1

To cite: Arora, P. (2012, April). Cubicle to the hammock? Contemporary work spaces in this leisure and digital age. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S)* in Copenhagen Denmark.

Title
Cubicle to the hammock? Contemporary work spaces in this leisure and digital age

Author
Payal Arora

Department of Media and Communication
Faculty of History, Culture and Communication
Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Website: www.payalarora.com

Abstract

New work spaces are emerging in physical and virtual domains and with it, an expectation of a new work culture. There is a shift in perception of what counts as a space of productivity. This corporate usurping and appropriation of leisure spaces is becoming visible across different sectors and across the globe, manifesting in technology, industrial, science or/and information parks. Simultaneously, we see corporations embrace and inhabit social and leisure spaces online, such as Blogger, Facebook and Twitter. This is seen as enabling the restructuring of the private-sector model from top-down to a more employee-driven and customer-oriented culture. This paper focuses on this new trend of corporate leisure spaces intended to foster innovation, networks and communication in this global and social media age. It synthesizes online and offline work spaces across geographies. It addresses this new architecting of work spaces and relates it to labor, leisure, innovation and networking in business culture.

Keywords: corporate parks, leisure, work space, labor, social media and business, corporate culture, offices

Word count: 150

Introduction

To draw the best talent, new corporate strategies are needed. Some companies are focusing on

the very space within which such talent can be nurtured –the 'office.' The typical grey cubicle is

making way for a different environment: pool tables, volleyball courts, assorted video games,

pianos, ping pong tables, and yoga and dance classes are becoming a signature of these new

labor landscapes (Kjerulf, 2009). Bicycles, scooters, and slides enable employee movement. Play

is infused in the design and shaping of the reception area and board rooms. The individual company is giving way to an ecology of offices situated in park spaces, resembling more a university campus (Daskalaki, Starab & Imasa, 2008). From cubicle to the hammock, there is a shift in perception of what counts as a space of productivity in today's business market.

It isn't surprising that creative and technology industries like Pixar, Yahoo, Apple and Google have embraced the re-architecting of these new corporate spaces to resemble play spaces (Chang, 2006). Innovation is their business; the less regulating, confining and spatially predictable a work environment is, the more likely it will generate new ideas (Goldstein & Luger, 1990). These corporate parks share more with the ethos of public parks, simulating a place which is relatively free from the typical business routine and least marked by institutional pressures; this is seen to contribute to enhanced and creative performance.

Interestingly, these new labor geographies are not confined to the West. Emerging markets have risen dramatically in the last decade and are less viewed as back-offices and blue-collar work spaces and more as drivers of today's global economy (Vaidyanathan, 2008). They are entering the world of business innovation, luring an increasingly global, cross-cultural and diasporic employee base. We see this manifested in ambitious new corporate designs of work spaces, be it the Infosys campus in Mysore, India, that serves as a green oasis for its employees in the din of everyday life to the impressive Shanghai Huawei Technologies Corporate Campus embedded in a lush wetland landscape and is "typical of the strong corporate identity connecting the workplace and nature[1]." Most of these companies are part of a larger industrial, science, or technology park where the concentration of expertise and knowledge is being promoted for regional development (Goldstein & Luger, 1990).

Furthermore, this appropriation of leisure space is not endemic to these niche industries but is becoming more commonplace amongst diverse private-sector entities including healthcare record industries. Epic Systems is a good example: situated across 800 acres of former farmland near Wisconsin in Madison, it is a supplier of electronic records for large healthcare providers like the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles, the Cleveland Clinic, and Johns Hopkins Medicine in Baltimore.

> The push to move the nation from paper to electronic health records is serious business. That's why a first look at the campus of Epic Systems comes as something of a jolt. A treehouse for meetings? A two-story spiral slide just for fun? What's that big statue of the Cat in the Hat doing here? Don't let these elements of whimsy fool you 2. (Freudenheim, 2012)

Their incentive to design their corporate space in the manner of a play space is to "draw programmers who might otherwise take jobs at Google, Microsoft or Facebook."

Hence, we are coming to an understanding of how work productivity, creativity and innovation are tied to the space within which it arises. Jason Fried (2010) found that most people got their work done when not at the office:

> Companies spend billions on rent, offices, and office equipment so their employees will have a great place to work. However, when you ask people where they go when they really need to get something done, you'll rarely hear them say it's the office… I don't blame people for not wanting to be at the office. I blame the office.

To complicate matters further, we see corporate inhabitation, appropriation and usurpation of leisure space extending to the social media domain. A decade ago, corporations wanted to sue business-bashing bloggers to cease and desist; today, big corporate giants like Microsoft plays host to more than 1,000 in-house web logs where workers can offer opinions on everything from astrology to C++ programming (Gely & Bierman, 2007). "We see blogging as a great opportunity for direct and deep two-way conversations," says Sanjay Parthasaratby, Microsoft's corporate vice president, "we get greater insight into what is going on with key technologies

inside the company." Blogging has become so popular at Microsoft that the company offers a web clearinghouse to highlight its various blogs and bloggers. Other companies are taking this up such as American Airlines that use blogs to give employees more channels to management or at IBM where employees from 30 countries use blogs to discuss software development projects and business strategies. Also, Hot Topic, a 690 store retail chain, is launching an internal social site for employees to use to share ideas and data.

Also, we see businesses extending their presence virtually on sites conventionally demarcated for online social and leisure purposes such as Twitter and Facebook (Hermann, 2006). This is seen as enabling the restructuring of the private-sector model from top-down to a more employee-driven and client-oriented culture. Further, web zones like LinkedIn are seen to facilitate networks and collaborations amongst employees and companies, the intent being that such connectivity of ideas and people will proliferate new ways of thinking and doing in the business sector (Guerrier & Adib 2003). Interestingly, its digital space has transformed and resembles more a social and leisure venue than a corporate site. Further, we see the rise of digital labor wherein people from across nations work on a project and are paid for their creative input (Howe, 2006). This posits a new challenge in the design of work space as these current corporate sites cater to a temporal, diverse and sporadic global labor market.

Hence, while there are a range of studies relating to organizational space and culture (e.g. Daskalaki, Starab & Imasa, 2008; Sommer, 1983; Urry, 1995), the internationalization and proliferation of industry/technology/ science parks (e.g. Goldstein & Luger, 1990; Phillimore, 1999; Vaidyanathan, 2008), and the private-sector appropriation of social media spaces (e.g. Guerrier & Adib 2003; Hermann, 2006;Terranova, 2000), there are few studies that provide a comprehensive frame to demonstrate linkages and highlight novelties across online and offline

corporate leisure spaces. This is essential to gain insight into the diversity, globalization, and spatialization of current business culture. It analyses assumptions of how these new business leisure spaces lead to the proliferating of innovation, and strategic networks and global competitiveness in this social media age. It positions this trend in the historical approach of legitimizing leisure space to increase productivity and brings to question the shift in the relationship between work space and mobility. In other words, it addresses the architecting of business spaces materially and virtually in the 21st century and relates it to changing perspectives on labor, leisure and innovation in business culture. It argues that boundaries of work and play are being radically remapped, manifesting in creative new corporate spaces and potentially new organizational cultures.

Thereby, this paper first delves into the physical architectures of corporate landscapes, explaining the growth and proliferation of these business parks across nations and cultures. It situates this in broader relations of work spaces and organizational cultures and the range of actors that contribute to the shaping of such spaces. Following which, this paper sheds light on the virtual architectures of corporate landscapes, explaining how businesses are adopting and shaping Web 2.0 spaces and how it relates to their work cultures. And lastly, a synthesis is created that highlights patterns across both these spaces. Overall, this paper lays the foundation for investigations into assumptions of corporations adopting leisure spaces for innovation, strategic networks and regional development.

Physical architectures of the corporate landscape

Relating work productivity to the physical environment is not new (Mayo, 1933; Homans, 1950, Sommer, 1983). From blue-collar environments such as factories to the white-collar desk job, it

is now commonly understood that the way work space is organized has a social impact on employee performance, attitude, and teamwork. The manipulation of a work space has utilitarian and symbolic repercussions; hierarchies and linear thinking can be embedded in the design and shaping of such business spaces, leading to a culture of control, privileging efficiency over creativity (Daskalaki, Starab & Imasa, 2008). Much of the earlier research on organization culture has focused on how spatial arrangements and physical architectures can reveal aspects such as power relations, company values and management styles (Henley, 1977). Further, the emotive aspects evoked by corporate structures has been highlighted (Urry, 1995) to the aesthetic dimension of corporate terrain that functions as emblems of the organization and the State (Guillen, 1997). For example, modernist architecture signaled a new era of scientific advancement and elicited faith in the new corporate and State agenda in the 1970s.

In later studies however, there has been more emphasis on the constructivist approach to these spaces, giving more weight to employee and customer agency:

> These behavioral or functionalist approaches have been challenged by more constructivist views that utilize the notion of 'appropriation' to demonstrate how users of space participate in giving meaning to a space. That is, according to constructivist approaches, the individuals (customers) do not only use (or populate) space but also co-construct it and in effect have opportunities to subvert or divert it from its pre-conceived basis. (Daskalaki, Starab & Imasa, 2008, p.50)

Of course, these relations shift and evolve as social engagements, policies, and economies transform, compelling us to view these spatial enactments as more dynamic. Hence, the focus is less about spatial outcomes on corporate culture and more about recognizing the range of boundaries formed, the types of employee and customer participation, and the spectrum of policy interventions that come together to create an existing organizational culture. Hence, while spatial structures of companies can be prescriptive, homogenous, dominating and regimented, users of

such space have the potential and ability to defy, play, circumvent and modify such terrains to create a new space different from the intended corporate design (Legge, 2005).

Further, the organization of space is not just within the specific company but also amongst different corporations. In fact, it has become common practice for companies across cultures and nations to be clustered together as part of the State drive to promote regional development, knowledge transferability and circulation (Goldstein & Luger, 1990; Phillimore, 1999). These corporate parks or what Castells and Hall (1994, p. 224) term as 'technopoles' are meant to serve as incubators for innovation and strategic terrain to foster networks and synergies with universities and other private-sector companies. Their signature is their leisure space with greenery, cafes, sport areas and other recreational facilities. With incubation however, comes the challenge to control and secure essential measures to protect and insulate corporate ideas:

> The ease of interaction among park enterprises is a function of the physical layout of a park, the extent of planned events such as colloquia, seminars, and so on, and the internal policy of park tenants. Park enterprises might prefer minimal, or tightly controlled, opportunities for external interaction in order to minimize labor force raiding and the leaking of innovation to competitors. (Goldstein & Luger, 1990, p. 73)

In essence, these parks, also known as research, science, industry, technology, and/or information parks, originated in western nations such as the US and the UK in the 1980s. They were often affiliated with academic or research institutions and have served as 'park' models to emulate across Europe and Asia (Vaidyanathan, 2008). In fact, corporate parks are a global phenomenon. East Asian countries such as Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Malaysia have started such parks, generally referred to as technology parks, and have been successful in attracting foreign investment and promoting growth of knowledge-based industries in these countries. Or take for instance Russian parks (Kihlgren, 2003) that came to being in 1997 due to

the State policy for 'Promotion of Innovation.' The program was geared towards the creation of a network of innovation centers in regions with high scientific, technological and innovative potential.

What was found however was that these science parks were not automatically leading to globally competitive products and services but did however serve as hubs of general business support and foster a collective corporate culture: "science parks should be seen more as service organizations providing a range of business support facilities to technology-based firms than as centers of scientific excellence" (Kihlgren, 2003, p.75). In fact, this causal link of architecting corporate spaces as 'park' spaces leading to innovation has been viewed as problematic. Massey et al. (1992) critiqued this trend as 'high-tech fantasies' accusing the State and corporate entities of being delusional in their beliefs that mere proximity through the clustering of companies within park spaces could lead to creativity in their specific industry.

However, many have brought up the case of the Silicon Valley in California to counter such criticisms on the low impact of corporate clustering on innovation (Saxenien, 2006); the Silicon Valley in fact has served as a motivating factor for governments and businesses alike to replicate this corporate landscape in their own nations. Yet, when examined, it was seen that it wasn't merely due to proximity but other policy, and context specific factors that contributes to the unique success of the Silicon Valley environment.

> Today Silicon Valley owes its prestige and success not so much to the 'entrepreneurial spirit from below' as to the presence of information technology (IT) giants like Intel, Cisco, Hewlett Packard and Sun, well-funded research institutes, and a network of assemblers with an extraordinarily high percentage of migrants and women workers employed at low wages under poor working conditions. If there is an overarching characteristic of Silicon Valley, it is the absence of unions or other forms of organized social resistance. From this point of view, Silicon Valley can indeed be seen as a role model. (Hermann, 2006; p.67)

Linked with this phenomenon is another related expectation that these parks would naturally serve as extensions of academia, helping with knowledge transfer and circulation. However, these science and technology parks, although resembling university campuses, have been criticized for relying on "an outdated linear model of innovation, which assumes that scientific knowledge can be transferred unproblematically from a research university to an adjacent park for development" (Phillimore, 1999, p. 673). Survey evidence from firms located on Dutch and Belgian science parks indicate that only 37% of firms in the former and 16% in the latter attribute their origins to universities (Feldsenstein, 1994). However, in the US, the variation across individual parks is very great. Goldstein and Luger (1990) have found that over 120 spin-off companies in the vicinity of the Stanford Research Park have university antecedents whereas for the Research Triangle Park the number of university spin-offs is virtually non-existent.

Furthermore, it was found that geographical proximity between a university and a science park was alone likely to count for very little in promoting technology transfer. However, Vedovello (1997) showed that although formal links were not strengthened by the park relationship, informal and human resource links were enhanced by geographic proximity. Also, the very nature of these park spatial designs is in being isolated and removed from urban centers. The rationale here is that isolation fosters synergies through a captured market. What was found however was that innovation is "most likely to happen in dense urban networks" instead of these artificial work enclaves which are in general low-density and homogenous in demographic, design and structure (Castells & Hall, 1994, p. 226). Basically, there is a push to examine relations and networks within these park spaces as less causal and predictive and also, to broaden the spectrum of actors that we need to focus on. In other words, our study of science/technology park spaces should include interactions also amongst parks in different nations and cultures, as

well as with diverse transnational government entities. This will provide a richer, more complex

picture of interaction and networking within these work spaces.

Interestingly, while there is little evidence of western park spaces leading to innovation,

knowledge transfer and strategic networks, parks in emerging markets seem to be demonstrating

a different kind of potential. For example, the techparks and biotech parks in India have gained a

good deal of attention in their impact on the Indian economy, making it arguably the Silicon

Valley of the world (Vaidyanathan, 2008). After the economic liberalization of 1991, the

government of India established the software technology parks of India (STPI) scheme and

opened numerous software parks around the country. Contrary to earlier findings on corporate

parks in the west being less effective in fostering innovation and synergies, these emerging

market parks seem to be thriving. This highlights the critical need to expand our contextual

frame of reference beyond the west in understanding contemporary work spaces:

> While Asian countries in general and India in particular, have imitated the park model, there are striking differences between their technology parks and the science parks in the west. These differences are important for comparative purposes and for a broader understanding of high-technology growth in India. Regarding such differences, most of the technology parks in India are specific to one sector such as information technology (IT) or biotechnology (biotech), and some of the technology parks are highly specialized within a sector. As well, a majority of the technology parks in India are not associated with any university. Finally, similar to the technology parks in Taiwan and Singapore, technology parks in India are export oriented whereas the science parks in the west are focused on R&D. (Vaidyanathan, 2008, p. 286)

These incubation park facilities, popularly known as 'plug-and-play,' allow for these centers to

engage and interact in a seamless and creative way. These parks are also marked by their ample

green landscapes usually spread over 300 acres or more. Cafes, gyms, yoga centers and

basketball courts dot this terrain. Take for example the International Tech Park (ITP) in

Bangalore that was opened in 2000. ITP is a joint venture involving Tata Industries, the

Singapore Consortium, and the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board (Vaidyanathan, 2008). It is located in Whitefield, which is 18 km from the center of Bangalore and is spread over 65 acres with a capacity of 2 million square feet:

> It is the first work-live-play park integrating office, retail, residential and recreational facilities in a single location. It offers standard IT park facilities such as plug-and-play as well as infrastructure such as security and fire protection systems, seamless telecommunication networks, optical fiber connectivity and a dedicated power plant. ITPB currently hosts over 120 companies in the fields of IT and ITES, software development telecommunications, electronic and other hitech industries and employs over 19,000 professionals. (p. 289)

Similarly, if we look at China, the first national science and technology industrial park (STIP) Beijing Zhongguancun was approved by the Chinese State Council in 1988, followed by 27 national parks in 1992 (Zhang & Sonobe, 2011). According to the Statistics Report of the China Torch High Technology Industry Development Center, there were 43,249 high-tech firms in China in 2006, and 27,293 were on-park and 15,956 were off-park, "while the on-park firms are clustered in STIPs, the off-park firms are scattered. Another important difference is that on-park firms are more favorably treated by the government than off-park firms" (p. 4). Strong policy and government incentive transforms these work spaces into innovative hubs by attracting the best and the brightest due to their superior work environment and unique privileges afforded by the State, giving them an advantage over other non-park corporate spaces.

Overall in these last few decades, corporate parks have exponentially sprung up across nations and are a popular option of organizing work spaces due to the persistent belief in fostering innovation and business networks. These parks share the common goal of providing ample leisure landscapes and activities within these arenas, blending work with play. In fact, the creation of corporate domains as play spaces has come to the forefront in recent years with the emphasis on promoting entrepreneurship (Hjorth, 2004). Here, entrepreneurship is described as

"forms of organizational creativity" and "tactics of creating space in managerially determined places" (p. 414). There is a strong correlation between creativity and entrepreneurship and an understanding that open leisure spaces are conducive to facilitate such outcomes.

Yet, birthing of such creative spaces is far from easy. Given the trend of public-private partnerships in shaping space, there is a challenge in fostering genuine leisure spaces within sponsored and corporatized realms (Loukaitou-Sideris & Banerjee, 1993). For instance, downtown plazas have become a common public-private initiative to web leisure and labor in urban spaces.

> Downtown rebuilding efforts not only change a city's skyline but also transform its urban form. A distinctive feature of the new downtown is the variety of open spaces created through private enterprise: plazas, paseos, gallerias, roof gardens, and arcades. Seemingly they are amenities for downtown office workers, corporate clients, tourists, and conventioneers. These spaces, though private owned are by agreement, available for public use and presumed to be in the public domain. (Loukaitou-Sideris & Banerjee, 1993, p. 1)

These 'negotiated plazas' in places such as San Francisco and Los Angeles have been examined and are found to be sanitized, predictive spaces instead, given the risk-averse nature of corporations. There is a lack of creativity and control in the design of such spaces, having thereby a potentially adverse effect on entrepreneurship and innovation. There is a curtailing of architectural freedom in creating spaces that cater to the ambiguities, potentialities and improvisational aspects of human action as planners get to decide the details. This freezing of corporate space into predictive styles is not surprising given the tendency of corporations to imitate success through replication. Also, these spaces are furnished for specific user groups and demographics, mainly white-collar workers, negating a diverse user group that can lend inspiration to corporate activity.

> This can be attributed to the fact that the goals of commercial and corporate developers are similar everywhere, and these are the goals expressed and served through design. Indeed it is clear that increasingly a great deal of attention is given to developing a certain mood for the space, to promoting a theme-park –type setting, to packaging and advertising the product, and finally to managing and maintaining the theme park environment. The planning and development of a modern downtown office complex is not unlike what is involved (on a grander scale) in the planning and design of Disney World or Universal Studio. (Loukaitou-Sideris & Banerjee, 1993, p.11)

To conclude, in spite of studies indicating weak linkages between innovation and corporate park spaces, there continues to be a growing preference of such leisure spaces for companies to stay at the forefront in this global economy. Part of the persistent appeal is due to the continued belief that they foster a more inclusive organizational culture and shared facilities enable policy and practice. However, the materializing of such spaces remains a challenge. Partly, this is due to the innate nature of corporate entities that are driven by narrow visions of profit and are in general risk-averse. Partly, this is due to the habit of replicating the known and established industry park models, thereby resulting in the disneyfication of work spaces, defeating the very intent for creativity through spatial design. And partly this is due to the creative control in the hands of policy-makers and planners and less in the hands of the architect, leading to more predictive outcomes. Also, we need to expand our frame of reference when we investigate work spaces, going beyond the western model and incorporating the range of emerging market corporate parks which are yielding diverse outcomes due to specifics of the context such as policies, infrastructures, demographics, and market mechanisms.

We also need to re-examine assumptions of correlations of corporate leisure spaces with innovation, entrepreneurship, strategic networks and regional development. And as the post-modern life takes root which is driven by commuters, part-time workers and outsourcing, the relations of labor and leisure need deeper investigation. In the next section, new social media

platforms serve as new corporate spaces, extending these discussions on the design and usage of the contemporary work space for innovation, networks and development.

Virtual architectures of the corporate landscape

New information and communication technologies (ICTs) offer new ways of spatializing living, working and playing. Leisure has been commonly associated with "constructs such as freedom, release, fun and choice; work with constructs such as compulsion, routine and restriction" (Guerrier & Adib, 2003, p. 1399).

> These strong demarcations between work and play have been attributed, as mentioned above, as a product of the industrial age. The division of labor came with a division for leisure. Time and space have been specialized by this dichotomy; a case in point is the 5-day work-week and the leisure-oriented weekend. (Author, XXXX)

Spaces were clearly marked for work and for leisure. Leisure space was defined as that which was not work space or that which was in relation to or a product of work; the two were believed to not meet: "leisure and labor are two sides of man's shield; both protect him. Labor enables him to live; leisure makes the good life possible" (Woody, 1957, p. 4). This perspective has its roots far back, as evinced through Aristotle's pontifications on the relationship between these two domains, stating that, "we labor in order to have leisure" (in Rosenzweig 1985,p.31).

In recent times, these realms are entangling as people find ways to incorporate leisure in their work life and are compelled to work in their leisure time (du Gay, 1996). Conventional work patterns are being challenged through new media affordances (Author, 2011; Gershuny, 2005). For instance, digital platforms allow for the breaking away from the 9 to 5 work day by opening up possibilities for part-time and remote workers that are not indigenous to the

company's location. This has given birth to the commuting, part-time and outsourcing work cultures.

We find ourselves in an era of busyness where the clear demarcation of spaces for work and for leisure has blurred with the rise of the 'thumb generation,' savvy netizens that are at the constant beck and call of their clientele and supervisors (Buckingham & Willett, 2006). Capitalistic notions of efficiency and productivity gain visibility through the likes of the Blackberry generation, paving way for a work culture that is immediate and constant. It is widely recognized that the pace of social life has changed significantly, some claim for the better and some for the worse (Wajcman, 2008). While these new technology spaces have allowed for the de-anchoring of the employee from the work place, it has entrenched the worker in the cycle of constant, albeit intermittent laboring (Gershuny, 2000). This culture of busyness facilitated to a great extent by new media technologies compels us to investigate its impact on the design of work space.

Also, new media spaces such as online communities, social network sites (SNS) and blogs are seen as new corporate spaces to create social capital, collaboration and bonding amongst employees in the work place (Gely & Bierman, 2007). Taking the United States as an example, it was found that social isolation at the workplace has in fact increased substantively since the 1980s with a marked decline of peer-support, "in 1985, about thirty-percent of people had at least one confidant among their co-workers. That proportion fell to eighteen-percent in 2004" (p.297). In fact, as more time is being spent at the workplace, new media tools have come to be seen as corporate spaces to foster employee social connectedness and community:

> As Americans are marrying later, divorcing more often, and living alone more, work may be becoming the new center of American community, and we may be transferring our community ties from the front porch to the water cooler…There is hope that internet

technologies – and blogs in particular – can decrease social isolation in today's workplace by strengthening weak ties between co-workers. (p. 299)

There is much enthusiasm about the potential of SNS as a new corporate space (Kaupins & Park, 2011; Leader-Chivee & Cowan, 2008). Through these digital platforms, employees are expected to reach out and connect with one another, facilitate a collaborative corporate culture, make business processes more efficient through outsourcing and recruiting, improve employee training and general communication across the workplace. They can also offer opportunities for employees to demonstrate their intellectual capital and become visible to the management and can gauge employee motivation and satisfaction faster and be able to respond quicker to labor unrest. Specifically, Twitter has gained much attention as a new means for corporations to improve project tracking, for employees to connect and collaborate, and for improved awareness of knowledge and expertise among employees (Rapoza, 2009). Furthermore, there is hope that a strong organization culture that sustains loyalty to the company brand can be enabled through the usage of these tools. Apple is an excellent case in point where its blog and Facebook Group called Apple Students have demonstrated tremendous success in maintaining a fan base, pushing the boundaries of what is possible in the branding of a company. Overall, the focus here is on creating enhanced knowledge management and sharing, connectivity, and a common and potentially 'cool' corporate culture.

Yet, while corporations and businesses in general across board are creating an online presence through social media, there is deep concern about security and leakage of company secrets (Hermann, 2006). For instance, most companies in the Fortune 500 are taking advantage of the opportunities of Facebook. However, if we delve deeper, this is taking place at a peripheral level as corporations are posting mainly news releases and mission statements, being very careful of the nature of information being shared within these spaces (McCorkindale, 2010).

More than three-quarters of these Facebook pages did not have any recent news or updates in the mini-feed. Also, a 2007 study found only 37 of the Fortune 500 companies maintained corporate blogs, most embracing the conventional one-way communication strategy (Cho & Huh, 2010). In 2008 and 2009, phishing attacks soared to 164% on social networking sites and in a survey of senior marketing executives, almost 20% of them reported being victims of online scams and phishing attacks aimed at hijacking their company's brand names.

Hence, while SNS are seen as important in the shaping of a new business culture and seen as a decentralized and emancipative space for labor (Castells, Hardt, & Negri, 2001), there are undoubtedly challenges. After all, "new information and communication technologies are not only instruments to improve communication and cooperation between workers, they also introduce new ways to control and divide labor. Second, the capitalist mode of production is characterized in a fundamental way by the contradiction between competition and cooperation" (Hermann, 2006, p. 65). Hence organization networking is highly moderated and monitored within what constitutes as corporate 'walled gardens,' protective enclaves for corporate activity. Of course, there are cultural and national differences that need to be noted, reminding us of the role culture plays in the shaping of organizational space:

> Specifically, 65% of employees in Europe report that their everyday work life includes social networking. In contrast to the United States, more large companies than small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Europe use social media tools. Large companies focus on internal social networks while SMEs use more external social networking tools. In general, two-thirds of employees in Europe feel that their companies are more transparent and more open because of the adoption of social networks. By country, Germany has the highest adoption rate and Great Britain the lowest. (McGrath, 2010, p.14)

Also, the Web 2.0 has opened up a new avenue for employees and employers to connect, creating a new and diverse labor pool:

> Technological advances in everything from product design software to digital video cameras are breaking down the cost barriers that once separated amateurs from

professionals. Hobbyists, part-timers, and dabblers suddenly have a market for their efforts, as smart companies in industries as disparate as pharmaceuticals and television discover ways to tap the latent talent of the crowd. The labor isn't always free, but it costs a lot less than paying traditional employees. It's not outsourcing; it's crowdsourcing. (Howe 2006, p. 2)

This trend however is looked upon skeptically by some concerned about the creation and mobilization of 'digital sweatshops' and 'Netslaves' where employees can be exploited for their free or cheap labor (Terranova 2000).

As the middle class expands, as choices increase, and mobility and access widens through new technologies, expectations on the type of labor people are willing to engage in have begun to shift. Emphasis is placed on being 'authentic' to oneself by creating coherence between our work and leisure lives (Guerrier & Adib 2003). In this perceived individualistic age, "people are encouraged to 'know themselves', 'be themselves' and 'be true to themselves' especially through their leisure activities" (p.1401). In fact, the ideal 'job' is now constructed around its proximity to leisure, stimulating personal satisfaction. Corporations are now seeing the benefits of leisure to enhance innovation and creativity at the workplace (Author, 2012b). The main difference between the industrial and the digital age in its perspective of leisure is that in the former, leisure was to supplement labor while the latter recognizes that leisure is interwoven with labor.

Concluding reflections: Corporate leisure spaces materially and virtually

The underlying rationale to structure corporate spaces materially through business parks or virtually through social media platforms is to partly leverage on leisure to enhance innovation. There is a recognizable shift in the organization culture where the role of leisure spaces is reflective of current trends of corporations becoming more employee and customer driven. Expectations have changed, not just of clients but of employees themselves who see their labor

and leisure activities as enmeshed and blurred. From initially rejecting such phenomena, businesses are now embracing and capitalizing on these blurred boundaries of work and play to maximize productivity and creativity in the work space, online and offline.

The belief that these shared, relatively unregulated and open spaces can foster creative out-of-the-box thinking has infused the architecting of such work spaces. After all, innovation is a way for businesses to remain competitive in this global and digital era. However, as we see with the evidence that has emerged from industry, technology, information and science parks as well as social network sites (SNS), the mere proximity of companies within a concentrated space does not necessitate novel knowledge production. In fact, there can be surprisingly low levels of knowledge circulation within these so called incubators of ideas. Partly this is to do with the need to protect company ideas from leaking out. The struggle to balance cooperation and competition is very much part of how the market functions. In this climate where the clustering of corporations has intensified due to the post-modern working life and by information and communication technologies, it has become even more pronounced a challenge. Hence, we see 'walled gardens' emerge; granting freedom within protective and monitored enclaves seems to become more the norm, compelling us to be more critical of these so-called open corporate spaces be it a company FaceBook page or cafes within these techparks.

Another expectation that seems to prevail from these relatively new corporate spaces is the hope that clustering of businesses will foster strategic networks. We see this in the vigor and exponential growth of corporate blogs, online communities and twitter accounts to the proliferation of information parks around the world. Yet, it is seen that the formation of networks does not materialize unless other factors such as policy initiatives, special facility privileges, government intervention, market conditions and the like collate to influence the effect of this

clustering on networks. The Silicon Valley is a good case in point; so are initiatives online such as Microsoft's embracing of new media platforms for internal sharing of ideas. These have been deliberative and carefully thought out efforts that have also been dependent on the specificities of the context. In general however, the success of clustering in emerging markets is less to do with proximity and more to do with the concentration of facilities in the midst of conditions that are generally starved of good infrastructures, giving them a disproportionate advantage.

In spite of these findings, we see the persistence and growth of such corporate spaces. These spaces serve as symbolic environments of expertise that allows a nation to define itself within the domestic and global market. Partly it is to attract talent and create a safe and communal environment in an age of dislocation and social isolation and fragmentation. And lastly, we need to pay close attention to how these walled enclaves relate to their outside environments and larger regional contexts and the ways in which they negotiate and make transparent what constitutes as corporate and public space. There is much concern that genuine public space is being lost as corporations commercialize and Disneyfy common public grounds. This is seen with the rise of advertisements and data sales within SNS and with downtown plazas becoming corporatized public grounds. Overall, we need to give credence to the fact that online and offline corporate spaces are transforming and responding to a new organization culture that is driven by new expectations, economies, technologies and global events. We also need to situate digital appropriations of leisure spaces such as blogs and SNS as extensions of efforts that have been well underway historically in creating clustered network spaces and leisure domains to enhance productivity and innovation. Leisure space has come to the foreground for the shaping of corporate spaces. We need to approach this phenomenon in a more integrated and holistic way, giving weight to a range of social and business enactments online and offline.

Word count: 7494/ 8000

References

Buckingham, D., & Willett, R. (2006). *Digital generations: Children, young people, and new media.* Routledge.

Castells, M., & Hall, P. (1994). *Technopoles of the world*. London: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M., Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cho, S., & Huh, J. (2010). Content analysis of corporate blogs as a relationship management tool. *Corporate Communications An International Journal*, 15(1), 30-48.

Chang, (June 19, 2006). Behind the glass curtain: Google's new headquarters balances its utopian desire for transparency with its very real need for privacy. *Metropolis Magazine*. Retrieved on February 10, 2012 from website: http://www.metropolismag.com/story/20060619/behind-the-glass-curtain

Daskalaki, M., Starab, A., & Imasa, M. (2008). The 'parkour organisation': Inhabitation of corporate spaces. *Culture and Organization*, 14(1), 49–64.

Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.

Felsenstein, D. (1994).University-related science parks-'seedbeds' or 'enclaves' of innovation? *Technovation,* 14(2), 93-110.

Freudenheim, M. (January 14, 2012). Digitizing health records, before it was cool. *New York Times,* Retrieved on February 10, 2012 from website: http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/15/business/epic-systems-digitizing-health-records-before-it-was-cool.html?pagewanted=all

Fried, J. (December 5, 2010). Why the office is the worst place to work. *CNN Opinion*, Retrieved on February 10, 2012 from website: http://articles.cnn.com/2010-12-05/opinion/fried.office.work_1_office-equipment-work-head-hits?_s=PM:OPINION

Gely, R., & Bierman, L. (2007). Social isolation and American workers: Employee blogging and legal reform. *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*, 20(2), 288-326.

Gershuny, J. (2000). *Changing times: Work and leisure in post-industrial society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, H.A., & Luger, M.I. (1990). Science/technology parks and regional development theory. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 4(1), 64-78.

Guerrier, Y., & Adib, A. (2003). Work at leisure and leisure at work: A Study of the emotional labour of tour reps. *Human Relations*, 56 (11), 1399-1417.

Guillen, M.F. (1997). Scientific management's lost aesthetic: architecture, organization, and the Taylorized beauty of the mechanical. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(4), 682–715.

Henley, N. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex and non-verbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hermann, C. (2006): Laboring in the network. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 17(1), 65-76.

Hjorth, D. (2004). Creating space for play/invention-concepts of space and organizational entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 16(5), 413-432.

Howe, J. (2006). Howe J (2006) The rise of crowdsourcing. *Wired Magazine*. Retrieved on February 10, 2012 from website: http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/14.06/crowds_pr.html

Homans, G. (1950). *The human group.* New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Kaupins, G., & Park, S. (2011). Legal and ethical implications of corporate social networks. *Employee Responsibility and Rights Journal*, 23, 83–99

Kihlgren, (2003). Promotion of innovation activity in Russia through the creation of science parks: The case of St. Petersburg (1992–1998). *Technovation*, 23, 65–76.

Kjerulf, A. (2009). *Happy hour is 9 to 5: Learn how to love your job, create a great business and kick butt at work.* Jyllands-Posten,Kjerulf.

Leader-Chivee, L., & Cowan, E. (2008). Networking the way to success: Online social networks for workplace and competitive advantage. *People Strategy*, 31(4), 40-46.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., & Banerjee, T. (1993).The negotiated plaza: Design and development of corporate open space in downtown Los Angeles and San Francisco. *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 13(1), 1-12.

Legge, K. (2005). *The rhetorics and realities of HRM*, Aniversary Edition. London: Palgrave.

Massey, D., Quintas, P., & Wield, D. (1992). *High tech fantasies: Science parks in society, science and space.* Routledge, London.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: MacMillan.

McCorkindale, T. (2010). Can you see the writing on my wall? A content analysis of the Fortune 50's Facebook social networking sites. *Public Relations Journal*, 4(3).

McGrath, L. C. (2010). Adoption of social media by corporations: A new era. *Business and Economic Review,* 13, 14-19.

Rapoza, J. (2009). Social skills. *eWeek,* 26(10), 14-20.

Saxenien, A. (1996). *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Schor, J. (1991). The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure. New York: Basic Books.

Sommer, R. (1983). *Social design: Creating buildings with people in mind*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Terranova, T. (2000). Free labor: Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*, 18(2), 33-58.

Papp, R. (1998) Alignment of business and information technology strategy: How and why? *Information Management*, 11(4), 6-11.

Phillimore, J. (1999). Beyond the linear view of innovation in science park evaluation: An analysis of Western Australian technology park, *Technovation*, 19, 673–680.

Urry, J. 1995. *Consuming places.* London: Routledge.

Rosenzweig, R. (1979). Middle-class parks and working-class play: The struggle over recreational space in Worchester, Massachusetts 1870–1910, *Radical History Review*, 21, 31–46.

Vaidyanathan, (2008). Technology parks in a developing country: The case of India. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33, 285–299.

Vedovello, C. (1997). Science parks and university-industry interaction: Geographical proximity between the agents as a driving force. *Technovation*, 17(9), 491–502.

Wajcman, J. (2008). Life in the fast lane? Towards a sociology of technology and time. *The British Journal of Sociology,* 59(1), 60-77.

Woody, T. (1957). Leisure in the light of history. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 313(1), 4-10.

Zhang, H., & Sonobe, T. (2011). Development of science and technology parks in China, 1988–2008. 5(26), *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal*.

---

[1] http://www.aiachicago.org/special_features/2011DEA/awards.asp?appId=318

[2] http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/15/business/epic-systems-digitizing-health-records-before-it-was-cool.html?hpw