Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Negotiating Authenticity in the Management of the Digital Sharing Economy

Simon Dickinson

simon.dickinson@plymouth.ac.uk

University of Plymouth

Nicholas Wyke

University of Plymouth

Xavianne Howman

University of Plymouth

Anna Carey

University of Plymouth

Katelyn Tyler

University of Plymouth

Ben Hanson

University of Plymouth

Andrew Johnston

University of Plymouth

Megan Walsh

University of Plymouth

Research Article

Keywords: sharing, economy, digital platforms, authenticity theory, sustainability, Sweden

Posted Date: November 23rd, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11390474/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

NEGOTIATING AUTHENTICITY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE DIGITAL SHARING ECONOMY

Authors: Simon Dickinson, Nicholas Wyke, Xavianne Howman, Anna Carey, Katelyn Tyler, Ben Hanson, Andrew Johnston, Megan Walsh
Author affiliations: *University of Plymouth (UK)*
Lead Author contact details:
Dr Simon Dickinson. Email: simon.dickinson@plymouth.ac.uk

Funding Declaration: There is no funding to declare

Consent to Publish declaration: not applicable

Data Availability: The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due ethical agreements with participants, but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

Ethical Approval and Accordance: The project was approved by the University of Plymouth Faculty of Science and Engineering Research Ethics and Integrity Committee, in accordance with the Universities UK's Concordat to Support Research Integrit guidelines.. The research was carried out following the guidelines of the ethics committee and the approval documentation. This included informed consent to participate in the study being obtained from all participants.

ABSTRACT

Sharing initiatives are increasingly promoted as mechanisms for reducing resource consumption and supporting sustainability transitions, with many now facilitated through digital platforms. Yet tensions persist over what constitutes sharing through these spaces, as platform infrastructures can simultaneously support sustainability-oriented practices while reproducing market logics. Recognising that tension, this study engages with authenticity theory (Walter & Stepick, 2018) to examine what constitutes 'authentic' sharing amongst platform managers and explores how these moral judgements shape what is included/excluded. It draws from research with platform managers and users of the community-based digital sharing initiative *Smarta Kartan* in Sweden. The research illustrates that internal contestations about authenticity can be observed through three everyday negotiations: resilience (*what activities foster resiliency of the platform*?), community (*who benefits from an activity's inclusion?*) and exchange (*do activities that require financial exchange constitute sharing?*). This discussion extends existing applications of authenticity theory by demonstrating the complex temporalities of authenticity judgements within these: here, platform managers evaluated initiatives not only in terms of whether they currently embodied common values of sharing, but also according to their perceived capacity and ideological malleability that might eventually contribute to alternative futures. In doing so, the study (i) provides evidence of intersectional forms of authenticity shaping decision-making in place-based sustainability transition projects, (ii) illustrates everyday politics of managing digital sharing platforms, and (iii) contributes to existing accounts of the messy realities of doing economies differently.

Keywords: sharing, economy, digital platforms, authenticity theory, sustainability, Sweden

INTRODUCTION

Sharing economies have emerged as a prominent strategy for reducing the environmental impacts of contemporary consumption practices (Boar et al., 2020). Sharing holds the potential to reduce resource consumption, minimise waste, promote sustainable attitudes and behaviours, and build new social structures (Leismann *et al.*, 2013; Rolim & Baptista, 2021). The emphasis on *access over ownership* that underpins sharing has seen it argued as a potential strategic practice that can break down hyper-consumerist cultures (Schor et al, 2015) – instead offering forms of networking and collaboration that undermine understandings of consumption and ownership as an individual practice (Richardson, 2015; Martin, 2016). The more recent and increasing digitalisation of the sharing economy (specifically, the use of 'platforms' such as websites and apps) has thus been viewed with a hope of radical potential given the growth in sharing practices they have enabled (Atkinson et al., 2015; Parsons, 2014).

However, there are tensions and conflicts around the nature of sharing produced by digital platforms (Acquier et al., 2017; Schor, 2016; Markendahl *et al.*, 2018). On one hand, the types of actors that platforms often enable and empower (notably, global sharing-based corporations such as AirBNB and Uber) may in fact be entrenching 'business as usual' material relations (as well as generating inequality through employment precarity) (Richardson, 2015). On the other, platforms can create and promote new sharing activities – broadening the range and type of sharing in the relevant place (Martin, 2016). While this can increase the impact of sharing activities, it may also foster sharing that differs from initial imageries of what sharing is/is about (Belk, 2014). For example, activities involving financial exchange may resemble renting rather than sharing, while some forms of car-sharing may increase rather than reduce environmental impacts (Markendahl *et al.,* 2018).

At issue in decisions about what to include and exclude on sharing platforms is what is considered appropriate or 'authentic' sharing. Authenticity refers to judgements about the moral values or commitments of a particular actor or initiative, or evaluations about whether the practices of actors are aligned with the end-goals of that movement (Walker & Stepick, 2020; Glynn & Lounsbury, 2005; Luna, 2017). Rather than an individualistic judgment, evaluations of authenticity reflect shared sentiments and meanings that are entwined with organisational identity construction (Skrentny, 2006). Constructed judgments of authenticity are thus important in many change-orientated organisations because they stimulate reflexive questioning about who *we* are, as well as who or what to include (Walter & Stepick, 2020). The questions about sharing above thus demand decision-making about who or what to include – decisions that shape the scope, scale, impact and performance of sharing itself.

Recognising that little research has explored the everyday practices of managing sharing economy platforms, this paper examines narratives of what 'counts' as sharing – hereafter framed as the management (and negotiation) of authenticity. It examines actors within the digital sharing economy in Gothenburg, Sweden. Analysis of the evolution of one platform there (Smarta Kartan – introduced in the following section), highlights a current a lack of understanding of how sustainability initiatives manage growth – including the extent to which they must reflexively negotiate the aims of the platform itself. The study contributes to theoretical understandings of the contemporary sharing economy by interrogating the

relevance of existing theories of authenticity in social-change contexts (Walter & Stepick, 2020) and drawing attention to the situated practices through which those claims and decisions are made. The aim is thus to illustrate how the every-day practices of managing a platform frame the nature and scale of transformation made possible by sharing.

It is worth beginning by noting that, while discussions of authenticity are common in social movement studies (Luna, 2017; Dencik, 2015; Delehanty, 2017), digital sharing platforms don't fit neatly into that categorisation. Whereas social movements are generally characterised by attempts to work towards coherent goals and often act outside of institutional politics (Tilly, 2004), digital sharing initiatives often have: dynamic and dependent relationships with institutions (e.g. could be funded or supported by political bodies); diverse (and possibly contradicting) rationales for participation (e.g. breaking down capitalist norms versus profiting from them); platform specific motivations and geographies, and; participants moving between different roles in the system (e.g. consumer to provider) (Ertz et al., 2018). In another point of potential difference, the digital platform acts as an intermediary actor whose decision around inclusion facilitates and mediates sharing, but who does not oversee or participate in sharing itself (Ertz et al., 2018). All of these characteristics make sharing platforms qualitatively different and important to study.

The Smarta Kartan (SK) Platform

SK is a free digital mapping service that aims to 'increase participation in the close sharing economy' (Smarta Kartan, 2024). It operates as an open-source mapping tool that documents initiatives that promote access over ownership. Alongside promoting activities that prioritise access to goods and services, the platform states it is driven by values of positivity ('spreading inspiration'), participation (utilising 'co-creative methods'), sustainability, integrity, openness ('highlighting businesses that are open to everyone) and inclusion (Smarta Kartan, 2024).

SK now covers initiatives in 7 Swedish locations and, at the time of writing, lists 725 enterprises (258 of these in Gothenburg). As a platform, SK hosts a broad variety of resource circulation schemes that represent common forms of exchange and collaboration in the sharing economy (Ertz et al., 2018). Current schemes on the platform include variations in (i) legal status (e.g. *non-profit* community food initiatives and *for-profit* second-hand vintage clothing stores), (ii) intermediation type (e.g. *peer-to-peer* swapping events which allow direct contact between consumers and *peer-to-platform* schemes, such as car-sharing, which bypasses peer interaction) and, (iii) access length (e.g. *short-term access* activities including couch-surfing and toy-sharing, and *long-term access* activities including land-sharing initiatives). The variety and number of schemes on SK is argued to have (i) rapidly increased sharing in Gothenburg (Palm et al., 2019), and (ii) contributed to place-marketing discourses of Gothenburg as 'the sharing city' (Markendahl, 2019; Goteborg & Co, 2024).

BUILDING AND MANAGING THE CONTEMPORARY SHARING ECONOMY (SE)

The study is situated at the intersection of three lines of academic exploration. The first examines the contributions of sharing in responding to contemporary societal challenges – in turn detailing the various rationales for participating in a sharing economy. The second

examines the role of digital platforms in facilitating and growing these contributions. It is through discussion of the role of digital platforms that the question of what the sharing economy is (and is becoming) is illustrated. The third narrates the messy practices of 'building the future' in the present – with specific discussion about how authenticity theory (Walter & Stepick, 2020) helps make sense of the realities of trying to do things differently within hegemonic systems.

Rationales for Engagement

In regard to the first, participation in the sharing economy is argued to be driven by common (and sometimes overlapping) rationalities. Most frequently, both the provision and usage of sharing initiatives are framed by a desire to increase access to goods and services. Access in terms of affordance is a clear driver for many of those who use the sharing economy, allowing those with less to temporarily take possession of resources they couldn't otherwise afford leading to a reduction in the need for ownership (Richardson, 2015), offering broader and cheaper access to goods and services in the short term (Acquier et al., 2017) and fostering personal utility (including time-saving) (Echegaray & Hansstein, 2020). As a result, *access over ownership* is a well-researched tenet, and often tagline, of initiatives participating in the SE (Belk, 2014; Curtis & Lehner, 2019).

Alongside, and sometimes intertwined with, increasing access, 'community building' is often cited as an important, pro-social driver and benefit of the SE (Bellotti et al., 2015; Cherry & Pidgeon, 2018). For users, sharing can foster participation in a "collaborative community" (Akbar & Hoffmann, 2023) that prompts interactions underpinned by "shared values" (Bellotti *et al.*, 2015). This can also include ideas of political citizenship and community: both Ziesemer et al. (2021) and Camacho-Otero et al. (2018) evidence that sharing is used as identity markers for those rejecting capitalist norms. As such, spaces for sharing (such as repair cafes) are community spaces in that they foster local networks but also invite critique of the status-quo and create space for the performance of alternative ways-of-doing.

A consequence of increasing access and building community is that participation in the sharing economy decreases the environmental effects of consumption – whereby the resultant re-use of goods decreases resource production and encourages more-localised consumption (Cherry & Pidgeon, 2018; Akin *et al.,* 2020). While a definitive quantification of the environmental positives of sharing is difficult to assess, research from different sharing practices have highlighted reduced environmental impacts compared to 'normal' practices – including in the contexts of transport sharing (Baptista et al., 2014) and household sharing (Ala-Mantila et al., 2016). Importantly, however, even though it is recognized that environmental principles underpin many SE initiatives, both social and economic principles are more commonly cited as motivations for sharing by consumers (Hamari et al., 2016).

Growth and the Digitalisation of the SE

The second strand relates to the role of digital platforms in shaping how the sharing economy is performed. Digital sharing platforms are internet-based entities that intermediate decentralised exchanges among peers (Aquier et al., 2017), and thus form collaborative or peer-generated markets. These platforms, generally websites or apps that either host a variety

of initiatives or enable use of just one, are widely seen to have reshaped the way people acquire and consume goods and services (De Canio et al., 2020), and the emergence of a digital sharing economy is seen as one of the main drivers of a circular economy (Camacho-Otero, Boks & Pettersen, 2018). Existing work has focused on platforms working across different scales – from neighbourhood ('hyperlocal') apps such as Nabohjelp (Akin et al., 2021) or Patchwork Present (Light & Miskelly, 2015) to international platforms such as AirBnB (Bucher et al., 2018; Fang & Li, 2022) and Uber (Ahsan, 2020; Bak, Nawrocka & Jaremen, 2022).

Broadly, digital platforms have been argued to increase the *ease* and *scope* of sharing. In regard to ease, platforms now facilitate the sharing of goods and services between users who previously were unlikely to come into contact with one another, or exchanges that may have required specialist knowledges. Platforms such as Nabohjelp (Akin et al., 2021), Patchwork Present (Light & Miskelly, 2015) and Smarta Kartan (REF) now – in addition to 'traditional' sharing of household items – facilitate sharing of resources such as land, plants, knowledge, time, co-working spaces, and even bitcoin. In regard to scope, platforms have provided the capacity to move beyond local, personal and small-group sharing (Pouri & Hilty, 2021). International platforms such as AirBnB (Bucher et al., 2018; Fang & Li, 2022) and Uber (Ahsan, 2020; Bak et al., 2022) now enable SE exchanges to take place across geographical divides. Both the increase of ease and scope enabled by digital platforms has seen (i) evidence of increased participation in the SE across most demographics (Warwas et al., 2022) and, (ii) increased pro-environmental impacts as a result of sharing (Pouri & Hilty, 2018).

However, the growth of the sharing economy stimulated by digitalisation is viewed cautiously. Digital platforms have contributed to the creation of largely unregulated marketplaces where the peer-to-peer dynamic of small-scale sharing has been replaced by business-to-consumer exchanges. Concerns with labour rights and conditions of workers associated with AirBnB and Uber, in particular, have led to arguments that digital SE platforms have moved away from disrupting capitalist norms and are now instead fuelling unregulated spaces of 'capitalism-on-steroids' (Ahsan, 2020). Instead of creating collaborative spaces, digital platforms are resultantly stimulating competition as initiatives fight for a consumer base – resulting in intensification and monopolization of the SE (Schor, 2016). The introduction of a monetary motive (or, at least element) has also led to critiques of 'psuedo-sharing', whereby social or environmental principles are used as a way of increasing wealth accumulation (Khalek and Chakraborty, 2023; Bocker and Meelen, 2017; Oberdorf, 2023). While the contradictions of platform-mediated sharing are well documented, far less attention has been paid to how platform managers navigate these tensions in practice

Growth as a challenge to values? A theory of authenticity

The final strand relates to how to make sense of the embodied practices of working against hegemonic systems. Geographers, in particular, have drawn attention to how activists and activist organisations envision and perform 'autonomous geographies' in the context of capitalist systems – that is, the creation of spaces where non-capitalist and collective forms of politics, identity and citizenship can be imagined (Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). A dominant theme in this has been a common shared recognition (amongst activists) of the limitation of

dogmatic anti-capitalist positions (Holloway, 2002). Instead, being simultaneously against and within capitalist systems often requires the adoption of a plurality of values, a pragmatism that allows survival and a probing of the landscape for fissures of possibility (Gibson-Graham, 2006; Dickinson, 2018). Chatterton & Pickerill (2010) argue that actors working in these spaces "…accept that their everyday lives will weave together practices and values that will sometimes feel embedded or trapped in capitalist ways of doing things" (p.488). This might mean the adoption of language, practices or networks that bring actors into the system they are attempting to deconstruct (Chatterton, 2006) – perhaps toying with co-option as to leverage moments and spaces of opportunity (Dickinson, 2018).

One way in which these interstices and dynamics of co-option have been made sense of is through observations of how actors make valuations of authenticity. Valuation of authenticity refers to the process by which actors assess the worth, credibility, and legitimacy of potential new partners to grow and/or help achieve their ultimate aims (Amenta, 2010). Authenticity is a fundamental lens through which to observe contentious politics, because it becomes an embodied assessment through which networks, relationships and potential change-projects are evaluated. Importantly, valuations of authenticity are dynamic (i.e. changing over time) and relational (i.e. judged through and shaped by developing networks and assemblages) (Luna, 2017). Authenticity is thus a socially constructed quality that will fundamentally affect an initiative's perceived legitimacy, trustworthiness, and effectiveness.

Relevantly, in developing a 'theory of authenticity' in contexts of stimulating societal transformation, Walker & Stepick (2018) identify two distinct forms of authenticity valuations. *Grassroots authenticity* refers to judgements of perceived alignment with idealised notions of a sustainable society, emphasising community-based origins and genuine commitment to the cause. On the other hand, *institutional authenticity* relates to judgements of whether actors 'fit' – to what extent do they align with other organisations/actors in the initiatives? While grassroots authenticity can enhance an organisation's fundamental legitimacy, institutional authenticity increases its access to resources and can ensure sustainability (fuelling growth and thus social impact). Failure to undertake these valuations can lead to judgements about inclusion that can undermine public support and/or project ambitions and ideologies.

However, as Walker & Stepick (2018) acknowledge, there are still a lack of understanding in how different organisational forms strategically signal different combinations of characteristics of authenticity to different audiences – including prospective initiatives and partners. While these applications of authenticity theory have had some application in contexts of activism (Odziemkowska, 2022; Pacheco & Khoury, 2023; Piazza & Wang, 2020), the sharing economy/collaborative economy context (with all of its paradoxes and divergent rationales for participation) (i) remains unexamined through this lens, and (ii) we know little about how precious actors negotiate authenticity to grow and survive.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is a part of a larger project into the sharing economy in Sweden and the UK. The project adopted a multi-method approach in Gothenburg (Sweden) across three research visits between 2022-2025 – combining semi-structured interviews with stakeholders and participant

observation methods. Although the following outlines the process and rationale for both methods in Gothenburg (as they frame and inform the researchers' situated knowledges), this paper draws only from data in the semi-structured interviews.

First, researchers undertook a form of participant observation by visiting projects listed on the platform – participating in sharing activities and conversing with volunteers and visitors. The rationale for this was to build an understanding of the platform/projects to inform interview questions, to build (however fleeting) senses of insiderness with participants, and to develop senses of reciprocity in sharing/volunteering with local people and projects (Goerisch, 2017). In total, 17 initiatives on Smarta Kartan were visited in 2023, 2024 and 2025 (including second-hand clothing stores, repair workshops and shared event/'creative' spaces). Written ethnographic observations were collected at all sites, as well as any documents related to the projects or platform.

Second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 8 participants who were involved with the management or support of the Smarta Kartan platform, or who were/had been an initiative on the platform (see Table 1). A judgemental (purposive) sampling strategy – defined by non-random selections made on determinations of relevance to the study (Rice, 2010) – was used to identify and recruit participants. Participants 1,3,4 and 6 were interviewed in 2022 and 2023 as a part of the project establishment and have thus been interviewed twice – meaning that the analysis draws from 12 interviews.

Interviews ranged in length (from 45 minutes to 3 hours) and questions followed a similar thematic format: (i) exploring the relationship of the participant to sharing and Smarta Kartan in Gothenburg, (ii) exploring their rationales for sharing as a practice and visions of the role of sharing in future urban life, (iii) exploring attitudes towards the growth of sharing in the city (and, if relevant, the growth of their project), and (iv) examining the role of digital platforms in that growth. In total, 26 hours of interview material was gathered. In doing so, discussion often gravitated towards hopes and worries with either the current impacts of Smarta Kartan, or the future direction of it.

286

Participant	Relationship to the sharing economy	Justification for project recruitment	Date/s and location/s (in brackets) of interview
1	Co-founder of a city-based sharing organisation that started SK. This involved personally and collectively managing the platform	Insight into the establishment and everyday management of SK	May 2022 and May 2023 (in a community café)
2	A member of the city-based sharing organisation that started SK.	Insight into the establishment and everyday management of SK	May 2024 (in a café in Gothenburg)
3	A civil servant whose work focuses on increasing citizen engagement in democratic and sustainability initiatives Gothenburg	Their department has intermittently funded and advertised SK. Involved in discussions about setting up the platform and can provide insight into original and developing rationales of the project	April 2022 and May 2023 (in local government offices)
4	A manager/organiser of a government-supported sharing initiative on Smarta Kartan	Insight into the process of applying to/being accepted by SK. Insight into the impacts of being on the platform	May 2022 and May 2023 (in local government offices)
5	A manager of a repair workshop on Smarta Kartan	Insight into the process of applying to/being accepted by SK. Insight into the impacts of being on the platform	May 2023 (in the repair café)
6	A manager of a community sustainability project that has decided not to participate in Smarta Kartan	Recruited through snowball sampling, with suggestion of value in talking to a group who disagreed with SK management strategies	May 2022 and May 2023 (in the community project space)
7	A volunteer at the same community sustainability project that does not participate in SK	Recruited through snowball sampling, with suggestion of value in talking to a group who disagreed with SK management strategies	May 2024 (in the community project space)

8	A civil servant who writes sustainability policy for Gothenburg and had conducted previous research on sharing	Contextual understanding of SK and its growth amongst broader sharing practice/discourse in Gothenburg. Has knowledge of SK activities through engagement with all founders and managers since its inception	April 2023 (in a local café)

287

All data were transcribed and analysed in NVivo. Bingham's (2023) qualitative analysis process informed a thematic analysis that utilised both inductive and deductive codes, with subsequent axial coding. Deductive codes were related to the over-arching project aim of examining how sharing economies stimulated and managed growth, including: *'growth', 'decisions', 'inclusion', 'exclusion', 'digital' and 'goals'*. The themes selected for discussion in this paper emerged from (i) a decision about which codes/themes demonstrated discussions about authenticity and (ii) using hierarchy charts in NVivo which demonstrated the themes with the most data (and nuance within that data).

DISCUSSION

The remainder of the article discusses the ways in which authenticity is discussed and negotiated by participants of the sharing economy. Discussion focuses on how growing the sharing economy stimulates a paradox, where the belief of growth promises increased societal and environmental impact but simultaneously promotes forms of sharing that are considered less authentic in the short-term (or, at least, requires decision-making about the inclusion of this sharing). This paradox can best be observed through three concepts that demonstrate the (messy) intersectional nature of grassroots and institutional authenticity: resilience, community and exchange.

Resilience

The first theme relates to decisions that affect the ability of the sharing platform to continue to function. It is worth noting that the sharing economy is characterised by issues related to resiliency – that is, the ability to sustain activity particularly in response to changing societal or economic issues. Resilience in these terms is about initiative or platform *capacity* (rather than the *outcome* effect on local communities). Some research has documented the difficulty faced by small-scale sharing initiatives in ensuring survival, namely difficulties in sustained government funding (Martin, 2016), lack of community resources/space (McShane & Coffey, 2022) and the challenges of dealing with regulatory bodies (Ganapati & Reddick, 2018). Other work has also highlighted the challenges in building absorptive capacity in larger initiatives (such as car-sharing or room-renting initiatives, including AirBNB and Uber), which tend to focus on platform infrastructure and increasing market share (Yuan et al, 2022; Floetgen et al., 2021).

In the context of Smarta Kartan, participants often referred to the challenges of the resiliency or 'survive-ability' of an initiative built on short-term state funding. SK received government funding to establish itself and, although the platform is still supported by various government departments (including having government-run sharing initiatives on the platform itself), that funding has decreased over time aside from some small additional grants (such as that provided by a local tourism board). Managed by a voluntary community organisation, the platform now relies on *"…unpaid labour, crowd-funding, more unpaid work, grants, more unpaid work and cities paying licensing fees…in that order"* (SK Co-Founder, 25/04/23) to maintain its existence. The same co-founder then explained how the ability to survive – and the limitations

on growth in projects generated by grants and unpaid labour – shapes the impact of the platform:

> "The money that helped set up Smarta Kartan is gone but it's started this project that needs ongoing time and money to survive. At the same time it's doing positive things. We obviously want to keep that going, yeah? So…if we grow we have more impact but then we also need more time and resource. At the moment it's at a sort of perfect spot from a labour and money perspective…you know, it can run and there's enough projects in Gothenburg to fuel it. But it could be doing a lot more...it could be bigger, it could be more accessible…I've got a million ideas." *(SK Co-Founder, 25/04/23)*

As a result, building resiliency for SK required negotiating between the inclusion of initiatives that aligned to original platform values and those who may not align, but whose inclusion could increase awareness/practices of sharing.

Fostering resilience led to SK needing to reframe initial visions of what and who 'fitted' in with the platform (i.e. institutional authenticity). Fit, in its initial form, appeared to be defined by things that didn't conform elsewhere but who were also characterised by (i) deep-rooted connections to place-based communities and (ii) a vision for alternative futures: *"we want the projects that are doing things differently to make all our lives better…the ones trying to give hope…in places you might not expect to see it" (SK Co-Founder, 25/04/23)*. Although fit, in these early days, was defined by this inability to fit elsewhere, the sustainability of the project forced the inclusion of more institutionalised and commercialised practices over time. Most notably, this internal reflection on values can be observed around the decision by platform organisers to include second-hand shops on SK – a decision which was seen as a challenge to the reputation and image that the platform had built. The decision was stimulated by a desire to make the platform sustainable (which included being resilient), a recognition of the growing societal recognition of the sustainability discourses of second-hand shopping, and an awareness of the messiness of community projects in relation to dogmatic values (e.g. second-hand shops also often ran repair cafes or other sustainability events. How could the platform advertise one but exclude the other?). When spoken to in 2023, one co-founder expressed that this inclusion (which had just been approved) clashed with the philosophy of the platform and created space for potential co-option:

> "I'm totally against it. I think we're making a mistake, and it makes me angry. If our line is 'access over ownership'…second-hand shops are not about that. I can't find the words…it's not the same thing. You're not lending something to someone. Fine…it's a better way of getting things to people who need them…it's still only the normal capitalist system we've all created." *(SK Co-Founder, 25/04/23)*

On second interview in 2024, the Co-Founder had shifted their perspective to recognise the growth and impact value of their inclusion:

> "I was totally against it…I'm still kind of but there's good and bad things…What has changed my mind is these second-hand shops, they have thousands of people on Instagram. They send word about sharing and the platform to others." *(SK Co-Founder, 1/04/24)*

Authenticity is this context is observed through the tension of including activities that could increase the resiliency of the platform but simultaneously contributes to capitalist modes of exchange.

An important consideration (and rationalisation), however, is the way in which this paradox works. Rather than creating space for co-option and entrenchment, the (i) sharing of the platform through social media and (ii) the establishment of a recognised relationship between more-and less-authentic sharing activities are perceived to reconfigure and potentially eventually upset existing economic practices through their proximity to other projects. By extending the remit of what is included SK is creating space for users to *"come into contact with people, projects and cool things" (SK Co-Founder, 25/04/23).* In this instance, the inclusion of seemingly 'less' grassroot and institutionally authentic activities are justified not only because it fosters survive-ability but because it creates encounters with 'more' authentic sharing activities.

Community

The second theme relates to how authenticity is negotiated through questions of what communities are built and represented through sharing. Previously noted, community-building is an often-cited rationale for growing the SE and these communities are often defined as much by what they include as by what they reject and exclude (i.e. capitalist rationalities) (Richardson, 2015). While digital platforms expand the scope and ease in which these communities are created, they can also alter the forms of social capital that are built through sharing exchanges. This can include a change in the actors involved (e.g. from peer-to-peer to business-to-peer) or even removing the necessity for face-to-face interaction. In other words, platforms can challenge grassroot visions of authenticity that value civically engaged publics and place-rooted peer-to-peer interaction.

In the case of SK, inclusion on the platform is underpinned by a belief in the necessity to foster local peer-to-peer connections. Initiatives that foster face-to-face interactions between residents are prioritised. It is believed that an emphasis on face-to-face interactions has a two-fold effect, whereby (i) localised impact is generated and (ii) the effects and benefits of sharing are made most visible. A civil servant associated with SK illustrated the latter by suggesting that the physical spaces associated with sharing are places where otherwise abstract notions of community can be witnessed: *"The most visible impacts of sharing is the building of a community. There's places where you can see that…toy libraries, bike kitchens, food waste initiatives etc. They're the places where people who have shared interests and needs come" (29.04.24).*

Additionally, the tangibility of these physical interactions are important because it's through face-to-face connection that further dialogue about the radical potential of sharing can be had. In this way, the act of sharing is valued not just because of the environmental (or otherwise) impact of that act itself, but also because of the future radical possibilities it engenders. A significant example of this is one of the founders of SK, who runs a neighbourhood 'sharing café' that he frames as a *"hub for sharing and other sharing start-ups"* (30/04/24) and what

he terms as *"...a place for sharing, yes, but crucially a place for talking and for ideas"* (25/04/23). Outlining a bike-to-work scheme (listed on SK) that he had founded, the same participant highlighted how face-to-face interactions are opportunities for knowledge dissemination: *"I bike with them from their house to their work and during that trip they just ask me all the questions you would need to know".* He later noted that, "…*when you talk to people all sorts of possibilities and opportunities come out"* (30/04/24). Another participant, a civil servant running an initiative on SK, echoed this by highlighting that sharing is all about *"...the people that you meet…the stories that you learn and take away"* (29/04/24). As such, in prioritising activities that have visible 'impact' and generate opportunities for face-to-face contact, SK platform managers are prioritising activities that foster deliberative and politically-purposeful sharing practices.

Participants also expressed a hesitation – or even signalled conflict – about including initiatives that did not generate local spaces of interaction (i.e. representing a valuation of grassroots authenticity). On one hand, this often manifested around whether to include digital initiatives such as car-sharing and room-renting apps, that do not rely on physical spaces or a necessity to meet. While acknowledging that digital communities were valued, from the outset SK managers agreed that international corporations (such as AirBNB or Uber) could not be advertised on the platform in part because they did not contribute to building local social capacities. One founder stated, *"It's not sharing when you're paying money to someone and something you've never met...we're a platform to make it easier for local people to access local things*" (29/04/23).[1] In their minds, digital communities were most useful when rooted in physical interaction: *"ideally people can meet with one another and then carry that relationship out online if they need to…same with digital projects, it's so much better when they have a space you can go to if you need to"* (SK Founder, 29/04/23)

On the other, conflict about inclusion was formed around the question of *'what community actually benefits from being included on Smarta Kartan?'* In some instances being regarded as local didn't solely justify inclusion and, instead, assessments were made about how the benefit-receiving community valued sharing. These value-differences also led to some initiatives refusing to be a part of the SK platform. One study participant – a representative of a community sustainability project – highlighted that they were approached by SK but felt as though inclusion fuelled an insular SE limited to "*a corporate creative bubble*" rather than the users of their initiative:

> "He [SK representative] was very excited to come into the building, [but] he made the project sound like it was all about them. Our work in the organization was nothing…he had so many ideas of... changing it, changing everything so it would not benefit us" (Sustainability Project Manager, 28.04.24)

These tensions reveal a belief in authentic sharing as consisting of tangible or existential exchange that builds local community. Activities that are underpinned by social networking deriving from communal consumption – or, at least, increased access – are prioritised in the

[1] See following section for further discussion on the dynamics of monetary exchange

management of the SK platform, normally at the exclusion of initiatives that are perceived to fail to build social capital through exchange. Importantly, to be authentic (and thus acceptable), in these instances, is comprised not just of participating in the seemingly radical act of sharing, but also incubating spaces for radical possibility that are engendered through social exchange. The above quote, however, indicates that these visions are not conflict-free, and that how this is achieved (and who it serves) is being constantly negotiated between groups.

Exchange

The final theme relates to how discourses of authenticity and authentic sharing were observed through what can be exchanged through the act of sharing. As a form of non-reciprocal and pro-social behaviour (Benkler, 2004), sharing has historically been regarded as separate from the market economy, where exchange is financial and doesn't require communality (Minami et al., 2021). As previously discussed, however, these systems aren't always neatly distinct from one another. In some instances, activities that require financial exchange (e.g. renting) are marketed as sharing (Belk, 2014). In others, financial exchange is required to facilitate growth of the sharing economy (e.g. to cover the costs of volunteers or associated infrastructure).

A theme across participants was tension about whether initiatives that required financial exchange (e.g. renting or buying something for a reduced cost) could be included on SK (i.e. a negotiation of institutional authenticity). Most commonly, participants narrated a process whereby an initial definitive principle was gradually challenged by the realities of generating platform security and growing the impact of the broader SE in Gothenburg. For example, a founder of the platform bluntly stated, *"true sharing…there's no money involved"* (30/04/24). That position – shared by others in the organisation that managed SK – provided a guiding principle that defined what could and shouldn't be included on the platform:

> "No rental companies, which means no AirBnB. No second-hand shops. No car renting or sharing…they almost always cost money and are backed by investors wanting money on their investment…only free person-to-person exchange can be there" (26/04/23)

While definitive, this over-arching principle was soon challenged by the realities of ensuring the sustainability of the platform, as well as ensuring that it had local impact. For SK, the afore-discussed decision to include second-hand shops was illustrative of this tension. The inclusion of these initiatives came from a recognition that they were often hosted in spaces that promoted sharing of different kinds – but also that they in some way provided *access* to goods and services to groups that could not otherwise afford them. The latter was also a reoccurring justification for their inclusion amongst participants not involved in the management of the platform: *"Sharing... contributes to social and economic sustainability too such as getting access for things people couldn't otherwise afford*" (civil servant, 29.04.24)

Despite broadening the eligibility of initiatives, participants expressed that doing so changed the dynamic of social interaction involved. In one instance, a civil servant noted that financial exchange equated to commercialisation:

> "You can have a fantastic connection with an actual person, but i think if the experience itself became more commercialised, it will spoil the authenticity" (Civil Servant, 29.04.24)

In another, the co-founder of SK highlighted how the money introduces a form of reciprocity and expectation that isn't found in more authentic forms of sharing:

> "There can be money involved but the more money involved the less it will be collaborative, right? So, if I'm buying something from you it's a completely different transaction than if I was giving something to you, like I'm not expecting anything from you if there's no money involved but [if I'm] paying you for something I'm expecting something else…Money ruins everything, right?" (SK Co-Founder 29.04.24)

At a later point, the SK Founder went further to explain the impact that would have on the public perception of the platform:

> "With the money involved, I wonder if we lose credibility too, right? We become another scheme accused of greenwashing"

The notion of 'ruin' reflected above demonstrates a belief that introducing financial exchange into the SE may support some of the proposed benefits of sharing (increasing participation and supporting the resilience of platforms) but also erodes at the authenticity and legitimacy of the platform itself. This perception reflect elements of 'astroturfing' often observed during the frotwh of social initiatives, whereby an advocacy group is labelled as 'fake' or 'insincere' because they no longer represent a genuine cause and instead reinforced capitalist norms (Lyon and Maxwell 2004).

The notions of ruin and commercialisation also reflect a sense of simultaneous questioning of grassroots and institutional authenticity in light of increasing access. Participants framed sharing as a relational experience, where the provision of access also engenders a mutually rewarding exchange that both parties benefit from (see also Kromidha et al., 2021). The management of the SK platform indicates a dynamism in the prioritisation of authentic exchanges, whereby conscious sacrifices to authenticity are admitted when the broader goals of increasing *access* are met.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the management of authenticity among platform actors of the digital sharing economy platform, Smarta Kartan. It has provided insight into how place-based sharing economy digital platforms manage the tensions between visions for radical alternative futures and the realities of ensuring platform growth and survival. A key finding of the study is that maintaining and growing the sharing economy stimulates a paradox, where the belief of growth promises increased societal and environmental impact but simultaneously promotes forms of sharing that are considered less authentic. For participants, being against and within the system they are seeking to change meant that their work required weaving together practices that sometimes felt as though they were embedding the system they sought to change, and at other

times felt more radical and progressive (see also Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). This study has demonstrated how this 'weaving' takes place and how the inclusion of less change-orientated sharing was rationalised and managed in ways that still serve fundamental platform values.

The study has engaged with Walter & Stepick's (2018) call to examine how non-traditional social change organisations make value judgements about authenticity to "deepen their impact with different audiences, grow, and survive" (p. 19). The focus on a digital sharing platform that occupies a complex space in the sharing economy – operating as a facilitator and mediator of sharing and who has a dynamic (and sometimes reliant) relationship with institutional politics (Ertz et al., 2019) – has provided a unique opportunity to apply authenticity theory (originating in social movement studies) to a sustainability transitions context. In applying authenticity theory to the governance of a digital sharing platform, this study identifies a temporal dimension to authenticity judgements. Assessments of authenticity were not based solely on whether initiatives aligned with platform values in the present, but also on their perceived capacity to contribute to more transformative futures. Platform managers therefore evaluated authenticity partly through anticipated trajectories of change and future political potential. In this instance, managers were willing to include initiatives that did not fit their mold or align with original platform goals if they held potential to foster deliberative and politically-purposeful sharing practices. Future work might consider – particularly within the discourses of co-option that characterise emerging social ventures (Dickinson, 2018) – how assessments of authenticity consider temporalities and possible futures.

In addition to the theoretical contribution of the study, the study has highlighted two further ways in which valuations of are important in understanding how alternative economies and ways-of-doing are constructed and performed. First, in negotiating trade-offs between platform resilience and 'authentic sharing', emphasis is placed upon the physical sites through which sharing takes place. In the context of SK, sharing was considered as productive acts through which visions for alternative economies and communities could be envisioned. Essential to this was the building and maintenance of physical spaces that supported alternative ways-of-doing. It also indicates the presence of messy and contradictory spaces that complicate dualistic framings of 'true' and 'pseudo' sharing (Belk, 2014a).

Second, the ways in which participants discussed authenticity revealed a complex politics of inter- and intra-community building. Common across most participants involved with SK was a belief that authentic sharing was characterised by peer-to-peer interaction that build social capital amongst participants. As well as reinforcing the belief in the value of physical sites for sharing, the value of interaction was used to justify the exclusion of initiatives on the platform. However, while a relatively uniform set of values (such as being anti-capitalist or the need for local participation) established a common ground between initiatives and SK management, the study highlighted tensions (or questions) around who benefitted most from inclusion. The notion of community, in these contexts, was considered in a two-part way: first, the values (and politics) of buying-into the SK community as an initiative (and thus fuelling a broader 'sharing movement') and, second, the extent to which local communities/networks would benefit from that buy-in (whose community benefitted most from a bigger sharing movement?). These

considerations reveal the challenge of ‘scaling up’ and growing alternative systems by actors who are primarily driven by small place-based projects (see also Routledge, 2003).

As such, this study has used authenticity as a lens through which the embodied decision-making of constructing alternative futures and systems can be observed. With the outcomes of the research drawing attention towards complex relationships between the digital and ‘real’ worlds, future work must further examine the diversities of entrepreneurial ‘enablers’ operating within the sharing economy. Walter & Stepick’s (2018) call has in part been responded to here with a focus on digital platform management, but there is still much to be learnt about the extent to which sharing "enablers" will continue to engage with digital, and at what "level" or scale. Additionally, with a key limitation of the study being the representational (or partial) nature of semi-structured interviews as a method to observe situated practices, future research could employ embedded methodologies to better witness atmospheres and processes of decision-making.

REFERENCE LIST

Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T. and Pinkse, J. (2017) 'Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: An organizing framework'. *Technological forecasting & social change*, 125, 1-10.

Ahsan, M. (2020) 'Entrepreneurship and Ethics in the Sharing Economy: A Critical Perspective' *Journal of business ethics,* 161(1), 19-33.

Akbar, P. & Hoffmann, S. (2023) 'Collaborative space: framework for collaborative consumption and the sharing economy'. *Journal of Services Marketing* 37(4), 496-509

Akin, D., Jakobsen, K. C., Floch, J. & Hoff, E. (2021) 'Sharing with neighbours: Insights from local practices of the sharing economy' *Technology in Society,* 64, 12.

Ala-Mantila, S., Ottelin, J., Heinonen, J., & Junnila, S. (2016). To each their own? The greenhouse gas impacts of intra-household sharing in different urban zones. Journal of Cleaner Production, 135, 356-367.

Amenta, Edwin, Neal Caren, Elizabeth Chiarello, and Yang Su. 2010. "The Political Consequences of Social Movements." Annual Review of Sociology 36(1): 287–307

Atkinson, R. D., McTernan, M., & Reed, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Sharing in the Success of the Digital Economy: A Progressive Approach to Radical Innovation*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bak, A., Nawrocka, E. & Jaremen, D.E. (2022) '"Sustainability" as a Motive for Choosing Shared-Mobility Services: The Case of Polish Consumers of Uber Services'. *Sustainability,* 14(10), 21.

Baptista, P., Melo, S., & Rolim, C. (2014). Energy, environmental and mobility impacts of car-sharing systems. Empirical results from Lisbon, Portugal. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *111*, 28-37.

Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of consumer research*, *39*(4), 881-898.

Belk, R. (2014a). Sharing versus pseudo-sharing in Web 2.0. *The anthropologist*, *18*(1), 7-23.

Belk, R. (2014b). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of business research*, *67*(8), 1595-1600.

Bellotti, V., Ambard, A., Turner, D., Gossmann, C., Demková, K. & Carroll, J. M. (2015) 'A Muddle of Models of Motivation For Using Peer-to-Peer Economy Systems'. *33rd Annual CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI).* Apr 18-23, Seoul, SOUTH KOREA, Assoc Computing Machinery, 1085-1094.

Benkler, Y. (2004) 'Sharing Nicely: On Shareable Goods and the Emergence of Sharing as a Modality of Economic Production'. *The Yale law journal,* 114(2), 273-358

Bhalla, S. (2023) 'Motivations and Constraints of Collaborative Consumption, Testing the Mediating Role of Attitude and nature of Trust' *Vision-the Journal of Business Perspective* 27(2), 189-201

Bingham, A. J. (2023). From Data Management to Actionable Findings: A Five-Phase Process of Qualitative Data Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*

Boar, A., Bastida, R., & Marimon, F. (2020). A systematic literature review. Relationships between the sharing economy, sustainability and sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, *12*(17), 6744.

Bocker, L. and Meelen, T. (2016) 'Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for intended Sharing Economy participation'. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions,* 23, 28-39.

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., Fleck, M. & Lutz, C. (2018) 'AUTHENTICITY AND THE SHARING ECONOMY'. *Academy of Management Discoveries,* 4(3), 294-313

Chatterton, P. (2006). 'Give up activism' and change the world in unknown ways. Or, learning to walk with others on uncommon ground. *Antipode* **38** 259–82

Chatterton, P., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Everyday activism and transitions towards post-capitalist worlds. *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers*, *35*(4), 475-490.

Cherry, C. E. & Pidgeon, N. F. (2018) 'Is sharing the solution? Exploring public acceptability of the sharing economy'. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 195, 939-948.*

Cogoy, M. (2004). Dematerialisation, time allocation, and the service economy. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, *15*(2), 165-181.

Cook, I., Evans, J., Griffiths, H., Morris, R., & Wrathmell, S. (2007). 'It's more than just what it is': Defetishising commodities, expanding fields, mobilising change…. *Geoforum*, *38*(6), 1113-1126.

Curtis, S. K., & Lehner, M. (2019). Defining the sharing economy for sustainability. *Sustainability*, *11*(3), 567.

De Canio, F., Nieto-Garcia, M., Martinelli, E. & Pellegrini, D. (2020) 'The motives behind consumers' intention to use peer-to-peer accommodation: an fsQCA application'. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 32(9), 2969-2989

Dickinson, S. (2018). Spaces of post-disaster experimentation: agile entrepreneurship and geological agency in emerging disaster countercartographies. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, *1*(4), 621-640.

Echegaray, F., & Hansstein, F. (2020) 'Share a ride, rent a tool, swap used goods, change the world? Motivations to engage in collaborative consumption in Brazil' *Local Environment,* 25(11-12), 891-906

Fang, Y.H. & Li, C.Y. (2022) 'Does the sharing economy change conventional consumption modes?' *International Journal of Information Management,* 67, 17.

Featherstone, D. (2003). Spatialities of transnational resistance to globalization: the maps of grievance of the Inter-Continental Caravan. *Transactions of the IBG* **28** 404–21

Floetgen, R. J., Strauss, J., Weking, J., Hein, A., Urmetzer, F., Böhm, M., & Krcmar, H. (2021). Introducing platform ecosystem resilience: leveraging mobility platforms and their ecosystems for the new normal during COVID-19. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *30*(3), 304-321.

Frenken, K. & Schor, J. (2017) 'Putting the sharing economy into perspective'. *Environmental innovation and societal transitions,* 23, 3-10.

Ganapati, S., & Reddick, C. G. (2018). Prospects and challenges of sharing economy for the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, *35*(1), 77-87.

Garrod, B., Zhao, A.L. and Koenig-Lewis, N. (2023) 'A greener way to stay: The role of perceived sustainability in generating loyalty to Airbnb', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 110, p. 103432. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2023.103432.

Gibson-Graham, JK. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis MN

Glynn, M.A., & Lounsbury, M. (2005). From the Critics' Corner: Logic Blending, Discursive Change and Authenticity in a Cultural Production System. *Journal of Management Studies,* 42(5): 1031–55.

Goerisch, D. (2017). “Doing good work”: feminist dilemmas of volunteering in the field. *The Professional Geographer*, *69*(2), 307-313.
Goteborg & Co. (2024). *The world’s most sustainable destination!* Retrieved from https://www.goteborg.com/en/places/smartakartan-se-2
Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the association for information science and technology*, *67*(9), 2047-2059.
Harvey, J., Golightly, D., & Smith, A. (2014). Giving and sharing in the digitally-mediated economy. Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 905–906.
Holloway J 2002 *Change the world without taking power* Pluto, London
Hossain, M. (2020) ‘Sharing economy: A comprehensive literature review’ *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 87, 11.
Ivanova, D. and Büchs, M. (2023) 'Barriers and enablers around radical sharing'. The Lancet. Planetary health, 7(9), pp. e784-e792. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(23)00168-7.
Kansal, P. and Bhalla, S. (2023) '10 years of consumer behavior in collaborative consumption: a systematic literature review of open access articles'. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, p. 24. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2023.2245548.
Khalek, S.A. and Chakraborty, A. (2023) ‘Do I share because i care?’: Investigating the factors influencing consumer’s adoption of shared consumption’. *Business Strategy and the Environment.* Volume 32 (Issue 8, p.g. 5669-5685)
Kromidha, E., Gannon, M., & Taheri, B. (2023). A profile-based approach to understanding social exchange: Authentic tour-guiding in the sharing economy. *Journal of Travel Research*, *62*(2), 324-344.
Leismann, K., Schmitt, M., Rohn, H. and Baedeker, C. (2013) 'Collaborative Consumption: Towards a Resource-Saving Consumption Culture'. *Resources {Basel}*, 2(3), pp. 184-203
Light, A. & Miskelly, C. (2015) ‘Sharing Economy vs Sharing Cultures? Designing for social, economic and environmental good’. *Interaction Design and Architectures,* 24, 49-62.
Lyon, T., & Maxwell, J. (2004). Astroturf: Interest Group Lobbying and Corporate Strategy. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 13*(4), 561–97.
Luna, Z. (2017). “Who Speaks for Whom? (Mis)representation and Authenticity in Social Movements. *Mobilization 22*(4), 435-450.
Markendahl, J., Hossain, M. I., Mccormick, K., Lund, T., Möller, J., & Näslund, P. (2018). Analysis of sharing economy services: Initial findings from sharing cities Sweden. *Nordic and Baltic Journal of Information and Communications Technologies*, *2018*(1), 239-260.
Martin, C. J. (2016). The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism?. *Ecological economics*, *121*, 149-159.
McShane, I., & Coffey, B. (2022). Rethinking community hubs: community facilities as critical infrastructure. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *54*, 101149.
Minami, L. A., Ramos, C. & Bortoluzzo, A. (2021) ‘Sharing economy versus collaborative consumption: What drives consumers in the new forms of exchange?’ *Journal of business research,* 128, 124-137.

Nguyen, S., Didi Alaoui, M. & Llosa, S. (2020) 'When interchangeability between providers and users makes a difference: The mediating role of social proximity in collaborative services'. *Journal of business research,* 121, 506-515.

Oberdorf, I. (SEK) (2023). *KIT - KIT - Media - Press Releases - Archive Press Releases - PI 2018 - Sharewashing Undermines the Culture of Sharing*. [online] www.kit.edu. Available at: https://www.kit.edu/kit/english/pi_2018_118_sharewashing-undermines-the-culture-of-sharing.php#:~:text=Sharewashing%20is%20a%20similar%20strategy [Accessed 17 Mar. 2024].

Odziemkowska, K. (2022). Frenemies: Overcoming audiences' ideological opposition to firm–activist collaborations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 67(2), 469-514.

Palm, J., Södergren, K., & Bocken, N. (2019). The role of cities in the sharing economy: Exploring modes of governance in urban sharing practices. *Energies*, *12*(24), 4737.

Panori, A. (2024) 'Platforms Enhancing Proximity in the Digital Era'. *Platforms, 2(1), 1-14.*

Parsons, A., 2014. The Sharing Economy: A Short Introduction to its Political Evolution. opendemocracy.net. 21 January 2014 <http://www.sharing.org/information-centre/articles/sharing-economy-short-introduction-its-political-evolution>

Pacheco, D. F., & Khoury, T. A. (2023). Social movements and entrepreneurial activity: A study of the US solar energy industry. Research Policy, 52(1), 104621.

Piazza, A., & Wang, D. J. (2020). Claim specialization, tactical diversity and the protest environment in the success of US antinuclear activism. Mobilization: An International Quarterly, 25(1), 93-114.

Pouri, M. J., & Hilty, L. M. (2018). Conceptualizing the digital sharing economy in the context of sustainability. *Sustainability*, *10*(12), 4453.

Rice, S. (2010). Sampling in Geography. In *Key Methods in Geography* (Eds. Nicholas Clifford, Shaun French, Gill Valentine), pp.230-252.

Richardson, L. (2015). Performing the sharing economy. *Geoforum*, *67*, 121-129.

Rolim, C. C. and Baptista, P. (2021) 'Sharing Lisboa: A Digital Social Market to Promote Sustainable and Energy Efficient Behaviours'. *Climate {Basel}*, 9(2)

Schor, J. (2016) 'DEBATING THE SHARING ECONOMY'. *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics*, 4(3)

Seyfang, G. (2009). *The new economics of sustainable consumption: seeds of change.* Palgrave, Macmillan

Shaheen, S. A., Chan, N. D. and Gaynor, T. (2016) 'Casual carpooling in the San Francisco Bay Area: Understanding user characteristics, behaviors, and motivations'. *Transport Policy*, 51, pp. 165-173. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2016.01.003.

Skrentny, J. (2006). Policy Elite Perceptions and Social Movement Success: Understanding Variations in Group Inclusion in Affirmative Action. *American Journal of Sociology 111*(6), 1762– 1815

Smarta Kartan (2024) *About The Smart Map.* [Online]. Available at:https://www.smartakartan.se/en/about-the- smart-map/

776 Stephany, A. (2015). *The business of sharing: Making it in the new sharing economy*.
777 Springer.
778 Toth, G., & Szigeti, C. (2016). The historical ecological footprint: From over-population to
779 over-consumption. *Ecological Indicators*, *60*, 283-291.
780 Vezzoli, C., Kohtala, C., Srinivasan, A., Diehl, J. C., Fusakul, S. M., Xin, L., & Sateesh, D.
781 (2017). Product-service system design for sustainability. In *Product-Service System Design*
782 *for Sustainability* (pp. 49-86). Routledge.
783 Voulvoulis, N. (2022). Transitioning to a sustainable circular economy: The transformation
784 required to decouple growth from environmental degradation. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, *3*,
785 859896.
786 Walker, E. T., & Stepick, L. (2020). Valuing the cause: A theory of authenticity in social
787 movements. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, *25*(1), 1-25.
788 Yuan, R., Luo, J., Liu, M. J., & Yu, J. (2022). Understanding organizational resilience in a
789 platform-based sharing business: The role of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Business*
790 *Research*, *141*, 85-99.
791 Ziesemer, F., Hüttel, A. and Balderjahn, I. (2021) 'Young People as Drivers or Inhibitors of
792 the Sustainability Movement: The Case of Anti-Consumption'. *Journal of Consumer Policy*,
793 44(3), pp. 427-453. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-021-09489-x.

794
795
796