Conceptualizing and Key Development Factors of the Sharing Economy in Contemporary Environment

Anna Valer'yevna MARKEEVA¹

¹ PhD in sociology, associate professor, Associate professor of Economic Sociology and Management Subdepartment, Department of sociology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation, e-mail: anna_markeeva@mail.ru
Address: 119991, Russia, Moscow, Leninskigory 1, bld.33, of 506

Abstract: We are already witnessing the emergence of a new economic paradigm - the sharing economy - that will radically transform way of life of society. The new economic paradigm is based on the values of a post-modern society - the imperative of sustainable development models, the growth of meaningful consumption and the development of new types of solidarity. The diversity of business and non-profit sharing services is a result of the growing areas of the sharing economy, the improvement of the technological infrastructure. The sharing economy takes place in organized systems or networks, in which participants conduct sharing activities in the form of renting, lending, trading, bartering, donation and swapping of different physical and non-material resources. The sharing economy framework is an "umbrella" concept. This approach generates not only problems (statistical accounting, regulation, etc.), but has benefits. "Flexible" methodologies that focus on the process of changing sharing practices provide great opportunities for understanding current socio-economic changes and making trustworthy forecasts. Global and country-specific factors determinate the development of sharing projects. Specific factors can include specific tax regimes; expansion of foreign digital platforms that popularize the culture of sharing, socio-cultural practices of non-market exchanges that have developed in countries, which are easily transferred and scaled from an offline to an online, etc. Russian authorities provide the best competitive conditions for sharing services, increase participants' trust, provide information support and promotion. The lack of state support for some sharing sector (in Russia – foodsharing and crowdfunding) leads to a slower its development.

Keywords: *sharing economy; sharing; the collaborative consumption; the accessed-based economy; collaborative economy; carsharing; foodsharing; crowdfunding; Russia.*

How to cite: Markeeva, A.V. (2021). Conceptualizing and Key Development Factors of the Sharing Economy in Contemporary Environment. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3Sup1), 94-112. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.3Sup1/353>

1. Introduction

"Temporality" is a characteristic feature of the post-modern human life. Sociologists note that the conversion of "temporality" into a stable social trend transforms many aspects of human life, penetrating and modernizing the foundations and norms of human interaction that have been established for centuries and destroys established social practices (Smirnov, 2014:5-8). No one is surprised by the growing popularity of speed dating services, the growing hybridization of goods and services that allows a modern person to satisfy several needs at once, the replacement of permanent, stable relationships with short-term and intimate ones. All this becomes a component of the emerging "snack" culture (Nam & Jung, 2021; Newman, 2010) and organically fits into the concept of socio-temporal "liquidity" (Bauman, 2008).

The global breakdown of the system of "strong" ties in favor of maintaining a few "weak ties" and contacts, the temporary nature penetrates into the economic system, radically changing the existing business models. The most tangible transformations are associated with the refusal to own property, the unwillingness of a person to bear the costs associated with ownership. As noted by Bardhi and Eckhardt (2017), modern consumers attach more importance to experience and quick access, rather than actual ownership. "Liquid consumption", based on such principles as flexibility, transience, detachment and speed, is becoming increasingly common around the world. It combines the tendency of rationalization with the need to find new experiences and emotions of consumptions. "Liquid consumption" is part of the global transformation to "liquid modernity", a stage in the development of society in which social structures and institutions are no longer stable or long-term, and this can not serve as "frames of reference for human actions and long-term projects" (Bauman, 2007, p.1).

It should be accepted that "liquid consumption" is not an evolutionary imperative: "liquid consumption can become re-solidified, and that there is not an inevitable move toward liquidity for all types of consumption" (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017, p.36). Post-modern society allows different types of consumption (liquid or solid consumption and many forms in between, if we consider these types of consumption as part of a vector) to coexist organically, enabling the individual to shift modes of action, to actualize one or another social networks, to move between different fields of meaning. However, various forms of "liquid consumption" are becoming widespread and is actively used by commercial organizations and users as a basis for business models that radically change

the nature and intensity of competition. These business models in the various embodiments (from a return to a new digital version of the p-2-p commodity exchange or donation to more complex options for co-production and co-consumption) are combined in the concept of sharing economy.

Since the first works have been devoted to share projects, two opposing points of view on this phenomenon have been formed. Some experts noted that there is nothing fundamentally new behind the phenomenon of sharing. Rental points for various equipment and devices, second-hand stores and mutual assistance cash desks existed earlier. The practices of exchanges, gifts, and mutual assistance in different historical periods were common among many groups of the population (for example, in the 70-80's in the USSR, the population actively used rental points for home appliances, sports equipment and mutual assistance cash desks), but they can not claim to be the basis for the formation of a new type of economy. Experts who adhere to traditional market views believe that the new model of the economy has no future: highlighting the lack of companies' interest to invest in innovations in conditions of inability to make a profit, pointing to the instability of the business model, and also pointing to the insignificant contribution of these projects to the countries' GDP.

Others pointed out that the sharing economy is "not a superficial idea, or a short-term trend, but a powerful cultural and economic force that rethinks not just what we consume, but how we consume" (Botsman & Roo, 2011, p. 15). In 2016, in a study prepared for the World Economic Forum in Davos, the development of sharing economy services was attributed to one of the leading technological drivers of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. The services and platforms of the sharing economy affect not only the development of markets, the expansion of opportunities for small organizations and individuals to produce and promote goods and services that were previously available only to large organizations, but also radically transform the requirements for employees, their skills and competencies (WEF, 2016, p. 13). According to the founder of the World Economic Forum in Davos, K. Schwab, their intensive dissemination in all over the world will lead to the need for a comprehensive discussion, rethinking the profound changes in the role of labor and capital in the new economic model; developing adequate responses to this "systemic challenge" of the new industrial revolution (Schwab, 2016).

Data on the current contribution of the sharing economy to the countries' GDP raise doubts about the need to pay attention to its

development. For example, the sharing economy market of Japan was estimated at 470 to 525 billion yen in 2018, which is comparable to the size of the carbonated drinks market in this country in 2011 (Yamasawa, 2018, p. 57). In this regard, we would like to express two arguments against such position. First, the existing system for assessing the contribution of new business models to GDP suffers from methodological flaws, which underestimates the real indicators of their contribution. There is a general lack of understanding or consensus on how to properly measure the sector's contribution to GDP. The statistics of countries take into account the indicators of a limited number of the business models' "umbrella" that it represents. Only a part of hybrid and prosumer (p-2-p) projects are taken into account. For example, adjusted research data in Japan show that the current GDP statistics does not reflect from 95 to 135 billion yen (0.022% of GDP) (Yamasawa, 2018, p. 58). As the scientific explanation and description of the platforms will be formed, the methodology assessing the contribution of sharing economy will be improved.

Secondly, the skeptical attitude of economists to the sharing economy does not prevent the active inclusion of the population in sharing practices. Today, millions of people are becoming active economic agents, changing the social and economic life of society with daily practices. They not only produce, but share everything with each other for free (information, goods, knowledge, etc.). They unite in communities to solve global and local social and environmental problems, social entrepreneurs create new socially oriented businesses, new companies are formed through crowdfunding; the "social" currency of the new economy appears (Rifkin, 2014).

Sharing practices fit the requirements of post-modern society - the growing need for models of sustainable development, the spread of meaningful consumption and the formation of new types of solidarity. There is a trend away from over-consumption and demonstration consumption. Consumers are engaging in mindful consumption restriction practices and demonstrating concern for sustainable use of resource and environmental degradation. Mindful and sustainable consumption is becoming a global process. While this style of consumption was initially confined to young people in developed economies, now research companies are finding it to be universal. The concept of the sharing economy responds to social change. It helps to harmonize the hedonistic motives of the individual, the desire to consume and form an identity through consumption, to gain new experiences and emotions with the demands of rationalization of consumption and environmental care (Niezgoda & Kowalska, 2020).

Sharing services not only have economic benefits for consumers, but also promote consumer habits and lifestyles that significantly reduce environmental damage.

The fragmentation of social life that is inherent part of liquid modernity leads people to search for new types of social contacts. There is currently a debate about the creation of new connections through sharing projects: some studies show that sharing services promote social solidarity and the formation of social capital (Penz et al., 2018), others point out that it is mainly creating "ephemeral, temporary bonds which serve a utilitarian purpose in the moment, rather than creating lasting bonds, which serve identity purposes" (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017, p. 27). It should be recognize, for economic, ideological and/or social reasons, sharing projects are now becoming popular. In 2019, 31.4% of the US adults (over 18 years old) was included in sharing economy projects (Kiesling, et al., 2018, p. 2). China demonstrates even more impressive results of the population inclusion. Thanks to the Government's 13th Five-Year Plan" of 2016, which laid down measures to stimulate the sharing economy in the key sectors of transport, housing, knowledge and skills, and everyday services for the first time, more than half of China's population - 800 million people - participated in sharing economic activities by 2020. Now, China is the world leader in the sharing economy, with a market volume of \$ 464.84 billion in 2019. Despite the fact that the annual growth rate has slowed down from the maximum growth values of 95.74 % in 2016, from 2017 to 2020 the average growth rate of China's sharing economy revenue was significantly higher than that of the traditional economy (Liu et al., 2020, p. 2).

Russia does not yet have data on the involvement of the population as a whole in the sharing economy. Two approaches are used as a tool for assessing its development: 1) indicators of the development of certain areas of the sharing economy are recorded (in monetary terms and the number of transactions); 2) surveys are conducted to demonstrate the degree of knowledge about sharing services and the intention to use them. The transactions on the main sharing platforms in Russia are amounted to about 1.07 trillion rubles in 2020 (+39% by 2019). In the pre-pandemic year, the sharing grew faster, the growth rate was 50% (2019) (RAEC, 2021 p. 3). The high interest of Russians in joining sharing has not been converted into real practice yet. Thus, 70% of respondents are aware of the sharing economy and existing projects, 81% express their willingness to use online services to rent or exchange a thing or service, and 78% are ready to share their property or provide a service on such services. However, only 25% of respondents have real experience as a consumer or a service/product

provider (RCCIT, 2018). This is due to a set of problems: existing gaps in the platforms regulation; low level of trust both in the services themselves and between users; existing digital gaps in the Internet using; existing state policy to support certain areas of the sharing economy that affect the interests of only young residents of large cities.

2. Sharing economy as an "umbrella" concept: to the debate about the definition of sharing economy

At the moment, there is a variety of approaches to the definition of a sharing company. They do not contradict each other, but reflect the variety of models and forms of the sharing economy manifestations that we are observing. The sharing economy is most often considered as a "collaborative consumption economy", seeing it as an alternative to owning private property. In this regard, we are talking mainly about two different consumption models: a model based on gaining access to a certain resource (the accessed-based consumption) and a model of actual joint consumption (the collaborative consumption). In the first case, it indicates a global trend associated with the transition from the model of selling a product or service to the model of selling a function for their use (Botsman & Roo, 2011; Avdokushin & Kuznetsova, 2019). In the second case, the researchers focus on the main task of the sharing economy platforms and services - the organization of collaborative consumption of goods and services, on the availability of technological tools or people and communities that "coordinate the acquisition and distribution of a certain resource for a fee or other compensation" (Belk, 2014, p. 1597). In this case, collaborative consumption is described through various types of exchange, rental and sale of goods or services for a fee or other forms of compensation, except in cases where no compensation is provided. The exclusion of exchange models without compensation (the ones at no charge), from consideration significantly narrows the concept, leaving a large range of implemented non-commercial projects without studying.

Another of the approaches connects the essence of the sharing economy not only with co-consumption or the organization of access to a certain resource, but also with the co-production of a product. In this regard, the sharing economy is considered as the "collaborative economy". We are talking about creating an economic system based on the idea that people and organizations should share, exchange existing or created resources (including in the form of collaborative activities), instead of buying and selling them (Ertz et al., 2019; Munger, 2018). The leading factors in the development of the collaborative economy are seen as collaborative

technologies: from public participation in scientific research, crowdsourcing and crowd wisdom up to online social engagement projects.

The variety of collaborative technologies in terms of the depth of people's involvement in the product creation and promotion (from contributive and collaborative projects to the co-created projects) determines the variety of model for organizing relationships in the sharing economy (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Belk, 2014; Scaraboto, 2015). Thus, a broadened view of the sharing economy as a socio-economic ecosystem built around the distribution (sharing) of human or physical resources; including both collaborative creativity, production, distribution and consumption of goods or services by people and organizations, better reflects emerging practices and models (Michellini et al., 2016, p. 99).

As already noted, the heterogeneity of existing projects within the sharing economy leads to a polarization views on its future. Some experts associate the development of the sharing economy mainly with services that allow realizing the altruistic motives of people (numerous donation sites, mutual assistance, etc.). They see it as an image of a new socially-oriented economy based on a system of universal cooperation and focused on solving socially significant problems (Dyal-Chand, 2015; McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2017; Rifkin, 2014). Others point out that such a romanticizing of the sharing economy is just a neat trick of digital platforms (as leading actors of this type of economy), trying to hide the priority of material benefits. In this view, it is more appropriate to talk about the successful socially-oriented positioning of platforms and services. Reciprocity, sustainability, environmental and social issues are just a marketing ploy to mask the true purpose of the projects (Booth, 2015; Malhotra & Van Alstyne, 2014; Shatkin & Yakovlev, 2020). At the same time, natural selection as a result of competition between models with prevailing non-market forms of exchange and hybrid business models may result to the consolidation of the latter as the basic (main) ones, contributing to the implementation of the platform capitalism. This is particularly alarming (Montalban et al., 2019; Zuboff, 2019).

Thus, Chinese scientists note that the "umbrella nature" of the sharing economy (a variety of models and unresolved issues in scientific circles around the definition) is the main obstacle to effective regulation and accounting, contributes to the emergence of fake business projects. This leads to the development of a quasi- and pseudo-sharing economy (Liu et al., 2020).

Overall, more specialists advocate the "demystification" of the sharing economy in order to eliminate mass abuses in the use of the trendy

term for pragmatic purposes, but also to avoid the spread of fake sharing projects.

Modern digital infrastructure opens wide opportunities (in time and spatial dimension) for organizing collaborative work, providing mutual assistance, for including unused or "underused" resources (intellectual, material, temporary, etc.) in the economic turnover, monetizing them immediately or receiving a new type of social currency in return (recommendations, reputation capital, etc.). The sharing economy as an "umbrella" concept includes a whole range of projects and services built on various forms of market and non-market exchanges (donation, barter) and allowing economic actors to be incorporated in economic activities, implementing both altruistic and purely pragmatic goals.

Contrary to current opinion, we believe that the "umbrella" of the sharing economy generates not only problems (statistical accounting, regulation, etc.). The umbrella nature of the concept allows us to cover the scale of the changes taking place, to see how various sharing practices and models are evolving, converging, etc. Attempts fix the boundaries of the sharing economy "here and now" reduce its diversity to private cases. For example, determination of the sharing economy borders by 7 key characteristics (access use rights instead of ownership, idle capacity, short term, P2P, internet platforms mediated, for monetary profit and shared value orientation) helps to identify sharing services (Liu et al, 2020) for which common regulatory mechanisms can be used. However, meaningful questions arise: why should foodsharing platforms, which are built in the B2C and do not pursue the material benefits, be excluded from the sharing economy? How legitimate is it to attribute sharing services that provide access not to knowledge and skills, but to people's emotions, to the pseudo-sharing economy? Especially in the context of the accelerating process of commodification.

We do not deny the possibility and need to identify components of the sharing economy, their key characteristics and social consequences. This is important for developing regulatory rules, eliminating the negative consequences of the sharing projects development for industries and/or economic actors. However, a broad view of the sharing economy as a continuously changing set of business/non-profit models and economic interactions is a more forward-looking research optics than a strict demarcation of the field of the sharing economy. It allows us to see a new model of the economy, which is not a direct alternative to the market or organization in its content, behind the current process of economic transformation. It can be assumed that as a result of the transformation, we

will come neither to the worst version of capitalism (rent or platform capitalism), nor to a socially-oriented collaborative economy. In the spirit of Polanyi's ideas (2002), a new economic model can be formed on the recombination of classical mechanisms coordinating economic activity: market exchange, reciprocity and redistribution with their new hybrid forms (including those that appeared due to digital transformation). Research optics, which considers the sharing economy through the continuums of interactions that take into account different types of participants' motivation (from giving to mandatory receipt of monetary benefits), different ways of organizing activities (offline, hybrid (offline and online) or online), different types of resources included in co-consumption, allows us to see the emergence of new model of economy in all its various manifestations. The model that combines the freedom of the participants' entry and exit, the fundamental absence of hierarchy, traditionally inherent in the market, with classical organizational elements - cooperation of the participants, the priority of the system of non-monetary valuations over monetary ones.

It should be recognized that the sharing economy is comprised of different elements which intertwine and have different emphases (Liu et al., 2020, pp. 5-6): collaborative consumption or the collaborative economy emphasizes people's collaboration and consumers' two-sided role; the peer economy focuses on individual-to-individual business models and reflects the community-based economy; the access-based consumption or rental economy stresses the value of access over ownership; the platform economy highlights the important role of technology.

3. Sharing economy: global and specific development factors

The development of sharing projects is influenced by both global and specific (country) factors. The spread of the sharing economy around the world could not be realized without the influence of three global trends: 1) spread of information technologies and the inclusion of various groups of the population in their use; 2) change of generations, the entry of cyber generations (Y and Z) into active economic activity, 3) urbanization processes strengthening.

The development of the sharing economy is primarily due to the active dissemination of digital technologies, which made it possible not only to include geographically and temporarily separated large groups of people in the process of collaborative production, exchange and consumption of goods and services, but also made these processes simple, convenient and cheap, significantly reducing the costs and risks of such activities.

The second trend is social. The nature of social transformations may not be as obvious as technological one, but it is associated with deep, revolutionary changes in the social order. The social driver is due to a change in the motivation of people who, like never before, strive to create something together, their deep desire to interact with each other, to share available resources free of charge. Sociologists attribute the growing popularity of the sharing economy to a generational shift. It is noted that the "digital generation" representatives socializing in the cyber environment have special skills and patterns of behavior and bring new social practices. Their internationalized consciousness, concentration on solving environmental and social problems, striving for self-realization, active interest in charity and volunteering– all this meets the ideals of the sharing economy. Young people are distinguished by a well-formed environmental thinking, a high level of sharing the sustainable development values, which is expressed in the requirements for the state, business, non-profit organizations to expand social and environmental initiatives. Young people also demonstrate a high level of involvement in socially-oriented and environmental practices. So, in Russia, the concern of young Russians with environmental problems, unsustainable use of resources has allowed us to bring sharing practices (carsharing, foodsharing, etc.) from the category of marginal to the mainstream ones.

No less important factor is the growing urbanization. Inhabitants of megacities are the great advocates of sharing services. The development of contemporary cities causes the deepening of many problems (transport, environmental, housing, etc.), which directly affect the quality of life of megacities` residents, its comfort, safety, cost. In these conditions, city residents do not wait for the problems to be solved by state or municipal authorities, but are actively involved in their solution by organizing communities. Many of these communities are built on the principles of the sharing economy. The research results show that the development of the sharing economy is also associated with the desire of urban residents to significantly reduce transaction costs, especially if the frequency of resource use is rare, and the cost of ownership is quite high (Horton & Zeckhauser, 2016).

These trends are the determinants of the sharing projects development in Russia. This can be confirmed by data on the portrait of a Russian user of sharing services: 56% of sharing services users are aged 18-30, with a very low percentage of users in older age groups due to insufficient digital skills. More than 75% of users live in megacities. The rapid development of sharing projects in Russian megacities is due to the

fact that it is easier for sharing communities to gain a critical mass of supply and demand in them - this is an important condition that makes collaborative consumption really convenient and reliable (RAEC, 2018, pp. 12-13).

In addition to global trends, there are specific factors that determine the rapid spread of sharing projects around the world. These can include specific tax regimes for sharing projects; expansion of foreign digital platforms that popularize the culture of sharing, socio-cultural practices of non-market exchanges that have developed in countries, which are easily transferred and scaled from an offline to an online, etc. The analysis of the Russian situation suggests that the specific driver of the sharing economy development in our country is the support of the state. State funding and administrative support for particular sectors and sharing services give the maximum effect. For example,

It is only through the action of the authorities interested in solving transport problems in Russian cities, Russia has become one of the leading countries in the development of carsharing and ridesharing in just 5 years. Despite the 2020 lockdown, which introduced significant restrictions on the operation of carsharing and carpooling services, they continue to occupy the 3rd place in the total volume of the sharing economy in Russia. In 2020, the total volume of these sectors amounted to 33.8 billion rubles (RAEC, 2021, p. 3).

A similar situation exists for service platforms. State programs to stimulate self-employment contributed to the effective growth of this segment. The law introducing a tax on the self-employed in all regions of the Russian Federation increased the volume of the Russian P2P part-time work market by 31%. By the end of 2020, it amounted to 183 billion rubles (RAEC, 2021, p. 6). Specialists of key Russian platform (Avito, YouDo, Profi. Ru) hope that the policy of the authorities interested in expanding self-employment and the telecommuting skills acquired through the self-isolation regime will lead to the expansion of self-employment, as opposed to the regular employment for different target of Russian.

The positive effect of state participation in the development of the sharing economy in Russia is manifested in three directions:

1. Creating competitive and favorable environment for sharing services. In comparison with a number of foreign countries, a "soft" regulatory regime is being implemented in Russia. This leads to growing resistance and conflict on traditional industry organizations and users (individuals and organizations) who are service providers on digital services.

However, the coincidence of the goals of the sharing services and the state allows them to receive the most-favored-nation treatment.

While the sharing services will help the state to solve strategic problems (transport and environmental problems of cities, problems of improving the quality of life of the population through the expansion of secondary and additional employment, employment legalization, etc.), a comfortable regulatory regime will be purposefully maintained. For example, despite the resistance of traditional taxi operators and the growth of strikes by taxi drivers dissatisfied with the activities of digital platforms (Uber, Yandex.Taxi, Citymobil. Taxi, etc.), these sharing services receive preferences and support from regional authorities. This is due to the fact that according to the data, from the development of Uber in Russia only, the increase in legal employment in for 4 Russian megacities (Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kazan, Novosibirsk and Yekaterinburg) amounted to 23.7 thousand people (Safiullin et al., 2017).

2. The state's involvement allows us to solve the problem of trust. According to the results of the Edelman Trust Barometer (2021), Russia ranks last in terms of trust among the 27 countries surveyed. The population of the country does not trust either state authorities (34 % - with an average of 53% for the participating countries), or business (34 % - with an average of 61 %), or public organizations (25%) (Edelman, 2021, pp. 42-45). In such institutional conditions, the development of sharing services is significantly hindered, because trust is one of the most important conditions for the sharing services. In an effort to expand sharing services, the state has taken a number of measures to verify users. For example, the Moscow Government has launched an experiment to verify the identity of sharing platforms users through the public services portal. Sharing services can work for free with the user identification system, the database of which includes about 9 million people - residents of Moscow Metropolitan area.

3. Information support and popularization of sharing services. Many of the existing projects are promoted on public services, as part of the major national or regional events. This has ensured the expansion of the service users audience without investments from digital platforms, has reduced the resistance and the fears of potential consumers and platform suppliers in short time.

Russian users are in favor of expanding the state's participation in the sharing economy. Russians support both the creation of state-owned sharing services (for example, similar to the People's carsharing project) and the expansion of regulatory practices (legislative consolidation of insurance on online services, penalties for failure to fulfill obligations, etc.). 73% of

users believe that this will increase the level of trust in sharing platforms, 68% indicate that such measures will contribute to solving user security problems (RCCIT, 2018).

Such a high state's involvement in the sharing projects also creates potential risks. Projects and services that currently do not fit into the priority state tasks, even if the need for them is formed among the population, cannot be fully implemented.

For example, this is evident in relation to foodsharing and crowdfunding projects in the Russian Federation. Russia demonstrates commitment to the sustainable development goals at different levels of government (state, local, corporate), but the development of foodsharing faces barriers. Today, at the stage of food sales and consumption in Russia, at least 16% of food products are lost (17 million tons of food that turns into food waste annually). Almost the whole volume of food waste (94%) ends up in dumps and landfills, where it becomes a source of soil, water and air pollution (RAEC, 2019, p. 3). However, despite the severity of the problem (it affects all regions of the Russian Federation), foodsharing services do not receive support from the state. Despite public initiatives, there are still tax and administrative restrictions that make retail work with food-sharing economically unprofitable. In 2020, a number of tax amendments were adopted that allow companies to take into account the value of property donated to socially oriented non-profit organizations, including foodsharing organizations, as a non-operating expense (up to 1% of the company's revenue). However, there are still a number of sanitary and epidemiological requirements for the sale of certain types of food, a ban on the return of product residues to manufacturers, which create a situation that it is cheaper for companies to dispose of products than to give them to foodsharing services. The government's lack of interest in the foodsharing is expressed in low financial and information support for the development of technological infrastructure in this sector. Foodsharing services need high-quality digital solutions for scaling. The leaders of Russian foodsharing are mainly charitable projects (the "Rus" Food-Sharing Fund, Foodsharing.Moscow "I will give food for free"), which do not have the resources to develop online platforms. Unlike other areas (carsharing, B2B sharing platforms, etc.), the state, with rare exceptions (the development of the bot @OneMlnTonsBot), does not stimulate hackathons, contests, does not allocate grants for the digital solutions in this sector.

This leads to a slower development of foodsharing in the Russian Federation than in Europe. The experts note very low indicators of solving the problem: in 2018, only 7 thousand tons of food were redistributed in

foodsharing (0.04% of the total food losses); limited territorial development of foodsharing (most projects are effectively functioning only in Moscow and St. Petersburg). As a positive point, it is indicated that foodsharing is growing dynamically (+20% in 2020), but such growth with such a low baseline is clearly not enough to effectively solve the problem of unsustainable resource consumption (RAEC, 2018; 2021).

The lack of state support for this sector leads to another negative aspect – foodsharing begins to spread purely as a charitable model. The experience of foreign countries demonstrates that foodsharing can also be implemented as a business model. The expansion of not only charitable, but also business models of foodsharing would allow retail companies to combine the economic goals of organizations and the solution of acute social problems at a higher quality level. In Russian conditions, it is possible to stimulate the development of B2B sharing models only with the active participation of the state.

The situation with the crowdfunding sector in the Russian Federation is even more complicated. In Russia crowdfunding is often associated with the financing of destructive (political and/or social) projects. The peculiarities of the development of crowdfunding platforms that resort to an international expansion strategy to ensure process optimization and a high level of customer service (Shneor et al., 2020, p. 507) raise concerns of the Russian authorities. These projects do not only receive state support (information, administrative, technical, financial) but fall into strict restrictions due to fears of loss of economic and/or political security. Starting from 2020, Russia has introduced minimum capital values for investment platforms; it has been established that the Bank of Russia will maintain the register of platforms; restrictions (monetary and legal) have been fixed for individuals and legal entities to attract investments through crowdfunding platforms. Limiting the possibilities of foreign financial inflows, controlling the movement of funds on platforms, etc. lead to the fact that the crowdfunding market is growing at a low rate (even compared to other areas of the sharing economy): from 2017 to 2020, no more than 5% per year, and the size of crowdfunding itself was estimated at 454 million rubles in 2020 (RAEC, 2021, p. 15). For comparison, the global volume of alternative financing in 2017 was \$418.52 billion (Shneor et al., 2020, p. 45). According to Statista's forecasts (2021), the cost of transactions in the crowdfunding segment will reach 959.0 million EUR in 2021. The Russian crowdfunding sector is very small in comparison with the sectors in other European countries. For example, the sector of the European crowdfunding leader - the UK - was estimated at \$834 million in 2020. It is also important

to emphasize the limited areas in Russia for co-financing. The main areas for fundraising are public projects, charity, music, cinema, literature and journalism. In Europe, co-financing is attracted to a variety of industries: food and beverages, healthcare and fitness, design and fashion, technology, advertising and marketing, construction and hotel services, consumer goods, data and analytics. Lobbying for the interests of traditional financial institutions is also partly a deterrent. A significant part of the largest players in the Russian financial sector are companies with state participation (Sberbank, VTB, etc.) that are not interested in developing co-financing practices.

If the government does not change its policy, create an institutional environment for co-financing, provide information support and popularize the tool among entrepreneurs and citizens, crowdfunding will remain only a part of charity.

The development of regulatory rules for sharing platforms is a global task, but the directions of state participation in stimulating sharing projects depend on the economic and socio-cultural conditions of certain countries. There is no common solution. For example, the experience of China with strict regulation and total control of sharing platforms and services (Cheng et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020) will not work in Russia. This is due not only to the low level of trust, but also due to the ambivalence of the existing relations between citizens, business and the state. Ambivalence is expressed in the demands for greater economic freedom and less state control in the economy, while at the same time it is necessary to reduce risks (up to their full compensation by the state) in case of negative outcomes. In the Russia, the main focus should be on creating environment for sharing services. Thus, it is necessary to popularize sharing practices in older age groups and support projects in medium and small cities, encourage the flow of investment and IT specialists, especially for non-profit sharing projects, educational programs to develop digital skills of the older population, ensure dialogue between traditional companies and sharing services, regulatory authorities and users.

4. Conclusions

In the future, an explosive growth of various types of sharing services and platforms and the formation of new types of social practices are predicted. This is due not only to economic factors: increased availability of service providers, reduced costs, personalization of services, but also to social determinants (changes in the values, motives and attitudes of people who want to co-create and share the results of their work). At the same time,

the inclusion of various age and economic groups of the population, the diversity of the sharing economy spheres in the countries will be due to the prevailing socio-cultural and regulatory conditions. In Russia, one of the key factors in the sharing economy development, which determines the effectiveness and diversity of the sharing economy models, is the state support.

The growth of sharing platforms, the increase in their contribution to the economic development of countries will actualize the discussion about the distinctive characteristics of the sharing economy. The problem of conceptual boundaries of the sharing economy (the defined criteria need to be comprehensive and inclusive, but also distinctive enough to accommodate its unique features in multiple contexts) will remain a key issue for theoretical debates in the coming years. This is because business and non-commercial models of the sharing economy will evolve and will be hybridized as a result of new technological (IT) solutions and the expansion of areas where sharing practices will be in demand. This will not allow us to fix the boundaries of the sharing economy and because of the diversity of existing models and the specific of their implementation in different countries, common rules of regulation cannot be used. "Flexible" methodologies that allow us to consider the sharing economy as an "umbrella" concept and research optics that focus on the process of changing sharing practices will provide great opportunities for understanding current processes and making forecasts.

Acknowledgement

Funding: The reported study was supported by the Interdisciplinary Scientific and Educational School "World Cultural and Historical Heritage Preservation" of the Lomonosov Moscow State University.

References

- Association of Electronic Communications (RAEC). (2018). *Co-Consumption Economics in Russia 2018*. <https://raec.ru/upload/files/raec-sharing-economy-nov2018.pdf>
- Association of Electronic Communications (RAEC). (2019). Foodsharing in Russia. <https://raec.ru/live/raec-news/11271/>
- Association of Electronic Communications (RAEC). (2021, February). *The sharing economy in Russia 2020. The test of for strength*.
- Avdokushin, E. F., & Kuznetsova, E. G. (2019). *Ehkonomika sovместnogo potrebleniya: sushchnost' i nekotorye tendentsii razvitiya* [Economics of

- Joint Consumption: Essence and some Development Trends]. *Economic Journal*, 2(54), 6-19. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ekonomika-sovmestnogo-potrebleniya-suschnost-i-nekotorye-tendentsii-razvitiya>
- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. (2012) Access-based consumption: The case of car-sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39, 881–898. <http://doi.org/10.1086/666376>
- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. (2017). Liquid consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44 (3), 582-597. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx050>
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2008). *Zhidkaya sovremennost* [Liquid Modernity]. Piter.
- Belk, R. (2014). You Are What You Can Access: Sharing and Collaborative Consumption Online. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1595–1600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001>
- Booth, A. (2015). “Sberingovaya” *ehkonomika, budushchee raboty i “postkapitalizm”*. [“Sharing” economy, the future of work and “post-capitalism”]. Per. from ang. A.Yu. Mironenko. <http://1917.com/XML/BQiA8fWBfUuPDqE5jcgZITNfUvM>
- Botsman, R., & Roo, R. (2011). *What's Mine is Yours: How Collaborative Consumption Is Changing The Way We Live*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cheng, X., Su, L., & Yang, B. (2020). An investigation into sharing economy enabled ridesharing drivers' trust: A qualitative study. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 40(4):100956. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eleap.2020.100956>
- Dyal-Chand, R. (2015). Regulating Sharing: The Sharing Economy as an Alternative Capitalist System. *Tulane Law Review*, 90(2), 241- 309. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2743959
- Edelman. (2021). Edelman Trust Barometer 2021. <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2021-01/2021-edelman-trust-barometer.pdf>
- Ertz, M., Durif, F., & Arcand, M. (2019) A conceptual perspective on collaborative consumption. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 9, 27–41. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs13162-018-0121-3>. doi:10.1007/s13162-018-0121-3
- Horton, J., & Zeckhauser, R. (2016, February). *Owning, using and renting: some simple economics of the “sharing economy”*. National Bureau of economic research. Cambridge. https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w22029/w22029.pdf
- Kiesling, L., Munger, M., & Theisen, A. (2018). From Airbnb to Solar: Toward A Transaction Cost Model of a Retail Electricity Distribution Platform.

- SSRN Electronic Journal*, paper no, 43, 1-40.
<http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20328.37128>
- Liu, C., Chan, R. C. H., Wang, M., & Yang, Z. (2020). Mapping the Sharing Economy in China. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6333.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166333>
- Malhotra, A., & Van Alstyne, M. (2014). The Dark Side of the Sharing Economy ... and How to Lighten It. *Communications of ACM*, 57(1), 24-27.
<http://doi.org/10.1145/2668893>
- Michelini, L., Pricipato, L., & Grieco, C. (2016). The social value of the sharing economy: a classification of innovative models in the food industry. *XXVIII Sinergie Annual Conference Referred Electronic Conference Proceeding Management in a Digital World*. Decisions, Production, Communication 9-10 June 2016 - University of Udine (Italy), 95 – 108.
<http://doi.org/10.7433/SRECP.FP.2016.07>
- Montalban, M., Frigant, V. & Jullien, B. (2019). Platform economy as a new form of capitalism: a Régulationist research programme. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 43, 805–824 <http://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bez017>
- Munger, M. (2018) *Tomorrow 3.0: Transaction Costs and the Sharing Economy* (Cambridge Studies in Economics, Choice, and Society). Cambridge University Press.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/9781108602341>
- McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2017) *Machine, Platform, Crowd: harnessing our digital future*. W.W.NORTON & COMPANY
- Nam, J., & Jung, Y. (2021) Digital natives' snack content consumption and their goals: A means-end chain approach. *Telematics and Informatics*, 63:101664.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2021.101664>
- Newman, M. (2010) New media, young audiences and discourses of attention: from Sesame Street to 'snack culture'. *Media, Culture & Society*, 32(4), 581–596.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443710367693>
- Niezgoda, A., & Kowalska, K. (2020) Sharing Economy and Lifestyle Changes, as Exemplified by the Tourism Market. *Sustainability*, 12(13), 5351.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135351>
- Penz, E., Hartl, B., & Hofmann, E. (2018). Collectively Building a Sustainable Sharing Economy Based on Trust and Regulation. *Sustainability*, 10(10), 3754. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103754>
- Polanyi, K. (2002). *Velikaya transformatsiya: politicheskiye i ekonomicheskiye istoki nashego vremeni* [The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time]. Aleteya.
- Regional Community Centre for Internet Technology (RCCIT). (2018). Sharing online services. Survey.
<https://rocit.ru/uploads/0aefe83a9e6d70e06f938c7492996e59a036b53c.pdf?t=1501493510>

- Rifkin, J. (2014). *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: The Internet of Things, The Collaborative Commons, and The Eclipse of Capitalism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Safiullin, M. R., Zaporozhets, O. N., Bychkova, O. V., Fazlyev, A. A., Savelichev, M. V., El'shin L.A., Ermolaeva, P. O., Mingazova, Yu.G., Prygunova, M.I., Demkina, E. P., Ishtiryakova, L. Kh., Shakirova, A. F. (2017) Analiz rynka gorodskogo peredvizheniya i vliyaniya Uber na razvitiye rynka v Rossii, s fokusom na sleduyushchikh gorodakh: Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg, Kazan', Novosibirsk i Ekaterinburg [Analysis of the urban movement market and the impact of Uber on market development in Russia, with a focus on the following cities: Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kazan, Novosibirsk and Yekaterinburg]. *Elektronnyi ekonomicheskii vestnik Tatarstana* [*Electronic Economic Newsletter of the Republic of Tatarstan*], 2, 4–63.
- Scaraboto, D. (2015). Selling, Sharing, and Everything In Between: The Hybrid Economies of Collaborative Networks. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42, 152–176. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv004>
- Schwab, K. (2016) *Chetvertaya promyshlennaya revolyutsiya* [The Fourth Industrial Revolution]. Eksmo Publishing House.
- Shatkin, M. A., & Yakovlev, L.S. (2020). Ehkonomika sovместnogo potrebleniya: sushchnost' i nekotorye tendentsii razvitiya [Transformation of ownership and authority in sharing economy] *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya* [*Sociological Studies*], 1, 31–41. <http://doi.org/10.31857/S013216250008322-7>
- Shneor, R., Zhao, L., & Flåten, B.-T. (Eds.). (2020). *Advances in Crowdfunding Research and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46309-0>
- Smirnov, M. A. (2014). Antropologiya nomadizma [Anthropology of Nomadism]. *Chelovek* [The Human], 3, 5–17.
- Statista. (2021). Alternative financing report 2021. <https://www.statista.com/outlook/dmo/fintech/alternative-financing/crowdfunding/worldwide?currency=eur>
- World Economic Forum (WEF). (2016, January). *The Future of Jobs. Employment, Skills and Workforce strategy for The Fourth Industrial Revolution Report*. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs.pdf
- Yamasawa, N. (2018). Statistical Understanding of the Sharing Economy. *Japan Spotlight*, art. No. 3, 57–60. https://www.jef.or.jp/journal/pdf/222nd_Special_Article_03.pdf
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. Public Affairs.