

Maintaining an affective commons through events: a practice-based study of three collaborative communities

David Rozas¹ (drozas@ucm.es), Bernhard Resch² (bernhard.resch@sydney.edu.au) & Silvia Díaz-Molina¹ (sdmolina@ucm.es)

¹*Department of Computer Science, Complutense University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.*

²*The University of Sydney Business School, Australia.*

Abstract

In this article, we look at how new forms of organizing in collaborative communities (Adler & Heckscher, 2006; Benkler, 2006; Fuster Morell & Espelt, 2018; Garrett et al., 2017; Scholz & Schneider, 2017) rest on collectively maintained 'affective commons' (Waters-Lynch & Duff, 2019). More concretely, we compare event-organizing practices in three case studies, showing how they compound into affective atmospheres that envelope the perceived potential of bodies to feel and act. In recognizing this product of continuous affective labor as a pooled resource (Ostrom, 1990) that is stewarded by a community with its corresponding ethos (Arvidsson, 2018), we highlight that collaborative organizational designs (Adler & Heckscher, 2018) can create diverse economic practices for the common good. We ask how digitally mediated work relations in coworking spaces, crowdsourcing platforms, and peer-to-peer production can strike a balance between reciprocal and transactional forms of value creation, which challenges the rampaging precariousness in the emerging gig economy (Hyman, 2018).

To explore the critical role of events in this process, we follow a sociomaterial approach to practice theorizing (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011; Gherardi, 2019) that is sensitive to the role of affect for organizing (Gherardi, 2017). In this view, affect is seen as a social phenomenon - a traveling intensity that resonates between human and non-human bodies. It permeates and attunes (Reckwitz, 2016) practices, materializing as bodily sensations and modulating bodies' capacities to act, affect and be affected. As affects shift the tone of a space, their capacity to cause different states of action readiness and structures of feeling materializes as an affective atmosphere (Anderson, 2009; Gregg, 2018). In their study of coworking (Waters-Lynch & Duff, 2019) suggest that atmospheres can be seen as a pooled resource, "inflecting bodies with novel capacities, new modes of interaction, new insights, tendencies or habits, new creative opportunities, a different experience of work" (Waters-Lynch & Duff, 2019, p. 8). We ask how event-organizing practices contribute to maintaining and replenishing this affective commons and how they mediate the conflictual mobilization of diverse value-creation logics in this process. Methodologically, we pursue a multi-case qualitative approach which comprises a total of approximately six years of ethnographic fieldwork. Through a cross-contextual analysis (Mason, 2002), we compare three case studies that differ in the size, type and degree of frequency in the organization of communitarian events.

The first case, *Drupal*, is an open source platform for the development of web applications and

currently powers approximately 2% of websites worldwide. What started as a small project in 2001, has gathered a community of more than 1.3 million collaborators worldwide. The main motto of the project - “come for the software, stay for the community” - is actualized in a wide range of events, ranging from local presentations and drinks to national *DrupalCamps* and global *DrupalCons* conferences. Secondly, *Enspirial*, a grassroots entrepreneurial community and social impact incubator based in New Zealand, is a network with a fluctuating membership between 150-300 people. It has been characterized as an ‘open cooperative’ (Pazaitis et al., 2017) enabling an ecosystem of initiatives and ventures, in which people practice resource-sharing, collaborative decisions and collective ownership. As a new organizational form, *Enspirial* is a collection of different communities, online channels and a coworking space, punctuated by meet-ups and biannual retreats. *Amara*, our third case study is, on the one hand, an open source project for the creation of subtitles, such as those of TED talks (Jansen et al., 2014) and on the other hand, a paid on-demand crowdsourcing service, offering subtitling and translation. We observed a noticeable absence of events, which led to various problems as the community increased its size and became more physically distributed over time.

We would like to participate in PROS to better flesh out the contribution of our analysis. Grounded in previous research on “affective commons” (Bollier & Helfrich, 2019; Waters-Lynch & Duff, 2019) we identified three main practices (1) ‘hooking a vibe,’ (2) ‘tuning into a vibe,’ and (3) ‘keeping the flow.’ Our analysis reveals how different forms of event-making play into each other to maintain affective commons as the lifeblood of communities (Singh, 2013). Large events function as spaces for generating and keeping momentum. Shared purposes, values and narratives are created to atmospherically ‘hook the vibe’ of the community. Smaller events translate this atmosphere into a rhythm or vibe through local rituals, enrolling the bodies of their participants. We highlight that keeping this flow as an ‘affecto-rhythmic order’ (Katila et al., 2019) or ‘affective oscillation’ (Resch & Steyaert, 2020) entails the establishment of a perpetually fragile gentle reciprocity, which challenges practitioners to become commoners through embodied practices of care (Singh, 2017) and sensemaking (de Rond et al., 2019).

References

- Adler, P., & Heckscher, C. (2006). Towards collaborative community. In C. Heckscher & P. Adler (Eds.), *The Firm as a Collaborative Community: The Reconstruction of Trust in the Knowledge Economy* (pp. 11–105). Oxford University Press.
- Adler, P., & Heckscher, C. (2018). Collaboration as an Organization Design for Shared Purpose. *Toward Permeable Boundaries of Organizations? Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 57, 81–111.
- Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(2), 77–81.
- Arvidsson, A. (2018). Value and virtue in the sharing economy. *The Sociological Review*, 66(2), 289–301.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. Yale University Press.
- Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S. (2019). *Free, Fair, and Alive: The Insurgent Power of the Commons*. New Society Publishers.
- de Rond, M., Holeman, I., & Howard-Grenville, J. (2019). Sensemaking from the Body: An

12th International Process Symposium
Thematic Track

- Enactive Ethnography of Rowing the Amazon. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(6), 1961–1988.
- Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing Practice and Practicing Theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1240–1253.
- Fuster Morell, M., & Espelt, R. (2018). A Framework for Assessing Democratic Qualities in Collaborative Economy Platforms: Analysis of 10 Cases in Barcelona. *Urban Science*, 2(3), 61.
- Garrett, L. E., Spreitzer, G. M., & Bacevice, P. A. (2017). Co-constructing a Sense of Community at Work: The Emergence of Community in Coworking Spaces. *Organization Studies*, 38(6), 821–842.
- Gherardi, S. (2017). One turn ... and now another one: Do the turn to practice and the turn to affect have something in common? *Management Learning*, 48(3), 345–358.
- Gherardi, S. (2019). Tracking the sociomaterial traces of affect at the crossroads of affect and practice theories (F. Miele & A. Carreri, trans.). *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 14(3), 295–316.
- Gregg, M. (2018). From careers to atmospheres. In S. Schaefer, M. Andersson, E. Bjarnason, & K. Hansson (Eds.), *Working and organizing in the digital age* (pp. 83–94). The Pufendorf Institute for Advanced Studies, Lund University, Sweden.
- Hyman, L. (2018). *Temp: How American Work, American Business, and the American Dream Became Temporary* (New York: Viking, 2018); Alexandra J. Ravenelle. Viking.
- Jansen, D., Alcalá, A., & Guzmán, F. (2014). Amara: A Sustainable, Global Solution for Accessibility, Powered by Communities of Volunteers. In C. Stephanidis & M. Antona (Eds.), *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Design for All and Accessibility Practice* (pp. 401–411). Springer International Publishing.
- Katila, S., Kuusmin, A., & Valtonen, A. (2019). Becoming upbeat: Learning the affecto-rhythmic order of organizational practices. *Human Relations; Studies towards the Integration of the Social Sciences*, 0018726719867753.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. Sage.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pazaitis, A., Kostakis, V., & Bauwens, M. (2017). Digital economy and the rise of open cooperativism: the case of the Enspiral Network. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 23(2), 177–192.
- Reckwitz, A. (2016). Practices and their Affects. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The Nexus of Practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners* (pp. 114–125). Taylor & Francis.
- Resch, B., & Steyaert, C. (2020). Peer Collaboration as a Relational Practice: Theorizing Affective Oscillation in Radical Democratic Organizing. *Journal of Business Ethics: JBE*, 1–16.
- Scholz, T., & Schneider, N. (2017). *Ours to hack and to own: The rise of platform cooperativism, a new vision for the future of work and a fairer internet*. OR books.
- Singh, N. (2013). The affective labor of growing forests and the becoming of environmental subjects: Rethinking environmentality in Odisha, India. *Geoforum; Journal of Physical, Human, and Regional Geosciences*, 47, 189–198.
- Singh, N. (2017). Becoming a commoner: The commons as sites for affective socio-nature encounters and co-becomings. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 17(4). http://www.ephemerajournal.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/contribution/17-4singh_0.pdf
- Waters-Lynch, J., & Duff, C. (2019). The affective commons of Coworking. *Human Relations; Studies towards the Integration of the Social Sciences*, 7, 001872671989463.

12th International Process Symposium
Thematic Track

Contact

Dr. David Rozas

drozas@ucm.es

Research Group on Agent-Based, Social and Interdisciplinary Applications (office 409)
Faculty of Computer Science, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
C/ Profesor José García Santesmases 9. 28040 Madrid, Spain.

Dr. Bernhard Resch

bernhard.resch@sydney.edu.au

The University of Sydney Business School, Discipline of Strategy, Innovation and
Entrepreneurship
Abercrombie Building (H70), Room 4224
Darlington Ln & Abercrombie St, Darlington, NSW 2008, Australia

Silvia Díaz-Molina

smdmolina@ucm.es

Research Group on Agent-Based, Social and Interdisciplinary Applications (office 409)
Faculty of Computer Science, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
C/ Profesor José García Santesmases 9. 28040 Madrid, Spain.