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\section*{Abstract.} We rely on Sundararajan (2016) to prove that the sharing economy is the present stage of a constant progress of the economy and society that is influenced to some extent by digital technologies. The latter take individuals back to recognizable sharing conducts, self-employment, and types of community-based network that survived before now: an enhanced type of something recognizable should gain boundless acceptance swiftly and have superior economic consequence than the creation of completely novel consumption practices or patterns of hiring. We develop primary empirical research for the principal case study that determines that the proficiencies of crowd-based capitalism make possible an economy that depends gradually on peer-to-peer platforms to regulate economic operations. We use meta-analysis to inspect evidence proving that rising blockchain technologies might reshape crowd-based capitalism, repositioning the crowd from being the origin of delivery to being the go-between that organizes and jointly dominates the market, but they may drive a novel phase of peer-to-peer markets and digital disorder. We attempt to address these increasing aspects by elaborating on the aspect that the variety of conducts and organizations that constitutes the sharing economy is a preceding illustration of a time to come in which peer-to-peer network becomes progressively predominant, and the crowd substitutes the company at the heart of capitalism.
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1. Introduction

Following Sundararajan (2016), this paper aims to prove that the sharing economy is the present stage of a constant progress of the economy and society that is influenced to some extent by digital technologies. The latter take individuals back to recognizable sharing conducts, self-employment, and types of community-based network that survived before now (Androniceanu, 2017): an enhanced type of something recognizable should gain boundless acceptance swiftly and have superior economic consequence (Tulloch, 2016) than the creation of completely novel consumption practices or patterns of hiring. (Sundararajan, 2016)

The on-demand economy designates digital media companies (Banning, 2016) that link users via two-sided platform-oriented marketplaces. The most important of on-demand platforms (Uber, Lyft, and Airbnb) indicate the interconnection and inconsistency between the
social and economic nature of these companies’ platforms. Such corporations have had substantial interfering effect upon current transit, housing (Vasile & Androniceanu, 2016), and labor markets. (Cockayne, 2016)

2. Literature review

Sharing as a discursive configuration is instrumental (Selth, 2016) in the design and effectiveness of economic practice. Although labor may be shaped via specific discursive frames (Besciu & Androniceanu, 2017), employees may repudiate or objectify them in dynamic and unstable fashions that may not accurately display their personal features (Bathelt & Turi, 2011). The pervasiveness and reproducibility of distributed information online (Belk, 2014), the unimportant value of the latter (Sanz, 2017), and the alleged selflessness of contribution (Williams, 2017) are essential to the economic arrangement of digital systems. Information distributed on social media by separate users has practically no value, an aspect linked to its disproportionate, omnipresent, and effortlessly reproducible traits (Dolack, 2017; McDonald et al., 2017). Transactional platforms (e.g. Airbnb and Uber) tip off the ones that make accessible redundancy of user resources or assets (Jones, 2017; Stinson, 2017). Uber operates on a pattern that hires users as contractors that enables them to deal in their working capacity to other smartphone users. Airbnb users benefit from listing properties, but are not officially hired or paid by the platform. Sharing links a series of distinct economic routines and digital platforms (Androniceanu & Drăgulănescu, 2016, A), and the laboring subjectivities (Panova & Buber-Ennser, 2016) and affective propensities (Friedman et al., 2016) that are associated with them. Proponents of the on-demand economy advocate or deter, via the preservation of the sharing trope, certain laboring and social routines. (Cockayne, 2016)

3. Methodology

Using primary empirical research and meta-analysis we elaborate on the aspect that the variety of conducts and organizations that constitutes the sharing economy is a preceding illustration of a time to come in which peer-to-peer network becomes progressively predominant (Lucas, 2016), and the crowd substitutes the company at the heart of capitalism (Camnaerts, 2011). The adjustability and smoothness of contracting via digital platforms instead of working a day-job (Popescu Ljungholm, 2016) may be challenging (performing on demand for various platforms may be likable), but obtaining a predetermined periodic income (Madsen & Wu, 2016) assists in organizing a future, something pretty demanding when an individual’s earnings vary (Ionescu, 2016) contingent on the caprices of delivery and request on a series of apps. Because other platforms concentrate on service labor increasingly, there is a rising threat of greater future social disparity. (Sundararajan, 2016) Sharing in the on-demand framework aims to regularize flexible kinds of work (Androniceanu, 2014) by postulating labor as a required contribution (Bauder, 2016), a sufficient and roughly ineffective must for inclusion, (Machan, 2016) in which sharing is associated with the recurrence of affect that guarantees social status via economic involvement (Layard, 2016), instead of one on social media platforms. Linking the distribution of information online to sharing in the framework of the on-demand economy takes on amalgamating labor with input of practically useless information. (Cockayne, 2016)
4. Empirical data and analysis

Our estimated data covers what the rise of the sharing economy means for incumbents and types of shared or on-demand online service. We aim to determine that the proficiencies of crowd-based capitalism make possible an economy that depends gradually on peer-to-peer platforms to regulate economic operations. Rising blockchain technologies might reshape crowd-based capitalism (Andrei et al., 2016), repositioning the crowd from being the origin of delivery to being the go-between that organizes and jointly dominates the market, but they may drive a novel phase of peer-to-peer markets and digital disorder. Developing this case, we reflect on the fact that there is a conflict between the profit-stimulated and goal-oriented directions of the sharing economy, between individuals who perceive it as a market economy and people who conceive it as a gift economy. (Sundararajan, 2016) If labor is comprehended in accord with the requirement to distribute information (Siekelova et al., 2017) in the social media frame of reference (Hellman & Majamäki, 2016), it is underrated and regarded only as a boundlessly accessible product for on-demand investment with almost no monetary worth. Such labor may be considered as real and converted into a superfluous object (Mihăilă, 2016) via conditions established by on-demand companies via the sharing rhetoric and the caprices of smartphone users to invalidate the dissimilarity between digital goods and working capacity. Consumers require conformity from labor no less than they would from goods, and carry out these normative criteria via routines of peer-implemented permissive supervision moderated via the platform. Sharing as a rhetorical figure of speech that guarantees inclusivity in the conditions of the on-demand economy (Weede, 2016) faces a link with the transaction of one’s working capacity, and not the contributing of one’s ideas on social media platforms. (Cockayne, 2016) (Figures 1–9)

Figure 1: What the rise of the sharing economy means for incumbents

Source: Vision Critical and WEF/Accenture Analysis (2015) and our estimations
Figure 2: LinkedIn ranks the highest in digital trust

Source: BI Intelligence (2017) and our estimations

Figure 3: The rise of the sharing economy

Source: Nielsen, Mashable statista and our estimations

Figure 4: Most commercially important digital marketing trends for 2017

Source: Smart Insights (2015) and our estimations
Figure 5: Type of shared or on-demand online service

Source: PEW Research Center (2015) and our estimations

Figure 6: Sharing economy and traditional rental sectors (CAGR)

Source: PWC (2013) and our estimations

Figure 7: The rise and fall of agricultural work (farm), industrial work (manuf), knowledge-based and creative work (CC), and routine low-wage service work (LWS) – from 1800 through 2017.

Source: Martin Prosperity Institute and our estimations
5. Results and discussion

On-demand laborers create, without associating truthfully with, the digitally interposed type of capitalist exchange. The sharing rhetoric hides the commitment of transformation to the capitalist way of production (Hurd, 2016), via a proposal for a more reliable and established kind of primarily social connection that furthers labors’ collaboration in the standardization of flexible work. On-demand platforms reinforce a grasp of goods and labor as unceasing, not disparate. The ideology of the sharing rhetoric redefines the notion of labor, while advancing an authentic alteration and concern for another course of action to the capitalist system (Anderson & Kantarelis, 2016), or a comeback to a relevant series of social connections. Apparent social dissimilarities between classes are eliminated from the public realm (Oliver, 2016), because the capitalist does not come across the laborers at a concrete market to deal in
their working capacity, operating transactions under conditions established by a third party platform, via the employment of a digital application (Androniceanu & Drăgulănescu, 2016, B) on a smartphone, besides intensifying the false impression of fairness between capitalist and worker (Williams et al., 2016), who both engage in an interactive delusion that the requirement formulated by the former in relation to the acquisition of the latter’s working capacity is a broad and social kind of sharing. (Cockayne, 2016)

6. Conclusions

On-demand and various other digital companies and platforms engage in the creation of the sharing rhetoric (Popescu & Predescu, 2016), which has a decisive role in the on-demand economy. Sharing, as a regulating undertaking for depicting on-demand labor, is a scheme for approaching the latter in idealistic terms of social connections and cooperation in neoliberal capitalism. Labor as something distributed, and not traded and paid for in the on-demand economy, is figurative with a kind of redundant always-accessible data. The workers who decide not to distribute their labor are construed as the characters that ungenerously or defiantly repudiate the commitment of involvement in the novel better existence and community. Sharing sets up the circumstances for debating labor as something users are allowed to access effortlessly and anytime (Androniceanu, 2012): the on-demand economy aims to conceive a series of prerequisites for grasping labor as something nonrefundable that should reciprocate swiftly to the requirements of smartphone users. (Cockayne, 2016)

Note

A version of this article was previously presented at the 17th International Scientific Conference Globalization and Its Socio-Economic Consequences, University of Zilina, 4–5 October 2017.
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