COWORKING SPACES for inclusion

RES-MOVE

Resources on the Move

WP2 – D2.2 Final report

Final report for T2.7 Field research survey results

Prepared by ZRC SAZU

Authors: Špela Kastelic, Jošt Žagar, Ivana Azhievska, Jure Gombač

March 2025

Co-funded by the European Union

RES-MOVE is co-funded by Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund of the European Union. The contents of this publication represents the views of the author only and is their sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

This report is published as part of the **Resources on the Move – RES-MOVE project**. The European Commission (Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund) co-funds the project. The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents that reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Co-funded by the European Union

Project number: 101140906 — RES-MOVE — AMIF-2023-TF2-AG-CALL

RES-MOVE Project Coordinator:
Academy of Entrepreneurship (Greece)

RES-MOVE Consortium:
Centro Studi Di Politica Internazionale (Italy)
Refugees Welcome Italia (Italy)
Glocal Factory (Italy)
Synthesis Center For Research And Education (Cyprus)
Fundación Musol (Spain)
BEST Institut für berufsbezogene Weiterbildung und Personaltraining GmbH (Austria)
MIGRAFRICA (Germany)
Netwerkpro (The Netherlands)
European Coworking Assembly (The Netherlands)
Place Network (France)
Malmö Ideella (Sweden)
Slovenian Migration Institute ZRC SAZU (Slovenia)

March 2025

This report was conceptualised, prepared and executed by the **Slovenian Migration Institute ZRC SAZU** as part of the RES-MOVE WP2 Research, Activity T 2.7 and T2.8, Deliverable D 2.2. The report is based on the local field research reports done by the collaborative effort of the **RES-MOVE Consortium.**

Co-funded by the European Union

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT

Collaborative and coworking spaces (CWCS) are increasingly recognised as environments that promote innovation and professional growth. These spaces allow individuals from diverse backgrounds to collaborate, develop skills, and access resources in a shared, flexible setting. This is true for migrants in particular. The Resources on the Move (RES-MOVE) project, co-funded by the EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF), acknowledges that various forms of collaboration, including fab-labs, maker spaces, and coworking in public areas, create a new landscape for the labour integration of qualified migrants, especially freelancers, craft skilled individuals, start-up entrepreneurs, and knowledge workers. Migrant inclusion in CWCS is not only a matter of social responsibility but also an opportunity to harness the diverse talents and perspectives that migrants bring. Refugees and migrants often face unique challenges, such as language barriers, cultural differences, and limited professional networks, which can hinder their ability to integrate into the local economy and community. CWCS can mitigate these challenges and promote social and economic integration by fostering an inclusive environment.

The Desk Research Report titled "*Collaborative and Coworking Spaces: A Perspective on Inclusivity*"[1], published in July 2024, analysed the role of CWCS in promoting inclusivity, with a focus on their function in the social and economic integration of migrants, particularly in non-urban areas, and their support for marginalised groups, including migrant women and LGBTQ+ communities. The report's development was supported by two focus groups with experts and professionals in rural coworking and

[1] Desk research *Collaborative Spaces: A Perspective on Inclusivity* is available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/106W2eXihTBJJ0vfuI50_RdeJRb49TpHR/view

gender-inclusivity. However, the meta-study in the report found that this potential remains largely unrealised within migrant communities.

To advance research in this area and gain a clearer understanding of the inclusion of migrant and marginalised communities in CWCS, the project launched a tailored Field research on the inclusivity perspective of CWCS in 11 implementing territories of the project countries: Athens (Greece), Nicosia (Cyprus), Ljubljana (Slovenia), Rome and Verona (Italy), Berlin (Germany), Vienna (Austria), Malmö (Sweden), Paris (France), Amsterdam (the Netherlands) and Valencia (Spain).

The field research began with a training for trainers' session, which was implemented in Ljubljana between September 2 and 4, 2024, organised and led by ZRC SAZU. The training aimed at preparing researchers from partner institutions on the best practices of interviewing members from vulnerable communities and the presentation of tools and methods the research will use. The objective was to collect interviews with migrants and representatives of local CWCS to assess perceptions of inclusivity, as well as the opportunities and challenges they identify in their collaboration. The field research also involved the preparation of Local Reports, which synthesise the findings and data collected in each territory.

This Final Report consolidates the findings from the 11 Local Reports, providing an overview of the current state of inclusive CWCS in the EU. It also contributes to developing Guidelines for Inclusive Coworking Spaces (ICSs), which will be published separately. Both reports offer critical insights for stakeholders, policymakers, and the European coworking community.

The report is structured into three main sections. The Development of the Field Research outlines the research process, including methodology, researcher training, and data collection strategies. The Research Findings provide an overview of the research territories and present key data from

interviews with migrants and CWCS representatives, specifically concerning challenges and opportunities related to inclusivity. The Conclusions and Reflections synthesise key insights and lessons learned from the research, examine the broader implications for inclusivity in CWCS, and consider how the findings can inform future initiatives, including the integration of the RES-MOVE project.

This report is the result of a collaborative effort by the RES-MOVE community, involving project partners, external institutions, and individuals across Europe. We are grateful for the opportunity to work closely with and learn from experts and professionals who contributed their knowledge of the field. Through a thorough examination of the topic, we hope this report enhances understanding of inclusivity challenges faced by marginalised communities and highlights the potential for the coworking movement to become more inclusive, open, and a catalyst for social inclusion and innovation.

1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE WP2

1.1. FIELD SURVEY AND DATA COLLECTION

The research team responsible for developing this report, which concurrently oversees the research work package (WP2), is part of the Slovenian Migration Institute (ZRC SAZU). This institute holds over 30 years of expertise in academic and applied research, focusing on migrant communities in Slovenia and beyond. WP2 comprises a range of activities, including desk research, the facilitation of two focus groups with experts and professionals specialising in rural coworking and gender inclusivity, the management of field research involving skilled migrants and coworkers, as well as the preparation of the *Guidelines for Inclusive Coworking Spaces* ("*Guidelines*").

The field research serves as the foundation for drafting the *Guidelines*, and involves data from 11 implementing territories across 10 EU countries. Partner organisations in the RES-MOVE project were tasked with engaging migrants and CWCS managers in their respective regions. In late September 2024, ZRC SAZU provided questionnaires for both groups. The research aimed to interview 110 migrant respondents and 110 CWCS managers, with data collection being done from October to December 2024.

The goals for migrant respondents were exceeded, with a total of 115 individuals participating, whereas CWCS engagement slightly lagged behind at 101 respondents. The study captured a variety of perspectives across both categories. Among migrant respondents, there was a greater representation of women (69 women compared to 46 men). Respondents were categorised into age groups (16–25, 26–35, 36–45, and 46+), with the majority in the 26–35 and 36–45 brackets. The research encompassed various legal statuses, including asylum seekers, refugees, individuals under

temporary protection, labour migrants, students, and naturalised citizens. The duration of residence in the host country varied from as little as one month to as long as 44 years. On average, participants lived in their host country for several years and achieved some stability. Among migrant respondents, educational backgrounds ranged from no formal education to advanced degrees, including PhDs and professional certifications. Most respondents had either a high school diploma or a bachelor's degree.

On the CWCS side, the research examined different types of coworking spaces, highlighting three primary categories: traditional coworking spaces, makerspaces and fab labs, and coworking environments centred on social innovation. All CWCS respondents participated in a uniform set of questions about their experiences, practices, and interests in interacting with migrant populations. The responses indicated that makerspaces, fab labs, and coworking spaces promoting social innovation were more inclined to have established methods for integrating migrants and encouraging their active involvement. Questions regarding their participation in the RES-MOVE program and future initiatives for improving migrant labour integration received positive overall feedback.

A review of CWCS revealed various inclusion strategies, including language support, cultural competency training, mentorship programs, and networking opportunities. The RES-MOVE project pinpointed two major challenges: integrating migrants into rural coworking spaces and fostering safe, welcoming environments for migrant women and LGBTQ+ individuals. Addressing the issues faced by migrant women is especially urgent, as they encounter more significant employment barriers compared to other migrant groups in the EU, frequently indicating higher unemployment rates (EIGE 2020).

While some promising initiatives addressing these challenges are already in place, broader research and action are needed. RES-MOVE aimed to advance this field of study by initiating a research-focused work package (WP2) that examines the inclusivity of CWCS, particularly within the project's target countries. To some extent, this objective was achieved, laying the groundwork for further exploration of this vital area.

2. FIELD RESEARCH FINDINGS

2.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE FIELD

Field research was conducted in 11 project territories in 10 countries (Netherlands, Greece, Austria, Germany, France, Sweden, Slovenia, Spain, Italy, and Cyprus) and covered 27 cities. In the project, Italy had two implementation territories (Rome and Verona) where field research was concentrated. Research in Rome was conducted by CeSPI and Refugees Welcome Italia, while in Verona, it was carried out by Glocal Factory. The research primarily focused on urban and suburban areas, where most coworking and collaborative spaces operate. However, some interviews were also conducted with migrants and CWCS representatives who work and live in rural areas and smaller urban centres, such as Zwettl (Austria) and Ajdovščina, Trbovlje, and Škofja Loka (Slovenia). These spaces have emerged partly due to the mobility of young professionals relocating from cities to the countryside.

Fast internet connections and remote work options have enabled professionals to perform their jobs outside urban cores, where high housing costs pose significant challenges. This shift in mobility from urban to rural areas has driven the development of coworking spaces beyond city centres. Nevertheless, the study shows that most CWCS remain concentrated in urban areas, where fluctuating populations and diverse job opportunities create a demand for more flexible workspaces. When considering migration (either persons seeking international protection or labour migrants), urban areas remain the desired destinations, while rural areas mostly present viable settlement options for persons with opportunities for remote work (digital nomads).

The research covered the following locations:

- **The Netherlands**: Amsterdam, Nijmegen, Utrecht, Oosterhout, Tilburg, Rijsenhout
- **Greece**: Athens
- **Austria**: Vienna, Mödling, Zwettl
- **Germany**: Cologne, Bonn
- **France**: Paris
- **Sweden**: Malmö, Lund, Fengerfors
- **Slovenia**: Ljubljana, Koper, Ajdovščina, Nova Gorica, Trbovlje, Škofja Loka
- **Spain**: Valencia
- **Italy**: Rome, Verona
- **Cyprus**: Nicosia

2.1.1 By territory - migrant and minority communities

The Netherlands: The Netherlands hosts a diverse migrant population, including refugees, asylum seekers, work migrants, and foreign students. Recent migration inflows have increased, with around 46,000 asylum applications filed in 2023. Refugees and asylum seekers predominantly originate from Syria, Afghanistan, Turkey, Eritrea, and Yemen, with Syrians forming a significant group. Labour migrants primarily come from EU countries such as Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria, drawn by opportunities in sectors like construction and healthcare. International students, especially from India, China, and Germany, contribute to the educational diversity of Dutch universities. Nijmegen, with its community-oriented approach, accommodates a significant number of refugees and asylum seekers supported by local shelters and integration programmes. *(based on local report prepared by Netwerkpro and European Coworking Assembly)*

Greece: According to the census conducted in 2021, Greece was home to 461,598 third-country nationals. Including 50,113 beneficiaries of international protection, 226,101 EU citizens, and 20,204 co-ethnics, the total legally residing immigrant population reached 758,016, which represents 7.2% of Greece's population (Hellenic Statistical Authority 2023). Albanians

constitute the largest immigrant group (60.1%), followed by Chinese (5.7%), Georgians (4.2%), Pakistanis (4.0%), and Russians (3.2%) (Greek Ministry of Migration and Asylum 2023). Asylum seeker arrivals have significantly increased, with a 63% increase in early 2023 compared to the same period in 2022. Between January and September 2023, 35,735 asylum applications were filed (Greek Ministry of Migration and Asylum 2023).

In Greece, the residence permits are mainly classified as "other" (218,049), "family reunification" (150,139), and "employment" (8,614). Additionally, there are 26,015 foreign students aged 5–17 enrolled in Greek schools, representing 2% of the total student population, with a concentration in the Attica region. (AlfaVita 2022). *(based on local report prepared by The Academy of Entrepreneurship)*

Austria: Austria's migrant population is significant, with 27.2% of residents (approximately 2.45 million as of 2023) being migrants. The largest migrant groups come from Germany, Romania, Turkey, Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Recent years have seen an increase in migrants from Syria, Ukraine, and Hungary. Vienna, home to around 1.9 million people, has the highest concentration of migrants, with 34.2% foreign nationals and 39.3% residents born abroad. The largest migrant groups in Vienna are from Serbia, Turkey, Germany, and Poland, and the city experienced a net migration increase driven by Ukrainian arrivals. Lower Austria, with a population of 1.65 million, has a lower rate of international immigration, seeing a net migration of 19,816 people in 2023. The largest migrant groups in the region come from Germany, Romania, and Turkey (Statistik Austria 2024). *(based on local report prepared by BEST)*

Germany: The migrant population in Cologne and Bonn is notably diverse, comprising refugees, asylum seekers, labour migrants, and international students. These cities attract a continuous influx due to their robust

economies, educational institutions, international organisations, and integration programmes. In 2023, Germany received 329,035 first-time asylum applications, representing 31.4% of all such applications in the EU (Eurostat 2024). In the same year, the country recorded 1.93 million immigrants and a net migration figure of 663,000 (Statista 2025). Both cities have historically mirrored national migration trends, with over 15% of their populations having a migration background. Major countries of origin for migrants include Syria, Eritrea, Afghanistan, Turkey, and Iraq, as well as economic migrants from Romania, Poland, and Bulgaria, alongside professionals and students from India and China. The number of foreign students is on the rise, attracted to institutions like the University of Cologne and the University of Bonn. *(based on local report prepared by Migrafrica)*

France: In France, 10.1% of the population are immigrants, primarily from Algeria, Morocco, and Portugal, totalling approximately 5.3 million people (Département des statistiques 2023). Additionally, around 1.7 million people born outside France with French passports are classified as "étrangers" (migrants). Migrants come for various reasons, including asylum (2.99%), studies (7.31%), family reunification (33.5%), and economic opportunities (8.68%), with 69% of economic permits issued to those with indefinite full-time employment. In Paris, migrants and their descendants represent a significant share of the population—20.1% are migrants, and 14.8% are descendants of migrants (Insee 2023). Paris accommodates 46% of France's asylum seekers but has only 18% of the necessary housing, leading to overcrowding. *(based on local report prepared by PLACE Network)*

Sweden: Sweden's recent migration policies have shifted towards deterring and reducing integration. Because of this, changes have been introduced for entry, which include higher subsistence requirements for labour immigrants, stricter asylum laws and restrictive changes in social programs.

In 2024 (from January to November) Sweden reported approval of 94,076 new residence permits. The majority were based on work permits (27,009), family relations (24,504), and asylum, which includes applicants under the Temporary Protection Directive (14 567), enrolment into a study program (18,453) and citizenship of other EU/ESS country (7,619) (Migrationsverket 2025). In Malmö in 2023, the total number of granted permits was 4225. Between January and August 2024, 1,941 people were granted residence permits. *(based on local report prepared by Malmö Ideella)*

Slovenia: The country's migrant population includes asylum seekers, refugees, labour migrants, and foreign students. As a transit nation for irregular migration, Slovenia recorded 60,587 irregular border crossings in 2023, along with 7,216 asylum applications. There is limited infrastructure to aid asylum seekers and refugees, with major facilities in Ljubljana, Maribor, Logatec, and Postojna. The ongoing conflict in Ukraine has resulted in temporary protection for 9,367 individuals, primarily Ukrainian nationals. According to the Ministry of the Interior, as of December 2024, 254,668 migrants have permanent or temporary residence permits in Slovenia, with 225,062 from non-EU countries. Approximately 148,000 foreigners are employed, accounting for nearly 16% of an overall workforce of about 1 million (Zidar 2024). Slovenia also attracts a significant number of work migrants, mainly from Serbia, Bosnia, North Macedonia, Kosovo, and other EU countries, as well as from India, Nepal, the Philippines, and Bangladesh, filling roles in construction, agriculture, and hospitality. Furthermore, the country hosts numerous foreign students, particularly from neighbouring countries and former Yugoslav republics. *(based on local report prepared by ZRC SAZU)*

Spain (Valencia): The Valencian Community in Spain is home to a significant and diverse migrant population, making up 13.9% of its residents (945,580 people) as of 2023. Most migrants are concentrated in Alicante

(52%), followed by Valencia (38%) and Castellón (10%). The largest migrant groups come from Romania (12.6%), the United Kingdom (10.2%), and Morocco (9.1%), with notable contributions from South America, especially Colombia. The migrant population includes economic migrants, students, asylum seekers, and retirees. Naturalisation rates show that 25% of foreign-born residents have acquired Spanish citizenship, with South Americans having the highest naturalisation rates (51.4%). The migrant population is relatively younger than the native population. Alicante, in particular, attracts many European retirees, especially from Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium. This diverse and dynamic migrant community contributes significantly to Valencia's socio-economic development and cultural landscape. *(based on local report prepared by MUSOL)*

Italy: Italy was divided into two independently researched territories (Rome and Verona) based on partner organisations' locations. Rome is a significant destination for migrants in Italy, with over 520,000 foreign residents in the metropolitan area, comprising 13.7% of the population (IDOS 2024). The largest migrant groups originate from other European countries (42%), followed by Asia (34.9%), Africa (12.3%), and the Americas (10.5%). The main nationalities include Romanian (22%), Filipino (10.6%), Bangladeshi (8.9%), Chinese (5.0%), Ukrainian (4.0%), Peruvian, and Indian (3.3%), with Egyptians, Polish, Sri Lankans, Albanians, and Moldovans each accounting for around 2%. The city hosts 1,267 refugees in the municipal SAI system and 3,460 more in the Ministry of Interior's CAS system. Foreign student numbers are also growing, with many coming from Iran, India, Tunisia, Kazakhstan, Turkey, and Greece. *(based on local report prepared by CeSPI and Refugees Welcome Italia)*

The second research territory in Italy was Verona. At the start of 2023, immigrants in Verona Province numbered 111,175, or 12% of the 925,656 residents. Verona's immigrant population remained stable from 2022, with

56,459 females (50.8%) and 54,716 males. In Verona, 38,333 immigrants (15.0% of residents) were recorded. Romania stands as the leading country of origin with 32,702 residents, followed by Morocco with 13,165, Sri Lanka with 10,520, and others. Among the top ten countries, Romania and Moldova have a female majority, with 53% and 64%, respectively. In contrast, males make up the highest migrant percentage in the cases of India (59%), Ghana (59%), and Pakistan (72%). In 2022, a total of 449,118 residence permits were granted in Italy, marking the highest figure in a decade, largely due to 148,000 temporary permits issued to displaced Ukrainians. Additionally, there was an increase in work and study permits, with over 25,000 study permits issued—the highest number since 2013. *(based on local report prepared by Glocal Factory)*

Cyprus: Cyprus has become a key destination for migrants, asylum seekers, and international students due to its strategic location at the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and Africa. In 2023, Cyprus saw a significant rise in asylum applications, with over 11,820 received, primarily from Syria, Nigeria, and Afghanistan. Additionally, Cyprus granted temporary protection to over 18,500 Ukrainian refugees. The country faces challenges in integrating this growing refugee and asylum seeker population.

Labour migration plays a vital role, with around 90,500 third-country nationals and 93,100 EU citizens residing in Cyprus, constituting nearly 20% of the population. Many work in tourism, construction, and domestic services, often facing legal challenges and exploitation. The migrant population is predominantly from Syria, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Nigeria, with Syrians forming the largest group due to the ongoing conflict in Syria. Indian and Bangladeshi migrants primarily work in labour-intensive sectors, while Nigerians contribute significantly as students and temporary workers. *(based on local report prepared by Synthesis)*

2.1.2 By territory - the state of CWCS

The Netherlands: The mapping of coworking spaces in the Netherlands highlights 10 key locations, each with distinct focuses like community engagement, entrepreneurship, and social impact. Notable spaces include De Kamer, Leegstand Oplossers, Social Impact Factory, #Workmode, Dotslash, Startup Amsterdam, Home - MidWest, Boost and Civic Archipel in Amsterdam, as well as Civic Noord Adinda, Al Amal in Utrecht, and Bindkracht 10 in Nijmegen. These spaces foster various initiatives that range from startups to social enterprises.

Findings from the research indicate that coworking spaces function as more than just work environments; they operate as community hubs, offering activities and opportunities for skill development. They foster collaboration, empowerment, and social integration, with a growing focus on bridging cultural gaps. While some spaces primarily support startups and freelancers, others receive government funding and prioritise social objectives. These spaces can play a crucial role in refugee integration, providing environments where individuals can develop job skills, build professional networks, and engage in community activities that promote inclusion and connection. *(based on local report prepared by Netwerkpro and European Coworking Assembly)*

Greece: Athens is gaining recognition as an attractive destination for digital nomads. Beyond its numerous cafés with free Wi-Fi, the city offers a variety of coworking spaces and professional hubs where digital nomads can connect and work productively (The Blogler 2024). Research and exploration identified approximately 33 coworking spaces across Greece, with 15 situated outside Athens. The spaces in Athens were the focus of the study. Most of these locations operate as coworking hubs traditionally, providing facilities such as offices, Wi-Fi, equipment, and meeting rooms

primarily through a model based on monthly or weekly fees. Some spaces occasionally offer free access or host activities for vulnerable groups through specific partnerships. Although their philosophy encourages such an approach, financial constraints prevent them from sustaining free access indefinitely.

Additionally, there are spaces, such as multilingual libraries and multicultural centres, that adopt coworking practices without formally labelling themselves as such. Survey responses indicate that these spaces often support migrants by providing resources, workshops, and community activities. While many did not initially identify as coworking spaces, respondents recognised shared characteristics during discussions and expressed interest in participating in the research. These spaces also demonstrated greater openness to collaborating with migrants and expanding their activities and initiatives to foster inclusion. *(based on local report prepared by The Academy of Entrepreneurship)*

Austria: Vienna's public libraries provide coworking-like services, featuring spaces for individual and group work, internet access, and events, and some even include maker spaces and digital labs (Stadt Wien 2025). The city has experienced substantial growth in coworking spaces, boasting over 30 CWCSas of 2024 serving freelancers, startups, and companies. The most common types of CWCS in Vienna consist of open-concept areas (e.g. Impact Hub), private offices (e.g. Stockwerk Coworking), event rooms (e.g. ZI8 Coworking), and specialised spaces (e.g. Musik Raum), frequently hosting networking events and workshops to foster collaboration. *(based on local report prepared by BEST)*

Germany: Cologne, a prominent urban centre, features numerous coworking spaces that differ in size, focus, and services. Venues such as Colabor e.V., the Migration and Development Council, and Demokratie

Space emphasise sustainability and social impact, embedding inclusivity into their practices. Additionally, the city includes conventional coworking hubs like Startplatz, which cater to tech startups and foster innovation. The research identified a total of 65 coworking spaces in Cologne.

Bonn has fewer coworking spaces than Cologne, but with an equally strong impact. Spaces such as Haus der Vielfalt and Palast der Löwin emphasise community engagement and cultural diversity, providing platforms for NGOs, artists, and migrant groups. Bonn's smaller size fosters a more intimate coworking environment, where personal connections and collaboration play a central role. Eight coworking spaces were identified in Bonn, with Haus der Vielfalt and Palast der Löwin being among those who responded to the survey outreach. *(based on local report prepared by Migrafrica)*

France: Paris and the surrounding area have approximately 40 coworking spaces and franchises, offering amenities such as complimentary coffee, meeting rooms, events, relaxation areas, and scenic views. Some cater to large corporations, providing premium packages that include services like spas, personal trainers, and parking facilities. Certain spaces have been repurposed from other ventures, such as cafés and libraries, which were not included in the total count, along with "third spaces" that individuals frequently use as coworking environments. These spaces are particularly valuable for those with limited financial resources.

Many coworking spaces in Paris host businesses that pay memberships for their employees, as well as independent workers. In their pursuit of profits, numerous coworking spaces have transitioned from providing flexible short-term options, allowing users to pay for just a few hours or a single day, to favouring longer-term agreements. Additionally, some coworking environments are established with a social mission. These versatile spaces

aim to assist individuals with migration or refugee backgrounds and the unemployed by offering them quiet areas to search and find stable careers. *(based on local report prepared by PLACE Network)*

Sweden: Sweden is renowned for its emphasis on innovation in areas such as sustainability and social issues, which has created numerous collaborative workspaces and there are at least 40 of these in Sweden. While Swedes hold privacy in high regard in their personal lives, they are keen to collaborate for development. Through interviews with both CWCS and the target group, it's evident that individuals from other developed nations also seek out similar spaces due to their familiarity with such environments in their home countries. This autumn, the number of CWCS interviewed was 11. The predominant type of space is "closed," where membership is necessary for access, although many offer activities for non-members. The "open" spaces, often managed by municipalities or non-profits, prioritise inclusivity and solidarity, as evidenced in Malmö. *(based on local report prepared by Malmö Ideella)*

Slovenia: In Slovenia, CWCS vary significantly between urban and non-urban areas. In urban regions, particularly Ljubljana, CWCS are plentiful and serve a broad range of professionals, offering services like creative hubs, innovation labs, and maker spaces. These spaces foster networking, innovation, and community-building, supporting a strong startup ecosystem with spaces like Impact Hub, Regus and Center Rog.

In contrast, less urban areas like Upper Carniola and Prekmurje have fewer CWCS but are growing in popularity. These spaces focus on local entrepreneurship and innovation, with emerging hubs in places like Kranj and Murska Sobota that support small businesses and startups. Rural coworking environments often offer a more intimate setting compared to the bustling urban hubs, with an emphasis on practical business support

and community-driven development. Non-urban spaces also tend to combine coworking with other functions, like living labs and maker spaces, which can encourage more specialised types of collaboration. *(based on local report prepared by ZRC SAZU)*

Spain: Valencia has seen a significant increase in CWCS in the past decade, driven by global trends for flexible and community-focused work environments. The city now hosts around 70 CWCS, catering to freelancers, startups, remote workers, and small businesses. These spaces are concentrated in creative districts like Ruzafa, El Carmen, and Benimaclet. The main types of CWCS in Valencia include:

- Traditional coworking spaces: Offering shared workspaces with amenities like desks and meeting rooms. Examples are A2CW and Wayco, which have over 3,000 square meters of office space.
- Niche and Specialized Spaces: These focus on industries like Estudio CHAFLÁN and Estudio Medusa.
- Hybrid Spaces: Combining coworking with facilities like cafeterias and event spaces, such as MULTIPRECIO.

(based on local report prepared by MUSOL)

Italy: In Rome, coworking spaces vary widely, from corporate offices serving businesses to more socially inclusive environments, both private and public. Excluding multinational companies like Regus, the focus was on less commercial coworking models. The most common type identified consists of private, shared workspaces that offer not only work facilities but also economic, entrepreneurial, technological, social, and cultural activities. These spaces aim to foster community engagement and, in some cases, create and share social and cultural content. Both international networks, such as Impact Hub, and national networks, such as Talent Garden, along with smaller, locally founded spaces, reflect these characteristics.

According to ECA's interactive mapping for the RES-MOVE project[2] Italy has around 160 coworking spaces, with 21 in Rome, though this is likely an underestimate. This research incorporated a predefined list of coworking spaces along with additional spaces identified through fieldwork, including those not officially categorised as CWCS. *(based on local report prepared by CeSPI and Refugees Welcome Italia)*

In the broader Verona area, coworking spaces in Veneto have grown rapidly. By early 2021, the region had 85 coworking spaces, up from 82 in 2020. Around 65% are located in provincial capitals, with Verona and Padua leading (19 each), followed by Venice and Vicenza (8 each). These spaces cater to diverse professional needs. Open spaces are designed for freelancers and small businesses, while hybrid spaces combine shared areas with private offices for greater flexibility. Vertical coworking fosters collaboration within specific industries, business centres offer temporary offices and meeting rooms, and fab labs provide makers and artists with prototyping tools. However, many of these spaces prioritise commercial goals, often at the expense of social inclusion. The seven spaces surveyed in Verona focus on inclusion-driven initiatives, particularly in organising activities with migrants. While not all are explicitly classified as coworking spaces, they serve as collaborative hubs supporting community engagement. *(based on local report prepared by Glocal Factory)*

Cyprus: CWCS are growing in popularity in Cyprus, especially in urban areas like Nicosia. These spaces cater to freelancers, startups, and businesses seeking flexible, cost-effective office solutions. Notable coworking spaces in Nicosia include Yfantourgeio TheWorkplace, HUB NICOSIA, Dignity Centre, and Room of Hope, offering high-speed internet, ergonomic furniture, meeting rooms, and event spaces. Coworking spaces in Cyprus encompass

[2] Map of CWCS in the EU is available at https://resmove.org/.

both traditional coworking spaces (open-plan areas and hot-desking, ideal for freelancers and remote workers) and serviced offices (private, fully-equipped offices for small to medium-sized businesses, without the overhead of traditional leases). *(based on local report prepared by Synthesis)*

2.2. DATA RESULTS - MIGRANT RESPONDENTS

For the purpose of this research, the project partners reached out to a diverse community of migrants across Europe. The target was to interview 10 respondents per territory. This goal was met or exceeded by most partners, though in some territories, it was not achieved due to challenges in respondent availability.

The profiles of the respondents were highly diverse in terms of age, legal status, employment status, and length of stay in their respective countries. Regarding gender, the respondents identified as women (69) and men (46), in some territories, such as the Netherlands and Cyprus, only migrant women were interviewed. The predominant age groups of respondents were 26–35 and 36–45 years. The length of stay in the host country ranged from as little as one month to as long as 44 years, reflecting the varied legal statuses of the respondents. On average, the research reached individuals who had been living in the country for several years and had established a degree of stability in their lives.

Respondents' legal statuses also varied widely, including asylum seekers, labour migrants, individuals granted residency due to family ties, those in the process of obtaining residence permits, individuals with international protection, and naturalised migrants with long-term residency. In terms of education, respondents represented a broad spectrum. While a few interviewees had no formal education or only primary education, the majority had achieved secondary education or a Bachelor's degree. Many

respondents held a Master's degree, and one had completed a PhD. The respondents were employed, self-employed/freelancers, or unemployed, highlighting that the research did not limit its scope based on legal or employment status.

2.2.1 By territory - Profiles

The Netherlands: The field research involved interviews with 10 migrant women in the Netherlands, aged 36 to 45 years. The respondents varied in legal status, predominantly labour migrants or asylum seekers, with approximately one-third being married. Educational levels ranged from secondary school to bachelor's degrees. About 50% had resided in the Netherlands for 5 to 9 years, 15% for over 15 years, and 35% for over 30 years. The findings highlight the diverse experiences shaped by education, legal status, and duration of residence, underscoring the complex challenges and opportunities faced by migrant women. *(based on local report prepared by Netwerkpro and European Coworking Assembly)*

Greece: The research included 11 migrants, slightly exceeding the target of 10, with an additional interview conducted with a digital nomad working outside Athens who offered valuable insights. The age distribution was predominantly young adults: five participants were aged 26–35, three were 18–25, and three were 36–45. Gender distribution was nearly equal, with six females and five males.

Respondents' legal status varied: four were labour migrants, three were second-generation migrants, one transitioned from student to expat, one was a digital nomad, and two identified simply as migrants. Educational levels were high, with seven holding Bachelor's degrees, three with Master's degrees, and one with a PhD. The length of stay varied significantly, with six migrants residing in Greece for over 15 years, including

one individual for 30 years. Others reported 15, 11, 8, 3, and 1.5 years. *(based on local report prepared by The Academy of Entrepreneurship)*

Austria: Field research in Vienna included 10 migrant respondents from diverse backgrounds, most of whom were between 26 and 45 years old, representing the active working-age population. The group had a slight male predominance (6 men, 4 women) and was primarily composed of labour migrants (9), with one student. Their educational backgrounds ranged from primary school to advanced degrees: 3 held Bachelor's degrees, 2 had Master's degrees, 3 completed secondary education, 1 had vocational training, and 1 had only primary schooling. The respondents' length of stay in Austria ranged from 13 to 44 years. They belonged to age groups of 18–25 years (1), 26–35 years (3), 36–45 years (5), and 46+ years (1). Their length of stay varied from 13 to 14 years (3), 17 to 26 years (6), and 33 to 44 years (2). *(based on local report prepared by BEST)*

Germany: The field research included 10 respondents from diverse age groups: 2 were aged 18-25, 4 were 26-35, 3 were 36-45, and 1 was over 46. The group consisted of 6 men and 4 women. In terms of legal status, 4 were refugees, 4 were labour migrants, 1 had subsidiary protection, and 1 participated in the European Solidarity Corps. Educational backgrounds varied, with 6 holding Bachelor's degrees, 3 having Master's degrees, and 1 completing vocational training. On average, participants had lived in Germany for 5 years, with individual durations ranging from 1 to 15 years.

Respondents pointed out challenges in the German labour market, including cultural biases, language barriers, and unrecognised qualifications, while emphasising the importance of networking and mentorship. Many appreciated inclusive co-working spaces with affordable access, childcare, and culturally sensitive staff, highlighting the significance of community and collaboration. The findings underscore the necessity for

tailored support to enhance employability and integration for migrants in Germany. *(based on local report prepared by Migrafrica)*

France: The research included seven respondents from Ukraine, Iran, Sudan, Canada, and Germany, with an average age of 30. On average, they had lived in France for about five years. The group consisted of three women and four men, with most holding either temporary protection status (2) or a work visa (2). One participant was a German citizen, another had refugee status, and one, formerly a refugee, had since obtained French citizenship. Additionally, all respondents held a Master's degree. Most were employed, either in permanent positions (3) or as freelancers/self-employed (3), while one was unemployed but actively seeking work. The number of interviewees was limited to fewer than ten due to the small number of migrant members in coworking spaces and privacy concerns. *(based on local report prepared by PLACE Network)*

Sweden: A total of 17 individuals participated in the research, including 11 in a focus group and 6 in individual interviews. The group consisted of 4 men and 13 women, with the majority aged 46 and older (9), followed by those aged 36-45 (7) and one participant in the 26-35 age group. Most respondents were refugees (11), while others were residents by family connection (3), asylum seekers (2), or held temporary protection (1). Educational backgrounds varied, with 7 having completed primary school, 3 finishing secondary school, 3 holding Bachelor's degrees, 3 earning Master's degrees, and 1 having no formal education. Participants had lived in Sweden for anywhere between 1 and 31 years, with half residing there for 7 to 11 years. The predominance of women reflects a broader trend in Malmö and across Sweden, where women encounter greater difficulties in accessing suitable activities through government or municipal programmes. *(based on local report prepared by Malmö Ideella)*

Slovenia: The research included 10 migrant respondents, 8 men and 2 women. They belonged to three age groups: 26–35 years (4), 18–25 years (3), and 36–45 years (3). Their legal statuses varied, with 4 asylum seekers, 3 students, 1 holding subsidiary protection, and 2 classified as "other" (a resident artist and an individual acquiring temporary residency). The respondents came from Morocco, Tunisia, Iran, Cameroon, Congo, Kazakhstan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Russia. Education levels included high school (6), primary school (1), bachelor's degrees (2), and one master's degree. The length of stay in Slovenia varied from one month to thirteen years, with an average of slightly over 2.5 years. *(based on local report prepared by ZRC SAZU)*

Spain: The research involved interviews with ten individuals, including four women over 35 and six men, most of whom were between 25 and 35 years old, with two participants aged 45 and 65, respectively. Most were obtaining residency or held a temporary residency, primarily as economic or labour migrants. Their educational background included technical or professional training, university-level education, and master's degrees. The majority migrated to the host country for economic reasons. *(based on local report prepared by MUSOL)*

Italy: Field research in Rome included interviews with 10 migrants, most aged 26–35 (6), with three aged 36–45 and one between 18–25. The group consisted of six women and four men. Four were political refugees with international protection, two held temporary protection, two were asylum seekers, and two had work or study permits.

Education levels were generally high, with four respondents holding bachelor's degrees, 2 having master's degrees, 2 completing secondary school, and 2 receiving vocational or technical training. Half were continuing their education in Rome, either at university or high school in

Italian. All interviewees attended Italian language courses, with many demonstrating notable proficiency. On average, respondents had lived in Italy for three years, with durations ranging from 1 to 8 years. Their countries of origin included Ukraine (2), the Middle East/West Asia (3), East Africa (2), West Africa (1), and South America (2). *(based on local report prepared by CeSPI and Refugees Welcome Italia)*

Field research in Verona included 10 participants, three aged 26–35, four aged 36–45, and three over 46. The group was predominantly female (7 women, 3 men). Legal statuses varied: 2 held political asylum permits, 2 had long-term residency, 3 had work permits, and 3 were in Italy through family reunification. Participants came from Morocco (3), Mali, Gambia, India, Pakistan, Colombia, Peru, and Nigeria. Educational backgrounds were diverse, with 4 holding higher education degrees, 3 completing vocational training, and 3 finishing secondary school. On average, they had lived in Italy for six years, most of which were recent or mid-term residents, while two had been in the country long-term. *(based on local report prepared by Glocal Factory)*

Cyprus: The field research included 10 migrant women with a diverse range of legal statuses, including refugees, asylum seekers, and a minority with subsidiary protection. The majority were aged 26–35. Education levels varied; most had secondary or vocational education, and a few held bachelor's degrees. The respondents' lengths of stay in Cyprus ranged from 2 to 7 years, with some having lived there for as long as 17 years, reflecting a mix of recent arrivals and long-term residents. Beyond the structured questionnaire, participants discussed challenges such as language barriers, difficulty accessing stable employment, and discrimination in job matching. Many underscored the need for tailored vocational training and psychological support. Despite these obstacles, there was a strong desire

for integration, economic independence, and contributing to Cypriot society. *(based on local report prepared by Synthesis)*

2.2.2 Experiences in the labour market and familiarity with CWCS

The majority of migrant respondents reported prior experience in the labour markets of their host countries. Those who lacked such experience were typically individuals with shorter stays in the country (up to one year). Among respondents with labour market experience, their answers revealed a common theme: widespread discrimination, particularly by employers undervaluing their qualifications and even administrative processes officials. Despite the diversity in legal status and educational levels among the migrant respondents, most shared negative experiences during their job searches or workplaces. Discrimination seemed to be influenced by cultural markers, such as wearing a headscarf and by skin colour.

One respondent from the Netherlands shared:

"In the daycare, home care, and store, some people welcome me, but others react differently because I wear a headscarf. They underestimate me: 'You know nothing, you know nothing, and you are nothing.' That hurts and is uncomfortable."

Similarly, respondents from Paris noted that their "European" appearance, notably lighter skin tones, appeared to result in more favourable treatment when applying for jobs. As one respondent explained, they believed their paler complexion made it easier to secure employment.

Many respondents across various countries reported being forced to accept jobs that did not align with their education or professional expertise. A respondent from Greece recounted:

"There's often an assumption that I'm only suited for certain types of work, like cleaning or caregiving, regardless of my education."

This ongoing trend implies that labour market discrimination—characterised by the inclination to direct migrants towards low-skilled employment—is a common occurrence, irrespective of the host nation. Such positions frequently cluster in service industries, including kitchen roles, caregiving, and cleaning. Due to their vulnerable legal status, migrants often have no choice but to accept these jobs under conditions deemed unlawful. As noted by a respondent from Rome said:

"In my country, I was working in engineering and automation, while here, I found myself doing anything else, working even 10 hours a day for a salary of 40 euros a day without a contract."

In Verona, most of the respondents noted that temporary contracts and seasonal work dominated their past work experience. Such conditions lead to the inability of a person to plan and build their career and life. As noted by the response:

"Most of my jobs have been temporary, and it's hard to plan a stable future."

In certain instances, such as Slovenia, participants highlighted another obstacle: they could not obtain jobs directly, as they only managed to find work via employment agencies. Their experiences show that companies preferred to hire them through these agencies, making it easier to dismiss them when their services were no longer needed.

Another significant challenge mentioned by many respondents was the lack of local language skills, which often limited their job opportunities. Moreover, state officials were frequently unwilling to recognise educational

qualifications and professional skills obtained in the respondents' countries of origin.

As for alternative working spaces such as CWCS, respondents' familiarity differed significantly by country. In Austria and France, every respondent knew about CWCS and had some experience with co-working spaces. In contrast, none of the respondents from Sweden reported any knowledge or experience with CWCS, with only one individual indicating previous experience in such spaces.

In most countries, at least half of the respondents were aware of CWCS and viewed the concept positively. The most commonly cited benefits included fostering inclusion, individual growth, and cooperation, as well as reducing costs. A responded from Germany noted the importance of cooperation and creativity that CWCS enables:

"Meeting people from different industries and sharing experiences would be both enriching and inspiring."

However, despite this familiarity, only a small number of respondents utilised CWCS in a strictly business-oriented context. Upon additional explanation and broadening of the definition of the CWCS, some respondents recognised their own community and social centres as possible candidates for the role of a CWCS. A larger proportion of respondents had thus engaged with more specialised collaborative spaces that served as social or community hubs when attending NGO meetings, educational seminars, and social events.

2.2.3 Appeal and motivation for joining a CWCS: expected benefits (incl. using CWCS during past time & working remotely - non-urban areas)

The majority of respondents expressed a positive attitude toward joining a CWCS. Only one respondent from Greece gave a negative response,

explaining that their current profession did not align with the type of work typically associated with CWCS. Like other responders, he associated working in a CWCS with strict tech in web development sectors.

The most commonly cited factors that made CWCS appealing included structured co-working options, opportunities to meet new people, cost efficiency, a focused and dynamic work environment, mentorship and educational opportunities, and a strong sense of community. Respondents also emphasised the importance of additional amenities and services, such as access to food and drinks, social events, and outdoor spaces, as key incentives.

When asked what would motivate them to participate in CWCS activities, most respondents indicated that alignment with their personal interests would be the primary driver. Based on the answers provided by interviewees, the communal aspect of CWCS, along with opportunities for social expansion and reduced work-related costs, emerged as the most significant advantages compared to traditional workspaces. One respondent, living in Slovenia, summarised the appeal of a CWCS by stating:

"They enable us to be outside of our bubbles. And co-working also helps us to save resources because you don't pay high expenses for rent. So being part of a co-working space is very practical."

When asked about their interest in joining a CWCS, many respondents indicated they were already involved with such spaces, either as professionals or as active members of their communities. Community involvement often took the form of volunteering in social or community centres, where respondents contributed to organising educational workshops and social events.

While some respondents used CWCS in a professional capacity, the majority were engaged as part of a community at the time of the research. It is important to recognise that these community-oriented spaces differ from traditional co-working spaces, which typically require paid memberships or rental fees. Instead, they function as collaborative hubs aimed at fostering social cohesion and community-building efforts.

Any perspectives on traditional co-working spaces were mixed. A respondent from Cyprus expressed concerns about the professional and formal nature of such spaces, suggesting that strict rules and a highly structured environment might feel alienating to newcomers or outsiders. Conversely, a respondent from France saw the formal structure of traditional co-working spaces as a positive feature. For remote workers, these spaces offer a way to maintain a balanced work-life schedule by providing dedicated workspaces outside the home.

Although many respondents lacked concrete experience working in a CWCS, the question of whether they had ideas to develop within such spaces sparked thoughtful responses. Their ideas generally fell into three broad categories:

1. **Individual Professional Ideas:** Respondents proposed ideas tied to their personal professions and skills, such as managing sports activities, web design, marketing consulting, and similar initiatives.
2. **Knowledge and Skill Development:** Suggestions included offering language classes, workshops to acquire valuable qualifications for the job market, and craftsmanship workshops to enhance practical skills.
3. **Social Cohesion:** Respondents highlighted the potential for organising programs focused on social inclusion, addressing societal challenges, and empowering specific social groups through targeted initiatives.

Respondents had diverse views on mentorship's role in a CWCS. Most expressed excitement about the availability of an on-site mentor, seeing it as a chance for guidance and feedback. They highlighted that an effective mentor should have expertise in their area and should be able to provide valuable social and business connections to nurture ideas. A respondent from Greece stated that noted:

"Having someone with industry knowledge and a fresh perspective would give me the confidence and clarity to take my projects further."

However, some respondents were less enthusiastic about the idea of mentorship—instead noting the importance of peer-to-peer collaboration and the value of exchanging ideas through constructive conversations. A respondent from Rome suggested a different approach, advocating for the role of facilitators rather than traditional mentors:

"It is crucial that there are facilitators who would stand as equals and help, especially in the collective and collaborative dynamics. A mentor would be useful because he or she could follow people one by one, but it takes a lot of funds and resources to be able to follow so many people."

Those who expressed no interest in mentorship were typically already established professionals who felt they had sufficient knowledge and expertise in their respective fields. The large majority of respondents were from urban areas. When asked whether they would prefer to work in a CWCS located in an urban or rural setting, most chose urban areas. Their reasons were either subjective, such as being accustomed to the dynamics of city life, or practical, including transportation convenience and family ties. However, some respondents expressed a preference for rural locations, citing the peace and quiet of the countryside as conducive to focusing on coworking activities and developing ideas.

The idea of providing childcare services within a CWCS was widely welcomed, even by respondents who did not have children. Many recognised the potential of such services to promote the inclusion of mothers and working parents. Respondents highlighted that childcare services could also encourage family participation in a CWCS, which they saw as beneficial for community-building efforts. Several respondents remained neutral about the concept, pointing out that they lacked children who would directly gain from it. While they did not oppose childcare services, they emphasised that these facilities should be situated away from primary working areas to reduce distractions for users.

2.2.4 Perception of inclusion

The respondents identified factors that contribute to creating a welcoming atmosphere in a CWCS, summarising their views as the need for a "friendly and inclusive atmosphere." These factors include the attitudes of employees and members, as well as the design and infrastructure of the CWCS itself.

Many respondents emphasised the importance of friendliness and openness among CWCS staff and members. A key aspect of this is their willingness to assist and engage with users. Respondents from Germany suggested that managers undergo training in cultural sensitivity and inclusion to foster better understanding and respect for diversity. Additionally, a respondent from France recommended that event presenters and CWCS employees should have migrant backgrounds. This would ensure that migrants using the space feel represented and more comfortable. Respondents from Slovenia highlighted the importance of a "stress-free" environment that encourages freedom of expression, while those in Rome proposed implementing a shared code of conduct to establish clear expectations for behaviour within the CWCS.

Numerous respondents noted the value of community and networking events as a means of creating connections between individuals from diverse backgrounds, including migrants and locals. Structured activities tailored to individual needs were also mentioned as essential. As one respondent from the Netherlands explained:

"Organized activities that cater to diverse professional and personal interests can help create a sense of belonging and purpose."

Simple gestures, such as inclusive signage, were also highlighted. A respondent from Greece noted:

"The simplest way for me to feel welcomed is those little stickers, like with a rainbow saying, 'Athens Home for All.' It's a sign of goodwill."

Respondents also addressed discomfort caused by unintentional actions or comments. For instance, a respondent from Greece shared:

"When people learn where I'm from, they feel the need to share their opinion. For example, if I say I'm from Ukraine, they will tell me their opinion about the war, regardless of whether they asked me first how my people are."

Respondents from Rome also noted the need that in order to create a welcoming atmosphere for migrants and refugees, CWCS should avoid labelling:

"Not a 'coworking space for refugees,' but a coworking space open to everyone."

In this regard, several respondents expressed a desire to be seen not merely as users of a CWCS, but as co-creators. The research from Verona highlighted the significance of being recognised as collaborators rather than simply members. One participant elaborated

“They should recognise me as a collaborator, not a number.”

The feedback from participants in the Italian regions highlights the necessity of cultivating an environment that addresses the needs of both local residents and migrant communities. Respondents from Verona specifically pointed out that migrants should be regarded as active contributors within the CWCS teams rather than merely placed in the role of passive "*service recipients*."

2.3. DATA RESULTS - CWCS RESPONDENTS

The other aspect of the research focused on conducting field interviews with at least 10 representatives of CWCS in each territory to gain insights into the current level of migrant participation in CWCS activities. Furthermore, the study aimed to identify potential solutions to enhance the future involvement of migrant groups in the practices and services of these spaces, with the ultimate goal of fostering greater social and economic activation of their knowledge and skills.

This goal was achieved in most territories, and the findings suggest that the research has yielded valuable insights that could contribute to the development of more inclusive co-working spaces. It is, however, important to note that the collection of interviews with CWCS did not receive all-affirming responses, when it came to the topic of inclusivity of migrants and marginalised groups. Some respondents expressed scepticism in reorienting their existing practices to be more migrant-inclusive, as that could change the outward image or legitimacy of their CWCS for potential non-migrant members. Furthermore, some responses also offered their reflection on security concerns in including migrants with specific nationalities. Even though most of these respondents agreed individuals with permission to work should be regarded as vetted and allowed to

participate in the workforce, CWCS in more conservative areas still remain cautious when it comes to acceptance of newcomers.

The research covered a wide variety of CWCS, which can be generally categorised into three main types[3]:

1. **Traditional Co-Working Spaces:** These are shared workspaces offering amenities like desks, meeting rooms, and private or shared offices. They may also include seminar rooms, event spaces, and more. Some of these spaces belong to international networks (e.g., Impact Hub), while others are independent organisations.
2. **Makerspaces and Fab Labs:** These collaborative workspaces are often, but not necessarily, located within schools, libraries, or other public/private facilities. They provide tools and spaces for workshops and group or individual creative projects.
3. **Coworking spaces focused on social innovation:** These hybrid spaces combine elements such as kitchens, cafes, and meeting rooms, and are designed to empower and support specific social groups, such as ethnic groups (West African migrants, Roma people, etc.), migrant women or the LGBTQ+ community.

The diversity in the backgrounds of CWCS respondents resulted in significant variation in the number of users and members in each space. Some spaces reported only a few members, while others had memberships exceeding a thousand. Generally, traditional CWCS had significantly higher user numbers, primarily because they attract paying customers who rent office spaces and related services.

Regarding location, the majority of CWCS represented in the research were situated in urban or suburban areas, with only a few located in rural regions.

[3] Categorisation partially follows the taxonomy presented by Capdevila (Capdevila 2018).

2.3.1 By territory - Profiles

The Netherlands: The research included eight CWCS, seven located in the Netherlands and one in Portugal. Although the Portuguese CWCS was outside the primary research territory, it was included for its representation of a rural coworking environment, offering potentially valuable insights. Respondents were interviewed from various types of CWCS. Four were classified as traditional coworking spaces, incorporating elements designed to create a welcoming atmosphere for diverse user groups. Two focused on social issues and the empowerment of marginalised communities, one operated as a hybrid space combining coworking services with amenities such as food services and community events, and one, located in rural Portugal, offered both coworking and coliving opportunities. *(based on local report prepared by Netwerkpro and European Coworking Assembly)*

Greece: The study engaged 10 respondents from various CWSs, with all but two based in Athens. Their profiles are:

- A makerspace, collaborative space, and fab-lab with 4-5 members and 12 students, mainly self-employed artists aged 30-40. Benefits include workspace, community, workshops, and professional support.
- A makerspace with 4 members, mainly self-employed university graduates. It offers workspace, community, workshops, technical advice, and professional support.
- A coworking and collaborative space located outside Athens with 30 members, equally divided between men and women. Members are diverse in employment and education. Benefits include workspace, community, internships, legal and technical advice.
- A coworking space with 170 members, mostly aged 26-35. Most members are highly educated, offering workspace, community, and professional support.

- A coworking space and incubator with 50 members, mostly self-employed and highly educated. It offers workspace, community, professional support, event hosting, and self-promotion space.
- A coworking space, collaborative space, and NGO located outside Athens with 20 members, mainly women. Benefits include workspace, community, internships, and soon, a community centre.
- A social kitchen and collaborative space supporting vulnerable groups, offering food, warmth, socialisation, and medical care. Open to all, with a focus on coexistence and inclusion.
- A coworking and makerspace with eight gender-balanced members. It offers workspace, community, internships, and workshops.
- A multicultural centre with 50-70 visitors, mostly students aged 12-17. It offers workspace, community, internships, workshops, and professional support.
- A new coworking and collaborative space focused on women's empowerment, expecting members aged 35-40. It offers workspace, community, workshops, professional support, and additional services for families.

(based on local report prepared by The Academy of Entrepreneurship)

Austria: Ten interviews were conducted with representatives of CWCS, including seven urban spaces in Vienna and three rural spaces in Mödling and Zwettl (Lower Austria). All are privately structured organisations offering fully equipped facilities to support customer projects and daily work. The research included six coworking spaces, three coworking and collaborative spaces, and one makerspace. They are mainly privately funded, with limited public support (non-urban CWCS reported public support).

The membership sizes range from 8 to over 120 members, with an average age of 35-40. Gender distribution varies, with most CWCS having a higher proportion of male members, typically ranging from 50% to 80% male. One CWCS reported a predominantly female membership (95%), while two others had more balanced gender ratios (50% male/female and 55% male/45% female). Members are diverse in employment types, with a majority being self-employed or full-time employed, along with some unemployed individuals seeking job opportunities.

The benefits of CWCS membership, as reported by the interviewees, include access to dedicated workspaces, collaborative communities, workshops, technical and professional support, and internships. Legal advice was less common but still offered in some spaces. Experiences with migrants were generally positive, with smooth integration in both urban and non-urban areas. *(based on local report prepared by BEST)*

Germany: The field research examined eight CWCS in the Cologne and Bonn areas, with fewer than ten surveyed due to availability constraints. In Cologne, spaces such as the Migration and Development Council Integration Hub, Colabor e.V., and Jama Nyeta e.V. emphasized collaboration, sustainability, and migrant empowerment. In Bonn, coworking spaces like Palast der Löwin e.V., Eutopia CoWorking, and House of Resources Bonn focused on professional development and support for migrants. Some CWCS operated as specialised hubs; for instance, Demokratie Space catered exclusively to queer people of colour. While certain spaces primarily served professionals (e.g., Eutopia CoWorking), others targeted specific groups, such as migrant and BIPOC women (Palast der Löwin e.V.) or refugees from Western Africa (Jama Nyeta e.V.).

Membership sizes ranged from 20 to over 100, with most spaces maintaining a relatively balanced gender distribution. Palast der Löwin had

a predominantly female membership, while Demokratie Space reported that 60% of its members identified as non-heteronormative. The majority of members were between 25 and 40 years old, with some spaces offering youth-focused programs to engage younger participants. Membership demographics encompassed freelancers, entrepreneurs, students, and individuals experiencing unemployment. Educational backgrounds varied considerably, with certain spaces exhibiting particularly diverse and multidisciplinary member compositions.

All CWCS offered workspace, collaborative environments, and professional development support, including mentorship designed for migrants. Some CWCS provided distinct services. For example, Demokratie Space focused on anti-racism initiatives and empowerment programs for marginalised groups, Jama Nyeta e.V. offered internships and translation assistance, and Colabor e.V. emphasised sustainability and community-driven mentoring.

Many CWCS tailored their services to migrant self-organisations (MSOs) and provided language support along with culturally sensitive programmes. Challenges included resource constraints and language barriers, while opportunities lay in utilising migrants' diverse perspectives to enhance creativity and community growth. *(based on local report prepared by Migrafrica)*

France: Survey responses include insights from seven representatives of CWCS, all based in Paris. Most of these spaces are privately funded and operate for profit, while others function as NGOs with a social mission or aim to establish themselves as community hubs. The CWCS encompassed a variety of formats, including private and open coworking spaces, event spaces, fab labs, food labs, accelerators, and incubators. They typically accommodated between 10 and 130 individuals daily, with one CWCS renting spaces to companies, expanding its reach to 1,500 coworkers across

Paris. Gender distribution was generally balanced, though five spaces had a slight male majority. One space had a predominantly female membership, driven by a food lab program designed to support underprivileged women in obtaining certification. The average age of coworkers ranged from 25 to 50 years. Younger coworking spaces often housed incubators and provided lower-cost options, while more established, company-leased spaces tended to be more expensive. Most CWCS organised events such as networking gatherings, seminars, and after-work social activities to foster a sense of community among members. *(based on local report prepared by PLACE Network)*

Sweden: The research included interviews with respondents from CWCS in Malmö (9), Lund (1) and Fengerfors (1), each playing a role in fostering community, creativity, and professional support. The Ground offers a dynamic and comfortable environment for individuals and teams, while Ailé of Sweden focuses on LGBTQ+ support and gender equality through inclusive events and activities. The Library of Rosengård functions as a multifunctional space where visitors can meet, participate in activities, borrow books, and access computers.

Palmgatans Collective Workshop promotes craftsmanship and hands-on creation, aiming to foster social development through artistic practice. Interkultur Lund helps new residents integrate into the local community through self-organised initiatives. STPLN offers studios, coworking spaces, and event venues, serving as a creative hub for a range of professionals. GOTO10, run by the Internet Foundation, provides a platform for Internet-related projects and digital innovation.

Not Quite brings together artists, designers, and craftsmen, offering workspaces, exhibition areas, cafés, and shops. Rehab Culture functions as a collaborative hub with studios and meeting rooms designed for creative

professionals. NAV Sweden provides an open space to develop and test new ideas, while Altitude Meetings specialises in conference rooms and digital studios designed to facilitate effective meetings and professional gatherings. *(based on local report prepared by Malmö Ideella)*

Slovenia: Field research covered 10 CWCS across Slovenia, with half located in urban areas (Ljubljana, Kranj, Koper, Novo Mesto) and the other half in non-urban areas (Ajdovščina, Trbovlje, Škofja Loka). Half of these spaces operate as private or informal initiatives, while the rest function as public spaces. Among them, six are conventional coworking spaces, five are collaborative spaces, and three operate as maker spaces or accelerators. Additional types include incubators, fab labs, creative hubs, and educational spaces.

Membership sizes vary significantly, ranging from a fab lab with 1,700 users to spaces with fewer than 30 members, with an average membership of 66 per space. Gender representation is nearly balanced, with 50.7% of members identifying as women and 49.3% as men. The average age of members is 34, though not all CWCS provided this data. Most members are either self-employed or work full-time, while a smaller proportion consists of unemployed individuals, volunteers, or retirees. The majority hold higher education degrees, while others have secondary or vocational qualifications. *(based on local report prepared by ZRC SAZU)*

Spain: All 10 CWCS surveyed are located in Valencia province, with one in a rural area and the rest in suburban regions. Most spaces have between 3 and 9 members, while one hosts approximately 20–25, and another, Wayco, has 200 members. Gender distribution is generally balanced, except for the coworking space with three members, which consists entirely of men. Members' ages range from 33 to 45, with the majority between 33 and 35. All CWCS operate as privately funded coworking spaces, primarily offering

workspaces, with some also fostering collaborative communities and hosting workshops. Wayco, the largest space, provides additional services, including workshops, social events, art exhibitions, and regional festivities such as Las Fallas. Members are primarily European freelancers or full-time employees whose companies cover their coworking fees. *(based on local report prepared by MUSOL)*

Italy: Field research in Rome covered 10 CWCS, all situated in urban areas. While primarily coworking spaces, many incorporated collaborative models and occasionally operated as incubators. To enhance sustainability, most spaces diversified their offerings beyond shared workspaces. These included collaborative initiatives such as member exchanges, shared projects, and training sessions, as well as specialised services like technical advice, educational programs, and cultural activities. Additionally, many spaces fostered social engagement through events, bars, and gastronomic initiatives. One Roman coworking manager explained, *"Co-working alone does not guarantee sustainability; we need to develop other initiatives that support it and cover the costs."*

While larger spaces, such as Talent Garden, accommodate hundreds of users, most serve 10–20 individuals daily, leading to ongoing efforts to expand user bases and diversify revenue streams. The majority of users are freelancers, entrepreneurs, or self-employed professionals working in fields such as graphic design, IT, architecture, and marketing. Students are less commonly found, as are unemployed users, except in spaces with inclusive mandates, such as Circolo Arci Stonehead or Millepiani, which also provide access to individuals with disabilities. *(based on local report prepared by CeSPI and Refugees Welcome Italia)*

The research in Verona focused on seven coworking spaces actively engaged with migrants, as other spaces demonstrated limited interest.

- **Casa di Ramìa**: A public collaborative space serving approximately 30 women, primarily migrants, offering coworking, legal consultations, professional support, and artistic initiatives. It focuses on empowering women from North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, Eastern Europe, and Latin America through mentorship and social services.
- **CentoSessantuno APS**: A private coworking space with 12 members, evenly distributed by gender, primarily self-employed or full-time workers with university degrees. It provides coworking, legal assistance, workshops, and support for North African migrants, with plans to extend operating hours to improve accessibility.
- **Community Center Verona**: A nonprofit coworking space for five part-time workers with university degrees. In 2024, it supported 949 migrants through language courses and social inclusion initiatives, working closely with social services and migrant organisations.
- **Circolo Pink LGBTE Verona**: An informal coworking space with approximately 100 members, including non-binary individuals, focused on LGBTE rights and anti-racism. It offers coworking, legal assistance, job support, and social resources, particularly on refugees from Nigeria, Morocco, and Sri Lanka.
- **Società Cooperativa Sociale Multforme Onlus**: A rural social cooperative employing 23 individuals, providing coworking, training, and job support. It specialises in integrating migrants into industries such as metalworking and gastronomy through mentorship programs.
- **Laboratorio Autogestito Paratod@s**: A self-managed space with 15 active members aged 26–70, offering Italian language classes, union services, theatre activities, and the “Sospesa” project, which redistributes surplus market goods to families in need. It prioritises migrant social services and integration.

- **La Bottega**: A coworking space with 30 members, primarily aged 35–40, mainly providing desk rentals. It is currently exploring strategies to enhance inclusivity.

(based on local report prepared by Glocal Factory)

Cyprus: Field research in Cyprus involved 10 respondents, including members and managers of CWCS. These venues, such as Hub Nicosia, serve as hubs of activity, offering workshops and events while fostering community connections. CWCS in Cyprus are highly community-focused, actively engaging in local initiatives and promoting inclusive environments. They function not only as workspaces but also as bridges between professional opportunities and community support.

The respondents highlighted that these spaces provide a variety of workshops and events, catering to skill development, networking, and professional growth. Managers emphasised their role in organising and maintaining the space, ensuring it meets the needs of its members, while also fostering connections with other CWCS both locally and internationally. Members valued the collaborative environment, access to resources, and engagement with a diverse community. Cyprus CWCS are highly community-oriented, participating in local initiatives and creating welcoming atmospheres. They bridge professional opportunities with community support, serving as more than just workspaces. *(based on local report prepared by Synthesis)*

2.3.2 Experiences & Familiarity with migrants

While CWCS primarily foster collaboration and innovation among business professionals, interviews conducted as part of the RES-MOVE field research indicate that diversifying these spaces by integrating members with migration backgrounds or from vulnerable communities presents both

challenges and opportunities. This section examines the dynamics of migrant inclusion across multiple CWCS contexts, with a focus on language barriers, inclusivity efforts, financial constraints, and strategies for collaboration and integration, as well as the limitations and challenges involved.

Initial responses from CWCS indicate that most individuals with a migration background who have engaged with these spaces originate from African countries, primarily Central and North Africa, as well as the Middle East. A significant number also come from other European countries, particularly the Balkans and Eastern Europe. Some respondents noted the presence of users from North and Latin America, Oceania, and Asia. However, despite the seemingly global representation, most respondents were unable to provide precise details regarding the specific countries of origin of their members.

Responses varied between smaller and larger, more commercially oriented CWCS. Staff in smaller CWCS tended to be more aware of their members' backgrounds, whereas larger CWCS placed less emphasis on nationality. Many respondents from the field research in Malmö indicated that they do not specifically track members' nationalities, instead prioritising diversity and cultivating dynamic, engaging communities over focusing on specific demographic groups.

One of the key challenges for respondents was navigating the ambiguity surrounding the term *migrant*. Many lacked a clear understanding of who qualifies as a migrant and were unfamiliar with the various protection statuses that define vulnerable migrant groups. Additionally, perceptions varied depending on socioeconomic status and professional qualifications, leading to inconsistent approaches in addressing migrants' needs and differing levels of inclusivity. In Amsterdam, in particular, some respondents

struggled to identify migrant members and often excluded refugees, associating them with financial and legal barriers to membership.

By contrast, spaces in Athens and Vienna, mainly smaller and more collaborative-oriented, showcased a more inclusive understanding of migrants, welcoming individuals from diverse national and professional backgrounds. This disparity shows a reminder to the project pilot actions to have a clearer definition and shared understanding of the beneficiary groups the project aims to include in the CWCS.

The predominant factor influencing migrants' inclusion in CWCS was language. English was identified mainly as the working language across many spaces, such as Athens, Cologne/Bonn, and Ljubljana. Since most CWCS expressed they support diverse and multilingual working environments, they found the use of English as a welcoming element for the entire space. However, the level of proficiency varied among migrant members, and in some cases, due to lack of proficiency created challenges in communication and collaboration, especially during workshops and training activities. Spaces in Malmö and Cologne/Bonn highlighted the potential for multilingual events and interpretation services to bridge language gaps. These initiatives could help migrants with limited English or local language skills feel more included. Furthermore, some respondents also touched on the importance of understanding cultural nuances among the CWCS staff, especially in cultural sensitivity training, to address diverse migrant needs.

A shared goal among almost all CWCS respondents was to create an inclusive environment for new groups of members. Many spaces, for example, recognised the value of diversity in enhancing the community's vibrancy and creativity but faced challenges in translating this recognition into actionable strategies. Various ideas were shared, such as hosting

collaborative events for migrant communities that would also help foster a sense of mutual understanding. Other solutions were proposed, which included tailored mentoring programmes and supporting activities that would address migrants' specific needs: business advice, legal guidance or integration/orientation courses. The main inhibition in realising most of these activities seemed to be financial or logistical constraints (shortage of staff), as CWCS would need targeted resources and expert support to enable more proactive measures.

However, financial barriers were not only an issue for CWCS. Many respondents replied that economic barriers to entering spaces and participating in their activities were a recurring reason why migrant participation in such spaces was much lower than for others. Many migrants, particularly those from vulnerable backgrounds, struggled to afford membership fees, limiting their access to CWCS services. In some cases, CWCS did not even attempt to offer their services to refugees because of their predispositions that this group of beneficiaries could not afford it. Several respondents proposed scholarships or free coworking desks to marginalised groups, while others identified possible solutions in partnering with NGOs that could help address financial challenges through outside funding.

In most interviews, external stakeholders, including government agencies and NGOs, were frequently mentioned as crucial in supporting migrants' integration into coworking spaces. CWCS could, for instance, help complement integration programs and enter the labour market by providing mentorship, training, networking opportunities with local businesses, and community-building activities.

Despite challenges such as language and financial barriers, most CWCS respondents with experience in migrant membership reported positive

experiences and outcomes from working with migrants. These beneficiaries helped create a vibrant intercultural atmosphere and contributed creative entrepreneurial solutions to local projects. Further tailoring their services to migrants' needs, such as offering childcare facilities or accessible workshops, was identified as a key strategy for enhancing inclusion. Respondents in Ljubljana and Nicosia suggested incorporating these elements into their offerings to attract and retain migrant members.

2.3.3 Motivation for inclusion of migrants: Mentorships and benefits; Identification of opportunities and challenges

Most of the CWCS included in the RES-MOVE field research across all project territories expressed their inclination to include people with migration backgrounds in their spaces if that has not been their practice already. In most interviews, respondents from CWCS replied they see this as an opportunity to foster diversity, enrich their communities, and promote social innovation. This motivation often materialises through mentorship programs, which serve as a bridge for migrants to integrate into their local communities and navigate professional and personal challenges. Mentorship programs, however, are accompanied by both opportunities and challenges, as coworking spaces face limited resources in multicultural management, securing cultural dynamics and structural barriers, such as financing new mentors.

The primary motivation for CWCS to include migrants lies in their shared vision of promoting diversity and innovation. As respondents across interviews pointed out, migrants can bring unique perspectives, skills, and resilience to coworking spaces. For instance, one respondent noted, "*Migrants bring another kind of resilience to the community, teaching us about perseverance.*"

In this regard, mentorship programs can provide a tangible mechanism for achieving inclusion in CWCS and a bridge to entering the labour market. Mentorship programmes help migrants overcome systemic barriers such as language difficulties, lack of local knowledge, and limited professional networks. One respondent highlighted the importance of mentorship in preparing migrants for the job market, offering "*resume writing, interview techniques, and workplace communication.*"

Additionally, many CWCS recognise the importance of inclusivity not just for the benefit of migrants but also for their broader communities. For example, a respondent emphasised that migrant inclusion fosters "*a multicultural environment, very open, very democratic,*" which benefits all members by encouraging mutual understanding and collaboration. Different CWCS have developed innovative mentorship models to address migrants' challenges and maximise the benefits of migrant inclusion, such as peer-to-peer mentorship, skill-based support, buddy systems or holistic approach programs designed to support migrant women in balancing work and family responsibilities. A peer-to-peer method is well known and involves experienced migrants mentoring newcomers:

"*Mentoring should be done among migrants, with those who have been in the country for longer periods advising and helping those with less experience.*"

Alternatively, Many CWCS focus on equipping migrants with specific skills, such as digital literacy, entrepreneurship, or creative abilities. For instance, one space emphasised teaching IT skills, mould-making, or graphic design tailored to migrants' career aspirations, while a buddy system, primarily used in the Netherlands, pairs migrants with locals to help them orient themselves and navigate new environments.

2.3.3.1 Opportunities and challenges

In terms of the opportunities that migrant inclusion in CWCS can offer, many respondents highlighted how the coworking environments could be enriched by introducing diverse cultural perspectives, practices, and traditions. Activities such as sharing personal stories, music, and food were often cited as effective ways to build trust and strengthen relationships within the community. A respondent from Ljubljana emphasised the reciprocal nature of these exchanges stating:

"*Migrants benefit by getting to know new people and information, and they bring new dynamics to our space and even neighbourhood.*"

This kind of social diversity drives innovation. Migrants' unique experiences often push CWCS members beyond their comfort zones, fostering creativity and problem-solving. One respondent remarked that collaborating with migrants "*enriches our discussions and brings unique solutions to community projects.*"

The CWCS respondents also focused on other opportunities, such as introducing new skills, using multiple languages in spaces, social impact and enhancing CWCS' networks. For example, migrants contribute to tasks like curating multilingual book collections, organising multicultural events, or even assisting with legal and administrative challenges faced by other members. This broadens the scope and capabilities of CWCS, making them more adaptable and globally connected. Mentorship programs, particularly those focused on empowering women or marginalised groups, have been identified as the most transformative, according to responses from those who organised or participated in them. One respondent noted, "*We see migrant women as a source of strength and resilience, and supporting them creates an enriching environment for everyone in the space.*" On top of that, inclusion and collaboration with migrants and migrant communities can expand CWCS' international networks.

Despite the significant opportunities, respondents also commented on the challenges and inhibitions in integrating migrants effectively. The issues they mostly face are language barriers and resource constraints, followed by the lack or failure to secure a safe and culturally sensitive space. In most of the cases, language was one of the most frequently cited obstacles, even though they previously mentioned that most migrants who are or have been part of their CWCS used English as their working language. Nevertheless, there is a limiting accessibility to using the CWCS programs and activities for non-English speaking migrants. Addressing this challenge would require additional funding for translation services, as well as training for mentors to navigate multilingual interactions, although many CWCS provide mentorship in English.

Furthermore, respondents complained that offering new services to provide comprehensive support for migrants means more financial resources, which many simply lack. Challenges include insufficient funding, limited staff time, and inadequate infrastructure. One respondent from Paris highlighted insurance issues for non-nationals in maker spaces, while another from Verona emphasised the time-intensive nature of helping migrants navigate legal and bureaucratic systems. They also touched upon the cultural differences, which while enriching the space, can also mean lack of understanding or even misunderstandings that can lead to conflicts. For example, respondents from Rome noted that the presence of migrants could lead to tensions among members with differing backgrounds and living conditions.

CWCS that have already engaged with migrants and actively supported their inclusion, offered several solutions to address existing challenges. These primarily involved extended language support, such as multilingual workshops and language classes, as well as cultural exchange events aimed at reducing biases among members. Additionally, many collaborated with

organisations, particularly NGOs specialising in migrant support, to enhance accessibility and integration. Respondents from CWCS with less experience in working with migrants suggested potential measures such as subsidised memberships or financial aid programs to improve accessibility. Others proposed staff training in areas such as anti-racism and cultural sensitivity to strengthen mentorship efforts and better support diverse members.

The analysis of responses indicates that CWCS managers and staff recognise the systemic challenges migrants face, including legal uncertainties, employment discrimination, and housing instability. While coworking spaces can offer some level of support, these issues often go beyond their scope and require broader collaboration with municipalities, NGOs, and other institutional partners to address effectively.

2.3.4 Networking and support of RES-MOVE

In the last section of interviews with CWCS' respondents, we asked two relevant questions:

1. *Whether CWCS, with or without experience in including members with migration backgrounds, already had an established network or connections with relevant stakeholders (NGOs, social/employment services) in the field of migrant integration*;

2. *Whether they can recognise the RES-MOVE project as a viable partner in addressing and successfully implementing the inclusion of people from migrant communities in their membership pool. We also asked them to list their suggestions and thoughts on how the project actions can support them.*

The responses across all 11 territories show that CWCS' existing relationships with stakeholders vary significantly and are influenced by their

geographical location, organisational priorities, and awareness of migrant inclusion as a goal. Urban spaces often demonstrate stronger networks due to easier access to NGOs, local authorities, and employment services.

Conversely, CWCS in smaller towns or rural areas frequently lack established networks but express openness to future collaborations. However, the survey in the Netherlands showed that CWCS in rural municipalities had the same awareness of possible stakeholder networks as those in urban centres, with mid-sized municipalities having the most limited knowledge. In some cases, CWCS have successfully partnered with NGOs, social services, and employment agencies to provide tailored support for migrants. For example, a respondent from Cyprus noted,

"*We work closely with local NGOs to exchange knowledge and good practices. They help us better understand the needs of migrants and how we can adapt our services to support them effectively.*"

Such collaborations have led to impactful initiatives, including mentorship programs, workshops and training, and implementing cultural community events. All of these initiatives included the existing and expanding membership pool and the CWCS' staff and management.

In general, most CWCS in smaller municipalities or with limited resources struggle to identify and connect with relevant stakeholders, which shows a gap in awareness and proactive networking. Some identified challenges include limited information on the relevant stakeholders and what they do, financial and staffing limitations to establish and sustain partnerships, or the lack of facilities or resources to implement inclusive services effectively.

2.3.4.1 The role of the RES-MOVE project in supporting CWCS

Following the second and last question in the field research on the role of the RES-MOVE project and how it can help CWCS inclusive outreach, the

responses were generally very positive, and the project emerged as a promising partner for addressing migrant inclusivity challenges. The responses mostly gravitated toward facilitating connections, providing resources, and sharing best practices.

One of the primary recognised benefits of RES-MOVE was the potential to act as a bridge between CWCS and stakeholders. Respondents emphasised the value of such networking opportunities, with one noting, "*RES-MOVE can help us connect with other organisations that have experience in migrant inclusion, enabling us to learn from their successes and challenges.*" The respondents specifically referred to facilitating new networks with established migrant businesses and relevant stakeholders, providing practical support in addressing migrant inclusion and creating a platform of shared good practices.

Many respondents with less or no experience working with members with migration or minority backgrounds shared that they would appreciate a comprehensive list of NGOs, employment services, and local authorities to establish new partnerships. They would also benefit from regional or international "inclusive CWCS" gatherings, where they could further network and foster collaboration and knowledge exchange. A few respondents also commented that RES-MOVE could initiate an online platform, which would be a resource hub for sharing good practices, case studies and contact information for relevant stakeholders.

The respondents offered the following collections of recommendations and strategies:

- Strengthening the network of stakeholders, primarily at a local level;
- Expand the already established inclusive services, such as mentorship programs, language support, professional training and cultural orientation;

- Investing in CWCS staff training to address diversity, inclusion, anti-racism, intercultural communication and conflict resolution;
- Improve existing infrastructure and provide resources for upgrading and expanding existing activities;
- Policy-level advocacy on finding sustainable funding for the improvement of migrant inclusion;
- Leverage online solutions, such as digital platforms, to help connect CWCS with stakeholders and promote CWCS initiatives.

Concerning tangible support, the majority of respondents mentioned creating funding opportunities within project pilot actions that would assist them with developing workshops, mentorship programs and facility upgrades that would better serve this new membership pool.

Another recurring yet welcoming feedback was the expressed interest in guidelines or handbooks, e.g., documented best practices and case studies that could offer actionable insights into mentorship programs, cultural mediation, and inclusive space design. Furthermore, they also expressed an interest in receiving training or workshops for CWCS staff and management on diversity, cultural sensitivity, conflict resolution, and intercultural dialogue that would build their capacity to support migrant members effectively. The combined results of the RES-MOVE field research in all 11 territories have shown that the RES-MOVE project can catalyse innovation by showcasing successful models of migrant-inclusive coworking spaces. One respondent shared,

"*Seeing how other coworking spaces operate, particularly those with strong migrant engagement, would give us ideas on how to expand our offerings and make our space more accessible.*"

By supporting CWCS in their inclusivity efforts, the project has a unique ability to help foster enhanced professional opportunities for people with

migration backgrounds or marginalised groups, promote cultural exchange and understanding among commonly unrelated groups of professionals, encourage local and regional development and close some of the existing gaps by creating save, welcoming and empowering spaces of innovation and collaboration.

3. LESSONS LEARNED

3.1 Reflection on the existing inclusivity and safe-space actions

When analysing respondents' answers regarding their existing practices of including migrants in the activities of CWCS, it becomes evident that approaches differ significantly depending on the type of space. CWCS that function as collaborative or community-oriented spaces tend to have more inclusive policies, as integration and support for vulnerable groups are among their primary objectives.

In contrast, classic and more traditional co-working spaces are less advanced in implementing active inclusion policies. While initiatives like *Coworking for Ukraine*[4] mobilised numerous co-working spaces to participate in a solidarity campaign for Ukrainian refugees (Mariotti, Monni 2023) this does not indicate that classic co-working spaces generally prioritise social inclusion as a core aspect of their development strategies. Researchers who engaged with both traditional co-working spaces and more socially oriented spaces reported significant disparities in their approaches to migrant inclusion. While traditional CWCS appeared largely indifferent to the backgrounds of their users, makerspaces and community centres often offered specific programs aimed at actively including migrants.

Some migrant respondents also expressed that they do not feel a sense of belonging in traditional co-working spaces, as these spaces are generally perceived as catering to professionals in the tech and computer industries.

[4] *Coworking for Ukraine* is a network of CWCS that offer free spaces for Ukrainian refugees. Map of included CWCS is available at: https://www.onecoworking.com/initiatives/coworking-for-ukraine.

It is important to note that traditional CWCS are often more "business-oriented," focusing on providing workspace and amenities in exchange for membership fees. Both CWCS and migrant respondents frequently cited financial barriers as a key factor limiting migrants' use of such spaces. Membership fees often make these spaces inaccessible to migrants, and traditional CWCS are generally less inclined to adapt their practices to accommodate individuals who may not be able to afford these fees.

The field research, which included respondents from various CWCS across Europe, extended beyond the scope of classic co-working spaces. The findings indicate that makerspaces, fab labs, and social or community centres have far more developed programs for migrant inclusion. This is likely because these spaces are less reliant on membership fees and more dependent on funding from local, national, and EU-level social and integration programs and so do not require any financial exchange from their users.

Several CWCS respondents highlighted that their spaces help members become part of a larger community through daily engagement in CWCS activities. Respondents from the Netherlands and Greece emphasised the importance of fostering regular connections and communication, celebrating holidays, and organising community and food-sharing events as key components of successful inclusion policies. Respondents from Greece also underscored the value of providing play areas for children and childcare options to facilitate the inclusion of families.

An essential feature of inclusive practices is open access to CWCS, ensuring that no consideration is given to an individual's legal status or ethnic background.

Researchers from Migrafrica in Germany highlighted notable examples of good practices. One such example is Jama Nyeta e.V. in Cologne, a CWCS that has become a community centre for migrants, primarily of West African descent. This space provides members with support for administrative concerns and access to medical assistance.

In Bonn, researchers identified two exemplary CWCS initiatives. The first is Palast der Löwin e.V., which serves as a sanctuary for BIPOC women. This organisation fosters entrepreneurial aspirations and cultural expression through mentorship programs. One participant shared how the space impacted her confidence:

"*Here, I feel seen and heard*."

The second example is the House of Resources in Bonn, which collaborates with migrant self-organizations by offering shared workspaces for developing migrant-led initiatives. In both cases, migrants are not merely users of the services but active community members, contributing to the spaces' development. As one CWCS respondent noted on the role of users of their space:

"*Their stories and skills turn our spaces into places of transformation*."

The research also identified good practices in Rome. CWCS respondents there emphasised that successful migrant inclusion, especially when aiming to enhance employment opportunities, requires organisations to be part of broader local networks. Such networks allow partners to offer complementary services and share critical information, fostering a more comprehensive approach to inclusion.

During the research, the CWCS respondents noted some of the barriers they face when building inclusive programs within their communities. Traditional co-working spaces mostly noted language barriers, cultural

differences, and time and financial constraints as reasons for the lack of inclusion programs in their CWCS. Spaces which already have established inclusion programs note problems like stable funding, "projectification"[5] of their work, communication difficulties, lack of staff, and unique needs of migrants they may go beyond the qualifications of the CWCS.

Some of the respondents have also noted possible solutions to the issue of financial constraints that limit migrant participation in the CWCS. One proposed solution was implementation of vouchers or subsidised membership fees which could be covered by third parties, including project funds (e.g. RES-MOVE). Another suggested option was to implement flexible pricing for vulnerable groups, whereby the CWCS would alleviate the financial burden. To tackle cultural and language barriers, the CWCS could engage migrant facilitators and translators. At a systemic level, the CWCS could enhance migrant employability by establishing networks with local institutions, such as municipalities or local authorities, to promote more inclusive integration.

3.2 Skill and knowledge recognition

The research highlights a pressing need to improve the recognition of migrants' skills and expertise. Migrants with formal education and proven skills often face significant challenges navigating the official recognition processes in host countries. Even when state authorities acknowledge their qualifications, many are compelled to accept positions for which they are overqualified. Ultimately, it shows the need for mechanisms to streamline

[5] Projectification is a process of change when organizations increasingly base their work in project form. Among negative effects of projectification are limited time for knowledge development, overwhelming deadline stress, and lack of trust and social continuity (Packendorff, Lindgren 2014).

and support recognising migrants' education and skills. The RES-MOVE project offers an opportunity to enhance the recognition of both formal and informal skills and knowledge of migrants.

Due to the diverse nature of CWCS, a unified approach to skill recognition with CWCS activities is not feasible. Community-based CWCS often regularly engage with migrants to identify and validate their skills. Migrant respondents in Slovenia, however, noted that recognition is inconsistent, often shaped by the structure and mission of specific CWCS. Key barriers include language challenges and a lack of proactive initiatives. In such instances, cultural mediation and mutual understanding play critical roles. Additionally, researchers from Austria identified several practices that could support skill and knowledge recognition in CWCS:

- **Tailored assessments**: Implement competency evaluations to accurately recognise migrants' skills in both regulated and non-regulated professions.
- **Multilingual support**: Offer resources and guidance in migrants' native languages to clarify procedures and requirements.
- **Professional development**: Provide training, workshops, and mentoring to help migrants update their skills and align with current market demands.

Overall, skill recognition in CWCS is closely tied to daily interactions with migrants as active community members. The main obstacles are language barriers and the absence of structured networks that would facilitate effectively utilising migrants' skills and knowledge. Regarding existing EU policies, the European Skills Agenda could be used to enhance migrants' skill recognition (European Commission 2020). The RES-MOVE project has the potential to address these challenges by strengthening cultural and linguistic mediation, as well as fostering network exchanges. To enhance

skill recognition and employability, CWCS could, with the support of RES-MOVE, partner with organisations providing vocational training, certifications, and job placement services, ensuring migrants gain validated skills recognised in the local job market.

3.3 Mentorship and training for migrants

Research conducted across all territories revealed that mentorship programs for migrants are present, but they are not widely available. For instance, in Malmö, CWCS respondents reported that mentorship programs had been implemented in the past. However, these initiatives ceased to exist following the end of project-based financing. In other territories, such as Cologne and Bonn, CWCS mentorship programs focus primarily on practical support, including assisting with navigating administrative procedures, fostering cultural sensitivity, providing language support, and aiding in establishing small businesses. Similar integration-focused mentorship programs were also observed in other research areas. While these programs play a valuable role in supporting individuals during the initial stages of integration, they often fail to address the specific and nuanced needs of migrant communities.

Research in Germany highlighted the urgent need for mechanisms to fast-track the recognition of foreign qualifications and to integrate migrants' informal skills into local labour markets. Findings from other territories echoed this issue, underscoring that migrants across Europe are frequently compelled to accept jobs for which they are overqualified. This highlights a widespread need for initiatives that enable migrants to showcase their skills and projects while connecting with potential employers.

To address these challenges, researchers in Rome identified three key stages for effective mentorship programs. The first stage involves

introducing migrants to the CWCS and its network of members. The second stage provides individualised support by recognising participants' skills and knowledge and assisting them in developing their projects or ideas. Finally, the third stage—referred to as "technical mentoring"—requires specialised guidance from experts with industry-specific knowledge. Unfortunately, existing mentorship programs often stop at the first or second stage due to a lack of robust and consistent networks capable of supplying the necessary professionals.

The most common critique of existing mentorship programs is that they either remain superficial, focusing solely on surface-level integration or are too generic in scope, failing to address the specific needs of migrant populations. Many respondents emphasised the importance of tailored programs that include comprehensive language support, cultural adaptation workshops, and targeted skills training. These foundational elements could then be enhanced with the support of professionals or partnerships with companies.

While such tailored programs exist in some regions, CWCS consistently face significant barriers in maintaining them. Chief among these challenges is the precarious nature of project-based financing and the absence of strong local networks capable of facilitating the successful inclusion of migrants into the labour market. Considering these findings, the RES-MOVE project could provide much-needed support to help address these challenges by fostering initiatives aimed at overcoming these systemic barriers, even though such support is limited to the duration of the project's activities.

3.4 Collaboration with other actors to promote diversity and inclusivity

When examining the collaboration of CWCS with other stakeholders, it's evident that the existence of networks facilitating migrant inclusion into the labour market is not a widespread practice. In most cases, traditional

co-working spaces do not dedicate their time to such purposes. In contrast, CWCS with a focus on social topics, have reported varied success in forming such multi-stakeholder groups. Such networks are crucial for exchanging experiences and practices. However, while some connections are robust and long-term, others are informal and short-lived.

In Cyprus, Hub Nicosia was highlighted as an exemplary CWCS that has built strong partnerships with local NGOs, educational institutions, and community organisations, promoting inclusion through workshops, mentorship programs, and cultural events. While some respondents acknowledged the presence of well-established partnership networks, many noted that such collaborations are often limited to one-off initiatives. Greek CWCS respondents reported experience working with organisations such as Amnesty International, the Greek Council for Refugees, ACCMR (Athens Coordination Center for Migrant & Refugee Issues), and Solidarity Now. However, they also emphasised that many of these partnerships are short-term, typically concluding once specific project activities are completed.

Most CWCS involved in the research have some level of engagement with other CWCS and local or state authorities, often facilitated by EU-funded projects. However, the temporary nature of project-based work usually prevents the creation of structured frameworks or long-term strategies of collaboration. As a result, many CWCS rely on personal or informal networks, such as friends or acquaintances, rather than formal institutional partnerships, limiting the scope and effectiveness of their efforts.

The RES-MOVE project has the potential to strengthen collaboration capabilities among CWCS. It can support efforts to enhance existing CWCS-stakeholder networks or create new connections by providing resources and guidance to improve inclusivity initiatives. Additionally,

RES-MOVE can leverage consortium knowledge to share best practices, support pilot activities, and document successful collaboration models that can serve as future case studies.

4. CONCLUSION

The research findings reveal significant differences in how CWCS across Europe approach inclusivity, collaboration, and skill recognition, highlighting both the challenges and opportunities in integrating migrants. Community-focused CWCS and those engaged with social issues tend to take the lead in developing inclusive programs, offering mentorship, and forming partnerships that support migrant members. In contrast, more traditional coworking spaces, often structured around business-driven models, are generally less equipped to meet these needs, primarily due to financial constraints and a lack of targeted initiatives.

Financial constraints, language and cultural barriers, and short-term project-based funding emerged as key obstacles limiting the accessibility and sustainability of inclusive initiatives. Many CWCS rely on informal networks for support, which constrains their ability to build robust, long-term partnerships with other organisations. Despite these challenges, many CWCS demonstrate that effective collaborations and inclusion models are possible, particularly when CWCS engage with NGOs, local authorities, and community organisations.

The research highlights the need to acknowledge and validate migrants' formal and informal skills, which are often overlooked or undervalued in host countries. Implementing tailored assessments, providing multilingual support, and working with training providers can help bridge these gaps, making it easier for migrants to enter the local labour market in roles that match their expertise. While mentorship programs exist in some regions, they often remain superficial; a more targeted, industry-specific approach is necessary to provide meaningful professional support.

The RES-MOVE project has significant potential to address these systemic challenges by enhancing collaboration capabilities, sharing best practices,

and supporting initiatives that promote diversity and inclusivity. By leveraging consortium knowledge and fostering new connections between CWCS and stakeholders, RES-MOVE can serve as a catalyst for long-term improvements, providing a foundation for sustainable and effective inclusion efforts across Europe.

5. REFERENCES

AlfaVita. (2022). Αλλοδαποί μαθητές: 26.015 παιδιά από 94 χώρες στα Ελληνικά σχολεία. *Η ΚΑΘΗΜΕΡΙΝΗ*. Available at: https://www.alfavita.gr/ekpaideysi/370346_allodapoi-mathites-26015-paidia-apo-94-hores-sta-ellinika-sholeia. (February 9 2022).

Azhievska, I., Gombač, J., Kastelic, Š., Pehar Seneković, A., Perachino, S. (2005). Collaborative Spaces: A Perspective on Inclusivity. Retrieved from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/106W2eXihTBJJ0vfuI50_RdeJRb49TpHR/view

Département des statistiques, des études et de la documentation Ministère de l'Intérieur et des Outre-Mer. (2023). *Les Chiffres clés de l'immigration 2022*. Avaialble at: https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Info-ressources/Etudes-et-statistiques/Chiffres-cles-sejour-visas-eloignements-asile-acces-a-la-nationalite/Les-chiffres-cles-de-l-immigration-2022.

Capdevila, I. (2018). Joining a collaborative space: is it really a better place to work?. Journal of Business Strategy, 40(2), 14–21. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-09-2017-0140.

Hellenic Statistical Authority. (2023). *Census Results of Population and Housing in Greece 2021*. Available at: https://shorturl.at/nRP9z.

Greek Ministry of Migration and Asylum. (2023). *Information Note on Legal Migration September 2023*. Retrieved from: https://shorturl.at/3m2bp.

European Commission. (2020). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: European Skills Agenda for sustainable competitiveness, social fairness and resilience*. Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0274. (July 1 2020).

EIGE - European Institute of Gender Equality. (2020). *Sectoral Brief: Gender and Migration*. Available at: https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/policy-areas/migration.

Eurostat. (2024). *Asylum applications - annual statistics*. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Asylum_applications_-_annual_statistics. (March 20 2024).

IDOS. (2024). *Osservatorio romano sulle migrazioni*. Idos Edizioni.

Insee - L'Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques. (2023). *Immigrés et descendants d'immigrés, Édition 2023*. Available at:: https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6793282?sommaire=6793391. (March 30 2023).

Mariotti, I., Monni, B. (2023). *When the coworking space community makes the difference! Relevant support for the Ukrainian refugees*. RSA Regions. Available at: https://regions.regionalstudies.org/ezine/article/issue-15-coworking-ukrainian-refugees/. (May 12 2023).

Migrationsverket. (2025). *Beviljade uppehållstillstånd översikter*. Available at: https://www.migrationsverket.se/Om-Migrationsverket/Statistik/Beviljade-uppehallstillstand-oversikter.html. (January 10 2025).

Packendorff, J., Lindgren, M. (2014). Projectification and its consequences: narrow and broad conceptualisations. In *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, vol. 17, p. 7-21. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v17i1.807.

Stadt Wien. (2025) Willkommen bei den Büchereien der Stadt Wien!. Available at: https://buechereien.wien.gv.at/.

Statista. (2025). *Number of immigrants in Germany from 1991 to 2023. Available at*: https://www.statista.com/statistics/894223/immigrant-numbers-germany/. (January 13 2025).

Statistik Austria. (2024). *Statistisches Jahrbuch: Migration & Integration* 2024. Available at: https://www.integrationsfonds.at/fileadmin/content/AT/monitor/WEB_Mig_Int_2024_final-komprimiert.pdf.

The Blogler. (2024) T*he best coworking spaces in Athens*. The Blogler. Available at: https://www.theblogler.com/best-coworking-spaces-in-athens/ (July 2 2022).

Zidar, M. (2025). *Share of foreign citizens among persons in employment at its highest to date*. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia. Retrieved from: httStatistical Office of the Republic of SloveniatWeb/en/News/Index/13370. (16 January 2025).