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0.1 ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to propose possible design scenarios for the future of the workplace by investigating the past, present and possible future changes of the relationship between work and architecture. Starting from an analysis of the current social phenomena of temporality and virtual connectivity, the thesis shows how this, consequentially, has originated cases of digital nomadism, co-working and the re-discovery work-life balance in the Western working cultures.

The thesis starts by analysing how Western culture has been affected by the increased number of digital platforms, following how Western cities have witnessed a rapid change in the urban fabric. Their need to adapt to a growing request to accommodate shared work facilities and temporary living spaces decreased the sense of stability while increasing the demand to temporary and part-time employment. Despite all, the most relevant change has been the possibility of virtual connections and the opportunity of access to online databases which has created the notion of work-life balance. This has led to a need for redefining the purpose of physical workplace.

The first chapter investigates how local working culture is influenced by phenomena such as digital connectivity and shared workspaces. How are the historical European cities and European office traditions adapting to new and modern requests? An in-depth architectural analysis of corporate headquarters and international workspace providers will demonstrate the fracture created by these entities trying to fit into the local context.

The second chapter will focus on understanding the contemporary office environment for the digitally connected individual, through a brief review of office history which specifies the digital tools for a modern workplace and the effects of increased workplace autonomy and flexibility. These studies are then furthered by site observations conducted with generous support and advisory of Benjamin Pardo and Knoll Inc., who provided the opportunity to study the modern workplaces in France, Italy, Germany, and United Kingdom as well as facilitated interviews with professionals in the field of design and architecture. In order to better understand the role of spatial divisions in the modern office, this chapter concludes by presenting a categorisation of furniture and space-dividing elements in the modern workplaces.

The last chapter will then reconstruct future workspace scenarios based on the observations made during the site observations and interviews. The three main topics used to analyse the relationship between the workspace and the city will be further developed into conceptual interior spaces, providing an explanation of the qualities of future office furnishings.
0.1 TIIVISTELMÄ

Tämän opinnäytetyön tavoitteena on esittää suunnitteluskenaarioita työpaikan tulevaisuudesta tarkastelemalla sen menneisyyttä, nykyisyyttä ja mahdollisia tulevaisuuden muutoksia, sekä tutkimalla työn ja arkkitehtuurin suhdetta. Lähtökohtana on esittää työn muutos yhteiskunnallisten ilmiöiden, kuten väliaikaisuuden ja virtuaalisen yhteyksien kasvun kautta, sekä kuinka nämä ovat johtaneet ilmiöihin kuten ”digitaalisen nomadismi”, yhteistyön korostaminen työympäristössä, sekä työ- ja perhe-elämän tasapainon löytämisestä ongelmien keskeiseksi teemaksi länsimaisissa työkulttuureissa.

Opinnäytetyö alkaa analysoimalla, kuinka lisääntynyt digitaalisten alustojen määrä on vaikuttanut länsimaiseen kulttuuriin. Suurkaupunkien tarve mukauttaa kaupunkitilaa on heijastunut myös ilmiöihin, kuten jaetuiden ”co-working” työtilojen ja tilapäisten asuintilojen kasvuun, heikentäen yksilön vakauden tunnetta samalla kun väliaikaisen ja osa-ajoittain kasvavat Euroopassa. Taustalla oleva olennainen muutos on ollut mahdollisuus virtuaaliseen yhteydenpitoon ja pääsy online-tietokantoihin, joka on vaikuttanut näkökulmaan työ- ja perhe-elämän tasapainon tarpeesta ja yksilön roolin kasvuun. Tämä on johtanut tarpeeseen määritellä fyysisen työpaikan tarkoitus uudelleen.

Ensimmäinen luku tarkastelee, kuinka nykyaiakaiset ilmiöt kätkeyttävät työympäristöä nykyaikaisissa työkulttuureissa. Euroopan historialliset kaupungit ja toimistoperinteet mukautuvat näihin uusiin vaatimuksiin? Yrityksen pääkonttorin ja kansainvälisten työtilojen tarjoajien analysointi on osoittanut, että Euroopan historialliset kaupungit ja toimistoperinteet mukautuvat nykyaikaiseen tilanteeseen.

Toinen luku keskittyy ymmärtämään digitaaliseen yhteisöön kytkeytyneen yksilön nykyaikaisesta työympäristöstä toimistojen historiakatsauksen avulla, määrittelemällä nykyaiakaisen työn digitaaliset työkalut sekä lisääntyneen autonomisen työskentelyn ja työn joustavuuden vaikutukset. Näiden tutkimisessa on lisäksi käytetty eurooppalaisen työtilojen havainnointia Benjamin Pardon ja Knoll Inc. -yrityksen tuella, joka tarjosi mahdollisuuden tutkia nykyaiakaisia työpaikoja Ranskassa, Italiassa, Saksassa ja Yhdysvalloissa. Tämä lisäksi opinnäytetyön havainnoiva osuus osoi, että nykyaiakaisella tapahtumalla työpaikoissa tämänhetkisen toimiston vaatimusten ymmärtämiseksi.

Viimeinen luku kokoa opinnäytteen tutkivan ja havainnoivan osan yhteen tulevaisuuden työtilan skenaarioilla, jotka jakaantuvat kolmeen pääaiheeseen. Näitä aiheita käytetään työtilan ja kaupungin välisen suhteen analysoimiseen, sekä käsitetellisten sisätilojen kehittämiseen päätyen lopulta esittämään tulevien toimistokulutusten ominaisuuksia.
0.2 INTRODUCTION

“Until very recently very few urbanists, architects or even space planners – who should have known better given their proximity to clients and responsibility to end users – have questioned how long it will continue to be necessary to assemble very large numbers of clerical workers in factory like offices every day from 9:00 to 5:00.” (Duffy. 2012)

In the 90s Japanese architect Kisho Kurokawa theorized that future generations would have a “moving culture” - homo movens “which has learned that movement and exchange produce value and discovery” (Kurokawa, K. 1994. P. 36). These theories described a culture high in mobility and focused on seeking locations of interesting events. Through mobility and events, the culture of “homo movens” would rely on building new communities and mental possessions instead of focusing on gathering physical objects. There are recognizable similarities in the current state of self-employed digital nomads and shared workspace services. Growing trends such as international co-working spaces as “WeWork” and “Spaces by Regus” emphasize global community values. And in our daily life, our digital platforms connect us almost in ways that seem like “we are everywhere, anytime and everyone at once”. (Self. 2018.p. 49)

The worker, as a self-employed individual and even self-managing employee, can view freedom as empowerment and gain more self-organization and responsibility. In the flexibility of work, the phenomenon of working in café has brought us to the realization of choosing where and when we could work. Whether a beginning entrepreneur, digital nomad or a corporate employee, the digital networks have provided all the jobseekers, recruiters and collaborators the access to greater networks of knowledge and a wider pool of talent. Digitalisation has changed both how we work, as well as how we organize work in groups. As the corporate headquarters seek space in the central locations in urban cities and co-working spaces take more real estate to spread a private network of workspaces, many historical European cities are still finding balance with sharing the platforms of the past.

While work can happen during commutes through increasingly smaller devices, it seems as even the city itself is becoming a factory (Aureli. Tattara. 2009). The spread of workspaces has created “today’s cities... dominated by the pervasive informality of social relationships, which subsume every aspect of human communication and cognition as a factor of production.” (Aureli. Tattara. 2008. P.53). With public and private spaces that carry stable WIFI connection and access to electricity, our cities have become urban playgrounds of co-work, flexible work, leisure and living. In such,
the distinctions between private and public has blurred and the space for work isn’t identifiable as it was.

Large corporations such as Microsoft are moving towards providing more flexible systems for an increasingly autonomous and agile world of work, whereas leadership and overall working culture has prior been tightly presented in a fixed location. These divisions had been clear within a building. While the freedom of remote communication has evolved far from just a theoretical idea from the 1970s - many of the corporations at first did not completely forget traditional hierarchies that were presented with the layouts in the interior office spaces. The slow growth of telecommuting has also been largely connected to local culture, specifically also to the culture of interaction and power relations (Van Meel, J. 2000. P. 124-125). While Generation Z is the first digital native generation, face-to-face communication still has a high value for them (Gassam, J. 2018). The importance of being close to others during tasks involving the handling of data is highlighted by Bill Gates who states “…in order to handle and visualize the vast amounts of data, we need meaningful ways of informal and easily accessible interaction in our workplace.” (Gates, B. 2005).

In traditional workplaces, taylorism aimed to improve working processes by separating task-based work and the management that oversaw these processes from conducting the task itself (Deamer, P. 2014. P 53). This separation of management and working processes created hierarchies which were easily distinguished.

The increase of individuals with access to digital collaboration platforms emphasizes the role of communications in managing working processes in both digital and physical realms. At the same time, the provision of an agile and flexible workplace tends to include less individually dedicated workstations, instead emphasizing spaces for group collaboration.

Has the role of the employee changed after the rise of digital tools? Does this affect the interior design of a workspace and the role of private and communal spaces? What will be the future of the workplace in the diverse context of Europe?
1. GLOBAL INDIVIDUALS
The first chapter investigates how local working culture is influenced by phenomena such as digital connectivity and shared workspaces. How are the historical European cities and European office traditions adapting to new and modern requests? An in-depth architectural analysis of corporate headquarters and international workspace providers will demonstrate the fracture created by these entities trying to fit into the local context.
Jesus Christ! Half of you cunts coming out of the building are dressed like fucking gap-year students.

Modern fucking corporate Lap-pleiners all looking... nah...

How in anybody's metaphor is supposed to have a sense of the fucking hipster hipster.

All right, work with it. Work with it. Work with...

WORK IS OVER!
IF YOU MUST IT
Every week, more and more people like you are going to work with an Osborne personal business computer.

Now Apple Osborne has done the same for personal business computing. Virtually everything you need in a personal business computer is available in one neat and compact system. A complete office in a case. It's easy to learn, simple to use, and quickly becomes a one-person, 12,000-key desk-top line.

The Osborne available from computer dealers near you. The week you could be going to work with an Osborne.
1970s / Personal Computers
Personal Computers becoming accessible by individuals to buy and use in their homes.

1983 / Portable computers
Compaq releasing its first portable computer that was one of the first 100% compatible systems with IBM, creating diversity to the PC markets.

1984-1985 / Portable telephones
The services and portable telephones as Mobira Talkman became available for customers giving wider connectivity.

1984-1985 / Portable telephones
The services and portable telephones as Mobira Talkman became available for customers giving wider connectivity.

Early 1990s / World Wide Web
The internet as we know it today gained significant steps to be broadly accessible through more advanced internet browsers and new more accessible and open internet protocols (Howe, 2016).

1995 / Email
Email being first invented already as early as 1960s, it became more commercially available after 1995.

1970s / Telecommuting
Telecommuting rising as a possibility of working remotely. In first phases mainly emphasized as a possibility to work remote from a “home office”.

1990s / Hackerspaces
Community-oriented and collaborative workspaces rise in Germany. Strongly linked to DIY culture, technology, and creating a community.

1950s / Open-plan and Burolandschaft
The open-plan office prior to 1950s was mainly consisted of desks formed in rows and focused on repetition of performative tasks (Duffy, 1972).
The office landscape by consultancy group “Quickborner Team”, brings efficiency and seemingly freely formed office system to tackle issues as un-efficient ways of communication.

1968 / The Cubicle Farms
Beginning of cubicles, beginning from phenomenons as “the Action Office” designed by Robert Prost for Herman Miller. Cubicles provided the individuals an adaptable division system while not being focused to isolating workers.
2005-2007 / Start up accelerators
First seed accelerators began in the US, providing programs combining investment and mentoring for young startups.

2006 / Storing in the cloud
Cloud storing as Box.net launched in 2006, Dropbox in 2007 and Google Drive in 2012, to now data facilities being the rising typology in architecture.

2006- / AI and parametric design
More developed computing can handle and access more complex processes, where individual can utilize tools as parametric- and alghorithmic design.

2008-2009 / IoT
The terms "IoT", short for Internet of Things, created by Kevin Ashton in MIT on 1999, has more objects connected to internet than people.

/3D-printing and automatisation
Moving further from crafts to new methods of production gives individual potentially access to more production methods.

2004 / Social networks
The Facebook opens on February 4th, 2004 and MySpace on August 1st 2004. Later, platforms as Instagram, Youtube and Facebook became important channels of marketing together creating social networks and communication.

2003 / Professional networking
Official launch of LinkedIn, a digital platform for professional networking. By 2016 it has 467 million users worldwide.

2013-/New tools for collaboration
Official launch of Slack in 2013, and its biggest rival Microsoft Teams launched in 2017. In 2020, multiple other digital platforms and apps also compete to create tools for organising and collaboration.

2005 / Co-working
Co-working as “a physical space, started in 2005 when Brad Neuberg used the term to describe a physical space where independent and mobile workers came together to work in a casual environment”(coworking.org).

2005-2007 / Start up accelerators
First seed accelerators began in the US, providing programs combining investment and mentoring for young startups.

2016-2017 / Large corporations in WeWork
In 2016, 30 % of sales workers from Microsoft moving into WeWork spaces. Between 2016-2017 an increase of 90 % of big corporate clients in WeWork.

2011 / Current iteration of WeWork
Opening of the commercial co-working spaces of WeWork, beginning the emphasis to the rise of co-working spaces globally.

2000s / “Playgrounds” and leisure
The office with more leisure-type functions and perks as pool tables and fresh beverages rise to compete over the workforce in information technology industries.

2010- / Digital workplace
The office with an increase of digital platforms for organizing meetings, agile work and flexible workplace.

Digital workplace creates also architecture as “smart buildings”, where hardware as sensors can be implemented to the building work to calculate sustainability, the spatial efficiency, and help to personalize the environment by users.
1.1 WORK

The meaning of the English word “work” relates mostly to the production, construction or the performance of something (Online Etymology Dictionary. 2020). Work is an effort or action thriving from situation A to situation B. This is either a physical or mental action, and most commonly considered to result is some type of income (English-ingles.com.2019).

The term “grind” typically refers to hard and monotonous work (Merriam-webster.com. 2020) which is often presented in relation to software engineers or start-ups conducting long days in order to eventually gain professional success. Through the emergence of co-working spaces and rise of technology companies in 2000s, “the grind” has been one of the most discussed factors of work. Nowadays this type of work is increasingly criticized in relation to defining a work-life balance. In co-working spaces, the meaning of “hard work” has shifted to entail something related to fulfilment and defining the self through communal workplace interactions. After the decline in need for people to perform manual labour and the creation of modern digital tools in Western society, the nature of work is predicted to shift from hard skills, as “specific job-related technical abilities... relatively easy to measure” (Oxford Reference. 2019), to soft skills like “communication, problem-solving, and teamworking” (Oxford Reference. 2019). These soft skills are argued to be “… not really skills but rather qualities or attributes” (Shappley, J. 2019). The worker is discussed to be more generally skilled than specialized, and not surprisingly, innovation and creativity are some of the key

![Graph showing weekly work hours](Image)

**Fig. 3** / Weekly work hours. Work hours of full-time production workers (male and female) in non-agricultural activities.
Fig. 4-5 / Pictures from the tv-series “The Silicon Valley”. The founding members of the series imaginary company in the beginning, and in their final headquarters in the final season.
words in workplace consultancy, where creativity is emphasized to be a skill to form clear patterns from large scenarios. As the world is increasingly connected and around 50% of jobs could become automated globally (European Commission. 2019), labour and work continue to find their new states. C. Wright Mills describes a rise of “white collar workers” (Mills, C. W. 1951), a class of well-educated workers risen in 1930s with focus on sales and service, handling of information, communication and management. Even these types of jobs are now moving to digital platforms and systems utilising automatization, not simply manual labour. Once more sophisticated systems perform more of the manuals tasks in work, a key question is the role of human employees at work.

In recent times, it is increasingly hard to define what are the borders of a workspace. The symptom of “work following home”, where one’s professional life follows into leisure time is becoming increasingly common through mobile technologies and digital platforms. “The internet allows people to communicate and access shared information and databases at a distance” (Rainie, Lee, and Barry Wellman.2012. p. 173). This is particularly common relating to knowledge-based professions not bound to one physical location due to technology or physical documentation. Because of this, our workplace has less justification for a dedicated workstation when defined by access to equipment and information. Now, the work can be increasingly a carriable object as a backpack and a laptop or a mobile device, leading to work being conducted in domestic space.

Because of this, work is becoming increasingly a switch of mentality to change the purpose of your time from private and leisure, to professional. A “study of 329 British workers found nearly 1 in 5 employees spends two to 10 hours a week working from bed” (Shellengerger, S. 2012). As an example, John Lennon’s and Yoko Ono’s week spent from a bed of a hotel in Netherlands as a publicity stunt in the 1960s, the work was conducted in the bed “treating the bed as a work space with a precise schedule.”(Colombina, B. 2018. P.190). If “industrialization brought with it the eight-hour shift and the radical separation between the home and the office or factory” (Colombina, B. 2018. P.190), contemporary discussions of work-life balance seem to bring back this discussion of what are the borders between work and leisure. Due to the contemporary trends of flexibility and agility of the work, the workplace does not require such clear divisions as coming five days a week to a designated desk or room. Instead, the work is communicated and organized through digital platforms.
Fig. 6,7 / The workplace and workers from tv-series “The Office”. A small clustered workplace of the tv-series emphasizing mostly on social aspects of the office workers.
Fig. 8 / An individual accessing the global networks.
1.2 DIGITALIZATION OF WESTERN CULTURES

“The elimination of the spirit of protectionism, in both trade and in the form of group loyalties that exclude all outsiders, is a universal struggle and a universal goal. But to pursue that goal also means that we are plunging into an age of confrontation: between benefit and harm, between personalities, and between cultures.” (Kurokawa. 1994. p.3)

Since commercially available personal computing and the spread of internet connectivity, our world has been more connected to spread of information and between individuals. The digitalization, defined as “Integration of digital technologies into everyday life by the digitization of everything that can be digitized” (IGI Global, 2020), is a norm instead of anomaly. From the beginning of the 2000s this connectivity has been presented by increased use of services, platforms and applications ranging from communications, organizational tools, advertising, entertainment, social networking and other methods to provide an individual new means of connection. One of the factors presenting this is how the statistics show the global growths of internet users by country where “the internet has been one of our most transformative and fast-growing technologies” (Roser. Ritchie. Ortiz-Ospina. 2020). On the downside, the individuals are usually monitored, with the freedom of these tools differing by culture and society. In a relatively recent survey, people between the ages of 16-24 in Europe were almost certainly attached to these forms of social networks. In an increasingly digital world, the communication through various platforms has provided new possibilities and “the rise of social media is an extraordinary example of how quickly and drastically social behaviours can change: Something that is today part of the everyday life of one-third of the world population, was unthinkable less than a generation ago” (Roser. Ritchie. Ortiz-Ospina. 2020).

Kisho Kurokawa, an architect whom was one of the key figures in the Metabolism movement in Japan, described “... a society in which we confirm our own identity by observing others, opening the possibility for increasing diversification” (Kurokawa.1994. p.5) in which a society would have “...fair and proper evaluation of different cultures, different talents, and different personalities.” (Kurokawa,1994. p.5). Kurokawa depicts how a society of symbiosis could be created using mobile individuals more focused on mental possession than physical. Today, in the realm of apps and digital platforms, we belong to a global network of individuals connected during our
Number of internet users by country

Internet users are individuals who have used the Internet (from any location) in the last 3 months. The Internet can be used via a computer, mobile phone, personal digital assistant, games machine, digital TV etc.


Fig. 9 / The number of internet users by country in 2010 and 2017. Internet users defined as individuals who have used the internet (from any location) in the last 3 months.
personal and professional time effecting our cultural, economic and political realities.

During the past decade, our work has occupied an increased amount of locations, accessible with various transportation methods reservable through shared platforms. The new transportation methods can include changes in public transportation, sharing cars or other vehicles offered by multiple service providers. At the same time, the technological development has created a difficulty for older generations to adapt into the use of these modern digital platforms and new technology (Jefferson, R. S. 2019). Our cities are in a constant dialogue on how to adapt regulations and systems into the new.

The list below presents a number of possibilities that an individual can currently access and utilize for connecting, sharing information, organizing and communicating. As many digital platforms monetize through their users, they also have provided the individuals an opportunity to monetize or access information for organizing their own personal or professional economics. The following are examples of the possibilities of utilizing digital tools:

- Organizing travels by comparing costs, duration, and finding most suitable personal solutions through platforms or apps of private transportation companies;
- comparing accommodation costs and cosiest locations from traditional hotels to short-term rentals;
- searching information through an extensive number of websites and services for any question in mind;
- contacting through voice- and video calls, emails, platforms for collaboration including Microsoft Teams and direct messages through time-zones;
- archiving, sharing and accessing information through cloud-services;
- and lastly searching for spaces to work through sites as Nomadlist, Coworker.com, and simply through “googling” local possibilities.

These digital platforms have both empowered the individual and made it a part of a large network. This is described as a new social operating system, that is “… in contrast to the longstanding operating system formed around large hierarchical bureaucracies and small, density knit groups…” (Rainie. Wellman. 2012. p. 6-7). We are working more from perspective of an individual through digital platforms but connected to a larger network of people. This networking happens through “…media that fosters individuality and remoteness almost by definition or by the nature of their technology”
(De Graaf, R. 2018). As the hardware for accessing the digital platforms has decreased in size, the commercially available mobile devices we utilize are also designed for personal use. Rainier and Wellman have called the consequences of this phenomenon “networked individualism”. In this context, “the structure of networked organizations is more flexible, laterally coordinated, team based, and boundary spanning” (Rainie. Wellman. 2012. p.177).

These networks have provided us with increased possibilities of job autonomy and flexibility of work outside of the corporate workplace, whilst at the same time we have seen an increase of digital services, platforms and hardware as sensors being implemented into our workplaces. These devices put the individual in the position of being the observer but also the one being observed, given the information can be accessed through networks. Given the risk of using these devices to monitor our behaviour, local and Europe-wide regulations limit the extent of use of these tools in order to protect our privacy. This also limits the amount of use of these tools, especially regarding to sensors tracking geographic movement.

---

**Fig. 10, 11 / Top:** Number of people using social media platforms. Estimates correspond to monthly active users. **Bottom:** Percentage of young people, aged 16-24, engaging in social networking online. Data refers to 2014 or closest available estimated.
“Information technology is the principal agent of change in office work and in office design.” (Duffy, Powell. 1997. p.52)

The modern technology has evolved through more powerful computing power and smaller hardware into providing a wider range of software and platforms. Through digital networks these modern tools have made it easier to communicate through borders and time-zones and to collaborate by sharing information through internet connections.

The digital platforms provided for personal use have also affected dense urban cities in multiple ways: disrupting the street with new methods of transportation as electric scooters and city bikes etc. (Bullard, Postrel.. 2018); altering how we perceive and create an idea of the architecture through social platforms and shared images versus thinking of the spatial dimension (Zeiba, D. 2019); creating interest for places by allowing individuals to review them (Butler. 2017; Ellson. 2018) and creating services for temporary accommodations affect our cities with short-term rental (Peach. 2017; Koster. Ommeren. Volkhausen. 2018).

With these peer-to-peer sharing platforms, Juliet Schor, Professor of Sociology at Boston University states that “these new technologies of peer-to-peer economic activity are potentially powerful tools for building a social movement centered on genuine practices of sharing and cooperation in the production and consumption of goods and services. But achieving that potential will require democratizing the ownership and governance of the platforms.” (Schor. 2014). Schor also discusses that when these companies expand to Europe, they will likely “be embedded in political, regulatory, and social context that will bring force them closer to the values of fairness, sustainability, openness, and cooperation” (Schor. 2014). Since this essay was written in 2014, there were clear cases and ruling aimed at limiting the expansion of international sharing services, as in cases of Uber (Bowcott. 2017) and Airbnb (O’Sullivan. 2018). At the same time, we are seeing workplace being provided through global services as “WeWork”, claiming to “bridge the gap between physical spaces and digital platforms” (WeWork. 2020). Utilizing new technology and digital networks has also become a trend in the construction of modern workplaces. WeWork uses BIM-modeling, short to Building Information Modeling, to create the spaces (Rhodes. 2018).

Other common platforms used in workplace as collaboration tools are Microsoft Teams and Slack, platforms for communication and sharing information using cloud services. Rise of these digital tools and services effect organizing our work and workplace increasingly.
1.3 TEMPORALITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

“Technology does not take root when it is cut off from culture and tradition. The transfer of technology requires sophistication: adaptation to region, to unique situations, to culture and custom. When the technology of one culture is introduced into another cultural sphere with different lifestyle, it is often difficult to ensure that the technology will take root there.” (Kurokawa, 1994. p. 6)

The culture of imposed economic instability has led to a culture of temporality, and a shift away from prioritizing one’s lifestyle stability early on in life. One example of this could be how urban populations see fewer younger families, and these families are increasingly reduced in size (Eurostat, 2019). In a report by the European Union from 2017, it was shown that the mobility of the workforce had increased steadily over the last few decades (Fries-Tersch, Tugran, Rossi, Bradley, 2018). While we have these slight increases of labour mobility - divided around 50-50 percent between male and female (Fries-Tersch, Tugran, Rossi, Bradley, 2018), we also see global markets providing scalable business opportunities and trends targeted to individual professionals and small companies as co-working rise. Living in rental apartments has also increased steadily in the EU-28 while the population in urban areas is estimated to grow (World Health Organization, 2019). Relating to work, temporary and part-time work has also lightly increased in EU-28 zone, in such creating a workforce with less stable knowledge of their economic future. Many can also take advantage of the modern networks and more personal opportunities of monetizing for content, services or products when working as digital nomads.

What Kisho Kurokawa defined as the “Age of Life”, was to move away from the “Age of Machine” “which rejects all ambiguity and difference in favour of speed, efficiency, and standardization” (Kurokawa, 1994. p. 21) and which “has been an age of Eurocentrism and logos-centrism” (Kurokawa, 1994. p. 7). The new “Age of Life”, where cultures would live in symbiosis, would see “the rising interest in the environment and the new importance given ecology aim at preserving the diversity of life” (Kurokawa, 1994. p. 10). This culture would also be less bound by physical possessions, and instead increasingly rely on events and mental possessions. In the symbiosis of cultures, the technology would need to adapt to the culture of the people it is used by. Such a world would then no longer be dominated by any singular cultural zone and by old hierarchical structures, and could be similar to a society of the priorly mentioned “networked individuals”.
Fig. 12,13/ Top: Distribution of flats and houses, EU28. The information presented excluded the residual category of others (those living in dwellings other than houses or flats), data extracted on 2017. Bottom: Part-time and temporary work in EU28.
Today, our workplace has become an environment for such culture to exist: a space of less physical possessions of individuals and more emphasis on networks and collaboration. The social and democratic revolution of the future holds “more empowered and better-connected individuals [that] will be more creative, more dynamic, less wedded to life-time jobs, but also more demanding and critical. This could allow to fundamentally rejuvenate the social contract and to invent a new form of governance.” (ESPAS. 2015. p.11). At the same moment, we also see an increase in protectionism through European politics, most clearly through United Kingdom decision of Brexit.

For these reasons, the following paragraph will focus on viewing the possibility of a societal change as “Age of Life” being able to exist in the European tradition of work and workplace.

1.3.1 THE EUROPEAN OFFICE TRADITION

With the population of the world being more connected to the internet, following paragraph will look to “… mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived indirectly from the peculiarities of a particular place” (Frampton. 2002. p.21).

This quotation in which Kenneth Frampton describes how “Critical regionalism” saw the importance of understanding the local nuances is critical in a globally connected world. While Kurokawa notes the necessity of technology to adapt into the local context, Frampton saw the importance of how “critical arrière-garde [defence] has to remove itself from the optimization of advanced technology” (Frampton. 2002. p.20).

“Such historical and political influences have made Northern European office buildings different in almost every aspect from those in North America: they tend to be low-rather than high-rise, suburban rather than city centre, narrow rather than deep, rambling rather than efficient, naturally ventilated rather than air-conditioned, and influenced by wishes of ordinary office workers rather than corporate in style” (Duffy. Powell.1997. p. 34)

One of the most relevant conclusions relating to European offices is that “there is a clear relation between office design and national context” (Van Meel. 2000. p.157). In European offices “over time, a country’s social, cultural and economic forces
create design solutions that become generally accepted” (Van Meel. 2000. p.156-157). Meanwhile, “real estate management is becoming an increasingly international and therefore complex discipline” (Van Meel. 2000. p.158), bringing workspace not to become solely locally owned. The most recent international examples of global membership-based workplace services, such as WeWork, can represent this.

Clearly, The European tradition of an office is as culturally varied as the continent itself. The cultural differences should be first understood in order to see if possible external factors, as a societal change with younger generation more used to modern digital platforms, could alter the tradition of a European office.

Airbnb faces opposition due to fear of the gentrification in the neighbourhoods where it has a presence, and due to negative effects to the local urban infrastructure (Bullard. Postrel. 2018). The impact of Airbnb in historical cities like Barcelona (Poole. 2018; Gutting. 2018) represents an example of the difficult relationship between global services and local context.

Similar to these services, the spread of large corporate headquarters also faces opposition. Google’s attempt to move to Berlin was turned away due to both concern over their tax-policies and negative views on data protection (BBC News. 2018). Similarly to Google, Amazon was pushed out of New York (Stone. 2019) and local citizens rebelled against the effects of large information technology companies in San Francisco (Sandler. Canales. 2018).

The city of San Francisco, the thriving center of the “big tech”, has seen an increase in the homelessness and rental costs in the urban center (Wong. 2019). The local neighborhoods have become problematic for both the new workforce moving into the city as also for the local citizens. San Francisco, by taking the role of hosting large information technology companies and start-ups, faces the challenge of how the cities can adapt to creating large “hubs” for information technology industries. In an era of fast spread of information, this has also been discussed globally.

When local media publishing house “Axel Springer” was able to provide a large campus in a central location of Berlin, its presence was approved and accepted. This shows that the large campus itself was not the issue. All the cases indicate that the concerns are the effects of these corporate entities or sharing economy to local environments, and whether these corporations or global services make a longstanding commitment into improving their immediate surroundings, both financially and societally.

The reason behind the acceptance of Axel Springer’s Campus is highlighted by Regula Lüscher, the Senate Building Director at Berlin’s Department for Urban
**Fig. 14,15** /Top: Photography of the upcoming Axel Springer campus by OMA architects. **Bottom:** the Microsoft Munich HQ. Buildings presenting examples of large headquarters extending horizontally instead of building higher.
Development and the Environment, who said: “The concept offers a strong symbolic force as it leads the course of the Berlin Wall diagonally through the building, thereby creating an atrium and spectacular interior, which addresses the unification of this city. Thus, Axel Springer continues its own architectural history in this location.” (Quirk. 2014). This example presents the effort taken into participating to the local tradition and history. It is taking in consideration the cultural context where “the aim of planning policies ... seek to strengthen the identity of Berlin by insisting that architecture must relate to the city, the historical and build context, to architectural tradition” (Balfour. 1995). Another key aspect of the Campus, besides fitting into the local context, is that Axel Springer himself has ownership and not a third party.

“The nation and the city will gradually achieve an equal status, and the cities will become increasingly autonomous, engaging in their own foreign relations, trade, and cultural exchange.” (Kurokawa. 1994. p.3)

“Building height is restricted because tall buildings do not ‘fit’ in the historical character of cities or because they obstruct the view of monuments. This is, for example, particularly important in Italian cities with their ‘ever present historical heritage’. “ (Van Meel. 2000. p.152)

Other examples with large corporate headquarters as Microsoft’s adaptation to local European context are as follows:

• Microsoft in La Feltrinelli House in Milan: this office has both open views and architectural reference of Milanese ports to fit into local context.
• Microsoft Munich headquarters: here, the use of sensors monitoring spaces is limited by German regulations. Also, height of the building cannot be higher than the local historical church called “Church of Our Lady”. These regulations were started by local initiative of a former mayor (DW Staff, 2004).

These examples outline how buildings were adapted to the local context. Traditionally, “Europe is known for its ‘ground scrapers’ rather than for its skyscrapers” (Van Meel. 2000. p.149) making corporate headquarters less visible normally in the skyline of the cities. As an example of regulations with building high-rises in central areas of the Finnish capital Helsinki, the new buildings must go by the suggested heights of the urban masterplan. They also have to match the surrounding buildings’ height (City Of Helsinki, 2010). When regulations act as the basis of all new urban development,
building higher building can become challenging. While the spread of co-working spaces can happen at a faster pace, overcoming the “fragmented ownership structures [that] form an obstacle to the acquisition of large plots [in Europe]” can be harder. (Van Meel. 2000. p.152). These regulations vary by city, not solely by country, and perhaps indicate somewhat of “the nation and the city will gradually achieve an equal status, and the cities will become increasingly autonomous, engaging in their own foreign relations, trade, and cultural exchange.” (Kurokawa.1994. p.3).

1.3.1.1 CULTURAL CONTEXT IN INTERIOR SPACE

“There are three aspects of culture that have an impact on workplace design: hierarchy, individualism and the way people interact.” (Van Meel.2000. p.156)

For the interior space and cultural context, examples like “in Sweden’s egalitarian culture, every employee gets his own private room.” (Van Meel. 2000. p.156) and “in the more hierarchic British culture, such offices are privileges meant for the higher echelons.” (Van Meel. 2000. p.156) present some of the cultural differences affecting the interior and its divisions. These have cultural importance with seclusion in forms of private rooms or open-plan office. Similarly, “in Germany, the Netherlands and Italy, hierarchy is expressed in the size of rooms and the number of people per room” (Van Meel. 2000. p.156) exist.

Differing traditions of social interaction also result in various practices for workplace planning. In Nordic cultures, social spaces are created in the workplace to encourage socialising whilst others acknowledge the need for private spaces intended for individual focus in which the worker has an increased ability to curate his or her own surroundings. In contrast, Italian workplace traditions vary greatly, with Van Meel stating“ ...all countries except for Italy have what are called ‘neutral’ cultures...” (Van Meel. 2000. p.156). This is apparent through“...lots of facial expressions, intonation, touching and gestures [which] is probably less easily replaced by e-mail or video conferencing than more ‘neutral’ types of interaction.” (Van Meel. 2000. p.121). These differing social traditions limit the possibility of adopting a teleworking culture, as the “acceptance of workplace innovations such as teleworking depends largely on psychological factors.” (Van Meel. 2000. p.166).

The effects of “fragmented ownership” (Van Meel. 2000. p.152) and protection of cities historical background create also variations for the design of a workplace: ”
When looking at floor plans of European office buildings, there is a crucial difference in the depth of floors between the UK and Continental Europe” (Van Meel. 2000.p.153). The spatial differences are explained by power relations, linking back to the way that the culture perceives hierarchies. Additional factors effecting the size are the local regulations and real estate markets. Normally with regulations for the office, “labour regulations gave employees the right to be involved in organisational decision-making” (Van Meel. 2000.p.154), affecting also the hierarchy of decision making.

In Continental Europe and Nordic Countries where labor organizations play an important role in participating in the planning of the workplace, employee wellbeing has come from factors where “due the strong role of employee representatives... Continental European countries have adopted regulations that stress the importance of daylight and an outside view. Only in the UK are such regulations absent.” (Van Meel. 2000.p.154). This procedure can cause a lengthy process before with beginning the construction, making the urban development to be a much slower process in most of the European countries in comparison to other continents.

“Private offices are an excellent means of controlling your interaction with others.” (Van Meel. 2000.p.106)

Apart from separating interior spaces and its’s qualities by power relations, the individual space has also been defined as a possibility to keep the privacy for concentration from social. In UK, “status symbols such as big private offices have been stripped away and most employees work in sunlit, spacious open-plan workplaces.” (Van Meel. 2000.p.68).

Typically, in Northern European offices create spaces intended to aid social encounters, but it tries to keep in mind the wellbeing and privacy of the workers in order for everybody to have state of wellbeing provided by their working environment. This is typically also presented as a provision of seclusions as private spaces, making acoustic privacy an important factor. In comparison, offices in the UK differ considerably perhaps due to the influence of office culture from the United States and its diverse cultural background of employees.
1.3.1.2 INTERIOR STYLE AND MATERIALITY

“What if this seemingly accidental—and usually regretted—homogenization was an intentional process, a conscious movement away from difference toward similarity?” (Koolhaas, 1995)

While divisions of the interior space vary clearly in Europe by cultural context, has materiality been affected by the globally more networked society and workspace as a service?

Other external issues also affecting the interior space could be the interference of workplace as a service, as in co-working spaces, where the design can be largely engineer oriented (Russi, 2019). Could the influence of digital platforms and workspace as a service create “non-places” in the interior style?

The referred term “non-places” is a neologism made by a French anthropologist Marc Augé. Typically, these “non-spaces” are spaces like motorways, hotel rooms, airports and shopping malls. The definition of what this space is is dependence highly on the individual experience, as a shopping mall is not a non-place for those who are working there (Augé, 2008). The work of Italian researcher Marco Lazzari suggests, that digital natives may also have a different perception of shopping malls as a meeting point thus not making it a non-place for them.

This refers to a contrary of “Non-places”, the “anthropological places” described as spaces where “The place offers people a space that empowers their identity, where they can meet other people with whom they share social references. The non-places, on the contrary, are not meeting spaces and do not build common references to a group. Finally, a non-place is a place we do not live in, in which the individual remains anonymous and lonely.” (Lazzari, 2012).

While the digital platforms like Airbnb present themselves with a way of experiencing the local culture, they have taken over cities by private investors. This phenomenon, together with the risen role of viewing architecture through images (Zeiba, D. 2019), has by side-effect created a medium of interior style to suit both domestic and personal presentation, as also to be viable for commercial use. With Airbnb, this style has become presented in examples as “Airbnb-auto.com” and “optimyzemybnb.com”, an optimization of interior design for commercial domestic style. For such “harmonization of space” (Chayka, 2016), the term “airspace” was used in an article by Kyle Chayka to describe the style and global effects of digital platforms. But whilst
Fig. 16-23 / Comparison of Reception-areas presented in WeWork.com. All present a different type of a counter as a block, where mainly the color and the material differing by its surroundings.
Figure 24-31 / Comparison of kitchen-areas presented in WeWork.com. All present a similar pattern with high counter, barstools, and hanging lights. The materiality of the space and shape of these interior elements differ by location, yet all presenting a similar graphical style.
the digital nomads have modified the American style café to become a typology of a workplace, the Parisian or Italian café is still a café. The current co-working and co-living concepts are designed through additions to spatial efficiency and utilizing metrics, which optimizes the design of the spaces. Yet, offices in Northern-, Continental- and Southern Europe all having their own tradition for the, services as the co-working should have to adapt to the local context.

I have had the opportunity to discuss on this matter with Nicola Russi, partner of Laboratorio Permanente, a Milanese architecture studio that designed “Spaces”, a coworking in Porta Nuova. The talk covered the importance of nuances on how co-working spaces adapt to the cultural context and on problematics of engineer-oriented design of these commercial shared spaces covered in following paragraph. Specifically, we discussed the example of how to adapt local Italian habits, like drinking coffee, into working context. Italians like to drink their coffee while standing in front of a high counter. Neglecting this type of necessity as a part of the interior design would create a conflict with the cultural habits of the users. Additional importance was put into the fit of materiality to local context and creating openness for the spaces to the surrounding areas. In “Spaces”, this meant that the materiality of Milan was reflected to the use of stone surfaces, and openness was created by a focus on views between interior and exterior spaces.

The materiality of these spaces, for example “WeWork”, seems to share the same typology: glazed walls, wooden surfaces, similar shades of colours and dark-coloured affordable work seats, whilst still adapting to the cultural context. The small nuances with surface materials, colour-combinations and with the style of furnishing presented some modifications of global service concept adapting to local concept. The interior spaces of “Spaces Porta Nuova” have taken these steps a bit further yet keeping a reference to other co-working spaces.

The images presented of “WeWork”-spaces indicate that their co-working spaces share similarities in the interior design, and focused on being spaces for meeting and being social, exactly the contrary of non-places, usually the spread of workspaces as a service also need to fit into what is provided in the local urban real-estate market. Also, by having a high focus on work community, these spaces would not make non-places for the users utilizing the space and interacting with other members. In the “Spaces” co-working, this context was perceived with the integration to the local context through materiality and user preferences by taking into account the local traditions as preference in wood and stone, the means of communication and leisure, and the connectivity between inside-outside.
Fig. 32-34 / Interior spaces of “Spaces” co-working Porta Nuov in Milan, Italy, with materiality reflecting to a Milanese style.
1.3.1.3 CONVERSATION WITH NICOLA RUSSI

Nicola Russi, a Ph.D. Architect is an associate professor at Politecnico di Torino and a partner in Milanese architecture studio Laboratorio Permanente with an extensive portfolio consisting of projects as: interior architecture of “Spaces “Porta Nuova for “IWG, a leader in multinational workspace solutions, the Scalo Farini area in Milan, a competition won together with OMA Architects. Academically, Nicola has also been in charge of rethinking the shared space for living with “Coexistenz Minimum”, as well as a study of the urban city in his recently published book “Backgrounds”.

In late November of 2019, I had a possibility to discuss with him on the subjects of contemporary co-working and -living spaces, as also the role of architects in understanding the broader context at their studio in Milan, Italy.

MH: To begin with, you have been working with office spaces both as private and shared spaces, as “Spaces” Porta Nuova and for the healthcare facilities published in FRAME-magazine as “Smart Edges”. My research on the future of the workplace began from the interest of the Japanese Metabolism movement and theories of a generation of globality, mobility, and mental possessions. As you have an extensive background in studying architecture and urban scale, most recently studied in the publication “Backgrounds”, I would like to begin by asking what you think is the role of an architect in contemporary cities, or in my case of an interior architect, especially regarding the current rise of shared spaces?

Nicola Russi: As architects, we define our role to understand also the bigger picture. We need to understand the people and the context of the building in its surroundings, not just to go by the demands of markets. We have a role in society to understand the context and our effects to it.

MH: How would you specify these in co-working spaces?

NR: In a co-working space, typically, all privacy is targeted to a workstation, and all sharing is in the “community spaces”. The most important factor of a co-working space is in the lobby, that is where things happen. It really is a club; it is much based on the privilege of being a member of it and usually has a clear separation from an outsider: for example, the translucent gates that let you see through but create an evident division of insiders and outsiders.
The design of a co-working and co-living space as a service is also based mostly on engineered space planning, but its style is mainly based on domestic atmospheres. They are created with different signals to look like a place of someone, but in reality, everything from the size of a table is designed by metrics. Also, with metrics and membership, many functions move to be shared and the size of private spaces and privacy is less.

These spaces are also very far from what, for example, one of the Japanese architects behind Metabolism, Kisho Kurokawa, designed with the Capsule towers. In the capsules, everything was integrated into one element, the capsule apartments. As well as a Metabolist project, every space here is scientifically planned, but the perception you have is completely different: the style is informal, and furniture appears free in the space. There is no immediate evidence of the strong design control behind it. This is the opposite of the techno celebration of the capsule-prototypes in the 70’s and 80’s.

MH: Similar changes can be seen to be a trend, for example, with the digital platform currently utilized to organize the communication and scheduling of an increasingly flexible workforce. With many things moving to algorithms and metrics, how do you see these private space providers fitting into local context?

NR: For example, I would argue that if you take Greek food eaten in Greece to your home, it never really tastes the same does it? Perhaps because of the light, the smell, the atmosphere, and everything around the original culture may really create a large part of the experience.
How we also perceive the co-working space is that it also needs to adapt to its surroundings. There is a specific way the locals will interact and how the culture works. For example, in Italy, you need to have a counter in the café. That’s how people are used to drinking their coffee, and you can simply not have it. This is one of the things we raise as a subject when designing co-working spaces; how the spaces fit the local culture in order also for the users to not feel disoriented.

In the case of Milan, we also defined all of the materiality, details, and atmosphere inside to fit into the local context. For example, Milan is a very “stony city”; the floor cannot just be linoleum. As we were working on a project in Berlin, we conducted studies on the local materiality in Berlin, in this case; tiling.

In Milan, we also demanded to make some furnishing bespoke to fit the local context better, and once the clients saw them, they understood the importance. You cannot only buy a piece of stock furniture and put it into a space. It would not fit the people and would alienate the space. By having the local context, you also make the space more acceptable for the users.

MH: Much of the role of an architect and designer working with these international organizations seems to take an active part in communicating the local needs.

NR: Yes. As architects, we need to be present and to say that in the original brief, some percentage needs to change by the culture, and some of the original briefs can stay. But it cannot simply come into the city as the city would not exist around it.

Before we talked about how space fits the local workforce coming in, but one thing is also the openings from inside out. With the windows, we try to open them up as much as possible. Not merely to give natural light, but also to have a dialogue with the surroundings.

Other workspaces, for example, the “TalentGarden Isola”, also have a variety of events fit for that space and context and not just for the members. This is one form of inviting the locals to use the spaces seen in many co-working spaces.
MH: The rise of these events is certain, mostly seeming to be made in order to create this feeling of community. Personally, it feels a bit distant, perhaps due to my Finnish heritage of not being most bound to “networking, or something distances me from those spaces, they don’t feel very accepting when looking from the outside in.

NR: It’s interesting if bringing it back to the thought of the café. Many of the co-working spaces could have access to ground floor café by the public, but it’s not so. The spaces are divided to be only for members and by doing this it creates a privilege to be there. This still clearly makes the spaces communicate that “we are here, and you are there”.

MH: The first contact from which I was able to have this discussion with you was through Ippolito Pestellini Laparelli, whom you are working together on the “Scalo Farini” project. I have witnessed a lot of need and push for more and more adaptability while researching workplaces, from large to small and shared. The Scalo Farini proposal caught my attention last spring due to the way it provides adaptability and sustainability, and what seemed to me as designing a contemporary ecosystem with the master plan.

NR: We are just at the beginning of a new phase, but of course, everything will come down to how much percentage of innovation can exist in the final design. In our original entry, a part was to try and perceive things through horizontal connections as the services are also growingly working as a network inside the city. So that between building, there would be some types of horizontal connections. Currently, we will try to develop one block that would perhaps have something to do with this.

MH: Another project presenting high adaptability for me was your prior project for the healthcare facilities office in Milan. The project described in your website as “Smart Edges” created a flexible structure called “spine” working between formal and informal spaces. In my prior discussions with Benjamin Pardo about the move of corporate storing to the data facilities, it will inevitably bring architecture designed with large areas for storage to require finding an alternative use for these spaces. Your adaptable system resembled to me, in a way, a solution that could be an elegant adaptation of dividing spaces other than by using storage elements. What was the concept and the brief behind this?
NR: The brief was actually very typical “we want this amount of open spaces, some private booths, copy machines,” and such. What we presented instead was an adaptable sub-architecture to hold all of these qualities. So instead of making the structure obvious in its presentation, now people can go around it and say, “let’s meet on this side of the “spine.” So even as also concentrating on very flexible and functional sides, it also a representative side that creates a spatial hierarchy.

The clients took it well, and now it is almost as a service, where we come back to the design when the client wishes something to be added or modified. We made a structure very adaptable by attaching infrastructure to the ceiling, and now the client can just call us to ask if they want some changes to it.

MH: With adaptability, it feels necessary to contrast this into temporality, often discussed with the current culture of materialism and digital media. Coming back to the realms of architecture and design, co-working and co-living feel as types of contemporary reflections of this very temporary state of mind. As if the whole world is a possibility, but with a specific loss of finding stability. The domestic spaces in houses are typically one of the most stable elements in our daily lives, can you tell more about your background on studying co-living and co-sharing spaces?

NR: By looking into statistics, it can be seen that more and more property has become rented instead of owned. Whilst urbanization is increasing statistically, these urban areas are mainly rented, whilst the peripheries traditionally have more owned property. This basically causes our housing to become a service by its existence.

For individuals, these service platforms also seem to be cheaper solutions, but in reality, the price per square meter is more. The secondary cost is the loss of private space, where most of the functions are categorized into what is often called communal areas. On some occasions, people are even paid to participate in communal activities. In this strange reality, what is the purpose of living in these spaces?

MH: How have you tried to rethink these factors in your academic work as with “Rentscapes” and “Coexistenz Minimum studios”?
NR: “Rentscapes” is a study of situations if the current form of co-living would not be market oriented. How could it support, for example, social housing? In social housing, there is also a clear need for the temporary housing of individuals.

When people come to social housing from various backgrounds and cultures, the shared space is usually perceived as space for conflict to occur. If many occupants have different opinions regarding these spaces and different views of life in general, sometimes shared spaces can be feared to emphasize this. This is also not the reality but thought driven by avoiding worst-case scenarios.

With “Coexistenze Minimum”, we have also tried to adapt the division of co-living spaces in ways where they would not be isolated buildings. We began from dividing the areas to 35 % private space, 15 % shared spaces, 15 % other spaces, and 35 % public. While moving forward from this, we tried to search for new alternative methods of these spaces to work more inclusively. These have presented various scenarios, and we are still searching. I usually believe innovation can happen in only a few percentages of a project so that it can be applied for regular use. So, we need to find those small things applicable to reality. Things cannot just happen as 50 % innovation – this will never be applied to reality and will stay as a concept.

MH: Thank you. This discussion about the phenomenon of shared spaces and the current role of architecture and architects was a very valuable insight.
2. TERRITORIES IN THE CORPORATE WORKPLACE
In the second chapter, the focus will be on understanding the current office environment for the digitally connected individuals through a brief office history research, specifying the digital tools for a modern workplace and effects of rising autonomy and flexibility of work.

These studies are then further taken into site observations conducted with generous support and advisory of Benjamin Pardo and Knoll Inc., whom provide the opportunity to study the modern workplaces in France, Italy, Germany, and United Kingdom as also as conduct interviews with professionals in the field of design and architecture.

In order to better understand the role of division in the modern office, this chapter concludes by presenting a categorisation and furniture elements observed in modern workplaces.
2.1 THE OFFICE

“The artificial separation of houses and work creates intolerable rifts in people’s inner lives.”
(Alexander, Ishikawa, Silverstein, Jacobson, Fiksdahl-King, Shlomo. 1977. p.52)

The ‘office’ has roots in the Latin word ‘officium’, meaning ‘duty’ or ‘service’, with rooms dedicated to domestic work already being seen in Roman and Greek architecture. The large offices have provided a space of communication, and possibility for the storage and sharing of information and utilities differently than smaller workplaces.

Through Wi-Fi connections the public and private spaces have become easily accessible and utilized to work from and our cities have become urban playgrounds of co-work, flexible work, leisure, and living. In such, the distinctions between private and public has blurred, and the space for working is not as identifiable as it was. In a sense, we are moving back to artisanal ways of close relations between work and our private lives. In both Greek and Roman spaces, the prior relations of domestic space and workspace; the relation of leisure and work, could be seen. In Greek homes, a room called the “andron” was for intellectual work with a built-in benches and decoration separating it from other areas where only males could work (Aureli, Giudici. 2018. p.158-159). In these spaces, matters such as politics were to be discussed and the space was separated from females by different entrances (Wikipedia. 2019). In Roman villas – “domus” – a space called “tablinum” was separated as an office in the domestic building. Importantly, both the Greek and the Roman dwellings had both spaces more open to public and closed private spaces. In such dwellings even “rather unwelcoming rooms became desirable as they offered the only retreat from the rather hectic space of the Roman domus” (Aureli, Giudici. 2018. p.162).

“Within a society that made politics into relentless social networking, retreating from public life became the prerogative of those who could afford the luxury of being alone. Leisure thus was not just not-work, but rather being protected from too much public interaction.” (Aureli, Giudici. 2018. p.162)

An example of separating the modern interior space by adaptable spatial divisions can be found in “the Action Office” by Herman-Miller with design of a furniture systems providing an adaptable furniture-systems to create individual spaces inside an open-plan office. Another example for workplace planning is a design method known
as “The Office Landscape” or “Bürolandschaft”, that influences the spatial divisions of open-plan office by means of organizing the spatial elements in highly calculated but seemingly organic methods (Pettermann. 2017).

The corporate workplace as a “playground”, a workplace typically including for example foosball tables and fresh beverages, represented a clear trend to design workspace between leisure and work. With the rise of co-working spaces, a network of commercial workspace providers has spread to urban cities. In these shared workspaces, the focus is on both efficient use of space and providing a spatial platform for collaboration, professional networks and events. The shared workspaces for co-working space emphasis the community and present the division of interior spaces with less emphasis on power relation.

In the corporate office, the concept of sharing spaces can be provided through the use of digital platforms, with the use of improved hardware and software technology. The shared use of space can be particularly seen in the risen use of digital platforms to provide both flexibility and agility in the office, as well as to calculate the spatial efficiency. These digital tools help to organize the spatial use and can create the office as a conceptually non-territorial space used by need and personal preference.

“The very option of locking oneself in a cubiculum out of sight, became the root for a new idea of the self and identity, which eventually triumphed with Christianity itself.”  
During the rise of teleworking the main location to work from aside from a corporate office was “the home office”. In modern Western domestic spaces, the room dedicated for work still exist, but work can typically occupy a kitchen table or a sofa instead of solely having a dedicated space. Instead, a suitable canvas behind as a background with virtual communication through video, can be the façade of representing a domestic workspace. With teleworking coming again more important in large offices as Microsoft Munich, through “new world of work” (Microsoft. 2018), the workspace moves outside of the corporate office. To adapt to this change, the role of corporate office has also become the corporate platform for collaboration and social, having less emphasis to provision of individual spaces.

Fig. 38,39/ Caption from the movie “Scusate se esisto!” presenting an implementation of a fake office environment into domestic space trying to replicate poorly a false location, while also having difficulties keeping the role by being interrupted by visitors.
Fig. 40/ Photograph of a shelf holding a note “Offline is the new luxury”. Taken from BASE Búro workspaces, Milan.

Fig. 41-43/ Captions from Netflix-series “Abstract” describing the seclusion of a workgroup responsible of rebranding the platform of Instagram, described in the subtitles by the co-founder of Instagram, Kevin Systron.
2.2 FLEXIBLE WORK THROUGH DIGITAL PLATFORMS

In the 1950s, the “Office Landscape” or “Bürolandschaft” design method, created by a consultant group called the “Quickborner team” gained popularity as an office design method in Europe in the 1960s. The core principles of the design were to design a flexible office layout for communication, as also to provide “improvements into the organizational system” (Fuller. 1976. p.62) that were seen to be in high importance.

In order to improve the communication inside an office environment, they claimed that “the need for communication is one argument used in favour of large, undivided floor areas...” (Fuller. 1976. p.62-63). Currently, the lack of proper social interaction in an office is indicated to be strongly related to open-office plans with recent studies revealing that such layouts reduce the face-to-face interaction up to 70 %” (Bernstein. Turban. 2018. P.3), while much of the communication moves into the realm of the digital platforms. As “day-to-day norms also play an important role, with 48% citing inefficient workplace interactions as preventing an effective culture”, the of ensuring the correct methods of communication is yet vital (Graham. Grennan. .Harvey. Rajgopal. 2019.p. 28).

For this, “the Office Landscape”-design was tackling also ways where “unnecessary and prolonged visits are avoided” (Fuller. 1976. p.64). An example would include the time taken to seek a colleague’s, only to find his or her space absent (Fuller. 1976.p.64). This would cause the visit to have been an inefficient use of working time and could be improved by working from an undivided space.

Some indications of why “The Office Landscapes” later fell as a popular design method, were that their core concept included “supposedly universal needs (that) cannot be shown to exist” (Fuller. 1976. p.67). Their design of the interior spaces tackled the office design from various aspects, yet not concentrating in any of these fully. As an example, their high focus on team-working is claimed to be unjustified (Fuller. 1976. p.62).

Factors as visual connectivity and communication is currently bridged through both visually transparent separation walls as also by digital platforms that let you view your co-worker’s location. Systems as “ROL intelligent office”, a digital platform for an agile office, provide the flexibility of choosing your daily and hourly workspace. This is done by making all workstations from desks and meeting rooms to soft seating reservable through provided digital platforms. These digital platforms give the individuals access to search information, as for example the location of their
Fig. 44/ Top: Example of how “Microsoft” can provide the location of a colleague through digital platforms.

Fig. 45-47/ Bottom: Digital platform of “ROL Intelligent Office” representing a brief look into their platform for the office. Both of these platforms show similarities of presenting the 2D or 3D illustration of the office environment and showing either location of colleagues or additionally also other utilities and details from desks to seats, booths and available transportation closeby the office.
colleagues. Similar tools are provided by Microsoft with their search tool for the office. Currently the utilization of these tools is affected by local regulations, specifically to protect individual privacy. One of the examples would be a notion made during a site observation visit to Germany, where local regulation prevented tracking of the personal behaviour and of spatial use, if the link between individual user and spatial use could be made.

With rise of these digital platforms in workplace, surveys indicate that the expectations for technology and digital platforms in workplace vary by generation (Bresman. Rao. 2014) (Gassam. 2018.). Similarly, a gap between how generations are grown to utilize these tools are clear – as a general example the use of social media with Generation Z and Generation Y.

In a survey published in Harvard Business Review, this was indicated to a difference of Generation Z showing more interest toward utilizing VR for work, while Generation X shared more enthusiasm towards tools for project management and self-education (Bresman. Rao. 2014). Similarly, surveys of Generation Z was indicated to wish both face-to-face communication and taking responsibility at work, whilst aiming for a leadership role was highly dependent by continent and culture (Bresman. Rao. 2014) (Gassam. 2018.). It is also suggested that “today's younger generation values autonomy and freedom in their lives more than prior generations” (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017.p.54), whilst also younger generations may be harder to motivate and see more importance in leisure and work-life balance (Twenge. 2010).

While contemporary technology is still finding best means to utilize virtual reality, the most visible digital tools affecting the work of all these generations have been mainly for organizing, collaboration and communication. Beginning from simple audio and video calls to emails, the diversity of these platforms have provided most recently possibilities to organize group collaboration through platforms like Microsoft Teams, Slack or Workplace by Facebook; share project documentation through cloud as in G-Suite, Box, Dropbox; and to communicate both private and professional life or marketing through platforms like Instagram and Facebook. Through utilizing parametric design and data, an individual can also handle more complex processes. Examples as Flinch, a plug-in targeted to make parametric design of floorplans through defined set of rules in a user-friendly platform “minimising tedious and repetitive tasks we free up time for design work” (Wellgren.. by Ravencroft. 2019).
With the current improvements in video calls, some improvements with the gap between face-to-face contact over messaging or voice call have been made. However, a gap still clearly exists between the subtle nuances of person-to-person encounter and virtual connectivity. Spatially, modern technology has meant that the office is required to have either more screens, surfaces for projections, or spaces to organize meetings between persons communicating from different locations via virtual connectivity. All of these share the necessity for access to electricity, and usually require also a working internet connection.

These tools have provided not solely flexibility for organizing the workplace, but also the flexibility of individuals to work remotely meanwhile staying connected to others through virtual.

Fig. 48-50/ Illustrations present different most typical types of screens providing connectivity and people apart the personal computer: A physical screen attached to movable elements or to the wall (2.), projections (1.) and increasingly smaller mobile screens in telephones and other carriable objects(3.). Additionally Virtual Reality and Artificial Reality provide types of “screens”, but with less physical screens.
For both individuals and the workplace, examples of the general changes with digital tools are as following:

- Collaboration and organization can change through multiple tools for communication in groups and person-to-person;
- Provision of digital platforms make the agile office solutions, where the location of the workstation, qualities of the equipment and environment as lighting conditions and height of the desk can be altered by individuals;
- The access or archive of information has changed our work to need different physical spaces for documentation. As an example, moving from paper documentation to storing in external servers. This depends on the profession, as for example law offices are required to also keep their physical documentation;
- Individuals can handle more complex processes by addition of parametric design and automation.

With these new possibilities, one of the clear changes in moving towards larger use of teleworking has been “a transition from in-person supervision to remote managing [of work]” (Kurland. Bailey. 1999. p.3), leading to a new possibility for increased autonomy of an employee, and managing work through digital services. The benefits of job autonomy for an employee can foster motivation as well as personal growth” (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017. p.48) and, “reduces conflicts arising from incompatible role pressures from the work and family domains” (Kubicek. Paškvan.
Bunner. 2017. p.48). But, the mobile workers can also “find it more difficult to balance work demands with home demands” (Kurland. Bailey. 1999. p.14). This indicates that the case of worker being both autonomous and mobile, individual employee’s personal needs will come into importance.

“...when designing work environments, supervisors should acknowledge individual differences in their employees’ need for autonomy and work values.” (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017.p. 54)

For those with the most mobility, the office will present itself as an option in a “workplace network”, meaning “expansion of work from one centralised location to many types of spaces and locations” (Vuokko. Kojo. Nenonen.2013. p. 21). For the ones still mainly occupying one location to conduct work, the remote office can be a “satellite office”, locations “within convenient commuting distances from their employees” (Vuokko. Kojo. Nenonen.2013. p.24). The “satellite” office is mainly a product that employee benefits by shorter commuting times and plausibility of adjusting personal schedules, and multiple satellite offices form “the workplace network”: the sum of different locations possible for conducting the work.

When it comes to differences between a flexible office space, home offices or other mobile locations, following emphasis of these spaces are listed as following: “the service provision of organisational offices and flexible offices should focus on providing users with the chance for socialisation using collaborative space solutions and community management policies. In the cases of home offices and mobile workplaces, service provision should instead emphasise ensuring functionalities such as efficient virtual connectivity and accessibility” (Vuokko. Kojo. Nenonen. 2013.p.21).

In large corporations, working remotely from a client’s or customer’s premises is also not always beneficial, as “it might be difficult for him or her to conduct any other work beyond interactions relating to that client” (Vuokko. Kojo. Nenonen. 2013.p.24). This is also affected if the employee has unfavourable emotional connections to the client.

With the flexible workplace, issues arise if the design and culture is not created organisation specific as “telecommuting challenges organizations to establish clear telecommuting policy guidelines” (Kurland. Bailey. 1999. p.10). The flexibility of work through telecommuting is also highly dependent on the cultural context. Where to work from home for a day in Norther Europe is less of a taboo, doing the same in Italy is more difficult (Van Meel. 2000.p.157). This indicates, that the design of future workplace will need to take into account not just cultural context, but also individual preferences and
needs. Currently, as we can access information whilst being physically less bound to one particular place, the rise in both software and hardware, as sensors utilized in workplace, the employee gains access to modify the environment and qualities as lighting, air conditioning, amount of monitors, location of the workstation, type of workstation as desk or soft-seat, and the height of the desk. The workplace becomes utilized by reservation, and less dedicated spaces can exist inside the office. They also have the possibility to provide data for understanding how to optimise the use of space, done through gathering data of the usage of spaces and equipment.

One of clear cases of this is “The Edge”-building in Netherlands. The building is owned by OVG real estate and largest office spaces are occupied by Deloitte. The building is claimed to be both the smartest and greenest building in the world (Randlal. 2015), where through digital platforms and sensors implemented into the architecture.

Before the rise of commercially available information technology, some widely known examples of standardization and design my dimesions and measurement of human body are examples as Le Corbusier’s “Moduler” and Ernst Neufert’s Architectural Data, Neufert described as a person of “absolute devotion to the efficiency of industry” (Graaf. 2017.p.60). They both have faced criticism for their emphasisa to create the spatial standards from the perspective of average white male. Most recently, “Contemporary architecture practice uses parametric design as a way to model, optimize, and simulate the built environment” (Niquille. 2018.p.218). The use of parametric design itself does not mean a more diverse set of data to be used in the design without user’s decision to do so, but these tools have the ability to make more variations of the design faster. New systems as “Jack & Jill”, a platform that lets users to design workplace ergonomics utilizing more diverse datasets; and “RAUPILOT”, a planning tool that presents the standards with highlighting more sizes and shapes of the users; can provide platforms for customizing spaces and objects more for differing needs through also in the case of “Jack & Jill” let the users to design more unique solutions without as significant use of time for planning.

These examples present the difficulty of combining the diversity of individuals into efficiency for general. Already cases as “The Office Landscapes” did provide complicated metrics for designing a personalized design solution for an office, but as stated the “supposedly universal needs cannot be shown to exist” (Fuller.1976.p.67) was some of the problematicas for this design method. Learning from these as from the problems of autonomous individuals, the diverse need of individuals should be taken into account when designing a workplace for these users. As the modern tools show possibilities for the individuals to work more autonomous, the various professional and personal preferences of these individuals should be taken into consideration.
Fig. 54-57 / Human dimensions presented in standards from Vitruvius, Le Corbusier and Neufert to Jack & Jill by Siemens. Before the digital platform of Jack and Jill “the white male standards” have been more dominant.
Fig. 58-60 / Presented in the example of screen captures from the website Nomadlist.com is the extensive access to information accessible by individuals – in this case considering working in Milan as “digital nomad”. 
2.3 AUTONOMOUS INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATE CULTURE

As large companies such as Microsoft aim for an increased provision of flexibility and agility of workers, it is becoming apparent that job autonomy also has possible downsides: “While an increase in autonomy may be generally beneficial in highly regulated and externally controlled work settings, it may be accompanied with more uncertainty and ambiguity in highly flexible and indirectly controlled work settings” (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017. p. 51).

What is described as the “autonomy paradox” also presents a relevant downside of job. A strain is caused to autonomous workers if their ability and knowledge, or networks to gain these abilities, is not sufficient to independently conduct tasks. In the “autonomy paradox”, while the employee gains autonomy over their schedules, as working times and - location, it also creates problems where “employees who have autonomy over their schedules, times, and places often intensify their work effort” (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017.p. 52). This eventually leads to more organizational control of the workers through values and norms, instead of clear autonomy (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017.p. 52).

As employees have more possibilities to choose when and where to conduct work, the demand for job and competency must be sufficient, meaning the employee must be equipped with proper control and tools to meet the demands (Kubicek. Paškvan. Bunner. 2017. P. 46). With management of these mobile workers especially in teleworking “the inability to review process may force management to increasingly manage outcomes” (Kurland. Bailey. 1999. P.5). This is where also hierarchy and power relations of European office play an important role: “Employees have to operate without the direct and visual control of their supervisors. Hierarchy can frustrate this way of working because managers may not believe that employees work at home as hard as they do at the office under their guidance.” (Van Meel. 2000.p.122).

This present the importance of both national culture and the organizational culture having a need of being prepared, if the employees are to be more autonomous or working remote. Some of the factors for improvement with the challenges of the teleworking are (Kurland. Bailey.1999.p.18):

- Guidelines, for example with communication, availability, scheduling and performance;
• Infrastructure, as good routes of communication;
• Availability of maintaining a consistency with scheduling;
• Scheduling for tasks and meetings;
• Trips to the main office in order to maintain organizational culture;
• Performance measuring, related highly to communication;
• Non-teleworker buy-in, to handle the adaptation and stress caused by employees working both through teleworking and solely from the corporate office.

With increase in flexibility and digital platform to organize employees with more autonomy, the contemporary management has moved from physical spaces towards the digital, from purely a human source to an inclusion of metrics and algorithm. While the modern tools for collaboration have presented to provide our workplace with more methods for collaboration virtually, simultaneously “the human behaviour risk” can be targeted by monitoring of the communications in these platforms (Strazzulla, P. 2019). For few examples, services as “Aware” and “Vyopta” provide monitoring of communication. If in an open-plan office we may have felt watched over by management, these tools may very well provide the same effects towards our digital communication. As the management could have shifted from physical space to digital software and hardware; monitoring the use of space, equipment and communication; means of tracking the progress of work could potentially come calculated and monitored, representing possible hierarchies and power in virtual space.

![Fig. 61](attachment:fig61.png)  

*Fig. 61 / The Job demand-control model from The The Bright and Dark Sides of Job Autonomy, originally from Karasek, 1979.*
As work-life balance has importance for younger generations, the importance of corporate culture comes also from the research suggesting that “higher perceptions of ethical culture associated with lower burnout and higher work engagement” (Huhtala. Tolvanen. Mauno. Feldt. 2014.p.1). This brings importance into the necessity creating organizational guidelines where “organizations need to prepare themselves and their employees for telework” (Kurland. Bailey. 1999.p.18). The following virtues are listed in order to be better prepared for teleworking: clarity, congruency of management, feasibility, supportability, transparency and discussability (Huhtala. Tolvanen. Mauno. Feldt. 2014.p.18-20).

“We found that top and middle managers’ shared emotions during the smartphone innovation process caused cycles of behaviours that harmed both the process and its outcome. Together, organizational attention structures and historical factors generated various types of shared fear among top and middle managers. Top managers were afraid of external competitors and shareholders, while middle managers were mainly afraid of internal groups, including superiors and peers. Top managers’ externally focused fear led them to exert pressure on middle managers without fully revealing the severity of the external threats and to interpret middle managers’ communications in biased ways.” (Vuori. Huy. 2016.p.1)

One of the recent industries being largely in the centre of discussion about the corporate culture has been the information technology industries, relating to work as “the grind”. As an example, from management during the fall of one of the innovative leaders of this industry at its time, Nokia corporations, represented the importance of management and leadership to be valuable in order to keep large corporations competitive and raise interest for younger workforce. With the example of Nokia, one of the indicated difficulties causing problems with management was the fear over sharing information. Yet before this, an example of Nokia’s former employee Jouni Mikkonen describes employing workers “almost straight from school bench” (Koskinen. 2018. 28:10) made innovations more possible to achieve. These employees were open to resolving ideas that seemed impossible for most, such as transferring information through air, now commonly known as wireless networks. What the innovation in Nokia also presented was a scenario of “getting out of the office” mentality, for example by using their top floor saunas with wide views over the horizon as meeting spaces (Koskinen. 2018. 25:05). These examples already from the 1990s present a former innovative corporation in technology industries showing levels of creative use of spaces.
Fig. 62 / Satire of the prior corporate culture of Microsoft before the current CEO.

Fig. 63 / Porta Volta building with Microsoft House Milano taking reference from the ports of Milan and providing translucency in the surfaces for the connection between inside-outside.
and utilizing young pool of talent that is open for furthering new ideas.

An example of how a “relatively flat-hierarchy” and less spatial separations by ranks not only helps in peer-to-peer knowledge sharing, but also allows high ranking personnel to benefit from a more open culture was further seen by interviewing Ben Forman and Lorraine Clarke from IDEO London for the thesis research. The culture of IDEO was felt to improve the state of executives to stay in touch with daily actions, but also meant the culture to have less strict control over employees based on hierarchical power relations.

Similar more open corporate culture can be seen in Microsoft, after their current CEO Satya Nadella began his work to redefine the company’s organizational culture (Stolzoff. 2019). Before Satya Nadella, the culture of Microsoft was presented to be a nearly hostile hierarchical systems, but it rapidly shifted to become more open due to efforts to improve the working culture through presenting Microsoft being more open towards collaboration (Stolzoff. 2019). Examples of these acts that encouraged this shift could include Satya Nadella showing up to a presentation using an iPhone and the company giving Apple iOS better access to Microsoft Office-software. As a result, Microsoft succeeded to represent themselves as a more open and collaborative with rivalling companies.

This example of Microsoft presents some levels of transparencies and openness being present in the modern face of corporate culture. While visiting Microsoft German headquarters in Munich, an agile and flexible corporate office presented a role of headquarters fostering a culture of less hierarchical structures and agile workers provided with workspaces also “Much like a showroom, the building is to be transparent and accessible to all.” (HPP Architects). For employees, the connection improving the work-life balance in these spaces has been described by Karl Aigner from kindergarten to laundry services and sport facilities. These facilities are not in order to make the workplace a home with “focus on your work 24/7 and have a cult-like devotion to your mission” (Magnussen. 2018). On the contrary, they exist in order to understand the impact of work in our private life and try and integrate the services to help with daily chores smartly for supporting the wellbeing of the workers.

Based on prior look into problems with autonomous and mobile workers, these changes in corporate culture of “Microsoft” and “Microsoft Munich” with a workplace having increased in agility indicate valuable examples from large corporations for current methods of being prepared for increasingly agile workforce. Additionally, modern examples of the corporate culture present ways to support the employees against a strain caused by stress between private and professional life. This support happens by giving an emphasis to employee’s personal needs.
2.3.1 CONVERSATION WITH BEN FORMAN AND LORRAINE CLARKE - IDEO LONDON

IDEO is an international global design company based in nine locations around the United States, Europe, and Asia. Beginning from projects as designing the first manufacturable mouse to Apple, the focus of IDEO is to create a positive impact, innovative and creative solutions, and to work under a broader umbrella concept of future binding their extensive portfolio together.

In October 2019, I had a valuable opportunity to sit down and discuss both the new IDEO London office and the corporate culture inside the company with the London Director Ben Forman and Experience Director Lorraine Clarke including also a tour of their new office in Herbal House. They had relatively recently moved to their new workspaces in Herbal House. As a company working under nearly no formal hierarchical structures, the conversation circled around both their new workspaces and their work culture, defining much of their spatial needs without the need to present strong power relations.

MH: To begin with, since you have moved to these premises during June-July 2018, can you tell me more about the reasons and aims for the new office in contrast to where you used to be?

Lorraine Clarke: What was lacking most in our former offices was the connection between people. The spaces were a long narrow corridor, and this didn’t improve the area to work informally or socially. It didn’t really present who we are or how we work well.

In the beginning, we wanted to design the new premises as around 80 percent done when moving in, and 20 percentages left to be adaptable by use. This also felt natural as our space has some strange non-90-degree angles to work with. So, we didn’t just want to try and make it fit without knowing what we actually need and how it feels.

MH: The new space feels very comfortable right from the entrance. In most of the offices I have visited in the UK, the spaces have been done with visually simple
furnishing, carpet tiles and with a lot of white surfaces. While touring of some of these spaces, it has also clearly come out that the employees want to escape this “hospital like white”. Can you describe some aspects of the materiality and interiors in your offices, as they feel nearly as I wouldn’t even have entered an office?

LC: With our current offices, we wanted the spaces to be more open, and the architects behind the project being mostly having experience in residential buildings, the spaces were also designed very domestic. After some hiccups with finding the right sizes of meeting rooms and other necessary spaces, we are now in a more defined state of the office. But there are still things to do.

Our culture is such that division of project rooms, large open areas, and amounts of private booths or for small groups suit us well. While some teams work in the dedicated project rooms made for approximately 6-12 people, we also work a lot from flexible workstations near the vertical circulation routes. The large staircase in the center was made as open as possible to connect our two floors. The general division of locating the meeting rooms and project rooms was that the more temporarily used meeting rooms will be in the odd and darker corners, where the project rooms and other workstations will access most of the natural light.

With surfaces of the office, we definitely did not want to have carpet tiles. This is why we have, for example, wooden floors and also otherwise used wood in the furnishing and bespoke cabinets. It does bring difficulties for modifying the spaces afterward, as we can no longer reposition the floor boxes. But we felt there is no other way. The cabinets that we use to divide the project rooms from each other were also all bespoke to fit our work habits. For us, this meant additions like small grooves where we can place cardboard planches/foam core.

MH: One very noticeable element of your office is also the presence of a large workshop-space nearby the entrance, especially as it may not come into mind as the first thing within a digital or consultancy related workspaces. What were the reasons behind this space?
**Ben Forman:** The workshop-area was very important for us. We do a lot of physical things on top of digital, but in our old premises, the time had driven the prior six m² workspace to be in the furthest corner of the floor and cluttered in ways of making it nearly unusable. Naturally, that meant it was not a very popular space anymore.

When we moved to the new spaces, we wanted the workshop to be one of the central elements of our office for the staff and visitors. Being close to the entrance and visible through glazed partition walls, it works in both ways of creating peer pressure of having the space look presentable, but also pushes us to keep it pleasant to work in. Now we can really enjoy using that space again.

**MH:** One of the main reasons for trying to reach out to you through Benjamin Pardo initially was the interest of learning more about your work culture, which the workshop also somehow presents. From what I’ve understood you don’t really rely on having strong formal power relations, can you elaborate on that?

**BF:** Yes, so what basically describes our culture best is something of a “relatively flat hierarchy.” In general, the same rules apply to all. There should be no exceptions to who can do what, especially based on ranking. Naturally, some have different responsibilities or confidentiality, but those are exceptions and not the norm.

To my knowledge only two out of our 700 employees have a private space, and that is mostly due to how much physical things they have gathered over the years. Most of the executives and directors also work from flexible workstations. This helps them to stay in touch with what is happening and to keep also informal connections.

As an experiment, more for client empathy really, we actually tried out to have a very traditional hierarchical culture in our office, for a day. All the executives and directors were working from private rooms and you had to schedule a time to meet with them. Additionally, the coffee was charged, there were no snacks, the breaks were limited, and all private calls or other non-work-related things were completely limited during the working hours and everyone had to adhere to a professional dress code.
By 11 am, a few of our employees had left the office for the day, some threatened to quit, the locks had broken on the snack cupboards and some employees were discussing how they might form a union. And not just the employees, the executives who were “locked” in their offices felt more lonely than focused. The system had isolated them entirely, and they felt that this type of hierarchy did not benefit them. There were no bouncing back ideas or having a moment of refreshing your thought by informal things and accidental conversations.

MH: So clearly, it makes sense why there are no traditional corner offices found from your workspace. Your culture clearly doesn’t need them as such. How do you then go around with confidentiality or personal space?

LC: For confidentiality, the central aspect for us was sound. We chose to have the project spaces on the 5th floor fully enclosed as we imagined that this would be the client floor. And we chose to have the project spaces on the 6th floor open, with a transparent curtain to indicate the need for heads down time. As I mentioned before we were prototyping the use of our space and have since recognized that this does not work for us and we have made the decision to glaze the entrances to the 6th floor project spaces, thereby allowing the light and the feeling of transparency while allowing the privacy of an acoustically sealed room. Additionally, acoustic panels are added to all of the ceilings. But this is not just for confidentiality, though. It’s also a general thing about having a nice office space with enjoyable acoustics.

For personal spaces, we mainly have individual lockers for all of our employees near the entrance. There is also some space for belongings in the project rooms, but nothing really that dedicated.

A key aspect of confidentiality is also culture. Many of our clients might also work together with our team inside our office. So, the key element comes to be the transparency and clear with communication. Our clients are told when the meetings we have are internal, and they can’t attend, and they understand that completely. We also ask all clients to sign an NDA with us when they begin a project. So that they understand they must keep everything that they see and hear confidential and with this comes the understanding that all of our other clients are asked to do exactly the same. They also want to trust in how we
keep private information, so we are very clear about setting those divisions. We want to keep that trust, but also keep the culture that helps us define how and why we do things. So, also when anybody from outside our company comes to work in our spaces, the first thing we do is to teach them our culture inside the office.

MH: It feels there is a lot of agility in your office, but then how do you organize and provide focus?

LC: We have the typical small private booths near the entrance where one person can work in privacy, i.e. a phone/video call, but these are mostly to be used for just conducting one task. Nobody can reserve them for more extended periods. We are currently also thinking about adding some small meeting rooms in areas that we didn’t figure the right use before. These are all reservable through digital platforms and screens near the spaces as well as our google calendar, we are exploring ways in which to include technology into our offices currently.

The only real change considering the privacy was to move our flexible workstations from near the entrance area on the first floor to our second floor. This was due to having them more secluded from the noise of all visitors and flows of our own employees. They were first put into the first floor due to having them closer to the action, but when we designed the space, we made our main staircase open enough so that it keeps the two floors feel connected. So then moving the flexible workstations to the second floor did not feel like they are put further from the action, just to provide the workstations in there a bit more of privacy.

But these are all still things we are trying out. We add, modify, and adapt the office as we go. This is something that also helps our culture, by helping us even know what we need and what works best for us.

MH: Thank you for the interview and the insight on IDEO London in order to learn from your example about collaboration and organizational culture.
2.3.2 CONVERSATION WITH RAPHAEL GIELGEN, VITRA

Raphael Gielgen is a Trendscout Future of Work for Vitra, specialized in understanding the factors behind the future of workspaces with Vitra, published also in Vitra’s Work Panorama 2019.

During an interview in early January of 2020, an opportunity to discuss their perspectives on matters as headquarters as a platform, a sense of belonging, productivity in the knowledge economy, and adapting the workplace to the future challenges of workplace design.

MH: I have begun my thesis research from the phenomenon of increasingly agile and flexible work. Relating to this, you have discussed of materiality and focus work moving to be conducted in domestic spaces. As the corporate office becomes more of a platform, what do you believe will be the role of the private and focus areas in the future corporate office?

Raphael Gielgen: It’s best to begin from considering what is the purpose of the work of today. It is to gain financial revenue, to develop, and to work at the core of the company driven by the cultural framework of the corporation. So, to say it easy, it is productivity on one side, and on another hand, it is to follow the culture.

So, the private office will not be as relevant for productivity in the future office. And it is not even part of the cultural framework of the company. So, I would say they will still exist, but they are not as relevant.

MH: So as during my research, some corporations have specifically related their headquarters to be a physical platform for the corporation. This would be something of you described?

RG: Yes, that is a good metaphor for the workplace.

MH: In your opinion, how would this platform then be defined as a place of belonging?
RG: That is important. To be so, part of the organizational framework is to build a community. Belonging needs a physical destination. That is very important.

MH: This has been presented before in the private office clearly by daily workspace becoming personalized by the users. Through the workplace as a platform and being increasingly agile, the workplace becomes more of participatory action. How would you see the employees being involved in these spaces?

RG: I would say you can do both, private and communal. You can provide for the entire community a space and even address the strong personal experience. You are a part of it, as a piece of a puzzle.

It is as co-creation that is becoming more important even in city development. In the moment of creating together, you make it yours. So, it is about the community, but you as an individual bring in an active contribution. This is what is the relation between personal and communal.

MH: One of the increasingly important factors in relation to transparency and co-creation is also adapting traditional corporate culture. With co-creation, an isolated corporate culture that is exclusive and stiff, would seem to be challenging to exist. How can do you believe it can adapt?

RG: It was not so important before as it is today for the management and the leadership of an organization to provide the opportunities on the whole horizon for the future of the company. This is necessary in order to ensure the means to transform the company into a new age. By this transformation, you address the needs of action to the employees, to your organization, and to your stakeholders.

And if this is part of the routine, then automatically, the people will know how important it is to collaborate. Less you put effort into these topics, the less you are successful.

Also, one of the problems is that the work is still much invisible. And as long as work is invisible, we have a considerable challenge in transferring work visible and to bring back transparency again.
MH: You have also touched the subject of the corporate office as open source. Virtual or physical prototyping has been one theme rising in many corporate offices. Also sharing an organizational space to things as to record podcasts for both corporate and employees’ own needs have been something present in some offices, or workers asking for space to prototype digital products. These are bringing spaces of action into the office as shared space. Do you believe these are some of the ways, or what would you consider bringing the work visible?

RG: There are many. Even the signage and screens in the open areas help bring the work visible. Main thing is to show what you do. There are many ways of using architecture to show what you do. A great example is R/GA’s new headquarters in New York. It shows various ways of how, in the digital age, the work can be made visible.

MH: Coming back to materiality, these increasingly flexible workplaces made as platforms are often still very white from the surfaces, with carpet tiles and material choices that are easy. How would you consider the workplaces to become then more diverse by appearance?

RG: I would say these types of choices as carpet tiles are rather old school. We should move further from them; companies should not be stuck with these types of spaces.

MH: Shared spaces as co-working spaces have defined, from a commercial point of view, the workspace also as more diverse in the material sense. Especially with less white. How do you see these types of hybrid workspaces affecting the field of work?

RG: Work as a service will be the major trend of the next 15 years. That will have the most significant change in corporate architecture. The workspace will become the space where you will come with your needs, and it will be the space taking care of them. Collaboration, as in large start-up accelerators between large corporations and growth organizations, will also happen more and more.
MH: Lastly, for this scenario of the workplace as a service, as a platform for a diverse workforce from the different generational backgrounds, will also contain introverts and extroverts, workforce with different personal needs apart from just collaboration. How do you believe the future workplace can accommodate these different types of needs?

RG: I would say it is easy, by making a diverse workplace with variety. The corporation should always consider their entire workforce and their habits because you need the introverts and the extroverts.
But traditional methods as worker being employed to perform a simple straightforward task will be a distant memory soon. For this, the corporation will need a lot of re-skilling and upskilling for their employees.

MH: Thank you, the discussion gave really valuable views on the emphasis of a future headquarters and its materiality.
2.4 OBSERVING THE MODERN WORKPLACE

Microsoft presented indication for a change in corporate culture that highlight the importance of networks and collaboration. In co-working platforms this is shown usually with focus on perks, events and community.

In workspace interiors this is mostly shown with informal and formal work settings, as for example through increase in social areas for collaboration and community through soft seating and other more tangible furniture elements. By time, the architecture has become less restricted by load-bearing structures affecting the division of interior. Acoustical separation of an office space happens through less visibly separating that allow the natural light to flow while acoustic separation of the interior spaces becomes important.

The following paragraphs will aim to present the contemporary role of territories through analyzing the spatial hierarchies in the modern workplace through case examples and site observations made during the thesis research.

Locations used for this part of the research have been chosen to reflect large corporate offices in the field of information technology, the industry most prepared for agile and flexible work, whilst still having a clear need for performing tasks such as software engineering. Other examples included are intended to reflect the influence of contemporary trends such as co-working and start-ups, as also some reflections on profession affecting on work environments.

In later analysis, the site observation will be referred to as Locations A, B, C and D due to confidentiality. These observations will focus on the types of spatial divisions with employees and with spaces for management and executive officers.
Fig. 64-66 / Images of a cubicle-office in 1980s - 90s, open-plan office with “Burolandshaft”’s design methods from 1965 and open-plan office from the 1950s.
2.4.1 THE OFFICE FOR OPEN AND SOCIAL

In the recent years, the role of co-working spaces have become widely understood through platforms such as “WeWork”. Typically, the key characteristics attributed to co-working spaces relate to communal lobbies and other shared areas, where most of the perks for members and furnishing arrangements for informal meetings can be found. Open-plan interior workspaces can be arranged further by using acoustic rather than visual dividers. These spaces provide the most flexible and social areas on the ground and top floors in a vertical hierarchy, as generally the levels between these floors provide more private areas of work. The private workspaces range from 1 to 50 personnel and the larger office spaces also have small separations for rooms of 1-3 people.

The main target group for such commercial co-working spaces is intended for freelancers and companies with a maximum of 50 personnel. In recent years, this concept has also been expanded to suit larger corporations, for example with “Headquarters by WeWork”. In these cases, adaptability is provided through outsourced facility management and rental agreements which in co-working spaces can be short-term memberships.

The floor plan of “Microsoft Vienna” together with the floorplan from “WeWork”-location in US can present some of the similarities and differences between co-working spaces and the corporate office. As the corporate interiors have gained informal spaces and small meeting rooms, the floorplan does not indicate to have dedicated rooms for management in the floorplan of this level. The interior workspaces are divided from the core outwards, starting from the meeting rooms and the informal areas including sofas and lounge-chairs nearby the highest noise levels nearby main circulation routes. The personal workstations are located in the outer perimeters of the floor plan close to the windows. Similar divisions were observed during a visit to the “Microsoft Munich headquarters”. Also, a provision of informal workareas were included in most of the work areas, located between individual workstation with height-adjustable desks and office-chairs. In a brief presentation and discussion with the Experience Lead of Microsoft German, Kay Mantzel, who has been in charge of the spatial concept of the Microsoft Munich, it was indicated that most informal areas nearby personal workstations were mostly unused due to what was indicated to be for
Fig. 67-68/ Floorplans of WeWork location in United States (top) and Microsoft Vienna (bottom).
Fig. 69-71 / Photographs taken during site observation visit from different types of agile “Converse”-spaces in Microsoft Munich headquarters.
the reason of being separated from other social functions as going to take a coffee.

“No building ever feels right to the people in it unless the physical spaces (defined by columns, walls, and ceilings) are congruent with the social spaces (defined by activities and human groups)” (Alexander, Ishikawa. Silverstein. Jacobson. Fiksdahl-King. Shlomo., 1977. p.941)

The reference above could explain why these informal spaces close to workstation do not necessarily function as intended. A design regulated purely by structure and from the viewpoint of an engineer will ultimately lead to spaces which will go against people’s social structures. Similar types of conversations about the role of architecture have been also recently, as why is the architecture usually seen as a machine and what is the relation of the users and the machine (Gleich, M., Stalder, L. 2017). This question gains importance especially when the rising trends of co-working and digital platforms in workplace indicate to have the risk of focusing to spatial efficiency and analyzing metrics.

What the architecture would ultimately needs to provide, is adaptation to social actions, and this cannot be achieved simply by following the limits of physical structure. This is indicated by “place the load bearing elements – the columns and the floors and the walls – according to the social spaces of the buildings; never modify the social spaces to conform to the engineering structure of the building” (Alexander. Ishikawa. Silverstein. Jacobson. Fiksdahl-King. Shlomo. 1977. p.945). While focusing on flexibility and non-territoriality, we need to understand also more of the social structures of an office before they escape the workplace, if the sole reason for visiting the workplace would be to collaborate.

The importance of well implemented design of the interior in order to maintain social behavior is both the interior structure as also with arrangement and forms of interior elements, as for example “a group will be most effective when it is arranged in a formation that is roughly circular, where everyone can see and be seen by everyone” (Deasy, C. M. 1974. p. 2). On the contrary, for example, “if the same group would be assembled in a narrow corridor where it could only line up in single file. Communication within the group would be difficult if not impossible” (Deasy, C. M. 1974. p. 2). The circular formation and its special importance for gathering has also been a formation presented in historical context to have a longer attachment to gatherings (Munari, B. 1960-76). In comparison to rectangular shapes, a circular form has closer link to interaction and communal. Yet, utilising the circular formation further in a workplace is not very typical apart from informal spaces. In site observations during
the thesis research, the round tables were mostly seen with arrangements of soft seating and in break-areas. Mostly in observing modern open-plan offices, these areas with soft seating were located near reservable meeting rooms or circulation routes and utilized as spaces of collaboration. The lunch areas were the most informal spaces to meet colleagues and worked for this meaning depending on the quality of their design and if the local culture would be more prone to taking their lunchbreak inside the office or elsewhere. Current trends with work environment including informal meeting areas and highlighting collaboration bring attention to understanding how informal meetings can occur in a workspace including large amounts of people.

One of the clear examples of spaces where individuals co-exist with a purpose of both being individual and a group is the domestic space.

“\textit{The basic purpose of a house is to provide a place where a group of individuals can co-exist with a minimum of friction and a maximum of satisfaction... Designing a house with this in mind, we would start by defining the social interrelationships to be dealt with rather than the operating functions. If we can arrange to increase the possibility of desirable behavior and decrease the possibility of undesirable behavior, the house would be conceived as a behavior setting.}” (Deasy. 1974, p.5)

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig72-74}
\caption{Photographs from IDEO London project room utilized for a workshop and meeting rooms and private booths scattered into darker areas of the floor.}
\end{figure}
Fig. 75 / Illustrations of the floorplan of IDEO London offices.
During site observations in the “IDEO London offices”, the main circulation routes and the work areas nearby these circulation routes were adapted with this friction in mind. The intention of these areas was to connect the two floors of IDEO offices, and also to host the most flexible and social areas of the offices. Other more confidential areas were further and nearby windows, and reservable meeting rooms were designed to occupy the darker corners of the floor area. The most dedicated spaces for employees were divided into rooms for six to ten people nearby windows. This was largely a decision in design reflecting the organizational culture of IDEO. In this case, the spatial divisions, flexible use of the office space, and the materiality, were affected largely by a less hierarchical organizational culture and profession with less tradition for cellular offices.

An earlier example of office building designed upon the premise of community and employee’s freedom is AHH Architect’s building “Centraal Beheer Offices” in Apeldoorn, Netherland, completed in 1972. This was one of the most radical examples of creating a space with a high level of vertical connections, and dividing the floorplan into small interconnected rooms.

“The Centraal Beheer”‘s concept was to create a small city, including the office building itself having interior “city streets” to take a coffee break, having elements from a normal street as telephone booths for private calls. The floor levels had inner courtyards, connecting different floors through balconies. The spatial division were formed into rooms that could host groups of 3-4 desks or a meeting area. Apart from dividing the interior spaces for team-based work, the cabinets for archiving documents were used to separate the workstations, and each cluster was separated from each other with approximately 4x6 meter sized small void spaces between. The interior space between could be occupied by an additional workstation.

What “Centraal Beheer“ ultimately presented was “...the turning point at which the attempt to create industrial democracy through open-plan offices was finally abandoned.” (Duffy, Powell- 1997.p.36). It presented a brave trial for the users to create their own spaces by making it possible for employees to create individual marks such as installing artworks in a space or by personalizing their work workstations with domestic furniture (Herzberger,1978) and indoor horticulture (Duffy, Powell. 1997.p.37). Architecturally, it created a framework for the culture and individuals to co-exist with both “a strong overall sense of order and liberating in the sense of allowing all the end-users to create their own preferred kinds of environments within a structure.” (Duffy, Powell. 1997.p.36).
Figure 76-78/ Illustrations of the workstations in Central Beheer by AHH Architects.
As we have seen in the case of “Central Beheer”, it is important to highlight the participation of users in order to create a space for community and co-existing. This participation of the employees can be affected “strongly on market conditions and the extent to which users are actually involved in workplace design.” (Van Meel. 2000, p. 157), but some possible indications of an increase in employee’s participation into the design of interior spaces have been present during the site observations for the thesis research. These are mainly two type: first of them has been the facilities for wellbeing present in corporate offices, and second is taking the employees into the design process of the office. The latter case of employee’s participation to the interior design was mostly done by surveying their needs, opinions and wishes. In both cases of “IDEO” and “Microsoft Munich”, the same formula of aiming to design 80% of office spaces prior to moving in while further adapting the leftovers, 20%, by the use once the company had moved in. The participation of the employees has been similarly important in visits to the London office of “Intuit”, a company for online accounting, where surveys of the interior quality as access to natural light, suggestions for future development of spaces, and interior spaces including dedicated rooms for each department to modify by their needs were natural part of the workplace. The suggestion for future development of spaces from employees included in this case rooms to be modified to include “prototyping”-spaces: rooms where to represent and test their digital products.

Another example from “DLA Pipers”, a global law-firm, was the corporation adapting to an open-plan office from a profession traditionally characterized by cellular-offices. In this particular case, the change meant a necessity of taking in consideration the importance of adapting also the organizational culture. The importance for adapting the culture was mostly shown in employees and employers’ responsibility in keeping the noise levels low in the open areas. For the interior design, this meant an addition of reservable private rooms to conduct calls and tasks in additional privacy, and equipment as coffee machines to have lower noise-levels. To provide spaces for wellbeing, such spaces as exercising rooms, private areas for napping, and other supportive facilities for employees’ personal and professional activities, like recording music or podcasts, were located in the basement floor. This recording studio was used both by the employees from marketing department and by anyone that would want to take advantage of them for personal reasons.

Regarding to materiality, employee’s participation in some cases meant changing the office interiors to include more indoor horticulture to substitute the feeling of the “hospital white” materiality. This change related to both carpet tiles and extensive use of white surfaces. With the office of “IDEO London”, a clear choice was made for
not using carpet tiles. Where these carpet tile floors can be beneficial for acoustics and indoor air-quality by binding dust-particles, they are also more adaptable to later changes than for example wooden floors, that in the case of “IDEO London” presented to cause problematics with accessing the electric outlets after finishing the floors. Still, the wooden floors were preferred to represent better the organizational culture within the office.
2.4.2 PHOTOGRAPHS FROM SITE OBSERVATION VISITS

Fig. 79-81/ Entrances of Adidas-campus in Herzogenaurach (top), co-working space “TalentGarden Isola” in Milan (middle) and for Station F business incubator for startups in Paris (bottom).
Fig. 82-84/ Startup accelerator spaces in Paris, France.
Fig. 85-87 / Co-working spaces in Milan, Italy.
Fig. 88-90/Co-working spaces in Paris, France.
Fig. 91-93/ Co-working space in Milan, Italy.
Fig. 94-96/Interior spaces from Microsoft Munich Headquarters in Munich, Germany.
Fig. 97-99 / Various meeting rooms from offices in London, UK.
Fig. 100-102/ Meeting rooms and pod-seats in UK Finance (middle), workstations in Intuit UK (middle) and Microsoft Munich (bottom).
Fig. 103-104/ Preliminary illustrations of “Axel Springer Campus” by OMA architects. The quantities 75-25 % are of time of the concept design.
Organizational culture and changes in the workplace show importance of employees’ participation to the workplace design. Some clear pattern came up during the site observation visits regarding interior elements that create the corporate office such as: reservable meeting rooms, private booths, increased use of soft furnishing, and visual transparency through the spaces. Francis Duffy has characterized the offices to be divided typically into different types following professional needs, ranging from the importance of social and private space. He states that in the future office the focus will become “clubs”, places with high interaction, accompanied by “cells”, places for temporary focus (Duffy. 1972). This can be seen in the elements of the current workplaces, and their furnishing for both collaboration and privacy.

How these interior elements are typically arranged can be seen in an example of “Axel Springer Campus” in Berlin, an ongoing project by “OMA Architects” for the publishing house “Axel Springer”. In its proposal for the division of interior spaces, it presents a profession-specific division to organize informal and formal office areas. The spatial division is made by having “informal” spaces designated for the employees working with digital media, and “formal”, more traditional, office spaces for employees with less need for physical collaboration. The “informal” spaces are located near a central void, occupied by the main circulation routes. The “formal” spaces are then arranged in the outer perimeters of the building, providing more privacy and focus for the workers in these areas. A similar example was seen in the office of the “IDEO London”, where the areas close to the core of the building are designed to be more open and social, designed to connect the two interior floors of their office.

The “Microsoft Domicile” office in Denmark by “Henning Larsen Architects” presents another typical example of how the open and more private spaces often appear in a physical structure: the meeting rooms and private booths are clustered nearby the central core of the building, and individual workstations are grouped in nearby proximity to the windows. Conceptually, this is, the most typical form of dealing with the contemporary office, and also fits the European tradition of providing employees access to the natural light. Both examples of “Axel Springer Campus” and “Microsoft Domicile” provide a clear division between shared-social and private areas, while the central core is a large open area connecting the floors visually and partly acoustically.

During site observations, the “Microsoft Munich headquarters” represented a more fluid division between social and private interior areas. It emphasized creating different zones for focus and social interaction by having different typologies of furniture and reservable rooms. This was largely affected by “Microsoft Munich” being the most agile work environment of a large corporation included in the site observations for
Fig. 105-106/ Photograph and floorplan of level 3 of Microsoft in Denmark by Henning Larsen Architects.
the thesis. The diverse set of furniture types provided different qualities in otherwise open workspaces and were largely used for shorter periods of time instead of giving employees dedicated workstations. The change to this type of reservable work environment with an increase in variety of reservable workstations, as lounge-chairs and different types of desks, was possible due to the work culture changing to provide employees agility through reserving space and organizing work with digital platforms from Microsoft.

A clear link between all examples was that the visually light-weight solutions, as for example glass walls, and soft-furnishing have increased in the creation of spatial divisions instead of using non-see-through walls. The new visually light and more welcoming solutions are more adaptable interior divisions than structural walls. They also present a workplace that provides more variety in the provision of workstations, and typically less physical storage-space for documentation. An example of an adaptable hybrid space is the “Smart Edges”-project by the architecture studio “Laboratorio Permanente”. “Smart Edges” created a flexible structure called “spine” working between formal and informal spaces, allowing the structure to change over time according to users needs.

In the agile workplaces, such as “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, the change to utilizing various types of furniture as personal workstations has been possible also due to increased use of digital platforms. The digital service provides workstations to be reservable remotely. These reservable locations are categorized as following:

- Personal Workstations, as typically an office chair and a personal work desk;
- Soft seating, as lounge seats and sofas;
- Reservable rooms as meeting rooms and private booths, typically from four up to twelve people at time.

Further, I will also analyze two additional elements affecting the modern workplace:

- the divisions to private and social areas influenced by the access of internal and external visitors;
- The internal power relations created between spaces designed for employee versus the space for employer.
Fig. 107-108 / “Smart Edges” project by Laboratorio Permanente.
Fig. 109/ Illustration of different types of workspaces met in site observation visits arranged from top down by amount of employees included in the work process on hand, from one individual to larger masses and meeting spaces.
2.4.3.1 PERSONAL WORKSTATIONS

Traditionally, one of the most personal workspaces for an employee is his or her workstation or a private office. Both of these private spaces becoming less personal and more shared in the more “agile” office.

The personal workstations for one employee typically held a more ergonomic work chair and work desk that was mostly height-adjustable in corporate offices and non-adjustable in co-working spaces. The individual workstations were secluded slightly from nearby circulation routes and other similar workstations with upholstered mid-height acoustic panels. Approximately 1200 mm high storage units were utilized to further divide the personal workstations from other areas. Lastly, most personal storage space of these traditional workstations was minimized into movable trolleys, that mostly seemed to be left unused.

During the site observation visits, the personal workstations were mostly in groups of six to eight desks, placed in two rows facing each other. Occasionally, the desks were also observed to be in groups of four, ten or twelve. The groups of workstations further formed large open workareas with approximately 30 to 36 personal workdesks. The most similar element in all observed workspaces was the size of the personal desk and its rectangular shape. The work desks in co-working spaces and start-up accelerators were by standard non-electric and, in some cases, wooden surfaces instead of white.

A difference in personal desks was only seen in the office of “IDEO London”, where the employees were mostly working around large desk in groups of four to six people large desks. “Microsoft Munich Headquarters” also provided different types of large desks for the use of groups that were indicated to be used by also individual employees at times.

For individual employees, the reservable private rooms are also used to conduct a temporary task in focus, in a space approximately 5 to 8 m2 in size, furnished with an office chair and a desk. If reservable private spaces are small booth-type, they could be as little as under 2 m2 in size. The usual maximum time set for one person to use these booths is mentioned to be around one hour in both corporate workplace and in co-working spaces. Small booths were also utilized to conduct individual tasks instead of solely providing temporary privacy for a phone call.
With “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, the personal workstations were further designed to have more variety than being solely a typical office chair and a desk. Instead, the personal workstation could vary from a high backrest chair, a meeting 900 mm high table for four people to a lounge chair or a sofa. Additional private booths for private calls or focus work and reservable meeting rooms were then provided nearby all workstations. These rooms were also working to divide large open areas.

2.4.3.2 SOFT SEATING

The most typical soft furnishing seen during site observations in corporate offices were arrangements of lounge-type areas for two to six people, designed to conduct individual work or to provide space for gatherings in small groups.

The furnishing of these areas was either by lounge chairs or sofas with a small round table, and the seating had either low or a high backrest. These types of furnishing arrangements were usually located nearby the entrance-areas, in corridors, nearby circulation routes or close to windows. Due to the capability of high backrest being able to provide seclusion, these types of seats and sofas were also used as spatial dividers. These trends of high backrests and use of glazed partition walls indicate that, even with interior spaces being connected visually, the need of acoustic separation is important.

Although soft furnishing and small meeting areas in open workspaces were seen in both corporate offices and co-working spaces, their most diverse use could be seen in “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”. The corporate headquarters included use of soft furnishing from sofas, to normal and high backrest seats as reservable workstations. The amounts and types of soft seating were selected and personalized following the professional needs of each department. This allowed the efficient use of workspaces to be defined by users. For example, a more agile and “informal” department could choose to have more soft furnishing than desks, and vice versa, another “formal” department could choose to have more work desks instead of sofas.

The only profession indicating to have less importance for keeping lower levels of noise were sales-workers. All other professions indicated to have more tendency to require some forms of privacy.

Defining the use by the profession is relevant when having contrasting typologies of furnishing, such as sofas and focus-desks. The arrangements of sofas emphasize gatherings and collaboration, whilst the focus areas demand a more
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Fig. 110/ Previous page: The variety of spatial arrangements in one of the floors of Microsoft Munich Headquarters. This floor presents most variety throughout the floor, while some other floors are also fully furnished with groups of six workdesks and medium to large meeting rooms.

Fig. 111-116/ This page: Illustrations and photography of the different types of spatial arrangements and their qualities.
A: Plasterboard wall and similar secluding walls
B: Cabinets extended to full room height, secluding space visually and acoustically
C: Transparent walls
D1: Height-adjustable desks with acoustic panels
D2: Ergonomic workchair
D3: Non-adjustable desks with acoustic panels
E: Mid-height storage units
F: Groups of high backrest seats
G: Lounge chairs for focus work
H: Higher cabinets
I: High tables and bar stools
J: Lounge-chairs
K: Small tables and seats
L: Low sofas and lounge-seats

Fig. 117/ Main divisions of space with attachments to floor.
A: Plasterboard wall and similar secluding walls
B: Cabinets extended to full room height, secluding space visually and acoustically
C: Transparent walls
D1: Height-adjustable desks with acoustic panels
D2: Ergonomic workchair
D3: Non-adjustable desks with acoustic panels
E: Mid-height storage units
F: Groups of high backrest seats
G: Lounge chairs for focus work
H: Higher cabinets
I: High tables and bar stools
J: Lounge-chairs
K: Small tables and seats
L: Low sofas and lounge-seats
private environment. In “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, both the focus areas and areas for collaboration could be designed with soft furniture, but the core functionality of these spaces is exactly the opposite. When these two arrangements are located too close, the social areas can create disturbance to the focus areas. This can cause one to become less utilized than the other. The problem could be related to “The basic purpose of a house [that] is to provide a place where a group of individuals can co-exist with a minimum of friction and a maximum of satisfaction...” (Deasy. 1974. p.5). It is also important to understand the behavior of users in different types of spaces, when choosing soft furnishing for areas of social gatherings and focus, that should be designed “according to the social spaces of the buildings; never modify the social spaces to conform to the engineering structure of the building” (Alexander, Ishikawa, Silverstein, Jacobson, Fiksdahl-King, Shlomo. 1977. p. 945).

In terms of materials used, the soft furnishing was also crucial in orienting users in the interior spaces. In the specific case of “Microsoft Munich”, the colors used were the one of the corporate identities. For example, green was the color used in focus-centric areas, red was then used in the most social spaces, yellow and blue characterized the spaces furnished with desks between the areas for social and focus. The soft furniture was not only used to provide more variety in provision of workstations, but also served as a tool to identify the different areas by color and style.

2.4.3.3 MEETING ROOMS

During site observation visits, most typical meeting areas were small and medium sized meeting rooms, lounge-type furnishing in open areas, and large spaces to host events as workshop.

The most occurring from these meeting areas were reservable rooms fitting four to six people and between 11 to 25 m² in size. These spaces were typically used for gatherings between internal personnel, to conduct temporary groupwork and to meet clients, and divided from open work areas only acoustically by glass walls. In cases of translucent walls being unable to provide enough privacy, either a film or a bespoke detail in the glass-panels secluded them visually from other spaces. This seclusion was done from top to down or in the eye level.

During the site observations, the location of the reservable spaces followed

Fig. 118/ Interior layout of “Location A”.
mostly a similar pattern as described before with “Axel Springer Campus” and “Microsoft Domicile”: they were mostly located nearby load-bearing pillars of the building, circulation routes and nearby the core of the building. The only difference from this pattern in the use of the reservable rooms was to use them for separating open work areas from each other and from lobbies or other circulation routes. The focus on locating reservable rooms closer to the inner core of the building and personal workstation closer to the natural light is understandable as the traditions for European office design value the employees’ access to natural light.

Multiple visited locations used arrangements of sofas and lounge-seats in open areas for “informal” meetings and collaboration. Different types of furnishing used for gathering of small groups worked additionally as spatial division between different open areas and personal workspaces.

“Microsoft Munich Headquarters” had the highest quantities of these furniture arrangements for “informal” meetings. The main problematics mentioned during observation visit was that some of them were left unused, indicated to be due to informal meetings happening instead near other communal areas as spaces close to coffee.

Additional space to meet colleagues daily in a more informal manner were the personal storage units. The employees of each department had their personal storage units grouped in one place nearby their colleagues, making the locker the most stable locations to see colleagues in an agile work environment.

The event spaces and large meeting rooms were not only for internal use, but sometimes also reservable by external users to hold events. These spaces were located in the ground floor and top floors of the building. The large meeting spaces were clearly split from the workplace if the company was located in only one floor of the building. These large spaces for events and meetings were more adaptable in size by modular walls and could be divided into two medium to large sized meeting rooms.

“IDEO London” office provided a difference in the design of meeting areas by combining their solution to group personal workstations to project-rooms. This difference meant that individual employees were located in spaces for groups of four to twelve people dedicated for their ongoing project. These spaces were secluded acoustically from nearby areas, and more collaborative for the groups inside to discuss about their project without creating high levels of disturbance to others. For the case of these rooms not fit for formal meeting with clients, as for example due to confidentiality, additional small reservable rooms likewise in other observation visits were also provided nearby
darker floor areas nearby the entrance.

Yet, a way of organizing the employees and employers into smaller project-based rooms can be an example of a workplace where spaces hold both individual workspace and informal meetings, instead of separating those areas in different zones in an open floorplan.

2.4.3.4 INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL VISITORS

As the modern office has come to represent collaboration, separating the different types of meeting areas for internal use and accessible by external visitors has become important.

Differing by corporation and profession, the areas separated for external visitors during site observations consisted mainly of medium to large sized meeting rooms, or other larger spaces for events. A typical form of divisions observed during the thesis are presented in the FIGURE 119, that represents the clear borders between areas for visitors from areas dedicated for employees, management and executives. A clear separation between different types of users, was indicated to happen mainly due to privacy.

This division was similar in both corporate offices and co-working spaces, yet when comparing large co-workspace providers and large corporate offices, particularly the case of “Microsoft Munich Headquarters” revealed more accessibility without payment or reservation than co-working spaces.

The division between internal and external users was typically seen in the separation of areas accessible to visitors in the ground and top floors of the building or in the floorplan secluding the workspaces from visitor areas clearly to different sides. Typically, the ground level was more openly accessible, whilst top floors required an invitation, or held other services as a private restaurant. In the case of “Intesa SanPaolo Headquarters” by RPBW in Torino, Italy, an example was given by the top floor being occupied by a restaurant and an indoor garden accessible only through reserving a table from the top floor restaurant.

In the case of “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, opening the headquarters to be a “platform” meant including openly reservable spaces for events or such in the ground floor. In addition to these reservable spaces, the ground floor had also open areas that were freely accessible without an invitation or reservation. These open areas were important for the concept of viewing the modern headquarters as “a platform” and
Fig. 119/ Divisions of the office environment between internal personnel and external visitors in Microsoft Munich (bottom right), and various locations in the UK (left).
were the main part of the corporate headquarter as a showroom meant to represent the corporation and make it accessible. Particular detail giving insight of why more spaces of “Microsoft Munich Headquarters” were open for external use was that the increased agility of workers meant that the workplace had less employees utilizing the workspaces five days a week.

Reservable spaces for external visitors were also included in the office of visited “Location A” in the UK, where the secluded visitor-area included a large room for external use. The main use of this space was for hosting events as workshops or lectures. Also, a small reservable meeting room for approximately for 4-6-person was included as a reservable space. This room was highly personalized, representing one of the clients of the company.

The case of “IDEO London” offices presented a way of a corporate culture whose working habits gave an additional example of openness. The offices of “IDEO London” could be accessed only by invitations but gave most extensive access for clients. Their culture of work included means for client’s personnel to be a part of the team working inside the “IDEO London” office. No clear spatial divisions were made to separate the clients from daily activities, but the divisions defined in the guidelines and culture of the workplace. This was communicated to the external personnel by always introducing them first to the culture and guidelines of IDEO, as in this case, the office of “IDEO London” worked as a satellite office for the clients. The office working as a satellite space for clients presented a scenario where creating clear guidelines to teleworking was important for the company hosting these remote workers, and by having such guidelines, it made it possible for them to have a more fluent and collaborative relationship with their clients.

2.4.3.5 POWER RELATIONS

Power relations and spatial hierarchies by rank are one of the key influences affecting the interior space and corporate culture to be more open. This was represented in various ways during the site observation visits, where the most agile and collaborative offices that presented collaboration and communication as the key focus for the workplace had fewer private rooms divided by rank.

The most traditional form of room to represent traditional hierarchies is the “corner office”: a private room in corner areas of the floorplan for higher-ranking...
officers and management. In the workplaces visited for the thesis research, the workplace hierarchies showed both similarities and indications of change from the traditional “corner office”. When the spaces for management and higher-ranking officers were not present in office space, the goal was to emphasize collaboration instead of a hierarchical culture. With an increase of agility in workplace, the office did not include such private spaces anymore.

The most secluded forms of the “corner offices”, as a visually secluded room, were not present in any of the site observation locations. Instead, some of the workplaces included acoustically secluded rooms for the management and executive officers, in rooms similar to reservable meeting rooms. The transparency of these rooms provided more visibility to employees and other visitors to glance inside a room, that were almost always empty during the visits.

The typical size of the rooms for management and executives was similar: approximately 15 to 35 m²; and furnishing including a desk, an office chair and a small area for informal meetings as around a round table. In addition, they were also nearby meeting rooms, that were prioritized for the use of higher-ranking officers. The executive and management spaces could be divided to different floors, for example managers being closer to their employees while executives being secluded in the upper floors of the building.

The location of these private rooms varied by country and size of the workplace. When some offices located private rooms for executives and management nearby windows, other located these private rooms in the same cluster as reservable meeting rooms closer nearby the load bearing elements.

Both cases of “IDEO London” and “Microsoft Munich Headquarters” were able to provide alternative concept for meeting areas and opening their workplace to visitors. Their openness was represented also in the lack of spaces for management and executives. This change was indicated to be due to changes in the work culture or organizational culture. In the case of “IDEO”, this was shown by less focus towards formal hierarchies, indicated well in their values for “same rule applies to all”. With “Microsoft Munich” on the other hand, less spaces for management highlighted the current changes in agile work and possibilities to work remotely. The new agility emphasized collaboration and making all workstations reservable, which meant in this case less provision of private rooms. Both of these examples present changes that affected the representation of traditional power relations in the interior spaces.
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Fig. 120 / Interior layout of “Location B”.
In agile offices of “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, the spaces for management and executives were combined to spaces reservable by employees, indicating the diminishing of the private spaces especially for management. Instead, the new spatial separations created areas with specified furniture-groups with an emphasis to different qualities and functions of spaces. These qualities varied from levels of privacy and focus to collaboration and informal meeting. This division gave more importance to personal and professional needs when considering the types of workspaces provided for both employees and employers. A problem from increased agility of employees was indicated to be with how to manage the work when less people are present in the workplace. This would justify the open areas and why the management would now need more focus on spaces to provide visual and acoustic openness to be more connected to others, but also having areas for focus and collaboration presented to be problematic. The workplace of “Microsoft Munich” also presented a clear indication on how the modern workplace needs to emphasize on guidelines especially with leaving the workstations empty when not in need for them and reserving the privacy of others in open work environments.

With “IDEO London”, the most significant reason for not including secluded spaces for management was their corporate culture. Instead of private rooms, the higher-ranking officers, from the executives to directors, worked from flexible areas of the office and in the same spaces as the employees. This provided them an opportunity to stay in touch with daily activities and have informal discussions with their staff. These discussions were not indicated to be solely focused on work-related subjects and were seen as a positive effect of working in open areas. The culture of work was also less strict, for example by not limiting employees to conduct any private calls during work hours, which could help the employees to feel less watched over whilst being located nearby their employers.

These examples indicate that a workplace focusing on collaboration and giving employees more agility affects also the hierarchies presented in the floorplan by rank. Additionally, the focus on collaboration and giving employees increased possibilities to choose their work location by agile work needs to be balanced with clear guidelines and a corporate culture that values following those guidelines.
2.4.4 CONCLUSIONS FROM SITE OBSERVATIONS

The site observation visits indicated changes in the workplace, highlighting the influence of both collaborative spaces and emphasis on individual employees. This change is mostly occurring between spaces for personal privacy and social interaction, showing signs in the provision of private rooms defined by rank, and by a possibility of opening the daily workplace more towards clients and other external visitors.

For individual employees, the typical workstations were relatively simple in many visited locations, but signs of providing more variety in agile and collaborative offices were present with both “Microsoft Munich headquarters” and in “IDEO London”. Whilst some of the workplaces still had traditional groups of personal workstations in an open plan, participation of employees in measuring the interior quality was a point highlighted during site visits.

Particularly with “Microsoft Munich” the change to agile work altered the personal workstation to be reservable by digital platforms and for limited time periods. Additionally, the workstations consisted of various types of office seating than a typical office chair and a desk. The new addition to personal workstations were various seats to provide focus or spaces for small gatherings, indicating the relation of work to both personal privacy and communication.

In the open plan, privacy of employees was mostly defined by organizational culture fostering guidelines to sustain a silent work environment. Spatially, personal privacy was also seen mostly in provision of reservable rooms that could give the workers a space of seclusion to conduct specific tasks. In “IDEO London”, this type of privacy was also given to small teams as a more dedicated space where they could work for a specific project in acoustically secluded rooms.

Including informal areas with welcoming furnishing was seen in all visited locations. The typical use was in providing spaces for small meetings in a more casual form. Lobbies, entrance areas, close perimeters of walls, and spaces near windows and circulation routes were typically included with furniture groups of sofas, lounge chairs and small tables. These types of furniture groups gave the employees locations to have small informal meetings without further seclusions from personal workstations, if not equipped with a high backrest. The soft furnishing was also used to separate different zones. Problematics of taking full advantage of using these arrangements for informal meetings occurred, when the acoustic separation from personal workstations
was not sufficient.

For meeting areas, the reservable rooms that were visible to surrounding areas through translucent walls were the most occurring typology of enclosed space. These rooms were mostly grouped near structural elements but could also work as spatial divisions that provided higher levels of seclusion than soft furnishing between otherwise open work areas.

The main conclusion from the rise of areas for meeting and collaboration is that they will need to take into consideration the provision of privacy, confidentiality and their fit for the work culture.

The areas defined for collaboration and meeting provided also an insight to the accessibility of external visitors in the workplace. The spatial solution separating the personnel from visitors was different varying by profession and corporate culture but indicated a close balance between transparency and corporate privacy. If more accessibility to the corporate workplace and their daily work life was provided, clear guidelines and a well-prepared corporate culture was necessary. When the company succeeded in these, it could both keep the confidentiality and provide more intimate relationship and higher levels of collaboration with their clients.

Opening up the headquarters to external visitors was also an important factor in the “Microsoft Munich Headquarters”, indicating that large corporate headquarters that wish to become more agile could provide more access to reserve spaces from their location. This could possibly raise more interaction between the corporate office and the local citizens or other professionals, and also benefit the corporation in finding alternative users for spaces that are less occupied daily by agile employees working remote.

While the collaboration and accessibility by external visitors could be benefitted from in some observed locations, these examples also represented the biggest change to move further from representing traditional spatial power relations, for example by having less spaces defined by ranks.

Overall, the typical private office was not existing. Instead of the seclusion of higher-ranking employees was replaced by translucent walls. If further division was made, it was conducted by separating spaces for executives or other to upper floors of the building. Having less separation by ranks was mainly due to the focus of workplace being collaboration and believing also in the usefulness of daily casual interaction between employees and employers. In specific examples that represented this, “IDEO London” and “Microsoft Munich”, the change was linked to the new agile culture of
work with Microsoft, and with “IDEO” having less emphasis on formal hierarchies. With both examples, the spaces for management and secluding the directors and executives from employees were seen as less beneficial, meaning fewer private spaces to be designed by rank.

Together, modern workplaces showed signs of change in emphasis to provide less of private rooms and increase in small collaborative areas by soft seats. Provision of privacy is less defined by traditional organizational hierarchies, and instead examples of the modern workplace showed an attempt to find meaningful places for collaboration, support the individuals through participation or agility, and include zones for more informal workplace interaction inside the work areas. Currently, these collaborative spaces seem problematic if they do not support the provision of acoustic privacy, presenting some of the difficulties to combine hospitality-furnishing for collaboration and open-plan workplace with personal workstations.

In a digital workplace, it is important for individual employees to participate in organizing their locations of work. The workplace needs to sustain this by finding proper means to provide individuals space of privacy, and enough space for community where the mobile workers can catch up. Whilst the corporate workplace becomes increasingly agile, interior design should include a clarity for the workers on how to behave in the workplace becoming less accessed daily.

When giving more access to external visitors, the workplace needs to provide sufficient levels of corporate privacy, but the means to define the limits of how to include visitors are indicated to vary highly by organizational culture. If the employees are to occupy the office less when becoming more mobile, viewing the corporate headquarters as a platform instead of an enclosed office could benefit these spaces to be utilized and function as collaborative platforms.
3. SCENARIOS FOR POST-HIERARCHICAL WORKPLACE
The following scenarios address the future of workspace based on the observations gathered during the site visits and interviews. The three main topics will analyse the relationship between work, the city and the individuals. Each of these scenarios will develop in imaginary interior concepts, accompanied by an explanation of future qualities for an office furniture.

Key areas of focus for the following scenarios will be:

- adaptation of the urban city and peripheries to the future of workplace;
- the divisions of a workplace based on functionality and work community rather than based on power relations;
- organize the workspaces to support both the private and the social use;
- finding a space of belonging for increasingly agile workers;
- creating a dialogue for the means to present both personas and corporations.
Fig. 122-124/ Workplaces for ergonomy and tasks, flexibility and collaboration and “nomad space”.
INTRODUCTION

A. ERGONOMY AND TASKS

The workplace is open, but individual. The emphasis is on function, to perform tasks, and the workplace ergonomics play an important role in sustaining the wellbeing of workers after the introduction of personal computing (Olivares. 2011).

This type of workplace is used to provide stability in life, but machines are taking more and more of the tasks typically identified to be an essential part of the work.

B. FLEXIBILITY AND COLLABORATION

The workplace is social, flexible, less territorial and focuses on gathering and collaboration. The furniture is constantly in demand to adapt to the historical and current trends. The workplace design focuses on communal and collaboration by providing an increased number of perks and events. This focus connects the workers. The private booths and glass walls provide seclusion from the noise. The furniture is high, medium, low, narrow, wide, open, closed, and everything in between.

C. NOMADS AND THE THIRD SPACE

The current workplace has vague borders of work. As we describe it now, it will focus on knowledge-based work and collaboration with machines that do more manual tasks which were previously carried out by people. The work culture is “no work and all work” at the same time, and provides limited life stability. This type of workplace could practically occupy any space, but the workers lean more on choosing location by preferences of atmosphere, level of focus, personal style, and surrounding networks. The ideal workstation needs to guarantee internet connection and electricity.

The eagerness to prefer qualities such as atmosphere and internet connection leads to a temporary loss of ergonomics. The importance of workspace ergonomics can be found again by individuals after trialling various work environments.

The nomad work and working remotely rely heavily on communication and informal networks, yet workspaces as a service can seem costly for individuals. Indeed, currently it is occupied mostly by consultants, marketers, programmers, and professionals from the creative field. While the individual is trying to understand the new meaning of personal space, he keeps himself actively working through digital connections.

The nomad work emphasizes both the role of the community and the one of the individual. In nomad space, you are you by being us, being us by being a bit of them, and through them being a bit of you.

It is not yet clear what is the future of this type of work and if it can provide life stability, but for now, it offers various solutions, such as diversity, and disruption to the culture of work.
The dichotomy between the necessity for individuals to be themselves whilst forming part of a community highlights the requirement for the individual to understand their own needs in relation to a communal will, both in a local and global context.

The growth of connected individuals and the networks that empower them have created a symbiosis between business and leisure. This culture is characterized by rapid movements and temporality, linked to the rise of protectionism and internationalism. Due to the uncontrollable force of rapid change, adaptation has become a form of protectionism. The disruption to local traditions on a global scale has given birth to a clash of ideologies between former societal rules and hierarchies.

This future of work is not believed to hold any leftovers of the “Tayloristic” ideas of the working process separating the task and the management, leading to an employee being in charge of both. In the past, employees achieved life stability by gaining a contract with a corporation to structure their professional lives alongside the ownership of a dwelling which rooted people to a place. The routes of progressing a career within a particular profession were also clear.

The workplace dominated by private rooms and cubicles is currently fading away. Instead, open workspaces include spatial divisions of varying tangibility that are achieved by non-permanent furnishing elements.

As physical documentation and paper use decreases in the workplace, data facilities are rapidly becoming an increasingly common architectural typology, and the corporate documentation is moving to “the cloud. The data is being stored in well-ventilated rooms with beeps and blinks, located either inside the corporate office or in a location further from the workplaces. With accessibility to the cloud, the workforce can become increasingly agile and the satellite office can be anywhere, not simply in a home office.

While the workplace has spread to be practically anywhere, the remote workers are controlling the work process and organizing work through the same network of “the cloud,” particularly through various digital platforms. Through these digital tools, the responsibility of managing and organizing work is becoming increasingly a responsibility of individuals. Traditional rules of workplace design, based on clear roles and hierarchies of leadership, are impossible to follow when structuring the future workplace.

The following scenarios will present the future of workplace through the relation of corporate workplace as “The campus” and the historical urban city. This relation of workplace and the city will be divided into three main categories: “The campus in the city”, “The campus without the city” and “The campus is the city”.

The three large scenarios will be than further developed to five concepts: “The Prototype Office”, “No. More Cubicle”, “Telecommunities”, “Posti Sinceri”, and “The Changing Rooms”. Each of them will focus on fundamental elements of the workplace: the table, the chair, storage systems, screens and panels, and the bespoken units.
INTRODUCTION

Fig. 125/ Workplace with nomads, collaborators and task-based work.
THE CAMPUS IN THE CITY

The corporate office as “the campus” needs to be located in the central areas of an urban city, near good routes of transportation and in the centre of focus. In order to be successful, the future headquarters will need to be seen as a positive change for their surroundings in order to publicly justify their movement to these locations. These demands will evolve “the campus” to become a platform of collaboration and communication, occupying more diverse users daily. Current examples are already seen with workspaces dedicated to start-ups, where investors, entrepreneurs and large corporation are able to collaborate.

The lower and the upper floors of the building will become even more open. The corporations will utilize ground floor spaces to gain ideas from collaboration with local professionals and to present and promote their involvement with the city. Creating central hubs for the increasingly mobile workforce and the local networkers will create a demand for the architecture to become increasingly densified with activities and events. Therefore, the large corporations will need to sustain confidentiality in a workplace with less visual borders and more temporary workers.

The global corporations will focus to collaborate and share the workspace with temporary workers spreading the idea of digital social networks into the physical workplace. This new corporate workplace will function as a hub of functionalities and collaboration. The public and the corporate sides will need to collaborate with increasing numbers of temporary workers and freelancers that have created the least stable and unpredictable workforce consisting of nomads. In order to stay competitive, prototyping and sharing the process will become a necessity, while the corporation will try to catch the best talent and keep them by providing them more career stability and satisfying personal needs. The division of the space will maintain areas for moments solitude to the open “rapid fire”, a space to produce outcomes.

Management will become nearly impossible to achieve if secluded from constant updates, thus the role of leadership will be about communication, documenting and further sharing the progress of work. The fundamental qualities that “the campus” leader will include soft skills, the ability to deal with constant changes, and communication skills to connect people and information.

The first scenario of “The campus in the city” is “The Prototype Office” evolving around action and collaboration, and an emphasis on gatherings will bring the focus to the table.

The second scenario “No. More Cubicle” that will re-create the office through clear spatial divisions by sub-architecture for personal and project-spaces. This scenario will have importance in creating various types of panels and screens to separate and to provide connectivity.
Fig. 126/ Workplace as a network re-focused to key locations in urban areas.
Fig. 127-130/ Mentality of “prototypes” manifesting in site observation visits.
The Prototype Office

Workspace as a prototype

In “The campus in the city”, “The Prototype office” is a space for creating physical and digital prototypes, or to represent the progress of creating products that are emerging from the corporate workspaces.

The collaboration between large private corporations and start-ups will increase, creating the workplace as an “Open Source” platform for collaboration and creativity. An increasingly agile and self-managed workforce will conduct work with contracts made on a project by project basis, boosting the number of freelancing. These workers will need to act quickly and share their progress more rapidly to get the most out of their job. Those that are not part of “do more than think” will be leading the corporate goals while staying constantly in the loop to know all the variations. They will have soft skills, so to be able to connect people, help employees with their needs and further curate the work so that the corporation will work under one shared vision.
"The Prototype office" being constantly adjusted by demand.
The current meeting rooms and booths are neutral in their appearance. They provide a reservable space for groups, and a space where the meetings between virtual connectivity can happen. Apart from providing larger tables for groups and technology for these virtual interactions, they mainly provide acoustic division which is otherwise difficult to find in open areas.

The spatial divisions of “the Prototype Office” will adapt and change the means of collaborating in these rooms. By providing more possibilities, the future reservable rooms will become spaces for creation. This will need more attachments to HVAC and to electricity, as the possibilities of these spaces need to be extensive when the question of what and how to “prototype” is highly related to the project at hand. This will be aided by the concept of these spaces to be “prototypes” in themselves, where walls are constructed from modular panels to produce easily adaptable shapes such as rectangles. When the project or technology changes, these rooms will also be able to change in size and location.

In these rooms, the work will be focused on testing and prototyping both digital and physical. By using traditional and new technologies, people will learn by doing. In “The Prototype Office”, the worker/citizen will not only be led by outcomes, but by understanding the process itself.

These prototyping rooms will first appear in the corporate office through modifying unoccupied and less reserved rooms. After some time, as the daily collaboration of start-ups and large corporations will increase, these prototyping spaces will become the core space of interaction between the temporary and full-time workers. This interaction will be an opportunity to use these prototyping rooms as the spatial division between the employees of the corporation and the temporary workers. As such crucial element in creating the division inside a future workplace, these rooms will be central in providing the culture of the modern corporate campus.
Fig. 132/ Various panels and attachments forming “The Prototype Office”.
Fig. 133/ Illustrative floorplan of “The Prototype Office”
Figure 134/ The rectangular and circular tables divided to users.
At the core of the collaborative nature of “The Prototype Office” will be the table that people will gather around and work together.

In the most basic forms, the tables appear in two typologies, the circle and the rectangle. With rectangles, the table presents clear territories and is easily adaptable to all directions of the grid. The circular table on the other hand is a shape for less hierarchical gatherings, emphasizing the more democratic community instead of territorial one.

As the individual becomes both self-managing and agile, the representation of power relations in spatial and furniture design will fade. The circular form will reappear, as the circular shape will represent the workers as equal. The shape will help the people to recognize a typology that by its nature is related to gatherings. These round tables will evolve to different organic forms and change in materiality in order to represent the shift in the corporate culture. New organic shapes will be a hybrid, taken from power relations represented in rectangular desks and gathering-centric idea of the round shape.

Represented in Figure 134 is an example of how these changes manifest. For example, the table number 4 in the illustration can be occupied by nine people, where all occupants are in less hierarchical relation towards each other. If ones are to attend virtually, they can be seated in the locations: A4 and A5, A6 and A7, or A8 and A9. The roundness of the shape will create less division for these people attending the gathering virtually and will be further supported by improved technology as augmented reality.
Fig. 135/
The rectangular table provides borders, but also emphasizes functions. The desk has seen additional attachment as small side tables utilized to carry out different tasks. Examples of these can be the addition of side tables for printers, tables for personal computers in the 90’s or typewriter desks already in early 20th century. The future of rectangular table in “The Prototype Office” is to provide surfaces in multiple modifiable levels, enabling workers to alter the workstations by various needs and to fit variety of increasingly smaller equipment. Some of the vertical surfaces provide divisions, while the horizontal surfaces create levels for organizing and utilizing equipment. The horizontal levels can be shifted to accommodate the user preferences.

What can now be seen in the digital platforms, for example in the “ROL Intelligent Office”, is the software that aids the employees to alter the spatial qualities of their immediate surroundings as for example: light, the height of the desk, and temperature. This adjustability by individuals will lead the rectangular table to be increasingly adaptable by the current user. When the users occupy the desk for short periods from few hours or day at a time, the importance becomes to the efficiency of the workstations in adjusting rapidly to the needs of the current user. This fast adaptation of the work environment will release the stress of using unnecessary time of adapting personal workstations by individual preferences manually. This adaptation together with the increased use of digital assistance will also take into account more complexity, modifying the space by considering the surrounding workers, location and preferred furniture.

In line with the idea of “The Prototype Office,” the rectangular table will also fit the same demands as the workplace in representing the corporate culture through action and collaboration. The rectangular table has the most usability if the supportive structure can create a highly modifiable system, that can then host varieties of surfaces and screens chosen by what is most suitable for the user and to reflect the corporate image. For example, preferences for wood over white laminated surfaces, surviving tough use or accommodating attachments to technology. The demand for high adjustability will emphasise the supportive structure of the table to be a long-time investment, while the surfaces are easily substituted elements. Due to collaborative nature of workplace and the extinction of private workspaces, the structure of the table is mostly made in large sizes to accommodate a minimum of six workstations.

The Storage systems
Fig. 136/ The circular table
Fig. 137 / The rectangular table
Forms of acoustics privacy found during site observations.
NO.MORE CUBICLE

Hyperbolic work chambers.

The “cubicle farms” of the 80’s provided the workplace with an adaptable furniture-system that could help to divide the floor area into personal workstations with extensive use of partition walls. These personal workstations made of adaptable partition walls provided seclusion for individual employees, separating them slightly from others. The downside of these cubicles was the fact of creating a very generic visual appearance, where individual employees might feel secluded from other activities and generalised in farm-like environments. In an open-plan design, the employee could instead feel more connected to a group, but with a loss of privacy and seclusion from background noise. In addition, when these open-plan environments have become more agile, the personal workstations have become less personalized as they are utilized by multiple employees during a short amount of time.

Instead, the reservable meeting rooms and private booths have spread to the modern office to provide a space for seclusion. Whether they are utilized in a shared co-working space, an office for finances or law, or a growing information technology company, these reservable rooms are creating the main divisions between acoustic privacy and open-plan office. Most typically these reservable rooms are utilized for group meetings, individuals to conduct temporary focused work or communicating between workers and to clients inside the physical office space.

“No.More Cubicle” will present the office as the urban city, where the individuals and groups can co-exist whilst having clear territories. At the same time, colleagues find each other and collaborate through digital platforms, enabling an increase in the agility of work. Now, the new cubicle-like division can re-emerge to create an office for both being connected to others whilst being able to conduct work in privacy. This workplace will be a territorial system, where the clusters of workstations are considered as “houses”. The different types of spaces in these units will emphasize the belonging and performance of teams and individual employees, depending on professional and personal needs. The corners of the new workplace-units will be formed to make open areas to fade their territorial nature, and to prevent the groups from remaining isolated from each other. These units will be highly adaptable to include various sizes of spaces inside in order to adapt to more diverse needs of local and professional context.
Fig. 142/ Workers searching for both seclusions and collaboration in the “No.More Cubicle”
The company provides the workspaces to employees and departments following projects or personal needs, and they will be utilized by specific departments within the company or by members of multiple departments that work in close collaboration.

The workstations in these units will be reserved for duration of hours, days, weeks, or months, but never longer. The sense of belonging will be temporary, but the compromise will help with the provision of privacy. Depending on the corporate needs, these units can occupy an entire floor area, or a portion of open areas where other spaces will remain as an open-plan office.

The compromise of adaptability over a complete bespoke solutions will demand these “house”-units to be constructed as sub-architecture, where the basis of the structure is made of modular elements. The importance for these elements that provide modularity will be on attachments, that should provide connectivity to electricity, possibility to create various types of rooms from individual rooms until group spaces for 10-12 person at time, and possibility to utilize more various types of panels and screens to separate these spaces.

![Diagram of workspaces](image)

- Modular posts
- Tangible panels for acoustic and visual seclusion.
- Panels and screens for electricity, technology, and monitors.
- Glazed partition walls with bespoke details for added visual seclusion.

Fig. 143/ Example of the units used in “No. More Cubicle”
Fig. 144/ “No. More Cubicle”-units arranged as an urban city: as blocks and emphasizing corners and movement to and between units.
Fig. 145/

Areas emphasizing open and social

NO MORE CUBICLE
Fig. 146/ Different panels and screens creating physical and virtual connections, and seclusions.
The walls of the modern workplace are mainly occupied by following elements: screens that present information, the technology that assists with virtual communication, storage units, and works of art. The walls devoid of shelves and cabinets have acquired a new role: they have become a transparent or translucent platform to visually connect spaces and provide access to natural light.

In “No. More Cubicle” the divisions made by adaptable screens and panels will be important. The purpose of screens and panels are presented in Figure 146, which highlights three different functions: representation of the corporate culture and information, communicating with others via virtual connectivity, and seclusion made with tangible materials and bespoken details in glass.

All of the screens and panels need to provide acoustical separation, and privacy differing by their function. The surface materials for panels that are used to seclude places visually will support wellbeing and represent the corporate culture through a specific choice of colours, style, and materiality.

The panels that need to provide digital connectivity will be surfaces where technology can be attached and projected to. The focus of these panels is to bring together the virtual space with physical space, by providing both seclusion from other surrounding spaces and by connecting the secluded space to virtual space. The panels will also bring more physical interaction between digital and physical space. When the panels are unused, they show information and present the progress of various corporate projects in order to keep the employees informed.

The last type of panels, the transparent walls, will have additional bespoke details that provide more privacy at eye level. The bespoke details will come important to keep confidential information secret and provide small visual seclusion in order to create temporary rooms of focus more private.

All of these panels are attached to modular frames, where different configurations alter privacy and connectivity for both individual and groups. Developing the details of the division walls will help to represent the corporate identity and add more diversity to the design. Participation of the employees and defining the configurations by professional needs is important in order to create a sense of belonging instead of a new “cubicle farm”.

NO.MORE CUBICLE
Fig. 147 / Screens and panels providing increased levels of privacy, technology, and materiality.
Fig. 148/ Conceptual image for seclusions and connectivity.
CAMPUS WITHOUT THE CITY

The previous scenario developed the workplace in the city by emphasizing the physical presence and constant innovation for economic growth, while “The campus without the city” will relocate the corporate headquarters outside the historical urban centres: to peripheries. Improvements in the way we connect through digital will provide the means for social interaction that will feel sufficient for everyday activities, no matter the physical distance between users, and by such these peripheric campus-environments will not feel as distant. As a result, the peripheric campus-environments do not need to fight for locations in dense urban cities. The employees in the new peripheric campuses can concentrate on long-term outcomes instead of continually providing prototypes and can focus on the work community instead of collaborating to expand their professional networks.

The younger generations have already grown up with more mobility and nomadic lifestyle, forming their worldview to be more open to various possibilities. Even when wishing for more life stability, moving to peripheries was felt to be a temporary sacrifice in order to gain the income that provides a stronger base for their future. This is why “The campus without the city” will need to come with a compromise of giving these younger generations an option for mobility and remote work.

The peripheric campus can provide both solitude and interaction, virtual and physical presence, and more room for communal and personal space. Risen autonomy of workers and agility have begun to offer solutions for the employees to find their personal preferences. They have started a shift, where worktime in the future workplace will need to take into account the work conducted from various locations, not solely from “the office”. Giving the employees the possibility where working remote is not seen as “unproductive” time will create a sense of trust and freedom, but also demand the employees to provide clear outcomes in order to keep this freedom.

The corporations will also need to take into consideration the surrounding cities to create a broader interest for the workforce to re-locate into these areas, as by the end of the day, the work can be just work. Due to this is why the “The campus without the city” will need to provide not just appealing corporate spaces, but also to take into consideration the living standards of their employees.

This will be further developed in the following paragraph “Telecommunities”.

Fig. 149/ The peripheries become more appealing for corporation and employees as digital connectivity increases.
Fig. 150-153  Conceptual images for “Telecommunities” from site visits.
Being located in dense urban cities is no longer a necessity due to digital connectivity. Instead, the corporations will find the cheapest real estate to foster larger campuses outside historical centres, and large areas of land are used to locate the corporate centres to peripheries. These spaces will be more specialized, yet also diverse and fulfilling destinations for a wide range of professional.

Even though the younger workforce felt disconnected in peripheric locations, ultimately some hoped to escape the dense cities. They saw the peripheries as a solution that provides more life stability, solitude, and clarity for their professional focus. The workers, now relocating to peripheries, have taken a step back from “hectic urban centres” by separating the domestic spaces from work in order to create a clear division between leisure and duty. Instead of “the home office”, the corporate campus has additional work locations in the commercial spaces of the corporation, as for example in the showrooms, for creating satellite offices with more utilities and sub-culture where the prior “nomads” can work from. This will give the employees various choices for workplace: ones opting for remote work can do so, and others wishing a central location will be given array of utilities and private spaces in the main campus.
Fig. 154/ The mobile workers searching for workspace by their daily preference.
Remote work will be a necessary option to provide to the employees, and in order to create a clear structure for work that escapes from being conducted in a singular location, the corporation will give an access to multiple satellite offices. If the corporate office has large facilities and spaces for big gatherings, the satellite workspaces outside the corporate campus function as “Neighbourhood Work Centres” (Kurland, N.B. and Bailey, D.E. 1999. P.13): spaces where small communities of teleworkers gather to be closer to others and to more utilities. These neighbourhood work centres will be fitted into other spaces in order to bring as little of economic strain to the corporation as possible: either through giving an access to a third-party workspace as coworking space in nearby cities, by having better means to work while on transit, or re-designing the commercial spaces of the corporation to foster more spaces to work from. The corporate sub-cultures that are established in these “Telecommunities” help to redefine the main corporate culture to be more varied and open.

The new workspaces in the “Telecommunities” will provide a variety of higher quality office furniture, a set of more advanced technologies and other utilities typically not found inside domestic spaces. Additionally, combining remote work to transportation more fluently will provide a solution where the employees do not need to find a dwelling so close to the corporate headquarters. When the remote work will become a norm, the employees can conduct work in locations set by their demands.

Re-designed showrooms and other commercial spaces will create vibrant locations that represent this change in the corporate culture. These spaces will sustain dialogue between the corporate employees and local neighbourhoods through events and functions targeted to the local context.
Fig. 155/ The “Telecommunities” forming small sub-cultures in commercial spaces.
Fig. 156/ The link between main campus and the “Telecommunities”
Fig. 157/ The sub-cultures of large corporations finding bespoken solutions, that fit the overall corporate image.
The spread of the corporate workplace to “Telecommunities” will cause the growth of sub-cultures that cultivate personal preferences and case specific solutions. Together with the addition of remote workspaces, the “Telecommunities” will also bring the corporate culture and culture of work to be in a distinct part of the design for commercial spaces.

In order for these hybrid spaces to be both representative and functional, the workplace that is more open to communicating with consumers and citizens will need to be more appealing, communal, and clear in representing the brand. In order to have more engaging and representative space, the interior design will promote bespoken solutions.

The most affordable choice to create personification is through the choice of colors and materials, but the increased emphasis on showing specialty will need a broader range of solutions. For this reason, loose furniture is expected to offer more specialization and customization in both visual appearance and functionality.

These expectations will demand the furniture providers to adjust their offering to include a wider variety of options and possibilities for customizing products based on a brand image and context. Making more structurally bespoke solutions in small quantities would create a strain on manufacturing lines. By having more structural elements as legs, seats, backrest, and shelves cross usable between different collections, the strain could be avoided, and a longer lifecycle for furniture parts could be far more sustainable solution.

Provision of bespoken solutions for corporations and re-utilizing older parts requires a deeper relation between the end user and furniture manufacturing. In order to deepen this relation, it will be necessary to involve all: the designers, customers, users and manufacturer in the design of the furniture.
In “The campus is the city,” the historical urban centers have become places of professional networks, including various events and activities. The whole city has become a hybrid: a platform for both leisure and work. In order to hold down the increasing difference between the local and global in urban cities, the communal governance needs to protect the local historical context while also compete over the global status of the city.

The corporate workplace competes to be located in the urban centers, to participate by creating the corporate workplace as a central campus for professional networks and innovation. The urban fabric of historical cities holds less empty areas to build these new campuses, so the corporate employees are forced to learn from nomad-culture of work in which the autonomous professionals occupy co-working spaces, cafes, libraries, and lobbies. Corporations join in by mobilizing their workforce to work from the city but from spaces controlled by a third party, for example, by buying memberships from co-working spaces. Instead of focusing the campuses to a single location, the corporate employees are spread throughout the city, expanding the corporate workplace to be a network where the corporation begins to be everywhere in the city. As the corporate workforce has spread to the city, the culture of work can no longer seem exclusive. The organizations in charge of providing places as co-working spaces will need to act as the middle man between the local culture and the global corporation, to find pieces of real-estate where to fit in the workers, and open up the culture inside these shared workspaces to local citizens through activities.

It will begin by combining open workspace to the planning of apartment buildings, private villas, commercial buildings, and formerly secluded corporate headquarters. Buildings in the city will all share private and public functions. Renewing historical and unused sites in the urban fabric will create new hybrids of commercial space, co-work, and co-living, where workers meet and live, work flexibly and collaborate.

The mobile workforce that lives and works in these hybrid spaces will ultimately wish to find a connection to the local context and to their work. Through having a newly gained option to work from various locations in a city, an integral part will be the choices of an individual: to find their own connection, their own preferences, and create small work communities. The function of the headquarters won’t be to host employees daily, but to reunite them at times and to connect them to the overall culture of the company.

The first scenario of “The campus is the city” is “Posti Sinceri” where individuals explore the local urban fabric in order to understand their preferences.

The second scenario is “The Changing Rooms”, focusing on creating a new centre of community and information to the workplace.
Fig. 158/ The urban city developing to professional networks in the urban fabric.
Fig.159-162/ Concept images for the “Posti Sinceri” from site visits.
Cafes have been the ground zero for representing the spread of work environments into public space. In “The campus is the city,” spread of the mobile workforce around the city leads to the workspace to be chosen by personal and professional preference. In “Posti Sinceri”, the interior space will need to foster comfortability of an individual and accommodate a community.

Instead of creating large new centers of activity, the people will adjust to an existing space. Individuals will choose a workspace by reviewing various services that can share information as spatial qualities and communal activities of places. Nearly every commercial and public spaces holds some type of a temporary hub as an additional service that can substitute the workspace.

The autonomous workers will form groups that consist of individuals returning to a place feeling the most beneficial for them, personally and professionally. An important emphasis is on colleagues or friends, as much as emotional attachment and qualities of the personal workstation. Location near transit routes will be privileged, emphasizing the role of the city and private transportation services to sustain the spread of workspaces.
Fig. 163/ The nomads searching for personal and professional belonging.
In order for the “Posti Sinceri” to preserve their customer base, they need to stay true to their core values and support the community within. To stay in good relation with their neighbors, the spaces need to include locals in their activities or create as little of disturbance as possible. “Posti Sinceri” is a hybrid: at the same time it can be a retail space, a restaurant, a library, a workspace, or whatever will be most valuable for the overall concept.

While some locations choose to be inclusive through events and large reservable spaces, the workspace will also need to maintain enough separation, mainly acoustically, in order to provide privacy in the daily work areas. In addition to simply dividing functions to different rooms, incorporated soft panels, hanging fabrics, monitors, and cable systems from the ceiling will create adaptable elements that diffuse the sound whilst keeping the spaces both personal and open visually.

The furnishing will express the values of the location and feel personal in materiality, as for example with wood or stone. The tables support various types of arrangements, from conducting personal tasks on a small side-table to meeting over a high counter. The chair becomes essential in providing the core of the workstation. When everything is more open, the chair evolves to provide additional privacy, becoming the symbol for rooting the workers into a place.
Fig. 164/ The nomads finding a preferred location by continuos search.
Fig. 165/ Acoustics divisions evolving in vertical space to an increase of tangible elements.
Fig. 166/ The evolution of the chair needing to fit functionally and visually to diverse locations and provide personal space.
Typically, the personal office chair is a significant element to provide the wellbeing of an employee through ergonomics. In co-working spaces, the ergonomics become less cherished, as the service providers do not face the same regulations and benefits from providing such qualities in their furniture. For example, the reductions from insurance costs from providing the highest standards of workspace ergonomics don’t entirely apply when the workspace becomes a third-party service. In fact, the emphasis in co-working spaces becomes to provide services and various types of furniture arrangements in addition to a standard workstation.

In an agile office environment, the corporate office has also changed from merely providing a personal workstation with a typical desk and a chair. Now, instead of personal office chair and a desk, the office has a variety of reservable workstations including different types of seats. This variety in furnishing has made the soft seats as sofas and lounge chairs to become not merely a hospitality furnishing for lounge areas, but additionally places to conduct work from. These soft seats have also begun to provide small focus-centric areas with high backrests.

Whilst the office becomes more social, communal, and agile, the most utilized office chair needs to fit into more varied types of spaces. It also needs to work in multiple different arrangements as for example: low and high, laid-back and strict. In an open and agile work environment, the personal ergonomics include physical wellbeing and even more importantly acoustics.

While the visual barriers inside an office interior are cut to less, provision of acoustic and spatial divisions will also be echoed to the chair. Staying visually simple and elegant, the personal chair will need to root the user to a moment of focus and provide increased levels of seclusions, as a womb emphasizing the individuals’ role and value to conduct his or her work when not in a direct need for collaboration. This will also give the chair a visual element, giving employees means to show their need for privacy as a small indication of “do not disturb”.

POSTI SINCERI

The Chair
Fig. 167 / The chair highlighting personal space and privacy.
Fig. 168-169/ The chair fits for multiple types of spaces and uses.
Fig. 170-173/Examples of physical storage from site visits.
THE CHANGING ROOMS

New rituals for social and communal

The corporate workforce is becoming more mobile, and the headquarters of “The campus is the city” is a central place to gather the employees, to root them to the overall corporate culture, and display the ongoing projects made in the company. An example of this is the modern corporate headquarters of “Microsoft Munich,” transforming itself to a “platform”. In this case, the headquarters becomes a central place for rooting the employees: a place full of utilities, activities, colleagues, and work community.

When the corporate campus becomes a “platform”, the interiors emphasize gatherings and communicate the identity of different zones more clearly, for example, by indicating a clear difference between social and personal zones through separate style. The design is required to function by the rules of social behavior, work culture, and provide a sense of personal belonging. The soft panels and personal lockers hold notes representing personal whilst the social spaces gains importance to represent the overall workforce.
Fig. 174/ The workers in “The Changing Rooms” creating personal rituals and connecting to corporate commonity.
At the same time, as these social areas appear, the communication also moves to digital platforms. These digital services give the employees an access to reserving workspaces, to find their colleagues, and to communicate with their peers and employers.

In “The Changing Rooms,” workspaces that emphasize high levels of interaction and collaboration are separated from reservable spaces that provide privacy demanded by different professions.

Due to the mobility of work, the change will not include fully dedicated workstations ever again. The demand for adaptability and collaboration with complex networks of information cannot foster such spaces. The privacy will be provided only temporarily, from periods of hours to a number of days or weeks. The private rooms are solely dedicated by project basis, and the former “corner offices”, dedicated rooms of higher-ranking officers, will disappear. Privacy will be only in reservable rooms, as the executives will utilize more and more of the social and collaborative areas to stay in the loop and connect with their workforce, as also both managing and organizing work happens increasingly through digital platforms.

To join these contrasting sides, the introverts and the extroverts, other than digitally, the core of “The Changing Rooms” will be the entrance areas between the collaborative and private sides of the office. These areas are dedicated to informal gatherings, personal storage, and to create a ritual for change between leisure and duty. “The Changing Rooms” connect both the interior spaces and the inside to the outside, becoming the heart of the corporate campus. They can be used to represent the corporation, and more access can be granted to external users by separating the floorplan clearly.
Fig. 175/ “The Changing Rooms” giving room to represent the personas.
Workspace for collaboration and meetings between internal and external users.

Entrance and social space for internal and external visitors.

Focus areas for mostly internal teams and individuals.

**Fig. 176** The campus is separated to three: Collaborative space, reservable private spaces, and "The Changing Rooms" to connect the space internally and to external users.
In “The Changing Rooms”, the corporate documents have moved fully to “the cloud. Large quantities of cabinets and other large storage units for corporate documentation have become mostly irrelevant.

“The Storage Systems” defines the role of modern storage units: to represent the personas and the corporate. The storage of personal belongings and representative nature will be central in connecting the workforce again, to create a sense of belonging and purpose for the nomads, by creating a space combining the individual space to a larger image. While the work environments become less stable, “the storage systems” are designed to join together all kinds of personalities: from introverts to the extroverts, and connect them to the corporation.

The change of private rooms to reservable “booths” makes so that the latter has smaller units of “storage systems”. These reservable rooms will be used to conduct temporary tasks in focus, and in order to make the temporary work environments feel more personal, the personnel can take objects from central location (S1) to a daily workstation (S2). By carrying out this ritual, it creates a sense of belonging for the agile workers. The reservable spaces hold further structures to hold the personal belonging temporarily.

The structure of “The Storage systems” will be modular and combined with both personal storage units and screens. The screens will give up-to-date information and represent the corporation (S3). Because of storing and producing mostly in digital, the only meaning of physical objects are to provide mental or physical benefits of people, or to support machines used for production.
Fig. 178/ Concept image for the representative side of “The Changing Rooms”.
Fig. 179/ The storage units with modularity and representative nature.
4. ENDNOTES
CONCLUSIONS

The empowerment of the individual through digital platforms has given him the autonomy to conduct more complex tasks and given him the possibility of working remote. A new set of tools and habits in the modern work has highlighted the importance and relevance of a work-life balance as a global trend. The transformation of the individual from local to global has changed the perception of work and determined a change in the design of the traditional European office.

While the individual is globally connected and free from traditional offices, the corporation needs to take into account cultural habits and local regulations when designing the workplace. Because the global worker can potentially work from anywhere, the corporate needs to provide precise guidelines and provide a physical and digital workplace that acts as a platform in which collaborative and, at the same time, autonomous work can be carried out.

The workplace has become more fluid and difficult to identify in a traditional office space. Therefore, it is important to define what characteristics and physical boundaries a modern workplace needs. Through site observation, the main spatial characteristics of a European workplace has been analyzed. The research has highlighted which qualities are more present in a European workplace: private spaces as much as collaborative spaces; workstation being temporary, more various and less personalized; an increase in highly identifiable space and an absence of spaces that identifies rank or hierarchies.

The final scenarios try to speculate on the future of the workplace in the diverse context of Europe. All of the three scenarios focus on the relation between the local context and the corporate culture, as well as personal versus communal space. Specifically, the dynamics between the city and the corporate workplace highlight the importance of transparency and openness in order to sustain the relation between the corporate workplace, local workforce and the surrounding city. The analysis between personal and communal spaces focuses on the future shift in workspace being about personal and professional needs instead of hierarchical division of spaces by ranks. Summing up, the thesis aims to points out how the future of workspace will need to adapt to the modern world of global connectivity while supporting the diverse cultural habits and contexts.
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