



LUND UNIVERSITY

**SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT – DEPARTMENT OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

MSC IN GLOBALIZATION, BRANDS & CONSUMPTION

**Collaborative Consumption Studies in the Less Affluent
World: The Problematic Legacy of the Less Affluent World
Traits**

- Master Thesis -

Handed in by: Soraya Maya, Yun Zhai,

Supervisor: Jon Bertilsson

Research field: Consumer Culture Theory

23th May 2013

ABSTRACT

Title: Collaborative Consumption Studies: The Problematic Legacy in the Less Affluent World's Traits

Date of the Seminar: May 28th, 2013

Course: BUSN39: Master Thesis in Globalization, Brands and Consumption

Authors: Soraya Maya and Yun Zhai

Supervisor: Jon Bertilsson

Subject: Consumer culture Theory

Language: English

Student paper type: Master

Publishing Year: 2013

Keywords: Collaborative Consumption, Less Affluent World, Affluent World, Globalization, Global Consumer Culture, Postcolonial Theory, Materialism.

Abbreviations: CC: Collaborative Consumption; AW: Affluent World; LAW: Less Affluent World.

Thesis purpose: The purpose of this thesis is to provide a new approach to the study of collaborative consumption. This new approach is to study collaborative consumption in the less affluent world from consumer culture theory apart from any managerial inclination in order to abstract the understanding of consumption patterns of the less affluent world towards collaborative consumption. The study aims to provide empirical consumer insight in Colombia, as representative of the Less Affluent World.

Methodology: A qualitative research method and semi-structured interview are adopted for this research. The interviewees are selected by the effect variables that affect one's motivation and perception on collaborative consumption. Insights can be interpreted through the consumer culture theoretical approaches and based on their interview narratives.

Theoretical perspective: The research question is based on consumer culture theory, and with focus on the global consumer culture and its impact on consumption patterns in the Less Affluent World.

Empirical data: Semi-structured interview with five local Colombians with distinctive personal life experience and participated in certain forms of collaborative consumption.

Conclusion: The study shows that the collaborative consumption that the Colombian interviewees experienced is not falling into the comprehensive elements of authentic collaborative consumption, because of the trust issue hinder people's collaboration in a

sense of wider scale, the researchers conclude that the collaborative consumption in Colombia is solidarity consumption within their nuclear family member. As a result of material possessiveness and colonialism, Colombian consumers lack a comprehensive understanding of the context of collaborative consumption and are less willing to involve wide range of goods. And the collaborative consumption is so far mainly understood in the Western construct instead of in the setting of Less Affluent World, the associated focus on Less Affluent World's identity shall be raised.

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1.	Background:	6
1.2.	Problematization	8
1.2.1.	CC as a contemporary construct of the LAW.....	8
1.2.2.	CC studies in the LAW.....	10
1.2.3.	Globalization and the global consumer culture and its impact on the consumption patterns of the LAW.....	12
1.2.4.	Studies of social capital in Colombia revealing a society that lacks of Trust.....	13
1.2.5.	What is problematic about CC in the LAW?.....	14
1.3.	Research Question.....	15
1.4.	Literature Review.....	17
1.4.1.	Collaborative Consumption	18
1.4.1.1.	The Collaborative Economy	18
1.4.1.2.	Particularities of Collaborative Consumption.....	21
1.4.2.	Solidarity Consumption.....	24
1.4.2.1.	Solidarity Consumption among family members.....	26
1.4.3.	Research opportunity: Criticism to the literature and prior understanding...26	
1.5.	Research Purpose and contribution.....	27
2.	CHAPTER II: Theory.....	29
2.1.	Consumption.....	29
2.2.	Sharing.....	31
2.2.1.	Sharing and the user commitment derived from temporary access.....	32
2.3.	Materialism	33
2.3.1.	Material possessiveness and the life satisfaction derived from it.	35
2.4.	The gift giving economy and its pro social sense embodied as charity.....	36
2.5.	Consumption as a relationship builder	38
2.6.	Trust and social capital	38
2.7.	Postcolonial theory, Globalization and Global Consumer Culture.....	40
3.	CHAPTER II: Methodology.	
3.1.	Research Philosophy.....	43

3.2.	Research design.....	44
3.3.	Data Collection Technique.....	45
3.4.	Data Analysis.....	47
3.5.	Conclusions.....	47
3.6.	The World of the Research Informants.	48
3.6.1.	What does signify the LAW? Soraya.....	49
3.6.2.	What does signify an emergent country? Tinco.....	50
3.6.3.	Why is Colombia a good example for this research?.....	51
4.	CHAPTER IV: Data Analysis	
4.1.	Pattern No. 1: Possession of Use-value And Symbolic Value.....	52
4.2.	Pattern No. 2: Materialism in the LAW as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture.....	57
4.3.	Pattern No. 3: Materialism as a result of the colonialist theory and the global consumer culture.	61
4.4.	Pattern No. 4: Gift giving and charity as a disincentive to CC practices or as a distortion of CC.	53
4.5.	Pattern No. 5: Social Implication of Possession.....	65
4.6.	Pattern No. 6: Lack of Habitual Consumption of Secondhand Goods.....	66
4.7.	Pattern No. 7: Lack of trust and social capital in the LAW as a disincentive for CC.....	67
5.	CHAPTER V: Discussion	
5.1.	Materialism as a result of the traits of the LAW.....	71
5.2.	The prevalence of the gift giving practice in the light of trust.....	75
6.	CHAPTER VI: Conclusion.....	77
7.	CHAPTER VII: Contribution.....	80
8.	CHAPTER VIII: Limits and future researches	83
9.	Bibliography and reference list.....	84
10.	Appendices.....	94

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter intends to present the current available theoretical and empirical information of collaborative consumption. Moreover, theoretical discourses are presented in order to address the research question. The research purpose is supported.

1.1. Background

“As I looked at my own life and listened to people around me, I realized that people were talking less about what they owned, and more about what mattered in their lives - things like the health, friendships, traveling, meeting new people, getting inspired, sharing good food, creating great memories, and having more time to spend with their families. I was also hearing: Hey, I don’t need two cars. Maybe I don’t need all these toys in my house. Maybe I don’t even need this big house. They were beginning to wonder about the intense focus on “acquisition” in our culture over the last fifty years. When I traveled to Chile, Argentina, and several places in Europe – Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Paris, and Brussels – this conversation became more ubiquitous and substantially louder” (Gansky, 2010, pp. 63).

This quote arouses a discussion that centers on two concepts, acquisition and ubiquity. Acquisition is “the act of acquiring possession of something” (Oxford Dictionary, 2013) and ubiquity is the “property of being present everywhere” (Wikipedia, 2013). Consequently, the author appeals to reflect upon the perception that people from all over the world are questioning their focus on acquiring possessions and shifting to a mind-set of valuing experiences and living a convenient lifestyle. However, the author centers the discussion on the emergent phenomenon of collaborative consumption.

The most complete contemporary definition of collaborative consumption comes from two North American authors, Rachel Botsman (2010) and Lisa Gansky (2010). Their definitions converge in the general stance that CC enables people to have greater access to goods and services diminishing the need of ownership. This enabled access emerged from Web 2.0 and its tremendous network connectivity and interactivity, which enable people to share digital assets such as files, photos, pictures, music, and knowledge. This

digital sharing process creates the conditions to generate trust and cooperation among users allowing this process to move to the physical and tangible world. Access is achieved through efficient allocation of resources, which can only be attained through the Internet due to its unique characteristics, namely democratic, ubiquity, friendliness, and connectivity that bridges people in a relative inexpensive way. This is why this research refers to CC as a contemporary concept triggered by Internet, instead of as the ancient practice of sharing.

CC is about access and less ownership accomplished through peer-to-peer relationships that consolidate into monetized or non-monetized transactions within digital market places (P2P Foundation, 2012). Digital marketplaces are sites whereby supply and demand meet under the forms of buying and selling, renting, swapping, and gift giving used and unused items. Among the multiple forms of collaborative consumption of the affluent world, Botsman and Rogers (2010) categorizes them into three systems:

Product service systems, which have been developed for renting low-use frequency products, temporary need products, expensive items, items that required expertise to repair, and products that need frequent updating.

Redistribution Market, which refers to move used products that are not needed at some place and can be considered trash, to places where are needed and reused.

Collaborative lifestyle: It refers to people's willingness to collaborate and help others based on the fact of sharing non-product assets such as knowledge, skills, time, spaces and money.

According to Neal Gorenflo, founder of the Shareable Magazine, CC is unique in the way it transforms social experiences from and through interactions of strangers willing to help and to share (PandoDaily, 2013). The peer-to-peer relation/transaction is the shift from a vertical and hierarchical consumption model from companies to customers, to a horizontal and flat dynamic between people willing to share peer-to-peer in the form of distributed infrastructures, to mobilize idle resources and assets more effectively (PandoDaily, 2013).

Besides technology, there are other three main drivers of CC in the AW (Latitude Research & Shareable Magazine, 2010; Botsman, 2010; Gansky, 2010): environmental concerns, which is the intrinsic outcome of sustainability generated through sharing, swapping, renting out, and selling used items; sense of community as a result of online

interactions that have made people more open to share with strangers and the fact that “social media revolution has broken down trust berries” (Latitude Research & Shareable Magazine, 2010, pp.132); and global recession: lower incomes encourage people to the idea of sharing for generating savings or earnings.

The AW illustration about CC is that it has created markets out of things that wouldn't have been considered monetizable assets before (Forbes, 2013). In figures, collaborative consumption is a disruptive economic force, which revenue is estimated to surpass \$3,5 billion in 2013, with a growth exceeding 25% (Forbes, 2013). This promising economic transformation is spreading over emergent economies, however their study is still superficial. One of the reasons of this incipient knowledge and research is that the contemporary phenomenon of CC is recent and driven by Internet and its Web 2.0 era. As a consequence, this document addresses CC through a sort of geo-politic glasses of the tension between the North and the South, the West and the East, the Colonizer and the Colonized, which centers in the robust contrast between the Affluent World and the Less Affluent World. Thus, CC is analyzed as a construction of the AW, which interpretation and development differ from the LAW 's assimilation and appropriation. Therefore, these two screens would be displayed.

1.2. Problematization

This part elaborates on four concepts in an organized way, starting with the argument that CC is a construction of the AW, continuing with describing the current CC studies in the LAW, following with the process of globalization and the consequences of its global consumer culture, and finishing with some studies of Colombia's social capital regarding the level of trust of the members of its society. Each of these concepts in themselves and their interactions present what and why this research considers is problematic with CC in the LAW.

1.2.1. Collaborative consumption as a contemporary construction of the affluent world

Collaborative consumption as a contemporary construction of the affluent world, mainly from The United States and West of Europe, appears to be resolving some of the tensions

of the contemporary society in developed countries. It is like a new ideology upon which people have hope and companies have started to see opportunities instead of threats. It appears as a disruptive answer to some of the consequences of the capitalism such as economic crisis, social isolation due to virtual connectivity, and environmental issues due to consumerism, materialism and the culture of a disposable and throwaway society. All of which entail people to reevaluate their lifestyle in terms of their consumption patterns.

Consequently, in the affluent world people are experiencing the rise of the collaborative consumption in the way that Botsman and Rogers (2010) describe as the result of the transformation of the economy, which could be compared to the Industrial Revolution where network technology is its main driver enabling an efficient and trustful platform to globally exchange and share tangible and non-tangible assets (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). Furthermore, Collaborative consumption changes the economy's main focus of what people consume to how people consume (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). In this sense, CC is based on the assumption that in this era people value experiences more than goods, therefore it can be seen the car industry's shift from the concept of selling cars to selling personal mobility services (Botsman & Rogers, 2010).

In the AW there are a vast array of empirical examples of CC, one of the most recognized example is the company Airbnb, a peer-to-peer platform launched in 2008 that matches private hosts and guests, offering 250.000 rooms in 30.000 cities in 192 countries (The Economist, 2013). Through this platform the owners of these rooms make money when they are underused. According to Botsman (2010) the peer-to-peer rental market alone is \$26 USD billion (The Economist, 2013). In the same stream, swapping has important examples, for instance clothing exchange has gone far with glamorous events such as the Pink Cow Clothing Swap in Tokyo, Fashion Reloaded Clothing Swap in Berlin, which are prestigious sites to exchange high contour clothing (Botsman, 2010). There are other examples of non-motenzed peer-to-peer collaboration such as Couchsurfing, which connects travelers with locals just for the sake of sharing hospitality.

1.2.2. Collaborative consumption studies in the less affluent world

Meanwhile, the perspectives of CC in the LAW appear over-optimistic due to a lack of extensive research. According to Ouishare (2012), a creative community for the collaborative economy, CC has exploded in Latin America. It argues that in this region of the world, CC is growing at a steady rate, however it does not present the figures neither does any other site. Moreover, it states that the factors that have encouraged this growth have been shared mobility, crowdfunding, and programs that support entrepreneurs. Regarding the shared mobility, Ouishare (2012) claims that carpooling platforms have vastly emerged due to the mental barrier for a first time experience with carpooling services is low. This affirmation is questionable since there are no information supporting this low mental barrier; in contrast, considering that Latin American countries are relative insecure, this could be a mental barrier for using carpooling. Crowdfunding and programs that support entrepreneurs are emerging from governmental, private and communal funds initiatives. However, It can be seen that the apparent drivers of CC in the LAW are different than those of the AW, and more importantly, the so-identified drivers of CC in the LAW do not consider an extensive analysis of the socio cultural context of this region. Thus there is an explicit need to understand CC in the LAW in order to determine how this society makes sense of it and simultaneously identify its drivers.

Nevertheless, there are successful CC platforms in Latin America such as Bikerio. This is a Brazilian bike-sharing platform created by the municipality of Rio de Janeiro in partnership with Itaú Bank, and Samba's bike system. The aim of this platform is to develop a sustainable and clean public transportation. In addition, in April 2012 Airbnb opened its South American hub in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and now it has more than 20,000 properties across Central and South America (Yahoo Finance, 2012). According to the directory of Consumo Colaborativo (2013) in Latin America, in the category of carpooling, there are many empirical examples, such as: from Argentina: Vayamos Juntos, Vamos Mejor, Sincropool, Compartochoche.com, Coviajeros, En Camello; from Brasil: Caronetas; from Chile: A dedo, Easyway. From Colombia: Comparte Tu Chevrolet, with the regulation Pico y Placa; from Uruguay: Voy contigo; and from México: Aventones. Surprisingly, the performances of these platforms are not published and some of them are not active peer-to-peer CC platform. For instance, Comparte tu Chevrolet is not a CC platform; instead it is an initiative of the company Chevrolet to incentive the usage of carpooling especially

during the regulation of *pico y placa*, which restricts the usage of cars depending on the cars' license number.

Another example of CC in Latin America is *Quienlohaga.com* (2013). This platform is an imitation of the successful American platform, *Taskrabbits*, in which task posters and task rabbits meet in order to get done daily chores and errands, such as buying groceries, pick up things, help to organize events, house cleaning, handyman, etc. According to *Taskrabbit*, on one side there are the task rabbits, which are entrepreneurs who have professionalized this occupation and who shared a neighborhood spirit. On the other side, there are the task posters who hire these services motivated by time limitations, convenience, and cost of opportunity-avoidance of investing time in non-income generating activities. This platform was created in Argentina at the end of 2012 and it is supposed to have presence in Colombia, Chile, México, Perú, Uruguay, and Bolivia, however, up till now, the web page displays that in none of these countries someone has posted a task. The lack of success of *Quienlohaga.com* could be attributed to the socio-cultural context of Latin America, in which unskilled and uneducated people perform the activities or jobs that are denominated errands and chores. Usually, the person in charge of these activities is the maid, whom for a fix salary does all the home duties. One of the traits that signifies the LAW is its low education coverage, thus most occupations such as housekeeper, cook, gardener, and so on, are not professionalized and so undervalued and underpaid. Consequently, this example advises the need for understanding how the LAW interprets CC.

The last three empirical examples of CC in Latin America, *Quienlohaga.com*, *Bikerio*, and *Airbnb* in South America display bring forward different questions. First, as it was stated, *Quienlohaga.com* failure could be attributed to a socio-cultural incomprehension. Secondly, *Bikerio*'s success could be attributed to an extensive government concern for educating and encouraging people to use the bike-sharing system. Finally, *Airbnb* success in Latin America could be associated to a strong inflow of tourists from the AW to South and Central America. Consequently, the success and failure of these local-creations and imitated-international initiatives converge in a need of understanding CC in different social-cultural settings.

1.2.3. The global consumer culture and its impact on the consumption patterns of the LAW.

The shortage of CC research in the LAW seems logical due to the so-called transformation of the economy in the form of CC is a phenomenon of the affluent world. In this sense, according to Gansky (2010), CC businesses are built on the growth of Internet, social media, mobile phones, and inexpensive connectivity. Clearly, these features are in progress and still incipient in emergent countries. In the same way, Gansky (2010) argues that the economic recession of the affluent world has changed the way people set their priorities in terms of giving more value to consuming the experience provided by an item instead of having the ownership of it. In contrast, the LAW is developing, thus it has started to experience the affluence, therefore it might not be possible for it to question the desire for ownership and change its life priorities in terms of consuming live experiences and disregarding ownership. This argument will be developed in the theory chapter through Ger and Belk's (1994,1999) cross cultural studies of materialism.

At the same time, once the AW has experienced the affluence through high consumption and so become aware of its negative consequences such as irreversible environmental damages, people privilege environmental initiatives and businesses. In a context of the LAW this environmental consumption could be related to what Ger and Belk (1996) call voluntary simplicity as a form of consumer resistance toward global consumer culture, but which could not be achieved by the less affluent world since it has not experienced the affluence, thus it would be a restriction, which could refer to "perceived relative deprivation and powerlessness of the LAW consumers" (Ger & Belk, 1996, pp.293), which greatly contrasts the affluence, access, and consumer power enabled by the democratization of Internet of the AW. As a result, it could be argued that the LAW wouldn't be able to deliberately and naturally make environmental responsible consumption decisions, thus environmental conscious, in the way that it is understood by the AW, would not be a driver for CC in the LAW.

Previously, it was mentioned that some empirical examples of CC in the LAW are imitations of those from the AW, which is a pattern of the process of globalization. Within the process of globalization, there is what Ger and Belk (1996) have called the global consumer culture. According to Ger and Belk (1996) the strong influence from the AW to

the LAW causes frustration, resentment, materialism, and social inequality, which hinder the way the LAW makes sense of its universe. Consequently, in the intertwined process of globalization and making sense of the local, the LAW consumption patterns change to adjust to the new reality and new forms of consumption-making sense appears such as glocalization, resistance, creolization, return to roots, and appropriation of goods and their meanings (Ger & Belk, 1996).

1.2.4. Studies of social capital in Colombia revealing a society that lacks of trust

Collaborative consumption has taken off through online platforms due to Internet connects people in a wide spectrum enabling interactions. The extent to which these interactions can reach further outcomes such as economic transactions and strong emotional relationships online and offline depend on trust (Gansky, 2010; Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Huang, 2012). Moreover, trust derives from social capital, which is defined as “the information, trust, and norms of reciprocity inhering in one’s social networks” (Woolcock, 1998, pp.153). As a consequence, social capital is a ground concept for approaching CC.

The Colombia’s National Planning Council and Sudarsky (1995) carried out a study to measure Colombia’s social capital and citizen’s participation called BARCAS. The BARCAS measure included the analysis of ten reservoirs of social capital namely, institutional trust, civic participation, mutuality and reciprocity, horizontal relationship, hierarchy, social control, civic Republicanism, political participation, information, and media. These reservoirs mainly refer to civil organization of daily basis such as neighborhoods, local and nongovernmental organizations such as church, and independent citizens organization of political or non-political scope; municipal, and governmental organizations. One of the main findings of this study was that Colombia’s social capital is feeble due to people do not trust strangers neither governmental institutions, which are associated with corruption, therefore the greatest source of social capital is civil society. However, the second major finding is that the current civil society is weak, vulnerable, and so it does not exert a control over the State and institutions.

Paradoxically, the study suggests that the lack of governability gives birth to the concepts of mutuality and solidarity, horizontal relationships, and hierarchy. These concepts arose from the questions of how people resolve collective problems and to whom they approach

when they have problems. The answer to these questions is that people do not seek for solutions to governmental institutions; on the contrary the solutions come from the family. In this sense collective problems are not collectively solved. According to the study, this situation is the consequence of an unaware society of the participatory methods to solve civil problems. Consequently, the level of association is very low and such association, as sources of social capital is not adding value in terms of trust and social capital.

This study is a screenshot that revealed a fractured and atomized society in which few institutions and believes contribute to strengthen social capital and trust. The description of atomized and fractured society refer to the process of people being isolated from society through “lack of social security, legislative linkage, friendship, solidarity, lack of social meetings with friends of work and neighborhood, and no economic support when trouble” (Sudarsky, 1995, pp. 32). As a result, people completely believe in media without validating the information with friends or any other type of legitimate source due to atomization and isolation. In this sense, non-validated believes becomes faith due to isolation. As a result, the study suggests the need to turn believes into reference rationality in order to validate sources of information in a more critical way.

This view of Colombia’s, as an country of the LAW, low social capital and so low trust and the previous review of CC, might imply a plausible pattern that in the absence of trust the interpretation of CC is different than in the AW. Consequently, a different interpretation of CC implies differences in the development of CC in the LAW and likelihood of distortions. Therefore, the way in which CC signifies people and simultaneously, the way people interpret and make sense of CC in the LAW from the stance of trust is the focus of our research.

1.2.5. What is problematic about CC in the LAW?

This research has presented and elaborated on four concepts in an organized way, starting with the argument that CC is a construction of the AW, continuing with describing the current CC studies in the LAW, following with the process of globalization and the consequences of its global consumer culture, and finishing with some studies of Colombia’s social capital regarding the level of trust of the members of its society. Each of these concepts in themselves and their interactions present the need to study CC in the

LAW. The research has shown the superficial approach that CC has done in the LAW, which basically centers in the power and speed of multiplication and replication hat CC has developed in the LAW. This multiplication-center approach neglects the need for further socio-cultural studies that allow the understanding of how the LAW makes sense of CC for the proper or at least suitable development of CC in the LAW.

Generally, what is problematic about CC in the LAW is the Westernized and standardized way that it has been spread and developed, causing concept-distortions, unsuccessful initiatives, and possibly some of the consequences of the global consumer culture such as stress, frustration, rejection, and so on. This situation presents a lack of knowledge of CC in the LAW from a socio-cultural stance, which implies the premise of consumer culture theory analysis. This is the knowledge gap that this research intends to address.

1.3. Research Question

Standing on the previous problematization of CC in the LAW, which is basically founded on the definitions and interactions of the concepts: CC as a contemporary construct of the AW, globalization and the plausible inadequacies of CC on the consumption patterns of the LAW, and the incipient level of trust in Colombia as an element that deters and distorts the way people interpret CC in the LAW, it can be identified a CC socio-cultural knowledge gap in the LAW and so the necessity of understanding how the LAW makes sense of CC. Therefore, this research addresses this knowledge gap under the research question - how does the LAW make sense of CC?. This research question is theoretically framed into two main elements, namely the process of making sense through consumption and consumer culture theory.

First, consumption from an abstract and sociological approach studies how individuals make sense of their world through consumption practices (Corrigan, 1997). In this sense, along history, the socio-cultural and economic particularities of each period of time shape the way people consume in order to make sense of and relate to their world. For instance, in the 18th century people engaged in the consumption of luxurious goods such as pottery as a means of class distinction and competition (McCracken, 1988, cited in Corrigan, 1997). Whereas, in the late 19th century in the light of capitalism, wealth is the social

currency of prestige, which can be attained either through conspicuous consumption or conspicuous leisure (Veblen, 1899). In conspicuous consumption people consume on a basis of going beyond subsistence and consuming high-end goods and experiences that cultivate the self (Veblen, 1899). In conspicuous leisure people engage in unproductive activities as a means of wealth (Veblen, 1899). Now, the 21st century, as a historical time characterized by the Web 2.0, social media, high flow of information, environmental threats and disasters, political and economic turbulence, and globalization and its paradoxical outcomes of homogenization and glocalization, entails new forms of consumption, thus new forms of making sense of the world. As a consequence, this research concentrates on understanding how the LAW makes sense of CC as a consumption practice.

Secondly, in order to address the research question the conceptualization of consumer culture theory is approached as ground theory. Consumer culture theory “refers to a family of theoretical perspectives that address the dynamic relationships between consumer actions, the marketplace, and cultural meanings” (Arnould, R. & Thompson, C, 2005, pp. 868). This so-called family of theoretical perspectives considers consumer culture as a social construct built on symbolic and material resources supplied by and mediated through markets (Arnould & Thompson, 2005). The symbolic and material resources are text, images, and objects collectively and individually used to make sense of realities and to build identities, in order to explicitly and implicitly establish socially accepted behaviors (Kozminets, 2001). “Consumer culture theory is organized around a core set of theoretical questions related to the relationships among consumers’ personal and collective identities; the cultures created and embodied in the lived worlds of consumers; underlying experiences, processes and structures” (Arnould & Thompson, 2005, pp.870).

Furthermore, consumer culture theory addresses four domains in order to understand consumers in context. The first domain is the concept of consumer identity project, which refers to the process whereby consumers build a coherent, diversified or fragmented sense of self through the interpretation of commercial symbolic meanings such as brands, retail settings, and advertisement (**Belk, 1988**). The second domain is Marketplace cultures, in which consumer are seen as culture producer. The third domain is the sociohistoric patterning of consumption, which studies how social class hierarchies influence consumption. The four domain is Mass-mediated marketplace ideologies and

consumers' interpretive strategies, which studies how ideologies shape consumption decision and behavior. In addition, consumer culture theory is extended to the analysis of consumption cycle, which includes the study of the symbolic and experiential aspects within the processes of acquisition, consumption, and possession. Within the elements of this consumption cycle, there is the analysis of the socio cultural complexities of exchange behaviors and relationships, such as gift giving. These socio cultural complexities will be developed in the theory chapter as ground theory for interpreting the empirical data and so answering the research question.

Finally, considering that the collaborative economy is rooted in deep social and cultural transformation (P2P Foundation, 2012) and Consumer culture theory addresses culture as a complex place where the process of making sense of the environment takes place, this research is a consumer culture theory study of CC, as a consumption practice, in the context of the LAW, which aims to understand how this society makes sense of CC in order to generate insights for creating new constructs and theoretical insights of CC in the LAW.

1.4. Literature Review:

Due to the contemporary definition of CC has recently emerged and developed since approximately 15 years ago, the concept has not been academically studied and deconstructed, thus the availability of explicit academic literature about CC is scarce. Therefore, this chapter focuses on two concepts, namely collaborative consumption and solidarity consumption. Following the description of theoretical part a criticism to the current theory is presented.

In addition, according to the current research insufficiency, this research focuses on CC literature mainly from two recognized authors, Rachel Botsman and Lisa Gansky, and three major organizations dedicated to study CC as part of the Collaborative Economy, which are the P2P Foundation, Shareable Magazine, and Latitude Research. The last two organizations launched a global survey, which aimed to capture the sharing attitudes and current engagement with sharing; the findings of this survey are used as trustworthy

literature. Finally, the concept of solidarity consumption is analyzed through the studies carried by Cass R. Sunstein and Edna Ullmann-Margalit.

1.4.1 Collaborative Consumption:

In order to present a complete radiography of the available knowledge of CC, the information is divided into two themes titled the description of the collaborative economy and the particularities of CC. The information was collected from different authors and different sources by scanning the web. However, for reasons of trustworthiness, the information is based on the authors Rachel Botsman (2010) and Lisa Gansky (2010) and the organization P2P Foundation, Shareable Magazine and Latitude Research. More specifically, the theme The Collaborative Economy is mainly based on the information stated by the P2P Foundation in its extensive document called Synthetic Overview of the Collaborative Economy, which as it names implies, it synthesizes the extensive descriptions of concepts that have arose within the Collaborative Economy.

1.4.1.1 The Collaborative Economy

CC is part of a major phenomenon defined with different names, namely The Collaborative Economy, The Sharing Economy, and The Community-Oriented Economy, which all are the consolidation of the emergent world of collaboration (P2P Foundation, 2012). These new collaboration practices have taken the forms of open innovation, co-design and co-creation, and crowdsourcing. Under this logic, CC is an infrastructure for sourcing the crowd and mutualizing idle resources. This means that CC is an outcome of an emerging social logic of horizontal or peer-to-peer collaboration. The definition of Peer to peer “is a form of relationality between humans beings whereby people can connect to each other without permission, and aggregate around the creation of common value” (P2P Foundation, 2012, pp.158). In peer-to-peer relations reciprocity is not compulsory.

This new social dynamics has developed new conceptions namely the intention economy, the pulled economy, and the viral attention economy. Briefly, the intention economy is the users’ ability to declare and discuss intentions in the form demand in order to make the offer to compete for satisfying that demand. In The pulled economy, networks allow people to be empowered and to pull products and services they want in their customized

conditions. An example of the pulled economy is the popular group purchasing practice in China whereby like-minded consumers organize online and meet up in the real world to obtain a good bargain from sellers. The viral attention economy is like the new currency of the online world saturated of information, in which advertiser struggle to get users' attention because once users' attention is achieved, the advertiser's material will go viral. This economy is an exchange of attention for goods.

CC, as an infrastructure for "sourcing the crowd" and mutualizing idle resources, develops within sharing communities, which are part of the community-centric model. These communities "create[s] the value, using Web 2.0 proprietary platforms, without much intervention of the owners of the platform. However, owners control the parameters of the platform and control its design, and monetize the attention capital which has been created by the user" (P2P Foundation, 2012, pp.48). These sharing platforms allow collective access to goods. In these sharing platforms there are three players: the community of sharers, the corporate owners of the platforms who commercialize the attention of the sharers, and commercial players who play for advertising.

The P2P Foundation synthetic overview of the collaborative economy (2012), presents the digital marketplace as a category of its own within the concept of collective economy, but this research places it as part of CC because that is how Botsman (2010) and Gansky (2010) establish it. Previously, it was explained that digital marketplaces are site where supply and demand meet under the form of buying and selling, renting, swapping, and gift-giving services and used and unused goods; therefore, CC could take the form of a monetized or un-monetized collaborative processes. In order to clarify the concept of An un-monetized CC, there is the platform Friends with things, which connects friends and neighbors in order to borrow and lend things and skills for free.

Additionally, according to Botsman (2010) the monetization in CC has the following strategies:

First, the service fee: the platform owner charges a fee for successfully matching buyers and sellers, borrowers and lenders. Second, freemium: the platform owner offers basic services for free. Third, tiered subscription plans: the platform offers subscription plans basically for renting its products. Fourth, on-sale: the platform buys unwanted items from people and them recycles and re-sells them for a higher price. Fifth, white label: the

company sells pieces of software that can be customized. Sixth, flat-membership: the platform requires an annual membership fee for its usage. Seventh, membership plus usage: The platform requires an annual membership fee plus additional charges based on the usage frequency.

Moreover, along the document it has been stated that CC is the social and economic shift from ownership to access without owning. According to P2P Foundation (2012), this shift has its roots in the dematerialization principle. Material things decrease their weight per performance, which makes them intangible services. Moreover, the availability of vast amount of data and people, allow physical products to be disaggregated and consumed as services (The Economist, 2013). This could be called the new dynamic of property, in which once things become more digital they become social property and so ready to be shared (P2P Foundation, 2012). The P2P Foundation report (2012), presents this phenomenon as “the ability to share on a large scale without diminishing the satisfaction of the individual renter” (P2P Foundation, 2012, pp.133). In addition the total cost of use decreases dramatically, then owning becomes irrelevant. The report exemplifies the sharing economy, as a limitless basement in which things are already there thus the renter does not have to invest resources in looking for something (P2P Foundation, 2012). Also, this shift to less ownership is seen as the experience economy in which buying experiences makes people happier than buying material things (Simon Smith, cited in P2P Foundation, 2012).

Furthermore, According to Janelle Orsi (Shareable Magazine, 2009), there are four degrees of sharing, which imply the relevance of trust for developing CC practices:

Sharing to the first degree requires cooperation and minimal planning. It is spontaneous and simple sharing processes such as potlucks or meal exchanges with neighbors or co-workers or lending tools to a specific neighbor.

Sharing to the second degree requires cooperation plus more extensive planning: It usually involves many people and valuable items, thus it requires more planning. E.g. sharing the ownership of a car between two neighbors.

Sharing to the third degree requires cooperation plus extensive planning and infrastructure. This is more complex because the ownership of an expensive good could be shared with more than 3 people, which requires financial and usage planning; thus this

degree requires a management infrastructure because the sharing process becomes a lasting community institution that needs to be managed. E.g. cohousing communities.

Sharing to the four degree requires cooperation, extensive planning, infrastructure, community-wide restructuring and mobilization. Due to the scope of this sharing degree, other players are needed such as legislators, banks, etc. E.g. city bike sharing programs.

Finally, nowadays CC is facing regulatory challenges in terms of economic policy. This situation is attributed to the fact that CC is an emergent concept that develops at a fast rate and which is still under construction, thus the parameters to regulate it are not clear. Though the last situation, some political institutions pinpoint CC as a mechanism to deliver access to the population that is economically worse off (The New York Times, 2013), which might grant a special treatment to regulate CC.

1.4.1.2. Particularities of CC

Gansky (2010) and Botsman (2010) agree on the drivers of CC. The first driver is environmental conscious, which means that people are aware of the harmful environmental effects of the capitalist consumption behavior, such as the throwaway culture and the disposable consumption. The throwaway culture refers to the idea of throwing away everything that is slightly damaged and that needs to be fixed in order to get a brand new one. The disposable society could be described as the short term convenience consumption, in which people use things once and then those things are thrown away omitting the needs of cleaning, washing, and storage. CC consumption conceives that what is not use or it is storage, it becomes waste and rubbish that pollutes the earth, therefore it needs to be redistributed to a place where it could be used.

The second driver is sense of community. In a consistent manner, Botsman (2010) calls it the evolution from generation me to generation we. This author states that the world, referring to developed societies, has experienced severe transitions from the feudal society, to the industrial revolution, to the hyper-consumption and individualistic society. The current consumer economy leaves less time and desire for human interactions diminishing the creation of social capital, thus losing the benefit of improving the efficiency of a society through the power of social networks and associations. In this sense, in developed countries people are aware of the devastating socio-cultural,

economic and political consequences of this human isolation, and a sense of community is emerging. Though Internet and social media decrease physical human contact because it sets interactions on a virtual space, surprisingly they are encouraging people to move away of the virtual space to get physical contact and reassuring the sense of belonging created at social media.

As we mentioned before Botsman (2010) organizes CC in three systems, namely product service system, redistribution markets, and collaborative lifestyle. Each of these forms requires a high degree of trust because in the beginning and in the end it is developing social relationships. It is important to stress that both sense of community and sustainability are inherit in CC, thus they are natural outcomes of the process. Whereas, CC users are driven by different motivations such as earning and saving money, do good and help others, and make physical space. The independency of CC's consequences from users' motivations is what makes the process not a personal sacrifice of the user. This element is relevant for this research due to we have mentioned that there is the possibility that in emergent countries the concept of CC could be seen as a stage in which people do solidarity consumption among family members or with people in need, which implies sacrifice and guilt instead of a self-interest.

According to Botsman (2010) CC has four principles – “critical mass; idling capacity; belief in the commons; and trust between strangers” (Botsman, 2010, pp. 75). Critical mass refers to reaching a big audience so that the movement can be sustainable. Idling capacity basically compromises the concept of distribution system previously explained. Believe in the common refers to believe that by providing value to the community individual value is achieved. Trust among strangers lies on the condition that personal relationships and social capital are in the center of the exchanges through CC. Thus, the mediator between these exchanges are the people, their relationships, their reputation, and so the trust among them. These four principles, specially the last two have different connotations and so implications in the context of the LAW. These connotations rely on the socio-cultural avocation. Therefore, the analysis of these principles in terms of how people from the LAW relate to these principles from the consumer culture theory, are within the research question.

1.4.1.3. Research opportunity: Criticism to the literature and prior understanding.

In sum, on the one hand, these two North American authors thoroughly explain the concept of CC, emphasizing on the economic transitions of the 20s, 50s, 80s, 90s, and the beginnings of the 21st century, and its impact on consumption and so on the socio-cultural context of the AW, which sat the conditions for the rise of CC. Although these theoretical stances are not specifically focused on how CC signifies its consumers in the LAW, they have contributed a good foundation to understand how people from the AW make sense of the concept of CC. In contrast, insufficient research has been done about how people from the LAW make sense of the concept of CC, while the concept is currently been adopted and developed. This ambiguity of developing initiatives of CC in the absence of socio-cultural knowledge in the perspective of consumer culture theory might be creating a distorted outcome of what should be CC in the LAW. For this reason, this research aims to fulfill this theoretical chasm with insights about how people from the LAW make sense of CC.

On the other hand, the two recognize organization dedicated to the Collaborative Economy, Latitude Research and Shareable Magazine (2010), did a global web survey which aimed to capture sharing attitudes and current engagement with sharing in a variety of contexts, considering trust, the role of community, and the new psychology of sharing. Even though it is not our concern to exhaustively present the findings of this research, the fact that this is study is catalogued a major study in the knowledgeable community of Collaborative Economy, it encourage the research to interpret its finding. This survey did not consider differences of context neither did make clear differences between the LAW and the AW relevant for the study. Thus, this survey addressed the sharing economy as a homogeneous phenomenon in a global setting, and this is how it presented the results. This generalization raises inquiries about the socio-cultural understanding of the sharing economy in the LAW since the study describes the contemporary concept of sharing economy as a development or social outcome of the AW. Therefore, this major study supports the need to address CC from the current research question.

1.4.2. Solidarity Consumption

Douglas and Isherwood (1979) suggest that when the goods consumed by an individual as he or she exercises sovereign choice to fulfill needs, the possession carries not only social categorization in certain social context, but also carries the function of maintaining social relationship upon their use as communicator (Corrigan, 1997). In the context of sharing possessions within kinship, such as nuclear family members, the collaborative consumption is focusing more on the level of maintaining kinship and their collaborative consumption is conducted largely based on the trust.

The researchers believe that the collaborative consumption based on trust within family bond of certain community is categorized into the concept of Solidarity Consumption. Sunstein and Ullmann-Margalit (2000) classified the goods, which are consumed in the context of solidarity consumption into public solidarity goods, and private solidarity goods. Public solidarity goods enhances consumer satisfaction when it is consumed in company with others, while private solidarity goods are consumed and enjoyed by individual with acknowledge that others are also consuming it (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). For a satisfied solidarity goods consumer, the personality can possibly be a non-conformist, which refers to, for example, trend-setter. Unlike conformist who desires to narrow the distance between his or her action and the action of average others, trend-setters and trend followers derived pleasure from the number of noteworthy participants who are consuming and encouraging the solidarity goods. Also, through this spreading consumption, the social norm and the religious consumer experience will give rewards emotionally and physically (Sunstein and Ullmann-Margalit, 2000).

Solidarity goods have relationship with club goods and network effort. The concept of 'Club Goods' is created when a group of people gather and benefit from sharing a public good which they exclude others (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). The attraction of such collaborative consumption may stem from the reduction of per-person cost or the affection people generated from the social interaction and the feeling of membership (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). In the meanwhile, because of the awareness of membership of common characteristics as exclusionary club goods, its value decreases when the amount of participants reach beyond a certain point, thus the club consumption generally sets up

certain barrier, for instance, monetary initiation fee, selection and assorted ceremonies to assure its members are devoted to make contribution. Another factor associated with solidarity goods is network effort, which prospers with the trend of communication technologies. Network effort connects and glues people firmly towards certain goods; even regardless of the choice is inferior to other alternatives. Yet this network effort makes some goods into solidarity goods (Sunstein and Ullmann-Margalit, 2000).

In the light of this, the solidarity consumption practice covers the collaborative consumption within community and certain affection bond, as well as through excluding the outsiders from the noteworthy group. Apart from solidarity goods, exclusivity goods and semi-solidarity goods serve complimentary concepts to the goods category (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). Sole ownership doesn't necessarily make a privately owned good into an exclusivity goods, but exclusivity goods gives value to the extent that can be enjoyed by one's own or in small groups (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). While the concept of semi-solidarity goods is classified in terms of a moderate extent between exclusivity goods and solidarity goods (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000).

On such note, the intrinsic and instrumental value and consumer satisfaction swift depending on the number of participating consumers in the context of solidarity goods and exclusivity goods. While in the situation of solidarity consumption, the motivation stems from reducing per-person cost and increasing sense of community through collaborative consumption of solidarity goods. The group of solidarity consumption shall be noteworthy instead of randomly gathered merely for the sake of grouping in large number. On the contrary of exclusivity goods, solidarity goods allows relatively open involvement for mutual consumer to enroll. However, the nature and value of goods when classifying them into any category of the three mentioned above shall be dependent on the innate quality and how people relate to it. Solidarity and exclusivity are always mixed to created consumer's identity through enjoying goods and activities together with group members in common yet meanwhile excluding others (Sunstein & Ullmann-Margalit, 2000).

1.4.2.1. Solidarity Consumption among family members

Belk (1988) points out one of the elements of the concept of solidarity consumption among family members by explaining that people are willing to share their possessions within their

family members because these possessions are signified as an extension of themselves by the aggregate group, in this case the family. In this scenario the objects contribute to the family identity project, which has to be transferred and preserved by all members. Belk (1988) also explains that family members share their possessions because there is the feeling that family is a part of themselves and so they need to take care of them. This family concept is world wide, however in most of the countries of the LAW family ties are stronger than in developed countries.

In this sense, by judging the level of prosperity of the AW and the LAW, the divergence reflects differences in their cultural and economic structures, which lead to different ways to understand and engage in CC. The conceptual structure of prosperity includes natural endowments, financial resources, humanly made capital, institutional capital, knowledge resource, human capital and cultural capital. The last four concepts constitute social capital (Fairbanks, 2000). Even if countries of both categories share same capitals, but the level of development of such capitals are different the result would be a different understanding and adoption of collaborative consumption. For example, if a culture encourages social trust and compliance, which are better cultivated in an economically developed country, people will have a more authentic understanding and practice of collaborative consumption that extends to a wide community. Less economically developed countries, on the other hand, because of a weaker sense of social trust and security, people might constrain their collaborative consumption in a sense of solidarity among family members. Furthermore, Belk (1988) presents an adverse element of the social and economic practice of sharing possessions within collectivities, which is the defused sense of the responsibility for taking care of what is shared. This causes suffering in everyone. This element could be a disincentive for sharing, which seems to be more accentuated in the Colombian context; therefore it will be research through the analysis of empirical data.

1.4.4.Criticism to the available literature

The previous description of the current available literature of CC could be criticized for being hegemonic. This claim is based on the absence of economic and cultural differences and considerations of documented CC literature in the contexts of the AW and the LAW. Therefore, it appears that CC generalizes its development in both contexts, thus assuming that what works in the AW must work in the LAW. This situation could be better

understood in Arnould's (1989) statement, "models of innovative consumer behavior ... must come to terms with enduring local 'world order logics' rather than assuming Third World consumers are becoming simply more cosmopolitan" (Arnould, 1989, pp. 259). Consequently, CC could be considered a model of innovative consumer behavior due to CC, defined as a contemporary construction of the AW, entails innovative consumption practices.

In addition, the previous concepts defined as socio cultural complexities of exchange behaviors and relationships have not been addressed as articulated elements of the theoretical construct of CC. Neither have these concepts been articulated in the studies of CC in the AW nor in the LAW. As a result, the knowledge gap of CC in the LAW from a socio-cultural stance or from the consumer culture theory is greater and more critical, thus the CC hegemonic notion is more prevalent.

1.5. Research purpose and contribution

This research aims to understand how people from Colombia, as a country of the LAW, make sense of CC from the theoretical stance of consumer culture theory. In this sense, this research focuses on understanding the drivers and the cultural meanings associated to CC in the LAW aside from any managerial influence, in order to extract how it authentically interprets CC. As a result, this research as an inductive approach, will contribute with new and revealing empirical and theoretical insights for creating knowledge about CC in the LAW. This new knowledge would present opportunities to influence successful CC practices in the LAW transforming and reinventing the way practitioners of CC do business in the LAW.

For farther elaboration of the purpose of this research, Ger and Belk's (1996) statement is applied to it. Ger and Belk (1996) claim that in order to understand the general concept of consumption is not only necessary to combine political and economy perspectives, but also to understand how locals make sense of their daily experiences, which is achieved through the glasses of consumer culture theory. Also, Belk and Ger (1996) argue that the Western approach is to study the global not the local, creating flaws and inadequacies in the interpretation of consumer cultures in the LAW, because patterns of consumption are consequences of the global transformation of the local society through the local meaning of consumption. As a consequence, this research aims to contribute to the general

knowledge of CC by bridging the current gap between the socio cultural interpretation of CC in the AW and the LAW. Also, based on the assumption that CC is a western construct, this research will contribute with a new approach to what we could determine as the centrality of CC studies in the AW, which appears to disregard the implications of the socio-cultural context of the LAW regarding the influence and expansion of CC in these countries. Thus, the general concept of CC in the light of consumer culture theory would be augmented.

Moreover, this research is a step ahead to minimize the negatives impacts of applying CC on the LAW, such as those stated by Belk (1996) namely frustration, resentment, and resistance, due to lack of knowledge related to consumer culture theory. At the same time, this research would give some guidance to understand how CC could be applied to the socio-cultural context of the LAW so that the western concept wouldn't be distorted but strategically and accurately adapted. As a consequence, it is strategic and critical to step ahead and understand how people from Colombia, as a country of the LAW make sense of CC.

Aligned with and further extending the concept of global consumer culture, there is the concept of a "disorganized capitalism" (Lash and Urry, 1987, cited in Appadurai, 1990, pp. 296) created by the "fundamental disjuncture between economy, culture and politics" (Lash and Urry, 1987, cited in Appadurai, 1990, pp. 296), which Appadurai (1990) described them in the analysis of five dimensions, namely ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, financescapas, and ideoscapas. Belk and Ger (1996) added the consumptionscape as the sixth landscape. Each landscape represents the global flow of its perspectival constructs and its implications on local, international, and global communities. Therefore align to this landscape framework; this research focuses on understanding the consumptionscape around the concept of CC. Because as Baudrillard (1988 [1970]) has stated, consumption becomes part of the economic system and so part of the communication system, thus consumption and economy transform and construct each other. In this sense, it is accurate and critical to understand how CC from a socio-cultural analysis shapes local and global economies, because as we have stated this research aims at understanding how the LAW makes sense of CC in order to give consumer culture insights useful for CC entrepreneurs, marketers, and even practitioners of the area of behavioral economics.

CHAPTER II. THEORY

In this chapter, the research deconstructs collaborative consumption as a concept and as a phenomenon through the definition and analysis interaction of seven concepts. First of all, the research tackles consumption as a departure point to analyze the empirical data. Second, the research continues elaborating on studies about sharing. Thirdly, materialism and possessiveness as the main disincentives to sharing and consuming without owning is approached. The fourth concept for the theoretical framework to deconstruct CC in the LAW is the gift giving economy. The fifth concept is consumption as a relationship builder. The sixth concept is the colonialist theory. The 8th and last concept is Trust under the general concept of Social capital.

Each of the last concepts and their elements that are relevant for our study are defined, approached from the consumer culture theory perspective and linked to CC in order to answer our research question. Reflections upon the relation and/or interaction between these concepts and the ones presented with Consumption and CC in the view of consumer culture theory will be attained.

2.1. Consumption

Considering that CC is in the confines of consumption and that this research is a consumer culture theory study that aims at understanding how people from emergent countries relate to and interpret CC, it is accurate to examine consumption in the way it signifies individuals by constructing their identities, positioning them in the social world, and helping them to make sense of their universe (Corrigan, 1997). In this sense, this research takes into consideration the perspective of consumer culture theory, in which consumption is a process that depends on the interplay of consumers' self-identity and such individual's affective and conative disposition linking with a specific group (Sankaran and Demangeot, 2011). Also, the classic theoretical approaches to consumption cultural analysis are used in this research, which mainly refer to Douglas and Isherwood's proposal of two uses of goods - goods are used for maintaining visible and stable categories of cultures (1979) and to develop social relationships (1979); Jean Baudrillard's affection stance between individuals and their objects, whom tend to personalize objects and reduce the element of commodity in such objects (Corrigan, 1997).

We mentioned that according to Douglas and Isherwood (1979) consumers use goods to construct and make sense of their world and to maintain social relationships. This statement could be tightly linked to CC and specifically to its driver of sense of community because individuals are driven by a desire of sharing something with people and so to build connections with people through consumption. Certainly, the underpinnings of this desire are different between people from the AW (affluent world) and people from the LAW (less affluent world) due to the socio-cultural conditions are different. In this sense, this research intent to make linkages and interpretations between the concepts of CC and consumption in the boundaries of how people relate to CC in emergent countries in order to contribute with theoretical analysis to the lack of research.

Moreover, this research reflects upon Veblen's (1975 [1899]) stance that social classes use goods to position themselves in the social structure, in which reputation is achieved through "pecuniary strength" (Corrigan, 1997, pp. 19), which means economic wealth that is more appreciated when it comes from what he defines as conspicuous leisure instead of conspicuous consumption.

Before we continue with the argument, it is important to explain the last two concepts of consumption: On the one hand, the main difference between Veblen's types of consumption achieved through pecuniary strength is that leisure consumption is attained without ordinary human workforce but instead it is inherited and achieved through devoting life to activities that are unproductive. On the other hand, conspicuous consumption is attained through the consumption of goods for reasons that go beyond the ordinary need of subsisting; therefore those goods represent the unneeded time given by wealth for being spent in leisure consumption such as traveling, sports, recreation, and refinement of the self.

Continuing with the argument, reflecting upon collaborative consumption within the boundaries of Veblen's interpretation of consumption, collaborative consumption might be a form of wealth demonstration of the western world. In addition, since CC puts more value on consuming experiences than consuming goods, it could be arguable and so a matter of research to consider CC a form of conspicuous consumption. Therefore, CC might represent a higher social status proper of refined and cultivated people who transcend the need of ownership or/and possession to live through the intangible but non-perishable knowledge of experiences. At the same time, reflecting upon Bourdieu's (1984) concept of cultural capital, CC could be even a form of cultural capital for the same reason of

transcending ownership and moving to a perhaps more cultivated state of mind of extracting the experiences and knowledge provided by goods. In sum, conspicuous consumption and cultural capital might be the form the western society relates to CC, however, this might not be the way emergent societies relate to CC. Thus this research aims at answering the question of how people from Colombia, as an emergent country, relate to CC.

Previously, it has been stated that according to Belk (1996) the LAW cannot adopt voluntary simplicity as a reaction to the global consumer culture because it has not experienced the affluence. Consequently, this research uses this argument to state that due to emergent countries have not experienced the affluence, they might not experience conspicuous consumption and cultural capital in the way that the developed countries do. Therefore, the emergent countries might relate to CC in a different way than developed countries do.

2.2. Sharing

Sharing as an imperative element of CC is developed in the context of consumer culture theory in order to answer our research question. The analysis of sharing is tackled through Gansky's (2010) statement that says that around the world people have the desire to share and to develop a sense of community, therefore the experience of sharing would make people feel wealthier in different ways than owning. However, this view could be exclusively of the affluent world and, according to Belk (1988), of the cultures that are used to share, such as the Australian aborigines.

Gansky (2010) in her book *The Mesh*, states that in USA "the culture and psychology of ownership are in transition" (Gansky, 2010, pp. 70) due to nowadays people from all over the world care less about what they own and more about living and consuming experiences, therefore, people are directing their lives toward a basic and sustainable lifestyle in which collaborative consumption appears to be the solution. Though, this is the author's perception, this doesn't ensure that people from emergent countries want to participate, leverage, and benefit from the concept of consuming without owning.

Belk (1988) suggests sharing as an alternative to private ownership, which has different forms such as "voluntary lending, contractual renting, gift-giving, pooling and allocation of

resources, authorized use of public property, and unauthorized use by theft and trespass” (Belk, 1988 p.1). Belk describes the act of sharing as the process of distributing what is considered ours to others for their use and of receiving something from others for our use for a specific or non-specific period of time. In this sense, Belk states the difference between ownership and possessiveness, in which the last one is a disincentive of sharing (Belk 1992, Klein and Baker 2004; Shultz, Kleine, and Kernan 1989). Ownership is the act of identifying that something is mine and possessing is the extension of the self over something, which creates attachment and identification (Belk, 1988). Moreover, sharing, possessing and ownership are culturally learned behaviors (Furby, 1976) and so are culturally judged or defined.

Belk asserts that sharing can take place under conditions of scarcity or excess and it also can be broadly (with anyone) or narrowly (couple, family) practiced. However, considering that we have empirical material that shows that Colombians do share in a context of family solidarity or with people in need and not in a broad context of strangers or acquaintances, the query arises -to what extent, can this statement related to sharing, be applied in emergent countries?

2.2.1. Sharing and the user commitment derived from temporary access

Unlike the possessiveness of materialism, sharing is considered to be relatively counter-productive for generating satisfaction. Since the driving force for possessing object is to project ideal self-image, status, and desire to signal uniqueness and identity through the objects, and these objects are solitary consumption which provides consumer pleasure when he or she consume with unique access. The act of sharing possession is not necessarily for gaining happiness for the materialist whose trait is non-generosity (Caprariello et al, 2013). Thus collaborative consumption requires a certain degree of prosocial awareness and devotion from the consumer.

As much as the relationship and connection between the consumer and the objects immediately matter a certain consumption practice, it is important to look at the collaborative consumption and the consumer’s commitment of doing it. In the interview of this research, interviewees emphasized their concern on the identity of the previous owner of the shared object or the counterpart to whom they are going to share their belonging. They also showed their commitment on collaborative consumption based on the

agreement of taking good care of the shared objects and showing respect to its value. In their narratives, the interviewees made a clear statement on the value of such access-based collaborative consumption, which is to avoid any negative outcomes such as lack of identification of the various users, varying significance of use and sign value or negative reciprocity (Bardhi et al, 2012). It is showed and in line with consumer's concern when they deciding whether to share a certain possession to other, since they will consider whether they know the identity of former or prospect user of the possession, whether they understand the importance of he possession and its valuable sign meaning to its owner as they do, and they will potentially risk undesirable interpersonal conflict or ostensibility for repair if the shared object is abused or broken. This concern is understandable because of the difference that ownership and sharing access entail, namely (1) nature of object-self relationship and (2) the rule that govern and regulates the relationship (Bardhi et al, 2012). Ownership enables consumer identify themselves by the extended self implied from the possession, while the short-term object-self relation, which is when sharing an object, the access is temporarily and the circulation of the object provides less commitment from the consumers. Additionally, ownership grants owner of property rights and thus stimulates owner's freedom and responsibility towards the solely-owned objects (Bardhi et al, 2012).

2.3. Materialism: The main disincentive to sharing.

According to Belk (1985), Materialism as a consumption-orientation deters sharing and it is defined as the importance of possessions in life as a primary source of happiness and dissatisfaction as well. Therefore the element of CC that "customers will like saving money and feeling richer, through reducing the costs associated with owning things" (Gansky, 2010, pp.47) needs to be analyzed in the light of materialism. Belk's materialism scale consists of three dimensions: possessiveness, envy, and non-generosity (Ger & Belk, 1994). These three dimensions are explained through another three scenarios: what people own and value; what people want; and what people miss and feel bad for not having. In addition, Belk's scale (Ger & Belk, 1994) measures the proportion of things seen as necessities and the proportion of material items wanted and missed. Thus the first three dimensions could be synthesized by saying that possessiveness is the excessive desire to acquire materialistic things, people, and memories; envy is the competition for having more than others; and non-generosity is to value things more than people (Ger & Belk,

1994). Now it is clear how materialism detracts people to practice CC not only because it deters sharing but also because it disincentives people to consume without owning.

Ger and Belk (1994) “question the cultural universality of a Western conception of materialism” (Ger & Belk, 1994, pp. 57), thus, they tested the concept in 12 countries, including affluent and less affluent countries. In this study, Ger and Belk (1994) enquire Inglehart’s (1981; 1990) political interpretation of materialism in affluent nations, which states that materialism is proper of the affluent world because it reaches the top at a high level of affluence and it should decline when low needs are satisfied. However, Ger and Belk (1994) noted that this materialism declination is not reflected in affluent nations such as USA and Japan. This paradox and Belk’s (1985) previous studies of the impact of globalization on the consumption patterns of the LAW, set the foundations to study materialism as a consumer culture research across cultures.

In Ger and Belk’s (1994) materialism cross culture study it was found that “Materialism is neither unique to the West nor directly related to affluence, contrary to what has been assumed in prior treatments of the development of consumer culture” (Ger & Belk’s, 1994, p.1). On the contrary Ger and Belk (1994) found that the most materialistic country of the sample belong to the LAW. According to Ger and Belk’s (1994), this paradox of materialism as a product of less affluence has two main explanations: one is Inglehart’s (1971,1981) scarcity hypothesis and the other is country instability.

On the one hand, Inglehart’s (1971,1981) scarcity hypothesis asserts that value is placed on things that are scarce. In this sense Ger and Belk (1994) argue that scarcity and deprivation create desires and so strong consumption orientations, therefore, it can be expected the LAW to be more materialistic than the MAW. On the other hand, Ger and Belk’s (1994) argument that country instability, in terms of abrupt changes in the political and economic systems, leads to strong socio-cultural changes, which are correlated to materialism. For instance Ger and Belk (1994) point out that countries that go through political changes such as reunification, independence, economic openings, wars, and so on, experience something that could be described as an identity crisis due to what used to be believed as good and socially acceptable becomes questionable. This identity crisis is accentuated by globalization and the Western influence driving the society to undergo feelings of frustration, deservedness, inferiority, which lead to materialism.

Ger and Belk (1994) argues that consumer desires might be increasingly interdependent across cultures due to globalization, thus cross cultural studies is an international concerns because of globalization's impacts on different fields, specially the one that is of this research interest, consumer culture theory. In addition, Ger and Belk (1994) affirm, "it is critical that we investigate the extent of consumption orientation in a variety of cultures – Westerns and non-Western, and affluent and non-affluent" (Ger & Belk, 1994, pp.58); therefore, aligned to this argument, it could be said, that this research studies the extent of collaborative consumption orientation in emergent countries by understanding how people from emergent countries relate, interpret and make meaning of CC. Moreover, in the way that Ger and Belk (1994) found a paradox of less affluence leading materialism, this research might find a paradox of the Western and contemporary concept of CC in the socio-cultural context of emergent countries through the analysis of empirical data.

2.3.1 Material possessiveness and the life satisfaction derived from it

Richins and Dawson (1992) shed light on the popular usage of Materialism from the Oxford English Dictionary, as 'devotion to material needs and desires, to the neglect of spiritual matters; a way of life, opinion, or tendency based entirely upon material interests'. Materialism is often regarded as a negative value system because it places possession and their acquisition at the center of life and encourages acquiring more and more possession to lead a happier life. And this value advocates both quality and quantity of possession (Segal et al, 2013). However, there are two facets of materialism, they are Instrumental Materialism and Terminal Materialism. The 'Instrumental materialism' is considered harmless form when an object serves as means to further and discover personal values and goals of life. In contrast, when the consumption of an object cannot go beyond possession itself, then it is 'Terminal Materialism' that becomes detrimental (Richins and Dawson, 1992).

Richins and Dawson (1992) reviewed the construct and the measurement of materialism and concluded that materialism conceptualizes the consumer value. The factors that comprise Richins and Dawson's scale of materialism are success, centrality, and happiness (Segal et al, 2013). The factors of materialism oriented consumer value mainly indicate that the materialist understands life individual value and judge individual's success based on the accumulated quantity and quantity of possessed objects, and engages at

material consumption as daily endeavor, so as to achieve life satisfaction through possessing material object rather than through other manners, such as developing interpersonal relationships (Richins & Dawson, 1992). Materialists proud themselves when they can possess objects which can project their ideal self image (Richins & Dawson, 1992). In the light of this statement, consumers tend to believe and develop the behavioural habit of keeping buying possessions in order to maintain a happy life and that their possessions convey such statement to the society.

Some people may feel happier on spending discretionary money on life experiences than on the intention of acquiring material possessions (Caprariello et al, 2012). Moreover, Boven and Gilovich's (2003) findings report that people gain greater happiness after spending discretionary money on life experience rather than on material possession. The captioned term of life experience is explained as 'event or series of events that a person lives through (Caprariello et al, 2012). Taking examples of consumption activities, the life experience can be seen as clubbing in town or having coffee in the coffee shop. Thus, Van Boven and Gilovich (2003) made a conclusion that "individuals will live happier lives if they invest in experiences more than material possessions" (Caprariello et al, 2012, pp199). In Richins and Dawson's (1992) research of measuring consumer value and its associated material possessiveness, the validation test shows that high scorers desire higher income, place greater emphasis on financial security and less on interpersonal experience, being more willing to spend money on themselves than on others, and less satisfied with their lives (Richins and Dawson, 1992). Based on such finding, it is paradoxical that consumers who orient their happiness by desiring and possessing material objects yet they may achieve greater life satisfaction through engaging life experience rather than obtaining material objects.

2.4. The Gift giving economy and its pro social sense

Gregory (1982) defined gift as inalienable objects exchanged between interdependent persons (Muriel, 2009). Consumer gift system is featured with social distinction, norm of reciprocity and symbolism (Giesler, 2006). These features give explanation of gift giving as an exchange pattern to reinforce the social connection and distinct such relation with the social environment of gifting outsiders. Also, the gift giving economy constitutes a moral economy opposite to the market economical monetary transactions. Thus gift giving

initiates rule an obligation for building up a complex pattern of give-and-take which helps consolidating the moral standard for social solidarity. In addition being a dyadic exchange, the gift giving becomes social fact that affects economic, legal, political, and religious spheres of society, with impact their development and continuity, which is important to shape social solidarity (Giesler, 2006).

The most important characteristic of the gift giving economy is social distinction. "Gift giving as a system of social solidarity is characterized by a number of social discourses, practices, and structures that are separable, because of their distinct characteristics, from those that form the subject matter of market exchange and other forms of gift giving" (Giesler, 2006, pp. 285). For example, Bardhi (2012) argues that online digital music access is more similar to sharing, characterized with more collaboration, pro social, and altruistic motivations than access of object in material form. Also, Belk(2010) suggests that the online music document sharing is more conducive than the offline sharing. Gift giving is also commonly argued that it is fundamentally related to a type of sacrifice. But in contrast to this, the example of online music sharing is a non-sacrificial form of gift giving, which remains with donor after transaction. This is especially true for the cyberconsumption, in which context of community collaborative consumption is based on multiplying knowledge by freely giving it away within the community (Giesler, 2006). Gift giving is a pro social behavior of giving away objects to help people in need, it entails the construction of the perfect gift (Muriel, 2009) something priceless, freely given, bearing no expectation for return and obligation from the receiver (Muriel, 2009), and such act of donation is similar to the act of charity.

In the light of the social distinctiveness of gift giving, gift giving is a reciprocal consumption that embodies profound social significance bonding with the interpersonal relation building. For example, it is routine practice for Japanese to give gifts to their colleagues when they return from a holiday or business trip, and also give gift on behalf of their company to their business partner upon significant greeting; on Japanese Valentine's Day, chocolate consumption is especially high in Japan because the Japanese female gives chocolate not only to their romantic partner but she has to do the chocolate give gifting to her significant others, such as colleagues and classmates (Minowa et al, 2011).In this way, the Japanese people expressed their gratitude towards people who are being nice to them in daily life.

Consumer researchers suggest that the gift giving varies from formal ritual as well as from the utility-driven economy to the post-modern symbolic consumer behavior (Minowa et al, 2011). Consumer relationship, in the cycle of gift giving and receiving, formulate, reformulate and strengthen or weaken their relationship (Minowa et al, 2011).

2.5. Consumption as a relationship builder

Consumption is also reckoned as a process of consumer's reproduction of culture during the consumption practice, because consumer often experience new social censuses which is craftly played by the role of marketing as seduction (Deighton et al, 1995). The social censuses is defined by Deighton and Grayson (1995) as the shared agreement in a society, and this social agreement between social actors shape and govern the interactions and perception of these social actors. Marketing plays its role, especially when it intends to create a seduction to the consumer, is to create the evidence to suggest a new and wider based social consensus in order to immerse in consumer's contextual consumption practice (Deighton et al, 1995). Therefore, consumers are influenced by the marketing tactics and the social implication generated within such consumption practice, and consumer experience the reproduction of certain consumption-based culture and its associated social connection.

Consumer build up relationship within a peer-to-peer level with other consumers can be regarded as an example addressing consumer loyalty sharing sense of brand community. Susan Fournier (1998) conceptualizes such consumer loyalty as a long-term, committed, affect-laden partnership, and this relationship also constrains relationship-inspired insight by encouraging ignorance of other potentially valuable relationship forms that may characterized with consumer-brand bonds (Fournier, 1998).

2.6. Trust and Social Capital

The concept of social capital comes from Putnam and his work of the confusing relation between interpersonal trust and the legitimacy of institutions (Ahmed & Evans, 2013). There are different perspectives of social capital regarding fields of studies such as management, politics, economics, anthropology, and so forth; however, its main scholars are Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam.

According to Bourdieu, social capital is “aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, , pp.). However, this research centers in Portes’ (1998) definition, “Social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (Portes, 1998, pp. 6). The source of social capital is relationships, this means that the people a person is related to are the source of its benefits (Portes, 1998). In this sense, social capital has three functions:

“A source of social control” (Portes, 1998, pp. 9): it refers to the process of reinforcing norms in society.

“A source of family support” (Portes, 1998, pp. 9): it refers to the process of reinforcing norms within family.

“A source of benefits through extra familial networks” (Portes, 1998, pp. 9)

Through Portes’ functions of social capital, it can be identified how social capital allows individuals to leverage from collective stances and efforts out of the governmental regulation. Simultaneously, social capital works as an organic mediator in issues that affect societies. Moreover, “working together is easier in a community blessed with substantial stock of social capital” (Putman, 1993, pp. 35-36). This stock is equated with the level of associational involvement and participatory behavior in a community and is measured by such indicators as newspapers reading, membership in voluntary associations, and expressions of trust in political authorities. In this sense trust generates social capital and vice versa. Only in the presence of trust is possible to create social capital due to it is required to create collectivities and associations. There are myriad studies that indicate social capital as a source of prosperity in a community because it creates intellectual capital that are later materialized in innovations and competitive advantage (Ahmed & Evans, 2013). Social capital is created when knowledge is transferred and shared through social integration based on trust. Consequently, high social capital and trust are traits of the AW, whereas low social capital and trust are traits if the LAW. Research of social capital and trust in Colombia are presented in the methodology chapter.

2.7. Postcolonial theory, Globalization, and the Global Consumer Culture.

According to Varman and Belk (2012) the understanding of consumption in the less affluent world derives from the construct of post-colonial consumption, which is based on the post-colonial theory. This theory stresses the complex relation between the colonized and the colonizer (Gupta, 1998). The post-colonized societies ambiguously struggle managing the legacy from colonialism and trying to catch up with the challenges and the pace display by globalization. In this sense, Gupta (1998) argues that in the post colonial world the concept of underdeveloped is a subject whereas the concept underdevelopment is a form of identity. In addition, Fanon (1952) claims there is a colonized identity, which is interpreted as inferior to the colonizer. Regarding the slavery from colonization, Varman and Belk (2012) stress the fact that slaves suffer from a deep crisis of identity, which often seems to be relieved by imitating their previous masters.

This process of identity transformation is accentuated through globalization in which colonized consumers aspire to be like the colonizers (Fanon 1952). Therefore, post-colonists' identities are in transformation. Ger and Belk (1996) study global consumer culture, global consumption homogenization, and cultural impacts of encounters of the Less Affluent World with marketization and globalization. According to Ger and Belk (1996) the less affluent world is exposed and influenced by the affluent world, which hinders the process of making sense and meaning of its environment.

Belk and Ger (1996) suggest that the uncontainable "global consumption influences are more apt to produce social inequality, class polarizations, consumer frustration, stress, materialism, and threats to health and the environment" (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 271). For instance, Belk & Ger's (1996) illustrate the brand Coke as "the colonizer of the exotic" (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 272). The LAW considers exotic everything that comes from the "sophisticated, contemporary, and materialistic United States" (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 272).

Varman and Belk (2012) claims that the anxiety created by the global consumer culture is reflected in people's desire for hiding their Third World identities (in the research lingua LAW) in order to imitate the AW. Furthermore, this new identity turns out to be ambivalent because the colonized is claiming for equality by signifying the colonizer and putting itself under the colonizer's gaze (Varman & Belk, 2012). This is a process of resistance and

challenge towards the colonizer called the post-colonial hybridity (Varman & Belk, 2012). Stigmatised people often employ masks to hide their identities (Goffman, 1968), for instance Islamic women in Turkey have transformed or masked their stigmatized practice of being covered to a fashionable statement of Islamist fashion (Sandikci & Ger, 2010). Furthermore, post-colonial subjects desire to displace their past master through contest in order to ensure its freedom (Fanon, 1952). According to Fanon (1952), the postcolonial subject can only achieve freedom through this conflictive emulation, thus imitation become a form of conquering. Therefore, some nations of the LAW, such as the ones from Easter Europe, sacrifice necessities for few luxuries, in order to feel equal to a global consumer (Belk, 1999; 1994).

Imitating Western's consumer behaviors temporarily allows post-colonized consumers to avoid feelings of deprivation and low self-esteem inherited by colonialism, and creates feelings of progress, modernity, and development. In this sense the LAW consume through western constructs such as shopping malls (Verman & Belk, 2012). However, this western constructs have different meanings in the LAW than in the MAW. For instance, shopping malls, as retail servicescapes that develop a consumer culture in the LAW, are interpreted as symbol of modernity, status, progress, and being western (Verman & Belk, 2102). Through shopping malls the Indian young society has played the post-hybridity behavior (Verman & Belk, 2102). Adolescent go to shopping malls wearing westernized clothes but do not buy anything because they cannot afford it; instead they chase stores' sellers by imitating a wealthy buyer similar to the West's (Verman & Belk, 2102). The young Indian consumers are aware of their exposition to the global consumer culture, however, instead of causing frustration, this consumers are experiencing feelings of country pride due to shopping malls signify modernization. This result, according to Verman and Belk (2102) exemplifies how the local is reinvented by the global by transforming LAW consumers' (in this case Indian) identity into one that is both local and global, Western and Indian.

Moreover, in this era of globalization there is a "disorganized capitalism" (Lash and Urry, 1987, cited in Appadurai, 1990, pp. 296) created by the "fundamental disjuncture between economy, culture and politics" (Lash and Urry, 1987, cited in Appadurai, 1990, pp. 296),

which Appadurai (1990) described them in the analysis of five dimensions, namely ethnoscapas, mediascapas, technoscapas, financescapas, and ideoscapas. Belk and Ger (1996) added a sixth landscape, which is consumptionscape. Each landscape represents the global flow of its perspectival constructs and its implications on local, international, and global communities. Baudrillard (1988[1970]) states, consumption becomes part of the economic system and so part of the communication system, thus, consumptionscape appears to paradoxically create complex forms of resistance, regarding the global consumer culture, and complex consensus of life meaning and identity construction.

According to Chatterjee (1997), the postcolonial theory indicates that colonized societies' histories have been read through the modernity or western discourse of lack and absence. On such note, colonized societies should create their own modernity since right now they are consumers of a universal modernity established by European colonial powers. Thus, the postcolonial theory is a mean to channel non-western societies definition of their own modernity in terms of a post-colonial interpretation of their identity. In this sense the post colonist theory offers insights to the transformation of the consumers' identities in the LAW.

CHAPTER III Methodology

3.1. Research Philosophy

This chapter will mainly elaborate the methodological ground and reasons for designing the research. This research aims at understanding how people in Colombia make sense of collaborative consumption as a phenomena in a socio-cultural environment of a country of the LAW. Therefore the epistemology selected for this research is Social Constructionism, which allows the researchers to capture respective consumer's connection with collaborative consumption in their own social setting. Since the initial approach to this paradigm is developed by focusing on the ways that people understand their intellectual universe especially relying on sharing their experiences with the language as medium (Smith et al, 2008), considering that consumer research on collaborative consumption in emerging countries is of limited and brief acknowledgment, and that the collection and the processing of data can prove or disprove various hypothesis and theories (Alvesson, 2003) the researchers reckon that the selection of qualitative methodology can best answer the research question. In order to obtain a good description of the range of experiences on collaborative consumption events, the research will conduct an analysis based on phenomenography to describe the context (Hale et al, 2007). In order to obtain the empirical information of consumers' values and believes attached to CC, the researchers will conduct one-on-one interview. Then the information and data will be collected from the transcription of the interviewee's narrative for further analysis mainly based on the paradigm of Consumer Culture Theory (here in and after referred as CCT), therefore the methodology for this research is decided to be qualitative research. The one-on-one semi-structured interview enables the researchers to expose to consumers in Colombia with different traits, for instance, educational level, individual income, which are variables affecting individual's involvement and understanding in collaborative consumption.

Netnography was intended to be a complementary method for data collection. The researchers believe that through observing consumers' dialogues, comments, and interactions developed on collaborative consumption related websites and platforms, it is possible to collect information about consumers' attitudes, believes, and values towards CC to answer our research question. However, Netnography was avoided due to

Colombia lacks online platforms dedicated to CC with open forums with rich interactions and interactions between users.

Followed by such, there will be analysis strategy based on the philosophy of Existential-Phenomenology and Hermeneutics. And the limitation and restriction of such methodology will be discussed at the end.

3.2. Research Design

According to Bryman and Bell (2011) a research design is a structure for collecting and analyzing data. Such a structure indicates the main focus of the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Considering there is literature and knowledge gap for the collaborative consumption in the LAW so in Colombia, this research will collect empirical material from the narrative of respondents from Colombia, therefore it is sensible to choose qualitative method as methodology for overviewing the social background where Colombian consumers are immersed in and interpreting the impact on their perception and motivation of collaborative consumption, which is possibly different from a socio-cultural setting in developed countries. Thus this research selects Social Constructionist as philosophical ground for research design whose departure point is based on the assumption that there is no absolute truth, and the researcher's role is to establish the explanation for the reality constructed within everyday life (Smith et al, 2008). Therefore the philosophical position of Localist is posted in interviewing analysis, which believes such approach emphasizing interviewing statement must be seen in their social context, and the interviewing should be studied as empirical situation rather than just as a data-collecting manner (Alvesson, 2003).

On such note, this research will provide description on the consumption phenomenon based on the methodology of Existential-Phenomenology. Such paradigm have been applied in research regarding experience of anxiety, learning, time and special possession (Thomson et al, 1989), and the challenge of conducting qualitative research based on interviewing transcript is grasping a precise understanding in a new perspective. Because the Existential-Phenomenology 'seeks to be a descriptive science that focuses on the life-world of the individual (Thomson et al, p136), therefore this research uses Existential-Phenomenology to conceptualize the consumers' experience into rigorous understanding

and studying consumer's series of cognitive experience as an intentional phenomena in a specific contextual setting (Thomson et al, 1989).

3.3. Data collection techniques

The research is designed of five semi-structured interviews. The researcher who speaks Spanish will take on the one-on-one interview with targeted consumers in Colombia, and such interviews are conducted through instant messaging software Skype. In such case, collecting observational data in a friendly, three-dimensional interpersonal space and task-oriented environment (Smith et al,2008) will be used and of help for the researcher to obtain non-verbal behavior implication on the consumer's insight on collaborative consumption as emerging phenomenon in Colombia. Also the application of hermeneutics encourages the researchers to integrate the insights into ways of interpreting textual material, which can comprise both in formal written format and verbal format. This philosophy emphasizes the importance of looking at material with the reference of context and being aware of there is no absolute interpretation of particular text (Smith et al,2008), therefore the interpretation of data collected from the research will be established upon the observation of particular interviewee and the specific social, economic and political context.

Semi-structured Interview Design

Bearing in mind that the initial intention for this research is providing updated descriptive narrative of consumers engaging collaborative consumption in Colombia, which embodies the major features defining an emergent country, the researchers set up semi-structured one-on-one interview via instant messaging tool Skype, as a main method to collect natural language data (Smith et al, 2008) yet the complexities and large information within the narrative of the semi-structured interview is challenging and requires certain control over adopting the relative data for constructing a follow-up question. Through conducting qualitative interview, unlike the questionnaires, is relatively loosely constructed and open to what the interviewee feels relevant and important to talk about, giving the interest to the research project (Alvesson, 2003). As in semi-structured interviews, the researchers are encouraged when collecting data to make choices as to which line of questioning they should explore further or inquire to discard even if there is already a framework to plot out the developing themes (Smith et al, 2008). The requirement for a competent researcher who conducts interviews, is that he or she shall be skillful and sensitive enough to

understand and relate the true feeling of the interviewees (Smith et al, 2008) so as to obtain authentic insight from the narrative and non-verbal expression. And the researchers are also encouraged to be objective and not to take social and linguistic difference as mere source of bias (Alvesson, 2008). In addition, the interview itself should be viewed as a complex social event that calls for theoretical understanding to screen out the useful information and shall apply reflexive approach to take a set of various theoretical viewpoints when necessary (Alvesson, 2008).

According to Bryman and Bell (2011) the sample methodology for qualitative research can be opportunistic and convenience. These terms mean that the researcher can define the sample without stratified criteria and according to its possibilities and sources (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Also, Bryman and Bell (2011) states that qualitative researches are in depth analysis where representativeness of the sample is not a main concern as it is in quantitative researches. This research will invite five interviewees who embody different yet representative individual traits, which are considered, in hypothesis, as factors that influence consumer's understanding, willingness and practice on collaborative consumption. Each interviewee is selected with traits representing responsible households who take purchasing decisions for the family; the educational background is representative: one of them have high school degrees, two have university degrees, and the remaining two have post graduate degrees. The level of income is representative as well: two are low income; two have average income and the remaining two have high income. Size of the cities: 50% of them come from big size cities and the remaining 50% from middle size cities. Gender: 40% are male and the other 60% are female. The decision of taking a sample of household interviewees is based on the belief that homogeneity related to this characteristic is accurate in order to make meaningful analysis. At the same time the decisions of having a sample with different educational and income backgrounds and genders was based on representativeness. Even though representativeness issues in qualitative studies are offset with in depth analysis, we wanted to have a heterogeneous sample regarding these two features in order to have different data for in depth analysis. Finally, these features are believed well cover the variables effective for differentiate Colombian consumers engagement in collaborative consumption.

The researchers decide to discard the other two interview methods namely diary methods and video recording (Smith et al, 2008), even if the diary method could possibly give extensive and extra information of individual's attitude and provides detachment in case the researcher gets over-involved personally, and video recording provides visual hints to study the interviewee, but considering the time-limit schedule and a relatively loose requirement for depth in the interview, the researchers choose semi-structured interview as an optimized method.

3.4. Analysis and interpretation of data

This research will use the bottom-up theory in order to analyze and interpret the data. However, the grounded theory was used in the sense of simultaneous analysis between theory and data. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) the Grounded theory was an iterative approach, whereby data collection and analysis repeatedly refer back to each other. Through this method, concepts and categories would be produced through open coding in order to answer the research question. According to the Grounded theory, the answers to the research questions could appear or be interpreted in the form of themes or concepts that simplify their understanding. The term open coding could be understood as the result of the process of examining data and identifying important concepts that encapsulate relevant patterns or conclusions drawn from the interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

3.5. Conclusions

Conclusions are drawn through the process of analyzing the relationship among patterns and contrasting them with the theoretical framework of the research. Patterns across the analyzed data are identified and produced until more abstract patterns that comprise the previous ones are found.

Since this research is conducted from both a deductive and an inductive approach, the conclusions will contrast theory regarding collaborative consumption and will generate "substantive theory" (Bryman & Bell, 2011) as well. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) substantive theory refers to theory in an empirical way and not in a formal way, which "requires data collection in contrasting settings" (Bryman & Bell, 2011, pp. 580).

3.6. The world of the research's informants

Considering that this research has a situational approach, it presents the world of its respondents in order to settle the reader in the actual context. The description of this context is addressed from the perspective of social capital in Colombia as an element that signifies it as a country of the LAW.

According to Sudarsky (1998) the Barcas measurement of Colombia's social capital indicates that it is feeble and that society's trust outside of the immediate nuclear family is low. Paradoxically, the study suggests that the lack of governability gives birth to the concepts of mutuality and solidarity, horizontal relationships, and hierarchy. These concepts arose from the questions of how people resolve collective problems and to whom they approach when they have problems. The answer to these questions is that people do not seek for solutions to governmental institutions; on the contrary the solutions come from the family. In this sense collective problems are not collectively solved. According to the study, this situation is the consequence of an unaware society of the participatory methods to solve civil problems. Consequently, there is lack of vertical articulation and so absence of mechanism that encourages the society to democratically exercise its right and duties to appeal to governmental and non-governmental institutions to solve civil issues. Aligned to the lack of vertical articulation, the study finds that people relative trust in non-governmental organizations such as church, guilds, labor unions, and political parties, but they are not active members of them. Therefore, the level of association is very low and such association, as sources of social capital is not adding value in terms of trust and social capital.

According to Sudarsky (1995), Colombia has political instability found in emergent countries with additional elements such as the legacy of a Mafiosi society and the turbulence of having guerrilla and paramilitary groups. This complex scenario has lead to a lack of governability that endures crime, violence, and corruption, causing the creation of solidarity and trust among the civil society more difficult. Colombia is fractured and atomized society in which few institutions and believes contribute to strengthen social capital. The description of atomized and fractured society refer to the process of people being isolated from society through "lack of social security, legislative linkage, friendship,

solidarity, lack of social meetings with friends of work and neighborhood, no economic support when trouble” (Sudarsky, 1995, pp. 32). As a result, people completely believe in media without validating the information with friends or any other type of legitimate source due to atomization and isolation. In this sense, non-validated believes becomes faith due to isolation (Sudarsky, 1995).

Sudarsky (1995) claims that Colombia emerges from the Jacobin Hispanic Catholic Tradition, which is the negative correlation between a country’s variable of having a catholic heritage and having less interpersonal trust and less economic growth. In addition, though this society has general solidarity in terms of responsibility for the poor and responsibility for peace, people do not take deliberate and effective initiatives to certainly care about public or generalized solidarity.

3.6.1. What does signify the LAW

Despite the argument that CC is a construction of the affluent world, it does not neglect the fact that it has spread over the less affluent world and it will continue doing so due to globalization, therefore, it is imperative to study CC in its early stage in the LAW. To develop this argument we refer to Ger and Belk (1996) and their studies of global consumer culture, global consumption homogenization, and cultural impacts of encounters of the Less Affluent World with marketization and globalization. According to Ger and Belk (1996) the less affluent world is exposed and influenced by the affluent world, which hinders the process of making sense and meaning of its environment.

Belk and Ger (1996) suggest that the uncontainable “global consumption influences are more apt to produce social inequality, class polarizations, consumer frustration, stress, materialism, and threats to health and the environment” (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 271). In this sense, CC as a western construct being adopted by or implemented in emergent countries could be creating this dilemma. For instance, using Belk & Ger’s (1996) analysis of the brand Coke illustrated as “the colonializer of the exotic” (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 272), when the LAW considers exotic everything that comes from the “sophisticated, contemporary, and materialistic United States” (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 272). In the same way, due to lack of research of CC In emergent countries, they could be adopting CC in a colonization mode that sweeps away any cultural, social, economic and political local

stance; or in Appadurai's (1990) terms, it does not take into account any of the five dimensions that end with the suffix *scapes* and their interactions.

Moreover, the concept of the LAW refers to "the modernizing or industrializing societies, and as contrasted to the more affluent and dominant or West" (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 298). This definition is aligned to the concept of emergent countries. Thus, the question of what signifies the LAW is translated to what signifies an emergent country.

3.6.2. What does signify an emergent country?

The definition of emergent country as a nation in process of industrialization and economic growth is not the main concern, on the contrary, to know what signifies an emergent country is the focus of this research. Therefore, another cultural factor to indicate a country at its developing level is, apart from its premature economic development, a less economically prosper country is featured with social trust in a relatively low level when compared with well-developed countries, which largely resulted from Static Culture. The opposite of Static Culture in the spectrum is Progressive Culture. People with the identification of Progressive Culture emphasize on future, the value of work as a major part constructed into daily activity, and the meaning of trust, which extends beyond the family to the broader community. In contrast, in the Static Culture, people identify themselves by focusing more on the past and present, and putting less emphasis on education and the importance of work as an important element for life but a manner for living. Moreover, people with Static Culture constrain their trust with family bond instead of confidently extending it to a wider society (Lawrence E. Harrison, 2000). In such case, it causes higher cost for people in Static Culture to exchange and do business when it does not involve enough mutual commitment as an unspoken rule.

In addition, according to Harrison and Huntington's (1985) research that aims at knowing the extend to which culture affects economics and political development, it demonstrates that in most Latin American countries culture has been an obstacle for development. They define human progress as "movement toward economic development and material well-being, social-economic equity, and political democracy" (Harrison & Huntington, 1985, pp. xv). Thus, since CC is about access to experiences, goods and services, environmental conscious, and financial efficiency, it could be placed in this definition of human progress.

Thus, due to CC is intrinsically related to trust and so to social capital, it could be seen that low social capital is a pattern of the LAW that could disincentive CC. Within the dimension of what signifies the LAW, there is the possibility that in Colombia people hardly practice the western concept of collaborative consumption; instead it might practice a type of peculiar CC of the LAW. Thus, in order to understand this situation, this research will analyze and interpret the empirical data through its theoretical framework.

3.6.3. Why is Colombia a good example for this research?

Colombia is a resourceful representative of the Less Affluent World to study, considering it is industrialized country in developing economical status. And this research focuses on consumer insight towards collaborative consumption largely based on the trust in a socio-cultural setting, Colombia's static cultural feature can be amplified to transfer into other Less Affluent World. By studying its static culture that leads people's spontaneous trust towards their family member instead of a board social circle. And because of the low average productivity in Colombia comparing to the Affluent World, the consumer in the Less Affluent World will develop a mindset with traits of materialism and colonialism. Both factors are shaping the traits of the socio-cultural setting in Less Affluent World and are crucial to look at when understanding the consumer insight on involving their possession in collaborative consumption.

CHAPTER IV: Data interpretation

This chapter centers in analyzing the empirical data collected through semi-structured interviews. The analysis is presented in a set of seven patterns, which have been identified across the interview and which lead to discussion in order to draw conclusions and answer the research question. The set of patterns-categorization is:

4.1. Pattern No. 1: Sharing Possession of Instrumental Use-value And Material Symbolic Value.

4.2. Pattern No. 2: Materialism in the LAW as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture

4.3. Pattern No. 3: Social Implication of Possession and Materialism as a result of the colonialist theory and the global consumer culture.

4.4. Pattern No. 4: Gift giving and charity as a disincentive to CC practices or as a distortion of CC.

4.6. Pattern No. 5: Lack of Habitual Consumption of Secondhand Goods

4.7. Pattern No. 6: Lack of trust and social capital in the LAW as a disincentive for CC

4.8. Pattern No. 7: Trust With Nuclear Family And Strangers

4.1. Pattern No. 1: Possession of Use-value And Symbolic Value

To conceptualize the Colombian respondent's connection with certain goods which they are willing to conduct collaborative consumption with, the researchers asked about different goods in a hypothetical scenario to capture the respondent's perception on their self identity with their owned objects. The interview questioned about female's and male's willingness to involve goods of instrumental value and goods of material symbolic value into the collaborative consumption with others. For example, driller and griller are set up as collaborative consumption goods in the scenario as instrumental-value goods, and clothing, which is catering for the respondent's profile, and children's clothes, which is not directly consumed by the respondent. As a male respondent, Peña, with post-graduate degree, at his 50s, reveals his willingness to share and the instrumental use value of goods. For instance, balloon pumping, griller and car, he projects different attitude towards

his openness for sharing and borrowing these objects. When asked about what he will do when he lacks a balloon pumper for occasional use, purchasing is of his prime option, while cost per use in a long term will be taken into account for potential renting decision. And he shows his consent on lending griller to neighbor even if on the relatively frequent basis conditioned that others keep good record of maintenance for that possession, and this would become part of the process of building up trust with strangers outside of natural family bond.

"...If I know the places that sell those things I will go there and check the prices or I'll check on Internet and the yellow pages to see where I can buy the machine, however, If it is a birth day I wouldn't buy it, I'll see the possibility to rent the machine and hire those kind of services..."

When he was asked about lending his griller to his neighbor, after several times, he answered, "I think that for one more time I will have to do that favor for him, if the first time I lent him the griller, he treated it right, I will lend it to him again, if it is available." Peña shows prudent attitude to sharing objects with a neighbor and such attitude depends on how he associates the nature of the goods in terms of the extent that such goods relates to instrumental use-value and material symbolic value. When the researcher changed the object into a car and asked whether he is willing to share, Peña shows willingness of sharing within nuclear family member. However he mentioned that possessions like a car is an exclusive good that is not for sharing frequently with relatives or the extended family. Also must-have household appliances such a driller, even if its use frequency is not high, Peña thinks that, "because we needed it for specific jobs" he will not borrow it when in need, instead, Peña thinks the easy access to this tool makes him prefer to buy it than borrowing from others. The nature of the driller in Pena's context is an exclusive good and private solidarity good which is considered consumed and enjoyed individually and within a small group rather than open up for public sharing (Sunstein and Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). Peña's perspective on a driller as a solidarity good used and enjoyed exclusively so as to achieve his satisfaction when exploiting this driller's instrumental value. Men is likely to show more willingness to own possession featured instrumental value and spend money on experience, such as household appliance, mobile and getaway trips. While women are more willing to purchase and own objects featured symbolic value, such as fancy dress and accessories (Sunstein and Ullmann-Margalit, 2000). And Peña considers the risk of

hygiene issue and the owner's background before he commits collaborative consumption, and this could be a reason that he eventually buy and own a desired object especially he foreseen a long term use, as he said,

'...Well, we would take the caution of cleaning it thoroughly, however, that would be the plan B, because the first option would be to try to borrow them from relatives or close friends, however, if I can afford to buy the tent, I would rather buy it because, you know, there are always good offers, promotions, good deals to get things, so I would buy it. Also, if we need the tent for a weekend, we might need it in the future, so it is better to buy it now and have it for future situations.'

The notion of owning prevailing household appliance is also shared by the male interviewed Gentil Jimenez. When he was asked whether he will like to buy a laundry machine and share it with his neighbors, he gave reasons that he will have limited access to the machine as he mentioned, 'it would be too difficult to organize the schedule so that everyone could use the machines whenever they want to, then we would argue'. Also, he is afraid of the potential risk of damaging the laundry machine and that will cause unnecessary interpersonal conflict with the owner. From his statement, his concern is related with the trust with the counterpart in consumption. Gentil Jimenez stated as follows,

'...because that's an expensive home appliance and it could be damaged so I would have to pay for the reparation and maybe to buy a new one, so I won't borrow it from him. When you borrow things and you have bad luck and things get damage when you're using them, usually the owner of the item won't understand and then you will have to buy a brand new thing, then in order to avoid that I just rather not borrowing expensive things. I rather rent because if things get broken then nothing happens because in the fee there is the insurance.'

From the above mentioned narrative, Gentil Jimenez's concern is on the doubt of well-regulated agreement on maintaining, assured careful usage and appropriate repair for potential damage. Material possession as an extend self and fully owned by the owner, the owner will feel stronger connection for the object as a symbol of extend self, together with a responsibility for its endurance and maintenance. Also in the LAW, people feel more

urged to protect and secure their valuable belonging because of their relatively weaker purchase ability upon relative longer working hour to afford a possession than the people in the AW. That increases their mindset of protecting and personalizing expensive objects and feeling reluctant to involving in collaborative consumption.

In the case of female informants, the goods they associate with private solidarity goods, they rather possess them and not to share them. These goods symbolize personal connection as an extension of self. Whereas, females are willing to share public-solidarity and semi-solidarity goods, because they see the value on sharing them. The Informant Lucero Fierro relied as such when she is asked whether she will rent a fancy dress, *'No! Now the market offers dresses at very good prices and renting dresses becomes more expensive, so I rather buy a dress even though I know that I probably wouldn't use it often.'* She takes also the wearing frequency of a dress when deciding to rent or buying it. When she gave examples of occasional dress such as wedding dress, *'...Sure that I would rent it because that it is very, very expensive and just for one occasion, no one would wear that dress ever again, not even your daughter'*. From her narrative, the consideration of economical long-term usage of the wedding dress carries instrumental use value more than the value of symbolic meaning. Wedding dress is weighed with heavy symbolic value because of its narrow and occasion-specific wearing context, and based on its rare usage frequency and no special personal complex with wedding dress, it shows no strong implication of extend self or personal connection with this female informants. Thus this informants decides not to own the wedding dress, instead, she turns to the solution of renting as a form of collaborative consumption

When Consuelo Fierro was asked about whether she would be willing to participate in a clothing swap event with her friends, her answer was positive and then she mention an extend list of things that included bags, shoes, scarfs, and jackets, which she would take to that swapping event. Posteriorly she was asked whether she would be willing to take similar things from the event to use them later, and her answer was:

“Well, maybe. I haven't have that situation, however, I think I would. I don't know... Actually I'm not sure whether I'll take and use accesories and clothes used by a friend. (Laughing). I would feel weird wearing a jacket that my neighbor has worn before. I don't know why I wouldn't do it, but I don't think I would. I just cannot

imagine wearing something I've seen my neighbor wore before, if it were from my sister or from someone who's not around me and neither me nor someone else has seen her wearing that jacket, I would be ok, but I just can't imagine walking outside with my neighbors' clothes (laughing). Ohh what a shame, but that's how I feel, why I wouldn't do it? ummmmm maybe because I wouldn't like people to see that I'm wearing my neighbor's clothes. Yes, I think that's the reason!"

From her narrative, the fashion clothing item to a female interviewee is more than clothes to wear based on its wearable value, but also an item carries symbolic meaning to convey one's uniqueness. In another word, fashion clothing item is an symbolic object to express oneself. In the consumption context for a female, she will feel uncomfortable wear clothes, which is to say, a same code of statement in the form of fashion, on a person she might see everyday in residence neighborhood.

When the respondent Peña was asked to name the useful things he would be willing to move from his home to a permanent room in his neighborhood so that all the neighbors could benefit from sharing everything that was in that room, his first answer didn't contain the list of articles, thus the question was raised one more time. In the second questions his answer was consistent with the first one:

First answer:

"Well, that idea is great, of course! If I have something to share... I would like to have an inventory so we don't repeat things and we could see if we have the elements that are need it. In addition, we would be willing to buy things to take to that place"

Second answer:

"Well, Let's see... we have to see the utilization of the things that we can give away according tot the usage frequency, for instance if we see something that we sporadically use and that thing corresponds to that requirement of the administration we'll analyze that aspect and take the decision"

The respondent's answers indicate that he doubts about his willingness to share, therefore, he cannot name the items he would share with his neighbors. His answer sounds as if he were thinking that such sharing activity is too good to be true, so he finished his answer claiming that he will be willing to buy new things to take to that sharing room.

From his narrative, such object donated for collaborative consumption does not fall into the authentic collaborative consumption category. The objects in the collaborative consumption is redundant item that can be donated or exchanged with, so as to prolong the life cycle of such object as well as provide support to others in need. This interviewee considers the lack of the setting for collaborative consumption house and considers buying extra items to fit in the missing role, but this is not out of the consideration for reallocating the existing resource he has to involve in collaborative consumption.

4.2. Pattern No. 2: Materialism in the LAW as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture.

Materialism as a main disincentive of CC is one of the elements included in the interviews in order to find patterns that help the researchers to answer the research question. Consequently, the informant Peña claims that he will be willing to share his car with relatives, however, he emphasizes that this practice should not become frequent and when he is asked to explain why, he answered:

“Well, because I think that a car is for the family, it is something required by the family, and if I lend it my family would be losing the possibility to use it for being lent to a relative. Also, I think a car is a necessity, then it should be there to be exclusively used by the nuclear family members such as dad, mom, and sons”

This answer is related to Ger and Belk's (1996) discourse about materialism in the LAW as a result of two phenomena, scarcity and globalization and the global consumer culture. First of all, the respondent's answer displays materialism in the sense that the car signifies happiness for the family members and deters the act of sharing as well. Secondly, the answer implies the presence of scarcity because apparently there is one car for the

nuclear family members or at least not all the members of the nuclear family have a car, thus they have to share it. In this sense, the practice of sharing the car with a relative implies deprivation and sacrifice by the members of the nuclear family. Thirdly, the answer indicates anxiety and frustration for not having what is considered basic needs, thus having the need to borrow or to lend them. The assumptions that a car is a basic need and those basic needs should be in every single household, therefore they should not be shared could be a trait of the way Colombia, as a country of the LAW, makes sense of its environment through consumption. This consumption pattern that basic goods should not be shared could be an outcome of the global consumer culture.

In order to interpret this pattern, the definition of basic goods is explored. However, the literature available defines basic goods in terms of the group of goods that addresses basic needs in the stance that human deprivation of basic needs has negative effects for the human health (Reinert, 2011). Consequently, the definition of basic needs is approached. Basic needs are defined as “what we need to survive, to be healthy, to avoid harm, to function properly” Griffin (1986, pp.42). According to Maslow’s hierarchy of basic needs (1987), at the bottom of his pyramid there are the physiological needs, which refer to two main concepts: homeostasis and appetites. Homeostasis refers to the things needed for the normal functionality of the body such as air, water, salt content, and so on. Appetites are preferential choices, which are supposed to indicate a need or lack in the body. Without going further in Maslow’s basic needs hierarchy, his psychological need level refers to food, water, clothing, shelter, and warmth, so on. Under these theoretical constructs, a car would not be part of the group of basic goods. However, the respondents imply, that in the Colombian context, a car is a basic good. This pattern might be an outcome of the global consumer culture, in which the AW influences the LAW. In this case the LAW could have interpreted that some goods need to be treated as basic in order to catch up with the lifestyle of the AW.

Similarly, other respondents’ answers obey to this trait of materialism in the LAW as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture such as Ximena, who when asked to answer whether she would lend her griller to her neighbor three months after she had previously lent it to him, she answered:

“Again? is he going to ask me for the griller? (Laughing)... Humm... what can I say... It seems he likes to grill but he hasn’t have a griller, he should get a griller, that’s a basic thing! (Sarcastically Laughing). Again... I would lend the griller to him with the same recommendations”.

This respondent used the word basic to refer that the griller is a basic household appliance. This claim seems contradicting considering that the question implies that the neighbor uses the griller sporadically, specifically every three months. In contrast, the respondent answer shows the pattern materialism due to it implies unwillingness to share more that one time. In addition, this pattern of considering some goods as basic could be a trait of the postcolonial theory, in which Colombian society imitates the AW by considering basic goods those that are not determined as such in the Colombian context. In this sense Colombia could be claiming equality to the AW by imitating behaviors of the LAW. For instance, if we consider the griller, this is a good that by no means is a basic good in the Colombian context. However, it is in some societies of the AW such as U.S. or Sweden, where the practice of having a BBQ is a common activity during spring and summer, thus regarding culture, a griller could be considered a basic good. Whereas, when it comes to compare the BBQ practice of the mentioned countries to the Colombian culture, the outcome would be that such practice could be compared to the wood stew by the river. In this context, a pot could be considered a basic good. It is noteworthy to state that in this analysis the interpretation of basic goods is in terms of basic household appliances.

When the respondent Consuelo Fierro was asked about why she would not rent a tent instead of borrowing it from a brother as she previously claim, her answer was:

“Yes, but as I said, since a tent is a basic household tool we should have it as something personal for the family, then we should have it and not renting. Because of that I don’t think I would rent it”

In the same way the last answer attributes the characteristic of basic to a good that is not considered a basic household appliances.

Likewise, when the respondent Claudia was asked if she would be willing to rent a tent, since she does not have one, her answer added another element to the pattern of materialism as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture, which is expensive products. Previously, it was stated that basic household goods should be owned; now the respondent brings up the element of price-value. This price-value appears to be another element that strengthens the pattern of materialism as a result of scarcity because it shows that people are not willing to share expensive things.

“No, a tent is something expensive and I think people wouldn't like to share it because they might be afraid that the person they lend it to could damage it. For instance, a few weeks ago my kids had a sleep over with their friends and one of them brought a big tent and his dad was so concern with the tent, he did a whole ceremony to set up the tent and made all the recommendations about it; it was crazy!”

It appears that some of the goods that Colombians interpret as basic, such as those analyzed in the semi-structure interviews, namely a griller, a washing machine, and a tent have a “positional aspect” (Zagorsji, Kelley, and Evans, 2007, pp.). This means that such goods reflect status and social standing. In contrast, some of those goods, considered basic and with a positional aspect, in the AW might have absolute aspects (Zagorsji, Kelley, and Evans, 2007, pp.). This means that in the AW these products are considered neutral and they do not reflect any distinction among people. This trait could be more understandable in Hsee et al. (2009) approach to possessions, who categorize goods and services as basic commodities and status products. In this case the analysis is that Colombians consider some goods that are considered commodities in the AW as status-symbolic meaning products because they symbolize the availability of economic resources to afford basic household appliances for the family enjoyment. Consequently, apparently Colombians are not willing to share status products.

In addition, the respondent Gentil explicitly states scarcity as a trait of the LAW that deters sharing when he was asked about how he feels when his kids lend their bikes to friends:

“Well, I would feel... let's see, if his friend urges the bike then it is ok, if not, I'll ask my son not to do that ever again because something could happen to the bike like an accident, he could break up the bike or the bike could be stolen and then we don't know if the friend's parents will pay for the bike's reparation and since the bike cost me a lot of money and effort to buy it I just wouldn't like to lose the bike”

The respondent's description that he does not know whether the parents of his kids' friends would pay for repairing or for buying a new bike in the case it were stolen, shows a sign of scarcity as a pattern of the LAW. The respondent doubts the counter person has the money and the responsible behavior to pay what they have broken up or lost. This situation could be interpreted that since Colombia is a county of the LAW, when someone asks to borrow something from someone else is because that person cannot afford to buy certain good. At the same time, the fact that someone cannot afford something could imply that such person is not economically capable to assume any responsibility in order to return the bike in the same condition that it was received.

4.3. Pattern No. 5: Social Implication of Possession and Materialism as a result of the colonialist theory and the global consumer culture.

The identification of this pattern derives from the analysis of materialism in the data in order to understand how the respondents behave regarding the elements of CC, in this case, its main disincentive. In this case, the respondent spontaneously elaborated a comparison between the behavior of renting washing machines in the context of U.S. versus de Colombian context. The respondent suggests the cultural and social context in Colombian towards possessing something is different from the one in America based on her life experience. In Colombia, owning something is considered higher social status and affluent in Colombian society, as she mentioned:

‘... There are things (behaviors) that are not well seen, for instance if you rent a washing machine, people would think that you don't have money to buy your own brand new washing machine, then you'll be judged and criticized. It is not easy to say I'm going to rent a washing machine, whereas in the States when you're traveling you go to a public laundry and put coins in a machine and wash your cloth and this is exactly like renting a washing machine in Colombia, but we just see it different because we are in Colombia.’

According to Fanon (1952) in this claim it could be identified the post-colonial legacy of an identity of low self-esteem and inferiority due to the informant manifests that in other countries, such as U.S, the society does not criticize not having a washing machine, in contrast, Colombia's society does criticize. This could be explained by understanding that goods signify people. In addition, the trait that the colonized subject emulates the colonizer in order to claim for equality (Varman & Belk, 2012) can be seen in Colombia. It appears that Colombian society demands people to own washing machines because they are considered basic households in the AW of U.S, thus it should be a basic household appliance in Colombia as well. Moreover, we can see a materialistic society, in which not having a basic household appliance, even when it is expensive, is a subject of criticism. In addition, we can see Belk's (1996) stance that countries that experience abrupt social changes and so instability are more prompted to have the ownership as a meaning of security addressing the lack of security that the government and economic system cannot provide them.

When the respondent Claudia was asked about what her relatives would say if they know that she has bought something from a second hand store, her answer shows that by no means, she would like her relatives to know about this. It is like if she were caught and she is ashamed of it. *"Well, first of all, I wouldn't tell them! (Laughing) because the truth is that it is something that is not well seen, (laughing) I'm sorry but that's how it is..."*

Posteriorly she explains this situation by claiming that the same situation in the U.S. would be socially acceptable. Moreover, she implies that renting washing machines is acceptable in the U.S. because that consumption practice is not associated with poverty, whereas it is associated with poverty in Colombia, therefore it is considered denigrated. In this part, the materialism pattern is identified, whereby not owning a washing machine is a source of dissatisfaction. In addition, this pattern is related to the global consumer culture in the sense that the AW influences the consumption patterns of the LAW causing stress, tension, and frustration (Belk, 1996).

4.4. Pattern No. 4: Gift giving and charity as a disincentive to CC practices or as a distortion of CC.

The most persistent pattern among the respondents, when asked questions regarding the process of what to do with idle goods or surplus goods, is the act of gift giving under the form of charity. Respondents indicate that give away idle stuff to people that need them is their first option over selling or swapping them. In fact, the behavior of swapping or selling used things appears to be considered not socially or morally acceptable.

When the respondent Peña was asked about what he usually does when he has surplus of an item he answered:

“We take the decision of giving them away if we know someone who needs it, for instance, we have a country house and we usually take there everything we don't use and give them away to neighbors because we know they need it. Also, we give away things we don't use to relatives, when we know they need them”.

Posteriorly, Peña was asked about how he feels when he give away things to people from the country side, his answer indicate a proper act of donation as it was previously explained in the theory chapter.

“Good, because we do it as an act of detachment and for supporting someone that it is in need”.

This situation could be related to the practice of gift giving, as relationship builder and source of happiness. This is explain with Belk (1984) in societies where the concept of self is founded on the concept of community-based, the practice of gift-giving within the extended family is understood as giving to the self and so building the self-identity. Colombian society is individual-based due to is a country in the process of industrialization. In the presence of labor division due to industrialization, societies become individual-based. Thus, even if Colombia is not a community-based, it appears that it still preserves the practice of gift giving for the sake of the community welfare.

Another element of the gift giving pattern in the form of charity is added with the information given by the respondent Claudia. When she was asked about what she does with the surplus stuffs, her answer indicates that it is socially or morally not acceptable to sell or to swap things that have been received as gifts. Paradoxically, it is acceptable to give them away to people who need them.

“If I know I won't use them I will give them away to relatives or someone that needs it and I definitely won't storage them. I won't sell them because I don't think it is right to sell something that I've received as a gift”.

Consuelo Fierro's answers is similar to the previous one: but she was asked to explain what she means with the expression that she is not the type of person that sells used things.

“Hahahah (laughing) because I think that something that has been used shouldn't be sold, that's my mentality, if it is something I've used then I just give it away, but I would never sell it, I don't know, but that's how I think. Actually, ideally we should give away brand new things, however, since there are things that are not been used and are in good condition, then someone else can continue using it, then why not to give them away”

When the respondents claim they prefer to give used things away instead of selling or swapping them because they are not good at selling or because their first option is to give them away, and they prefer to rent things instead of borrowing them from a friend because they either would feel ashamed if the good damages or they just do not want to bother someone else, this pattern can be identified.

According to Prattis (1987) collaboration within the extended family and neighbors in premarkets or marginal societies with production of subsistence, help them to survive. In these premarkets there is valuable gratification and reward in gift giving that are not present in market economies (Corfman and Lehman, 1987). Even though not all the countries of the LAW are premarket or marginal societies with a production of subsistence, this trait could be implicitly present in the LAW setting consumption patterns. Moreover, according to Arnould' (1989) findings in the society of Zinder, an African country of the

LAW, when it comes to buy things, this society prefers to develop personal relationships with relatives and the people from the marketplace than to make good deals. Corfman and Lehman (1987) define this behavior as “compromise over minor distributive decisions in the interests of overall equity or fairness seems to influence norms of expectations and compliance” (Arnould, 1989, pp. 246). Thus, this consumption pattern is identified in the Colombian context due to respondents claim to prefer to give away instead of making money through selling, renting or swapping their idle possessions.

4.5. Pattern No. 6: Lack of Habitual Consumption of Secondhand Goods

Counting the above mentioned social, cultural and infrastructural context (Bardhi et al, 2012) in Colombia, the consumption of secondhand goods and the associated shops is relatively rare to Colombian interviewees. Buying or selling used goods is seldom or never happened to the interviewees. When they were asked to picture themselves in a scenario that their goods is to be recycled, they usually give the usable ones away to their acquaintance or abundant them, rather than considering giving the recyclable goods to a secondhand shop or even shop in secondhand shop. As Lucero Fierro, a female interviewee at her age of 40 and holding a post graduate degree, talked about how she handle the recyclable goods,

‘...Some of them are stored and most of them are given away to people that need them. For instance, we start giving them away to the maid, then we look for people who really need that and that really will use those things, people that we know won't storage those things. So, usually it is in this order: the maid, family and institutions that need them. We recycle things we don't need. I always give those things away, I never sell them, I'm not the type of person that sells used things, for instance, I've never sold a washing machine or anything like that’.

While another interviewee Gentil Jimenez has experience of shopping in second hand shop, which is in good condition, but he is willing to buy goods in second hand shop, which is cheap, and of low-involvement because he concerned of the uncertain background of previous user and the quality. As he said,

'...home appliances because I don't know the quality and the previous use that they have received and so I wouldn't know how long it will last. For instance, I don't like to buy used motorcycles because you don't know how it was previously treated and what technical problems it has'.

Peña:

"What do you mean with second hand, like a used car? Not really, I've bought used cars but I'm very careful with that, I look for trustful car dealers, or car owners that I know, but other kind of things like home appliances, we haven't bought them from second hand. I've never liked to buy used things and would never like to buy them"

Consuelo Fierro: Her answer when she was asked to explain why she has not buy things from second hand stores.

"Because always the first option is to buy things brand new. For instance, I don't feel comfortable buying used cars. However, if we have to because of financial reasons, well, we would definitely do it, but if we can afford a brand new car we prefer to buy it new. We always make the financial effort to buy things brand new in order to feel secure that the car will be ok for at least the first 4 years"

In the light of these narratives, the interviewees weigh the quality and the background of previous owner in their second hand goods shopping process. Moreover, the concern for having goods of good quality that would last for a quite long time is prevalent.

4.6. Pattern No. 7: Lack of trust and social capital in the LAW as a disincentive for CC

The trait of low trust and so less willingness to share is almost evident in all the respondents' answers. However, the strongest evidence comes from the respondent named Gentil, who cannot afford to buy a washing machine, therefore he uses the service of renting them out to be used in his house. When Gentil was asked if he has thought about the idea of associating with the neighbors that are in the same situation than him to buy washing machines to be shared among them, he answered:

“It would be too difficult to invest money where there are a lot of people, a lot of investors. For instance, it would be too difficult to organize the schedule so that everyone could use the machines whenever they want to, then we would fight. That it is a good idea, but where there is no coexistence it is not possible to do group buying. Then it would be better for me to sacrifice myself and save money in order to buy my own washing machine”.

Through this answer, it can be observed a society with low level of association and trust, therefore, low social capital. The respondent uses the words - too difficult, to argue, and coexistence – which indicate a society that lacks of trust, reciprocity, and perhaps tolerance, which hinder the development of initiatives of association for community benefits. As it has been stated, trust is imperative to develop CC consumption practices.

“Well, they are children, then when they want something, they just go and get it, thus I think there is no problem with that. However, I would talk to my kids and tell them that it is better not to borrow things because there is the risk of breaking them up and then we would have to pay them like if the bikes were brand new. Also, if I see that my son needs a bike then I would do anything possible to buy it for him”.

The same respondent indicates the same lacks of trust pattern through a different believe. When the respondent was asked about how he feels when his kids borrow their friends' bikes, his answer indicates distrust toward people. This distrust is embodied in the form of people taking advantage of situations to benefit themselves or to be better off without deserving it. The respondent answer indicates that the kid's parents from which his son borrows the bike might be advantageous people who might charge a high and not reasonable price for the reparation of the bike, in case of damage.

4.7. Pattern No. 8: Trust With Nuclear Family And Strangers

Trust is obviously an important and prime consideration when the informants decide to lend or to borrow goods. All the informants also showed their initial willingness to share with nuclear family members. The respondents' willingness to share within the nuclear family is very convincing and positive. These were the answers when asked about what

they will be willing to share with siblings: Claudia: ...”Everything, with my brothers absolutely everything”; Ximena: “What ever they want”; Lucero Fierro: “Wow... well, if I can share a griller with a neighbor then I can share everything with my brothers, everything! When it comes to material things, I'm willing to share everything with them, whatever they need, we are too united, that's how we are used to be...”. This pattern could have its explanation in the concept of Static Culture. Which indicates that societies of emergent countries or the LAW constrain their trust within family bond instead of confidently extending it to a wider society (Lawrence E. Harrison, 2000). Moreover, in Static cultures people rely more on the nuclear family than in the whole society and in the government. This pattern also refers to Colombia’s low social capital (Sudarsky, 1998). According to the definition of social capital “the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (Portes, 1998, pp. 6) Colombian people do not benefit from belonging to a community bigger than its nuclear family due to its low social capital, therefore its low trust in people outside of its nuclear family. In contrast, it appears that people have to heavily rely on family members.

Aligned to the concept of Static Culture Lawrence E. Harrison, 2000), the respondents claimed that when they build trust with acquaintances or community members, they tend to build up trust based on fair treatment on the maintenance of the shared object. For example, they expect others treat their borrowed goods as well as the original owner does and that they can afford reparation in case the goods are broken. The Colombian static culture hinders processes of exchanging such as sharing. Thus, it could be seen how Colombian’s static culture is an obstacle for development because processes of sharing allow further economic exchanges that enhance development (Harrison & Huntington’s (1985).

The informant with post-graduate degree, Claudia Montoya, at her age of 40, shows her willingness on involving family members and her attitude on trust when she decides to consume collaboratively or not.

‘Because we are family, there is a bond that allows to have that type of trust and confidence to borrow and lend things, then I won't be ashamed to bother them. For instance, with a friend there isn't that trust then I don't know if that friend would be bothered with the lending situation, then everything depends on trust and

confidence.... Clothing I do give it away, pretty often. The cloth that my kids don't wear anymore and that are good, I give it away to a younger cousin or to close friends with whom we have trust and confidence. What is broken or damaged I throw it away.'

The nature bond within family member makes it a priority for Colombian informant to choose to conduct collaborative consumption and support with. In addition, the informant Gentil Jimenez talked about his sense of security on trusting strangers, he claimed that it takes time to build up mutual support over time and to understand the personality and background of the stranger who borrows and uses his possession,

'I always borrow it from my neighbor because we support each other, whatever he needs from me I try to lend it to him and viceversa. We are good friends and good neighbors, for instance, if he needs a shovel, I'll lend it to him, if I need a driller, he will lend it to me. We trust each other, then I'm not afraid of lending something to him because I know he will give it back to me in good conditions and he has never disappointed me. With the neighbors that I don't trust I don't share. For instance, in my neighborhood people constantly move so there are always new people and that makes hard to get to know them so I cannot trust them'.

Having good understanding of each other over a history record is a manner shared by other informants when they evaluate the extent of trustworthy counterpart for the collaborative consumption.

According to Janelle Orsi (The Shareable Magazine, 2013), there are four degrees of sharing, which imply the relevance of trust.

Sharing to the first degree requires cooperation and minimal planning. It is spontaneous and simple sharing processes such as potlucks or meal exchanges with neighbors. According to the analyzed data, in the Colombian context, this is practiced within family members, friends, and at some degree with the friends of a friend.

Sharing to the second degree requires cooperation plus more extensive planning: It usually involves many people and valuable items, thus it requires more planning. E.g. sharing the ownership of a car between two neighbors. According to the data analyzed this

only takes place in low-income communities of Colombia. i.e. the respondent Gentil who shares his motorcycle with his neighbor at a regular basis.

Sharing to the third degree requires cooperation plus extensive planning and infrastructure. This is more complex because the ownership of an expensive good could be shared with more than 3 people, which requires financial and usage planning; thus this degree requires a management infrastructure because the sharing process becomes a lasting community institution that needs to be managed. E.g. cohousing communities. This was not identified in the data.

Sharing to the four degree requires cooperation, extensive planning, infrastructure, community-wide restructuring and mobilization. Due to the magnitude of this sharing degree, other players are needed to be mobilized such as legislators, banks, etc. E.g. city bike sharing programs. This stage was not tested.

Chapter V

Discussion

This chapter is based on the discussion of three patterns that comprise all the other seven patterns. The individual and simultaneous discussion of the two patterns will lead to answer the research question in a sequence of theoretical analysis of data, finding relationships among patterns and finding more abstract patterns that comprise the others. Some of the seven patterns are categorized in more than one of the three major patterns because they have consumption patterns that signify these major patterns.

The three transversal patterns are:

The first pattern is named materialism as a result of the traits of the LAW. This pattern comprises the interactions between the traits of the LAW with the dynamics of globalization, the global consumer culture, and the postcolonial theory. This pattern includes two of the seven patterns described in the data analysis as it follows.

4.2. Pattern No. 2: Materialism in the LAW as a result of scarcity and the global consumer culture

4.3. Pattern No. 3: Social Implication of Possession and Materialism as a result of the colonialist theory and the global consumer culture.

The second pattern is called the prevalence of the gift giving practice. This pattern comprises the patterns that indicate detraction from CC practices different than gift giving, specifically regarding people's willingness to make money from idle goods, namely selling, renting out, and swapping used goods. This pattern synthesizes the importance of maintaining good relationships with individuals through practicing gift giving and avoiding all the other exchange activities of CC. This pattern includes the four patterns of the data analysis, as it follows.

4.1. Pattern No. 1: Sharing Possession of Instrumental Use-value And Material Symbolic Value.

4.3. Pattern No. 3: Social Implication of Possession and Materialism as a result of the colonialist theory and the global consumer culture.

4.4. Pattern No. 4: Gift giving and charity as a disincentive to CC practices or as a distortion of CC.

4.6. Pattern No. 5: Lack of Habitual Consumption of Secondhand Goods

5.1. Materialism as a result of the traits of the LAW.

“Materialism is neither unique to the West nor directly related to affluence, contrary to what has been assumed in prior treatments of the development of consumer culture” (Ger & Belk, 1994, pp.55). This statement is the departure point to elaborate the discussion on materialism as a result of the traits of the LAW, as a transversal pattern found on analyzed data, which leads to answer the research question. This research did not intend to confirm Ger and Belk’s (1994,1999) findings about materialism across cultures, neither attempted to measure the grade or level of materialism in the LAW. Instead, this research studies and articulates materialism from its theoretical construct regarding its general definition and its meaning in the LAW.

According to the definition of CC, materialism is a determine element that deters people to engage in CC practices. Moreover, according to Belk’s materialism scale, materialism has three dimensions regarding behaviors and feelings toward goods, and the definition of goods. For this part of the discussion this research centers in the materialism’s scale of the dynamic of the definition of goods due to the data collected and analyzed shows relevant patterns.

Materialism in terms of goods
Wanted
Necessities
Missed

First of all, ownership is the act of identifying that something is mine and possessing is the extension of the self over something, which creates attachment and identification (Belk, 1988). In the analyzed data was identified that respondents consider possessions the goods that are determined as basic, expensive, and personal goods. Moreover, those goods, excepting the Balloon-pumping machine, are considered not supposed to be shared.

Basic	Expensive	Private
Car	Car	Clothing
Washing Machine	Washing Machine	
Griller		
Tent		
Balloon pumping machine		

However, in the case of the goods considered basic, it is contradictory that this set of goods is considered basic in the context of a country of the LAW. This paradox was explained in the data analysis, which generally indicates that under normal or typical circumstances of the Colombian context, these goods are not considered basic. Consequently, the explication for the meaning of goods that cause materialism and so detracts people from sharing, are define under the construct named materialism as a result of the trait of the LAW. This construct is elaborated on two individual constructs, namely globalization and the global consumer culture, in which the elements of scarcity and social instability are present, and the postcolonial theory.

Globalization and the global consumer culture

First of all, the theoretical Ger and Belk (1994) argue that consumer desires might be increasingly interdependent across cultures due to globalization. This interdependency is based on the influence of the AW over the LAW, which as it was stated before, determines the consumption patterns of the LAW (Belk, 1994). However, As Belk (1994,1999) claims the flow of consumptionscapes (Appadurai,) is from the local to the global, from the West to the East, from North to South, and viceversa. Therefore, even though there is the tendency of homogenization and so the creation of a global consumer culture, there are evidences that indicate that the local shapes the global (Belk, 2012). Consequently, the Colombian pattern of goods categorization/meaning that determines materialism could be seen as an outcome the global consumer culture.

Secondly, this categorization and meaning of goods established by the respondents could be attributed to the symmetry of meaning as a result of the negotiation/ambiguity among the local, the Western, and the global meaning of such goods. Arnould's (1989) claim that

through consumption, goods reach the symmetry of meaning, which refers to the consensus of the meanings and values of goods as part of the material culture inventory of a society. In this sense, the goods that the respondents defined as basic, expensive, and personal, as a common pattern, have the common meaning of being valuable and signify status in terms of purchase power, therefore these types of goods are part of the material inventory of this society as goods that are not supposed to be shared.

It is noteworthy to state that this set of basic, expensive, and private goods, which are not supposed to be shared, signify people in the sense that they show to society that the owner can afford those goods. Even though, those basic goods could be considered luxuries in the LAW due to its price (not for its functionality, and the job they get done), these goods are must-have products in order to gain equality with global consumers. Thus, in the local, this goods signify purchasing power, and in the global, equality, and perhaps dignity. Another element of this consensus is scarcity. Since Colombia is a country of the LAW, it entails deprivation, thus people have to make a great effort and perhaps sacrifice in order to afford the basic goods of the global consumer culture. This pattern of the LAW in the light of globalization creates materialism.

Third, Colombia as an example of a country of the LAW displays social instability, which according to Ger and Belk (1999), causes identity crisis. And societies under identities crisis and low support from the government as a trait of the LAW, seek security in possessions. Moreover, the LAW consumers seek legitimacy by emulating Western consumer behavior through the consumption of aspirational goods and experiences, which in this case, the LAW (Colombia) could be giving them a new meaning of basic-aspirational goods. This pattern appears to support the statement that Colombian people do not do CC practices due to materialism as a result of the traits of the LAW. This is explained in the consumer behavior that basic, expensive, and private goods should not be shared, because they are an extension of themselves that provide them security.

The postcolonial theory

Previously, it was stated that the post-colonized countries struggle with the legacy from colonialism and try to cope with the challenges and the consumption pace display by the West. Also, the colonized identity was introduced as inferior to the colonizer Fanon (1952).

This was followed by the postcolonial distinction between underdeveloped as a subject and underdevelopment as a form of identity Gupta (1998). In this sense, this identity pattern could be identified as the abstract pattern behind the materialism pattern in Colombia that disincentive people to do CC.

This argument can be identified in the abstract claim behind the respondents' answers that basic goods should not be shared because they are must-have even though they know that such basic goods are expensive and difficult to afford. In the Colombian society it can be identified the "maskarade" (Goffman, 1968) behavior. Apparently, everyone agrees in pretending to behave according to the belief that basic goods are ordinary goods that everyone should have in its home therefore no body needs to borrow them. In this sense, Colombian people are hiring their Third World identities (Varman and Belk (2012) because it is a country of the LAW, in which there is scarcity therefore, people would need to share and collaborate, at least at one point.

It was mentioned that through the basic goods categorization/meaning, the Colombian society is emulating a consumption pattern of the AW. Also, it was mentioned that the basic goods categorization/meaning in the local context of Colombia signifies purchasing power and in the global context it might signify equality and perhaps dignity and so freedom. However, considering Fanon's (1952) stance that only through the conflictive emulation of the colonizer, the colonized can achieve freedom, the cycle of emulation is the rule in the Colombian context as a country of the LAW.

5.2. The prevalence of the gift giving practice.

It is demonstrated in the interview narratives that the interviewees seldom have habit of sharing, borrowing and swapping goods or other abundant resource. Their reactions are usually giving away the goods to others or selling an used goods of high purchase expenditure for the purpose of refunding certain proportion of money. Yet this gift giving act involving no expectation of equivalent return or obligation from the receipt party. On one hand, Colombian consumer reinforce their relationship with others by gift giving, and such reciprocal action is a form of consumption help consolidating the social relationship as a kind charity among people. On the other hand, the prevalence of the gift giving practice limits their full exposure to collaborative consumption, in which context, swapping and sharing are also important. It is an important facet in collaborative consumption to

involve interaction and build up relationship based on continual temporary access and the trust to fuel such interpersonal collaboration. In the interview narrative, one interviewee expressed the concern that involving sharing and swapping with acquaintance is sometimes troublesome, in that case, gift giving is more convenience and free from such care.

A point to be made in the facet of gift giving is, because of this prevalent gift giving practice as major form of collaborative consumption in Colombia, this is also considered to be a relative reason why Colombia consumers choose close and handy social circle such as, family member and neighborhood, instead of reaching out a network larger than the existing one. When people choose giving away the surplus possession, they tend to relate the close friends and members of kinship. Apart from the motivation of helping out and maintaining or enhancing the relationship, it is also more convenient to do so because they can save their extra evaluation on the trust between them and strangers. They can easily evaluate how much trust they put on their family member or colleagues or close friends, also because of their long-term bond constrains the potential risk of breaking the agreement and social norm. And when trust issue is of doubt in Colombia, especially people feel unsecured and skeptical for the people outside their nuclear family, the authentic collaborative consumption can be hard to carry out.

Chapter VI

Conclusions

The answer to the research question, how do people from Colombia, as a country of the LAW, make sense of CC?, is constructed on a transversal pattern that comprises the last two patterns that were previously discussed. The transversal pattern is called the problematic legacy of the LAW. This pattern is theoretically framed on three concepts: social capital and trust, postcolonial theory, and globalization and the global consumer culture. Due to these discourses have been extensively discussed along the thesis, they will not be reviewed. These three theoretical concepts are the tipping point of the problematic legacy of the LAW.

This pattern will be deconstructed into two main discourses which comprises the three discourse as follows.

Challenge of the Cultural inventory of goods and identity in the light of materialism.

Ownership is the act of identifying that something is mine and possessing is the extension of the self over something, which creates attachment and identification (Belk, 1988). Materialism is the importance of possessions in life as a primary source of happiness and dissatisfaction as well, which deters CC and so sharing (Belk, 1985). According to our findings, Colombia is a materialistic society signified through possessions. The possessions that are understood as basic, expensive, and private cannot be shared. The pivotal discourse of the materialism and the unwillingness to share patterns, is that those goods are the extension of self.

Colombian society has the construct that basic-aspirational goods are not supposed to be shared outside of the immediate nuclear family, which neglects the principle of CC of sharing in a massive scope, including strangers. This research defined Basic-aspirational goods as the type of goods that allow Colombian society to perform the basic lifestyle of the AW. However, in the Colombian context these basic-aspirational goods are not considered basic goods in terms of needs to survive neither to live a decent or dignified life, nor the set of goods that are basic for performing the traditions or behaviors rooted in the Colombian culture. Moreover, in the Colombian context, some of these goods are not

easy to attain due to price-income limitations. In this sense, basic-aspirational goods have the symbolic of exhibiting the purchasing power to materialize the aspirational Western lifestyle. This construction, is the result of the consensus between Colombia and the AW's influence. This so-called consensus is based on the interaction of two discourses namely postcolonial, and globalization and the global consumer culture. In this consensus, Colombia's identity and inventory of cultural goods comes to terms in the light of stress, ambiguity, frustration, and so forth caused by globalization and the global consumer culture. According to the postcolonial theory, this consensus is

Challenge of the Cultural inventory of goods and identity in the light of trust and the nuclear family

CC challenges Colombian construction of trust and social capital in the sense that they deters people to practice CC. Colombia's low trust derives from the traits of the LAW. Also, Colombia's low trust comes from the static culture, in which people do not trust people outside of their nuclear family, thus they relay in their immediate family member. This pattern creates an atomized society that is challenged by the massive reach of CC.

Answer to the research question, how do people from Colombia, as a country of the LAS, make sense of CC?

According to this transversal pattern, the answer to the research question is that Colombia, as a country of the LAW, makes sense of CC as a problematic western construct, which challenges its inventory of cultural goods and its identity.

CC is understood as problematic in Colombian society due to CC's practices of sharing, renting, selling, and swapping used and idle possessions would change Colombian society's identity and inventory of cultural goods. In this sense for Colombians is problematic to consider sharing or renting possessions that signify them as an extension of self. In the light of CC theory, It could be argued that possessions is what signifies Colombian people, not access, thus is problematic to trade possessions in terms of ownership for access.

Also, it is problematic for Colombian society to change its rooted practice of gift giving idle goods to people that need them, and move to the practice of making money out of those

idle goods through CC practices such as selling, renting out, and swapping idle goods. This practice would shake Colombians' identity construct that seeks to maintain social relationship rather than making good economic deals.

In addition, in Colombia is problematic to think about collaboration outside of the immediate nuclear family. It is further problematic to consider collaboration that requires collective planning and a complex structure to function. Consequently, it could be argued that in the Colombian context, yet is not possible to gain access and ownership of recycle or used goods at the risk of distrust.

Chapter VII

Contributions

Contributions are based on the stance of CC studies in the LAW from a consumer culture theory as follows.

7.1. CC challenges in the LAW

This research provides empirical consumer insight towards understanding the challenges for practitioner of authentic collaborative consumption to expect the circumstance in the Less Affluent World. The economical and cultural feature in Less Affluent World may be the factors that differ consumer's understanding on collaborative consumption and limits the forms of collaboration from the context in the Affluent World. The scarcity of the commodity and the feeling of deprivation spreads the urge among the Less Affluent World, and consumer there tend to secure their survival by accumulating the possessions, and tend to judge an individual's social status by the material possession he or she has. This mindset of materialism shed its impact on Colombian consumers when they participate in collaborative consumption. For example, the narrative of interview suggests that Colombian consumer reluctant to involve the basic, personal and expensive possession, and generally, they believe that their possession will possibly damaged when others use it or ever used by others. And they also concerned about the proper compensation or potential interpersonal conflict if disputes happen. They take assorted imaginary potential risk into account before deciding get involved in collaborative consumption and deciding which kind of possession can be taken to the collaborative use, and the trust issue in the Less Affluent World holds the consumers back when they were suggested to have wider forms of collaboration. And this insight is interpreted into the trust issue in a static culture-oriented country and colonialism mindset as the result of globalization.

Such concerns towards trust in the level of society hinder consumers in Less Affluent World to purchase the comprehensive scale of collaborative consumption. The prevalence of gift giving as the major form adopted by Colombian consumer concerns the researchers that such inauthentic collaboration will not be driven by the concern for other incentives. For example, environmental protection, prolonging the life cycle of a product, notion that

against excessive material possessiveness and abstract pleasure of helping out others including but not limited within close social network.

Therefore, the challenges for the authentic collaborative consumption in Less Affluent World will be reckoned as the trust issue in a static culture-oriented country, the mindset of life pleasure associated with material possessiveness, and the education of diverse forms of collaborative consumption which could settle more comfort zones, and these facilities are built for consumers to communicate and eliminate the odds of their concerns.

7.2. Understanding the socio-cultural consensus that makes the inventory of cultural goods of the LAW.

Another finding in consumer insight is the different category of goods they perceived to involved in the collaborative consumption, and this is affected by the contextual socio-cultural consensus. Less Affluent World receives the impact of colonialism and wish to secure their share by obtaining material goods as a link with the Affluent World. People in Less Affluent World show reluctant attitude towards involving expensive, basic and personal objects, their behavior demonstrated during the form of collaborative consumption are mainly conceptualized into eight patterns, with implication of Colonialism as an underlying sociological feature impacting their perception upon such peer-to-peer consumption practice. In the light of this, they view an object as necessities goods rather luxury goods. For example, griller and driller are view as must-have household in Colombia so the consumers are less ready to involve such goods in collaborative consumption, and they prefer to have it as a permanent owned goods; in some countries of Affluent World, for instance, Sweden and America, consumers are used to using access-base laundry machine, but in the context of Colombia, consumers see laundry machine household necessity, and few of them use the access-base laundry machine service, so if the collaborative consumption regarding access-base laundry machine will be less possible initiated in Colombia.

This research manages to raise the awareness of understand specific cultural meaning of goods in certain socio-cultural context. It is respectful to study consumer's willingness on involving goods with contextual significance to them, instead of making judgement and expectation for the range of objects, which are distributed into collaborative consumption in Less Affluent World.

7.3. Encourage the creation of the LAW identities without a Western hegemonic stance.

Bearing in mind the different socio-cultural consensus shaping the collaborative consumption in the Less Affluent World, and that collaborative consumption is defined and studied in most existing literature as a construction within a Western hegemonic stance, this research encourages a new standpoint to construct a specific pre-text for the Less Affluent World, and by doing so, the consumer can be set free from the anxiety of colonialism. Without understanding the difference constructed by their own socio-cultural background, there will be a potential risk of anxiety and blind spot for the Less Affluent World to practice and explore an authentic and resourceful collaborative consumption fitting in their context. Thus this research provides insight of the local Colombians narrated their feeling and position in the globalization homogenic marketing scape, and such consumers self portrait can serve as a ground to construct the self identity as a Less Affluent World.

Chapter VIII

Limitations and Future Studies

The main limitations of this research are mainly lying in three aspects: (a) the absence of discussion on intangible asset collaborative consumption; (b) the trust issue in online environment for the Less Affluent World; (c) the limited volume of study sample.

Regarding to the intangible assets in collaborative consumption, this research does not cover the skill exchange. For example, exchange on the base of material possession and the assistance in the form of skill as return. And also the dynamic during trust establishment in online setting. Given the consideration of nowadays people reach out to a wider social network via Internet, the social media and other collaborative consumption related forums are not studied in this research. It is easy to fall into bias if this research merely make its judgement on the base of real world scenario, instead of including the virtual world.

Another limitation is the small volume sample for in-depth study in this research. Since the volume is 5 interviewees even if the researchers selected them with relatively effect representative features, yet the limited data and narrow interpretation are inevitable in this case. Further study shall make complementary information on intangible asset and the trust establishing process within collaborative consumption in the Less Affluent World. Such focus shall be amplified under the offline and online setting, with larger sample of targeted consumers in order to picture an comprehensive and context-oriented consumer insight for the subject.

Bibliography & Reference List

Ahmed Qureshi, A.M. & Evans, N. (2013). Adopting a Trust-Based Framework to Generate Social Capital: Espousing Social Learning and Social Capital for Enhanced Innovation, Improved Performance and Competitive Advantage. Proceedings of the International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management a& Organizational Learning, pp. 548-556, 9p.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 7, pp.295-310.

Arnould, R. & Thompson, C. (2005). Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, pp. 868-882.

Aston, M.N., Nathanson, C.A., Schoen, R. & Kim, Y.J. (1999). Family Demography, Social Theory, and Investment in Social Capital. *Population and Development Review*, 25 (1), pp. 1-31

Arnould, E.J. (1989). Toward a Broadened Theory of Preference Formation and the Diffusion of Innovations: Cases From Zinder Province, Niger Republic. *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 16, pp. 239-267.

Agnew, John. (1981). Home Ownership and Identity in Capitalist Societies, in James S. Duncan, ed., *Housing and Identity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, London: Croom-Helm, 60-97.

Askegaard, S. & Trolle, L.J. (2011). Towards and Epistemology of Consumer Culture Theory: Phenomenology and the Context of Context. *Sage Publications*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 381-404.

Belk, R. (?). *Ownership, Ego, and Sharing*. University of Utah, USA.

Botsman, R. & Rogers, R. (2010). *What's Mine is Yours*. Harper Collins Publishers.

Bergquist, Magnus (2003). Open Source Software Development as Gift Culture: Work and Identity Formation in an Internet Community. In Christina Garsten and Helena Wulff, ed., Oxford: Berg, 223-341.

Brenda Segal and Jeffrey S. Podoshen, 2013, An examination of materialism, conspicuous consumption and gender differences, *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 37, p189–198.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods*. 3rd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Belk, R., Sherry, JR.J.F. & Wallendorf, M. (1988). A Naturalistic Inquiry Into Buyer and Seller Behavior at a Swap Meet. *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 14, pp. 449-470.

Belk, R. (1984). Cultural and Historical Differences in Concepts of Self and Their Effects on Attitudes Toward Having and Giving. *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 11, ed. Thomas C. Kinnears, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, pp. 754-760.

Boachie-Mensah, F.O. & Boohene, R. (2012). A Review of Cross-Cultural Variations in Consumer Behavior and Marketing Strategy. *International Business and Marketing*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 118-125.

Belk, Russell (1985). Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World. *Journal of consumer Research*, 12 3) December, 1985, 265-280.

Belk, Russell (1987). Identity and Relevance of Market, Personal, and Community Objects, in Jean Umiker-Sebeok, ed., *Marketing and Semiotics: New Directions for the Study of Signs for Sale*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 151-164.

Belk, Russell (1988), Possessions and the Extended Self, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 139-168.

Belk, Russell, 1992, Attachment of Possessions. Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in theory and Research, Vol, 12, Place Attachment, Irwin Altman and Setha Low, eds., New York: Plenum Press, 37-62, 1992.

Craig J.Thompson, William B. Locander, Howard R.Pollio, 1989, Putting Consumer Experience Back into Consumer Research: The Philosophy and Method of Existential-Phenomenology, Journal Of Consumer Research •Vol. 16,

Chatterjee, P. (1997). Our Modernity. Rotterdam/Dakar: SEPHIS and CODESRIA, pp. 1-20.

Cass R. Sunstein and Edna Ullmann-Margalit (2000). Solidarity in Consumption, John M. Olin Law & Economics Working Paper, vol. 98, pp. 1-29.

Corrigan, P. (1997). The Sociology of Consumption, London: SAGE Publications.

Corfman, K.P. & Lehmann, D.R. (1987). Models of Comparative Group Decision-Making and Relative Influence. Journal of Consumer Research, vol. 14, pp. 1-13.

Elizabeth D. Hale, Gareth J. Treharne, George D. Kitas, 2007, Qualitative methodologies I: asking research questions with reflexive insight, Musculoskeletal. Care 5(3): 139–147

Elgin, Duane (1998), Voluntary Simplicity, Revised Edition: Toward a Way of Life that is Outwardly Simple, Inwardly Rich, New York: Harper.

Furby, Lita. (1978). Sharing: decisions and Moral Judgments about Letting Others Use One's Personal Possessions. Psychological Reports, 93, pp. 595-609.

Fanon, F. (1967). The Wretched of the Earth. London: Penguin.

Fleura Bardhi and Giana M. Eckhardt, 2012, Access-Based Consumption: The Case of Car Sharing, Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 39, December, P881-898

Felson, M. & Spaeth, J.L. (1978). Community Structure and Collaborative Consumption: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 21, no.4, March/April, pp. 614-626.

Griffin, J. (1986). *Well-Being: Its Meaning, Measurement, and Moral Importance*. Carendon: Oxford University Press.

Gansky, L. (2010). *The Mesh: Why the Future of Business is Sharing*, United States of America, Penguin Group.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ger, G. & Belk, R. (1994). Cross-Cultural Differences in Materialism. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, vol. 17, pp. 55-77.

Ger, G. & Belk, R. (1999). Accounting for Materialism in Four Cultures. *Journal of Material Culture*, vol. 4(2), pp. 183-204.

Ger, Guliz and Rusell W. Belk (1999). Accounting for Materialism in four Cultures. @ *Journal of Material Culture*. 4. Pp. 183-204.

Ger, G., & Belk, R. (1996). I'd Like to Buy the World a Coke: Consumptionscapes of the Less Affluent World. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, vol. 19, pp. 271-304.

Gupta, A. (1998). *Post-Colonial Developments: Agriculture In The Making of Modern India*.

Hirschman, E.C. (1980). Innovativeness, Novelty Seeking, and Consumer Creativity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 7, pp. 289-295.

Harrison Lawrence. (1985). *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind – The Latin American Case*. United States, Harvard Center for International Affairs.

Huang, X. (2012). Lifestyles in Virtual Communities: Collaborative Consumption and Interaction. *Chines Journal of Communication*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 109-127.

Hill, R.P. & Martin, K.D. (2012). Absolute and Relative Restriction and Consumer Behavior: Implications for Understanding Global Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 37-61.

Harrison, L.E., & Huntington, S. (2000). *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. United States, Basic Books.

Hammerslough,, 2001. *Dematerializing: Taming the Power of Possessions*, Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Inglehart, Ronald. (1981). Post-Materialism in an Environment of Insecurity. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 75, pp. 880-900.

Isaacs, S. (1935). Property and Possessiveness. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. 15, pp. 69-78.

Irene Sabaté Muriel, 2006, Exchange networks and free shops in Berlin: gifts and commodities in 'alternative' consumption experiences, *etnográfica* maio de, 13 (1): P49-75

John Deighton and Kent Grayson, 1995, Marketing and Seduction: Building Exchange Relationships by Managing Social Consensus, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21, March, P 660-675.

J.-P. Chaput, L. Klingenberg, A. Astrup and A. M. Sjödin, 2010, Modern sedentary activities promote overconsumption of food in our current obesogenic environment, *obesity reviews*, International Association for the Study of Obesity 12, p12–20

K. Sankaran & Catherine Demangeot. (2011). On Becoming a Culturally Plural Consumer. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 540–549.

Mannathukkaren, N. (2010). Postcolonialism and Modernity: A Critic Realist Critique. *Journal of Critical Realism*, vol. 9, Issue 3, pp. 299-327.

Mats Alvesson, 2003, Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, And Localists:A Reflexive Approach To Interviews In Organizational Research, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 13-33.

Maslow, A.H. (1987). *Motivation and Personality*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Marshal L. Richins and Scott Dawson, 1992, A Consumer Values Orientation for Materialism and Its Measurement: Scale Development and Validation, *Journal of Consumer Research, Inc.* Vol. 19, December, p303-315.

Mark Easterby-Smith, Richard Thorpe & Paul R. Jackson (2008) *Management Research: An Introduction*. 3rd edition. London: Sage

Markus Giesler, 2006, Consumer Gift Systems, *Journal of Consumer Research, Inc*, Vol, 33, September, P283-290

McGuire, M. (1991). Group Composition, Collective Consumption, and Collaborative Production. *The American Economic Review*, vol. 81, no. 5, pp. 1391-1407.

Myers, N., & Kent, J. (2004). *The New Consumers: The Affluence of Affluence on The Environment*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

Prattis, G.I. (1987). Alternative Views of Economy in Economic Anthropology. *Beyond the New Economic Anthropology*, ed. John Clammer, London: Macmilla, p8-44.

Peter A. Caprariello and Harry T. Reis, 2013 , To Do, to Have, or to Share? Valuing Experiences Over Material Possessions Depends on the Involvement of Others, *American Psychological Association*, Vol. 104, No. 2, p199–215

Rynkiewich, M. (2011). Do We Need Postmodern Anthropology for Mission in a Postcolonial World? *Mission Studies*, vol. 28, pp. 151-169.

Reinert, K.A., (2011). No Small Hope: The Basic Goods Imperative. *Review of Social Economy*, vol. LXIX, no. 1, pp. 55-76.

Sudarsky, J. (?). Colombia's Social Capital: The National Measurement With The BARCAS. pp. 1-48.

Sandikci, Ö., & Holt, D.B. (1998). Malling Society: Mall Consumption Practices and the Future of Public Space. J.F. Sherry, Jr. (Ed.), *Servicescapes: The Concept of Place in Contemporary Markets* (pp. 305-336) Chicago: NTC Business Books.

Susan Fournier, 1998, Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 24, March, P 343-373.

Trivers, R.L. (1971). The Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, vol. 46, pp. 35-39.

The Barometer of Social Capital (Barcas); Measuring Social Capital in Colombia. Montreal, World Congress of Sociology (1998).

Varman, R. & Belk, R. (2011). Consuming Postcolonial Shopping Malls. *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 28, pp. 62-84.

Varian, Hal R. (2000). Buying, Sharing and Renting Information Goods. <http://www.sims.berkeley.edu/~keleyr>, Annette. (1992). Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 14, [ppedu/hal/papers/sharing.pdf](http://www.sims.berkeley.edu/hal/papers/sharing.pdf).

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework. *Theory and Society*, ed. 27, pp. 151-208.

Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 24, pp. 1-24.

Wallendorf, Melanie and Eric J. Arnould. (1988). My Favorite Things: A Cross-Cultural Inquiry into Object Attachment, Possessiveness, and Social Linkage. *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 14, pp. 531-547.

Weiner, Annette. (1992). *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yuko Minowa, Olga Khomenko and Russell W. Belk, 2010, Social Change and Gendered Gift-Giving Rituals: A Historical Analysis of Valentine's Day in Japan, *Journal of Macromarketing* 2011, Feb 27, p31-44

Yasemin Özerkek & Sadullah Çelik. (2010). The Link between Government Spending, Consumer Confidence and Consumption Expenditures in Emerging Market Countries. *PANOECONOMICUS*, vol. 4, pp. 471-485.

Online Access Reference

Barbrook, Richar (2005), The Hi-Tech Gift Economy, *First Monday*, http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue3_12/barbrook/index.html.

Consumo Colaborativo. (2013). Available Online: <http://www.consumocolaborativo.com/>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

Collaborative Fund. (2013). Available Online: <http://www.collaborativefund.com/>. [Accessed 15 May 2013].

Friends with Things. (2013). Available Online: <http://friendswiththings.com.au/>. [Accessed 15 May 2013].

Forbes. (2013) Airbnb And The Unstoppable Rise of the Share economy. Available Online: http://www.forbes.com/sites/tomiogeron/2013/01/23/airbnb-and-the-unstoppable-rise-of-the-share-economy/?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=linkedin. [Accessed 15 April 2013].

Latitude Research & Shareable Magazine. (2010). The New Sharing Economy Report. Available Online: <http://www.shareable.net/blog/the-new-sharing-economy>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

Ouishare, Connecting the Collaborative Economy. (2012). Collaborative Consumption Explodes in Latin America. Available Online: <http://ouishare.net/2012/08/collaborative-economy-explosion-latin-america/>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

PandoDaily. (2013). Collaborative Consumption is dead, long live the real sharing economy. Available Online: <http://pandodaily.com/2013/03/19/collaborative-consumption-is-dead-long-live-the-real-sharing-economy/>. [Accessed 15 May 2013].

P2P Foundation. (2012). Synthetic Overview of the Collaborative Economy. Available Online: <http://p2p.coop/files/reports/collaborative-economy-2012.pdf>. [Accessed 15 May 2013].

Quienlohaga.com. (2013). Available Online: <http://www.quienlohaga.com/r/?pais=81&provincia=1673&ciudad=443687&categoria=0&q>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

Shareable. Available. (2013). Online: <http://www.shareable.net/users/neal-gorenflo>. [Accessed 15 May 2013].

Shareable Magazine. (2009). Four Degrees of Sharing. Available online: <http://www.shareable.net/blog/four-degrees-of-sharing>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

The Economist. (2013). The Rise of the Sharing Economy. Available Online: http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21573104-internet-everything-hire-rise-sharing-economy?fsrc=scn/ln_ec/the_rise_of_the_sharing_economy. [Accessed 15 April 2013].

The New York Times. (2013). A Politician From the Future. Available Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/23/us/23iht-letter23.html?smid=pl-share&_r=1&.

[Accessed 13 May 2013].

Taskrabbits. (2013). Available Online: [Accessed 13 May 2013].

The Economist (2013). The Rise of the Sharing Economy. Available Online: <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21573104-internet...> [Accessed 9 March 2013].

The Free Dictionary by Farlex (2013). Available Online: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/acquisition>. [Accessed 8 May 2013].

Wikipedia (2013). Available Online: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ubiquity>. [Accessed 8 May 2013].

Yahoo Finance. (2012). Airbnb Celebrates Record Growth 10 Million Guest Nights Booked. Available Online: <http://finance.yahoo.com/news/airbnb-celebrates-record-growth-10-100000555.html>. [Accessed 13 May 2013].

Appendix

1. List of question for the semi structured interviews:

1. If you need a pumping machine to inflate the balloons of the party of your children, what would you do?
2. If you're neighbour ask you to lend him your griller because he wants to invite his boss over his house, what would you do? Why you decide to do that?
3. What about your wife, would she agree with your decision?
4. If every four months your neighbor asks you for borrowing your griller, what would you feel?
5. What would happen if the neighbour breaks the griller? What would you expect him to do?
6. What would you be willing to share with your sisters and brothers?
7. What would you be willing to share with an stranger?
8. How do you feel when your kid lends their bike to friends?
9. How do you feel when your kid borrows his friend's bike?
10. What would you do if your kid breaks or damages the bike?
11. How do you feel when your kid lends their cousin's bike?
12. How do you feel when your kid borrows his cousin's bike?
13. Why there isn't a problem with a cousin?
14. What do you do with redundant things?
15. Why do you say that you don't sell things that you don't use?
16. What do you do with the clothes that you don't use?
17. To whom do you give that clothes?
18. What things have you given away? To whom did you give them to?
19. Have you received something used by a friend? What did you do with that?
20. How often do you give away things? How do you feel when you give them away?
21. How do you think the other person, receiver, feels? What do you feel when you receive those things?
22. Do you have a driller? How often do you use it? Why do you borrow it from the neighbor?
23. Do you have a tent? Let's say that you need one for the family and only for the

weekend, what would you do to get it? What about it renting a tent?

24. Have you bought something from second hand stores? Why?

25. Let's imagine the situation that you buy something from second hand, what do you think your family and friends would think about it?

26. If you have something abundant, usually what will you do with it? Can you give an example.

27. Let's imagine the situation in which the administration of the building launches a project in which the people have to share something useful from their homes and take it to a room in which everything that is in there is for the use of all, what would you take to that place?

28. Would you be willing to swapp clothes and accessories with friends?

29. What would you take to that swapping event? Would you be willing to take those things and use them?

30. Let's imagine the situation in which a neighbor that you don't know places a table in the main entrance with a note saying that anyone can take that table otherwise he will throw it away in 3 days and you need that table, what would you do?

31. Let's imagine the situation in which you're having a party and you want to have a chocolate fountain, what would you do to have it?

32. What if in Bogotá there is a company tha rents cars for hours, days, weeks, and months, at an affordable price, would you be willing to use this service instead of owning a car?

33. Have you swapped something?

34. Let's imagine the situation you and your husband plan to get a treadmill, what would you do to get it?

35. If you know that a friend or acquaintance is selling one, would you be willing to buy it from him?

36. Let's imagine the situation in which you have the treadmill but you move to a smaller apartment and the treadmill doesn't fit anywhere in the apartment, the you cannot have it, what would you do to get rid of it?

37. What if the administration doesn't allow you to take the treadmill to the building's gym?

38. What do you think about the service of renting out washing machines, which the company takes to and picks up from your place? Do you like this service to be used permanently or just for getting out of troubles? Do you like this service to be used permanently or just for getting out of troubles?

39. When you had to furniture your or your son's college room, what did you do? Bought

them brand new, secondhand stores, from family, from friends.

40. Would you be willing to rent a fancy dress?

41. What do you think about renting a wedding dress?

2. Concepts:

2.1. The affluent world and the less affluent World: These concepts are used according to the definition that Belk and Ger (1996) do. Thus, the less affluent world refer to “the modernizing or industrializing societies, and as contrasted to the more affluent and dominant or West” (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 298). This definition is aligned to the coming one of emergent countries, which is further developed by explaining what signifies an emergent country. In the same way the definition of Affluent world relates to Belk and Ger’s (1996) definition of “a force –technological, economic, political –no longer radiating in any simple way from a discrete geographical or cultural center. This force is disseminated in a diversity of forms” (Belk & Ger, 1996, pp. 298).

2.2. Web 2.0: The Internet era of high connectivity and high interactivity, which goes in multiple directions between users and companies. Companies are no longer the owners of brands and products but the users who have the power to re-shape them.

2.3. Inventory of the cultural goods: They are the goods that have a meaning in a certain society and help its individuals to make sense of their world.