

03

Collaborative Consumption and the Fashion Industry

Claudia E. Henninger, Celina Jones, Rosy Boardman, Helen McCormick

This chapter focuses on collaborative consumption, a 'newly' emerging phenomenon within the UK fashion industry. Although not new per se the topic area remains under researched and lacks clear-cut definitions. This chapter provides an introduction to collaborative consumption by exploring its origins, definitions, key characteristics, and terminologies used, before moving onto exploring collaborative consumption examples. Future areas of research are highlighted to further examine a field of increased interest within the fashion industry.

Keywords: Collaborative consumption, UK fashion industry, swapping, emerging phenomenon, sharing

Sustainable Fashion Consumption

Collaborative Consumption and the Fashion Industry

*Claudia E. Henninger, Celina Jones,
Rosy Boardman, Helen McCormick*

This chapter focuses on collaborative consumption, a 'newly' emerging phenomenon within the UK fashion industry. Although not new per se the topic area remains under researched and lacks clear-cut definitions.

This chapter provides an introduction to collaborative consumption by exploring its origins, definitions, key characteristics, and terminologies used, before moving onto exploring collaborative consumption examples.

Future areas of research are highlighted to further examine a field of increased interest within the fashion industry.

Keywords: Collaborative consumption, UK fashion industry, swapping, emerging phenomenon, sharing



VERTAISARVIOITU
KOLLEGIALT GRANSKAD
PEER-REVIEWED
www.tsv.fi/tunnus

Emergence and definition of collaborative consumption

The 21st century has seen dramatic changes in the fashion industry's landscape; not only are consumers more conscious of the impact that their clothing has on the environment (e.g. Eckhardt et al. 2010; Hamari et al. 2016), but also media outlets globally report on a relatively new trend in the fashion industry: *collaborative consumption* (e.g. Purvis & Evrenos 2014; Hoh 2017). Although *collaborative consumption* is not new per se, it thus far lacks a clear-cut definition and can best be described as an intuitively understood, yet fuzzy concept (Markusen 1999; Codagnone & Martens 2016). This chapter explores the current debate in the literature on *collaborative consumption* by investigating its origins and providing an overview of key definitions, before moving on to discussing its terminologies and examining challenges associated with it, by further providing examples.

In its simplest form *collaborative consumption* can be described as a transactional exchange between parties, and thus is "as old as humankind" (Belk 2014, 1595). Sheth et al. (2011) emphasise that consumers participating in these exchanges seek to 'trade up'; they aspire to gain products better than those they have traded in, as individuals associate their belongings with self-expression and self-worth (Belk 1988). As such, trading in their own clothes for 'better' ones may enable individuals to also move up the 'social ladder', as the items they have gained may be associated with a higher social class and/or the individual's aspirational group. In its early stages these exchanges have predominantly happened in close-knit circles, among friends and family, which is often referred to as sharing-in (Ingold 1986; Belk 2010). Today, exchanges and sharing transactions are increasingly common among strangers and have been described as sharing-out activities (Ingold 1986; Belk 2010). The latter is accelerated with the emergences of new technologies and Web 2.0, as it has facilitated the creation of sharing platforms that can be used and accessed on a global scale. The most prominent sharing platforms can be found within the tourism industry (e.g. CouchSurfing,

Airbnb, SpareRoom) or in the transportation industry (e.g. Uber, CarShare), yet the fashion landscape has also seen some success in recent years, such as Rent the Runway, Lena the Fashion Designer and Chic by Choice (Pike, 2016). However, before engaging further with what challenges and opportunities are arising from these *collaborative consumption* business models, it is vital to define the term.

Felson and Spaeth (1978, 614) define the term *collaborative consumption* as "those events in which one or more persons consume economic goods or services in the process of engaging in joint activities with one or more others". Whilst instructive, this definition has been criticised for being too broad and too inclusive (e.g. Belk 2014; Codagnone & Martens 2016; Iran & Schrader 2017), as any social situation in which individuals come together and 'share' something, whether purposeful (e.g. arranged) or accidentally, could be described as consuming something collaboratively. As such, this type of consumption could be more accurately described as 'coordinated', whereby individuals happen to be at the same place at the same time and consuming as a collective, yet the actual act of consumption is based on a marketplace exchange. Thus, Belk (2014) insists that Felson and Spaeth's (1978) definition has a focus on acquisition and distribution of the actual resources. Belk and Rogers (2010, xv) narrow down the meaning of the concept by providing a more focused definition, which sees *collaborative consumption* to include "transactional sharing, bartering, lending, trading, renting, gifting, and swapping". Yet, a question that arises here is whether gifting, sharing, and actual market transactions can and should be combined, as each have their own characteristics (Belk 2014)? To resolve this further, gifting to someone means an item changes ownership from one party to the next, yet this may not necessarily imply that multiple people collaboratively consume this gift. Further, the motivation underpinning gift giving can fundamentally be different to that of collaborative consumption (Hollenbeck et al. 2006; Belk 2014; Codagnone & Martens 2016; Iran & Schrader 2017; Belk & Dalli 2014).

Belk (2014) indicates that the definition of *collaborative consumption* needs to be inclusive, yet narrow at the same time. For him *collaborative consumption*

Emergence and definition of collaborative consumption

The 21st century has seen dramatic changes in the fashion industry's landscape; not only are consumers more conscious of the impact that their clothing has on the environment (e.g. Eckhardt et al. 2010; Hamari et al. 2016), but also media outlets globally report on a relatively new trend in the fashion industry: *collaborative consumption* (e.g. Purvis & Evrenos 2014; Hoh 2017). Although *collaborative consumption* is not new per se, it thus far lacks a clear-cut definition and can best be described as an intuitively understood, yet fuzzy concept (Markusen 1999; Codagnone & Martens 2016). This chapter explores the current debate in the literature on *collaborative consumption* by investigating its origins and providing an overview of key definitions, before moving on to discussing its terminologies and examining challenges associated with it, by further providing examples.

In its simplest form *collaborative consumption* can be described as a transactional exchange between parties, and thus is "as old as humankind" (Belk 2014, 1595). Sheth et al. (2011) emphasise that consumers participating in these exchanges seek to 'trade up'; they aspire to gain products better than those they have traded in, as individuals associate their belongings with self-expression and self-worth (Belk 1988). As such, trading in their own clothes for 'better' ones may enable individuals to also move up the 'social ladder', as the items they have gained may be associated with a higher social class and/or the individual's aspirational group. In its early stages these exchanges have predominantly happened in close-knit circles, among friends and family, which is often referred to as sharing-in (Ingold 1986; Belk 2010). Today, exchanges and sharing transactions are increasingly common among strangers and have been described as sharing-out activities (Ingold 1986; Belk 2010). The latter is accelerated with the emergences of new technologies and Web 2.0, as it has facilitated the creation of sharing platforms that can be used and accessed on a global scale. The most prominent sharing platforms can be found within the tourism industry (e.g. CouchSurfing,

Airbnb, SpareRoom) or in the transportation industry (e.g. Uber, Didi, CarShare), yet the fashion landscape has also seen some success stories in recent years, such as Rent the Runway, Lena the Fashion Library, and Chic by Choice (Pike, 2016). However, before engaging further with what challenges and opportunities are arising from these *collaborative consumption* business models, it is vital to define the term.

Felson and Spaeth (1978, 614) define the term *collaborative consumption* as "those events in which one or more persons consume economic goods or services in the process of engaging in joint activities with one or more others". Whilst instructive, this definition has been criticised for being too broad and too inclusive (e.g. Belk 2014; Codagnone & Martens 2016; Iran & Schrader 2017), as any social situation in which individuals come together and 'share' something, whether purposefully (e.g. arranged) or accidentally, could be described as consuming something collaboratively. As such, this type of consumption could be more accurately described as 'coordinated', whereby individuals happen to be at the same place at the same time and consuming as a collective, yet the actual act of consumption is based on a marketplace exchange. Thus, Belk (2014) insists that Felson and Spaeth's (1978) definition lacks a focus on acquisition and distribution of the actual resources. Botsman and Rogers (2010, xv) narrow down the meaning of the concept by providing a more focused definition, which sees *collaborative consumption* to include "transactional sharing, bartering, lending, trading, renting, gifting, and swapping". Yet, a question that arises here is whether gift giving, sharing, and actual market transactions can and should be combined, as each have their own characteristics (Belk 2014)? To reiterate this further, gifting to someone means an item changes ownership from one party to the next, yet this may not necessarily imply that multiple people collaboratively consume this gift. Further, the motivations underpinning gift giving can fundamentally be different to those of collaborative consumption (Hollenbeck et al. 2006; Belk 2014; Corciolani & Dalli 2014).

Belk (2014) indicates that the definition of *collaborative consumption* needs to be inclusive, yet narrow at the same time. For him *collaborative*

consumption is defined as “people coordinating the acquisition and distribution of a resource for a fee or other compensation” (ibid. 1597). Although he recognises that acquisition and distribution of a resource takes place, through fee payment or other compensations, Belk (2014) broadens the definition to include transactions that entail a non-monetary exchange, such as bartering, trading, and swapping. This chapter follows Belk’s (2014) definition when discussing examples of *collaborative consumption* within the UK fashion industry.

Characteristics and terminology of collaborative consumption

The emergence of Web 2.0 and the creation of peer-to-peer platforms have enabled *collaborative consumption* to flourish, whereby individuals can make use of their idle capacities by simply exchanging them or renting them out, and thus, extending, in this case, the garment’s useful life and average time of wear (Kaplan & Haenlein 2010; Hamari et al. 2015). An example of this is Facebook Marketplace, which has boomed in popularity since its inception in 2016, whereby consumers can sell, giveaway or exchange any items, including clothes, shoes or accessories, to people in their local area. This has various implications for the industry in that consumers now no longer need to actually purchase garments and accessories, but can instead rent, swap, or exchange these in any other way (Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012; Benoit et al. 2017). It may thus not be surprising that *collaborative consumption* and its associated business models have previously been described as disruptive, as they are breaking the rules and norms of existing business practices. Although often said to be inferior to established business models, disruptive innovations provide alternative benefits that may attract consumers (Christensen & Raynor 2003; Markides 2006). For example, swap shops allow individuals to exchange their garments without having to make a monetary transaction, enabling consumers to change and revamp their wardrobe, whilst simultaneously discarding their unwanted items. Although the

economic aspect (Akbar et al. 2016; Park & Armstrong 2017) draw for individuals into engaging with *collaborative consumption* always guaranteed that individuals will receive high quality items and have a consistent experience when embracing these disruptive business models (Richard & Cleveland 2016). Whilst the focus of this chapter is not on investigating the impact of disruptive innovations on the fashion industry – as this would exceed the scope of this chapter – it is important to understand that these models can have both positive and negative impacts on the economy at large (Christensen & Raynor 2003; Armstrong 2017). This, in turn, has implications for their popularity and the acceptance of some models over others, e.g. swapping versus

Table 1. Terminology – Collaborative Consumption (adapted from Belk 2014; Hamari et al. 2015; Benoit et al. 2017).

THEME	KEY TERMINOLOGY	SOURCE IN WHICH TERMINOLOGY IS USED
CONSUMPTION PRACTICES DESCRIBED AS ‘SHARING’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative consumption • Commercial sharing systems • Co-production • Co-creation (linked to S-DL (service-dominant logic)) • Pro-sumption • Product-service systems • Access based consumption • Non-ownership services • Two-sided market • Sharing economy or Shareconomy • Collaborative consumption 	Mont, 2002 Prahala & Ramaswami, 2000 Vargo & Lusch, 2004 Rochet & Tirole, 2002 Humphreys & Grayson, 2008 Belk, 2010 Botsman & Rogers, 2014 Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2015 Bahrdi & Eckhardt, 2012 Lamberton & Rose, 2012 Wittkowski et al., 2014 Botsman, 2015 Hamari et al., 2015
VIEWPOINTS OF COLLABORATIVE CONSUMPTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing • Borrowing • Reuse and remix culture • Charity • Secondhand market and sustainable consumption • Anti-consumption 	Hibbert & Horne, 1999 Lessig, 2008 Young et al., 2010 Ozanne & Ballantine, 2010 Belk, 2014 Jenkins et al, 2014

consumption is defined as “people coordinating the acquisition and distribution of a resource for a fee or other compensation” (ibid. 1597). Although he recognises that acquisition and distribution of a resource takes place, through fee payment or other compensations, Belk (2014) broadens the definition to include transactions that entail a non-monetary exchange, such as bartering, trading, and swapping. This chapter follows Belk’s (2014) definition when discussing examples of *collaborative consumption* within the UK fashion industry.

Characteristics and terminology of collaborative consumption

The emergence of Web 2.0 and the creation of peer-to-peer platforms have enabled *collaborative consumption* to flourish, whereby individuals can make use of their idle capacities by simply exchanging them or renting them out, and thus, extending, in this case, the garment’s useful life and average time of wear (Kaplan & Haenlein 2010; Hamari et al. 2015). An example of this is Facebook Marketplace, which has boomed in popularity since its inception in 2016, whereby consumers can sell, giveaway or exchange any items, including clothes, shoes or accessories, to people in their local area. This has various implications for the industry in that consumers now no longer need to actually purchase garments and accessories, but can instead rent, swap, or exchange these in any other way (Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012; Benoit et al. 2017). It may thus not be surprising that *collaborative consumption* and its associated business models have previously been described as disruptive, as they are breaking the rules and norms of existing business practices. Although often said to be inferior to established business models, disruptive innovations provide alternative benefits that may attract consumers (Christensen & Raynor 2003; Markides 2006). For example, swap shops allow individuals to exchange their garments without having to make a monetary transaction, enabling consumers to change and revamp their wardrobe, whilst simultaneously discarding their unwanted items. Although the

economic aspect (Akbar et al. 2016; Park & Armstrong 2017) is seen as a draw for individuals into engaging with *collaborative consumption*, it is not always guaranteed that individuals will receive high quality items and/or have a consistent experience when embracing these disruptive business models (Richard & Cleveland 2016). Whilst the focus of this chapter is not on investigating the impact of disruptive innovations on the fashion industry – as this would exceed the scope of this chapter – it is vital to understand that these models can have both positive and negative impacts on the economy at large (Christensen & Raynor 2003; Park & Armstrong 2017). This, in turn, has implications for their popularity and the acceptance of some models over others, e.g. swapping versus renting.

Table 1. Terminology – Collaborative Consumption (adapted from Belk 2014; Hamari et al. 2015; Benoit et al. 2017).

THEME	KEY TERMINOLOGY	SOURCE IN WHICH TERMINOLOGY IS MENTIONED
CONSUMPTION PRACTICES DESCRIBED AS 'SHARING'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative consumption • Commercial sharing systems • Co-production • Co-creation (linked to S-DL (service-dominant logic)) • Pro-sumption • Product-service systems • Access based consumption • Non-ownership services • Two-sided market • Sharing economy or Shareconomy • Collaborative consumption 	Mont, 2002 Prahala & Ramaswamy, 2004 Vargo & Lusch, 2004 Rochet & Tirole, 2006 Humphreys & Grayson, 2008 Belk, 2010 Botsman & Rogers, 2010 Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010 Bahrđi & Eckhardt, 2012 Lamberton & Rose, 2012 Wittkowski et al., 2013 Botsman, 2015 Hamari et al., 2015
VIEWPOINTS OF COLLABORATIVE CONSUMPTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing • Borrowing • Reuse and remix culture • Charity • Secondhand market and sustainable consumption • Anti-consumption 	Hibbert & Horne, 1996 Lessig, 2008 Young et al., 2010 Ozanne & Ballantine, 2010 Belk, 2014 Jenkins et al, 2014

Thus far we have only focused on *collaborative consumption* as an isolated concept, rather than linking it to the wider field of the sharing economy. Within the academic literature both the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, have received an increased interest across a multitude of different fields. It may be unsurprising that various terms have emerged that all describe similar consumption practices, all of which have 'sharing' as a common theme. An explanation could be that 'sharing' practices, and *collaborative consumption* more specifically, lack a clear-cut definition, which implies that the lines are blurred as to what *collaborative consumption* actually is. Reviewing the literature further, *collaborative consumption* can be researched from a variety of different viewpoints, which further adds to the complexity of the topic. Table 1

Table 2. Overview of collaborative consumption services (adapted from Armstrong et al. 2015; Park & Armstrong 2017).

MODES OF EXCHANGE	TRADING ACTIVITY	MONETARY TRANSACTION	MODE OF ACCESS	FORMAT
ACCESS OF OWNERSHIP	Renting	Yes	Temporary	Business- to Consumer or Peer-to-peer
	Lending	No	Temporary	Peer-to-peer
	Borrowing	No	Temporary (in some instances return not expected, e.g. piece of paper)	Peer-to-peer
TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP	Donating	No	Unlimited	Consumer-to-business
	Purchasing pre-loved garments	No	Unlimited	Business- to Consumer or Peer-to-peer
REDISTRIBUTION	Swapping	No	Unlimited	Peer-to-peer

provides a brief summary of key terms used within the context of *collaborative consumption*. It has to be highlighted that Table 1 is based on a systematic literature review, but rather was added to illustrate the complexity of the topic area and provide a basis of discussion.

Aside from the notion of 'sharing', Table 1 further highlights that sustainability features are dominant within the references associated with *collaborative consumption* practices and the viewpoints of *collaborative consumption* (Piscicelli et al. 2015). Sustainability here is defined in accordance with Elkington's (2004) Triple Bottom Line, which suggests a business structure focusing on social, environmental and economic sustainability. To reiterate this further, key to both the sharing economy, of which *collaborative consumption* is a part of, is the reduction of waste and the reuse of discarded products, in this case garments, for as long as possible.

Overall, it can be said that the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, share two key similarities: first, consumers are able to share goods (garments, accessories) without necessarily acquiring them, and second, they have thrived through Web 2.0 and the emergence of peer-to-peer platforms (Belk 2014).

Examples of collaborative consumption – swapping in the UK

Although *collaborative consumption* has accelerated since Web 2.0, different business models exist that facilitate both online and offline activities, which allows for an inclusive approach. Hamari et al. (2015) started to map 254 consumption services in their study divided into two modes of exchange and multiple trading activities. Some services have a monetary transaction attached to them or not. Table 2 provides a summation of their overview, with the addition of redistribution practices discussed by authors, such as Armstrong et al. (2015) and Park & Armstrong (2017).

Thus far we have only focused on *collaborative consumption* as an isolated concept, rather than linking it to the wider field of the sharing economy. Within the academic literature both the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, have received an increased interest across a multitude of different fields. It may be unsurprising that various terms have emerged that all describe similar consumption practices, all of which have 'sharing' as a common theme. An explanation could be that 'sharing' practices, and *collaborative consumption* more specifically, lack a clear-cut definition, which implies that the lines are blurred as to what *collaborative consumption* actually is. Reviewing the literature further, *collaborative consumption* can be researched from a variety of different viewpoints, which further adds to the complexity of the topic. Table 1

Overview of collaborative consumption services (Armstrong et al. 2015; Park & Armstrong 2017).

	TRADING ACTIVITY	MONETARY TRANSACTION	MODE OF ACCESS	FORMAT
	Renting	Yes	Temporary	Business- to Consumer or Peer-to-peer
	Lending	No	Temporary	Peer-to-peer
	Borrowing	No	Temporary (in some instances return not expected, e.g. piece of paper)	Peer-to-peer
	Donating	No	Unlimited	Consumer-to-business
	Purchasing pre-loved garments	No	Unlimited	Business- to Consumer or Peer-to-peer
ON	Swapping	No	Unlimited	Peer-to-peer

provides a brief summary of key terms used within the context of *collaborative consumption*. It has to be highlighted that Table 1 is not based on a systematic literature review, but rather was added to illustrate the complexity of the topic area and provide a basis of discussion.

Aside from the notion of 'sharing', Table 1 further highlights that sustainability features are dominant within the references associated with consumption practices and the viewpoints of *collaborative consumption* (Piscicelli et al. 2015). Sustainability here is defined in accordance with Elkington's (2004) Triple Bottom Line, which suggests a three-pillar structure focusing on social, environmental and economic aspects. To reiterate this further, key to both the sharing economy, of which *collaborative consumption* is a part of, is the reduction of waste and the delay in discarding products, in this case garments, for as long as possible.

Overall, it can be said that the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, share two key similarities: first, consumers are able to access goods (garments, accessories) without necessarily acquiring ownership, and second, they have thrived through Web 2.0 and the emergence of peer-to-peer platforms (Belk 2014).

Examples of collaborative consumption – swapping in the UK

Although *collaborative consumption* has accelerated since Web 2.0, different business models exist that facilitate both online and offline 'trading activities', which allows for an inclusive approach. Hamari et al. (2015) started to map 254 consumption services in their study dividing them into two modes of exchange and multiple trading activities that can have a monetary transaction attached to them or not. Table 2 is an adaptation of their overview, with the addition of redistribution of ownership discussed by authors, such as Armstrong et al. (2015) and Park and Armstrong (2017).

It is argued that although ownership of garments change hands during swap shops, they can also be returned at any point in time and swapped for yet another garment or swapped back by the original owner. Thus, ownership is redistributed for an unlimited time rather than fully transferred. As such, this mode is rather unique and provides interesting avenues for further studies.

A key question that may emerge at this stage is why explore *collaborative consumption*, and specifically swapping behaviour, in the UK? What makes this topic interesting and significant? From an economic perspective the sharing economy, which includes swapping and renting, facilitates €28bn worth of transactions within Europe alone (ONS 2017). This clearly highlights that this industry sector is of growing importance. The Office for National Statistics (cited in Daneshku & Vandevelde 2016) further indicates that whilst retail shopping has seen an increase of 4% overall, spending on footwear and clothes has decreased by 4%. This further suggests that consumers may look for alternatives to purchasing new fashion items in traditional high street shops or online and engage more with the *collaborative consumption* phenomenon, which would link to and further support the fact that they are disruptive innovations (Markides 2006).

In the UK market, swap shops are increasingly popular with websites such as 'Love your Clothes' or 'Swishing' providing information on how consumers can set up their own swaps, as well as informing them about events happening in their local area. Clothes swapping implies that people meet either online or in person and exchange garments, without making any monetary transactions (Perlacia et al. 2016; Battle et al. 2018). Yet, the latter aspect might be slightly misleading, as participants do not have to pay for the items swapped, as they are simply trading in their own clothes and gain new garments, however the actual event may have a small fee attached, which allows organisers to cover their overheads. Although consumers seem to be wary of swapping events, as they are relatively informal and unstructured (Armstrong et al. 2013) they have been increasingly popular, especially amongst millennials and during Fashion Revolution Week, which marks the anniversary

of the Rana Plaza Factory accident that saw thousands of people lose their lives (Tuttle 2012; Parveen 2014). Indeed, it is events such as the Rana Plaza factory collapse in 2013 that have really brought the negative side of the fashion industry to light, thrusting issues such as poor working conditions, low wages and other ethical issues such as child labour, alongside the negative environmental impact, into the media spotlight around the world. The increased awareness of these issues have created a more conscious consumer, particularly the millennial generation, whereby the move for change in consumption practices is gaining momentum.

Although swap shops are becoming increasingly popular, they have not yet been reflected in mainstream research. We would, thus, like to take the opportunity to raise a couple of key questions and discuss them in detail that may encourage future explorations in this area. When we conducted our swapping events we found that people have different 'strategies' in terms of when they arrive at the event, how they search for clothes, and how long they stay for. A question that emerges here is whether there are consumer typologies emerging and whether these are also reflected in their every day behaviour. This aspect is of importance as it may also shed light on sustainable behaviour and green consumption. Young et al. (2010) pointing out that there are a variety of typologies of green consumers, yet their study excluded fashion products. A future enquiry could investigate the underpinning motivations of people participating (or not) in swapping events. Although authors (Armstrong et al. 2015; Park & Armstrong 2017) have started to problematize the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, research thus far lacks depth in relation into the underpinning drivers and barriers. This issue is as important as sustainability, and more specifically sustainable consumption, has become a top global priority for the UN (2018).

It is argued that although ownership of garments change hands during swap shops, they can also be returned at any point in time and swapped for yet another garment or swapped back by the original owner. Thus, ownership is redistributed for an unlimited time rather than fully transferred. As such, this mode is rather unique and provides interesting avenues for further studies.

A key question that may emerge at this stage is why explore *collaborative consumption*, and specifically swapping behaviour, in the UK? What makes this topic interesting and significant? From an economic perspective the sharing economy, which includes swapping and renting, facilitates €28bn worth of transactions within Europe alone (ONS 2017). This clearly highlights that this industry sector is of growing importance. The Office for National Statistics (cited in Daneshku & Vandevelde 2016) further indicates that whilst retail shopping has seen an increase of 4% overall, spending on footwear and clothes has decreased by 4%. This further suggests that consumers may look for alternatives to purchasing new fashion items in traditional high street shops or online and engage more with the *collaborative consumption* phenomenon, which would link to and further support the fact that they are disruptive innovations (Markides 2006).

In the UK market, swap shops are increasingly popular with websites such as 'Love your Clothes' or 'Swishing' providing information on how consumers can set up their own swaps, as well as informing them about events happening in their local area. Clothes swapping implies that people meet either online or in person and exchange garments, without making any monetary transactions (Perlacia et al. 2016; Battle et al. 2018). Yet, the latter aspect might be slightly misleading, as participants do not have to pay for the items swapped, as they are simply trading in their own clothes and gain new garments, however the actual event may have a small fee attached, which allows organisers to cover their overheads. Although consumers seem to be wary of swapping events, as they are relatively informal and unstructured (Armstrong et al. 2013) they have been increasingly popular, especially amongst millennials and during Fashion Revolution Week, which marks the anniversary

of the Rana Plaza Factory accident that saw thousands of people lose their lives (Tuttle 2012; Parveen 2014). Indeed, it is events such as the Rana Plaza factory collapse in 2013 that have really brought the negative side of the fashion industry to light, thrusting issues such as poor working conditions, low wages and other ethical issues such as slave/child labour, alongside the negative environmental impact, into the media spotlight around the world. The increased awareness of such issues have created a more conscious consumer, particularly amongst the millennial generation, whereby the move for change in consumption practices is gaining momentum.

Although swap shops are becoming increasingly popular, this is not yet been reflected in mainstream research. We would, thus, like to take the opportunity to raise a couple of key questions and discussion points that may encourage future explorations in this area. When observing swapping events we found that people have different 'strategies' in terms of when they arrive at the event, how they search for clothes and how long they stay for. A question that emerges here is whether there are consumer typologies emerging and whether these are also reflected in their every day behaviour. This aspect is of importance as it would also shed light on sustainable behaviour and green consumption, with Young et al. (2010) pointing out that there are a variety of shades of green consumers, yet their study excluded fashion products. A further enquiry could investigate the underpinning motivations of participating (or not) in swapping events. Although authors (Armstrong et al. 2015; Park & Armstrong 2017) have started to problematize the sharing economy and *collaborative consumption*, research thus far lacks an exploration into the underpinning drivers and barriers. This issue is important as sustainability, and more specifically sustainable consumption, has become a top global priority for the UN (2018).

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of *collaborative consumption* by offering an insight into current debates on its definitions and the variety of terminology used to discuss this emerging phenomenon. Although *collaborative consumption* is not as mainstream in the fashion industry as it is in the tourism and transportation industry, it has seen some success stories that are continuously growing, indicating that it has potential. Further research is needed into this area in light of the recent rise in media coverage associated with these disruptive innovations ranging from safety issues (e.g. in Airbnb accommodation), assaults (e.g. towards and from Uber drivers), as well as recent bans of some of these platforms in countries such as Denmark. There is a question of whether any of these issues will affect the fashion industry, seeing as many of the issues raised relate to the close proximity of the user and those providing the good and/or service, yet this is slightly different for the fashion industry, therefore requiring future research.

References

- Akbar, P., Mai, R., & Hoffman, S. (2016). When do materialistic consumers join commercial sharing systems. *Journal of business research*. Vol. 69, pp. 4215–4224.
- Armstrong, C.M., Niinimäki, K., Kujala, S., Karell, E., & Lang, C. (2015). Sustainable product-service systems for clothing: exploring perceptions of consumption alternatives in Finland. *Journal of cleaner production*. Vol. 97, pp. 30–39.
- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G.M. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of consumer research*. Vol. 39:4, pp. 881–898.
- Battle, A., Ryding, D., & Henninger, C.E. (2018). Access-based consumption— a new business model for luxury and secondhand fashion business? In: Ryding, D., Henninger, C.E., & Blazquez Cano, M. (eds.). *Vintage luxury fashion*. Cham, Switzerland. Palgrave, pp. 29–44.
- Belk, R. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of consumer research*. Vol. 15, pp. 139–168.
- Belk, R. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of consumer research*. Vol. 36, pp. 715–734.
- Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of business research*. Vol. 67:8, pp. 157–164.
- Benoit, S., Baker, T.L., Bolton, R.N., Gruber, T., & Kandampully, J. (2010). A triadic framework for collaborative consumption (CC). *Journal of business research*. Vol. 79, pp. 219–227.
- Botsman, R. (2015). Defining the sharing economy: What is collaborative consumption—and what isn't. Fast Company (online), retrieved: www.fastcoexist.com/3046119/defining-the-sharing-economy-what-is-collaborative-consumption-and-what-isnt [Accessed 22.4.2018].
- Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2010). *What's mine is yours: The rise of collaborative consumption*. New York, USA. Harper Collins.
- Christensen, C.M. & Raynor, M.E. (2003). *The innovator's solution: C* and sustaining successful growth. Boston, MA. Harvard Business School Press.
- Codagnone, C., & Martens, M. (2016). *Scoping the sharing economy: or definitions, impact and regulatory issues*. Europa (online), retrieved: ec.europa.eu/jrc/sites/jrcsh/files/JRC100369.pdf [Accessed 22.4.2018].
- Corciolani, M. & Dalli, D. (2014). Gift-giving, sharing and commodity exchange at Bookcrossing.com. *Management decision*. Vol. 52:4, pp. 614–624.
- Daneshku, S., & Vandeveld, M. (2016). *Clothes buying goes out of fashion in the UK*, Financial Times (online), retrieved: <https://www.ft.com/content/5c274b28-7f3d-11e6-8e50-8ec15fb462f4> [Accessed 22.4.2018].
- Eckhardt, G.M., Belk, R., & Devinney, T.M. (2010). Why don't consumers consume ethically? *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 9:6, pp. 426–434.
- Elkington, J. (2004) Enter the triple bottom line. In: Henriques, A. & Richardson, J. (eds.). *The triple bottom line, does it all add up?* London: Earthscan, pp. 1–16.
- Felson, M. & Spaeth, J.L. (1978). Community structure and collaborative consumption. *American behavioural scientist*. Vol. 21:4, pp. 614–624.
- Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: do people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the association for information science & technology*. Vol. 67:9, pp. 2047–2059.
- Hibbert, S., & Horne, S. (1996). Giving to charity: Questioning the decision process. *Journal of consumer marketing*. Vol. 13:2, pp. 4–13.
- Hoh, A. (2017). *Rise of clothes swapping helps make a small dent in the fashion waste*, ABC News (online), retrieved: <http://www.abc.net/news/2017-05-19/clothes-swap-making-small-dent-in-war-on-fashion-waste/8537090> [Accessed 21.4.2018].
- Hollenbeck, C.R., Peters, C., & Zinkhan, G.M. (2006). Gift giving: a community paradigm. *Psychology and marketing*. Vol. 23:7, pp. 573–584.

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of *collaborative consumption* by offering an insight into current debates on its definitions and the variety of terminology used to discuss this emerging phenomenon. Although *collaborative consumption* is not as mainstream in the fashion industry as it is in the tourism and transportation industry, it has seen some success stories that are continuously growing, indicating that it has potential. Further research is needed into this area in light of the recent rise in media coverage associated with these disruptive innovations ranging from safety issues (e.g. in Airbnb accommodation), assaults (e.g. towards and from Uber drivers), as well as recent bans of some of these platforms in countries such as Denmark. There is a question of whether any of these issues will affect the fashion industry, seeing as many of the issues raised relate to the close proximity of the user and those providing the good and/or service, yet this is slightly different for the fashion industry, therefore requiring future research.

References

Alkbar, P., Mai, R., & Hoffman, S. (2016). When do materialistic consumers join commercial sharing systems. *Journal of business research*. Vol. 69, pp. 4215–4224.

Armstrong, C.M., Niinimäki, K., Kujala, S., Karell, E., & Lang, C. (2015). Sustainable product-service systems for clothing: exploring perceptions of consumption alternatives in Finland. *Journal of cleaner production*. Vol. 97, pp. 30–39.

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

Attle, A., Ryding, D., & Henninger, C.E. (2018). Access-based consumption—a new business model for luxury and secondhand fashion business? In: Ryding, D., Henninger, C.E., & Blazquez Cano, M. (eds.). *Vintage luxury fashion*. Cham, Switzerland. Palgrave, pp. 29–44.

Belk, R. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of consumer research*. Vol. 15, pp. 139–168.

Belk, R. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of consumer research*. Vol. 36, pp. 715–734.

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

Benoit, S., Baker, T.L., Bolton, R.N., Gruber, T., & Kandampully, J. (2017). A triadic framework for collaborative consumption (CC). *Journal of business research*. Vol. 79, pp. 219–227.

Botsman, R. (2015). Defining the sharing economy: What is collaborative consumption—and what isn't. Fast Company (online), retrieved: <https://www.fastcoexist.com/3046119/defining-the-sharing-economy-what-is-collaborative-consumption-and-what-isnt> [Accessed 22.4.2018].

Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2010). *What's mine is yours: The rise of collaborative consumption*. New York, USA. Harper Collins.

Christensen, C.M. & Raynor, M.E. (2003). *The innovator's solution: Creating and sustaining successful growth*. Boston, MA. Harvard Business School Press.

Codagnone, C., & Martens, M. (2016). *Scoping the sharing economy: origins, definitions, impact and regulatory issues*. Europa (online), retrieved: <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/sites/jrcsh/files/JRC100369.pdf> [Accessed 22.4.2018].

Corciolani, M. & Dalli, D. (2014). Gift-giving, sharing and commodity exchange at Bookcrossing.com. *Management decision*. Vol. 52:4, pp. 755–776.

Daneshku, S., & Vandeveld, M. (2016). *Clothes buying goes out of fashion in the UK*, Financial Times (online), retrieved: <https://www.ft.com/content/5c274b28-7f3d-11e6-8e50-8ec15fb462f4> [Accessed 22.4.2018].

Eckhardt, G.M., Belk, R., & Devinney, T.M. (2010). Why don't consumers consume ethically? *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 9:6, pp. 426–436.

Elkington, J. (2004) Enter the triple bottom line. In: Henriques, A. and Richardson, J. (eds.). *The triple bottom line, does it all add up?* London: Earthscan, pp. 1–16.

Felson, M. & Spaeth, J.L. (1978). Community structure and collaborative consumption. *American behavioural scientist*. Vol. 21:4, pp. 614–624.

Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the association for information science & technology*. Vol. 67:9, pp. 2047–2059.

Hibbert, S., & Horne, S. (1996). Giving to charity: Questioning the donor decision process. *Journal of consumer marketing*. Vol. 13:2, pp. 4–13.

Hoh, A. (2017). *Rise of clothes swapping helps make a small dent in the war on fashion waste*, ABC News (online), retrieved: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-05-19/clothes-swap-making-small-dent-in-war-on-fashion-waste/8537090> [Accessed 21.4.2018].

Hollenbeck, C.R., Peters, C., & Zinkhan, G.M. (2006). Gift giving: a community paradigm. *Psychology and marketing*. Vol. 23:7, pp. 573–595.

- Humphreys, A., & Grayson, K. (2008). The intersecting roles of consumer and producer: A critical perspective on co-production, co-creation and prosumption. *Sociological compass*. Vol. 2, pp. 963–980.
- Ingold, T. (1986). *The appropriation of nature: Essays on human ecology and social relations*. Manchester. Manchester University Press.
- Iran, S., & Schrader, U. (2017). Collaborative fashion consumption and its environmental effects. *Journal of fashion marketing & management*. Vol. 21:4, pp. 468–482.
- Jenkins, R., Molesworth, M., & Scullion, R. (2014). The messy social lives of objects: Inter-personal borrowing and the ambiguity of possession and ownership. *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 13:2, pp. 131–139.
- Kaplan, A.M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business horizons*. Vol. 53:1, pp. 59–68.
- Lamberton, C., & Rose, R. (2012). When is ours better than mine? A framework for understanding and altering participation in commercial sharing systems. *Journal of marketing*. Vol. 76, pp. 109–125.
- Lessig, L. (2008). *Remix: Making art and commerce thrive in the hybrid economy*. New York, USA. Penguin Press.
- Markides, C. (2006). Disruptive innovation: in need of better theory. *Journal of product innovation management*. Vol. 23, pp. 19–25.
- Markusen, A. (1999). Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: The case for rigour and policy relevance in critical regional Studies. *Regional studies*. Vol. 33:9, pp. 869–884.
- Mont, O. (2002). Clarifying the concept of product-service system. *Journal of cleaner production*. Vol. 10, pp. 237–245.
- ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2017). *The feasibility of measuring the sharing economy: November 2017 progress update*. ONS (online), retrieved: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/articles/thefeasibilityofmeasuringthesharingeconomy/november2017progressupdate> [Accessed 27.5.2018].
- Ozanne, L.K., & Ballantine, P.W. (2010). Sharing as a form of anti-consumption? An examination of toy library users. *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 9:6, pp. 485–498.
- Park, H., & Armstrong, C.M.J. (2017). Collaborative apparel consumption in the digital sharing economy: an agenda for academic inquiry. *International journal of consumer Studies*. Vol. 41, pp. 465–474.
- Parveen, S. (2014). *Rana Plaza factory collapse survivors struggle one year on*, BBC (online), retrieved: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-27107860> [Accessed 15.4.2018].
- Perlacia, A., Dumil, V. & Saebi, T. (2016). *Collaborative consumption: Live fashion, don't own it*. SSRN (online), retrieved: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2762017>. [Accessed 27.6.2017].
- Pike, H. (2016). *Will the 'sharing economy' work for fashion?* Business & Fashion (online), retrieved: <https://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/tech/will-the-sharing-economy-work-for-fashion-rent-the-run> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- Piscicelli, L., Cooper, T., & Fisher, T. (2014). The role of values in co-consumption: insights from a product-service system for lending and borrowing in the UK. *Journal of cleaner production*. Vol. 97, pp. 21–28.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences in the new service practice in value creation. *Journal of interactive marketing*. Vol. 18, pp. 5–13.
- Purvis, K., & Evrenos, M. (2014). *How to set up a clothes swap in your city*. The guardian (online), retrieved: <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2014/sep/15/how-to-set-up-clothes-swap-in-your-city> [Accessed 21.4.2018].
- Richard, B. & Cleveland, S. (2016). The future of hotel chains: brands and places driven by the sharing economy. *Journal of vacation marketing*. Vol. 23, pp. 239–248.
- Ritzer, G., & Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, consumption, prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'. *Journal of consumer culture*. Vol. 10, pp. 13–36.
- Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2006). Two-sided markets: A progress report. *Journal of economics*. Vol. 37:3, pp. 645–667.
- Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N., & Srinivas, S. (2011). Mindful consumption: A consumer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*. Vol. 39:1, pp. 21–39.
- Tuttle, B. (2012). *I'll trade you my skinny jeans for your skinny jeans*. Time (online), retrieved: <http://business.time.com/2012/05/07/ill-trade-you-my-skinny-jeans-for-your-skinny-jeans/> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- UN (United Nations) (2018). Goal 12: *Ensuing sustainable consumption and production patterns*. UN (online), retrieved: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-consumption-production/> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004a). Evolving to a new dominant logic for service marketing. *Journal of marketing*. Vol. 68, pp. 1–17.
- Wittkowski, K., Moeller, S., & Wirtz, J. (2013). Firms' intentions to offer ownership services. *Journal of service research*. Vol. 16:2, pp. 171–184.
- Young, W., Hwang, K., McDonald, S., & Oates, C.J. (2010). Sustainable consumption: Green consumer behaviour when purchasing products. *Sustainable development*. Vol. 18:1, pp. 20–31.

- Humphreys, A., & Grayson, K. (2008). The intersecting roles of consumer and producer: A critical perspective on co-production, co-creation and prosumption. *Sociological compass*. Vol. 2, pp. 963–980.
- Ingold, T. (1986). *The appropriation of nature: Essays on human ecology and social relations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Iran, S., & Schrader, U. (2017). Collaborative fashion consumption and its environmental effects. *Journal of fashion marketing & management*. Vol. 21:4, pp. 468–482.
- Jenkins, R., Molesworth, M., & Scullion, R. (2014). The messy social lives of objects: Inter-personal borrowing and the ambiguity of possession and ownership. *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 13:2, pp. 131–139.
- Kaplan, Á.M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business horizons*. Vol. 53:1, pp. 59–68.
- Lamberton, C., & Rose, R. (2012). When is ours better than mine? A framework for understanding and altering participation in commercial sharing systems. *Journal of marketing*. Vol. 76, pp. 109–125.
- Lessig, L. (2008). *Remix: Making art and commerce thrive in the hybrid economy*. New York, USA: Penguin Press.
- Markides, C. (2006). Disruptive innovation: in need of better theory. *Journal of product innovation management*. Vol. 23, pp. 19–25.
- Markusen, A. (1999). Fuzzy concepts, scanty evidence, policy distance: The case for rigour and policy relevance in critical regional Studies. *Regional studies*. Vol. 33:9, pp. 869–884.
- Mont, O. (2002). Clarifying the concept of product-service system. *Journal of cleaner production*, Vol. 10, pp. 237–245.
- ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2017). *The feasibility of measuring the sharing economy: November 2017 progress update*. ONS (online), retrieved: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/articles/thefeasibilityofmeasuringthesharingeconomy/november2017progressupdate> [Accessed 27.5.2018].
- Ozanne, L.K., & Ballantine, P.W. (2010). Sharing as a form of anti-consumption? An examination of toy library users. *Journal of consumer behaviour*. Vol. 9:6, pp. 485–498.
- Park, H., & Armstrong, C.M.J. (2017). Collaborative apparel consumption in the digital sharing economy: an agenda for academic inquiry. *International journal of consumer Studies*. Vol. 41, pp. 465–474.
- Parveen, S. (2014). *Rana Plaza factory collapse survivors struggle one year on*, BBC (online), retrieved: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-27107860> [Accessed 15.4.2018].
- Petrlacia, A., Duml, V. & Saebi, T. (2016). *Collaborative consumption: Live fashion, don't own it*. SSRN (online), retrieved: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2860021> [Accessed 27.6.2017].
- Pike, H. (2016). *Will the 'sharing economy' work for fashion?* Business of fashion (online), retrieved: <https://www.businessoffashion.com/articles/fashion-tech/will-the-sharing-economy-work-for-fashion-rent-the-runway-rental> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- Piscicelli, L., Cooper, T., & Fisher, T. (2014). The role of values in collaborative consumption: insights from a product-service system for lending and borrowing in the UK. *Journal of cleaner production*. Vol. 97, pp. 21–29.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences the net practice in value creation. *Journal of interactive marketing*. Vol. 18, pp. 5–14.
- Purvis, K., & Evrenos, M. (2014). *How to set up a clothes swap in your area*. The guardian (online), retrieved: <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2014/sep/15/how-to-set-up-clothes-swap-in-your-area> [Accessed 21.4.2018].
- Richard, B. & Cleveland, S. (2016). The future of hotel chains: branded marketplaces driven by the sharing economy. *Journal of vacation marketing*. Vol. 22:3, pp. 239–248.
- Ritzer, G., & Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, consumption, prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'. *Journal of consumer culture*. Vol. 10, pp. 13–36.
- Rochet, J.-C., & Tirole, J. (2006). Two-sided markets: A progress report. *Journal of economics*. Vol. 37:3, pp. 645–667.
- Sheth, J. N., Sethia, N., & Srinivas, S. (2011). Mindful consumption: A customer-centric approach to sustainability. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*. Vol. 39:1, pp. 21–39.
- Tuttle, B. (2012). *I'll trade you my skinny jeans for your skinny jeans*. Time (online), retrieved: <http://business.time.com/2012/05/07/ill-trade-you-my-skinny-jeans-for-your-skinny-jeans/> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- UN (United Nations) (2018). Goal 12: *Ensuing sustainable consumption and production patterns*. UN (online), retrieved: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-consumption-production/> [Accessed 23.4.2018].
- Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004a). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of marketing*. Vol. 68, pp. 1–17.
- Wittkowski, K., Moeller, S., & Wirtz, J. (2013). Firms' intentions to use non ownership services. *Journal of service research*. Vol. 16:2, pp. 171–185.
- Young, W., Hwang, K., McDonald, S., & Oates, C.J. (2010). Sustainable consumption: Green consumer behaviour when purchasing products. *Sustainable development*. Vol. 18:1, pp. 20–31.