Working Within the Collaborative Tourist Economy: The Complex Crafting of Work and Meaning

Jane Widtfeldt Meged and Mathilde Dissing Christensen

Abstract This chapter explores from a critical perspective how workers in the collaborative tourism economy craft meaning and identity in work and discusses transformations on the established labour market induced by the collaborative economy. It does so through the perspectives of guides working with Copenhagen Free Walking Tours, a platform offering guided tours and hosts offering short-term rentals on the platform Airbnb. Both guides and hosts practice job crafting. However, guides and hosts navigate the collaborative economy in different ways. Both markets require hosting qualities drawing on personal competencies when delivering hosting–on-demand. Guides can be characterised as social lifestyle entrepreneurs as they experience guiding as a lifestyle with high social and cultural returns. To the contrary, the Airbnb hosts interviewed can be perceived as micro-entrepreneurs practising pseudo-sharing, and manoeuvring in micro-competitive platform capitalism.

Keywords Airbnb • Copenhagen Free Walking Tours • Informal economy • Job-crafting • Collaborative economies

1 Introduction

The collaborative economy may be examined from a range of interrelated perspectives such as (1) an ideological perspective tapping into sustainability, shared communities and non-profit (e.g. Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Gansky, 2012); (2) an economic perspective presenting new hyper flexible business models eliciting

J.W. Meged (✉)
Department of People and Technology, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: janewm@ruc.dk

M.D. Christensen
Department of People and Technology, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark
Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA
e-mail: mdc@ruc.dk

D. Dredge, S. Gyimóthy (eds.), *Collaborative Economy and Tourism*,
Tourism on the Verge, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-51799-5_12

hidden resources at extremely low cost facilitated by technological development (Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Gansky, 2012; World Economic Report, 2014); or (3) a critical perspective—albeit a hitherto less widely applied perspective—addressing the impact of the collaborative economy on, for example, working life and on the welfare system, particularly in developed countries (Nielsen, 2015; Skytte, 2014a, 2014b; We-Economy, 2015).

Taking the third perspective above as a point of departure, this chapter explores how the meaning of work and identity are crafted by workers in the collaborative tourism economy. The chapter discusses the transformations on the labour market induced by the collaborative economy, and how workers in the collaborative tourism economy position themselves vis-à-vis the established labour market in a welfare state like Denmark. The collaborative economy envisions a new economic model based on sustainability and sharing, where the glue and tradable value are trust and social capital (Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Germann Molz, 2014a, 2014b; Rifkin, 2014). Rifkin (2014) argues that, in the wake of a third industrial revolution, the economy will be based on abundance instead of scarcity as the Internet of Things (IoT) will lead to extreme productivity at 'near zero' marginal cost, thus producing the next item for 'almost free'. To some extent one can argue that this is already happening in education with MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), publishing, communication, entertainment and in areas of tourism. The proponents of the collaborative economy see former workers as prosumers and micro-entrepreneurs engaging in "a distributed, collaborative, open, transparent, peer-to-peer economy as an expression of lateral power" (Rifkin, 2014, p. 241), carried forward by visions of empathy and the common good.

These visions of the benefits of the collaborative economy are already being put to the test as the emergence of the collaborative economy is sending shockwaves through the established economy and labour market. Collaborative enterprises are beginning to overtake old markets, e.g. in hospitality (Airbnb), transport (Uber) and many other services in the tourism economy, disrupting the markets and turning the tables on the "old workers" and professionals in the tourism labour market.

In the Danish labour market, "pay and working conditions are typically laid down by collective agreements concluded between trade unions and employers' organisations. This system of labour market regulation is referred to as 'the Danish Model' " (Ministry of Employment, 2015). This labour model was constructed during the twentieth century, and is based on strong labour market organisations with a high membership rate, which currently is around 70% of workers (Ministry of Employment, 2015; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015). The third party in the employment equation is the state, which by and large leaves the social partners alone to agree on conditions through collective bargaining, but it also ensures universal welfare for all citizens by applying substantial redistribution through healthcare, a free education system and social security. Furthermore, the state supports an active labour market policy by offering guidance, a job or education to all unemployed persons (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015). The result is a generous welfare model, where organised workers are guaranteed a minimum wage

well above that of many other countries, which, as of November 2015, amounted to 14.82 euros per hour for an unskilled worker (HK, 2015). Unemployment benefits are also provided at a relatively high level—up to 90% for the lowest paid workers. Furthermore, workers receive other important rights and benefits such as sick pay, six weeks annual holiday and more than a year parental leave.

The model is also referred to as 'flexicurity', as it ensures extensive worker protection while also taking changing production and market conditions into account (Madsen, 2002; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015). This flexibility manifests itself in a high level of job mobility, as employers can easily hire and fire workers to adjust to the market—indeed, about 25% of Danish private sector workers change jobs each year (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015)—but security for the workers when needed. The system builds on mutual trust and responsibility, where public expenditure constitutes as much as 58.2% (2010) of GDP, and simultaneously ranks Denmark amongst the countries with lowest inequality in the world (OECD, 2015).

However, critical voices claim that collaborative economies present a threat to the current organisation of labour within the Danish society. The Danish think tank We-Economy hosted the *Fair Share—dilemmas in a digital job market* seminar in March 2015, which was well attended by the industry, unions, the press and other interested parties. At the seminar, critics draw attention to the notion of 'Platform Capitalism' (Olma, 2014), which views many collaborative enterprises as a 'gig economy' of subcontracting. Along these lines, the leftist newspaper *Information* reported after the seminar:

> ... the [collaborative] services are accused of undermining hard-fought for working rights and further spur a new class of casual labourers, roustabouts or 'self-employed' free-lancers without rights—the so-called precariat. Instead of being micro-entrepreneurs a new group of micro-earners has been created (Kjærgaard, 2015, own translation).

While terms like sharing or collaborative economy may denote acts of friendship and participation, a kind of supplementary part-time job that is half-work, half-social, it is already a global billion dollar business, and many people have made it a way of living, executing small jobs in a gig economy. This has given rise to critical voices in Denmark as well as internationally, reflecting a growing ambivalence against the unintended impact of collaborative economies (Allen, 2015; Mosendz, 2015; Nezik, 2015; Olma, 2014; Quijones & Street, 2015; We-Economy, 2015). Another observation from the seminar was the traditional workers unions' unpreparedness to handle this type of work and workers, which they might consider constitute a fundamental threat to the old structures and ideas of job markets, but that also pose opportunities of new ways of organising old as well as new members. While working in the collaborative economy may be a detriment for workers who crave stability, it may offer flexibility and opportunities for others (The Economist, 2015). We will therefore examine how workers within the collaborative tourist economies negotiate stability, flexibility and opportunity. Which tasks are being crafted working within the collaborative tourist economies? How is meaning

created within their working life, and do workers share concerns for the precarious nature of their work, and if so, how are these concerns navigated?

2 New Workers and Lifestyle Entrepreneurs in Tourism

Tourism is an important generator of jobs (Ladkin, 2011), but as part of an economy that is heavily involved in globalisation and restructuration, employment in tourism tends to adjust through flexibilisation strategies, such as numerical flexibility, externalisation, wage flexibility, temporal flexibility and functional flexibility (Buchholz et al., 2009). Many types of tourism workers have always been flexible labourers, such as guides (Meged, 2017), workers in the cruise-ship industry (Weaver, 2005) and hotel employees (Adler & Adler, 2004), with heavy stratification running along the lines of ethnicity, gender and class. However, more than just turning into a flexible labour market, tourism is also a hub for new workers or lifestyle entrepreneurs (Meged, 2017; Veijola, 2009a). This development is characterised by the notion that in tourism "a new emphasis on human and physical capital in the forms of communication and affective labour is prominent: a bodily mode of work that produces social networks, forms of community, biopower" (Veijola, 2009a, p. 114).

To understand how these new tourism workers actually shape their work, we turn to the theory of job crafting, which captures "the active changes employees make to their own job designs, in ways that can bring about numerous positive outcomes, including engagement, job satisfaction, resilience and thriving" (Berg, Dutton, & Wrzesniewski, 2007, front page). Job crafting practices fall into three categories: the first involves changing the job's task boundaries in number or form, the second involves changing cognitive task boundaries, which is how workers alter their view of their work, and the third involves changing the relational boundaries to other actors. Workers job crafting depends on the objective features of their job design, as well as on their motivational orientation; whether they perceive their work as a job where their focus is on financial rewards; as a career, (where focus is on advancement); or as a calling (where focus is on the enjoyment of carrying out socially useful work). Motivation may also be either intrinsic, i.e. doing the work for its own sake, or extrinsic, i.e. doing the work for a reason apart from the work itself, where the former enhances job crafting more than the latter (Berg et al., 2007).

In a recent study, Meged (2017) shows how certified guides are ardent job crafters, who typically act as guides to pursue their passion for people, arts and history. They perceive themselves as natural born guides and by engaging in lifelong learning, networking and creativity, they craft new job opportunities and thereby see themselves as self-employed lifestyle entrepreneurs rather than as causal labourers, although they are effectively hired as such by employers. Guides often take on large amounts of unpaid work, sometimes below market rates, as they may be in fierce competition with colleagues, who are also competitors, and can suffer a great sense of isolation. Garsten (2008) argues from a critical perspective

that what is labelled as "freedom of choice", and the use of positive buzzwords like "flexibility", 'lifelong learning and "entrepreneurship", may in fact just be a spin to cover a not-all-that-voluntary adaptation to strong market forces. In reality, adaptation is individualised and internalised, leaving the workers in an isolated, fragmented and highly competitive state in their working life.

In this chapter, we explore how workers or lifestyle entrepreneurs in the collaborative tourism economy perceive their role and how they craft their work, but also, critically, we look at the implicit and explicit cost-benefits of working in an economy operating in the informal sector (Guttentag, 2015, p. 9). We consider two case studies of two different business models in the collaborative tourism economy, namely the global company Airbnb and the small locally run Copenhagen Free Walking Tours, in order to observe the differences and similarities of working within the two businesses. The first company in our case study, Airbnb, is truly global and market-mediatized, while the other, Copenhagen Free Walking Tours, is small, local and self-governed, although it is also market-mediatized. Our analysis utilizes a number of research tools, including netnography, a literature survey, participant observations and interviews with agents working with the respective companies, namely four guides (Guide X, Y, Z and V) from Copenhagen Free Walking Tours and two hosts (Host K and M) from Airbnb.

3 Working with Copenhagen Free Walking Tours

Copenhagen Free Walking Tours (CFWT) was started in 2012 in the city of Copenhagen, Denmark, by a couple of guides. The previous year they had worked with the 'worldwide' company of free guided tours Sandemans New Europe, which had started to offer tours Copenhagen in 2011. Much of the early CFWT model is derived from the co-founders experience with Sandemans, so it is worthwhile to first give some background information on Sandemans. Sandemans was originally set up in Germany in 2004 and offered free guided tours of Berlin, which quickly became popular and helped them expand to other regions and cities. It now operates in 18 cities in Europe, the Middle East and US, and operates an ethos of peer-to-peer guiding, mainly attracting young tourists (Sandemans New Europe, 2010). The concept is a tips-alone based income for the guides who, in return, have to pay 1–2 euros per tourist to the company (guide Z and V). Sandemans works as a franchise, with local offices and management personnel. In its first year of operating in Denmark, the Danish branch did not pay off well enough, and the company suddenly decided to close down activities in Copenhagen in November 2012 (Guide Z). However, as the tourists continued arriving for daily tours, a couple of the guides decided to continue to offer tours but through their own company, and hence, Copenhagen Free Walking Tours (CFWT) was born. In its first year of operation, CFWT offered one daily tour, which attracted around 50–70 tourists in the high season, and the tours proved so successful that within 3 years CFWT had grown exponentially. By August 2015 CFWT were offering four daily tours with

three different itineraries, guiding an average of 400–500 tourists daily, and even more on special occasions. However, demand is seasonal, and in low season, they offer only one daily tour; indeed typically in February they may have as few as 20–25 tourists on weekdays, and around 50–60 on weekends. In addition, they have started to offer organised pub crawls. Initially CFWT engaged eight guides, five of whom worked for CFWT as their primary occupation and only source of income; now, just 3 years later, the company engage 15 guides, of which ten of them earn their living entirely by guiding for CFWT. The takings from conducting a tour involving an average of 30 tourists is, according to the interviewees, around 120–200 euros. The tacit norm amongst the guides is that 6.5 euros per tourist is a fair and just tip, although tourists can give any amount they feel is justified.

CFWT is run collectively by all the guides, and an early collective decision was taken to lower the return fee to the company to 65 cents per tourist, to fund the company spending money on marketing, such as brochures, umbrellas, etc. As everybody pool their competences and labour, this permits the company running costs to be close to zero. Guide X explicates the working ethos of CWFT in the frame of collective ownership:

> It is the mindset of Christiania [a small self-governed free town in the centre of Copenhagen], that people create the society, that people themselves create community, like you do on Facebook, If you are not there, Facebook doesn't exist. Nobody from outside is doing it for you, it is the members who create it (Guide X).

During the interviews with the guides, it became clear that all of them put substantial work into the company without additional economic reward, other than the tips they got from the tours. The guides hold monthly meetings, where decisions regarding CFWT are taken in plenary. All the company marketing is planned and carried out by themselves, and each guide has responsibility for a district, in which they regularly distribute flyers. The partner of one guide has cleverly set up their homepage to operate in connection with Facebook and TripAdvisor, where they advertise themselves as the highest rated walking tour in Copenhagen, with a rating of five out of five. Email details are collected from all the tour participants prior to departure with the promise that they will receive only one mail from CFWT. In turn, the guides then take the lead and the same day send a personal email to all the tour participants containing a link to the CFWT Facebook profile, where the photos from the tour groups are posted each day. Additionally, the tour participants are asked to leave a rating on TripAdvisor. This work can be rather cumbersome for the lead guide, as the number of tourists on one tour may be as high as 150–200. One of the co-founders of CFWT explained how they thought of it as a hobby, even the ones who earned their living from being a guide. The co-founder herself had permanent employment elsewhere but had initially continued to work with CFWT, mostly as a key administrative person, responsible for statistics and forecasts and for working out duty rosters etc., besides also guiding some tours.

Clearly the guides subscribe to a collaborative entrepreneurial ethos, where everybody contributes with time and skills without calculating the exact time or

cost, and this ethos is also adopted and managed by the constant influx of newcomers. The co-founder interviewed had just left CFWT to focus on a regular job, and explained that since its start in 2012, there was only one of the original guides now left in CFWT, rationalising "Guides are drifters, here today gone tomorrow!" Guide Y described how she had worked as volunteer in a non-profit Copenhagen café, when she first joined CFWT to do tours in German, and she essentially saw CFWT as part and parcel of the environment of volunteers. This points to a generation of super flexible collaborative lifestyle entrepreneurs, who are highly prone to job craft in almost-zero-cost platform enterprises. They cognitively identify themselves with the company, which may be why they are willing to assume a number of unpaid tasks, even if they are only briefly associated with the company.

To explain this commitment, we also have to look at the social fabric of CFWT:

> This group (CFWT) also works as a group of friends, who has a lot of fun together. And there have been the pub crawls in the evenings, so in that way it was a fun crowd to be part of. The tourists also sense that, and they get dragged into it, and it is a kind of an everyday party (Guide Y).

Crafting meaningful connections to colleagues and tourists are important (Meged, 2017), and in CFWT the boundaries between work and privacy have seemingly been erased, as guides are happy to spend their free time with colleagues and even with tourists after a tour, e.g. going to new places or for drinks. Furthermore, CFWT is an integral part of a wider young international community of unskilled tourism workers in Copenhagen, who regularly socialise at a central Kayak bar (Guide Y). The CFWT homepage reveals that only three out of twelve guides are Danish born, indicating a global, flexible workforce working on platform enterprises, which to a large degree eludes national regulations and functions as an informal economy. This is exemplified by the mixed attitudes of the guides in regard to taxation and the formal Danish welfare system. The co-founder clarified that all the guides received an explanation about how to fill out their tax forms, i.e. for when income consists of tips. "It is box 12 in the tax form" (Guide Z); however, it is left to the discretion of the individual guide on how much to fill in. Another guide had discussed the issue with colleagues, and was left with the impression that some would not pay tax at all, while others would, but only to the extent they felt they could afford it, hence considering it as a kind of a private moral issue (guide Y). This demonstrates that CFWT is part of an informal economy. Guide Y explained that she knew that some of her foreign colleagues, who worried about their residence permit, but even though she had permanent residency, she also worried about working in the informal economy:

> As I do not save for my pension, I do not earn paid holiday, I do not build up hours to my unemployment insurance fund, which is important should I need unemployment benefit one day, because the hours I work are not registered anywhere, and I toiled. You are a kind of out of society, you don't exist actually, you are out of the system. What if I can't work anymore, then I have no safety net, because I did not exist in the labour market. But also in the future, if I have to look for other jobs, then I am not present anywhere. It is a little scary. It could have some immeasurable consequences later, which I am not even able to predict

> now. A couple of months are ok, but to continue year in and year out would make me feel insecure in all senses (Guide X).

CFWT offers a full lifestyle package for its' guides/workers, but it appears to be connected to a fleeting lifestyle, where people operate in fluid networks loosely attached from the formal structures of society. For some people, this temporary lifestyle may be attractive, as they constantly add to their cultural and social networks and economic capital, but for other people looking for stability it may provoke anxiety. The isolation from society, which Garsten (2008) claims this competitive system fosters, is not between people, as seen with the certified guides (Meged, 2017), but rather an isolation from the formal structures in society. However, in both instances problems are individualised and internalised, as the guides rarely discuss these issues amongst themselves (Guide Y).

4 Working with Airbnb

One of the most successful and well-known collaborative platforms is the accommodation platform Airbnb. Airbnb is, unlike the non-monetised alternative Couchsurfing (Bialski, 2013; Germann Molz, 2007, 2013, 2014a, 2014b) still relatively unexplored, albeit there are a few studies in the literature (Guttentag, 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen, 2015). In Airbnb's business model, users create a profile and either search for a place to rent (acting as a guest) or offer a place for others to rent (acting as a host). Hosts may offer single or multiple rooms, sometimes with the host present in the residence, as well as entire apartments. Accommodation is offered at various standards, accommodating both the budget conscious backpacker as well as the more comfortable traveller. The host determines the price of their accommodation and chooses to accept or reject requests by potential guests.

Airbnb was launched in 2008 and has since grown at an astonishing pace to now operate in more than 190 countries and over 34,000 cities (Guttentag, 2015; New York State Attorney General, 2014). The platform offers more than 1.4 million listings and is valued at US$25.5 billion, with expected revenue of US$900 million in 2015 (Demos, 2015). Airbnb provides the platform that facilitates contact between hosts and guests and offers a safe marketplace through providing three key elements: secure payments, a US$1 million host guarantee and by creating trust through verified profiles, message functions and a review system. Furthermore, support is offered through professional photographs and descriptions of the accommodation, an algorithm guides the host towards prices in comparable accommodation and a 24/7 customer service is offered. Airbnb charges a 3% service fee from the host and a service fee ranging from 6 to 12% from the guest.

Whereas peer-to-peer platforms are creating new structures in the working life of guides, Airbnb also allows users who rarely perceive themselves to be professional hosts to play a role in the tourism industry. Although a user's motivation to host

through Airbnb may not necessarily solely be economic (Ikkala & Lampinen, 2015), at times of recession and economic distress income through hospitality exchanges may represent a quite significant income (Primack, 2012). Host M, whose main work is as a waiter, explains how, at times, Airbnb has formed the main, or large part, of her income:

> At that point I was only working part time and sort of needed the money. And it was a really good way to earn some money, rather than risk eviction. It [the apartment] is a Co-op. So I have bills to pay. It was an extra income, a quite important income! Later on, I was out of a job, and I wouldn't go on welfare. At that time it was more or less my (only) income (Host M)

To Host M, the profit from Airbnb presents a significant income, and an essential back-up income in case of economic misfortune, in which case she vacates her apartment and stays with relatives to rent her residence out, which prevents her from having to vacate the residence permanently. Another host (K) channels her income from Airbnb towards an indirect retirement fund, and sees it as an important economic supplement, as she tries to pay off her mortgage before pension, and to help her "butter the bread".

Both interviewees had economic reward as their sole motivation, why they primarily adjust their engagement and availability as hosts on an economic cost/benefit rational basis. Nevertheless, these forms of economic transactions exist, to a large extent, within the informal economy, and even though Airbnb is not illegal in Denmark, various regulations have caused many rentals to be classed as not fully legal, as seen in multiple settings (Guttentag, 2015; New York Attorney General, 2014). Furthermore, much of the resulting income is not taxed, either because it is not reported or because the hosts make sure not to make more profit than allowed within the local tax frames.[1] One host we interviewed was aware that Airbnb rental is not permitted in her housing cooperative, and also admitted that she doesn't keep a keen eye on whether the income exceeds the permitted tax frame. The other host, though, was very aware and careful to stay within the tax-free frame. However, both starkly refused to pay taxes from their income, as they agreed that if you pay taxes, it is simply not worth it. Like the guides in CFWT, the Airbnb hosts perceive themselves as micro-entrepreneurs; however, with a clearly pronounced economic scope. An interesting discussion between the interviewees revealed what they called a "generational" issue. One host, who was nearing her pension refused to depend on such an unstable income, which could be prohibited or made less lucrative in the future, as is happening now in several cities (Quijones & Street, 2015). The other host, who is young and unattached and was neither a member of a union nor an unemployment fund, had no problem of thinking of Airbnb as her safety net in times of trouble, thus indicating her greater reliance on the informal sector than on the welfare state.

[1] In Denmark, a certain amount of income from rent is exempt from tax. The precise amount is determined in accordance with the real estate value.

Although Airbnb is clearly a company of significant scale and value, their commitment to their hosts, who hold the assets that produce the value, is quite detached. As a collaborative platform, it does not act as an employer, and has none of the responsibilities and obligations that employers in hospitality firms normally have, particularly if the parties have signed a collective agreement. On the contrary, as micro-entrepreneurs, hosts are more likely to compete against fellow hosts rather that to unite efforts towards the "employer". Our hosts explained how they consider competition from other local Airbnb hosts when adjusting prices, in order to make sure their price is low enough to attract requests. When Host M had Airbnb as her only income, she lowered her prices further to attract guests. During this period, she let her apartment roughly 15 days a month in order to make ends meet. Conversely, our interviewed hosts raise prices or demand longer stays, when they are in less need of money.

Hosting on Airbnb does not simply mean offering a place to stay. Rather, a long list of tasks is tied into the (unofficial) job of being an Airbnb host. Most obvious perhaps is preparing the home for the guest, e.g. by cleaning and laundering, as well as cleaning and washing after the guest's departure. Hosts often spend time making sure that breakfast is available (if offered). They also organise how to welcome the guest and hand over the key. Both hosts M and K valued meeting their guests personally upon arrival, mainly in order to instruct them about the particularities. This could sometimes involve hours of waiting. However, before an appointment is even made, hosts spend considerable time communicating with potential guests. They try to determine which guests to accept and they answer questions about the destination, often making use of their social capital, when their personal knowledge doesn't suffice. Furthermore, hosts usually remain within reach of current guests during the stay, often through text messages. As such, hosting requires cleaning and accommodation-related tasks, but also other skills, such as the capability to function as a local informant.

Such demands add to the workload and, in particular, one host felt the tasks surrounding hosting, and particularly demands for availability, quite stressful at times:

> Finally it was just like it took over, and I do think you use an incredible amount of time to write and . . .. I have gotten a boyfriend lately, and I felt like I was on the phone all the time. He asked: What are you doing? Oh—it is Airbnb I replied almost every time (Host K).

Both hosts agreed that these pressures are further amplified, if one has limited digital and/or cultural capital. Familiarity with technologies, languages and the cultural aspects of one's town makes the tasks of Airbnb less troublesome. Airbnb's review system was seen as particularly important by the hosts, which is not surprising as a review system translates helpful and fast responses into reputation capital (Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Germann Molz, 2014a). Well aware that the social capital displayed through the review has a very real economic value, hosts feel a pressure to be available all the time.

> You can see it on your rating system, on your profile, how often you answer. Whether you have a 100% answering score, and how fast you answer. So it means something. So usually

> I answer as fast as possible and always within 24 hours, because otherwise it is taken as a no. That adds to your profile (Host M).

These shared practices of monitoring and reporting are an essential part of creating trust between guests and hosts and is considered a basic condition of hosting, "Everybody reviews everybody. They review you and you review them" (Host M). Even though it can been argued that trust and reputation systems are a vital part of the collaborative economy, the disciplining effect of collaborative surveillance practised in the echo chamber of mutual reviews (Germann Molz, 2014a) adds strongly to the complexity of crafting work with Airbnb. In fact, while most of the work undertaken in connection with hosting through Airbnb is done out of necessity, and with the scope of economic reward, it may also be done to secure the hosts' homes, as is the case with our interviewed hosts. Other job crafting practices enhancing personal satisfaction were ranked at a minimum.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

As a common feature between working with CFWT and Airbnb, both guides and hosts practice job crafting. While Aibnb hosts first and foremost mobilise physical idling assets, namely their homes, the guides only mobilise intangible idling assets, namely their personal services, and we see that guides and hosts approach and navigate the collaborative economy in different ways. Both markets require hosting qualities, overlapping private and work spheres and drawing on personal competencies, as well as flexibility and preparedness, when delivering hosting–on-demand. The scope to which this is felt as a burden or a reward appears closely connected to motivational factors, and to the assets being offered. The guides working with CFWT convey strong intrinsic motivation, doing the work for its own sake. Their approach can be characterised as a social lifestyle entrepreneurship. Although they experience quite significant economic rewards, they also consider guiding a lifestyle that offers them social and cultural returns, which is a general trait found in the guide profession (Carnicelli-Filho, 2013; Guerrier & Adib, 2003, 2004; Meged, 2017; Veijola, 2009a). Veijola (2009a) and Valkonen (2010) argue that the job of the guide is a source of happiness and passion, to the point where guides sacrifice their private lives and stay fit to "turn themselves into fountains of hospitality and affective connectivity and their lives into incessant vital labour" (Veijola, 2009a, p. 120).

The CFWT guides practise extensive job crafting, incorporating numerous tasks into their working life. They develop a perspective towards their professional life that appeals to them; they integrate sociality with colleagues and tourists, as well as participating in a collaborative management of the company. For them, the collaborative approach allows them to live a flexible lifestyle, with the opportunity to travel for large parts of the year as well as "being their own boss", also utilizing

social, cultural and digital competencies through the collective management structure.

Although other motivational factors exist (Ikkala & Lampinen, 2015), the Airbnb hosts interviewed demonstrated a solely economic and thus extrinsic motivation, which made them less prone to job craft, perhaps as it is a tangible resource that is the key asset offered. However, even though they clearly execute numerous tasks to deliver hospitality-on-demand, they do not perceive themselves as working in hosting, but rather as performing necessary and time consuming supplementary tasks in order to rent their homes to tourists in short-term rentals. They consider hosting "a lot of work", sometimes to such an extent that it even triggers stress. Although often meeting their guests, they have no desire for sociality and perceive them solely as customers. This hospitality-on-demand is guided by the Airbnb review function serving as a surveillance system, as well as their wishes to keep an eye on their property. Such hosts can fruitfully be understood as micro-entrepreneurs practising pseudo-sharing (Belk, 2014). As such, it can be argued that they appropriate a traditional neoliberal approach, and rather than participating in collaborative exchanges with peers, they manoeuvre in micro-competitive platform capitalism (Dredge & Gyimóthy, 2015).

Collaborative platform enterprises in tourism demonstrate remarkable strengths in mobilizing seemingly limitless labour and competences from new workers in high yielding businesses at close to zero costs. The organisational boundaries of collaborative enterprises are porous and ever changing with low entry and exit barriers for individuals. The benefit for workers appears to be precisely this flexibility, as well as the accumulation of economic, digital and network capital, and for lifestyle entrepreneurs, like guides, also cultural and social capital. All these forms of capitals are increasingly vital, and partaking in platform economies may well equip and harness workers for the future of a global labour market with a rapidly decreasing number of fixed positions (Buchholz et al., 2009; Rifkin, 2014).

It could be argued that a precarious, footloose workforce is no stranger to the tourism industry. "Tourism-related jobs, occupations and employment are often precarious, low-paid and labour-intensive; they appropriate embodied presences and personalities and especially feminine skills and female bodies" (Veijola, 2009b, p. 84), and combined with a strong seasonality, the industry has long attracted and absorbed a large uneducated workforce and groups with limited attachment to the organized labour market, such as women, youngsters and immigrants. Furthermore families with limited funds have often been known to rent part of their accommodation to visiting tourists. In recent times, the precarious working conditions in various transnational tourist livelihoods have been addressed e.g. by Meged (2017) covering licenced guides, Weaver's (2005) research on cruise ships workers and Adler and Adler's (2004) work on hotel workers. As such, there are many parallels between the working conditions within the collaborative economies and the traditional tourism industry. However, it can also be argued, that tourism industries have started the process of professionalizing only relatively recently, and there has been an upsurge in tourism educations on all levels (Airey, Dredge, & Gross, 2015). Professionals, like the certified local guides, in Copenhagen have been organised in

a union since 1978 and have long participated in collective bargaining with central employers with regard to minimum wages and basic working conditions, even though they still work as casual labourers (Meged, 2017). The collaborative economy puts this development under pressure, causing increased economic competition, and in fact the employers of the Copenhagen certified guides are beginning to opt out of the collective agreements as this chapter is being written, as they want to be able to hire unskilled low cost guides. As such, differences between the established but sometimes precarious industry and the collaborative part of tourism appear to be anchored between the notions of professionalism, formal organisation and also authenticity, which we address below.

Tourism has previously been perceived as an extraordinary practice, but traditionally restricted to tourist enclaves separated from the world of the everyday. However tourist landscapes are created within and coexist with existing landscapes of the everyday (Edensor, 2001, 2007; Larsen, 2008) Accommodation in private homes, and other collaborative practices, can be seen as a counterpart to mainstream tourism, either as a more sustainable mode of travel or symbolically an anti-hotel, representing local identity and connection to the surrounding community. It can be seen as an attempt to enter what Goffman calls the "authentic" back-stage rather than settle with the front-stage performed for the tourist gaze (Bruner, 2005; MacCannell, 1973; Urry & Larsen, 2011).

Collaborative tourist economies seem to attach themselves to strong notions of 'authenticity' and both older and current trends with tourists increasingly demanding 'authentic and special' experiences (Bruner, 2005; MacCannell, 1973). Following such trends, Airbnb promotes itself with strong notions of authenticity and belonging through their slogan 'belong anywhere' (Airbnb, 2015). Furthermore, at a seminar at the Danish Architecture Centre in November 2015, an Airbnb representative argued that not only did the use of Airbnb help disperse tourists throughout the city, it had a strong effect on the types of experiences encountered. Hosts play a vital role conveying, facilitating or maybe even co-creating local authentic experiences. This adds to the expectations and tasks of hosts, and support-services, such as meals (Ferenstein, 2014), transfers and so on are being encouraged by Airbnb (Quora, 2016).

As such, the new actors within the collaborative tourism industries are pressuring established business models by offering service and products tapping into such trends. However, little is known about how such processes affect local urban areas, where the tourism is increasingly dispersed and where tourism overlaps with the spaces and everyday activities of the people there. How authenticity is staged and perceived by guests as well as new collaborative actors and existing businesses should be ground for further research, as this could very likely have strong implications for service and professionalism in the industry, where a professional approach might be perceived as being opposed to the notions of authenticity.

Several of the guides from CFWT and one of the Airbnb hosts appear to subscribe to the values of a global informal economy detached from the welfare state, regardless of whether they had grown up within a welfare system. Short-term

rentals or free guided tours offer them the opportunity for income, and in the case of Host M security and flexibility in an unpredictable job market. However, as both guides and hosts navigate the informal economies, they have little of the security and rights that are part of being employed within the formal labour market. This raises concern for some of our interviewees with regard to the fleeting and vulnerable character of their livelihood, which instils a sense of being isolated and left outside the formal structures of the society. They themselves stress that their participation in the collaborative economies must be either limited in time span or they must remain non-dependent on the income generated here, or even must utilize both strategies as a detachment.

Collaborative platform enterprises have grown so rapidly that legislation and labour organisations are lagging behind, leaving a void for the isnformal part of the collaborative economies to flourish (Klarskov, 2015a, 2015b; Thorup, 2015). At a national level, this is acknowledged by the Danish Minister for Business and Growth, Troels Lund Poulsen, who demonstrates a positive attitude towards utilising the collaborative economy as a lever for future growth (see also Dalberg Research, 2014). However, he also states, "We must not make a parallel society, where the sharing economy is exempted from tax and consumer protection does not apply" (Klarskov, 2015b, own translation), and it is his ambition for "Denmark to be one of the best countries in the EU to integrate sharing economies within the ordinary economy" (Klarskov, 2015a, own translation). How and in what way this integration into the ordinary economy should be applied to the rights of workers in the collaborative economy seems less clear, and political attention is mainly focussed on business and particularly taxation issues. However, in the US, where the sharing economy first took off, there are now signs of workers in the collaborative economy taking collective action. The Seattle based Uber drivers have organized the App-based Drivers Association to gain bargaining power and establish some basic rights (Rogers, 2016). This movement may diffuse to other sectors and countries.

The present study questions to what extent this situation is perceived as a problem by workers within the collaborative economy. Although some interviewees voiced concern about working outside formal structures, others did not seem to perceive their working and living conditions as problematic. At the same time, these workers demonstrated a viewpoint that tax should be paid at a minimum or outright avoided. Platform economies, whether "pseudo-collaborative" like Airbnb or fully collaborative like CFWT, create contrasts between flexibility, opportunities and security, which are balanced by the individual. However, such platforms thrive in informal global IT-based structures with subversive traits, which also challenge formal national and regional power regimes, which is why the drive for legislative and organisational changes might just emanate from the latter.

Even though some established actors note that the collaborative platforms are competing in a lower price range of the market, and therefore do not affect competition equally, the collaborative economy disrupts and challenges established ways of working and doing business (Guttentag, 2015). However, there is a further need to understand how the growing number of new workers and micro/lifestyle

entrepreneurs in the collaborative tourism economies understand and craft their work, as they shape and change the industry at a micro level. It is also important to further understand the role the collaborative economy plays within the lives and economies of individual workers, not least in times of economic recession (Botsman, 2012; Primack, 2012), and their consequent protests if or when local governments take legal actions against these new structures, such as in New York (Mosendz, 2015), Barcelona (Quijones & Street, 2015) and Berlin (Nezik, 2015).

Clearly, the collaborative economy affects different contexts differently. In the United States, Airbnb hosts defend the platform in public media, arguing that it functions as a social security safety net (Allen, 2015; Primack, 2012). They argue that in times of unemployment or during health issues, Airbnb has kept them from eviction and economic disaster. In contrast, the Danish welfare state offers a (relatively) fine-masked security net; however, the findings of this study indicates that in particular the younger generation are subscribing to the collaborative safety net rather than registering in the systems of the traditional welfare state. The question is how and to what degree this will circumvent the future order of the economy and ways of organising labour, as it potentially may level out national differences, both between individual welfare programs and between welfare states and the rest of world.

References

Adler, P., & Adler, P. (2004). *Paradise laborers: Hotel work in the global economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Airbnb. (2015). *Belong anywhere—Airbnb's new mark and identity*. http://blog.airbnb.com/belong-anywhere/

Airey, D., Dredge, D., & Gross, M. J. (2015). Tourism, hospitality and events education in an age of change. In D. Dredge, D. Airey, & M. J. Gross (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of tourism and hospitality education*. London: Routledge. Accessed May 12, 2016.

Allen, J. (2015). Activists gather at NYC's City Hall to protest Airbnb. *USA Today*. Accessed January 20, 2016, from http://www.usatoday.com/videos/news/2015/01/20/22062641/

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

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2007) *What is job crafting and why does it matter?* Center for Positive Organizational Scholarship, Michigan Ross School of Business. Accessed April 15, 2011, from http://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads

Bialski, P. (2013, August). *Not on my couch. The limitations of sharing in the age of collaborative travel and hospitality networks*. Paper presented at the RC21 conference, Berlin, Germany.

Botsman, R. (2012). The currency of the new economy is trust. *Tedtalk*. Accessed September 9, 2015, from http://www.ted.com/talks/rachel_botsman_the_currency_of_the_new_economy_is_trust?language=en

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

Bruner, E. M. (2005). *Culture on tour: Ethnographies of travel*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Buchholz, S., Jabsen, A., Kurz, K., Marold, J., Schmelzer, P., & Blossfeld, H. P. (2009). *Globalization, economic restructuring and increasing uncertainty in old age. A theoretical framework*. Walqing. Work and Life Quality in New and Growing Jobs. EU- Framework 7.

Carnicelli-Filho, S. (2013). The emotional life of adventure guides. *Annals of Tourism Research, 43*, 192–209. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2013.05.003.

Copenhagen Free Walking Tours. (2015). Accessed September 1, 2015, from http://www.copenhagenfreewalkingtours.dk

Dalberg Research. (2014, September). *Analyse af barrierer og udviklingsmuligheder for peer-to-peer virksomheder i Danmark*. Erhvervsstyrelsen.

Demos, T. (2015, June 26). Airbnb raises $1.5 Billion in one of the largest private placements. *The Wall Street Journal*. Accessed January 20, 2016.

Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015). Collaborative economy and tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research, 40*(3), 286–302.

Edensor, T. (2001). Performing tourism, staging tourism (Re)producing tourist space and practice. *Tourist studies, 1*(1), 59–81.

Edensor, T. (2007). Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism. *Social and Cultural Geography, 8*(2), 199–215.

Ferenstein, G. (2014). Airbnbs stealth home dining experiment is going to be awesome. *Venturebeat*. Accessed April 21, 2016, from http://venturebeat.com/2014/06/10/airbnbs-stealth-home-dining-experiment-is-going-to-be-awesome/

Gansky, L. (2012). *The Mesh. Why the future of business is sharing*. New York: Penguin.

Garsten, C. (2008). *Workplace vagabonds: Career and community in changing worlds go work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Germann Molz, J. (2007). Cosmopolitans on the couch: Mobilising hospitality and the Internet. In J. Germann Molz & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilising hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Germann Molz, J. (2013). Social networking technologies and the moral economy of alternative tourism: The case of couchsurfing.org. *Annals of Tourism Research, 43*, 210–230. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2013.08.001.

Germann Molz, J. (2014a). Collaborative surveillance and technologies of trust: Online reputation systems in the 'new' sharing economy. In A. Jansson & M. Christensen (Eds.), *Media, surveillance and identity: A social perspective* (pp. 127–144). New York: Peter Lang.

Germann Molz, J. (2014b). Toward a network hospitality. *First Monday, 19*(3). doi:10.5210/fm.v19i3.4824.

Guerrier, Y., & Adib, A. (2003). Work at leisure and leisure at work: A study of the emotional labour of tour reps. *Human Relations, 56*(11), 1399–1417. doi:10.1177/00187267035611006.

Guerrier, Y., & Adib, A. (2004). Gendered identities in the work of overseas tour reps. *Gender, Work and Organization, 11*(3), 334–350. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00234.x.

Guttentag, D. (2015). Airbnb: Disruptive innovation and the rise of an informal tourism accommodation sector. *Current Issues in Tourism, 18*(12), 1192–1217. doi:10.1080/13683500.2013.827159.

HK. (2015, December 2). Alt du skal vide om løn, hvis du arbejder i butik. http://www.hk.dk/raadogstoette/emner/loen/handel/loen-butik

Ikkala, T., & Lampinen, A. (2015). *Monetizing network hospitality: Hospitality and sociability in the context of Airbnb*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on computer supported cooperative work and social computing.

Kjærgaard, K. B. (2015). Deleøkonomi eller Platformskapitalisme? Dansk Design Center. Accessed May 18, 2016, from http://ddc.dk/2015/03/deleokonomi-eller-platformskapitalisme/

Klarskov, K. (2015a, August 14). Minister vil skabe bedre vilkår for deleøkonomi. *Politiken, Økonomi*. Accessed May 12, 2016, from http://politiken.dk/oekonomi/virksomheder/ECE2795839/minister-vil-skabe-bedre-vilkaar-for-deleoekonomi/

Klarskov, K. (2015b, August 15). Troels Lund vil gøre mere for deleøkonomi—selv om han ikke selv bruger det. *Politiken, Økonomi*. Accessed May 18, 2016, from http://politiken.dk/oekonomi/dkoekonomi/ECE2796089/troels-lund-vil-goere-mere-for-deleoekonomi-selv-om-han-ikke-selv-bruger-det/

Ladkin, A. (2011). Exploring tourism labor. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(3), 1135–1155. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2011.03.010.

Larsen, J. (2008). De-exoticizing tourist travel: Everyday life and sociality on the move. *Leisure Studies, 27*(1), 21–34. doi:10.1080/02614360701198030.

MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology, 79*(3), 589–603. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2776259.

Madsen, P. K (2002, May 16). *The Danish model of flexicurity–A paradise with some snakes*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Condition. Interaction between labour Market and Social Protection. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.199.4437&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Meged, J. W. (2017). Guides crafting meaning in a flexible working life. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, Special Issue*.

Ministry of Employment. (2015). *The Danish labour market*. Accessed December 2, 2015, from http://uk.bm.dk/en/Themes/The%20Danish%20Labour%20Market.aspx

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2015). The Official website of Denmark. Accessed December 2, 2015, from http://denmark.dk/en/society/welfare/flexicurity/

Mosendz, P. (2015, January 21). Face-Off: NYC Lawmakers Grill Airbnb on Illegal Hotels. *Newsweek*. Accessed September 9, 2015, from http://www.newsweek.com/face-nyc-lawmakers-grill-airbnb-illegal-hotels-301060

New York Attorney General. (2014). *Airbnb in the city*. Accessed May 12, 2016, from http://www.ag.ny.gov/pdfs/Airbnb%20report.pdf

Nezik, A. K. (2015, April 10). Tourism troubles: Berlin cracks down on vacation rentals. *Spiegel Online International*. Accessed September 9, 2015, from http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/berlin-cracks-down-on-estimated-18-000-vacation-rentals-a-1026881.html

Nielsen, J. S. (2015, January 28). Nu raser kampen om deleøkonomien. *Information*. Accessed May 18, 2016, from https://www.information.dk/udland/2015/01/raser-kampen-deleoekonomien

OECD. (2015). *Inequality*. Accessed September 9, 2015, from http://www.oecd.org/social/inequality.htm

Olma, S. (2014). *Never mind the sharing economy: Here's platform capitalism*. Accessed September 9, 2015, from http://networkcultures.org/mycreativity/2014/10/16/never-mind-the-sharing-economy-heres-platform-capitalism/

Primack, D (2012, August 16). How AirBNB helps users save their homes. *Fortune*. Accessed May 12, 2016, from http://fortune.com/2015/08/30/disney-infinity-critics/

Quijones, D., & Street, W. (2015, August 11). Barcelona just declared War on Airbnb. *Business Insider*. Accessed September 7, 2015, from http://www.businessinsider.com/barcelona-just-declared-war-on-airbnb-2015-8?IR=T

Quora. (2016). *Do Airbnb hosts ever provide transportation to their guests*. Accessed April 21, 2016, from https://www.quora.com/Do-Airbnb-hosts-ever-provide-transportation-to-their-guests

Rifkin, J. (2014). *The zero marginal cost society: The internet of things, the collaborative commons and the eclipse of capitalism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rogers, W. (2016). Sharing economy workers seek their fair share. *Left Labor Reporter*. Retrieved from https://leftlaborreporter.wordpress.com/2016/01/28/sharing-economy-workers-seek-their-fair-share/. Accessed April 21, 2016.

Sandemans New Europe. (2010). Accessed September 2, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WHfbYDUxnG4

Sandemans New Europe. (2015). Accessed May 18, 2015, from http://www.neweuropetours.eu/

Skytte, C. (2014a, May 30). Fra forbruger til medbruger. *Information*. Accessed May 12, 2016, from https://www.information.dk/debat/2014/05/forbruger-medbruger

Skytte, C. (2014b). *Skal vi dele? Er deleøkonomien en del af løsningen eller en del af problemet?* Danmark: Skytsengel.

The Economist. (2015, January 3). The future of work. There's an app for that. *The Economist*. Accessed May 12, 2016, from http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21637355-freelance-workers-available-moments-notice-will-reshape-nature-companies-and

Thorup, M. (2015). Freelance- og deleøkonomi udfordrer solidariteten. *Information*. Accessed March 18, 2015.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0*. London: Sage.

Valkonen, J. (2010). Acting in nature: Service events and agency in wilderness guiding. *Tourist Studies, 9*(2), 164–180. doi:10.1177/1468797609360595.

Veijola, S. (2009a). Gender as work in the tourism industry. *Tourist Studies, 9*(2), 109–126. doi:10.1177/1468797609360601.

Veijola, S. (2009b). Introduction: Tourism as work. *Tourist Studies, 9*(2), 83–87. doi:10.1177/1468797609360748.

Weaver, A. (2005). Interactive service work and performative metaphors: The case of the cruise industry. *Tourist Studies, 5*(1), 5–27. doi:10.1177/1468797605062713.

We-Economy. (2015). Er der solidaritet i deleøkonomien? Accessed May 12, 2015, from http://we-economy.net/?p=852

World Economic Report. (2014). Towards the circular economy: Accelerating the scale-up across global supply chains Ellen MacArthur Foundation and McKinsey and Company. World Economic Forum, Geneva, Switzerland. Accessed May 18, 2015, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_ENV_TowardsCircularEconomy_Report_2014.pdf

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179–201.