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Abstract
Car sharing is a transportation option that is rapidly growing on the Swedish market coupled to both increasing urbanization and sharing trends. This study investigates how the creation and stabilization process of CS organisations unfolds coupled with the challenges that occur along the way. Four Swedish car sharing organisations are examined with the help of Callon’s four moments in the process of translation. This study shows that the process of creation and stabilization of the CS organisations is complex and relies on forming coalitions, collaborations and networks. Further, our study indicates that the CS organisations need to collectively grow the car sharing industry. It concludes that car sharing organisations challenge the institution private car ownership through their different translation processes of car sharing. When using the theoretical lens in this study it is further concluded that the car sharing organisations processes can never be rendered as fully stabilized since it is a continuous process.
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Introduction
You will have people who really enjoy personally owned cars, but for the same reason people own horses today. It's not a utility; it's something that is a romantic hobby.

Jamais Casci (Business Insider, 2015)

Today the world is experiencing a period characterized by a triple crisis regarding the environment, economy and social division (The Changing Ways, 2014), including rapid population growth, limited natural resources and growing awareness of the climate change effects. These conditions pressure businesses to look for new solutions and to rethink their current business endeavours (Matzler, Veider & Kathan, 2015). One such business trend that has gained momentum within the increasingly strained mobility sector is the concept of car sharing (hereafter CS), which seemingly has become a topic on everyone’s lips (Corwin, Vitale, Kelly & Cathles, 2015; Forbes, 2015; The Economist, 2016). The rapidly increasing pressure on urban transport due to urbanisation (Miller, 2013; Noland & Polak, 2002)
coupled with the desires from consumers to see the concept of sharing succeed within the mobility industry (PWC, 2015), creates an intriguing context in which mobility actors operate (Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014). Further, issues like space limitations in urban environments, hectic traffic and high parking demand compel consumers to adopt new transportation modes reinforcing this business trend (Starostovich & Sánchez Contreras, 2015). In response to this, emerging and existing businesses are together creating an array of CS initiatives addressing these needs in transportation and infrastructural issues by enabling sharing between consumers (Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014).

When it comes to defining this rather exploding business trend it is important to understand that CS is one way of how the concept of “Sharing Economy” is adopted within the mobility industry. “Sharing Economy” can be defined as a socio-economic system built on the sharing of human and physical assets (Matofska, 2013; Nadler, 2014) in which organisations can capture untapped potential residing in goods that are not entirely exploited by their owners (Metzler et al., 2015). Based on this, the car is identified as the untapped resource that CS organisations want to use more efficiently by sharing. CS can roughly be divided into two different ways of organizing themselves, commercial organisations and communal cooperatives, both providing similar functions (Mont, 2004). In the last decade a third version of CS has emerged, a peer-to-peer (hereafter P2P) service (Alli., Baresi., Bianchessi., Cugola., Margara., Morzenti & Savaresi, 2012). Irrespective of the increased attention of this business trend, CS is still currently in its infancy (Matofska, 2015). This raises questions of: How and why was CS initiated? How has it evolved and which actions and relations are involved?

It is said to be an on-going transformation process of consumer behaviour within CS (Huwer, 2004). Mont (2004) have noticed an attitude change where the customers seems to have shifted from young environmentally aware people towards more ordinary people who see mostly personal benefits with CS. It is also important whilst attracting new members, to recognize that private car ownership acts as an institution that poses as an obstacle to overcome (Mont, 2004). On one hand, car ownership is seen as the largest barrier for CS activities (ibid), since all CS business models seek to reduce the need for individual ownership of personal vehicles (Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014). On the other hand, some researchers argue that the attitudes regarding vehicle ownership has changed (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Nykvist & Whitmarsh, 2008; Mont, 2004; Prettenthaler & Steininger, 1999), creating a new paradigm of ownership through providing a viable transport alternative (Khuchua, 2002). Previously not owning was viewed as an inferior way of consumption (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012), but this has changed. According to Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012), this change in vehicle ownership is a result of increased access based consumption together with the higher level of liquidity in society. The embedded norms of private car ownership and assigned interests of the various stakeholders make private car ownership a social institution, which challenges the emergent CS organisations when trying to attract new members (Mont, 2004). This emergent shift in consumer behaviour provides an intriguing context and opportunity for organisations operating within CS.
By earlier research from the beginning of the millennium CS was described as a niche market (Herodes & Skinner, 2005; Mont, 2004). However, in the last few years CS has become more established and is now regarded by some as a viable solution for the future of urban transportation (Alli et al., 2012). Earlier studies recognize the potential of CS and conclude that the European market is more susceptible to CS than the American market (Katzev, 2003). Thus, providing a context in which CS may succeed to be consolidated as a viable transport option (Steininger., Vogl & Zettl, 1996). The Swedish CS market contains many small actors such as cooperatives, but also some commercial actors (Jakobsson, 2002). The changing attitude towards private car ownership combined with the high public transportation usage is leading towards a behavioural shift on the Swedish market, however, this is happening slowly (Nykvist & Whitmarsh, 2008; Jakobsson, 2002). Further, since car manufacturing is an important economic player in Sweden there may be a conflict of interests regarding governmental involvement (ibid). Even though CS in general is suggested to be a viable solution for future urban transportation, with the potential to replace private car ownership, previous research have indicated that the Swedish CS market faces obstacles, like a slow consumer behaviour shift and strong car manufacturers. This ambiguous context of the Swedish CS market, raises interest regarding the CS organisations creation process and their challenges.

Governmental organisations and policies also affect the development of a functional and sustainable CS market, for example when it comes to adjusting and improving the legal framework, e.g. providing reserved parking pace (Loose, Mohr & Nobis, 2006) or demanding new policies to be produced (Gossen & Scholl, 2011). Additionally, governmental involvement may influence behavioural change by signalling that CS is important and prioritized (Dowling & Kent, 2015). It is argued that in order for the CS organisations to overcome some of the industry issues, the policymakers and the CS organisations must come together to create a gradual adoption of technological development within sustainable mobility (Nykvist & Whitmarsh, 2008). Thus, the governmental and CS relationship is essential. Additionally, Mont (2004) do not only stress the importance of collaboration between the networks and the government to become economically feasible, but also within the network itself including actors such as public transportation, car dealers and other carpools. Further, other researchers agrees about the need for a dense CS network in order to influence and collaborate with authorities and governments (Enoch & Taylor, 2006; Miller, 2013; Pretenthaler & Steininger, 1999). Thus, since CS organisations are more or less dependent on their contextual actors it is important to understand the relations between them.

The combination of CS becoming increasingly accepted by consumers as a viable transportation option, together with the ambiguous context of the Swedish market, consisting of various actors influencing each other, provides a fascinating context to study. Additionally, the development of the CS market from a niche market to a more established mainstream practice (Alli et al., 2012) is an interesting trend that is yet underscrutinized in the literature. In this fascinating context with the recent market development there is yet much to discover regarding how these CS organisations are created and attempt to stabilize their existence. Even though several categories of CS can be found within academia, not much research has
been produced aiming to understand how the CS organisations actually have been created. Consequently, providing a great opportunity to study how this process unfolds and solidifies. The aim of the study is thus to understand and explain how the creation and stabilization process of CS organisations unfolds, coupled with the challenges that occur along the way. This will be accomplished through answering the following two questions: How are car sharing organisations created and stabilised, and what are the challenges they encounter?

This article is structured as follows; first a theoretical framework describing ANT and the use of the sociology of translation is given. Secondly, the methods used to collect and analyse the empirical material in this study are described. Thereafter the narratives of each CS organisation will be presented in the empirical material. This is followed by a discussion where the empirical material is analysed with the aid of the theoretical framework and then discussed in relation to previous research. Finally, conclusions are drawn and further implications addressed.

**Theoretical Framework**

In this chapter relevant theories will be presented that the authors have used in order to make sense of and analyse the empirical material. Actor-Network Theory (ANT) will be described in this section, followed by a more detailed explanation of the sociology of translation in the next section.

Time, space and networks play a central role in facilitating collaboration and cooperation and the cooperative transportation systems are integrated human and technological systems in which participants share resources and information in order to collaborate on solving accessibility (Miller, 2013). Therefore this study builds upon the combination of Actor-Network-Theory (hereafter ANT) (Latour, 1986) and the sociology of translation (Callon, 1986) in order to understand how these actions and processes unfold (Munro, 2009). Further, the key to understanding the CS market is to identify the main actors within the particular area (Khuchua, 2002). Thus, this study involves several actors resulting in a multiple-case study of CS organisations operating in Gothenburg.

**Actor-Network Theory**

According to Latour (1991) technology is the result of continuous negotiations and mediations involving numerous diverse actors. ANT consists of a network of actants, which can be both human and non-human, e.g. animals, ideas, concepts and objects (Czarniawska, 2014). The actants are those who act and are enacted upon and once they obtain a relatively stable and distinct character they become actors (Latour, 1991). ANT is an approach used for studying social relations in action i.e. in the making, which was introduced during the 1980’s when researchers started investigating the construction of technology and science (Callon, 1986; Latour, 1986; 1987; 2005; Law, 1986). They mean that the social and technical cannot be separated and thus, all objects and scientific facts are collectively constructed. Therefore, by tracing these actants, ANT can be used to understand the society and the ‘social’ (Latour, 2005).
When looking into an actor-network one traces whom is speaking to whom, where the arguing people go and when trying to convince other actants what new elements they obtain (Latour, 1987). Further, when people get convinced and enrolled eventually the discussing stops and slowly people, situations and objects get erased; they become so called black boxed and taken for granted. The context and the content merge (Latour, 1987) and a black box is put around what is too complicated, that one does not need to know about and a border is drawn around the network. This way the actions inside the black box become insignificant and one can instead focus on the inputs and outputs of it (Latour, 2005). Blackboxing occurs through a process called translation (Callon, 1986) where the networks are continuous processes of translation. Inside the networks continuous negotiations occurs throughout the whole translation process (Latour, 2005). ANT can facilitate researchers to trace and understand management-in-action, e.g. by studying organizing in action-nets (Czarniawska, 2004). A network consists of a vast amount of actants such as companies, investors, suppliers, distributors, customers, media etc. Further, ANT focus on explaining how both human and non-human actants build actor-networks i.e. the continuous process of translation based on enactments (Latour, 2005). This approach is mainly used to trace the ways things come together and acts i.e. how the black box is constructed, in order to become taken for granted (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010).

**Introducing the Sociology of Translation**

According to Callon (1986) translation is always a process, which might fail, and never a completed achievement. The process involves four phases that might overlap; beginning with the problematization where the actants included and their interests are identified. The obligatory passage point (hereafter OPP) is usually associated with this first phase, were the focal actor identify the purpose of the endeavour and consequently defines the action program (Callon, 1986). It can be described as a point that the other actors need to pass through in order for the focal actor to render themselves as indispensable within the network. Thereby the OPP becomes a necessary component for the construction of a network. In Callon’s translation process (1986) the problematization is followed by the interessement phase, consisting of a set of actions used by the actant in order to attempt to impose and stabilize the identity of the other actors defined through its problematization. If the interessement is successful it leads to enrolment, where a set of interrelated roles are defined and delegated to the actors who accept them. For the fourth phase of mobilisation to occur, a spokesperson is negotiated who represent the network and speaks on behalf of the other actors involved. According to Akrich and Latour (1992), this continuous process of the four phases of translation can be disrupted by so-called antiprograms. These are actions of actants in conflict with the negotiated program from the problematization phase, e.g. competitors. What is defined as a program or an antiprogram is relative, depending on the perspective of observer.

The sociology of translation and ANT allows the investigation of power relationships, permitting the explanation of how a few actors obtain the right to express themselves and thus representing the numerous silent actors they have mobilized (Callon, 1986). Therefore, it
becomes interesting to understand the construction of black boxes and open them up with the aid of the translation process, in order to investigate how ideas travel and comes into being (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). According to Latour (1986) each actor acts in different ways in their translation. The translation is in the hands of people, whom each might act in numerous different ways; letting the idea-qua-object drop, modifying it, deflecting or betraying it, adding to it or appropriating it. When repeated actions are reached the idea is institutionalized and becomes taken for granted i.e. black boxed (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). Mass storage, mass reproduction and mass media technologies make the translation continuous and magnified, speeding it up (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). The translation of ideas is an on-going process in which the context matters, where an idea started long ago and is simply continuing searching for its optimal form, inhabiting different forms along the way (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996).

According to Callon (1986) science and technology make up dramatic stories were the identity of the actors in one of the issues at hand, and were the identities are formed and adjusted only through action. Depending on what one expects to see, and partially on what one is able to notice in terms of their own accessible categories, people reading the same text sees different ideas in them (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). Therefore the ANT and the sociology of translation become helpful for understanding the creation process of the black box and investigating on-going interactions in networks and the different translations made when ideas travel with the help of idea-qua-objectives. This study will employ these theories when analysing the creation and stabilization process of the CS organisations, and the challenges they encounter. The next chapter will inform the reader of how the empirical material have been collected and analysed.

**Methodology**

**Research Design**

This chapter will present how this study was conducted and motivate why. Firstly, the design of the research will be described in this section and then it will be specified in detail how the data was collected and analysed in the following sections. Lastly, potential risks and limitations will be presented in the final section.

This study have been accomplished through using a qualitative method, due to the complex nature of the study’s research questions: How are CS organisations created and stabilised, and what are the challenges they encounter? This provides complexity since it involves a process of collecting sensitive data from a practical point-of-view i.e. answering a practical how question derived from everyday life (Silverman, 2013). Further, due to the exploratory nature of the aim of the study, the model of constructionism was deemed suitable, where one view the world as a social construction i.e. facts, objects and truths are collectively constructed and is not taken for granted (Silverman, 2013). Therefore, the creation of the CS organisations are seen as socially constructed. Thus, in order to understand these complex constructions the framework of ANT and sociology of translation have been applied resulting in a more abductive method.
To gain a more nuanced and complete understanding when examining the Swedish CS market it is important to include CS organisations from different categories in which they may organize themselves. In this study the cooperative CS organisation Göteborgs Bilkoop represents a non-profit carpooling actor. Sunfleet and Moveabout represent commercial actors, whilst Snappcar represent a commercial P2P. The choice of organisations was based on the fact that they are all known actors within CS in Sweden, referred by each other, and represent different ways of organizing CS. Thus, the Snowball effect was used to choose which organisations to include in this study. The starting-point was to select a viable organisation, in this case Göteborgs Bilkoop, since they are well-established on the CS market and have been used in previous research regarding sharing (Belk, 2014). The selected organisations all cater to both private consumers and companies. This presents an interesting possibility for comparison of contrasts and similarities between them. During the process of identifying relevant actors to include in the study, the municipality was continuously mentioned as a prominent actor by the participating CS organisations. Thus, in order to understand the context and the relations between the actors on the CS market, the authors had some contextual dialogues with Göteborgs Stad. In order to study the creation of these organisations both the accessibility and geographical location was large factors affecting the selection process. Since it is also important to study how these organisations operate in a specific territory, all four selected organisations operate in Gothenburg, Sweden. It should also be mentioned that Gothenburg is the second largest city in Sweden providing one of the largest CS markets.

Since this study strives to add new knowledge to previous finding in this area and to provide new insights into the creation and stabilization process of CS organisations, a case study method have been used (Czarniawska, 2014). As a consequence of selecting four different businesses within CS, a collective case study approach was deemed suitable to be able to collect relevant data in order to answer the research questions. Hence, giving the study specific inputs of each case. The usage of collective case studies increases the ability to generalize since one investigates a general ’phenomenon’ (Silverman, 2013). The research process was divided into various stages entailing small amount of initial data collection, which then was processed in order to be able to collect more relevant data in later stages.

**Data Collection**

This study has used data from both primary and secondary sources in order to answer the research questions. The primary data consist of semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews with key individuals from the four CS organisations and the governmental organisation (see Appendix 1). To be rendered as a key individual they should be involved in the management and/or have widespread knowledge of the organisational practices of respective CS organisation in order to provide the authors with relevant information. Further, the snowballing method has assisted identifying the key individuals of each organisation (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2008); the researchers contacted people in management positions, which then referred them other relevant interviewees. Due to all of the interviewees being involved within the management of each case organisation the general
perspective conveyed in this study is thus from a management point-of-view. Consequently, 15 interviews were held in total, three from each case organisation as well as three contextual interviews.

The data was collected through holding 30-60 minutes semi-structured interview sessions with each participant. The interviews provided data of the subject’s day-to-day activities and can be treated as formulations of some pre-existing social and psychological world to understand the narrative construction (Silverman, 2013). The semi-structured approach implies that the structure was not fully open and had some pre-determined questions, in order to guide the instrumental dialogue between the interviewer and interviewee (Kvale, 2006). For a more detailed overview of the interview questions see Appendix 2. In this study both face-to-face and telephone interviews have been used due to practical issues of location. Whilst collecting material through interviews it is vital to avoid implicating the material (Kvale, 2006) and thus the researchers had in mind ethical issues such as power asymmetry that may arise during the interview sessions. Further, the researchers have used ‘good’ note writing techniques including recording as it happens, preferably not more than one day after the interview (Martin & Turner, 1986). All of the interviews was audio recorded in order for the researchers to have unlimited access to the material as well as being transcribed verbatim. The interview process was continued until the discourse was exhausted, when the answers started reoccurring and confirming previously collected statements. Further, secondary data compiled by others than the researchers in the form of documents and reports (Jacobsen, Sandin & Hellström, 2002), has been gathered through various databases, websites, and given from the participating organisations.

**Data Analysis**

The initial processing i.e. categorization, of the gathered data was initiated during the data collection stage. This entailed combining the transcriptions of the audio records with the author’s original notes to provide as a complete scene as possible. After the five first interviews were conducted they were analysed in order to help the researchers to develop more specific questions to gain relevant information for the remaining interviews. However, the more advanced stages were implemented during the analysis phase. Due to this being a qualitative collective case-study trying to gain more insights into a specific topic, it is highly appropriate to use Grounded Theory as an comparative analysis tool. Further, it is an appropriate tool for material collected through semi-structured interviews that offers researchers a strategy for sifting the data material (Martin & Turner, 1986). The process entailed describing, defining and specifying relationships, which pushed the investigation forward and helped the researchers to discover the concepts further (Martin & Turner, 1986). Therefore, the analysis process involved extensive categorization of the collected material.

The categorization was done through continuously transcribing the recorded interviews and then the material was commented and partly categorized separately between the two authors of this study. After this the processed material was compared, discussed and combined with each other in order to construct a complete categorization of the empirical material. Thus, the authors screened the material and reached a mutual agreement of what was rendered as
important to highlight in the empirical material. Data accumulated under a label was used to develop a nominal definition, theoretical meaning or substantive content (Martin & Turner, 1986). Further, by using a comparative method the initial categories were modified and broaden. Some of the used categories was: why was the organisation initiated, its pros and cons, identified issues and obstacles, and other actors on the market. Through incorporating the theoretical framework of ANT and the sociology of translation with the results of the continual movement between data, notes and theory the study have traced the creation and stabilization process of the CS market. Thereby, ensuring that the data analysis is theoretically based and that the theory is grounded in data (Silverman, 2013).

**Limitations and Risks**
Since the study relies on information collected from people there exist a risk of the subject altering or answering the data differently due to the knowledge that they are in the presence of a researcher or someone outside of the organisation (Kvale, 2006). To minimize this effect the interviews was held in a place where the participant feels comfortable and safe i.e. they chose the interview location themselves. Further, the researchers tried to be reassuring of the non-judgmental basis of the interviewer(s).

In sum, this qualitative study has used semi-structured interviews to collect the empirical material from four case organisations. Then, by using Grounded Theory the authors have sifted through their material, which have been analysed with the help of ANT and the sociology of translation. In the following chapter the empirical material will be presented.

**Empirical material**

*A general Setting of the Swedish car sharing industry*
This section provides the reader with a general setting in order for the reader to understand the organisations and the context in which they operate. Then, each organisation's narrative of their creation process will be presented respectively in the following section.

The Swedish CS market can be described as slowly expanding containing many small actors and one large actor. Göteborgs Bilkoop is one of Sweden’s oldest and largest carpool cooperative. They were founded in 1988 as Majornas Bilkooperativ and have a car fleet of approximately 20 cars in the area of Gothenburg. They are a non-profit organisation, and in order to use one of the cars one has to be a member of the cooperative. This entails that every member needs to pay a membership fee and contribute to the cooperation by performing his or her assigned tasks, which is supposed to require approximately 6-7 hours per year (Göteborgs Bilkoop, 2016). Sunfleet is a commercial carpool company owned by Volvo and Hertz, which was founded in 1998 and is now the largest CS actor in Sweden (Appendix 3). They operate over 1000 cars in 50 different cities (Sunfleet, 2016). Moveabout is also a commercial CS actor like Sunfleet, but instead of being owned by a car manufacturer and a car rental company it was founded by entrepreneurs in Oslo, 2007. What separates Moveabout from the other CS actors on the Swedish market is the fact that they only operate with electrical vehicles. They were launched in Sweden 2009, and today they operate the largest electrical vehicle fleet in the world with over 100 cars (Moveabout, 2016). Snappcar is
a P2P CS service founded in 2011, formerly known as Flexidrive and partially owned by Schibsted. Flexidrive was then acquired and became a part of the Dutch company Snappcar in 2015. They want to encourage one to borrow your neighbour’s car (Goldberg, 2015; Snappcar, 2016).

**Göteborgs Bilkoop - Paving the way for carpooling in Sweden**

Göteborgs Bilkoop was founded 27 years ago as Majornas Bilkooperativ when an environmentally driven group of people simply wanted another solution of owning a car. The idea of a cooperative carpool in Gothenburg emerged from the news of a successful carpool cooperative in Örebro, spread by the cooperative consult association. Interested people gathered up for a meeting, and they began discussing the idea of co-owning cars through a cooperative instead of each person individually owning their car.

Further, visions of the cooperative carpool was discussed, some wanted a large cooperative with 100 cars, whilst others wanted to keep it small and familiar. The carpool was started and in the beginning it was just five people that shared one car that catered to their needs. Then one of the founders moved to Majorna, and brought the car from the cooperative with him and started to recruit new members locally. As most of their members then lived in Majorna they decided to name the cooperative Majornas Bilkooperativ. Majornas Bilkooperativ then encountered some economical problems along with low availability of the sole car. The cooperative then held an annual meeting where they agreed that the solution was to buy another car, create a board of directors and try to grow the cooperative. When the board was created a majority of the board members was cautious and decided that the cooperative could not afford to buy a new car, thus breaking the decision made at the annual meeting. Since the car is an expensive capital good with a value that decreases quickly, but at the same time double the sharing capacity, this first expansion step is said to be very critical. As a consequence, the cashier and the chairman of the board performed a coup, they went against the majority decision of the sitting board of directors and went and bought another car for the cooperation. After this first expansion Majornas Bilkooperativ slowly grew recruiting more members. Eventually they bought and incorporated another cooperative carpool that also had encountered economical problems connected to them not growing, and offered their members to join Majornas Bilkooperativ. As Majornas Bilkooperativ spread out through the whole city of Gothenburg they decided to change the name to Göteborgs Bilkoop. The cooperation has now been stable for a long time according to one of the founders, but it has had a shaky and unorganized past driven by individual engagement and interest.

Majornas Bilkooperativ identified three main types of potential members to join the cooperative based on different incentives; those driven by environmental motives, those driven by economic motives and those driven by practical reasons. These motives remain today in Göteborgs Bilkoop. Their non-profit solution was also an economical incentive that attracted members, whom did not want someone that made profits of their car driving. Further, they identified a feeling that it was cumbersome to have a car in the city, hard to get parking space, traffic queues and congestion taxes, which all are practical issues.
There is a large difference (in relation to other carpools) that also is one of the reasons we joined. That we can influence, all members can influence which cars we have and were they are placed, it is really a large difference. Compared to other actors, we have different cars and brands, simply a mix, which provides an ability to find ones favorite car and try different ones. Something I see as a large advantage. (Gbg Bilkoop 3)

Majornas Bilkooprativ presented a solution to their members’ environmental and economic costs of individual car ownership by offering cooperative CS. They were able to cut down on costs as it is a non-profit organisation requiring all members to voluntary work approximately 6-7 hours/year in order to keep the cooperative on-going. They also offered a practical solution to avoid the responsibilities that came with private car ownership, e.g. with good placements of their cars in different parts of town. Further, they also view their way of organizing themselves as a non-profit cooperative as a strength when it comes to offering their members democratic power by being a part owner, as exemplified above. The members get the ability to influence which cars the cooperative has and where they are placed, showing the freedom one gains as a member compared to as a customer. They are not bound to any specific brand or model of cars and can adjust the supply after the members’ needs and preferences. From the beginning, the cooperative did not define themselves as any other company on the capital market, for them making money was not the goal of the cooperative but a means to an end. Thus, filling the gap on the CS market as a democratic cooperative organisation offering an environmental, economical and democratic alternative solution to the problem of car ownership, separating themselves from the commercial actors.

Göteborgs Bilkoop point out that their main divergence from other actors is the fact that they are a cooperative with non-profit incentives, thereby deeming themselves to a disadvantage when it comes to having resources to put into marketing efforts such as commercials and ads. However, they needed marketing in order to attract and recruit new members. Thus, Göteborgs Bilkoop had to focus on marketing efforts that required fewer resources like marketing themselves through local public events and handing out flyers outside grocery stores. They also opted for using mouth-to-mouth marketing and encourage their members to act as ambassadors for the organisation. In order to increase and ensure their members internal identification with the cooperative they hold informational meetings for all new members, trying to personally involve them from the start. The cooperative also sees different collaborations as a positive method for raising the general public's interest of CS. Previously they were involved within a carpooling network that was created in order to purchase a telematics system for handling the booking of the cars. However, the collaboration was broken when some of the CS organisations switched system.

The cooperative also discovered shared interests with Göteborgs Stad. They both wanted to reduce the amount of cars in Sweden and thereby decrease the general pollution that the transportation sector cause, and improve the city’s infrastructure. Thus, by using open dialogues they created a collaboration where they together have been involved in several information campaigns aiming to increase the awareness of CS. Through their collaboration they have taught their knowledge about CS and carpools helping others to get started. Since
Göteborgs Bilkoop is one of the first CS organisations on the Swedish CS market and have been active for a long time, other CS organisations both commercial and cooperative, have asked for their guidance. Thereby the cooperative acted as a ‘role model’ for other carpool cooperatives as well as a source of information for the whole industry.

But they have also to a certain degree done the mistake of not recruiting enough as well as starting to have too old cars and a bad economy, and they think it is so hard that they have decided to close down. So now we are discussing to do the same thing with them, so we have just sent out a survey to their members asking them if Göteborgs Bilkoop takes over the cooperative do they still want to be members, just to see what they think. So we have grown through incorporating very small car cooperatives to a large extent. (Gbg Bilkoop 1)

The cooperative now want to grow their car fleet with more cars, improved cars and more environmentally friendly cars, in order to continue to meet the demands of their members. In order to afford these new cars they say that they need to grow their cooperative by recruiting more members. Since their marketing resources are scarce incorporating smaller car cooperatives in the local area, which often have been too small to survive themselves as highlighted in the example above, does this. By buying and incorporating these smaller cooperatives they have been able to expand throughout the years and recruited more members into the cooperative.

When thinking about the future challenge to recruit more members, Göteborgs Bilkoop express that it is still too cheap to privately own a car and therefore the pressures to join are still low. They explicitly state that the privately owned car is the competitor and that most of the behavioral barriers are related to that. Further, they point out that it is a hard service to sell since it is a large step to take by selling your own car and giving up that ownership. According to Göteborgs Bilkoop marketing is still concentrated on everybody owning cars, where the car is constantly marked as personal freedom, which affects the consumption patterns regardless of other available options.

Regarding the competitors it is both pros and cons. Because Sunfleet has also done a lot of marketing and that creates an interest and commitment towards carpools in general, so it is multifaceted. Of course it is clear that they take a large market share, but I do not want to say that it is purely negative, it is really very little negative, it is to a large extent positive that they exist. (Gbg Bilkoop 3)

Another issue for Göteborgs Bilkoop to tackle is their competitor taking their market shares. They identify Sunfleet as their main competitor since they both are active in Gothenburg competing for similar individuals. Nevertheless, they point out that even though Sunfleet has more money to spend on marketing they create an overall interest and involvement for carpools, which promotes the whole industry. Further, Göteborgs bilkoop have also attended several meetings with various governmental organisations and other corporations to openly establish dialogues between them trying to build the general CS market.
**Sunfleet - A commercial giant making us rethink private car ownership**

Sunfleet is a commercial carpool that was initially founded as a small-scale experiment in 1998, as a response to an open procurement issued by Göteborgs Stad to facilitate a more environmentally sustainable urban development. They were able to secure this procurement by convincing Göteborgs Stad that they were the best option mainly by using their owners’ strong and well-known brands Volvo and Hertz as a professional stamp. After obtaining this procurement they needed to access cars for the carpool in order to launch their business. Thus, this resource became of vital importance affecting the feasibility of the launch. When the cars were acquired the experimental division was launched with Göteborgs Stad as the only client.

*We started in 1998 and it began as a development project between Volvo and Hertz were we wanted to offer a third option for the client, in this case short-term rental. However, from Volvo’s perspective I can imagine that they wanted to strengthen their position in various municipality procurements. I can even imagine them using us as a showcase towards the public in order to open the customers eyes for their products. (Sunfleet 3)*

Sunfleet identified a lack of a professional service between car rental and private car ownership that did not demand personal involvement on the CS market. Thus, by obtaining the procurement issued by Göteborgs Stad they could realize their vision to provide customers with a third option i.e. something between taxi and rental with short-term rental. They started to render themselves as a professional carpool for Göteborgs Stad where their members could escape the problematic of private car ownership or long-time renting. Further, as illustrated by the example above this small-scale experiment by the two owners Volvo and Hertz, worked as window of display towards the general public promoting the two established brands as well as expanding their existing service offerings.

In order to continue growing and become more profitable Sunfleet wanted to open up their services for companies and private individuals in 2004-2005. Thus, they needed to expand their segment by not working exclusively with Göteborgs Stad, resulting in efforts to attract and engage new members through banners and flyers. This new segment included people who did not want to belong to a cooperative carpool where engagement is highly important and more or less expected, but also companies that wanted to try commercial carpooling. After reformulating their business segment and opening up their services their organisation started growing. Since 2007 they have had a continuous stream of approximately 20-30% new members each year.

When Sunfleet became rather dominating on the market around 2009-2010, they identified a needed to make some changes related to their ownership structure. Thus, altering their interests and starting a phase were they have to reformulate their business and alter their course of action. The fact that both Volvo and Hertz offer products or services indirectly competing with carpooling may be one of the incentives for Sunfleet to become emancipated. Thus, they needed to convince their owners that it would be beneficial for the division to
become independent. For instance, they used the argument that they are the ones who attain the industry and operational knowledge. The negotiations succeeded and they were able to overcome the contradictory situation of their owners i.e. offering products and services that indirectly competes with Sunfleet, by convincing them to let Sunfleet become emancipated.

*It is not them who are the experts, thus it is we who decide what should be done and develop proposals accordingly. Then, of course they can have their views and insights regarding stuff.* (Sunfleet 1)

They reached their independency from their owners in 2011 and became the Sunfleet we know today. As the example above illustrates, the industry knowledge lies within Sunfleet and not their owners, leading to the owners only providing inputs and back-up. Thus, the separation resulted in Sunfleet carrying their own costs and running their own operations. Further, even though Sunfleet has strong owners providing financial back-up they do not have lots of resources to spend on marketing. They believe that this is related to the fact that the CS industry itself is not a high margin industry, resulting in rather small profits.

*Generally I would say that we are an alternative to the privately owned car, since we are a carpool who offers a full-service concept reducing everyday issues related to car ownership.* (Sunfleet 3)

Today Sunfleet is the largest carpool actor in Sweden active in approximately 50 cities with 30 employees nationwide, still rendering themselves as indispensable on the CS market since they offer a professional carpool reducing hassles connected to private car ownership without requiring any extra work. Thus, their business idea and incentives is unchanged after their emancipation from their owners and opening up their services to others than Göteborgs Stad. When it comes to issues that Sunfleet must overcome, they identify the existence of a behavioural and attitude barrier connected to an entry threshold. They believe that this barrier is connected to an underlying need for certain behavioural change to use their services, e.g. planning trips ahead, not having stuff lying around in the car and so forth. Further, Sunfleet mean that without this threshold they could have a broader customer segment. In turn this entry threshold makes it harder for the individuals to adopt Sunfleet’s services. This threshold contribute to the main obstacle of private car ownership since it makes people chose to own a car instead of engaging in carpooling. Since consumer habits are deeply rooted Sunfleet have tried to counteract the effects of this barrier by identifying motivations and incentives of the customers that join their carpool. Beyond environmental incentives, cost efficiency, reduction of practical issues i.e. looking for parking space, and importance of availability and access i.e. being able to access the car whenever and in several locations, are identified. These together are believed to result in higher level of comfort. Further, the service itself has improved in the last five years, resulting in the ability to attract more practical minded individuals. Moreover, Sunfleet identify a general change in the main reasons to engage in CS from environmental towards practical benefits especially in larger cities, e.g. the price sensitivity is lower in larger cities like Stockholm and Gothenburg.
Sunfleet have developed strategies and tools aiming to stimulate these identified motives. For instance to meet the availability and access desire, they have worked with simplifying their service offer by continuous system updates making the technical systems easier to use and minimizing the difficulties to become a member. Via the usage of media communication like articles and interviews in various newspapers they have tried to inform people about their services and the benefits of joining, such as cost-efficiency and comfort. Further, by becoming more visible by exhibiting more cars in active areas they have tried to increase the awareness of their services, showing that they are available in many locations. Moreover, they have changed their logo from green to blue, branding themselves more towards Volvo in order to attract new members. They developed this new logo in order to diverge from “greenwashing” presumption, which they mention to be increasingly common when companies use the colour green.

We have more to do with Västtrafik and bike sharing than with the automotive industry. One cannot become a Västtrafiks customer if you cannot get rid of your car, which you can’t if you need it sometimes. We solve the sometimes. Simultaneously, we cannot get any customers if our customers do not solve daily transport needs without cars. You either have a car or you use a carpool. Thus, we have a lot to gain by collaborating with them and we need to become even better at it. (Sunfleet 2)

Sunfleet identify public transportation organisations as one of the most important actors to collaborate with since it gives strong signals to the public related to marketing efforts as well as public transport being a necessity for carpooling to work, due to public transport taking care of the daily transportation. As can be seen in the example above Sunfleet do not identify public transportation as a competitor since they do not compete to attract customers rather they are compliments feeding each other with customers. When it comes to already established collaborations Sunfleet had a market campaign together with the public transportation actor Storstockholms Lokaltrafik (SL) where they offered customers a package deal. By aligning Sunfleet’s interests with that of public transportation they try to attract and convince the general public to use their carpooling services. As a result of negotiations between Sunfleet and Västtrafik, the public transport actor in Gothenburg, Sunfleet has obtained the ability to open their cars with the Västtrafik-card. Thus, Sunfleet have partly succeeded with engaging Västtrafik by establishing this particular collaboration. The Västtrafik-card is used as to attract potential members and maintaining current members. However, the collaborations between Sunfleet and various public transport organisations have not reached its full potential yet and a willingness to develop this further is expressed. Thus, they need to continue negotiations with them.

Another strategy that Sunfleet has developed to attract and convince more members is related to the level of internal engagement. Commonly identified internal motives for the employees is personal passion for the future of mobility pushing innovative boundaries and the general reduction of environmental effects that this service is believed to have. Thus, by aligning their personal motives with that of the organisation’s they have become involved, dedicated and practice what they preach. Moreover, this process of alignment is simplified by the fact
that everyone working within Sunfleet actually actively pursued Sunfleet as an employer and thereby already highly engaged. Consequently, Sunfleet describe that they use their internal engagement to spread knowledge about their service to their social circle, and thereby increasing general interest.

Sunfleet identify bilpoolen.nu as a direct competitor since they obtained the latest procurement form Göteborgs Stad instead of Sunfleet. In order to surpass this direct competitor they try to outmatch them in service quality and maintain their position as largest carpool in Sweden making them more attractive for customers. The fact that they have expanded their service with new mobility alternatives, e.g. electrical bicycles and want to continue exploring such solutions can be interpreted as a strategy to outshine their competition. Thus, by offering more one can attract and convince more customers to chose Sunfleet. Besides bilpoolen.nu Sunfleet view other industry actors as a compliment since they offer slightly different services, but they can still be competition in terms of brand. For instance, they believe the smaller cooperative carpools like Göteborgs Bilkoop to be no real threat since they are small, not active in the same places and do not attract the same segment. Thus, instead of competing with these smaller actors they prefer working with them since they believe that the market needs several actors in order to function properly.

So there is actually no definition of what a carpool is at the moment, which is creating the most problems because you cannot make the tax cuts, for example, we have 25% tax meanwhile taxis and flights have 6%. (Sunfleet 1)

Sunfleet identify several issues that they have to overcome, by engaging the parliament, which is related to the market growing faster than legislation can keep up with. All of the interviewees identify troubles with obtaining parking spots, high VAT and troubles with not enough charging stations in urban areas. As exemplified above if a legal definition were to be created for what carpool actually entails Sunfleet believes that many issues would then be resolved. Sunfleet has open dialogues and communication with governmental institutions like parliament, Göteborgs Stad and other municipalities like Stockholm and Malmö. Both related to continuous collaborations between Sunfleet, relevant municipality and developers when building new residencies as well as with Göteborgs Stad as an endorsing client. Nevertheless, since no direct measures have been taken to solve the legal definition issue there are indications of an existing lack of parliament engagement, which handle all legislation in Sweden. Thus, Sunfleet express a need to continue their efforts of engaging them through open dialogue, sharing experiences and actively participate in the discussions both directly and via media presence.

**Moveabout – Shaping the future of truly sustainable mobility**

Entrepreneurs and visionaries who wanted to create sustainable traveling founded Moveabout in 2008. They were initially started in Norway, a forerunner country when it comes to electric cars, and now also operates in Germany, Denmark and Sweden. They saw that a truly sustainable mobility option was something that was currently missing on the CS market and thus it became their main mission to provide it. Thereby, they would decrease the general
pollution that the transportation sector caused, becoming the answer to making society more sustainable and make a difference environmentally. In order to find a true sustainable solution a negotiation process followed where different mobility options were discussed. They reached the conclusion that combining electric cars with renewable energy together with the efficient utilization of a carpool concept was the best option.

_We began slowly in Norway and then in Sweden in 2009, but noticed pretty quickly that this car did not really possess the quality that we needed in Sweden..., so we had to pause until 2012. (Moveabout, 1)_

Hence, they waited until 2012 when the cars was sufficient enough to use so that they could become a real practical alternative towards their customers, recognizing both their customers and their own concern about providing a practical and environmental solution. Through dialogues with car manufacturers they found a common interest of putting out more electrical cars on the market, generating good PR for the car manufacturers and providing Moveabout with cars to use in their services. Currently they have different collaborations with electrical car manufacturers, such as putting up electrical charging stations around the country.

Moveabout are very clear with not wanting to partake in “greenwashing” and they explain that they want to work with organisations that really want to invest in environmental sustainability and decrease their emissions by 80-90%. This is what they think makes them unique compared to other CS organisations i.e. providing a truly sustainable mobility solution. Although ordinary carpools have been around for a while, electric carpools are a niche that is very young and interesting. They mention that they do not have any direct competitors and instead they view the other CS organisations as compliments, since they do not offer the same services and are not truly sustainable. However, they express a wish for more competitors in the future since it is good for business making them improve their services further.

Moveabout choose large organisations such as corporations and municipalities as their main focus area since they got more “bang for their bucks” and could reach more people at once, although their carpools are open for individuals as well. In light of the organisation’s vision and goal to reach out to as many people as possible due to operating within a new niche market, their specific target group of potential customers became; large organisations that are early adapters and share Moveabout’s interest for true sustainable mobility.

_The only thing the customers needs to do is drive the cars and everything else we take care of, they are whole, they are clean and in the right spot (Moveabout, 2)._
reach a broader customer base. As mentioned above, Moveabout offer their customers a full-service concept, which is emphasized by their slogan “zero hassle, zero emissions”.

So we contact them and talk to them, ask them what they are doing today and then we can tell them about our alternative, that is both more cost efficient and better for the environment, plus the fact that they get good PR. (Moveabout 2)

In order to reach their primary customers Moveabout started to select and contact interesting potential customers such as electrical companies, where they thought a shared interest in using electrical vehicles could be found. Further, having the Moveabout slogan on the cars is seen as good PR for the customer organisations, showing that they invest in environmentally friendly mobility. The slogan on the cars has also become a way to advertise themselves to new potential customers locally, reaching out to individuals and showing that they have a carpool in the area that they can join.

Moveabout identified issues related to behaviour and attitude barriers connected to car ownership, which they need to overcome in order to sell their services. They believe that these barriers arise from norms of viewing cars as mobility. They think that these habits are deeply rooted and that people might not be completely ready for this change yet. At the same time Moveabout mention noticing a generational change towards sharing and traditional ownership. They express that many young people do not view the car as a status symbol to the same extent as they previously did, and believe that they now see the car as solely a means of transportation. These barriers towards CS make the alternative of privately owning a car more attractive. In order to minimize the attitude barriers and convince customers to use their services Moveabout work with improving and simplifying their services, to appeal to the practical interest of their potential customers. Enabling them to take the first step to join and becoming customers.

When Moveabout found out that the combination of electric carpool and electric bicycle pools is said to cope with the hardest environmental standards set by researchers, they initiated a new internal vehicle negotiation process. The negotiation was initiated since Moveabouts prime interest is finding the most sustainable mobility solution. Through maintaining open dialogues with various municipalities, the shared concern of creating a more sustainable society was found and collaboration with Göteborgs Stad was initiated. Together they have just developed the world's first complete electric bicycle pool. However, since sustainable mobility is Moveabout’s primary focus they express that they are open for other mobility solutions in the future if proven more sustainable. The relationship between Moveabout and Göteborgs Stad deepened further as they found shared interests with the energy company Renova. Together the three of them are collaborating on the El-mob project where they are trying to find a common urban electric mobility solution combining cars, boats, public transport and bicycles.

Moveabout mention that there is a lot of talk but rather few actions taken to support environmental organisations by the parliament, and that the politicians actually have a great
opportunity to affect the legislative process to make it easier for electric cars and CS in general. At the same time Moveabout point out that the Swedish market is highly dependent on large car manufacturers, whose sole mission is to sell more cars. Thus, becoming the opposite of what Moveabout wants to obtain with their vision of creating a sustainable society with sustainable mobility solutions. Further, the lack of understanding true sustainability and “greenwashing” is what Moveabout view as their main obstacle. Thus, they see the lobbying from the scale industry as another issue to tackle. They argue that the large car manufacturers have resources for lobbying, which makes it easier for them to get their point across with the legislators. While Moveabout’s circumstances as small actors operating on an early niche market limits their resources for lobbying against Sweden’s large car manufacturers. Further, they express that operating with electrical cars is a more demanding area with issues such as limited driving distances, charging possibilities and the fact that electrical cars are more expensive goods than their non-electrical equivalents. They also face the issues of removed previously free parking for environmental cars in the city and the small size of the environmental car premium. Something they view as more symbolic than influencing.

I lobbied for it as early as 2012 in Almedalen, and I then noticed that the Centre party showed interest when I talked to them. They expressed that they did not have previous knowledge about this, and since then they have pursued the matter, and I hope that it will become reality in the future. (Moveabout, 2)

In order to tackle these problems Moveabout tries to create a dialogue with the parliament and lobby for their cause, e.g. to raise awareness and create an understanding regarding the unfair VAT levels. If they would manage to solve these CS issues private car ownership would become less attractive. However, even though Moveabout is still a pretty small organisation they have still managed to gain global recognition and become a legitimate contender for sustainable mobility worldwide. At the climate convention in Paris Moveabout was named one of the top 100 best climate initiatives in the world. An acknowledgement that also raised the UN’s interest, resulting in them also mentioning Moveabout in their report. This acceptance has lead to more organisations taking an interest in the company and helps the company on their way to attract new customers. In the future Moveabout wants to grow and become an influencing actor on the market, pushing others actors to follow. When they launched in Sweden in 2009, people barely knew what an electric car was, thus the organisations taking interest in Moveabout were mainly early adopters. However, in line with the environmental question gaining more and more interest in society and the company gaining attention and becoming viable actors on the CS market, the interest in the organisation is growing quickly.

SnappCar - Truly social P2P CS, changing society by connecting people
Two young men wanted to create something “new and cool” that could combine their passions for making the world a better place and connecting people. Thus, they wanted to create a concept of a P2P CS platform enabling people to borrow a car from their neighbour
when needed. One of the fundamental motivations for the concept was to benefit the environment through sharing resources that are inefficiently used i.e. the neighbour’s car, and thereby decreasing carbon dioxide emissions. Thus, aiming to reduce this issue and fill this gap on the market they became the first P2P CS platform in Scandinavia enabling efficient usage of privately owned cars.

_Then it turned out that it was very tricky to actually get the business up and running. We spoke to various insurance companies for at least six months, or most people said no straight away without thinking about it. No insurance company in Sweden had previously created car insurance on a daily basis, hourly basis, or a weekly basis; it was always on an annual basis (Snappcar 3)_

Initially they encountered some issues, one related to insurance, e.g. how do you insure a car on an hourly basis or if someone gets a parking ticket who should be responsible. In order to overcome this issue before being able to launch their business, they needed to reach an agreement with an insurance company as exemplified above. Thus, they pitched for several insurance companies with no success, until they found an employee of the insurance company IF who believed in them and their idea. This employee decided to develop and calculate a system for how this new insurance premium would look like. Hence by aligning this person’s interest with theirs, they were able to convince and engage him, and with him the insurance company IF, which was of vital importance for realizing the business idea. After they had reached an agreement with the insurance company they created the platform, which took around six months. This platform became their main tool enabling people to share cars by connecting people and to provide organized P2P CS.

However, this was not the only issue that Snappcar had to deal with before launching their business. They needed to consider how to get their rather unconventional idea noticed and used by potential users, primary identified as younger people born from the 80’s who do not identify ownership quite as important, and who instead values more static experiences like access. Although, they do not want to define their segment too much since they are a service for everyone. In order to attract their segment, they made it free to sign up and enabled members to rent whenever needed, supposedly simplifying the membership process. Even though human interaction is one of the main internal motives for their business, they wanted to attract members by emphasizing that through using this service one can either earn some extra money by renting out your unused car, or you can rent a car up to 50% cheaper than from regular car rentals. Further, in order to spread their idea they chose to use social media and to promote it through people in their own social circle. Because people are more prone to listen and take tips from friends than strangers, the usage of social media is a way of convincing people to join by generating trust as they start with close circles. Thus, the internal engagement and motivation is an important factor when raising awareness regarding their business. Their concept became reality in 2011 and was launched under the name Flexidrive, primary located in Stockholm as the sole P2P CS one the Swedish market.
It went okay, there were many people signing up, but not enough members were activated. In other words there were many who thought the service was interesting but did not take the step to actually rent the neighbour’s car. Who is your neighbour really and is it safe? (Snappcar 3)

As their business received increasingly more members they managed to capture the interest of a large investor in the beginning of 2013, a large media company called Schibsted. Schibsted believed in Flexidrive vision to besides premiering the environment, bringing people together by creating new meetings between people in cities and help car owners save money on the Swedish market. Thus, they started supporting Flexidrive by helping them with their media communication through mostly top-down strategic marketing, using banners and exposure on traditional websites. This rather extensive involvement indicated that Schibsted believed in Flexidrive, which enabled Flexidrive to become more established within the Swedish CS market. However, as can be seen in the example above the response from the Swedish people was somewhat disappointing since many signed up as members but did not actually use the service. In other words, there was a lack of properly convinced and engaged members. The interest for the service existed but it was hard to get them to use the it. This unexpected result revealed another issue, which they were not initially aware of i.e. a fear of borrowing from strangers and trusting others to use your car. This issue obstructed the input of potential members making them less prone to share their privately owned cars with strangers or neighbours. In order to counter this, Snappcar believes that they need to educate people more about their business. Further, in regards to not achieving the anticipated result, they mention the usage of top-down marketing as one influencing factor, since the core message of the organisation gets lost. Nevertheless, the initial strategy failed and resulted in a slow but steady upward curve not reaching the expected financial outcome.

When Schibsted decided to withdraw their support from Flexidrive after three years of involvement during 2015, they needed to find new investors and at the same time be able to keep their vision. Their solution to continue their operations was to merge with a Dutch company named Snappcar, with a similar business idea but operating in a larger scale. Snappcar is ranked as the world’s third largest P2P CS company, active in Holland, Germany and Denmark, with over 150 000 members, compared to Flexidrives 10 000 members. Thus, after Flexidrive became Snappcar they enjoy scale benefits of belonging to a large organisation and also larger financial back-up. This merger has also resulted in minimizing previous issues related to attracting new customers by completely changing their strategy from top-down to bottom-up marketing. They now use more community building ways to involve people, by using social events like BBQ, content marketing, spreading their message directly by talking to people and YouTube clips. They have now already seen an increase of new members since these changes was made, indicating more success with both the engagement of new members and their own development as a serious CS actor.

Many of the car owners we interviewed said that they used our services to make money or save money. However, after using the service they rendered the fact that they meet other
people and that they got to help somebody like their neighbour as equally or even more important than the initial economical motive. (Snappcar I)

Additionally, a motivational change has been found when somebody becomes a member of Snappcar. Initially, as exemplified above, it might be purely economical i.e. earn or save money, but after using the service members appreciate the human interaction even more in the sense of meeting other people and to have the ability to help your neighbour. Further, the way one use the car as a means of transportation changes, e.g. one will not take unnecessary trips around the corner, but instead use the car more efficiently and plan ahead before usage. Also people using Snappcar’s service have been noted to create new habits such as borrowing the same car from the same neighbour several times i.e. repeating the human interaction, and thus creating and maintaining relationships with other members.

I really believe that Gomore and us help each other in getting people to think, rather than competing. It is only good if several actors drive the same message. (Snappcar I)

Snappcar identify a direct competitor, Gomore, who offer a very similar service to that of Snappcar. However, they deem the threat of Gomore as rather insignificant since Snappcar is much larger than Gomore on the Swedish market. Further, as exemplified above their overall attitude towards competitors is that they rather view them as something positive for the greater good as well as a tool for increasing overall industry awareness. For instance, they view Sunfleet and other carpools as compliments since they do not offer the same experience and service, but still they do acknowledge the importance of them on the CS market. They also identify other car rental organisations and Drivenow as secondary competitors. Moreover, Snappcar mention that it is not strange to use services from both them and other organisations such as Sunfleet. This indicate that they are highly aware of people using both their services and other actors on the CS market, making them more like compliments than competitors since using one service do not exclude using the other.

It is very unclear when we talk to Transportstyrelsen, but they do not pull back our permission. No one dares to say that this is correct anyway, so it ends up with everyone being uncertain and looking at each other. As you can imagine you get a little tired after 5 years with no one taking responsibility of the question. (Snappcar 3)

Several issues are connected to legislation and political framework, deriving from laws lagging behind the market development. Issues like missing a legal definition of P2P CS, high taxes and accessing public parking spots are some of the mentioned problems that they have to try to overcome. Snappcar mention that legislation must be adapted for this type of services and that authorities stands as question marks at the moment, not really knowing how they should act. An example of confused politicians and governmental employees was brought up related to the car rental law, which states that all who rent out cars need to have an issued permission by Transportstyrelsen. The issue here is that Transportstyrelsen have issued one such permission to Snappcar as an organisation, but the ones who are actually renting out the cars are private car owners. As exemplified above, this creates difficulties since neither
Transportstyrelsen nor Snappcar knows if this is the correct approach. Consequently, there is a lack of engagement and involvement by the parliament to create functional legal framework and the development of proceedings related to these. In order to overcome these issues connected to lack of engagement and involvement by the parliament, preventing them from establishing themselves as a serious actor within the CS industry, they have actively tried to negotiate with them. For instance, they have tried to negotiate with them by creating a formal bill to parliament regarding reduced tax when renting out cars. Further, they have tried to communicate via debate articles in media where they highlight various issues related to legislation and P2P CS. So far, they have created some level of interest and are currently trying to convince and engage them.

Since the merger is relatively new the actual effects internally and externally have not been successfully measured yet. However, they have seen a significant increase of new members during the last year and believe that it will continue to grow. Also a generational shift has been noticed were today's generation of young people want access instead of owning. This combined with some of their tools to increase the general awareness, such as communication with vital actors like the parliament as well as active media involvement, e.g. debate articles and PR, have contributed to the increased interest of their services and a flow of new members. Snappcar is continuously trying to reach people who have a similar ideology as them, and thus share their interests so that they can commit to their services and become their ambassadors. Thereby promoting Snappcar’s services further. They now define themselves as a platform connecting neighbours through the usage of existing cars in an effective manner, where the average rental period is 2-3 days. Snappcar highlight the fact that they enable social relations through their service, where one can get to know one's neighbour. This is where they distinguish themselves from other actors on the market, defining themselves as a truly social P2P CS service aiming to change the society by creating human interaction. Snappcar explicitly aims to decrease the traditional view of transportation, at the same time as increasing human interaction by connecting people for the greater good of society. Through their existence and aim to challenge traditional way of transportation, they attempt to decrease the usage of private car ownership. Snappcar’s and the other case organisations narratives will be analysed and discussed in the next chapter.

Discussion

In this section the empirical material will be analysed with the help of the theoretical framework, mainly using Callon’s (1986) four phases of translation: Problematization, Interessement, Enrolment, and Mobilisation. Further, similarities and differences within the translation processes will be discussed. The study’s aim and research questions will be discussed and answered in relation to the findings. Lastly some of the findings will be connected to previous research with a comparative approach.

The aim of the study is to understand and explain how the creation and stabilization process of CS organisations unfolds, coupled with the challenges that occur along the way. Thus, the research questions discussed in this section are: How are car sharing organisations created and stabilised, and what are the challenges they encounter? Through the collected empirical
material this study will exemplify the process of creating and stabilizing a CS organisation in four ways by drawing upon the sociology of translation (Callon, 1986).

**How car sharing organisations are created and stabilized**

**Problematisation**

When it comes to the question of how CS organisations are created and stabilized, the case organisations have been found to start with a problematisation process in which they identify their own interests and what problem they want to solve with their business. Thereby creating a vision for their organisation, including defining their service and whom to target. For instance, an environmental driven group wanted another solution for owning a car resulting in the creation of Göteborgs Bilkoop. They started with deciding to become a non-profit cooperative carpool spreading locally. Thus, with their cooperative organisational design they offer a democratic solution contrasting other commercial CS actors, hence constituting their OPP. In turn, Sunfleet was founded by its two owners Volvo and Hertz in order to obtain the procurement issued by Göteborgs Stad. After becoming emancipated and opening up their services to both private individuals and organisations, they now render themselves as a professional carpool where their members can escape the problematics of private car ownership or long-time renting. Thus, creating their OPP. When some entrepreneurs and visionaries wanted to create sustainable mobility it resulted in the creation of Moveabout, offering an electric carpool. They are very clear with not wanting to partake in “greenwashing” and this is how they frame their unique services compared to other CS organisations, establishing their OPP as a truly sustainable mobility solution. Snappcar was created as Flexidrive by two young men who wanted to create something “new and cool” that could combine their passions for making the world a better place and connecting people. After becoming Snappcar they now distinguish themselves from other actors on the market by enabling efficient usage of privately owned cars aiming to change the society through creating human interaction. Thus, creating an OPP as a truly social P2P CS service. Through different problematization processes all of the CS organisations have found their own niche within CS that they render themselves indispensable within. Thereby, identifying their individual OPP in accordance with Callon (1986), which shapes all their relationships with other actors and/or actants. In sum, you can co-own your car, pay to utilize a shared car, pay to utilize a truly sustainable shared car, share your own car or use your neighbour’s car. Additionally, the overall problem that they all view themselves as the solution for is the environmental wastefulness of private car ownership.

In the problematization phase the CS organisations have also identified the necessary key actors to enroll in order to be able to realize their vision, which is consistent with Callon (1986). For instance, they need the support from different key actors depending on each organisation's particular situation. Something that all of the organisations had to consider was to acquire cars suitable for their particular needs in order for them to be able to offer their services. Göteborgs Bilkoop also identified their members as key actors because the cooperative would not be able to exist or operate without them since the members are their driving force. Meanwhile, Moveabout had to establish communication with car manufacturers and negotiate with them in order to acquire cars that were practical enough to
attract their members. Another interesting key actor identified by Snappcar was the insurance company, which was vital in order for them to launch their business concept. Further, as revealed in empirical material, beyond different kinds of cars, the CS organisations have identified booking systems, Västrafik-card, and Snappcar’s platform as vital components to succeed with their business endeavours. In the case of Sunfleet and Västrafik, the Västrafik-card shows that technology aids the collaboration and act as a proof of their collaboration. Thus, these non-human actants have been found to have large influence in all of the case organisations’ stories and sometimes they are even identified as key actants, consequently affecting their twist and turns. Based on this it is important to acknowledge these non-human actants as they impact the outcome of the organisation's, which is consistent with the notions of Latour (1991).

**Interessement and Enrollment**

After identifying the key actors the CS organisations needed to align their interest with their key actors, and develop various interessement-devices in order to entice and convince them to join their quest. The case organisations used various marketing efforts to attract and enroll members. For instance, Moveabout primarily marketed themselves through logos on their cars whilst Snappcar held social events like BBQ’s as well as used banners. Banners is something that was also used by Sunfleet. Additionally, both Sunfleet and Göteborgs Bilkoop handed out flyers to potential members. Göteborgs Bilkoop also held information campaigns and attended public events to raise CS awareness. Additionally, in order to minimize the behaviour and attitude barriers connected to the CS services, both Sunfleet and Moveabout used the interessement-device of improving and simplifying their services to appeal to the practical interest of their potential customers. Enabling them to take the first step to join and becoming enrolled customers. In regards to interessement-devices and enrolment, all of the case organisations have identified their own internal enrolment as highly important. They have been found to tackle this differently and have created various interessement-devices to amplify it. All of them have implemented a strong organisational environment, which acts as an interessement-device in order to internally enroll newcomers. Additionally, in the case of Göteborgs Bilkoop they hold internal information meetings where they discuss their co-ownership freely, since they have issues with members not taking their cooperative responsibility. Thus, they use this interessement-device to reduce the lack of internal enrolment. In sum, by using these devices the case organisation initiate negotiations with relevant actors in order to enroll them, and thereby defining their particular interrelations.

These case organisations have also shown that new key actors and actants have been found along the way, creating a situation where these need to be enrolled as well. This happens related to two types of situations; when they find another actor with shared interests or when the organisation change their motives and incentives starting a re-problematization. For instance, when Göteborgs Bilkoop had economic issues they had to find a solution. Thus, they gathered and decided to acquire more cars in order to grow their operations, which lead to them having to re-define their vision for the future. Sunfleet also started a re-problematization process when they decided to open up their services for both private individuals and other organisations. Further examples of re-problematization processes are;
when Moveabout had their vehicle negotiation and decided to add electrical bicycles, as well as when the investor Schibsted withdrew from supporting Flexidrive and they were acquired by Snappcar. By re-problematizing the CS organisations manage to survive through adapting to their continuously changing context.

**Mobilisation**

After the case organisations have been able to enroll their identified key actors and/or actants, they have all become spokesperson within their own network. When this is accomplished they can be labelled as mobilized. As exemplified by the empirical material Göteborgs Bilkoop became accepted as a viable actor by Göteborgs Stad when they were invited to public information meetings. Further, by acting as a ‘role model’ for other cooperatives they arguably became a spokesperson for cooperative carpooling mobilizing themselves. Meanwhile, Sunfleet has become an important spokesperson for the development of the CS market since they have been recognized by other actors as the largest and most influential CS actor. Even though Moveabout is a small organisation they have been globally recognized and accepted as a legitimate actor on the market by the UN. Thus, acting as a spokesperson representing sustainable mobility worldwide. Compared to the other case organisations Snappcar’s Swedish mobilisation process is new since end of 2015. However, since Snappcar is an established international organisation they furthered former Flexidrive’s mobilisation when they acquired them.

The translation process of how CS organisations are created have been exemplified by using the four phases of problematization, interessement, enrolment and mobilisation. This study argue that each organisation’s creation process entails identification of their interests, what problem they want to solve with their business and thereby creating their individual OPP. It also includes a need to identify and align their interests with the necessary key actors and/or actants in order to enroll them and consequently become mobilized i.e. realizing their vision. Hence, this study shows that the creation process is complex and not predetermined. Moreover, this process is not linear, thus the phases can occur simultaneously as can be seen in the material, e.g. re-problimatization. It is important to note that the translation cycle is never fully closed, since maintaining enrolment and mobilisation is a continuous process. For instance, key actors can stop being enrolled at any time and challenges can occur interfering within the present network. Thus, when answering the stabilisation part of the first research question through the theoretical lens used in this study, the sociology of translation, this study argue that the CS organisations can never be rendered as fully stabilised since it is a continuous process.

**The challenges that the CS organisations encounter**

Throughout the translation process the CS organisations encounter various challenges connected to lack of enrolment and antiprograms. Since the industry is still in it infancy there is not yet enough enrolled customers and actors, creating low margins. Consequently making it hard to invest money into interessement-devices such as marketing efforts and resources for lobbying in order to achieve external enrolment. The CS organisations have identified a need to enroll more of the general population and not only early adopters, in order for them to
establish themselves as a valid and mobilized industry. Even though the case organisations have attempted using several interessement-devices such as lobbying, debate articles and bill to parliament, the industry problems still remain indicating that there are a lack of enrolment of the key actor parliament. However, the enrolment of this actor is crucial for the CS industry in order to continue their operations and to overcome issues connected to legislation. Forming strong collaborations enables them to negotiate as a unit increasing their negotiation power. Since all of the case organisations believe that the overall industry goal to increase CS is most important and that weather other actors are seen as competitors or complement they all play an important role in pushing the industry forward. This shared view of the industry makes it easier for them to align their interest and create mutual incentives in order to form collaborations. Thus, by enrolling each other they perceive that they inherit stronger bargaining power towards the government acting as an interessement-device. Thereby influencing the enrolment phase of the parliament and hopefully reach an agreement aligning the CS industries interests with them.

For a network to take form the actors themselves have to reach some form of mobilisation by enrolling people and form coalitions (Callon, 1998). There is an antiprogram of private car ownership, which becomes harder to overcome if the CS industry does not manage to enroll enough key actors such as governmental institutions like the parliament. The interviewees of the case organisations mention several common problems that they all face. They all express that the laws and regulations are lagging behind the rapid development of the industry itself. Sunfleet, Moveabout and Snappcar also mention that the politicians themselves are confused and do not really know how to handle the situation. Furthermore, a legal definition of what a carpool entails are missing, creating more problems. Resulting in inhibiting municipalities to release public places to create parking spots for the carpools in urban areas and creating barriers for tax concessions, resulting in higher VAT for carpools; 25% compared to mere 6% for taxis or flights. Sunfleet, Moveabout and Snappcar all mention this as an obstacle and question why this is since their services actually promotes the environment. Issues like these created by the lack of a legal definition of carpool, all result in strong motivations for people to not share cars, thereby enforcing the antiprogram of private car ownership. The creation of a legal definition of a carpool would thus act as an interessement-device in order for the actors to become legal spokesmen and thereby emancipate and mobilize the actors within the CS industry.

This study has found private car ownership to be the biggest challenge and fundamental antiprogram of the whole CS industry, since it directly inhibits the existence of CS organisations. Further, this study argues that the CS organisations together challenge the institution of private car ownership by forming various collaborations. Their practices of sharing are established on the market through eroding the institution of private car ownership and thereby trying to create a new institution through repeated actions of sharing, which is consistent with (Czarniawska & Joerges, 1996). This is somewhat consistent with previous studies, that identify the institution of car ownership as the largest barrier for CS activities (Mont, 2004) and that all CS organisations seeks to reduce the need for individual car ownership (Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014). The attitude shift towards private car ownership
mentioned by previous studies (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Khuchua, 2002; Nykvist & Whitmarsh, 2008; Mont, 2004; Prettenthaler & Steininger, 1999), have not been investigated in this study. However, the studied organisations have all mentioned the existence of such a shift both in general and in connection to a generational shift.

Adding more research about car sharing

When connecting the empirical material from the four case organisations with previous studies there are several different themes that needs to be discussed. In previous research the CS market was described as niche market moving towards a more established market (Alli et al., 2012; Herodes & Skinner, 2005; Mont, 2004). Further, Nykvist and Whitmarsh (2008) and Jakobsson (2002) the Swedish market have been described as an industry full of small and flexible actors operating in a fast moving and expanding market. The evolvement of the CS market as well as the Swedish situational context has been confirmed by the empirical findings in this study. These market conditions and the expressed small margins by the case organisations can arguably be connected to them having a positive attitude towards collaborations and organising themselves as networks. They have a common goal to grow the industry and therefore they view each other as potential co-actors rather than traditional competitors, fostering collaborations. Even though this study have investigated organisations with diverging organisational structures they have been found to encounter the same industry problems, creating a shared interest of challenging the institution of private car ownership.

This study has found the importance of involving and enrolling the governmental institutions, such as the parliament, as an actor in order to overcome some of the industry issues. Identified issues by the case organisations are partly consistent with those of previous studies such as insufficient legal frameworks in need of new policies (Gossen & Scholl, 2011; Loose et al., 2006). However, according to the case organisations operating in a Swedish context, additional issues are identified such as no legal definition of carpooling and high VAT-levels. This study also show that CS organisations are positive towards creating collaborations and work together as a network to increase their lobbying power and overcome these issues. The need for creating such collaborative network has been highlighted by previous studies (Enoch & Taylor, 2006; Miller, 2013; Prettenthaler & Steininger, 1999).

Conclusion and Implications

The creation and stabilization of CS organisations can be understood by analysing how this continuous processes unfolds, which have been achieved through drawing upon the sociology of translation (Callon, 1986) in this study. In order to understand this process, collected empirical material from the four CS organisations have been analysed from an ANT perspective enabling this study to provide an overview of some of the current Swedish CS organisations.

The aim of the study is to understand and explain the creation and stabilization process of CS organisations, and identify the challenges that these CS initiatives encounter. Our study illustrates that the creation process is complex including identifying interests, aligning those with key actors, enrolling relevant actors and/or actants in order to become mobilized as
established actors as well as a spokesperson for their network within the CS industry. These steps do not necessarily happen in a linear order and are continuously adjusted. This study reveals that the CS organisations translation process is highly dependent on forming coalitions, collaborations and networks. Further, whilst using the theoretical lens of sociology of translation this study argues that the CS organisations can never be rendered as fully stabilised since it is a continuous process. In this study private car ownership has been identified as the biggest challenge and fundamental antiprogram of the whole CS industry. Further, in order to overcome this antiprogram collaborations between the CS organisations and other key actors is essential. In sum, by upholding a continuous translation process the CS organisations consequently become a real alternative to private car ownership.

These findings might not have been detected if not analysed from a translation process perspective since they are easy to overlook if one regards CS as an taken for granted outcome. Thus, this analysis has allowed us to reflect upon and find possible practical implications for actors within the CS industry in Sweden and its policymakers. For instance, as a consequence of the market being rather small and dynamic, our study shows that the CS organisations need to collectively grow their industry. Moreover, forming collaborations can be used as an interessement-device in order to enrol the parliament and municipalities for their cause, thereby facilitating the process of removing industry issues connected to legislation and infrastructure. Hence, contributing to the battle against the antiprogram of private car ownership.

By looking at CS as a process rather than a result the study has contributed towards understanding the dynamics involved in the creation and stabilization of the CS organisations and how this process unfolds. This is something that has not been given much attention in previous studies in regards to CS. In order to achieve this, the creation and stabilization of the CS organisations must be apprehended in the context of the interactions that construct the emerging network. In this case by the means of ANT and Callon’s process of translation. Further, by comparing four CS organisation this study have increased the ability to generalize about the creation and stabilization process of Swedish CS organisations and the challenges they encounter. This coupled with the exhausted discourse in the empirical material enables this study to elevate the perspective and provide a more general depiction of the CS industry in Sweden.

This study has focused on investigating the creation and stabilisation process of four CS organisations and throughout the process we have encountered several interesting aspects that was not further investigated in this study. Thus, we purpose further studies to be made within these areas. First we recommend future researchers to investigate the relationship between public transportation and CS and its’ purposed positive correlation i.e. the actors feeding each other with customers. Another intriguing subject is the attitude shift towards private car ownership mentioned by previous studies (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Nykvist & Whitmarsh, 2008; Mont, 2004; Prettenhalter & Steininger, 1999), which have not been investigated in this study. However, the case organisations mention the existence of such a shift both in general and due to a generational shift. Lastly we purpose future scholars to conduct a quantitative
consumer study regarding the motivations and incentives to join CS organisations and how and if these have changed over time. Thus, rejecting or confirming what has been mentioned by the participating CS organisations in this study.
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Appendix 1 – Information regarding the interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Involvement time in org.</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Interview duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Bilkoop</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>2016-02-02</td>
<td>&gt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Bilkoop</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2016-02-04</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Bilkoop</td>
<td>Previous Board Member</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>2016-02-24</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfleet</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td>2016-02-11</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfleet</td>
<td>Market Manager</td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td>2016-02-08</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunfleet</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
<td>&lt;1 years</td>
<td>2016-03-02</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveabout</td>
<td>Market Manager</td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td>2016-03-10</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveabout</td>
<td>VD</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>2016-04-13</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveabout</td>
<td>After Sales Manager</td>
<td>&gt;3 years</td>
<td>2016-04-10</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnappCar</td>
<td>CEO Swedish Market</td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td>2016-03-17</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnappCar</td>
<td>PR/Communication</td>
<td>&lt;1 years</td>
<td>2016-03-17</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnappCar</td>
<td>Citymarketing Stockholm</td>
<td>&lt;1 years</td>
<td>2016-03-17</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Stad</td>
<td>Carpool Manager</td>
<td>&gt;1 years</td>
<td>2016-02-23</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Stad</td>
<td>Previous Carpool Manager</td>
<td>&gt;2 years</td>
<td>2016-02-22</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollaborativ</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>&gt;2 years</td>
<td>2016-02-16</td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konsumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2 – General Interview Questions

**In Swedish**

1. Berätta lite om dig själv:
   a. Vad har du jobbat med tidigare?
   b. Hur länge har du jobbat här?
   c. Vad jobbar du med här? Hur ser en vanlig arbetsdag ut för dig?
   d. Varför engagerade du dig inom denna organisationen?

2. Hur hade du beskrivit er verksamhet?
   a. Vet du varför ni startade initiativ?
   b. Har ni några mål? Jobbar ni efter nått mål?
   c. Hur ser er organisationssstruktur ut? Vem bär ansvaret?

3. Ser du några hinder, problem som er organisation möter eller har mött?
   a. Tillit?
   b. Upplever du att ni har stött på problem i relation till generella regelverk och riktlinjer?

4. Enligt dig anser ni er har några konkurrenter? I så fall vilka?

5. Har ni någon form av samarbete med någon annan aktör?
   a. Ser ni någon potentiell samarbetspartner i framtiden?

6. Vet du om det finns något närverk för er och liknande organisationer?

7. Har det varit en jämn ström av intresse för er organisation, i relation till tex. antal medlemmar sedan ni startade, eller har det varierat?
   a. Hur?
   b. Vad tror ni detta beror på?
   c. Hur når ni ut till nya potentiella kunder? Marknadsföring?

8. Vilken typ av samarbete har ni med Göteborgs Stad?

**In English**

1. Tell us a little bit about yourself:
   a. What have you worked with previously?
   b. For how long have you been involved in this particular organisation?
c. What do you work with in this organisation? How does a normal workday look like?
d. Why did you involve yourself in this organisation?

2. How would you describe your organisation?
   a. Do you know why the organisation started initially?
   b. Do you have any organisational goals? Do you work in accordance with any goals?
   c. How does your organisational structure look like? Who is responsible?

3. Do you see any problems and/or obstacles that your organisation faces or have faced in the past?
   a. Do you experience that the organisation has encountered any problems regarding the general regulations and guidelines?

4. According to you do your organisation have any competitors? If so who?

5. Do you have any form of collaborations with other organisations? If so who?
   a. Can you see any potential cooperation partner in the future that might be beneficial?

6. Do you know if there are any networks for your organisation and similar organisations?

7. Have the external interest in your organisation been stable or variable in relation to for instance the amount of members since your operations was started?
   a. How?
   b. Why do you think this is?
   c. How do you reach potential new clients/members? Marketing?

8. Which kind of relationship, if any, do you have with the municipality/ governmental organisations?

Appendix 3 – Number of members in the participating CS organisations
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*Figure 1. Illustrates number of members in Sweden*