



LJMU Research Online

Kostopoulos, I, Magrizos, S, Carrigan, M and Lazell, J

**Fostering sustainability through technology-mediated interactions:
Conviviality and reciprocity in the sharing economy**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/11957/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Kostopoulos, I, Magrizos, S, Carrigan, M and Lazell, J (2020) Fostering sustainability through technology-mediated interactions: Conviviality and reciprocity in the sharing economy. Information Technology and People, 33 (3). pp. 919-943. ISSN 0959-3845

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>



Fostering sustainability through technology-mediated interactions: Conviviality and reciprocity in the sharing economy

Journal:	<i>Information Technology & People</i>
Manuscript ID	ITP-10-2018-0474.R4
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Computer-mediated communication (CMC) < Technology, Peer-to-peer network / file sharing < Technology, knowledge transfer < Phenomenon, Literature review < Methodology, Community of practice < Study setting, Knowledge-based community < Study setting, Information society < Phenomenon, Information sharing < Phenomenon, Information exchange < Phenomenon

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Fostering sustainability through technology-mediated interactions: Conviviality and**
4
5 **reciprocity in the sharing economy**
6
7
8
9

10 **ABSTRACT**
11

12 **Purpose:** This article addresses the lack of scholarly attention paid to the sharing economy
13 from a sociological perspective, with respect to the technology-mediated interactions between
14 sharing economy users. The paper provides a critical overview of the sharing economy and its
15 impact on business and communities and explores how information technology can facilitate
16 authentic, genuine sharing, through exercising and enabling conviviality and non-direct
17 reciprocity.
18
19

20 **Approach:** The paper begins with a critique of the technology-mediated sharing economy;
21 introduces the concept of conviviality as a tool to grow and shape community and sustainability
22 within the sharing economy; then explores reciprocity and sharing behaviour. Finally, the paper
23 draws upon social exchange theory to illustrate conviviality and reciprocity, using four case
24 studies of technology-enabled sharing.
25
26

27 **Findings:** The paper contributes to the emerging debate around how the sharing economy,
28 driven by information systems and technology affects social cohesion and personal
29 relationships. The paper elucidates the central role conviviality and reciprocity play in
30 explaining the paradoxes, tensions and impact of the sharing economy on society. Conviviality
31 and reciprocity are positioned as key capabilities of a more sustainable version of the sharing
32 economy, enabled via information technology.
33
34

35 **Originality and value:** The findings reveal that information technology mediated sharing
36 enterprises should promote conviviality and reciprocity in order to deliver more positive
37 environmental, economic and social benefits. The diversity of existing operations indicated by
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the findings and the controversies discussed will guide the critical study of the social potential
4
5 of sharing economy to avoid treating all sharing alike.
6
7

8 **Keywords:** Sharing economy, conviviality, reciprocity, sustainability
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Information Technology & People

1. Introduction

The Sharing Economy (SE) is an emerging economic model that has been revolutionized by the wide dissemination of innovative technology-enhanced digital platforms and that has attracted considerable academic debate and public attention (Mair and Reischauer, 2017; Guttentag et al., 2018). Information technology is “at the heart of the rising concept of the SE” and characterizes its differentiation from traditional business, work and sharing practices (Sutherland and Jarrahi, 2018, p.328). The SE is one of the fastest growing economic segments of the larger, flourishing information-intensive services sector (Apte and Davis, 2019). Developing the right information systems and sharing platforms can transform cities, generate huge economic impact and foster the open and socially beneficial behaviours that underpin advances such as digital commons like Open Street Map (Almirall et al., 2016). Despite the sharing economy’s potential to improve and transform people’s lives, it has faced significant criticism (Davies et al., 2017). Whether the SE will deliver on its promises of openness and egalitarianism, “much like other opportunities that information technology has created” (Ladegaard, 2018, p.397), or become another source of “digital” inequality and exclusion (Hargittai and Hinnant, 2008) remains to be seen.

Technological applications in the sharing economy typically take the form of information systems that facilitate peer-to-peer communication to share access to goods and services, enabling collaborative consumption through community-based platforms (Hamari et al., 2016). While previous research has investigated SE participants’ attitudes (Yuan et al., 2018), motives (Wilhelms et al., 2017) and economic propositions (Schor, 2017), there has been little scholarly discussion about the technology-mediated interactions between SE users. This is surprising since, by definition, the sharing economy is a “socio-economic ecosystem that commonly uses information technologies to connect different stakeholders – individuals, companies,

1
2
3 governments, and others – in order to make value by sharing their excess capacities”
4
5 (Laamanen, et al., 2016, p. 218). Hasan and Linger’s (2016, p.2) call to reposition the social in
6
7 ‘information systems’ towards capturing more societal dimensions “without necessarily having
8
9 a productive purpose in a business sense”, highlights the lack of engagement with convivial
10
11 communication in such digital platforms. Past research has failed to explore the technology-
12
13 mediated relationships that occur between the diverse stakeholders involved in the SE (Leung
14
15 et al., 2019), despite calls “to reflect more deeply on the nexus between society and economy
16
17 under the premise of new forms of sharing” (Kornberger et al., 2017, p.7).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The multitude of organizations that could be grouped under the SE umbrella term makes the
25
26 SE an even more complex concept (Acquier et al., 2017). Unsurprisingly, how we understand
27
28 and assess performance of the SE is complicated by this lack of clarity and inconsistencies
29
30 across phenomena (Bradley and Pargman, 2016). Although it is difficult to “analyse and
31
32 classify [SE] practices given their novelty and the broad areas that they cover” (Li et al., 2019;
33
34 p.2), some emerging taxonomies have classified SE enterprises into different segments. For
35
36 example, previous research has distinguished between digital and non-digital forms of SE
37
38 (Dredge and Gyimóthy, 2015); non-profit or for-profit platform orientation (Gössling and Hall,
39
40 2019); and private or public interest (Cohen and Muñoz, 2016). However, most of these
41
42 taxonomies “are too crude to acknowledge the types of interactions among the users” (Palgan
43
44 et al., 2017, p.72). For example, according to these classifications Couchsurfing and Airbnb
45
46 would belong to the same category as for-profit, digital and private interest accommodation
47
48 platforms. Yet the former has the potential to build social cohesion, while Airbnb has been
49
50 criticized for the opposite, dominated by opportunistic, sterile behaviours (Edelman et al.,
51
52 2017); uneven economic losses to the hotel industry (Zervas et al., 2017); increased nuisance
53
54 in neighbourhoods (Kathan et al., 2016); and a rise in the price of housing (Frenken and Schor,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2017). Similar behaviours by other firms, along with unfounded sustainability claims, give rise
4
5 to criticism of the SE, arguing that many of these practices are rather fake or pseudo-sharing
6
7 (Belk, 2014a). In this paper, we acknowledge that important differences exist between those
8
9 SE firms that primarily recirculate and enable increased access to services and resources, and
10
11 those firms that utilize locally-embedded knowledge to build social cohesion.
12
13
14
15
16

17 This paper addresses the significant void in knowledge regarding technologically
18
19 mediated communication within the sharing economy's digital platforms. It offers theoretical
20
21 insight into social exchange by drawing upon the concepts of conviviality and reciprocity. The
22
23 social aspect of sharing has been overlooked and has particular resonance for the information
24
25 technology sector, given the longstanding debate on whether the use of information technology
26
27 empowers the disenfranchised; reduces discrimination and connects strangers; or increases
28
29 discrimination and inequality, leading to "awkward encounters" between strangers (Ladegaard,
30
31 2018). The SE is positioned at the frontier of an ongoing discussion over the negative
32
33 implications of technological change, such as how innovation in the IT sector has disrupted
34
35 traditional working practices (Sundararajan, 2016). To better reflect the idiosyncrasies of
36
37 different SE organizations, we develop an alternative conceptualization of a technology-driven
38
39 sharing economy that recognizes the varying degrees of personal interaction and the potential
40
41 to build social relationships.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Using the theoretical lens of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), we contribute to the
50
51 limited theoretical frameworks that attempt to explain SE's underlying structure and
52
53 mechanisms (Heo, 2016). According to social exchange theory, social behaviour and
54
55 interpersonal interactions are the outcome of an exchange process (Emerson, 1976). Exploring
56
57 this process, we identify the concepts of communal bonding - or, *conviviality* - (Nowicka and
58
59
60

1
2
3 Heil, 2016, Illich, 1973) and *reciprocity* (Lawler et al, 2000) as tools grow a sense of
4
5 community within the SE. Conviviality and reciprocity are positioned as key capabilities of a
6
7 more sustainable version of the sharing economy which is significantly transformed via
8
9 information technology. Initially used to study close, mutual relationships that involve more
10
11 than duties and obligations, and rooted in trust, solidarity and support, social exchange theory
12
13 resonates with the SE. To illustrate this, we propose a typology of SE businesses and their
14
15 digital platforms and use four case studies that depict organizations with varying degrees of
16
17 skills, social relationships and connectivity to illustrate conviviality and reciprocity in practice.
18
19 We offer definitions, examples and key suggestions for firms in the SE and conclude with a
20
21 discussion of theoretical and policy implications and directions for future research.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **2. The Sharing Economy and the Information Technology Sector**

30
31
32
33 The terms ‘sharing economy’, ‘collaborative consumption’, ‘access based consumption’,
34
35 ‘peer-to-peer economy’, are often used interchangeably (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015) to
36
37 describe the act of “consumers, granting each other temporary access to under-utilized physical
38
39 assets (i.e. idle capacity)” (Frenken and Schor, 2017, p.3). Described as an emerging
40
41 “economic-technological phenomenon” (Hamari et al., 2016, p.1), these exchanges do not
42
43 always involve material or financial compensation (Parguel et al., 2017), and represent a
44
45 democratizing new business model, with many positive environmental, economic and social
46
47 outcomes. Their growth is sustained by increased consumer awareness of the possibilities of
48
49 social information systems alongside multiplying online communities, positioned to allow
50
51 people to harness underutilized time and resources, and earn additional income (Hamari et al.,
52
53
54
55
56 2016).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The SE has emerged as an alternative to traditional forms of consumption and ownership,
4 enabled by digital platforms that allow users to contribute content and connect with each other
5
6 (Carroll and Romano, 2010). Contemporary information systems are fostering online markets
7
8 that compete with traditional business (Mittendorf, 2016); whilst interactive Web 2.0
9
10 technologies have driven the inexorable pace of sharing worldwide (Sharma and Baoku, 2013)
11
12 and the embedded culture of openness and freeness that underlie some SE models (Belk,
13
14 2014a). The Internet can mediate transactions by matching supply and demand (Kumar et al,
15
16 2018); dramatically reduce transaction costs (Henten and Windekilde, 2015); facilitate trust
17
18 among strangers (Mittendorf, 2016); and help reverse perceptions of disadvantage. Thus,
19
20 sharing is increasingly considered as a distinctive consumption preference (Schor and
21
22 Fitzmaurice, 2015). Online platforms and mobile applications enable modern sharing economy
23
24 transactions, driven, in many instances, by a shared ideology of common good or collective
25
26 purpose (Hamari et al. 2016). However, digital inequality remains a critical issue (Hsieh et al.,
27
28 2008), and the potential for social exclusion around technological innovation and the SE
29
30 remains challenging, complex and multifaceted (Mervyn and Allen, 2012).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Recent literature has opened conversations regarding the nature of exchanges and mediation
41
42 that takes place within the SE and how this is conceptualized and approached in the information
43
44 technology literature. Dillahunt et al.'s (2017, p. 2) review of SE in computing literature
45
46 examines the rapid growth of research in this area, most of which explores; "optimization,
47
48 socio-technical design, geography, and social relationships". Sutherland and Jarrahi's (2018)
49
50 review observes similar trends in how technological affordances in the SE, particularly
51
52 mainstream platforms such as Uber and Airbnb, account for a considerable proportion of the
53
54 discussion. These affordances include the ability of platforms to: generate flexible assignment
55
56 of work; provide on-demand access to labour; offer the algorithmic ability to match services
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or resources with users, thereby extending the reach of services; manage transactions, and
4
5 further the ability to mediate trust and facilitate collective actions (Sutherland and Jarrahi,
6
7 2018). These accounts, however, are often unlinked and separate from debates taking place in
8
9 other disciplines around sustainability in the SE (Davies et al., 2017). As Sutherland and Jarrahi
10
11 (2018, p.338) note: “most of the work on the SE does not problematize the technology itself”
12
13 and requires further understanding of the “social dynamics of the sharing context”.
14
15
16

17
18
19 By considering SE platforms as part of a transition to a more sustainable future, a much more
20
21 valuable discussion can be achieved (Martin, 2016). Shifting consumer values, such as reduced
22
23 ownership or liquid, flexible lifestyles (Kathan et al., 2016), further support the popularity of
24
25 the SE, enabled through such technological platforms as sharing apps or community websites.
26
27 The SE depends on these social or community dynamics for sharing and collaboration to occur
28
29 (Hamari et al., 2016). Sharing is attractive to sustainably motivated consumers, and the SE can
30
31 signify minimalism and anti-consumption (Ozanne and Ballantine, 2010), or an intentional
32
33 political act (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015). As a route to non-extreme market resistance,
34
35 sharing companies promote themselves as environmentally, socially and economically
36
37 sustainable (Laurell and Sandström, 2017), encouraging consumers to buy and own less. This
38
39 multifaceted motivation behind sharing is a crucial difference not only between the SE and the
40
41 conventional transactional (buying and selling) economy but also between sharing and pseudo-
42
43 sharing (Belk, 2014a).
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 While the sustainable benefits of the SE may be unproven and possibly overstated, these
52
53 alternative spaces of consumption (Gollnhofer and Schouten, 2017) provide choices that
54
55 potentially both reduce and rebalance consumption more responsibly, and challenge
56
57 throughputs of excess consumption and waste (Schor, 2017). Savolainen (2009) notes the
58
59
60

1
2
3 importance of understanding the influence new information systems have on society. The
4 potential environmental impact of the SE is seductive; through sharing, mobility demand in
5 Singapore could be met by 30% of its existing vehicles, and a further 40% reduction if people
6 car-shared (Almirall et al., 2016). The public benefits of such technology-supported SE include:
7 reduced travel times, less congestion and diminished environmental impacts. Thus, the sharing
8 economy is a powerful disruptive force in many industries, impacting quality of life in cities.
9
10 Nevertheless, tensions exist between the platform capitalism of Uber and Airbnb versus more
11 social-based models of sharing (Almirall et al., 2016). While these multibillion dollar for-profit
12 'sharing' companies dominate their respective markets, those same organizations are
13 increasingly being critiqued and legally challenged over poor working conditions, health and
14 safety lapses and dubious contracts (Ravenelle, 2017).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Many of the tensions within the sharing economy reflect the increasing momentum around
32 controversial societal changes due to human-computer interactions. Brynjolfsson and
33 McAfee's (2014) work light on how technical progression is becoming decoupled from human
34 progression. Arguably the disruption the SE has brought to traditional industry is embellished
35 within this, such as how a process of 'uberization' has led to growing economic insecurity
36 (Fleming, 2017). Research, however, has questioned and provided greater nuance to the
37 debates around the negative impacts of SE via its technological capabilities. Martin (2016)
38 recounts the contradictory discourses of how the SE has been framed in research. Acquier and
39 Carbone (2018) differentiate mission driven and creative common platforms from those
40 platforms that monetize access to a central pool of resources or matchmake people and services
41 to facilitate transactions. The technical capability of the sharing economy is all too often
42 vilified (Martin, 2016) and its sociotechnical status misunderstood (Murillo et al., 2017).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Although the SE is not without its controversies, there have been few attempts to question some
4 of its benign assumptions (Parguel et al., 2017). The reach of the sharing economy's
5 technological capability is not yet properly understood. Sutherland and Jarrahi (2018) highlight
6 the lack of studies on mediating technologies in the SE sector, as well as the divergent use of
7 terminology to describe their social and economic characteristics. There is a distinct lack of
8 clarity about what 'technology' corresponds to. In echoing the call for a greater focus on the
9 SE as a sociotechnical phenomenon (Hamari et al., 2016), we position understanding of SE's
10 mediation via information and communication technologies as a critical part of both a cause
11 and a solution to sustainability issues (Lennerfors, et al., 2015). For example, environmental
12 benefits, such as reduced carbon emissions from car sharing, remain unproven; second-hand
13 consumption may not foster zero-waste, possibly triggering indulgent overconsumption
14 (Denegri-Knott, 2011). While the SE revolution could lead to greater inclusion and remove
15 social barriers, Castells (1989) warns of the dual city, where technological developments could
16 polarize and devalue social groups rather than unite communities. These potential pitfalls are
17 compounded by terminological confusion around the SE; moreover, the lack of research in this
18 area is creating uncertainty about its impact upon communities, economies and the
19 environment (Murillo et al., 2017). Thus, Mervyn and Allen (2012, p.1126) suggest technology
20 is "Janus-faced: offering hope and inclusion for some" yet excluding others.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The focus here, therefore, is not to give further insight into the technological affordances of the
48 SE and the different ways in which exchanges take place, such as aspects of software and
49 design that enable mediation via digital platforms, as this has been addressed elsewhere
50 (Sutherland and Jarrahi, 2018). Rather, the focus of this paper is to provide further clarity on
51 the nature of those exchanges within the SE's sustainability remit. This is achieved by creating
52 greater nuance between what is described as 'pseudo-sharing' versus sharing, which
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 incorporates characteristics conviviality and reciprocity from the perspective of how the SE's
4 digital platforms can have the most societal impact.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **3. The Sharing Economy as Pseudo-Sharing**

11 **3.1 Reviewing the sustainability claims of the SE**

12
13
14
15
16
17 Proponents of the SE claim that it has many economic, environmental and social advantages.
18
19 The direct economic effects of sharing are obtained by eliminating intermediaries and
20 delivering a more socially just model (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015). Consumers can now
21 access commodities that would otherwise be unaffordable; producers can enjoy new income-
22 earning opportunities, reduce running costs and earn from underused assets. The eco-friendly
23 credentials of sharing may seem self-evident: sharing reduces the demand for new goods;
24 means less hotel construction; re-circulates goods rather than promoting consumption; leading
25 to lower footprint (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015). Airbnb suggest their guests use “significantly
26 less energy and water” than staying in a hotel (Airbnb, 2017); shared transportation allows
27 people to reduce their eco-footprint without restricting their mobility (Cohen and Kietzmann,
28 2014). Finally, the SE has potential to build social capital within communities; contribute to
29 values of “equality, mutuality, honesty, openness, empathy, and an ethic of care” (John, 2013,
30 p.114); and create feelings of solidarity and bonding (Belk, 2010). Companies that operate in
31 the SE advertize their ability to increase social connections and build social networks; users
32 also cite making friends, socialization and communal bonding as important motivation for their
33 participation (Murillo et al., 2017; Böcker and Meelen, 2017; Ozanne and Ozanne, 2011)
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 However, the complex, negative externalities faced by traditional businesses, employees,
57 citizens or the environment, are rarely discussed. Regarding the economic dimension, *members*
58
59
60

1
2
3 can be affected by uneven income distribution (Ravenelle, 2017), as markets are dominated by
4 very few intermediaries (Murillo et al., 2017), moreover users' unpaid labour helps SE
5 companies employ far fewer people (Schneider, 2014). *Non-members*, such as traditional
6 businesses, face anti-competitive behaviour (Malhotra and van Alstyne, 2014), for example
7 rented cars violating state zoning regulations (Ranchordas, 2015) and unlicensed, or
8 commercially uninsured private drivers (Frenken and Schor, 2017). The environmental
9 benefits of the SE have been largely assumed and not empirically tested (Frenken and Schor,
10 2017). While the SE tackles underutilization of resources, it can generate rebound effects that
11 shift, rather than reduce, consumption, thereby delivering environmental harm (Acquier et al.,
12 2017; Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015). Finally, despite their communal rhetoric, many sharing
13 platforms fail to create long-term social ties. Users often express disappointment at the extent
14 of social connection they develop (Dubois et al., 2014); while the anonymity, temporary access
15 and market mediation of the SE model may even lead to opportunistic behaviours (Bardhi and
16 Eckhardt, 2012). These findings appear to run counter to the altruistic motivations that
17 underpin sharing, and the tensions and inconsistencies in the SE emerging demand further
18 empirical investigation.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE
43
44
45
46

47 **3.2 Pseudo-sharing**

48
49 The previous discussion shows that the impact of the SE is contested and largely based on
50 informal, assumed or sometimes conflicting claims about digital collaborative behaviours. The
51 term *pseudo-sharing* has been employed by previous studies to describe; “commodity
52 exchange wrapped in a vocabulary of sharing” and questions the authenticity of certain parts
53 of the sharing economy (Belk 2014b, p.7). Critically investigating the sharing economy poses
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 questions about its sharing qualities, hinting that what is commonly referred to as the SE has
4 been compromised. This is due to two equally powerful phenomena that underscore the
5 negative dimensions of the SE, as presented in Table 1. Firstly, the idea of direct, negotiated
6 and compulsory reciprocity (Belk, 2014b), which suggests that most users and providers
7 participate for the sole motive of profit. The SE has attracted significant venture capital money
8 looking for the ‘next Uber’, thus tainting (Griffith, 2013) the genuine sharing economy. Money
9 can blight the altruistic intentions of participants, much like a dinner guest who offers to pay
10 rather than share their wine during the meal would taint the experience (Benkler, 2002; Belk,
11 2007). Couchsurfing is an exemplar of the difference between genuine and pseudo-sharing
12 based on economic motives. While guests are encouraged to bring a small gift or cook a meal,
13 payment for the service is forbidden. According to Couchsurfing’s CEO, the experiences
14 people *share* via Couchsurfing cannot be bought with money. In contrast, Airbnb (often cited
15 as Couchsurfing’s for-profit competitor) positions itself as, "a community marketplace for
16 unique spaces" (Griffith, 2013, para. 10; emphasis added). Such a personal act as sharing your
17 home with a stranger invites friendship and engenders conviviality with other members, so
18 when Couchsurfing shifted from a non-profit to a for-profit organization, many community
19 users gradually dissipated, no longer able to align their value system to the new format (Belk,
20 2014b).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Secondly, the lack of social interactions and meaningful relationships can also lead to pseudo-
48 sharing. There is evidence that information technology has brought loneliness (Lim and Kim,
49 2018) and anxiety and isolation (Caplan, 2006) to some of its users, and this is manifest in the
50 SE. Shared economy platforms such as Airbnb and Uber are digital ‘matchmakers’ between
51 users however this ecosystem is not purely transactional, but is also socio-economic; “with a
52 higher diversity of inter-relationships and opportunities for co-investment, co-learning and co-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 innovation than traditional business models” (Laamanan et al., 2016, p.1). For example, to
4
5 increase profits, sharing providers have invested in technological developments (such as smart
6
7 locks for houses), thereby providing a faster service, but also minimizing social interaction.
8
9 Fenton’s (2013) study of car sharing reports that service users described their interactions as
10
11 “anonymous” and “sterile”, challenging its potential to truly build community goodwill.
12
13 Similarly, a major societal concern is discrimination and exclusionary behaviours in the choice
14
15 of collaborator (Frenken and Schor, 2017). For instance, some non-black hosts of Airbnb
16
17 charge 12% more than black hosts (Edelman and Luca, 2014) and guests with distinctively
18
19 African-American names were more frequently turned down by hosts (Edelman et al., 2017).
20
21 In a field study of Uber and Lyft, Ge et al., (2016) found that African-American passengers
22
23 were more likely to experience longer waiting times and more cancellations from drivers.
24
25 When Willer et al. (2012) compared solidarity and group identification between Freecycle (an
26
27 app to donate items for free), with Craigslist (which exchanges items for money), they found
28
29 stronger evidence of social connections among Freecyclers. Similarly, Zipcar members had no
30
31 interest in meeting other members and no sense of attachment, seemingly operating; “primarily
32
33 from selfish, pragmatic, and individualistic motivations rather than from altruism, concern for
34
35 the environment, or concern for the collective good” (Belk, 2014b, p.8).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Societal and economic concerns such those mentioned above have led some academics to
46
47 criticize SE platforms. References to the “skimming economy” (Malhotra and van Alstyne,
48
49 2014) and “pseudo-sharing” (Belk, 2014a, 2014b) are attached to profit-based sharing or
50
51 renting, which, for some (Frenken and Schor, 2017; Belk, 2014a), sharply contrast with more
52
53 socially driven sharing and lending, leading to questions whether the SE is a “social movement
54
55 that solves pressing socio-economic global problems, or whether it is perhaps a business
56
57 consultancy fad orchestrated by self-interested intermediarie” (Dredge and Gyimóthy 2015,
58
59
60

p.299). Frenken and Schor (2017) also disagree with the appropriation of the word ‘sharing’ suggesting that “renting” is more appropriate. Tom Slee’s (2016) recent polemic also highlights how SE companies use feel-good rhetoric to hide their irresponsible business models, often financed by highly speculative venture capitalists; “what started as an appeal to community, person-to-person connections, sustainability and sharing has become a playground for billionaires, Wall Street and venture capitalists” (Slee, 2016, p.163).

Against this backdrop, we advocate a different type of technology-mediated, socially inclusive and cohesive SE. Kornberger et al. (2017) argue for “a real sharing economy”, one based on “meaningful” sharing, not only of excess resources, but one that leverages information technology for an integrated sharing of “moral concern”. We demonstrate how the SE is “replete with tensions and paradoxes” (Acquier et al., 2017, p. 1) regarding its boundaries, impact and rationales. The various sharing economies, each with complex, contested and asymmetrical emphases on different actors (Dredge and Gyimóthy, 2015) require examination through multiple lenses. Next, we offer a theoretical framework that can be used to classify SE firms.

4. Theoretical Framework

4.1 Social exchange theory and the sharing economy

Social exchange theory was introduced by Blau (1964) as a framework to explain people’s behaviour through the exchange of rewards and benefits between actors. Early research on social exchange theory distinguishes between transactional and communal relationships (Clark and Mills, 1979). While both types of relationships are in some way beneficial for the members, the difference is that in transactional relationships the benefits are assumed and expected as part of a transaction. On the other hand, communal relationships are more open ended and less

1
2
3 time bonded, and benefits can be derived from various non-transactional aspects of the
4 relationship, such as emotions, social interaction and interpersonal trust (Mills and Clark,
5 2013). Although these two types seem contradictory, in most relationships they coexist either
6 equitably, or with one outweighing the other (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). In the SE
7 context, most participants develop a combination of both transactional and communal
8 relationships, depending on the type of platform they use and whether their motives are
9 intrinsic/altruistic, such as social interaction and sustainability, or extrinsic, namely related to
10 utilitarian benefits (Tussyadiah, 2015).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Recent studies explore the aforementioned relationship between altruistic and utilitarian
25 motives in the SE through the theoretical lens of the crowding-out effect (e.g. Hamari et al,
26 2016; Cox et al., 2018). This argues that individuals' intrinsic motivations start to wear out
27 when their extrinsic motivations increase. In a SE context, this translates into occasions where
28 people start using SE platforms for intrinsic reasons, but eventually monetary savings dominate
29 their drive for participation (Hamari et al, 2016). Hence, their motives morph towards those of
30 the traditional economy, which Belk (2014a) has described as "pseudo-sharing". Examples
31 include global hospitality and transportation companies (e.g. Airbnb, Uber), which started as
32 communities where participants enjoyed sharing services, but have transformed into cost-
33 effective alternatives for hotels and hired car services.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 However, this inversely proportional relationship between altruistic and utilitarian motives can
50 manifest in the opposite way. As Cox et al. (2018) report, in some crowdfunding platforms,
51 participants still consider intrinsic motives as the catalyst for their participation, despite the
52 substantial tangible (e.g. monetary, resources) benefits they get. Moreover, for such platforms,
53 research shows cues appealing to altruism attract more contributors than business/ financial
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cues (Allison et al., 2015). These findings align with studies that indicate that activities such
4 as recycling, donating and volunteering, which provide a utilitarian motive for participants,
5 have an insignificant or substantially negative impact on participants' overall motivation (e.g.
6 Bekkers and Wiepking, 2010). This suggests that when meaningful sharing takes place, the
7 consequences of the crowding-out effect may be minimized and intrinsic motives can prevail.
8 According to Hamari et al. (2016), there are two ways to achieve this: a) *increase the intrinsic*
9 *motivations* (e.g. by creating more pleasurable and communal experiences); or b) *curb the*
10 *extrinsic ones* (e.g. by enabling an "equal sharing" environment). This proposition tallies with
11 previous studies on social exchange theory that explain meaningful sharing using variables
12 such as interpersonal interaction and generalized reciprocity (Gyimóthy, 2017).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Based on the above discussion, in the following sections we demonstrate how specific SE
29 platforms can move away from the pseudo-sharing paradigm towards a more authentic type of
30 sharing, dominated by intrinsic, altruistic motives. With our focus on the interactions among
31 people and the minimization of the pursuit for solely direct transactional benefits, we use
32 *conviviality* (intrinsic) and *reciprocity* (extrinsic) lenses (explained in detail in the following
33 sections) to explore the SE more critically and recommend a classification that enables a
34 distinction to be drawn between sharing and pseudo-sharing.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **4.2 Conviviality**

48
49
50

51 Very commonly the social benefit of participating in sharing platforms is cited as having equal
52 or greater importance than economic or other utilitarian motives. As explained in the previous
53 section, one way to prevent negative aspects of the crowding-out effect and enable meaningful
54 sharing is to enhance participants' intrinsic motivations, such as their pleasure and communal
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experience (Hamari et al., 2016). On this basis, we introduce *conviviality* as a differentiating
4 factor between authentic, meaningful sharing and pseudo-sharing.
5
6
7
8
9

10 The concept of conviviality is associated with “sociable, friendly and festive traits” (Nowicka
11 and Heil, 2016, p.1) and denotes a sense of community and sharing (Guercini and Ranfagni,
12 2016). Across disciplines such as anthropology, geography and sociology, conviviality is
13 imbued with narratives that articulate a deeper concern with the human condition and the
14 meaning of togetherness. In fact, early research on social exchange theory identified
15 friendliness, sociality and conviviality, along with the feeling of reciprocity, as the main ways
16 of developing trust and symbolic value in social exchanges. Illich (1973) proposed that social
17 tools – such as social institutions – could be shaped to help people live harmoniously in
18 complex social systems. We propose that Illich’s (1973) notion of conviviality has parallels
19 with the emergence and growth of the SE. Moreover, we argue that conviviality can be one of
20 the main reasons why the sharing economy’s alternative market arrangements are increasingly
21 challenging the current unsustainable economic paradigm (Kilbourne et al., 1997).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Guercini and Ranfagni (2016, p.770) define conviviality as:

41
42 *the propensity for sharing and a phenomenon that is created, sought after or*
43 *....emerges from the community and contributes to the strengthening of the bonds*
44 *within a group, without compromising individual freedom, but that gives rise to*
45 *new possibilities deriving from the perceived closeness and greater sense of*
46 *community.*
47
48
49

50 Conviviality has been considered by recent studies of cosmopolitanism and multicultural, local
51 and national identities (Nowicka and Heil, 2016, Gilroy, 2004), and, more recently, of the
52 sharing economy (Marovelli, 2018). Passion, skills and social relationships (Guercini and
53 Ranfagni, 2016) drive the *conviviality economy*: conviviality represents a tool to grow and
54 shape a sense of belonging, enabling participants to reap benefits from community. Following
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Illich (1973), Guercini and Ranfagni (2016) conceive community as space where people are
4
5 united, regardless of their inherent differences.
6
7

8
9
10 Conviviality represents both a source for the formation of these new communities, and the glue
11
12 that holds an existing community together (Guercini and Ranfagni, 2016). Conviviality acts as
13
14 a reservoir of community, delivering a strong sense of social anchorage, even when
15
16 transactions take place online. The SE is a context in which conviviality may prove particularly
17
18 valuable and significant, as a determinant of benefits beyond the functional and mundane
19
20 aspects of community sharing, and where the underpinning processes and stories from
21
22 convivial sharing interactions may be examined. An indicative example can be found in a
23
24 comparison of corporate transportation platforms such as Uber, with their more convivial
25
26 equivalents (e.g. Car2Go); the latter entails interactions between private individuals and is
27
28 based on the benefits deriving from personal interaction.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Conviviality essentially represents good, quality life, and Nowicka and Heil (2016, p.6) present
36
37 a useful framework for empirically mapping conviviality. The four principles of conviviality
38
39 are, *common humanity*; *common sociality*; *individuation* and *managed conflict*. Communities
40
41 of conviviality operate on the basis of mutual aid, spontaneity and empathy, and seek
42
43 togetherness through; “ad hoc and temporary commonalities and similarities and consensus
44
45 over issues of interest or concern” (Nowicka and Heil, 2016, p.12). By analysing conviviality,
46
47 we seek to provide insight into how the social aspect of an interpersonal exchange, often
48
49 overlooked in the discourse of the technology-mediated sharing economy, can determine the
50
51 nature of the relationship between participants. The negotiation, transformation and transition
52
53 processes that shape any convivial encounter may appear ephemeral, but these social practices
54
55 and the interdependence of the people involved in the SE require attention and analysis if we
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are to better understand the genuine sharing economy and move further away from pseudo-
4
5 sharing.
6
7
8
9

10 **4.3 Reciprocity**

11
12
13
14
15 Expectation of direct reciprocity is one of the main characteristics that distinguishes authentic
16
17 sharing from pseudo-sharing (Belk, 2014a). Although reciprocity as a concept has been central
18
19 in public discourse for thousands of years, there is substantial ambiguity around its definition
20
21 (Gouldner, 1960). From one perspective, reciprocity is considered the driver behind
22
23 interpersonal transactions, in other words the reason why individuals respond to positive
24
25 actions made by other people (Emerson, 1976). Reciprocity is also believed to be a cultural
26
27 expectation, an individual orientation and a social norm, meaning that people not only feel
28
29 obliged to return good actions, but also expect everyone else to share this view (Cropanzano
30
31 and Mitchell, 2005).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 According to social exchange theory, interpersonal exchanges can be categorized based on the
39
40 type of reciprocity to which they are related (Lawler et al, 2000). When an exchange between
41
42 two or more individuals is based on weak or no feelings of reciprocity, the foundation of the
43
44 exchange is a negotiation that leads to an explicit agreement; for instance, when a customer
45
46 agrees to pay a fee to purchase a product or a service. If an exchange is not based on a clear
47
48 agreement, but is still founded on expectations of direct reciprocity between two parties, it is
49
50 called reciprocal exchange (Molm et al., 1999). According to Belk (2014a), many companies
51
52 develop business relationships based on these two types of exchange and masquerade them as
53
54 genuine sharing. In reality, these transactions do not differ significantly from regular
55
56 commercial ones, as they are not based on actual feelings of mutual responsibility, but rather
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on extrinsic motivation (Norbutas and Corten, 2018). Examples of such pseudo-sharing
4 exchanges can be found in the hospitality industry, where reciprocity involves either a
5 monetary payment (e.g. Airbnb) or a non-monetary, but contracted and direct value provision
6 (e.g. Couchsurfing).
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 According to generalized reciprocity theory, altruistic behaviour can be contagious and
15 reciprocity can be indirect rather than paired. In recent years, digital sharing technologies have
16 enabled interactions that are established on such a generalized sense of reciprocity. Movements
17 like Access to Knowledge (A2K) have proved that individuals sometimes engage in sharing
18 without expecting an immediate reward for their actions. On the contrary, they do it to
19 contribute to societal and environmental causes, engage in collaborative activities and feel part
20 of a strong community (Eisenstein, 2011; Bucher et al, 2016). This form of augmented
21 reciprocity leads to two additional types of exchange that have been thoroughly analyzed in the
22 social exchange theory literature (Lawler et al, 2000) as: a) productive exchanges, i.e.
23 interactions where all parties collaborate and join resources in order to generate mutual value
24 (e.g. charity and communal activities); and b) generalized exchanges, i.e. interactions where
25 individuals offer value to a community of people, while receiving indirect benefits from their
26 participation in the community or from the members of the community as a whole (e.g. the
27 A2K movement or Freecycle). Following suggestions from Hamari et al. (2016), we propose
28 that the lack of direct reciprocity – or the establishment of a generalized reciprocity climate -
29 can enable meaningful sharing by decreasing the extrinsic motivations for participants and, in
30 so doing, enhancing the intrinsic ones.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **5. Classification of Sharing Platforms**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The previous discussion reveals conviviality and reciprocity as two major factors that
4 differentiate authentic sharing from pseudo-sharing. Although these two characteristics are
5 interrelated they are distinct notions that determine the nature of the exchange within the
6 sharing platform both separately and interactively. As such, a service may fall into the category
7 of genuine sharing - either because it is based on non-direct expectations of reciprocity (Belk,
8 2014a), or because there is an element of conviviality (Frenken and Schor, 2017), or both
9 (Murillo et al., 2017). To get a better understanding of how conviviality and reciprocity shape
10 the type of a sharing exchange, we propose a 2x2 taxonomy of sharing platforms; essentially a
11 taxonomy of the pertinent types of exchange, based on these two variables. As shown in Table
12 2, sharing platforms can be put into four distinctive categories based on whether they entail
13 convivial interactions, and on whether they assume direct and compulsory reciprocity. The four
14 categories are explained below:

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 *a) Non-convivial – directly reciprocal*

34 This category includes platforms like the large hospitality (e.g. Airbnb, Onefinestay) and
35 transportation (e.g. Uber, Car2go) service providers, which are not genuine sharing platforms,
36 but rather provide transitional commercial services for a fee. In such cases, the interactions
37 between the stakeholders (providers and users) are not convivial and are solely based on
38 materialistic, mostly monetary, transactions. According to social exchange theory this is a
39 typical case of *negotiated exchange*, based on negotiations, explicit agreements and contractual
40 obligations (Lawler et al, 2000). In platforms that belong to this category, the extrinsic motives
41 of participants outweigh the intrinsic, indicating that meaningful sharing is unlikely to occur.
42 These platforms are closer to traditional corporations or, as Belk (2014a) describes them,
43 pseudo-sharing organisations.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *b) Convivial – directly reciprocal*
4

5 In some sharing platforms, interactions among individuals are directly reciprocal, but
6 participants' motives are social and the relationships members develop are more meaningful.
7
8 Examples of platforms that follow this paradigm can again be found in hospitality (e.g.
9 Couchsurfing) and transportation (e.g. Blablacar). In general, when using such platforms,
10 members are very rarely obliged to pay a fee, but are expected to 'return the favour' to the
11 service provider (Norbutas and Corten, 2018). The type of exchange in this case is *reciprocal*,
12 which, according to social exchange theory, means sequential, tacit and beneficial for all parties
13 across time (Lawler et al, 2000). Sharing platforms that belong in this category include not-
14 for-profit organizations, such as Superkitchen, that are aligned to successful social movements
15 (Cathcart-Keays, 2015). We suggest that in these platforms, although all members obtain
16 certain benefits and therefore extrinsic motives do exist, the intrinsic aspect is equally or more
17 important. As Mills and Clark (2013) note, in exchanges like these the relationships are
18 communal and hence benefits derive from various non-transactional aspects of individuals'
19 participation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *c) Non-convivial - non-directly reciprocal*
41

42 Even though convivial interactions are indicative of a genuine sharing economy, they are not
43 a prerequisite. Meaningful sharing exchanges may also occur when individuals participate in
44 communities and offer their services without expecting to get something back, even if they do
45 not develop convivial relationships (Belk, 2014a). In many cases, participants do not even
46 know the other members of the community, but are still willing to generate value for them
47 (Eisenstein, 2011). Examples of such sharing platforms include revolutionary online
48 knowledge exchange organisations (e.g. Wikipedia), open source software (e.g. Linux, R
49 programming) and other platforms linked to the A2K movement (Kapczynski, 2010).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following a social exchange theory approach, members of these communities engage in
4 *generalized exchange*, as they provide unilateral benefits to other members of the community,
5
6 while receiving them from different members or from the community as a whole (Lawler et al,
7
8 2000). Our proposition is that these platforms are not engaged in pseudo-sharing, since the
9
10 benefits members receive are communal and based on intrinsic motives, such as sustainability,
11
12 and they challenge the traditional market arrangements.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *d) Convivial – non-directly reciprocal*

20
21 According to social exchange theory, productive exchanges are those where all participants
22
23 contribute for everyone to benefit, hence they co-create the value and incur benefits and costs
24
25 simultaneously (Lawler et al, 2000). In a sharing economy context, this type of exchange
26
27 implies that participants contribute to a common cause without expecting to receive benefits
28
29 directly from the individuals they are helping. Instead of expecting, or even demanding, direct
30
31 reciprocity, they participate in a community built on feelings of generalized reciprocity and
32
33 they share their resources and knowledge in a collaborative and convivial environment (Belk,
34
35 2014a). Not-for-profit and charity projects are often based on this type of sharing; for example,
36
37 the “Train of Hope” charity – where volunteers share resources and collaborate to support
38
39 refugees in Vienna (Kornberger et al., 2017). We argue that this is the category where pseudo-
40
41 sharing is the least likely to occur. In such sharing platforms, intrinsic motives are the dominant
42
43 force behind individuals’ behaviour, to the point that if extrinsic motives are offered,
44
45 individuals may disengage due to the crowding-out effect (Hamari et al, 2016).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

55
56
57
58 **5.2 Case study methodology**
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Case study research as a strategy for methodological exploration is well documented (Flyvberg,
7
8 2011), and is rooted in the positivist tradition, typically aspiring to extract variables from
9
10 context to generate propositions and build theory (Piekkari et al., 2009). Thus case study
11
12 method is chosen for theoretical, not statistical, reasons (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), with the
13
14 intention of filling theoretical categories, often providing examples of polar types (Eisenhardt,
15
16 1989). Using case studies as a research strategy is chosen here for illustration purposes, in order
17
18 to provide a clearer view of how our theoretical arguments could be applied in an empirical
19
20 setting (Siggelkow, 2007). Case study research has become increasingly refined, and
21
22 considered a valid form of inquiry to explore a range of complex issues, particularly when
23
24 human behavior and social processes are central to understanding. Following a positivist,
25
26 idiographic approach, in this paper we use instrumental, exemplar cases to provide a broader
27
28 appreciation of reciprocity and conviviality within sharing communities (Bell et al., 2018).)
29
30
31 The empirical component of this paper entails four instrumental case studies (Stake 1995)
32
33 based on secondary data sources. We apply our proposed 2x2 taxonomy to the sharing
34
35 economy, providing a brief example for each quadrant (Curb Mobility, SuperKitchen, Fon
36
37 Wireless, Repair Cafés). Purposive sampling was used to select each case, where the intention
38
39 was to provide insight regarding the particular phenomena of reciprocity and conviviality. The
40
41 value and importance of purposeful sampling comes from selecting information-rich cases to
42
43 study in depth, allowing learning that delivers a “great deal about issues of central importance
44
45 to the purpose of inquiry” (Patton, 2002, p.230). These case studies are detailed (Ritchie and
46
47 Lewis, 2003), and phenomena are studied in context using various data collection methods
48
49 (Yin, 1994). For this study, data source triangulation was achieved by drawing the secondary
50
51 data from a number of sources (Yin, 1994) that included: newspaper articles, conference
52
53 speeches, online blogs, and websites run by the communities and groups. Once all the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 documents and information were assembled, data analysis was carried out by the authors using
4
5 a deductive approach framed by the discussion and literature presented in previous sections.
6
7 This concentrated review of relevant documents helped to illuminate the phenomena under
8
9 study (Jamali et al., 2009). Case studies are noted for their ability to secure rich descriptions
10
11 and while illustrative cases do present weaknesses in terms of generalizability and
12
13 representativeness, Yin (1994) argues that case studies are generalizable to theoretical
14
15 propositions and not to populations. This approach is similar to ones followed in conceptual
16
17 papers both in the IT sector (e.g. Saariko et al., 2018) and the sharing economy domain (e.g.
18
19 Belk, 2014a, 2014b). The four organizations were chosen for two additional reasons: a) they
20
21 represent four sectors where sharing economy platforms are active; and b) these specific
22
23 organizations have not been analyzed in previous relevant literature.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Case study 1. Negotiated exchange: *Curb Mobility*

32
33 Curb Mobility provides mobility solutions to the transport sector, principally represented in the
34
35 sharing economy by an app that facilitates taxi services. The Curb app, introduced to the US
36
37 market in 2015, enables licenced taxi drivers (in contrast to Uber and Lyft that are accessible
38
39 to anyone with an appropriate vehicle) to find and receive fares via an app-based service thus
40
41 enabling them to offer services that match up with those offered by competing apps. This
42
43 facility is important given both how app services have had a negative impact on taxi drivers
44
45 and the changing expectations of passengers regarding their car sharing experience, such as the
46
47 provision of a price before the journey begins. These impacts have caused tensions between
48
49 traditional taxi services and drivers of app services, leading to the re-regulation of for-hire
50
51 services globally.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Despite a well-positioned business model and mission, we argue that Curb is an inherent
4 example of pseudo-sharing. Curb facilitates the sharing of information to connect drivers and
5 potential passengers for a solely economic aim. Curb's support of on board payment solutions,
6 combined with the app, is an example of direct reciprocity. As part of this negotiated exchange
7 between driver and passenger, three factors are the focus points for a more efficient service.
8 These include: the setting of processing rates; the provision of technical support to drivers; and
9 the usability and reliability of both software and hardware. Curb's business model takes a
10 percentage processing fee, such that the driver and the firm are in an explicit agreement of
11 conditions of payment. At the same time, users do not engage in any sort of meaningful
12 interactions apart from the core transaction. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that the
13 exchanges between them entail very low to zero conviviality and belong to the negotiated
14 exchange category of our proposed classification.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Curb describes its platform as “Open. Flexible. Powerful” and as the “foundation for a scaleable,
34 efficient, intelligent, open transport system” (<https://gocurb.com/>), promoting a fast and
35 convenient way for passengers to request and pay for rides. In contrast, Li and Zhao (2015)
36 explain how a similar app, e-hail, has disrupted stakeholder relationships between drivers,
37 passengers, regulators and professional associations, enabling a more direct connection
38 between drivers and passengers. The implementation of information technology in Curb's
39 case, clarifies the direct value provision between the two parties, with the aim of the service
40 not being for any sense of community or social exchange, but solely monetary.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Case study 2. Reciprocal exchange: *Superkitchen*

55 Established in 2013 in Nottingham, UK, Superkitchen aimed to “start a revolution around the
56 dinner table” (Cathcart-Keays, 2015, para.10). Exclusively using surplus ‘good’ food destined
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for waste, Superkitchen serves affordable, healthy, freshly-cooked meals to over 1,000 people
4 per week. These welcoming social spaces have been established in more than 30 towns across
5 the UK, run by social entrepreneurs or volunteers. Superkitchen's social mission is two-fold:
6 to help the environment by saving food from landfills and to tackle loneliness and food
7 insecurity within local communities. Internal reporting identifies a strong sense of community
8 and conviviality within Superkitchen, driven by shared experiences and learning, support and
9 a sense of belonging (Superkitchen, 2016).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 With a shared website (<http://superkitchen.org>) that connects the Superkitchen communities
22 around the UK, the sharing model of Superkitchen upcycles surplus food into social eating
23 meals, saving 66 tons of food from landfill per month. Avoiding the current 'high choice-high
24 waste' food business model, Superkitchen offers a varied, but limited menu of one or two
25 choices each meal, serving food that costs and produces less waste (Superkitchen, 2016).
26 Saving food from landfill and delivering high nutritional quality meals is just one aim. A core
27 second ambition of Superkitchen's mission is to promote social inclusion. Everyone is
28 welcome to join and this 'shared family' atmosphere is reinforced by members sitting around
29 a table and sharing the same meal. This participation facilitates 'personal coherence' and leads
30 to health, wellbeing and feelings of happiness.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 The digital platform is hosted by a network of members who run social eating spaces, cooking
48 for their communities, as well as offering support in setting up a kitchen and helping citizens
49 locate a Superkitchen in their community. Superkitchen posts good practice films and blogs,
50 tweets events and shares recipes between kitchens and also provides online advice. The
51 conviviality of Superkitchen is apparent throughout its operations. By bringing together
52 producers, supermarkets, volunteers, social entrepreneurs and consumers, it develops social
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 capital in the community and turns “spare food into friendship” (Hufton, 2016, para.1).
4
5 Producers and volunteers experience community service, make a difference to local people’s
6
7 lives and reduce global food waste. Consistent with the notion of reciprocal exchange,
8
9 consumers are asked to participate by either contributing for their own shared meal or paying
10
11 a nominal (£2.50) fee. Despite the requested fee, we argue that Superkitchen remains part of
12
13 the ‘genuine’ sharing economy, as highlighted by the convivial aspects in its practice and the
14
15 reciprocity of participants. Many pay not only for their own meal, but also for an extra fee, a
16
17 ‘Superspoon’ – a meal for attendees who cannot afford to pay themselves. In addition to a
18
19 nutritious meal, vulnerable consumers and volunteers sharing in these events receive affection,
20
21 connection, and a social space with informal support. Through their increased societal
22
23 participation, they leave empowered, more confident, with a renewed sense of belonging and
24
25 of being an ‘active participant’ in the community. On this basis, we conclude that exchanges
26
27 at Superkitchen – both online and offline - entail both conviviality and direct reciprocity and
28
29 can be therefore classified as *reciprocal exchanges* in our proposed taxonomy.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Case Study 3. Generalized exchange: *Fon Wireless*

39
40 Fon wireless is a commercial Wifi sharing network, founded in 2006 in Spain. The company’s
41
42 operations are based on an innovative sharing technology, which makes it possible to broadcast
43
44 two separate WiFi signals to their users’ routers; one just for the owners and a second one
45
46 which allows the owners to share part of their connection with other members of the company’s
47
48 network (Allerson, 2012). Fon customers can either pay a fee or share their WiFi with other
49
50 users by using a router that is linked to broadband connections offered by the company’s
51
52 partners (Shi et al., 2015). In return, they get free access to Wifi away from home using one of
53
54 the 20 million Fon hotspots, most of which have been created by the company’s other users
55
56 (Bloomberg, 2018). Fon is now considered the largest Wifi provider worldwide, with a client
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 base that includes hotels, restaurants and large retailers, and with successful partnerships with
4
5 leading broadband providers (Fon, 2018).
6
7
8
9

10 Fon Wireless is a successful example of a commercial corporation that uses sharing technology
11
12 to enable their users to offer benefits to each other. It entails a degree of reciprocity (Shi et al.,
13
14 2015), but not a direct, paired one. Instead, users gain value from their participation in the
15
16 community and, in return, they choose whether they will repay the community by sharing a
17
18 part of their Wifi connection or by paying a fee. As explained previously, this type of
19
20 interaction falls into the *generalized exchange* category, in other words, the company's
21
22 customers offer value to other users and they receive back benefits from the community as a
23
24 whole (Lawler et al, 2000).
25
26
27
28
29

30 Despite being a very successful for-profit platform, Fon enables genuine sharing between their
31
32 customers. They describe themselves as “driven by a community WiFi approach” and their aim
33
34 is to enable their users to offer value to each other (Fon, 2018). Indeed, their commercial
35
36 success is founded on the effective management of users' feelings of generalized reciprocity
37
38 and the significant reach their services have achieved is due to their users' collaborative value
39
40 production. This genuine sharing among between their users, who do not gain explicit
41
42 monetary benefits from their participation, differentiates Fon from other companies that sell
43
44 traditional services yet mask them as sharing (e.g. Airbnb, Uber); a phenomenon which is more
45
46 authentically badged as pseudo-sharing (Belk, 2014a).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Case Study 4. Productive exchange: *Repair cafés*

55
56 A repair café is a community space that provides materials, tools and know-how to fix broken
57
58 consumer products without money or any direct exchange (Muñoz and Cohen, 2018). The cafés
59
60

1
2
3 aim to mitigate the generation of waste created by the short life span of consumer products,
4 following an ethos of repair rather than replacement. Founded in 2010 in Amsterdam, the
5 Repair Café Foundation has guided more than 1,500 repair cafés to organize locally. Cafés are
6 typically operated by skilled volunteers who want to give back to their community and
7 encourage others to live more sustainably by means of the promotion of product repair and
8 longevity (Keiller and Charter, 2016). Sustainably motivated repair practices are driven by the
9 sharing of knowledge within a convivial framework of local and global organization, and are
10 supported by volunteering and community collaboration. Repair Café hosts an online platform
11 (<https://repaircafe.org/en>) that connects cafés and communities worldwide and provides a
12 digital starter kit for a small fee. It also puts interested citizens in contact with other people or
13 groups in their area who have shown an interest in starting their own Repair Café.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 At a community level, repair cafés deliver a convivial space for social interaction, with the
32 social aspect of repairing highly valued items, even if the repair is unsuccessful (Cole and
33 Gnanapragasam, 2017). Repair cafés are also associated with promoting social cohesion; cafés
34 in the Netherlands are funded specifically for this purpose (McGrane, 2012), and online forums
35 and Facebook enable communities to share knowledge and ideas across the world. Conviviality
36 runs through these activities; interactions are based on collaborative practices, with visitors to
37 the cafés gaining skills as part of an ongoing learning process via ‘sharing the repair’ with
38 others. They receive benefits from their participation and a culture of healthy reciprocity is
39 enabled. These benefits are not monetary and not necessarily received by the participants
40 directly from the people they interact with. As explained, this type of community participation
41 falls under *the productive exchange* category of our proposed taxonomy.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Often the repairing knowledge held by volunteers is a forgotten, redundant, less relevant or
4 less in demand skill in a throwaway, mass consumption world. Technical knowledge has now
5
6 shifted locale to multinational organizations that produce products rather than users
7
8 (Valenzuela and Böhm, 2017). Shared repairing provides an understanding of how things work
9
10 and repurposes practical knowledge via the provision of a service to the public, in a space for
11
12 convivial practices (Bradley, 2018), revaluing these skills with an ethic of care (Shaw et al.,
13
14 2016). Repairing is reinterpreted as a sociable activity that brings people together in common
15
16 sociality based upon the appreciation of such skills, with volunteers appraising items and
17
18 attempting repairs in solidarity with the visitor rather than a customer-service provider
19
20 relationship. Table 3 portrays the convivial aspects of Repair cafés and Superkitchen.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE
29
30
31
32

33 **6. Discussion and Conclusions**

34
35
36
37

38 With the SE spreading inexorably in the global marketplace, this paper is a timely contribution
39
40 to a crucial knowledge gap surrounding the social and sustainable aspects of community
41
42 sharing, and the potential it represents. Muñoz and Cohen (2018) suggest that the SE space
43
44 offers a rich opportunity for scholars to explore, from many interdisciplinary angles. While
45
46 information technology has enabled a vast array of different forms of sharing to emerge, the
47
48 interactions between members in the SE have not been rigorously discussed. Analysis of the
49
50 parameters that shape these interactions is essential, in order to understand how organizations
51
52 utilize sharing technologies and processes, as well as to offer value to SE participants and
53
54 society in general.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Drawing on social exchange theory, we use instrumental, exemplar cases within a sharing
4 economy, selected for their insight regarding the particular phenomena of reciprocity and
5
6 conviviality, and reveal where differentiation is manifested, based on meaningful communal,
7
8 rather than transactional, drivers. Our analysis of the first case study, Curb, indicates that when
9
10 reciprocity is based on a transactional, commodity experience and low levels of conviviality
11
12 negotiated exchanges occur and sharing becomes commercial. Curb epitomises pseudo-
13
14 sharing, where communal relationships are not featured or built; interaction is a closed
15
16 encounter; and emotion, trust or social interaction are immaterial to the expected benefits
17
18 received, reflecting Blau's (1964) original theorization of social exchange. Although
19
20 successful, technology-enabled platforms like Curb become vulnerable in the sharing
21
22 marketplace, based as they are on primarily extrinsic exchanges, without embedding more
23
24 sustainable sharing attributes and rewards. Contrastingly, Superkitchen embodies the open-
25
26 ended, interpersonal and socially interactive rewards of a convivial sharing economy, where
27
28 reciprocity is the catalyst for socially inclusive communal benefits, underpinned by the
29
30 transactional exchange of surplus food and conversation. Sustainability and community, along
31
32 with economic imperatives, fortify the benefits exchanged, and non-obligatory, proactive
33
34 participation lies at the core of this sharing platform. Scaling up and proliferation of these
35
36 shared eating encounters is enabled by the underpinning digital networks. By fostering greater
37
38 community social capital through the reciprocal connections it establishes, Superkitchen
39
40 represents a more resilient, altruistic (Allison et al., 2015) model of conviviality within the
41
42 sharing economy than those exhibiting primarily transactional exchange rewards.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Our exploration of Fon Wireless case study demonstrates how commercial actors – in this case
55
56 the organization and its customers – can co-create a mutually beneficial exchange that reflects
57
58 communal, rather than merely transactional, rewards. While a hybrid system of fee or shared
59
60

1
2
3 access operates, the potential non-monetary basis for differentiation characterizes Fon as both
4
5 a communal and a transactional sharing platform – as opposed to an either/or (Clark and Mills,
6
7 1979) - with conviviality delivering a collaborative value proposition that transcends mere
8
9 pseudo-sharing. Social interactions do not define Fon’s shared encounters, yet valued
10
11 communal rewards and connections are derived for customers from the balance of intrinsic and
12
13 extrinsic incentives. The analysis of Repair cafés provides a further example of non-contractual
14
15 reciprocity; here communal interaction and productive exchange are deeply intertwined in
16
17 purposeful sustainability. Online communities catalyze the shared knowledge, ideas and
18
19 exchanges, facilitated by repurposed knowledge within convivial spaces – online and offline –
20
21 to enable social interaction benefits that stretch beyond those who participate in the repair.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Our suggestions are critical for SE organizations, consumers and policymakers, who can use
30
31 the suggested categorization to understand how people interact with sharing technologies and
32
33 with each other, and to effectively distinguish genuine sharing exchanges from pseudo-sharing
34
35 ones. Organizations interested in building their legitimacy and reputation (Wang et al., 2019)
36
37 can facilitate conviviality among users and encourage sustainable consumption and, whenever
38
39 possible, non-direct reciprocity. With the advancement of information technology, we expect
40
41 social technologies such as online reviews or message boards to be used to facilitate trust and
42
43 user interactions (Bapna and Qiu, 2017) or mimic traditional face- to-face social relationships
44
45 (Ou et al., 2014). From a user perspective, our taxonomy distinguishes different SE business
46
47 propositions, sets expectations accordingly and helps alignment between motives and offerings
48
49 of each category. Finally, public policy needs to engage with a broader understanding of the
50
51 SE that recognizes the distinguishing attributes of the different SE models outlined in this paper
52
53 and supports authentic sharing rather than pseudo-sharing to deliver greater social and
54
55 sustainable benefits.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Based on this, this paper's first contribution is the introduction and application of the concepts
7
8 of conviviality and reciprocity to frame a discussion about the genuine, authentic SE. In doing
9
10 so, we extend knowledge and understanding of the opportunities these two features have to
11
12 offer to the information technology sector and its role in supporting local transformation, social
13
14 cohesion and sustainability. We suggest that information technology used by sharing
15
16 enterprises should encourage conviviality and generalized reciprocity to flourish, if positive
17
18 environmental, economic and social benefits are to be realized. Another important contribution
19
20 of this paper is the categorization of sharing platforms based on the degree of conviviality and
21
22 type of reciprocity they entail. As discussed, these two concepts determine not only the
23
24 authenticity of the sharing process (Belk, 2014a), but also - following a social exchange theory
25
26 approach – signify the type of the exchange between participants (Lawler et al, 2000).
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 A third contribution pertains to the implementation and extension of social exchange theory to
34
35 explain the differences between organizations in the sharing economy landscape (Blau, 1964;
36
37 Clark and Mills, 1979). Drawing upon early arguments that distinguish between the
38
39 transactional aspects of an interaction and the communal ones and acknowledging that these
40
41 two aspects can coexist (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005), we offer a comprehensive
42
43 classification of sharing platforms based on the degree of reciprocity and conviviality they
44
45 entail. In this way, we show how the expansion of social exchange theory can be used to fill an
46
47 important gap in the literature and explain how technologically- mediated communication can
48
49 help determine the nature of interactions in the SE context with wider sustainability
50
51 implications. The extension of social exchange theory to the sharing economy confirms a
52
53 taxonomy of different platforms with unique characteristics, participant motives and
54
55 behaviour.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The diversity of operations in the sharing economy and the controversies therein can help guide
7
8 scholars to critically study the social potential of the SE, rather than treating all sharing alike
9
10 (Muñoz and Cohen, 2018). Our analysis highlights and elucidates the central role of
11
12 conviviality and reciprocity in understanding the paradoxes, tensions and impact of the SE on
13
14 society. Researchers should investigate what the SE, in its various guises, means for the future
15
16 operation of organizations and the market, as well as the challenges, possibilities and
17
18 alternatives it could present to the currently unsustainable economic paradigm. Further
19
20 empirical investigation is needed, such as the recent work by Laurell and Sandström (2017)
21
22 contrasting the idealism of non-market logics with profit driven SE firms.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Using the normative arguments expressed in this paper, further analysis of the ‘social’ promise
30
31 of the sharing economy should be explored, particularly the motivations and experiences of
32
33 stakeholders in the genuine sharing economy, if we are to measure its feasibility (Murillo et
34
35 al., 2017); understand how information technology can unleash its potential for replication or
36
37 scaling (O’Reilly and Binns, 2019); and encourage future participation – both by providers and
38
39 users. The social potential of the SE rests in the creation of stronger communities and forging
40
41 interpersonal relationships embedded with conviviality and reciprocity. The SE model forces
42
43 people to push the boundaries of their lives and turns consumers into active and engaged
44
45 members of societies. A greater understanding of how the co-creation of conviviality takes
46
47 place - online and offline - would be a fruitful research direction. Such studies could provide
48
49 indications for the general direction (and possible proliferations) the SE might take in coming
50
51 years, and also reveal the ways in which the notion of sharing becomes utilized by SE actors,
52
53 drawing on both non-market and market logics.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The implications for sustainable production, consumption and the conviviality economy are
7
8 complex and not yet fully understood. Environmental motivations seem significant for car and
9
10 ride-sharing; social motivations and substantial personal interaction dominate meal sharing;
11
12 repair cafés flourish with both environmental and social aims (Böcker and Meelen 2017). Thus,
13
14 the SE may offer transformational promises in contrast to the environmentally controversial
15
16 dominant social paradigm, yet tensions are inherent, both conceptually and in practice (Acquier
17
18 et al., 2017). Therefore, we need to expand our knowledge and assessment of the overall value
19
20 and capability of the SE to further the circular economy, specifically potential transfer and
21
22 scaling up of local initiatives is needed. This is particularly pressing, given that intangible
23
24 sharing via information technology-enabled platforms is yet to be adequately examined, such
25
26 as the altruistic notions of sharing and lending within online communities. The present paper
27
28 offers some initial arguments and propositions on how true and meaningful interactions can be
29
30 facilitated in online communities with the use of genuine sharing platforms.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Scholars from different disciplines can draw on a broader range of theoretical foundations
39
40 including geography, sociology and public policy, to identify theoretical interventions that can
41
42 deliver a greater focus on conviviality and generalized reciprocity in existing and future work.
43
44 This may involve analysis of the awareness, attitudes and adoption of sharing practices
45
46 (Wilhems et al., 2017) across cultural and geographical contexts, such as research beyond the
47
48 North American and European settings. While offering information rich cases, our analysis
49
50 contains only secondary data content.-Like most previous research into the SE, our paper is
51
52 normative and conceptual in nature. This leaves considerable space for future, primary data
53
54 based empirical exploration of the SE in terms of its many diverse business models.
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Acquier, A. and Carbone, V. (2018), "Sharing economy and social innovation", *Cambridge Handbook of the Sharing Economy and Law*, pp. 1-17.
- Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T. and Pinkse, J. (2017), "Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: An organizing framework", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 125 No. Supplement C, pp. 1–10.
- Airbnb (2017). "Helping Travel Grow Greener. Internal Report". Available at <https://press.atAirbnb.com/app/uploads/2017/03/Airbnbandsustainabletravel2017.pdf>
- Allison, T.H., Davis, B.C., Short, J.C. and Webb, J.W. (2015), "Crowdfunding in a prosocial microlending environment: Examining the role of intrinsic versus extrinsic cues", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 53–73.
- Allerson, J. (2012) "Fon announces next generation Fonera Simpl with EAP optimized for mobile devices", *Business Wire*. Available at: <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20120226005026/en/Fon-Announces-Generation-Fonera-Simpl-EAP-Optimized>
- Almirall, E., Wareham, J., Ratti, C., Conesa, P., Bria, F., Gaviria, A. and Edmondson, A. (2016), "Smart cities at the crossroads: New tensions in city transformation", *California Management Review*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 141–152.
- Apte, U.M. and Davis, M.M. (2019), "Sharing economy services: Business model generation", *California Management Review*, Vol. 61 No. 2 pp.104-131
- Bapna, R., Qiu, L. (2017), "Repeated interactions versus social ties: Quantifying the economic value of trust, forgiveness, and reputation using a field experiment", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 841–866.
- Bardhi, F. and Eckhardt, G.M. (2012), "Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 881–898.

- 1
2
3 Bekkers, R. and Wiepking, P. (2010), “A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy:
4 Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving”, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*,
5 available at: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/09/08/0899764010380927.abstract>
6 (accessed 22 September 2016).
7
8
9
10
11
12 Belk, R. (2007), “Why not share rather than own?”, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of*
13 *Political and Social Science*, Vol. 611 No. 1, pp. 126–140.
14
15
16
17 Belk, R. (2010), “Sharing”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 715–734.
18
19
20 Belk, R. (2014a), “Sharing versus pseudo-sharing in Web 2.0”, *The Anthropologist*, Vol. 18 No. 1,
21 pp. 7–23.
22
23
24 Belk, R. (2014b), “You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online”,
25 *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 8, pp. 1595–1600.
26
27
28
29 Bell, E., Bryman, A. and Harley, B. (2018), *Business Research Methods*, Oxford University Press
30
31 Benkler, Y. (2002), “Coase’s penguin, or, Linux and “the nature of the firm””, *Yale Law Journal*,
32 Vol. 112 No. 3. pp. 369–446.
33
34
35
36 Blau, P.M. (1964), “Justice in social exchange”, *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 193–206.
37
38 Bloomberg, (2018) *Company Overview of FON Wireless Ltd.* Available at:
39 <https://www.bloomberg.com/research/stocks/private/snapshot.asp?privcapId=42721686>
40
41
42 Böcker, L. and Meelen, T. (2017), “Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for
43 intended sharing economy participation”, *Environmental Innovation and Societal*
44 *Transitions*, Vol. 23, pp. 28–39.
45
46
47
48
49 Bradley, K. (2018), “Bike kitchens–spaces for convivial tools”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*,
50 Vol. 197, pp. 1676–1683.
51
52
53
54 Bradley, K. and Pargman, D. (2016), “The sharing economy as the commons of the 21st century”,
55 *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, available at:
56 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsx001>.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Brynjolfsson, E. and McAfee, A. (2014), *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and*
4
5 *Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York
6
7
8 Bucher, E., Fieseler, C. and Lutz, C. (2016), “What’s mine is yours (for a nominal fee) –
9
10 Exploring the spectrum of utilitarian to altruistic motives for Internet-mediated sharing”,
11
12 *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 62, pp. 316–326.
13
14
15 Carroll, E. and Romano, J. (2010), *Your Digital Afterlife: When Facebook, Flickr and Twitter Are*
16
17 *Your Estate, What’s Your Legacy?*, New Riders, Berkeley, California.
18
19
20 Caplan, S. E. (2002). “Problematic Internet use and psychosocial well-being: development of a
21
22 theory-based cognitive–behavioral measurement instrument”. *Computers in Human*
23
24 *Behavior*, Vol. 18 No. 5 pp. 553-575.
25
26
27 Castells, M. (1989), *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring,*
28
29 *and the Urban-Regional Process*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
30
31 Cathcart-Keays, A. (2015) ‘In Nottingham, one woman is fighting food poverty with social
32
33 eating’, *The Guardian*. Available at: [https://](https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/feb/17/nottingham-fighting-food-poverty-social-eating)
34
35 www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/feb/17/nottingham-fighting-food-poverty-social-eating
36
37
38 Clark, M.S. and Mills, J. (1979), “Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal
39
40 relationships”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 37 No. 1, p. 12.
41
42
43 Cohen, B. and Kietzmann, J. (2014), “Ride on! Mobility business models for the sharing
44
45 economy”, *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 279–296.
46
47
48 Cohen, B. and Muñoz, P. (2016), “Sharing cities and sustainable consumption and production:
49
50 Towards an integrated framework”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 134, pp. 87–97.
51
52
53 Cole, C. and Gnanapragasam, A. (2017), “Community repair: Enabling repair as part of the
54
55 movement towards a circular economy”, available at: [https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-](https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/36102)
56
57 [jspui/handle/2134/36102](https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/36102) (accessed 5 August 2019).
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cox, J., Nguyen, T., Thorpe, A., Ishizaka, A., Chakhar, S. and Meech, L. (2018), “Being seen to
4 care: The relationship between self-presentation and contributions to online pro-social
5 crowdfunding campaigns”, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 83, pp. 45–55.
6
7
8
9
10 Creswell, J. W. (2014), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods*
11 *Approaches*, (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
12
13
14 Cropanzano, R. and Mitchell, M.S. (2005), “Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review”,
15 *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 874–900.
16
17
18
19 Davies, A.R., Donald, B., Gray, M. and Knox-Hayes, J. (2017), “Sharing economies: Moving
20 beyond binaries in a digital age”, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, Vol.
21
22
23
24
25 10 No. 2, pp. 209–230.
26
27 Denegri-Knott, J. (2011), ““Have it now!”: Ebay and the acceleration of consumer desire”, *ACR*
28 *European Advances*, Vol. E-09, available at:
29
30
31 <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/1006905/eacr/vol9/E-09> (accessed 10 December 2017).
32
33
34 Dillahunt, T.R., Wang, X., Wheeler, E., Cheng, H.F., Hecht, B. and Zhu, H. (2017), “The sharing
35 economy in computing: A systematic literature review”, *Procedures. ACM Human-Computer*
36 *Interaction*, Vol. 1 No. CSCW, pp. 38:1–38:26.
37
38
39
40 Dredge, D. and Gyimóthy, S. (2015), “The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical
41 perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices”, *Tourism Recreation Research*, Vol.
42
43
44
45
46 40 No. 3, pp. 286–302.
47
48
49 Dubois, E., Schor, J. and Carfagna, L., 2014. Connected consumption: a sharing economy takes
50 hold. *Rotman Management*, Vol. 1, pp.50-55.
51
52
53 Edelman, B. and Luca, M. (2014), “Digital discrimination: The case of Airbnb.com”, Harvard
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Business School NOM Unit Working Paper 14-054.

- 1
2
3 Edelman, B., Luca, M. and Svirsky, D. (2017), "Racial discrimination in the sharing economy:
4 Evidence from a field experiment", *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Vol. 9
5 No. 2, pp. 1–22.
6
7
8
9 Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989), "Building theories from case study research", *The Academy of
10 Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 4, p. 532.
11
12
13 Eisenstein, C. (2011), *Sacred Economics: Money, Gift, and Society in the Age of Transition*, North
14 Atlantic Books, Berkeley California.
15
16
17 Emerson, R.M. (1976), "Social exchange theory", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp.
18 335–362.
19
20
21
22
23 Fenton, A. (2013), "Making markets personal: Exploring market construction at the micro level in
24 the car-sharing and time bank markets", unpublished paper, Harvard University.
25
26
27
28 Fleming, P. (2017), "The human capital hoax: Work, debt and insecurity in the era of
29 Uberization", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 691–709.
30
31
32
33 Flyvbjerg, B. (2011), Case study. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage
34 Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th ed., pp.301-316, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
35
36
37
38 Fon, (2018). Available at: <https://fon.com/>
39
40 Frenken, K. and Schor, J. (2017), "Putting the sharing economy into perspective", *Environmental
41 Innovation and Societal Transitions*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 3-10
42
43
44 Ge, Y., Knittel, C.R., MacKenzie, D. and Zoepf, S. (2016), *Racial and Gender Discrimination in
45 Transportation Network Companies*, National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge,
46 Massachusetts
47
48
49
50
51 Gilroy, P. (2004), *After Empire: Melancholia Or Convivial Culture?*, Routledge, New York.
52
53
54 Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967), "Discovery of grounded theory".Routledge, New York
55
56
57 Gollnhofer, J.F. and Schouten, J.W. (2017), "Complementing the dominant social paradigm with
58 sustainability", *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 143–152.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gössling, S. and Hall, C.M. (2019), "Sharing versus collaborative economy: How to align ICT
4 developments and the SDGs in tourism?", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp.
5 74-96.
6
7
8
9
10 Gouldner, A.W. (1960), "The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement", *American*
11 *Sociological Review*, pp. 161–178.
12
13
14 Griffith, E. (2013), "Does money taint the sharing economy?", *Pando*, 14 March, available at:
15 <https://pando.com/2013/03/14/does-money-taint-the-sharing-economy/> (accessed 25 June
16 2017).
17
18
19
20
21 Guercini, S. and Ranfagni, S. (2016), "Conviviality behavior in entrepreneurial communities and
22 business networks", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 770–776.
23
24
25
26 Guttentag, D., Smith, S., Potwarka, L. and Havitz, M. (2018), "Why tourists choose Airbnb: A
27 motivation-based segmentation study", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 342–
28 359.
29
30
31
32
33 Gyimóthy, S. (2017), "Business models of the collaborative economy", in Dredge, D. and
34 Gyimóthy, S. (Ed.), *Collaborative Economy and Tourism: Perspectives, Politics, Policies*
35 *and Prospects*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 31–39.
36
37
38
39
40 Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M. and Ukkonen, A. (2016), "The sharing economy: Why people participate
41 in collaborative consumption", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and*
42 *Technology*, Vol. 67 No. 9, pp. 2047–2059.
43
44
45
46
47 Hargittai, E. and Hinnant, A. (2008), "Digital inequality: Differences in young adults' use of the
48 Internet", *Communication Research*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 602–621.
49
50
51
52 Hasan, H. and Linger, H. (2016), "Guest editorial", *Information Technology & People*, available
53 at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-08-2015-0200>.
54
55
56 Henten, A. and Windekilde, I. (2015), "Transaction costs and the sharing economy", *info*, Vol. 18
57 No. 1, pp. 1-15
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Heo, C.Y. (2016), "Sharing economy and prospects in tourism research", *Annals of Tourism*
4
5 *Research*, Vol. 58, pp. 166–170.
6
7
8 Hsieh, JJ Po-An, Arun Rai, and Mark Keil. "Addressing digital inequality for the
9
10 socioeconomically disadvantaged through government initiatives: Forms of capital that affect
11
12 ICT utilization." *Information Systems Research* Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 233-253.
13
14
15 Hufton, C. (2016, April 22). Super Kitchen turns spare food into friendship. *The Daily Telegraph*.
16
17 Retrieved from [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/good-news/seven-seas/bringing-communities-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/good-news/seven-seas/bringing-communities-together-at-meal-times/)
18
19 [together-at-meal-times/](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/good-news/seven-seas/bringing-communities-together-at-meal-times/)
20
21
22 Ilich, J. (1973), *The Art and Skill of Successful Negotiation*, Prentice-Hall.
23
24 Jamali, D., Zanhour, M. and Keshishian, T. (2009), "Peculiar Strengths and Relational Attributes
25
26 of SMEs in the Context of CSR", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 87, pp.355-377.
27
28
29 John, N.A. (2013), "The social logics of sharing", *The Communication Review*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp.
30
31 113–131.
32
33 Kapczynski, A. (2010), "Access to knowledge: A conceptual genealogy". Access To Knowledge
34
35 In The Age Of Intellectual Property, Gaelle Krikorian, ed., Zone Press 2010.
36
37
38 Kathan, W., Matzler, K. and Veider, V. (2016), "The sharing economy: Your business model's
39
40 friend or foe?", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 59 No. 6, pp. 663–672.
41
42
43 Keiller, S. and Charter, M. (2016), "The second global survey of repair cafés: a summary of
44
45 findings" The Centre for Sustainable Design, Surrey Uk.
46
47
48 Kilbourne, W., McDonagh, P. and Prothero, A. (1997), "Sustainable consumption and the quality
49
50 of life: A macromarketing challenge to the dominant social paradigm", *Journal of*
51
52 *Macromarketing*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 4–24.
53
54
55 Kornberger, M., Leixnering, S., Meyer, R. and Hoellerer, M. (2017), "Rethinking the sharing
56
57 economy: The nature and organization of sharing in the 2015 refugee crisis", *Academy of*
58
59 *Management Discoveries*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp.314-335
60

- 1
2
3 Kumar, V., Lahiri, A. and Dogan, O.B. (2018), “A strategic framework for a profitable business
4 model in the sharing economy”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 69, pp. 147–160.
5
6
7 Laamanen, T., Pfeffer, J., Rong, K. and Van de Ven, A. (2016), “Business models, ecosystems,
8 and society in the sharing economy”, *Academy of Management Discoveries*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp.
9 218–221.
10
11
12
13
14 Ladegaard, I. (2018), “Hosting the comfortably exotic: Cosmopolitan aspirations in the sharing
15 economy”, *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 381–400.
16
17
18
19 Laurell, C. and Sandström, C. (2017), “The sharing economy in social media: Analyzing tensions
20 between market and non-market logics”, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol.
21 125, pp. 58–65.
22
23
24
25
26 Lawler, E.J., Thye, S.R. and Yoon, J. (2000), “Emotion and group cohesion in productive
27 exchange”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 106 No. 3, pp. 616–657.
28
29
30
31 Lennerfors, T.T., Fors, P. and van Rooijen, J. (2015), “ICT and environmental sustainability in a
32 changing society: The view of ecological world systems theory”, *Information Technology &
33 People*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 758–774.
34
35
36
37
38 Li, C. and Zhao, J. (2015), *Humanizing Travel: How e-Hail Apps Transform Stakeholder
39 Relationships in the US Taxi Industry*. Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting
40 Location: Washington DC, United States
41
42
43
44
45 Li, D., Liu, G., Jia, F. and Sun, H. (2019), “Sharing economy–based service triads: Towards an
46 integrated framework and a research agenda”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 218
47 pp.1031-1044
48
49
50
51
52 Lim, M.S. and Kim, J. (2018), “Facebook users’ loneliness based on different types of
53 interpersonal relationships”, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 646-665.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Mair, J. and Reischauer, G. (2017), “Capturing the dynamics of the sharing economy: Institutional
4 research on the plural forms and practices of sharing economy organizations”, *Technological*
5
6 *Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 125, pp. 11–20.
7
8
9
10 Malhotra, A. and Van Alstyne, M. (2014), “The dark side of the sharing economy ... and how to
11
12 lighten it”, *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 57 No. 11, pp. 24–27.
13
14
15 Marovelli, B. (2018), “Cooking and eating together in London: Food sharing initiatives as
16
17 collective spaces of encounter”, *Geoforum*, Vol. 99 pp.190-201
18
19
20 Martin, C.J. (2016), “The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of
21
22 neoliberal capitalism?”, *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 121, pp. 149–159.
23
24
25 McGrane, S. (2012), “Amsterdam tries to change culture with ‘repair cafes’”, *The New York*
26
27 *Times*, 8 May, available at: [https://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/09/world/europe/amsterdam-](https://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/09/world/europe/amsterdam-tries-to-change-culture-with-repair-cafes.html)
28
29 [tries-to-change-culture-with-repair-cafes.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/09/world/europe/amsterdam-tries-to-change-culture-with-repair-cafes.html) (accessed 5 August 2019).
30
31
32 Mervyn, K. and Allen, D.K. (2012), “Sociospatial context and information behavior: Social
33
34 exclusion and the influence of mobile information technology”, *Journal of the American*
35
36 *Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 1125–1141.
37
38
39 Mills, J. and Clark, M.S. (2013), “Communal and exchange relationships: Controversies and
40
41 research”, *Theoretical Frameworks for Personal Relationships*, Psychology Press, New York
42
43 pp. 41–54.
44
45
46 Mittendorf, C. (2016), “What trust means in the sharing economy: A provider perspective on
47
48 Airbnb.com”. Digital Commerce Conference, Association for Information Systems.
49
50
51 Molm, L.D., Peterson, G. and Takahashi, N. (1999), “Power in negotiated and reciprocal
52
53 exchange”, *American Sociological Review*, pp. 876–890.
54
55
56 Muñoz, P. and Cohen, B. (2018), “Entrepreneurial narratives in sustainable venturing: Beyond
57
58 people, profit, and planet”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 56 No. S1, pp. 154–
59
60 176.

- 1
2
3 Murillo, D., Buckland, H. and Val, E. (2017), “When the sharing economy becomes neoliberalism
4 on steroids: Unravelling the controversies”, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*,
5
6 Vol. 125 No. Supplement C, pp. 66–76.
7
8
9
10 Norbutas, L. and Corten, R. (2018), “Sustainability of generalized exchange in the sharing
11 economy: the case of the ‘freecycling’ Facebook groups”, *International Journal of the*
12
13 *Commons*, Vol. 12 No. 1.
14
15
16
17 Nowicka, M. and Heil, T. (2016), *On the Analytical and Normative Dimensions of Conviviality*
18
19 *and Cosmopolitanism*, Eberhard Karls Universität. Tübingen
20
21
22 O’Reilly, C. and Binns, A.J.M. (2019), “The three stages of disruptive innovation: Idea
23 generation, incubation, and scaling”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 61 No. 3, pp. 49–
24
25 71.
26
27
28 Ou, C.X., Pavlou, P.A. and Davison, R. (2014), “Swift guanxi in online marketplaces: The role of
29 computer-mediated communication technologies”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 209–
30
31 230.
32
33
34
35 Ozanne, L.K. and Ballantine, P.W. (2010), “Sharing as a form of anti-consumption? An
36 examination of toy library users”, *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 9 No. 6, pp. 485–
37
38 498.
39
40
41
42 Ozanne, L.K. and Ozanne, J.L. (2011), “A child’s right to play: The social construction of civic
43 virtues in toy libraries”, *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 264–278.
44
45
46
47 Palgan, Y. V., Zvolaska, L., & Mont, O. (2017). Sustainability framings of accommodation sharing.
48 *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, Vol. 23, pp. 70-83.
49
50
51 Parguel, B., Lunardo, R. and Benoit-Moreau, F. (2017), “Sustainability of the sharing economy in
52 question: When second-hand peer-to-peer platforms stimulate indulgent consumption”,
53
54 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 125, pp. 48–57.
55
56
57
58 Patton, M. Q. (2002), *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Piekkari, R., Welsh, C. and Paavilainen, E. (2009) Case study as disciplinary convention: evidence
4
5 from international business journals, *Organisational Research Methods*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp.
6
7 567-89.
8
9
- 10 Ranchordás, S. (2015), “Does sharing mean caring: Regulating innovation in the sharing
11
12 economy”, *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science and Technology*, Vol. 16 No. 1 pp. 413-477.
13
14
- 15 Ravenelle, A.J. (2017), “Sharing economy workers: selling, not sharing”, *Cambridge Journal of*
16
17 *Regions, Economy and Society*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 281–295.
18
- 19 Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (2003), *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science*
20
21 *Students and Researchers*, London: Sage.
22
23
- 24 Saarikko, T., Jonsson, K. and Burström, T. (2018), “Software platform establishment: effectuation
25
26 and entrepreneurial awareness”, *Information Technology & People*, Vol. 332 No. 3, pp. 579-
27
28 602.
29
- 30 Savolainen, R. (2009), “Information use and information processing: Comparison of
31
32 conceptualizations”, *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 65 No. 2, pp. 187–207.
33
34
- 35 Schneider, N. (2014), “Owning is the new sharing”, *Shareable*, Vol. 21, p. 2014.
36
37
- 38 Schor, J.B. (2017), “Does the sharing economy increase inequality within the eighty percent?
39
40 findings from a qualitative study of platform providers”, *Cambridge Journal of Regions,*
41
42 *Economy and Society*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 263–279.
43
44
- 45 Schor, J.B. and Fitzmaurice, C.J. (2015), “26. Collaborating and connecting: the emergence of the
46
47 sharing economy”, in Reisch, L. and Thøgersen, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on*
48
49 *Sustainable Consumption*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 410-425
50
51
- 52 Sharma, G. and Baoku, L. (2013), “Customer satisfaction in Web 2.0 and information technology
53
54 development”, *Information Technology & People*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 347–367.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Shaw, D., McMaster, R. and Newholm, T. (2016), “Care and commitment in ethical consumption:
4 An exploration of the ‘attitude–behaviour gap’”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 136 No. 2,
5 pp. 251–265.
6
7
8
9
- 10 Shi, J., Gui, L., Koutsonikolas, D., Qiao, C., & Challen, G. (2015). “A little sharing goes a long
11 way: The case for reciprocal wifi sharing”. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop
12 on Hot Topics in Wireless (pp. 6-10).
13
14
- 15 Siggelkow, N. (2007), “Persuasion with case studies”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50
16 No. 1, pp. 20–24.
17
18
- 19 Slee, T. (2016), *What’s Yours Is Mine: Against the Sharing Economy*. OR Books, New York
20
21
- 22 Stake, R.E. (1995), *The Art of Case Study Research*, Sage.
23
24
- 25 Sundararajan, A. (2016), *The Sharing Economy: The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-
26 Based Capitalism*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachussets.
27
28
- 29 Superkitchen. (2016). Super kitchen welcome pack. Reducing food poverty and encouraging
30 social eating. Internal Report provided by the company
31
32
- 33 Sutherland, W. and Jarrahi, M.H. (2018), “The sharing economy and digital platforms: A review
34 and research agenda”, *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 43, pp. 328–
35 341.
36
37
38
39
40
41
- 42 Tussyadiah, I.P. (2015), “An exploratory study on drivers and deterrents of collaborative
43 consumption in travel”, *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015*,
44 Springer, Cham, pp. 817–830.
45
46
47
48
- 49 Valenzuela, F. and Böhm, S. (2017), “Against wasted politics: A critique of the circular
50 economy”, *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, Vol. 17, pp. 23–60.
51
52
53
- 54 Wang, Y., Xiang, D., Yang, Z. and Ma, S. (Sara). (2019), “Unraveling customer sustainable
55 consumption behaviors in sharing economy: A socio-economic approach based on social
56 exchange theory”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 208, pp. 869–879.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Wilhelms, M.-P., Henkel, S. and Falk, T. (2017), “To earn is not enough: A means-end analysis to
4 uncover peer-providers’ participation motives in peer-to-peer carsharing”, *Technological*
5
6 *Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 125, pp. 38–47.
7
8
9
10 Willer, R., Flynn, F.J. and Zak, S. (2012), “Structure, identity, and solidarity: A comparative field
11 study of generalized and direct exchange”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 57 No. 1,
12
13 pp. 119–155.
14
15
16
17 Yin, R.K. (1994), *Applications of Case Study Research*, Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
18
19 Yuan, C.W., Hanrahan, B.V. and Carroll, J.M. (2018), “Assessing timebanking use and
20 coordination: implications for service exchange tools”, *Information Technology & People*,
21
22 Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 344-363.
23
24
25
26 Zervas, G., Proserpio, D., & Byers, J. W. (2017). The rise of the sharing economy: Estimating the
27 impact of Airbnb on the hotel industry. *Journal of marketing research*, Vol 54 No.5, pp. 687-
28
29 705.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Positive and negative consequences of the sharing economy in the three dimensions of sustainability

Positive	Negative
Environmental Impact	
Extension of useful life	Additional transportation or cleaning/repairs
Reduction in new product demand; less throughput	Extended use of inefficient products (e.g. old cars; white goods)
Economic Impact	
Low cost	Decline in industries such as hotels, taxis
New income potential	Unfair, unregulated competition
Increased access to resources	Monopolistic powers
Social Impact	
Social ties	Labour standards unclear, insecure working conditions
Social coherence	Safety, privacy, discrimination
Conviviality	Homophily

Table 2: Sharing platforms classification

		Non-Convivial	Convivial
Direct reciprocity	<i>Type of Exchange</i>	Negotiated exchange	Reciprocal exchange
	<i>Characteristics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Predefined contractual obligations - Mostly extrinsic motives - Sustainability is not a significant factor - Technology plays an important role - Social interactions are moderately important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-contractual obligations - Both intrinsic and extrinsic motives - Sustainability is a moderately significant factor - Technology plays a moderately important role - Social interactions are important
	<i>Examples</i>	Aibnb, Uber, Craigslist, Rentl, Onefinestay, Kickstarter, WorkAround, Curb Mobility	Couchsurfing, Blablacar, BeWelcome, CovEvent, MovingWorlds, Superkitchen
Non-direct reciprocity	<i>Type of Exchange</i>	Generalized exchange	Productive exchange
	<i>Characteristics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-contractual obligations - Mostly intrinsic motives - Sustainability is a significant factor - Technology plays an important role - Social interactions are not important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-contractual obligations - Mostly intrinsic motives - Sustainability is a significant factor - Technology plays a moderately important role - Social interactions are important
	<i>Examples</i>	Wikipedia, Linux, Freecycle, R programming, Slideshare, Apache OpenOffice, Fon wireless	Library of Things, Retoy, Train of Hope, Repair cafes, Fixit Clinic, Little Free Library

Table 3: Mapping the convivialist principles of our case studies

Convivialist principles	Repair Café	Superkitchen
Common humanity <i>i.e. shared compassion; understanding of suffering</i>	Shared endeavours to combat waste; environmental degradation; shared repair problems;	Shared endeavours to combat social isolation; food poverty; food justice; mental health and wellbeing; waste reduction and environmental degradation
Common sociality <i>i.e. shared, communal, community gathering</i>	Shared conversation, friendship and repairs; intergenerational and local community knowledge exchange	Shared eating, conversation and friendship; shared recipes and cooking skills; problem sharing and informal support.
Individuation <i>i.e. shared discovery and experience of meaning and purpose</i>	Shared sense of community and common purpose towards environmental goals; promotes generativity	Achieves living together with different people and creating a shared community, common purpose towards environmental and social justice goals; promotes <i>salutogenesis</i>
Managed conflict <i>i.e. limiting the negative aspects of conflict</i>	Accesses underutilized assets rather than competing for resources; recirculates household goods rather than added consumption; avoids throughput of raw materials; limited competition with tradespeople	Accesses underutilized food rather than competing for resources; recirculates surplus food rather than added consumption; avoids throughput of food waste; exists in parallel to DSP; transcends social barriers