,’ while the object of the rational desire is ‘the real good’” (ibidem p. 93, cf. *Metaphysics* XII.7.1072a28).

are *intellectual-volitional* powers but drawing cognitive contents from the senses (e.g., Aristotle, Krapiec 1998; Woźniak 2018; Golonka 2020).

Thus, thanks to these powers, one's reason closely cooperating with their rational desire, human beings can voluntarily¹² *recognize* themselves and *choose*¹³ *their aim*, leading to their real good, and *take actions* toward achieving them. This results in experience of happiness. Moreover, from realistic perspective, for the execution of one's *personal agency*, a *voluntary choice* is necessary; it constitutes an origin of external acts (Woźniak 2020).

Therefore, if the employee does not recognize the aim—*actually realized* by the company—as consistent with his/her own aim, leading to their real good, there is no chance for success (Golonka 2020; cf. Woźniak 2018; Nowicki and Kowalska 2016).

Hence, much of the efforts undertaken by the managers in order to “motivate” the employees, to convince them that realization of predefined aims often presented as good to them (even literally that can “make them happy”), as well as offering more and more sophisticated benefits (inter alia coworking environment, various flexible working conditions, “family-like” relationships, etc.), are *unrealistic* and cannot result in constructive effects in a longer term. This might be one of the major reasons of a high turnover of employees in the seemingly the most attractive, “creative,” “innovative” high-tech companies (cf. PayScale reports), as well as voluntary departures of talented employees especially those with entrepreneurial ambitions (cf. Miller 2010a, b; Popper 2010) despite creating a particularly attractive work environment for them. Such environment *seems not* to be of *major importance* however pleasant, just as what Rasmussen mentioned: “I love it here and it took a lot for my wife and I to get past that hurdle that we will be leaving paradise” (Hutcheon 2010, p.1).

Meaning of Aim

From a realistic perspective, the voluntary recognition and choice of an aim by individual themselves is of a crucial meaning for the execution of one's *personal agency* and one's development. The aim is overriding one's cognition of reality as well as actions undertaken by a human being, and the actual *aim is organizing* them (Golonka 2020; Woźniak 2018 cf. Aristotle).

In coworking as physical spaces usually offered by entrepreneurs to their customers, the individuals—customers, “coworkers”—can use the space as well as the working infrastructure, facilities, etc., as resources for the purpose of their own individually chosen aims and work toward achieving them. Other individuals can

¹²Voluntariness is “that of which the moving principle is in the agent himself, he being aware of the particular circumstances of the action” (NE III.1.1111a13), thus a “person who has a capacity to judge about his/her own judgement is subject of Aristotelian voluntariness” (Woźniak 2020).

¹³“The act of decision is the judgment about what has been deliberated upon. The act of choice is an act of rational desire to take a particular course of action based on prior decision” (ibidem, p. 92).

voluntarily recognize those aims as their own, and they are free to join to help in achieving them.

In such a case, a working *community* is a natural *result* of voluntarily *choosing and realizing of the same aim by a number of individuals* (namely, unity of humans' rational desires in consenting to the same thing¹⁴). In such a situation, the community actually supports the development of individuals' rational human nature and what exactly the community—and, broader, society—is supposed to serve¹⁵ (e.g., Krąpiec 2009). As such, the aim, recognized and voluntarily chosen by individuals using their reason and following rational desire, actually *organizes* not only the person but also the people who work toward achieving it. And this kind of organization actually results in people's happiness in collaborating—coworking—as sometimes observed by the author of the coworking idea (DeKoven 2013). In such an organization there is no need for any external attempts to “motivate” or “influence” working individuals from the outside.

In the example of Lars Rasmussen, he experienced that in his very first entrepreneurial venture while developing Maps online, he wanted to “recreate” such an experience inside of the Google company and next in Facebook, hoping that in a smaller-sized company it will be possible (Hutcheon 2010; cf. D'Onfro 2015). As he said, “to find something different and new” for Internet users was his aim (Rasmussen 2009; Hutcheon 2010), appreciated by the users and his coworkers. “Lars has a knack for building elegant, powerful products that people love” (Taylor 2010, p.1). Rasmussen described his view on termination of his venture by managers: “It takes a while for something new and different to find its footing and I think Google was just not patient” (ibidem, p.1).

At the beginning of collaboration, he recognized consistency between his aim and Google's aim. “At the time it [Google] cared solely about making users happy, and argued that business models were much better determined *after* a product had become successful with users” (Rasmussen 2009, p.1). However, it turned out that even though the mission statement of the company, reflecting such an aim, resembles the one from the very beginning of the history of this company (consistent with what Lars was aiming at), the *actual* aim set by Google managers had changed. And consequently, as Rasmussen noticed, “in the time that it took us to build Wave, the rest of the company changed direction” (Rasmussen 2013, p.1).

The new aim was specified shortly after by Larry Page, CEO of a new entity, “mother” company of conglomerate in which Google is one of the “daughters,” namely, Alphabet (2015). “The new entity,” he wrote, “was an alpha-bet (Alpha is investment return over benchmark), which we strive for!” (Sharma 2019, cf. <https://abc.xyz/>, p.1). Thus, this new aim actually organizes work of both the managers and the employees in all the dependent companies in the Alphabet conglomerate including Google.

¹⁴Cf. Thomas Aquinas on concord, and peace (ST, Vol. 34, Q 29, Art.1), see Aquinas (2006).

¹⁵The opposite understanding leads to subordination of human being to “the collective.”

Since actual aim in the mentioned example of the Google company (investment return over benchmark) overrode the previous aim, the decisions and actions of managers also followed the actual aim, and as a consequence, the projects which were not serving this purpose were terminated. “Google had changed its strategy toward Google Plus ... and Wave wasn’t superaligned with that” (Rasmussen 2013, p.1).

Hierarchy in any organization supports the realization of an aim set usually by top managers or people who decide on the strategic issues. Even in organizations with a “flat” structure, there are still managers deciding on the aim of the organization and predefining goals for the employees (in this case performance/financial goals) as well as controlling their realization.¹⁶ From this point, the actual realized aim as organizing decisions and actions of people is of a much more significant importance than rules and regulations, such as “grades,” “salary levels,” “ranks,” etc., as mentioned by DeKoven (2013). Hierarchy as such is not contradictory to a real equality of working individuals. From a realistic perspective, equality is derived from the voluntary choices of individuals pursuing the same aim rather than imposed from the outside as of rules or regulations supporting the *impression* that everyone, both managers and employees, is *as if* equal. Thus, as every individual is different and has unique abilities, skills, ambitions, etc. (Krapiec 1998; Golonka 2020), hierarchy might be helpful in achieving the common aim, if such an aim has been recognized as a real good by the individuals and voluntarily chosen by them. Contrary to the assumptions of DeKoven (2013), hierarchy is neither the source of problems in achieving that nor a major obstacle.

In the described example, it turned out that Google’s new aim was not consistent anymore with Rasmussen’s aim. In order to realize the aim chosen and recognized voluntarily—to execute Lars’ personal agency and in order to remain faithful to the good he has chosen—he finally left the organization, and, after working for a few years with Facebook, he dropped all of the benefits including “financial bonanza” (see D’Onfro 2015) to pursue a new venture.

Conclusions

In the literature, coworking has been analyzed from various perspectives; however, the very term has been used to describe numerous concepts of working practices. Moreover, little research has explained the differences among described coworking ideas and practices, and more precisely, no research has been found that has looked at these concepts specifically, as well as at differences from the realistic perspective.

¹⁶Google’ managers—however not called *managers* in order to make an impression of family-like organization—still decide, analyze, calculate, and evaluate the effectiveness of “creative production,” toward the aim (investment return over benchmark), incorporating advanced analytical systems for this purpose (e.g., Shrivastava et al. 2018; Garvin 2013).

This study is an attempt to rectify this. In order to investigate different types of coworking, analysis of existing documents, literature studies, and research papers was conducted. Two major types of working were specified: *coworking* (coworking as a space, coworking as a way of working, coworking as a community) and *corpocoworking*.

To clarify the differences, the discoveries of realistic philosophers on the human nature were incorporated. Some of these concepts were developed based on the incomplete vision of human nature (considering mostly sensual faculties) derived from theories of modern philosophers. Therefore, attempts to implement them in organizations are unrealistic and cannot lead to success in a longer term. Supported by examples from the working practice, it seems to be crucial to consider complete vision of human being, both sensual and—more importantly—rational.

Furthermore, in this chapter, the most significant meaning of *aim*, voluntarily recognized and chosen by the individual, was explained as crucial for the execution of one's personal agency and also as organizing both the cognition and actions taken by them. Also, the importance of an aim was explained in collaborating—and coworking—of individuals.

In this respect, researchers—as well as entrepreneurs, freelancers, employees, and managers of the companies—can benefit from the results of the analysis by enhancing their understanding of the different types of coworking practices as well as the importance of considering a complete vision of a human being.

Considering realistic intellectual tradition, particularly Aristotle's view on human nature, and taking into consideration its consequences for management and organization could be suggested as a major recommendation for future research.

References

- Anderson, A. J., Kaplan, S. A., & Vega, R. P. (2015). The impact of telework on emotional experience: When, and for whom, does telework improve daily affective well-being? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 882–897.
- Aquinas, T. (2006). *ST. Charity* (Vol. 34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Argyris, C. (1958). The organization: What makes it healthy? *Harvard Business Review*, 36(6), 107–116.
- Aristotle. (1924). *Methaphysics. Ross edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bandinelli, C. (2020). The production of subjectivity in neoliberal culture industries: The case of coworking spaces. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 23(1), 3–19.
- Bentley, T. A., Teo, S. T. T., McLeod, L., Tan, F., Bosua, R., & Gloet, M. (2016). The role of organisational support in teleworker wellbeing: A socio-technical systems approach. *Applied Ergonomics*, 52, 207–215.
- Bertschek, I., & Niebel, T. (2016). Mobile and more productive? Firm-level evidence on the productivity effects of mobile internet use. *Telecommunications Policy*, 40(9), 888–898.
- Blagoev, B., Costas, J., & Karreman, D. (2019). 'We are all herd animals': Community and organizationality in coworking spaces. *Organization*, 26(6), 894–916.
- Boeri, T., Giupponi, G., Krueger, A. B., & Machin, S. (2020). Solo self-employment and alternative work arrangements: A cross-country perspective on the changing composition of jobs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(1), 170–195.

- Bouncken, R., & Reuschl, A. J. (2016). Coworking-spaces: How a phenomenon of the sharing economy builds a novel trend for the workplace and for entrepreneurship. *Review of Managerial Science*, 12(1), 317–334.
- Bouncken, R., Ratzmann, M., Barwinski, R., & Kraus, S. (2020). Coworking spaces: Empowerment for entrepreneurship and innovation in the digital and sharing economy. *Journal of Business Research*, 114, 102–110.
- Bueno, S., Rodríguez-Baltanás, G., & Gallego, M. D. (2018). Coworking spaces: A new way of achieving productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 16(4), 452–466.
- Butcher, T. (2018). Learning everyday entrepreneurial practices through coworking. *Management Learning*, 49(3), 327–345.
- Cabral, V., & van Winden, W. (2016). Coworking: An analysis of coworking strategies for interaction and innovation. *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Development*, 7(4), 357–377.
- Campbell, F. A. (2018, May 25). *Why thousands of Google employees are protesting across the world*. VOX. <https://www.vox.com/2018/11/1/18051884/google-employee-walkouts-explained>
- Castilho, M., & Quandt, C. (2017). Collaborative capability in coworking spaces: Convenience sharing or community building? *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 7(12), 32–42.
- Clifton, N., Füzi, A., & Loudon, A. (2019). Coworking in the digital economy: Context, motivations, and outcomes. *Futures*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.102439>.
- Code, A. (1986). Aristotle: Essence and accident. In R. Grandy & R. Warner (Eds.), *Philosophical grounds of rationality: Intentions, categories, ends* (pp. 411–439). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Danziger, K. (1996). *Naming the mind. How psychology found its language*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage.
- Dardori, M. (2018). From reverse mentoring to collaborative community's emergence: A career capital perspective. In *2nd International Symposium of the Research Group on Collaborative Spaces*, (hal-01758226), London.
- DeKoven, B. (2013, May 25). *Deep fun*. <https://www.deepfun.com/the-coworking-connection/>
- Di Martino, V., & Wirth, L. (1990). Telework: A new way of working and living. *International Labour Review*, 129(5), 529–554.
- DiRiso, A. (2019, May 25). *The history of coworking*. <https://www.coworkingresources.org/blog/history-of-coworking>
- D'Onfro, J. (2015, May 25). Why this engineer quit his job at Facebook to found an 'interactive music' startup. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/why-lars-rasmussen-quit-facebook-to-start-weav-2015-6?IR=T>
- Edwards, J. (2016, May 25). Google employees confess all the things they hated most about working at Google. *Business Insider*. <https://businessinsider.com/pl/international/google-employees-confess-all-the-things-they-hated-most-about-working-at-google/05erzyl>
- Elias, J. (2019, May 25). Google veterans: The company has become 'unrecognizable'. *CNBC*. <https://www.cnn.com/2019/12/31/google-veterans-the-company-has-become-unrecognizable.html>
- Fung, B. (2019, May 25). Tensions between Google and its employees are reaching a breaking point. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/11/26/tech/google-employee-tensions/index.html>
- Gandini, A. (2015). The rise of coworking spaces: a literature review. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization*, 15(1), 193–205.
- Gandini, A., & Cossu, A. (2019). The third wave of coworking: 'Neo-corporate' model versus 'resilient' practice. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549419886060>.
- Garrett, L., Spreitzer, G., & Bacevice, P. (2017). Co-constructing a sense of community at work: The emergence of community in coworking spaces. *Organization Studies*, 38(6), 821–842.
- Garvin, D. (2013, May 25). How Google sold its engineers on management. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2013/12/how-google-sold-its-engineers-on-management>
- Gerdenitsch, C., Scheel, T. E., Andorfer, J., & Korunka, C. (2016). Coworking spaces: A source of social support for independent professionals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(581). <http://10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00581>

- Given, W. (1946). Freedom within management. *Harvard Business Review*, 24(4), 427–437.
- Golonka, M. (2019). Entrepreneurship education: Realistic perspective. *Entrepreneurship – Education*, 15(2), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.24917/20833296.152.3>.
- Golonka, M. (2020). Alice and the organizations from the Mad Hatter's land. In W. Gasparski (Ed.), *Krytyczna teoria organizacji. Elementy filozofii i praktyki zarządzania* (pp. 87–111). Warszawa: Poltext.
- Google Careers. (2018, May 25). How we care for Googlers. *Google*. <https://careers.google.com/how-we-care-for-googlers/>
- Grazian, D. (2019). Thank God it's Monday: Manhattan coworking spaces in the new economy. *Theory and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-019-09360-6>.
- Green, R. (2014). Collaborate or compete: How do landlords respond to the rise in coworking? *Cornell Real Estate Review*, 12, 52–59.
- Hutcheon, S. (2010, May 25). Why I quit Google to join Facebook: Lars Rasmussen. *SMH*. <https://www.smh.com.au/technology/why-i-quit-google-to-join-facebook-lars-rasmussen-20101101-1799q.html>
- Jennings, E., & Jennings, F. (1951). Making human relations work. *Harvard Business Review*, 29(1), 29–55.
- Josef, B. (2017). Coworking from the Company's Perspective – Serendipity-biotope or Getaway-spot? *30th BLED eConference: Digital Transformation – From Connecting Things to Transforming our Lives*. <https://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/254940/>
- Jylhä, T., Vuolle, M., Nenonen, S., & Virtaneva, M. (2015). Towards business potential of workplace services in Finland. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 21, 518–523.
- Keogh, O. (2019). Big businesses embrace energy and collegiality of 'corpworking'; Established companies are sharing working spaces with freelancers and start-ups to foster innovation. *Irish Times, Finance*, p. 75.
- Krąpiec, A. (1998). *Rational psychology*. KUL.
- Krąpiec, A. (2009). *Człowiek jako osoba*. Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
- Lashinsky, A. (2012, May 25). Larry Page: Google should be like a family. *Fortune*. <https://fortune.com/2012/01/19/larry-page-google-should-be-like-a-family/>
- Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A., & Isaac, H. (2016). The new office: how coworking changes the work concept. *J Bus Strategy*, 37(6), 3–9.
- Lumley, R. M. (2014). A coworking project in the campus library: Supporting and modeling entrepreneurial activity in the academic library. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 20(1), 49–65.
- Mayerhoffer, M. (2020). Growth factors of the coworking industry: The case of Prague. *Journal of Property Investment & Finance*, 38(3), 203–212.
- Mayo, E. (2003). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Merkel, J. (2015). Coworking in the city. *Ephemera Journal*, 15(1), 121–139.
- Miller, C. C. (2010a, May 25). How giant Google aims to stop brain drain. *NDTV*. <https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/how-giant-google-aims-to-stop-brain-drain-440549>
- Miller, C. C. (2010b, May 25). Google continues losing long time employees. *TechCrunch*. <https://techcrunch.com/2009/08/03/google-continues-losing-long-time-employees-to-vmware/>
- Morganson, V. J., Major, D. A., Oborn, K. L., Verive, J. M., & Heelan, M. P. (2010). Comparing telework locations and traditional work arrangements. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(6), 578–595.
- Neuberg, B. (2005). *The Start of Coworking (from the Guy that Started It)*. http://codinginparadise.org/ebooks/html/blog/start_of_coworking.html.
- Nowicki, M., & Kowalska, K. (2016). Uczenie się w perspektywie św. Tomasza z Akwinu i neurobiologii – dysharmonicznie czy unisono? *Studia Edukacyjne*, 42, 273–288.
- Parrino, L. (2015). Coworking: Assessing the role of proximity in knowledge exchange. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 13, 261–271.
- Perrin, F. A. C. (1923). The psychology of motivation. *Psychological Review*, 30, 176–191.
- Pohler, N. (2012). Neue arbeitsräume für neue arbeitsformen: Coworking spaces [New workspaces for new forms of work: Coworking spaces]. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 37, 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11614-012-0021-y>

- Popper, B. (2010, May 25). Why googles retention plan backfired. *CBSNews*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/why-googles-retention-plan-backfired/>
- Rasmussen, L. (2009, May 25). The story of Google Maps & Google Wave. *The Warren Centre*. <https://thewarrencentre.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/IL2009.pdf>
- Rasmussen, L. (2013, May 25). Interview with Lars Rasmussen. In S. Schlinkert (Ed.), *Interview with Lars Rasmussen*. Newsweek. <https://www.newsweek.com/newsweek-interview-facebooks-lars-rasmussen-63157>
- Riegel, J. W. (1923). The appraisal of labor “efficiency”. *Harvard Business Review*, 1(3), 342–354.
- Robelski, S., Keller, H., Harth, V., & Mache, S. (2019). Coworking spaces: The better home office? A psychosocial and health-related perspective on an emerging work environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(13), 2379. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16132379>.
- Robbins, E. (1943). Management-labor cooperation. *Harvard Business Review*, 21(4), 415.
- Ross, W. D. (1923). *Aristotle*. London: Methuen.
- Sabsay, N. (1947). From the workers’ point of view. *Harvard Business Review*, 25(3), 339–347.
- Schoen, D. (1957). Human relations: Boon or bogle? *Harvard Business Review*, 35(6), 41–47.
- Selekman, B. (1947). Conflict and cooperation in labor relations. *Harvard Business Review*, 25(3), 318–338.
- Sharma, R. (2019, May 25). Why Google became Alphabet. *Investopedia*. <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/081115/why-google-became-alphabet.asp>
- Shrivastava, S., Nagdev, K., & Rajesh, A. (2018). Redefining HR using people analytics: The case of Google. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 26(2), 3–6.
- Snider, J. (1946). Management approach to the annual wage. *Harvard Business Review*, 24(3), 326–338.
- Spinuzzi, C. (2012). Working alone together: Co working as emergent collaborative activity. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26, 399–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912444070>.
- Spinuzzi, C. (2015). *All edge: Inside the new workplace networks*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spinuzzi, C., Bodrozic, 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.
- Strauss, G. (1954). White-collar unions are different! *Harvard Business Review*, 31(4), 73–82.
- Sutter, J. D. (2009, May 25). The genius brothers behind Google Wave. *CNN*. <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/TECH/10/27/rasmussen.brothers.google.wave/index.html>
- Šviráková, E., Soukalová, R., Bednár, P., & Danko, L. (2015). Culture managers education: System dynamics model of the coworking design Centre. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174(12), 1684–1694.
- Tanaka, R. M., Vicentin, I. C., Fadel, A. T., & Haluc, J. W. (2017). Shared work (Coworking) characteristics in Brazil in an individualized society context. *Espacios*, 38(4), 17.
- Taylor, B. (2010, May 25). Lars Rasmussen, father of Google Maps and Google Wave, heads to Facebook. *Tech Crunch*. <https://techcrunch.com/2010/10/29/rasmussen-facebook-google/>
- Troland, L. T. (1928). *The fundamentals of human motivation* (ed. Hafner, 1967). New York: Van Nostrand.
- Whyte, W. (1956). Human relations theory – A progress report. *Harvard Business Review*, 34(5), 125–132.
- Wong, N. (2019, May 25). Google snubs WeWork, signs Toronto lease with co-working rival IWG. *Bloomberg News*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-10-17/google-snubs-wework-signs-toronto-lease-with-co-working-rival>
- Woźniak, A. (2018). The role of volitional power in the theory and practice of home schooling. *Open Education*, 2, 67–88.
- Woźniak, A. (2020). The misconducts of UN peacekeepers as an unintended consequence of the Kantian law-based ethics and moral psychology: An Aristotelian analysis. *Scienza e Pace*, 11(1), 85–99.

- Yang, E., Bisson, C., & Sanborn, B. E. (2019). Coworking space as a third-fourth place: Changing models of a hybrid space in corporate real estate. *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, 21(4), 324–345.
- Young, P. T. (1936). *Motivation of behavior. The fundamental determinants of human and animal activity*. New York: Wiley.
- Zaleznik, C. R., Christensen, C. M., & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1960). Beyond motivation. *Harvard Business Review*, 38(3), 123–125.
- Zhou, Y. (2019). A taxonomy of coworking space: Manhattan, NYC. *Cornell Real Estate Review*, 17, 58–65.