

Innovations in Consumption: Three Case Studies on Alternative Systems of
Provision in Halifax, NS

by

Chris Dufour

Submitted for the Combined Honours Degree Program in the Faculty of Arts and
Social Science in Environment, Sustainability, and Society and Political Science

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
April 2017

Supervisor: Dr. Anders Hayden

© Copyright by Chris Dufour, 2017

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

DATE: April 2017

AUTHOR: Chris Dufour

TITLE: Innovations in Consumption: Three Case Studies on Alternative Systems of Provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia

DEPARTMENT: College of Sustainability

DEGREE; Bachelor of Arts Convocation: May 2017
Environment,
Sustainability, and Society and
Political Science

Permission is herewith granted to Dalhousie University to circulate and to have copied for non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of individuals or institutions. I understand that my thesis will be electronically available to the public.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

The author attests that permission has been obtained for the use of any copyrighted material appearing in the thesis (other than the brief excerpts requiring only proper acknowledgement in scholarly writing), and that all such use is clearly acknowledged.

_____ Signature of Author

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	1
1.2 Purpose of Study	3
1.3 Research Questions	4
1.4 Limitations and Delimitations	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review	7
2.1 Emergence of Alternative Systems of Provision	7
2.2 Niches, Strategic Niche Management, and Systems of Provision	9
2.3 Grassroots Innovations and Alternative Systems of Provision	11
2.4 The Sharing Economy	15
Chapter 3 Methods.....	20
3.1 Assumptions and Rationale for a Qualitative Design.....	20
3.2 The Type of Design Used.....	21
3.3 The Role of the Researcher	22
3.4 Data Collection Procedures.....	22
3.5 Methods for verification	23
3.6 Analysis and Coding.....	23
Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis	25
4.1 Case Study Profiles	25
4.2 Identified Goals	25
4.3 Successes	30
4.4 Obstacles	36
4.4 Organizational structures.....	40
4.6 Future Goals.....	42
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Future Research	45
Appendix.....	53
Appendix A: Letter of Invitation	53
Appendix B: Consent Form	55
Appendix C: Interview Guide	59
Appendix D: Research Design and Audit Trail Guide	62

Abstract

Given the challenges of climate change, mass consumerism is dominant in mitigation discourse. This thesis studies alternative systems of provision to investigate alternative sustainable consumption options. Systems of provision are the parameters of consumption, including all stakeholders involved from the beginning of production to the consumption of a good or service. It is an applied lens to study consumption. Alternative systems of provision seek to establish sustainable consumption that have a lesser ecological footprint, a greater sense of community, affordability, and social equity. This thesis seeks to gain a greater understanding of alternative systems of provision and the obstacles and challenges that they face. Three case studies are conducted in Halifax, Nova Scotia on organizations participating in alternative systems of provision. The case studies are Off the Hook, CarShare Atlantic, and the Halifax Tool Library. The study finds that alternative systems of provision challenge the culture of individualized and commodified systems of provision through their focus on social equity, economic benefits to consumers and producers, and reducing their ecological impact. They face challenges from lack of public awareness, funding limitations, and exhaustion of human capital. This research contributes to the literature on systems of provision, sociotechnical transitions, and consumption. The thesis recommends future research to study consuming members of alternative systems of provision, public perception, and the sharing economy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my thanks to my supervisor Anders Hayden for his committed guidance in this research. Thank you, Anders, for steering me in this research and guiding me to produce a thesis that I can be proud of. This research could not have been without his support and assistance.

I'd like to thank Steve Mannell, Andrew Bergel, and Daniela Turk for their feedback, guidance, and motivations throughout this process. Thank you for such extensive review of the thesis process; I would have been lost without your help.

The participants of this research were helpful through providing a plethora of information and connecting me with other individuals in their communities. I would like to extend my appreciation and gratitude to them for assisting me in this research and their enthusiasm in alternative systems of provision.

Lastly, I'd like to thank my friends and support system for assisting me through this process. Thank you Rosa Poirier-Mckiggan for your ideas, motivation, and intellectual and emotional support through writing this thesis.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

A prominent response to climate change currently relies on the consumer. Having a plethora of choices available to them, the consumer chooses among options for the acquisition of goods and services. Humans are consistently consuming, whether for survival or a means to acquire social status through material goods. The pressures to own individually, upgrade our products, and keep up with innovative technologies contributes to consumption. Ultimately, consumption relates to ecological footprints of individuals, populations, and the globe. This indicates that consumption needs to be addressed in accordance with the impacts of climate change.

As the human population increases, concerns of consumption have been constant in climate discussions. Population increase is not the sole concentration of the consumption dilemma, rather it is the global North's disproportionate level of consumption. In response to carbon and ecologically intensive consumption, "green" consumerism emerged, dominating climate change mitigation discourse. Green consumerism, or "green growth", attempts to mitigate climate change while continuing economic growth. Through prioritizing economic growth there are many aspects of ecological sustainability that are undermined (Wanner, 2014). Despite the efforts of green growth, greenhouse gas emissions are still rising in some countries and not falling fast enough in others; global emissions have risen each year by 3% since 2000. In response to rising emissions and degrading ecological activities the pressures for structural changes to adapt to climate change are ever increasing and dire (Akenji, 2014). Green consumerism focuses on current trends and patterns of consumerism, placing the responsibility of climate change mitigation on the individual. This consequently removes consumption issues

from the social, economic, and political systems (Akenji, 2014). As green consumerism dominates consumption-based climate change mitigation strategies, alternative mechanisms to consume are given little attention.

The individual decides to consume certain goods, creating a degree of agency over how and what they consume. Yet, the degree of agency is confined to the options available within markets. In a neoliberal capitalist economic system, markets create spaces for competition and innovation. As innovations expand there are more opportunities for alternatives to emerge within and outside of current markets (Kemp, Schot, & Hoogma, 1998). If consumption is addressed as a sustainability issue then available alternatives must adequately change the culture of consumption. Alternatives can change or revamp our systems of provision.

Systems of provision establish the parameters of consumption; they include the consumer, product, and the overarching platform used to acquire the products (Bayliss, Fine, & Robertson, 2013). Studying consumption through a systems of provision lens “emphasises the socially embedded nature of consumption behaviour and, rather than concentrating on deliberate consumption decision-making, looks instead at the role of inconspicuous (habitual, low-profile) consumption in overall lifestyle practices.” (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008, p. 672). Alternative systems of provision differ from mainstream systems in their emphasis on goals of ecological sustainability, social equity, and a greater sense of community. Systems of provision involves all the various steps of consumption: production, manufacturing, distribution, etc. Understanding each of these steps as part of a system helps to gain insight into how alternatives can challenge individualized and currency-based consumption.

1.2 Purpose of Study

Alternative systems of provision challenge the ecological impacts of excessive and individualized consumption while exploring more feasible and sustainable options. Motivations for alternative systems of provision include reducing environmental impacts, increasing economic feasibility and social connectedness, and making products more accessible (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008). The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of organizations participating in alternative systems of provision and the opportunities and obstacles these organizations face.

Alternative systems of provision are often found in grassroots initiatives and niches that are focusing on sustainable consumption. Grassroots initiatives that are seeking alternatives are a starting point for research (Seyfang and Longhurst, 2015). Scholars' ideas of alternative systems of provision are comparable to those found among scholars of sociotechnical transitions. Sociotechnical transition scholars focus on entire system changes and bring insight into alternative systems of provision. Sociotechnical transitions begin within niches, spaces advocating for transitional initiatives while still operating within the current sociotechnical structure (Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). These niches vary in their focus, innovations, and composition—including grassroots organizing, alternative economies (such as the sharing economy or local community currency), or other forms of community organizations (Seyfang and Longhurst, 2015). This study concentrates on several variations of alternative systems of provision niches present within Halifax, Nova Scotia.

1.3 Research Questions

Three case studies are conducted in Halifax, Nova Scotia that focus on organizations participating in alternative systems of provision. The three organizations are CarShare Atlantic, The Halifax Tool Library, and Off The Hook. This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the goals, challenges, and areas of success in alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?
2. How have organizational intentions evolved over time and what factors have contributed to this evolution?
3. How can theories on technological and social innovations be applied to alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?

1.4 Limitations and Delimitations

The limitations to this study are the small sample size and the limited time-frame for the research. This study uses qualitative methods and is exploratory of alternative systems of provision. With a small sample size, this research cannot generalize about alternative systems of provision but identifies common themes and patterns. The study population are those in administrative, organizational, or leadership roles within the three identified alternative systems of provision in Halifax. Within the three organizations, 1 to 3 individuals are interviewed from each, a total sample of 6 individuals. There are a limited number of key individuals with in-depth knowledge of these organizations, but hearing from more than one voice gives a broader understanding. Additionally, this study's time restrictions within an eight-month period creates limitations to the amount of data collected and time available for analysis.

The delimitations of this study are the selected population and the number of case studies. This study only investigates the perspectives of administrators, organizers, or leaders in

alternative systems of provision. Where interacting with members and participants in the organizations may provide further insight into alternative systems of provision, time restrictions create a barrier and, thus, the scope is narrowed. In Halifax, Nova Scotia there are several organizations involved in alternative systems of provision and more case studies could be conducted. The three case studies are chosen because they vary between profit and non-profit models.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Despite limitations, no research studies exist on alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Alternative systems of provision are not necessarily a new phenomenon within the study of consumption, but an evolving area with new technological advancements and innovations. This research includes organizations differing in the products and services they provide. These differences create an understanding of the broader conditions and obstacles that alternative systems of provision encounter.

Alternative systems of provision are diverse and broadly defined. Many initiatives that create alternative systems of provision are part of the sharing economy, otherwise known as collaborative or connected consumption. For the purpose of this study, the sharing economy is the creation of markets and spaces focusing on “recirculation of goods, increased utilization of durable assets, exchange of services, and sharing of productive assets” (Schor, 2014, p. 2) The sharing economy operates in profit, not-for-profit, business to consumer, and peer to peer models (Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2009). Within this research, the sharing economy makes up two of the case studies conducted.

Alternative systems of provision do not come without complexity and criticism. In an era of economic insecurity and inequalities, the desires to consume less or in alternative fashion may

be more of a reaction to economic states of suffering. Participation in alternative systems of provision may be a result of economic insecurity, while on the other hand, alternative systems of provisions may be initiated to revamp consumer culture and reconceptualise consumption to fit a sustainability agenda.

Throughout this study, I contribute to the literature by exploring alternative systems of provision and provide insight into the various models. With a population of organizers, administrators, and leaders, I expect to see findings that exemplify changes in growth, organization structure, operations, and the intended trajectory of the organizations. With varying degrees of profit and not-for-profit organizations, this study highlights themes and patterns within different organizationals and how their operations. This paper includes a review of literature, discussion of methods, the findings of the research, and a conclusion including future research opportunities.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Emergence of Alternative Systems of Provision

Many theories and ideologies advocate environmental sustainability. Among these theories are discourses on the political, economic, and social systems. Environmental sustainability discourses commonly focus on the role of government and institutions within the prevailing sociotechnical regime. Sociotechnical refers to the intersecting relationships between the use of technology and its embeddedness in social relations. The term focuses on the social and technological components of a given environment (Seyfang & Smith, 2007). Sociotechnical regimes are the presence of specific institutionalized technological and social ideas which guide governmental and institutional decisions. Consequently, a sociotechnical transition refers to a change in the ideas and attitudes held within a sociotechnical regime (Seyfang & Smith, 2007; Kemp, Schot, & Hoogma, 1998). Systems of provision encompasses the process of consumption, including the production, distribution, and purchasing of goods and services. Social and cultural influences guide patterns of consumption and establish norms surrounding systems of provision (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008). Systems of provision are reoccurring in sociotechnical and transitional literature, and thus, the ideas and theories within sociotechnical literature guide this research.

Failures to meet global environmental and social sustainability frames the discourse on sociotechnical transitions. Inadequate mitigation of environmental and social issues has led scholars to critique current sociotechnical regimes. In the literature two relevant schools of emerge: top-down approaches and bottom-up grassroots initiatives (Smith & Seyfang, 2007). Top down approaches can include mechanisms of green growth to attempt sustainable

development. Green growth seeks to use current social, political, and economic systems to achieve sustainability, such as the use of supply and demand or comparative advantage to establish sustainable consumption. These mechanisms work to correct the market failures contributing to the climate crisis through the market. This perspective dominates the current sociotechnical regime in preserving the values of economic growth. A top-down perspective is dominant because it maintains existing social, political, and economic systems (Seyfang, 2009; Lorek & Spangenberg, 2014). Lorek and Spangenberg (2014) argue that the green economy does not meet human basic needs nor operate within the globe's carrying capacity. Sustainable development's main tenants are to meet basic needs and operate within the carrying capacity; a green growth model's ability to achieve environmental and social sustainability is questionable because of its inability to meet the tenants of sustainable development (Lorek & Spangenberg, 2014). The main critique of this model is that green growth has led to greater efficiencies in reducing fossil fuel intensive operations, however, overall emissions have risen as production rates increase to meet consumer demands (Akenji, 2014).

Alternative systems of provision offer opportunities to change or modify the top-down and business-as-usual approach. Systems of provision include production, marketing, transportation, marketing, and consumption; they encompass the social and technological components of consumption, such as social norms of consumption and the technology used to access specific goods and services. (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008; Bayliss et Al., 2013). To explore alternative systems of provision, scholars focus on bottom-up approaches. Brown and Vergagt (2016) argue that the shift from individualistic consumerism will involve grassroots innovation and citizen engagement. These engagements and innovations are likely to produce the demand on government and corporations to shift away from business-as-usual (Brown & Vergagt,

2016). The dichotomized top-down versus bottom-up approaches to sustainable development and mitigating unsustainable consumption is more nuanced in practice than it is in theory. The goal of many alternative systems of provision is to establish consumption based on values that emphasize environmental sustainability, social equity, and building stronger community networks (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008). Although there is contention over the definition and parameters of alternative systems of provision, various forms of grassroots initiatives, community organizations, and the sharing economy are included as alternative systems of provision in this study. The following sections outline theories and ideas within sociotechnical literature, grassroots initiatives, and the sharing economy, encompassing the ways that each influences alternative systems of provision.

2.2 Niches, Strategic Niche Management, and Systems of Provision

The study of alternative systems of provision within sustainable consumption is relatively new. Alternative systems of provision and sociotechnical transition literature are often found in niches. Groups advocating alternative systems of provision in niche spaces are also supportive of sociotechnical regime transitions (Seyfang, 2009; Seyfang & Longhurst, 2016). A sociotechnical regime projects the direction of development through its complex interwoven ties to “cognitive, social, economic, institutional and technological processes” (Seyfang & Smith, 2007, p. 588). Advocates of alternative systems of provision aim to challenge the current sociotechnical regime in niche countercultural spaces, commonly seen through grassroots initiatives (Kemp, Schot, & Hoogma, 1998; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). The term ‘sociotechnical’ implies a shared effort within the social and technological aspects of the regime, however, the social component is stressed more in transitional literature. This is because grassroots niches are significantly more socially innovative than they are technical (Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). The analysis of

technological and social innovations offers a starting point for the study of alternative systems of provision.

Organizations and groups advocating for transitions in sociotechnical regimes are studied within their effectiveness and management styles. Kemp, Schot, and Hoogma (1998) present niche space as integral to new technological advancements as niches work as a domain for learning. Niches build the foundation for an innovation to move into the dominant sociotechnical regime. The success of niche diffusion into mainstream, in technological and social innovations, is determined through a combination of the internal operations within niches and the external conditions of the regime. Kemp et Al. (1998) argue that the amount of interplay between niches and the regime is indicative of the amount of diffusion that will take place. Transition of a sociotechnical regime requires niche spaces to gain social license and go through trial and error before they can be scaled up. Kemp et Al. (1998) argue that niches in sociotechnical regime shifts “function as local breeding spaces for new technologies, in which they get a chance to develop and grow.” (p. 185). Niche spaces are created to bring new, and sometimes transformative, innovations into the mainstream sociotechnical regime (Kemp et al., 1998; Schot & Geels, 2008; Seyfang & Longhurst, 2015). Alternative systems of provision counter the mainstream consumerism agenda and, thus, are likely to surface in the form of niches.

Theories on sociotechnical transitions inform the development process of niches. Strategic Niche Management (SNM) is applicable to sociotechnical transitions and the function of niche spaces amongst the broader sociotechnical regime. SNM posits social and technological innovations, including grassroots initiations and some alternative systems of provision, in protected niche space where common issues of expectations, networks, and learning can be fully address (Kemp et Al., 1998; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). Strategic Niche Management is a

strategy to introduce new innovations into market niches and an eventual regime shift. Various actors can implement SNM, such as governments, NGOs, or businesses. SNM consists of five broad steps: (1) choosing a technology or innovation; (2) selecting a location to implement a niche experiment; (3) setting-up the niche space with a degree of protection; (4) scaling-up the experiment through various policy initiatives; and (5) breaking-down the niche protection and introducing the innovation as embedded in the sociotechnical paradigm (Kemp et. Al, 1998). In an evaluation of strategic niche management literature ten years after its emergence, Schot and Geels (2008) argue that interactions between regimes and niche spaces have become increasingly complex, warranting consideration into the effective translation of sociotechnical innovations into the regime. Innovations can become isolated in niches without avenues to diffuse into the dominant sociotechnical regime. Yet, the translation of innovations to the mainstream agenda can threaten the autonomy of the niches and their goals and values (Seyfang & Longhurst, 2016; Schot & Geels, 2008). Niches exist in various forms where some are grounded in specific community movements and goals, known as *simple* niches, and others are found as part of a larger network of transitional movements, coined *strategic* niches (Martin, 2016; Hargreaves, Hielscher, Seyfang et Al., 2013). The use of strategic niche management and the conceptualization of alternative systems of provision as niche spaces helps to offer a theoretical framework for this study, however, the various structures of niches creates nuances in SNM theory and must be taken into consideration.

2.3 Grassroots Innovations and Alternative Systems of Provision

Alternative systems of provision are likely to occur through grassroots initiatives as both often seek paradigm shifts towards ecological sustainability, social equity, and a greater sense of community (Seyfang & Paavola, 2008; Seyfang & Smith, 2007). Grassroots initiatives

commonly differ from market-based social and technological innovations. Grassroots initiatives from more top-down initiatives in their organizational structures, resource bases, focus on the social economy, and their differing motivations (Hargreaves et Al., 2013). Grassroots organizers often create niche spaces and have the ability to implement SNM to introduce social innovations (Kemp et Al., 1998; Seyfang & Smith, 2007). Seyfang and Smith (2007) write “grassroots are not the exclusive, powerful vanguard for more sustainable futures, but a source of innovative diversity” (p. 590). Through this innovative diversity, many alternative systems of provision surface in grassroots initiatives. Some examples of grassroots alternative systems of provision are community food cooperatives, community shared agriculture or fisheries, or the Transition Town Movement.

Alternative systems of provision are present in grassroots discourse as many, not all, alternative systems of provision are found in grassroots initiatives. Grassroots movements “arrive in reaction to perceived social injustices and environmental problems often arising in conventional innovation models” (Smith, Fressoli, & Thomas, 2014, p. 115). Grassroots initiatives challenge the top-down and individualized approach of the mainstream regime through forming collective groups (often of social and environmental activists and organizations) to advocate for bottom-up, citizen led initiatives (Feola & Nunes, 2014; Smith et al., 2014; Seyfang & Smith, 2007). Some grassroots movements are essential for identifying challenges in niche spaces to understand the problems alternative systems of provision face.

The Transition Movement is a grassroots movement that advocates for alternative systems of provision. The Transition Town Movement arose in response to climate change and peak oil. To address climate change, the movement attempts to restructure conceptions of mainstream market mechanisms. There is a focus on alternative systems through re-localizing

the economy to reduce dependency on the global economy (Feola & Nunes, 2014; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). The Movement is ‘transitional’ in that “a transition is a fundamental shift in a socio-technical system, reflecting significant changes across a range of domains; technical, political, institutional, cultural, etc.” (Seyfang & Longhurst, 2016, p. 2). Alternative systems of provision are spread out through the Transition Movement such as community currencies, cooperatives, and the sharing economy. Research into the Transition Movement has outlined the need for focus on social innovation rather than technological innovation. Since the Transition Movement is countercultural and creates niche towns and communities, a large amount of social innovation occurs. With an emphasis on social innovations, the nature of niche diffusion is complicated as it requires social and ideological transition rather than purely technological (Feola & Nunes, 2014; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). In contrast, Smith and Seyfang (2007) build on this through arguing that the separation of social and technological does not help to facilitate efficient steps forward, but that sociotechnical regimes must recognize the interwoven nature of social relations with technology.

The Transition Movement’s relevant initiatives are examples of alternative systems. Through focusing on a re-localized economy, initiatives such as community currencies and local trading schemes become a norm in these niche spaces. The inclusion of initiatives that re-localize the economy are direct alternatives to the mainstream sustainable development methods of green growth (Feola & Nunes, 2014; Seyfang & Haxeltine, 2012). Localized economies are created through the implementation of community currencies. Community currencies operate alongside and attempt to meet the same needs as conventional currencies; their impact on communities varies based on their structure and implementation. Additionally, studies show that community currencies help to build community pride, social capital, and, most significantly, create separate

and tangible alternatives (Seyfang & Longhurst, 2015). The Transition Movement provides various examples of alternative systems of provision and the role of grassroots organizing.

Grassroots provides several examples of success in niche spaces and the building of community; however, literature shows that success is difficult because of the diversity and complexity of grassroots. A reoccurring challenge in grassroots initiatives is the diffusion of ideas and innovations in niche spaces into the larger sociotechnical regime. The diffusion of ideas is difficult because of the separation of networks. The networks within the current sociotechnical regime and niche spaces are sometimes so stratified that the diffusion of ideas from one to the other is limited (Smith & Seyfang, 2007). Scholars attribute lack of idea diffusion to fundamental value differences between grassroots initiatives and the sociotechnical regime. Grassroots movements tend to focus on bottom-up approaches; to adhere to the hierarchal nature of government and corporate institutions grassroots movements principles may be weakened in order to translate their ideas (Smith et al., 2014; Smith & Seyfang, 2007). The limited ability to diffuse ideas into the mainstream shows that some alternative systems of provision require changes in the dominant sociotechnical and political regime.

Grassroots movements, including those involved in alternative systems of provision, are complex and diverse in their focus and priorities. Feola and Nunes (2014) find identifying success indicators is difficult because of the broad spectrum of ideas held in grassroots innovations. Grassroots initiatives are context dependent; the social, economic, and political structures influence the success of a grassroots innovation. This is difficult for movements that challenge mainstream systems of provision. Grassroots innovations are faced with meeting the needs of their location to provide the necessary materials and resources in their communities while also following the agenda of wide-scale systems change (Smith et al., 2014). Seyfang and

Haxeltine (2012) argue grassroots innovations can benefit from focusing on managing their expectations, building their networks, and concentrating on learning processes. This diversity and complexity of grassroots innovations complicates the ability to apply generalizations and theory; approaches to researching grassroots development need flexibility (Hargreaves et Al, 2013). The various organizational structures and goals in alternative systems of provision must be taken into consideration when research is done.

Many alternatives surface through grassroots innovations. In this study, two grassroots organizations (Halifax Tool Library and Off the Hook) are studied and the application of grassroots innovation literature is helpful to contextualize challenges present in other grassroots organizing and to draw parallels between the literature and the findings throughout the data analysis.

2.4 The Sharing Economy

Although the sharing economy is separate from grassroots innovation literature many examples of grassroots innovations involve the sharing economy. The sharing economy can manifest in various structures such as corporate, social enterprise, or not-for-profit. but because of the broad spectrum of sharing economies it warrants a separate section of analysis. Scholars contest the sharing economy definition and there are disagreements over which initiatives should and should not be included within the sharing economy (Schor, 2014). The sharing economy is broad and diverse consisting of various structures, thus, its categorization into alternative systems of provision is more nuanced. There are multiple terms used to describe the sharing economy, such as “collaborative consumption”, “connected consumption”, “access-based consumption” (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Mohlmann, 2008; J. Schor, 2014), however the term “sharing economy” is used in this study.

The sharing economy is a contentious field among social scientists and economists as sharing economies spread throughout multiple sectors of the economy, including the for profit and not for profit sectors. The sector of profit, not-for-profit, business-to-consumer, and peer-to-peer can have varying influences on the nature of each sharing economy. For example, many car-sharing organizations are business-to-consumer and for-profit while community tool libraries are considered to be not-for-profit and peer-to-peer (Schor, 2014). Scholars also critique the sharing economy for their susceptibility to corporatization and monopolization. Martin (2016) argues that corporate co-option of the sharing economy frames it purely as an economic opportunity and exploits the economic circumstances of the lower classes, making the sharing economy, in these instances, a proponent of neoliberal capitalism. Further, Henwood (2015) criticizes Airbnb and Uber, where billion dollar industries have been created in ways that exploit those who are in states of economic insecurity and take large portions of profits for the use of their domain. Henwood (2015) describes sharing economies as “a nice way for rapacious capitalists to monetize the desperation of people in the post-crisis economy while sounding generous, and to evoke a fantasy of community in an atomized population.” The creation of alternative systems of provision in sharing economies do not always challenge the problems embedded in the mainstream economy. Some forms of the sharing economy may strive for sociotechnical and sustainable transitions while others utilize the sharing economy as a means of economic growth.

There is a focus on the perceived benefits of sharing within economic, environmental, and social realms that makes the sharing economy attractive to some. Schor and Fitzmaurice (2009) find motivations for participating in the sharing economy as: gaining access to lower cost goods and services; the perceived reduction of carbon and ecological footprints; increased social connections and networks; technophilia; and ideological. The economic and sustainability

motivators for participation differ because sustainability is likely to increase positive attitudes towards the sharing economy but the economic benefits are more likely to increase participation over the sustainability motivators (Hamari, Sjöklint, & Ukkonen, 2015). With a broad spectrum of motivations into the sharing economy, it results in various platforms and innovations surfacing.

Within sharing economies, there is substantial focus on technological innovation. Differing from some grassroots focus on the social innovations, it is argued that the sharing economy predominantly emerged out of growing technological innovations and access to online platforms (Schor, 2014; Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2009). Ebay and Craigslist are said to be starting points for what is coined the “new sharing economy” as they are some of the first examples of bringing strangers together to share (Schor, 2014). Furthermore, some scholars studying the sharing economy focus on the use of the internet and mobile apps to conduct research into the technological phenomenon of sharing economies. For example, some study the use of sharing websites and the utilization of the internet for car sharing and Airbnb, for example (Belk, 2014; Hamari et al., 2015; Schor, 2014). The technological innovations of sharing economies contribute to alternative systems of provision as important instruments for creating technological niches within sociotechnical regimes.

Car sharing schemes is contentious in the literature on the sharing economy. Some scholars differentiate car sharing from the sharing economy, defining it as “access-based” consumption where there is no shared ownership but rather strictly a sharing of access (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012). However, for this study car sharing is included in the sharing economy. In car sharing, it is found that participants prioritize self-interest and utilitarianism; they see the participation in car sharing as a market exchange rather than an aspect of sharing, and are

predominantly concerned with cost-saving (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012; Mohlmann, 2008).

Despite critique of car sharing within the sharing economy, several car sharing organizations offer significant social and technological innovations that contribute to alternative systems of provision. For example, Green Move in Regione Lombardia, Italy is a car sharing scheme which seeks to use electric vehicles to make transportation more accessible and reduce ecological impacts of transportation (Luè, Colorni, & Nocerino, 2012). Car Sharing is significant to sustainable and sociotechnical transitions in urban settings. With an increase in urbanization, car sharing facilitates less individual ownership of cars reducing the presence of cars in urban centers. Reduced presence of cars in urban centers assists in making cycling, walking, and modes of public transportation more efficient, as seen in Bremen, Germany (Glotz-Richter, 2012). Although car-sharing initiatives are critiqued for corporatization and profit-based models, many forms have been integral in offering alternative systems of provision and promoting sustainable urban consumption.

The example of car share outlines several themes within the sharing economy literature. The use of traditional market exchanges is contentious. Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) argue that “market-mediated type of access [sharing] does not produce a sense of joint or perceived ownership and is not prosocial but instead is primarily guided by self-serving and utilitarian motivation and negative reciprocity toward the accessed object, firm and other consumers.” (p. 895). The problem of individualization and utilitarianism in the sharing economy is countered through not-for-profit, peer-to-peer sharing economy initiatives. In a study done on sharing events that omit the use of monetary transactions, it is found the events can be a space to bring a diverse group of people together and contribute to community engagement. These spaces of sharing also attempt to extend the life cycle of a product and are anti-consumptive in their

motives (Albinsson & Yasanthi Perera, 2012). Yet, community-based sharing events of this nature are also grassroots and face issues of niche diffusion. These innovations do have the possibility to move into the larger sociotechnical regime but are limited in government and corporate policies because of their lack of monetary exchanges (Albinsson & Yasanthi Perera, 2012; Seyfang & Longhurst, 2015). This study takes into consideration the various nuances presented in the sharing economy literature through including for-profit and not-for-profit sharing economy case studies.

2.5 Summary

Alternative systems of provision are imbedded in a critique of the sociotechnical regimes dominate Western constructions of the economic, political, and social systems. The theories and literature are used throughout this study to highlight broad themes and problems present in alternative systems of provision. In striving for ecological sustainability, social equity, and a greater sense of community, parallels can be drawn between grassroots innovations, the Transition Movement, sociotechnical transitions, and multiple elements of the sharing economy to contribute to the understandings of alternative systems of provision. Within this study of Car Share HFX, the Halifax Tool Library, and Off The Hook, this literature is used to contextualize the state of alternative systems of provision abroad and locally.

Chapter 3 Methods

3.1 Assumptions and Rationale for a Qualitative Design

This study is explorative and uses qualitative methods to acquire data. This gives insight into the narratives of the groups being studied (Gillham, 2000). Given that there is no research done on alternative systems of provision in Halifax, this study uses qualitative methods to obtain data that contributes to a greater understanding of alternative systems of provision and the obstacles and successes they face.

Qualitative research methods help uncover narratives within organizations and create understandings of phenomena; they are used to obtain the perspective of those involved in alternative systems of provision. The qualitative methodology for this study is case study research. This case study research uses semi-structured interviews and analysis of documents produced by and about the organizations. Case study research is most effective for this study to obtain an understanding of phenomenon that is occurring; it can help acquire more information and describe the nuances better than closed-ended research methods, such as the use of closed-ended questionnaires (Woodside, 2010). Case study research helps create a holistic understanding of topics and builds knowledge of examples of the phenomenon that may be used for theory development and further studies (Flyvbjerg, 2006). In studying alternative systems of provision, case study research is effective in obtaining data to support the purpose of this research.

3.2 The Type of Design Used

This research contains three case studies, studying separate organizations participating in alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The three case studies are the Halifax Tool Library (HTL), CarShare Atlantic, and Off The Hook.

In each case study, open-ended semi-structured interviews with 1-3 individuals are conducted. Participants are in administrative, organizational, or leadership roles within the organizations. The problem-centered interview (PCI) style, outlined by Witzel (2000), will guide the structure of these interviews. PCI has three components which assist in data collection. First, PCI incorporates problem-centered orientation where the researcher must work to reach a degree of understanding of the conditions of the research group to formulate meaningful and well developed interview questions. Second, objection orientation asserts methodological flexibility is needed in the interview. Semi-structured interviews allow for flexibility to expand on topics which surface in the interview. Thirdly, process orientation encourages cooperation between the interviewer and the interviewee so that a degree of trust is established to allow the interviewee to answer truthfully and have confidence in the research (Witzel, 2000). Due to time limits the first component is not incorporated, however, measures are taken to include the latter two. To establish flexibility and trust, semi-structured interviews are used and trustful relationships are built through member-checking and ensuring ongoing and informed consent. PCI establishes a framework for effect data collection and allows opportunities for flexibility.

Data is coded per the dominant themes, key words and phrases that surface throughout the interview. To analyze the data, theories and literature on sociotechnical transitions are applied to draw comparisons between other findings on alternative systems of provision and the experiences of those in Halifax. This also helps outline contrasting experiences. Refer to Appendix D for a diagram on research design and process.

3.3 The Role of the Researcher

Given that this study involves interactions with human subjects, the role of the researcher is to establish trustworthiness with the participants. In conducting this research, provisions for meeting credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are adopted to adhere to standards of qualitative research (Shenton, 2004). In adopting Shenton's (2004) recommended provisions for qualitative research, the following are conducted by the researcher: to ensure credibility I use well-recognized methods; interact with participants according to the guidelines of The Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics (PRE); debrief and accept feedback from advisors and colleagues; and conduct member checks. Transferability is assured through giving adequate information on the design of the study while outlining the boundaries and limits. Dependability is achieved through clear depictions of the theoretical frameworks and the descriptions of methods and research instruments. Confirmability is done through methods descriptions, and limits and delimitations. In addition to these provisions, a research audit trail is conducted (Appendix D) to allow the reader to interpret the process of events and research design throughout the study (Carcary, 2009). Overall, the role of the research is to ensure the quality of this qualitative study under the supervision of thesis advisor.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

The data collection includes two components: (i) interviews and (ii) document collection. First, open-ended, semi-structured interviews are done with 6 participants (1 – 3 from each case study). To collect data from interviews, this study had to be approved by the Research Ethics Board at Dalhousie University. The interviews are recorded and transcribed for coding and analysis. To recruit participants, eligible individuals are contacted through an invitation email (appendix A). Upon agreeing to participate, a consent form (Appendix B) is reviewed between

myself and the participant. The interview is guided by an interview guide (Appendix C). The use of quotations and transcripts are approved in the publication of this study through member checking.

Documents and media are collected that are produced by and about the chosen organizations. These documents include statements on the organization's websites, media articles, and information posted on the organizations social media platforms. A total of 29 articles published in local newspapers, blogs, and other websites were collected to analyze. 8 articles were acquired about the Halifax Tool Library, 6 about CarShare Atlantic, and 5 about Off the Hook. In addition to this, all the organizations websites were used to collect data.

3.5 Methods for verification

The main method for verification in this study is member checking. Member checking in qualitative research gives participants the opportunity to engage in the research process through approving the use of the information provided (Carlson, 2010). Member checking is done through sending any use of quotations or sets of transcriptions that are published directly to the participant for approval. This process is integral to conducting trustworthy qualitative research and may mitigate any problems with the misuse or misinterpretation of data from the participant. It also assures that the findings from the study accurately reflect the participant's experiences, verifying the validity of the findings from the research.

3.6 Analysis and Coding

To analyze the data collected, an online qualitative research program is used (Dedoose). Interview transcriptions and collections of media and documents are uploaded and coded. All documents are protected through password encryption. Twenty-five codes (see Figure 1 for codes) are created that are based on key themes brought out during the interviews and informed

by the literature review. The interview transcriptions, media, and documents are coded for analysis (see Chapter 4).

Codes	Sub-Codes
Organizational Goals	Social Impact Ecological Sustainability Economic Sustainability Goal Changes
Areas of Success	Growth Partnerships Social Benefits Diffusing Ideas
Obstacles	Financial Challenges Government Policy Human Capital Awareness
Future Goals	Growth New Initiatives New Partnerships
Diffusing Ideas (Niche Theories)	
The Sharing Economy	
Organizational Structures	

Table 1: Codes for Analysis

Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

4.1 Case Study Profiles

The three case studies are the Halifax Tool Library, CarShare Atlantic, and Off the Hook. The Halifax Tool Library (HTL) was established in 2013 and works to provide an avenue for shared ownership of tools in Halifax. HTL is a not-for-profit organization operating in the North End of Halifax. Members contribute a yearly \$50 membership fee to the library and can access the library during open hours (Halifax Tool Library, 2016). CarShare Atlantic, formerly called CarShare HFX, is a for-profit car sharing organization in Halifax where members can book times to access a car at allocated locations. The organization began in 2008 and continues to exist (CarShare Atlantic, 2016). Starting in 2010 under the Ecology Action Centre, Off the Hook aimed to bring local and sustainable sourced fish to consumers while providing adequate payment to fishers. To do this, they created a foundation for a Community Shared Fishery (CFS) in Halifax. Off the Hook has since dissolved their Community Shared Fishery season as of June 2016 (Off The Hook, 2016). In the interviews conducted, it is found that the community shared fishery model has been adopted and adapted by two Halifax organizations: Afishianado Fishmongers and Hooked Halifax.

4.2 Identified Goals

The goals are organized between ecological sustainability and social impact. The social impact includes organizational intentions to bring economic prosperity to consumers and producers to alleviate significant financial barriers for accessing goods and services.

Each organization has an overarching goal that guides their operations. For Off the Hook, Interviewee A claimed:

“We were creating market mechanisms for increasing the value of small-scale, community-based fishers and raising the profile and level of awareness around the importance of seafood, and we were creating market mechanisms that reflect price fairness. The overall idea is for consumers to start paying a price that reflects the reality of the sustainability value proposition”

For the HTL, Interviewee F claimed:

“The core mission statement is putting underused tools in the hands of people that need them. That’s probably always going to remain the number one purpose of the Halifax Tool Library.”

And for CarShare Atlantic, Interviewee B said:

“The goal was to create a car mobility option without owning a vehicle. If people do not have mobility options they are isolated and their opportunities of prosperity are limited. The more modes (options) people have to move around for transportation the more prosperous we will be as a society.”

Off the Hook goals focus on social equity through their attempts to create market mechanisms that allow small-scale fishing to continue. HTL strives for social equity through increased access to tools and attempting to meet the needs of people in the community; HTL interviewees stress the importance of accessibility to the low-income population in Halifax. CarShare Atlantic goals are oriented around social prosperity through intending to benefit all components of transportation in Halifax.

4.2.1 Motivations: Ecological Sustainability

The case studies each have motivations that relate to ecological sustainability. CarShare Atlantic interviewees identify reduction in emissions from less cars on the road as their main

contributor to sustainability. HTL and Off the Hook's main ecological benefits are respectively: reducing the use of raw material consumption through reducing individual consumption of tools and supporting sustainable fishing practices.

CarShare Atlantic intends to reduce emissions through limiting the individual ownership of cars. CarShare Atlantic interviewees identified that car sharing operations have the capacity to reduce individual ownership of cars; they said that some members of CarShare Atlantic got rid of their owned vehicles because of their access to CarShare cars. Regarding reduced emissions and car culture, interviewee C state:

“Moving beyond car culture is a big thing that we have to push for and people don't always understand or value it. Everyone has different values but when you look at the reduction in greenhouse gases from car sharing it is important.”

Off the Hook also encouraged a reduced ecological impact through encouraging the consumption of sustainable seafood. Off the Hook prioritizing small-scale hook and line fishers as they claim the impacts on the oceans are lessened as opposed to industrial trawling fishing operations. To do this, they work to bring sustainable fish to individuals and also large institutions. In Off the Hook's blog *Small Scales*, Cantafio (2015) wrote:

“we're also continuing to engage with Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the fishing industry to ensure that conservation measures are in place for species-at-risk that are caught in the groundfish fishery, and to increase awareness about the importance of these species. We hope that this work will help further reduce the impact of the bottom longline fishery in particular.”

HTL's ecological impacts focus more on changing what interviewee D refers to as an “industrial culture” where their work is particularly focused on reducing individualized consumption that is

dominant in Western culture. They do this through their work in the sharing economy and attempting to change values and consumption behaviours.

Off the Hook, CarShare Atlantic, and HTL create new avenues for sustainable consumption in Halifax. They intend to create more sustainable society while also trying to change the systems upon which consumers acquire their goods, such as through sharing or increased education on what they're consuming.

4.2.2 Motivations: Economic Sustainability and Social Benefits

Social benefits, such as a greater sense of community or providing economic benefits, motivate alternative systems of provision and is a dominant focus in all three case studies. In the goals of the organizations, the three case studies contribute to social benefits through mitigating the economic impacts of current systems of provision. Halifax Tool Library and CarShare Atlantic target economic benefits for consumers through their participation in the sharing economy. Interviewee F states:

“We do have a policy that if someone is having financial difficulties we'll do our best to accommodate their needs because we're not about restricting access but about improving people's access to tools whenever possible. It doesn't do the Halifax Tool Library much good but it does that one person some good.”

Interviewees stressed that CarShare membership as opposed to car ownership can save members roughly \$5000 to \$7000 through not having to pay for gasoline, car maintenance, and the costs of purchasing the car. Interviewee B states:

“The money saved from not owning a car and using carsharing, is being spent on things other than car culture; it's being spent on vacations with their kids, an extra soccer or piano lesson, and for most part back into the local economy.”

These economic incentives are intended to save community members money. In saving money, it is CarShare Atlantic's intentions that the saved money is going to stimulate the local economy.

Interviewees from the Halifax Tool Library focused on the topic of inclusion and economic accessibility of tools, stressing the expense of tools as a barrier for many low-income people. CarShare Atlantic implements a variety of plans to make membership affordable for people. CarShare Atlantic Interviewees brought up engaging with students, low-income people, and single parents to mitigate the financial barriers of transportation in Halifax (see *Successes: Social benefits*).

Off the Hook approached social impacts and economic benefits through attempting to disrupt the commodity chain of seafood. Interviewee A claimed

“If seafood is just a commodity and everyone gets paid the same then you incentivize the industrialization of fishing. There's no incentive to be a small-scale hook and line ground fisher.”

Off the Hook sought to decommodify the commodity chain through fair pricing so fishers, processors, and distributors can receive a price that reflects the labour and value of small-scale hook and line caught ground fish (Off the Hook, 2016). Interviewee A stressed that their goal is to give fishers more agency and safety in their work through trying to encourage consumer payment that allows them to avoid fishing in dangerous conditions. These goals of social benefits and economic feasibility in Off the Hook are to preserve a sustainable but endangered fishing industry that is being squandered through competition with industrialized fishing operations. In a radio segment, Off the Hook fisher Bo Gillis argues that there are no livelihoods for communities with industrial fishing operations that “pillage for hundreds of fish.” (Boutillier, 2011). Off the

Hook's goals of a new market mechanism were guided through social benefit and economic equity to benefit local fishing communities.

The economic benefits of the three case studies arise differently and impact the organizations ability to sustain their operations or make a profit. As shown, CarShare Atlantic and HTL target benefiting consumers through making goods and services, such as transportation, more affordable and accessible. This is likely to increase the number of people who use CarShare Atlantic and HTL. In contrast, Off the Hook gives economic benefits to the fishers to support their more sustainable fishing practices. Customers of Off the Hook reported through a survey that they were satisfied with the products and prices of their CSF products (Knox, 2011). Despite satisfaction with products and prices, Interviewees expressed that their main demographic were still upper class white Haligonians because of the cheaper prices that industrialized fishing operations can offer to those on a strict budget. This limited demographic hindered the reach of Off the Hook to bring sustainable seafood to the broader population of Halifax. This created challenges for Off the Hook where rather than incentivizing consumers through costs and savings they had to work to change values and perceptions of the fishing industry.

4.3 Successes

Successes in alternative systems of provision are all measured in relation to the organizations economic growth, the introduction of new ideas, establishing partnerships, and creating social benefits for community.

4.3.1 Economic Growth

CarShare Atlantic experienced the most economic growth out of the three case studies. The organization started in 2008 with 9 cars and now has 44 cars and a membership of over 1200 people. This amount of growth was the largest in comparison to HTL and Off the Hook. HTL's

growth is more about volunteer and board growth. Interviewee E expressed that the organization has tripled its numbers of volunteers in the last year. Interviewees also spoke of the high volume of tools donations where they now have over 1300 tools in the library. HTL's membership goal is 200 members to pay for operating costs, and during the time of the interviews (January) they had reached 152 which meant they needed another 48 by April for the end of their fiscal year. With more volunteers they're able to open more days of the week and longer. Yet, with limited economic growth this create a challenge for HTL. Off the Hook's economic growth was a significant challenge. Interviewees preferred to keep exact revenue numbers out of the study. The interviewees stressed that because the CFS and their operations were experimental they ran into growth problems when discovering that some of their operations could not be scaled-up.

4.3.2 Diffusion of ideas

All three case studies reveal that introducing alternative systems of provision into the dominant sociotechnical regime is met with resistance, misunderstandings, and policy and by-law restraints. Given that diffusing is challenging for alternative systems of provision, growth through introducing new ideas are indicators of success. Each organization attempts to change the consumption norms of Halifax. For example, Off the Hook Interviewee A stated:

“The average consumer is waking up. The more that we can influence people towards these principles the better. We're infiltrating spaces that would have been impossible ten years ago.”

HTL and CarShare Atlantic stressed the importance of changing member attitudes about ownership, possession, and sharing. They indicate that this is a goal of participating in the sharing economy. Participants from Carshare Atlantic state that before their existence Nova Scotia did not have a car sharing operation and claim that through changing perceptions of

individual ownership they could change the transportation infrastructure of the City of Halifax.

Further, HTL interviewee D stated:

“The Halifax Tool Library creates a sense of inspiration and surprise. I think it’s a learning tool because members are taken out of any firm position on ownership and possession and are able to see new opportunity.”

The interviewees of all three case studies believe that their organizations are changing the perceptions of their members, the public, and government, and businesses. More research is needed to determine the impact that these organizations have or have had for people.

4.3.3 Partnerships

The partnerships of all three organizations propel their ability to diffuse ideas and garner community, business, and governmental support. CarShare Atlantic and Off the Hook primarily focus on business and government partnerships. CarShare Atlantic during the time of their rebranding partnered with a large carsharing company Communauto, based out of Montreal. Through this partnership, CarShare Atlantic opened new opportunities for their members; Interviewee B stated:

“Now that we’ve partnered with Communauto’s reservation system, if you become a member of CarShare Atlantic you can also use the cars in Ottawa, Quebec City, Montreal, Kingston, Sherbrooke, Gatineau, and Paris (France).”

The partnership with Communauto gave CarShare Atlantic more resources; they now use Communauto reservation systems and Interviewee C state that they often work with them to get help on marketing. An integral component of the partnership was that it kept their rates low.

Interviewee B stressed that if the organization were to invest in created the reservation software

and all associated technology for operating a car sharing organization then their rates would have to be much larger.

Off the Hook identified partnerships as effective means to decommodify industrialized seafood. Through receiving a grant with the JW McConnell Family, Off the Hook set out to put local seafood in Nova Scotian Hospitals. Regarding this, interviewee A stated:

“If any institution has the most constrained prices margins given their ability to spend it would be hospitals. If we could get a hospital to start serving this type of seafood then no other institution would have an excuse.”

Although Off the Hook supplied hospitals with local seafood because of changes in the hospitals group purchasing organization and the loss of institutional champions in the hospitals they were only able to do so for a short period of time. These partnerships with various institutions and businesses helped Off the Hook and CarShare Atlantic work to change systems of provision. This contributes to the finding of Kemp et al. (1998) and Seyfang and Pavoola (2008) through the creation of partnerships they were able to expand their niches and diffuse their ideas more easily.

Although Halifax Tool Library participated in business and government institutional partnerships, interviewees stressed that their partnerships were more oriented around community partnerships. Some of these partnerships include the Dalhousie Urban Garden Society, Nova Scotia Public Research Interest Group (NSPIRG). Interviewee F also mentioned that they're looking to build a partnership with the Immigration Services Association of Nova Scotia (ISANS).

4.3.4 Social Benefits

Social benefits were a dominant theme that interviewees focused on in this study. Other studies have found that alternative systems of provision and grassroots initiatives have an aptitude for social equity and community building (Seyfang & Pavaola, 2008; Seyfang & Smith, 2007). Interviewees of all three case studies pressed the importance of building community and striving for social equity.

Halifax Tool Library's social benefits hone in on marginalized communities. Interviewees expressed the importance of equity policies that can alleviate social dynamics which are harmful to marginalized communities, such as women and transgender volunteer-run shifts. Regarding policies, interviewee E said:

"We've done work on our membership policy to account for accessibility and the stratification of the membership. We've also done some work on our diversity and social inclusion policy."

HTL is perceived as a spot for community building and collective innovation as members exchange ideas and help each other with projects. Volunteers of HTL claim that access to tools and new skills is empowering for community members, stressing that there are a plethora of barriers to tool access and the HTL helps mitigate those (Dingwell, 2016). Interviewees identified some of these barriers to tool access are related to broader social issues, such as class, gender, and sexuality. Class is a barrier because of the expense of tools that some people struggling economically may not be able to access. Gender and sexuality barriers are related where interviewees understood that spaces focusing on tools are often dominated by men which can limit the accessibility to tools for some people due to persistence violence against women and the LGTBQ+ community. These issues all hinder people's ability to gain tool literacy, which is an understanding of tool usage. To overcome these barriers, HTL has taken several steps such

as a new program “Do It Herself”, a workshop for and by women only to increase tool literacy. As mentioned in section 4.2.2, they are flexible on their membership fees to accommodate low-income people. Additionally, Interviewee E said that they were consulting with the LGBTQ+ community to work through barriers the community faces to tool access and increase knowledge and awareness of HTL.

The social benefits of Off the Hook and CarShare Atlantic are financially oriented. For CarShare Atlantic saving members’ money was one of their biggest successes. Interviewees stressed that CarShare Atlantic members on average spend less than \$2000 per year while according to CAA car ownerships spend \$7000 to \$10000. These savings are one of the larger incentives, according to interviewees, for car owners to switch to carsharing. In addition to the overall savings Interviewees mention economic savings package that CarShare Atlantic offers some members, such as the “Dynamic Duo” package. This package gives people with Metro Transit passes (UPASS) access to CarShare Atlantic for \$8/month and receive a 12.5% discount off the cost of their UPASS (CarShare Atlantic, 2017). CarShare Atlantic benefits its members through saving them money; this likely contributes to their success and social traction in Halifax.

Off the Hook interviewees stressed contributing to economic sustainability in small coastal communities of Nova Scotia. Although at its small scale, the impacts on small coastal communities were enough that they were helping some fishers better their chances of economic sustainability in hook and line fishing (Ecology Action Centre, 2010). The economic benefits of Off the Hook did not transfer to the consumer, meaning that consumers often had to pay higher prices for the fish; this likely contributed to more obstacles for the organization.

4.4 Obstacles

Obstacles for each case study include public awareness, financial challenges, human capital, and policy/government based. The absence of public awareness of the organization is determined as an obstacle; financial challenges are when an organization struggled to acquire funding or funding threatened their operations; human capital is the amount of people they have working or contributing to the organization; and policy/government based refers to instances where government policies restricted initiatives.

4.4.1 Awareness and Difficulty Diffusing Ideas

Awareness is a challenge for all three organizations in their ability to introduce new ideas into Halifax and Nova Scotia. Kemp et al. (1998) and Seyfang and Smith (2007) identify diffusion as a major challenge in alternative systems of provision; their findings hold true to this study.

For the HTL, awareness impacts their ability to fulfill their goals and receive adequate funding. Interviewees stressed that awareness of their existence and what their purpose is integral for their growth. To help them mitigate these challenges, Interviewee F said:

“We’re doing everything we can as a working board to raise the exposure of the Halifax Tool Library so that people know about us. We usually see a spike in volunteers, donations, and members following a media event.”

Much of the HTL awareness barriers revolve around infiltrating spaces outside of the do-it-yourself community. Interviewees wanted an increase in members from marginalized and low-income communities to fulfill their mandate.

CarShare Atlantic’s awareness obstacles manifested differently. They faced obstacles of awareness and understanding in achieving institutional partners, where many had difficulty understanding car sharing or did not want to partner with another business. In the case of students,

Student Car Share, a separate car sharing entity, was partnered with Dalhousie Student Union until the company closed. In response to this, Interviewee B claimed:

“In 2015 Dalhousie Student Union endorsed Student Car Share who was really a car rental agency and who had only two cars at the time when CarShare Atlantic had over thirty. I am not sure why they went with Student Car Share, it may have been because they had title “Student Car Share” but in reality it had nothing to do with students. We were local, established, cheaper and more accessible for students. It was really a mistake to not at least talk to CarShare Atlantic to find out what would be more viable for students.”

CarShare Atlantic has taken several steps to overcome these challenges and changed their policies to cater more to students. In several media publications, CarShare Atlantic representatives promoted the fact that they reduced their age requirements from 21 to 18 (Mutton, 2016; Metro, 2016).

Off the Hook expressed concerns over public awareness on the state of the fishing industry. Interviewees stress that hook and line fishing is no longer profitable but that fishery stocks are being pillaged by industrialized fishing. They wanted more public awareness on the state of the fishing industry in order to create a values shift that could inform consumption behaviour. Changing consumer values is difficult for Off the Hook because it requires convincing their customers to pay more for a product.

4.3.2 Financial Challenges

Financial challenges did not surface as a significant barrier for CarShare Atlantic. The lack of financial challenges is likely attributed to their partnership with Communauto because of their increased access to reservation services. Interviewee B said that car sharing organizations have existed in Canada and Europe for much longer and the organization was able to take

policies and best practices to adapt them for Halifax; this meant that starting and operating a car sharing organization was easier because best practices can be adopted from other organizations. More significantly, Car sharing organizations are in much higher demand than a tool library or sustainable fishing industry and, thus, have a better likelihood of economic success.

Off the Hook and The Halifax Tool Library expressed greater concern over financial barriers. The Halifax Tool Library receives very limited funding. When the HTL opened, organizers told Metro News that they needed 250 members to cover their operating costs (Clark, 2014). With their intended growth plans and desires to hire staff, these membership costs are unlikely to grant the HTL enough funding. Interviewee F said:

“The challenges of having a staff are of course funding and the funding available is almost entirely centered around programs. That’s a serious challenge because there’s just no way we will be able to afford staff with just a 200 member per year income.”

Following a similar question, interviewee E stated:

“It’s still going to take time, unless we got a massive grant I can’t see us having a paid staff member under our current funding model for at least another three to five years.”

The financial barriers of the HTL threatened the longevity of the organization and is a significant challenge. The HTL interviewees stressed that this is a significant concern of the board of directors and is being addressed in their growth plan.

Off the Hook’s financial obstacles relate to infiltrating the seafood market for institutions (such as universities and hospitals) and convincing consumers pay higher prices so small-scale fishers could get payment that reflected their labour. Accordingly, Interviewee A said:

“The average consumer is driven primarily by costs and savings before any consideration of organic, local, artisan, etc. We needed to figure out how to infiltrate the markets that focus on savings and costs.”

Breaking into new market places to achieve a sustainable market demand was one of the most emphasized financial obstacles of Off the Hook. Figuring out how to enter markets driven by costs and savings was a more significant obstacle for Off the Hook in comparison to CarShare Atlantic and HTL because their products were focused on values and ethical payment of fishers. This is challenging when working in markets of costs and savings and trying to convince consumers to pay more for a product.

4.3.3 Human Capital

Human capital is the amount of employee and/or volunteer capacity that each organization had. CarShare Atlantic, Off the Hook, and the HTL all identified this as a major challenge. CarShare Atlantic’s human capital obstacles revolved more around their rate of growth and the eventual need to expand their employee numbers. In contrast, HTL and Off the Hook saw human capital exhaustion in their efforts to diffuse their ideas and garner support for their operations. An Off the Hook interviewee referred to ‘*sweat equity*’ as finite, stating:

“Sweat equity is the amount of effort you’re putting into your work. So, if you’re waking up in the middle of the morning to drive from Brier Island to Digby just to sell fish it wears on you and you run out of energy. We ran out of sweat equity.”

Additionally, interviewees and media accounts of the HTL stress that some board members and volunteer may dedicate between 5 and 30 hours per week to the organization. Limited amount of people and energy limits the operations of each case study.

4.3.4 Policy and/or government based

Government policies and bylaws did not directly conflict with the organizations but created obstacles that they needed to navigate. CarShare Atlantic worked to change city bylaws to allow for on-street parking of their cars and was able to use other cities as examples for how the city could do that (Bundale, 2015). Regarding working with the city, Interviewee C said:

“We’ve had a lot of meetings with the city to get them to see our vision. Being an organization that is looking ahead, it’s hard to find that in others. Which is frustrating when a city should be planning for 50 years in advance.”

Off the Hook saw the most institutional barriers. Interviewee A mentioned that international trade agreements are difficult to navigate because buyers are not supposed to favour local industries. These trade agreement barriers were challenging for Off the Hook when entering into public-sector institutions such as hospitals. To enter into these institutions, an interviewee said that they had to bring local seafood in the middle of the night and have it received by the janitorial staff of the hospital in order to have their seafood sampled. The Nova Scotia moratoria on ground fish (pollock, cod, halibut, etc.) processing licenses created another policy barrier where Off the Hook is not able to use their own processing plant and they still have to buy their fish back from a second-hand fish processor.

4.4 Organizational structures

The organizational structures changed the levels of success, goals, and the way each case study operated in the city. Off the Hook and CarShare Atlantic are social enterprises while the HTL uses a not-for-profit model. This impacts the administration of the organizations.

The HTL interviewees expressed fatigue because of the demanding nature of an unpaid working board of directors. They identified that for a not-for-profit organization, many felt comfortable with the state of the board, however, understood that there was a common pattern of

burn out. Board members are required to do volunteer shifts as well as other administrative tasks, Interviewee D claimed:

“Those of us who were actively volunteering were getting burned out. I spent about a year doing one of the behind-the-counter shifts every week largely alone and it was tiring”

The difficulties of being a not-for-profit wore on the board’s volunteer capacity.

CarShare Atlantic had difficulties forming partnerships with some institutions because they felt it was not ethical to endorse a for-profit business like CarShare Atlantic. To address some of these barriers CarShare Atlantic sought BCORP certification. B Corporations seek to establish more transparency and accountability in the for-profit business sector; B Corporation Certified businesses are monitored, evaluate, and verified by a separate entity. Most importantly, B Corporations are accountable to all stakeholders rather than just shareholders. Accountability to stakeholders changes the dynamic of a ‘corporation’ as it is conventionally limited to maximizing profits for shareholders (B Lab, 2016). Yet, the organization still saw resistance to partnerships. Interviewee C said:

“That’s something we really struggle with; people assume that we’re only there to sell our product. We’re not about that, we’re about advocating for integrated mobility and having mobility for everyone to make Halifax a better place to get around and an overall better city to live in.”

Off the Hook struggled with their social enterprise structure because of their affiliations with the Ecology Action Centre (EAC). Interviewees identified that Off the Hook with a for-profit model was technically administered by a not-for-profit (EAC). This posed challenges because Off the Hook was ultimately accountable to meeting the mandate of the EAC. Meeting the needs of a not-for-profit as a for-profit organization was not working with Off the Hook.

Interviewee A attributed this to the nature of the industrialized fishing industry because for Off the Hook to disrupt the seafood commodity chain they would need scale-up their operations beyond the community shared fishery to start a larger entity. This was beyond the EACs scope; operating as a for-profit organization would have more challenges trying to meet the mandate of a not-for-profit.

4.6 Future Goals

All three case studies have future goals of growth. Although Off the Hook no longer operates, Hooked Halifax and Afishianado Fish Mongers have picked up on the original goals of Off the Hook and intend to continue building a sustainable seafood industry in Nova Scotia. One of the goals of Off the Hook was to develop what an interviewee described as a “seafood hub” for Nova Scotia that includes all stakeholders of the local fishing industry to build resiliency for local small-scale fisheries. Off the Hook dissolved in 2016, however, the work of establishing a sustainable seafood industry was adopted by Hooked Halifax and Afishianado Fishmongers, who according to an interviewee have adopted similar values to the Off the Hook CFS model. In regards to the future of the Seafood Hub, interviewee A said:

“Hopefully we can contribute to some sort of rural economic renaissance in Nova Scotia so that all the young people don’t need to live in HRM and can maybe move into the country again. We want to bring money back to the local communities and out of the hands of big, rich corporations and monopolies that are destroying our province.”

CarShare Atlantic intends to grow through diffusing new innovations into the social and governmental fabric of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and Atlantic Canada. The overall future vision for CarShare Atlantic is what Interviewee B said a ‘regional approach’ where they can have CarShare Atlantic operate in various places such as Moncton, PEI, Fredricton, etc. Beyond

expansions and new partnerships, CarShare Atlantic interviewee C said their vision for the future is:

“to have other modes of transportation be more normal for the future; for people not to question car sharing and have them understand what car sharing means.”

The HTL interviewees identified a plethora of new growth plans and organizational changes to help mitigate the challenges and obstacles. Regarding their desires to be accessible to marginalized and lower-income communities, a future plan is to expand their operations beyond one centralized location. Interviewee F brought up the idea of satellite libraries around HRM or to implement a mobile tool library that can reach rural communities outside of Halifax. These new initiatives are an attempt to bring the HTL outside of the North End of Halifax. The HTL future plans for operations are to establish better governance and policies to keep the organization sustainable and able to meet future trajectories. In the long term, interviewee E aspires for a nationwide tool library network by saying:

“What if one day we were all under one umbrella or one not-for-profit title? We could have all policies shared and franchise the not-profit in some way. We could have on the ground policy difference but we’re all governed under the same type of service and website so it would make everything easier for everyone.”

The future goals of all three organizations are congruent with Kemp et Al. (1998) theory of strategic niche management. Through their respective goals and plans, CarShare Atlantic is entering into stages four and five: (4) scaling-up the experiment through various policy initiatives; and (5) breaking-down the niche protection and introducing the innovation as embedded in the sociotechnical paradigm. Through expansion plans, restructuring the organizations, and distinct images for growth, CarShare Atlantic is trying to expand niches and

fabricate themselves into the dominant sociotechnical regime. With plans to reach a 100 car fleet and their 1200 members, CarShare Atlantic appears closest to doing this, however, the HTL and Off the Hook (Afishianado and Hooked Halifax) have strong aspirations to achieve this. HTL is increasing their volunteer capacity, consistently receiving more donations and have reached over 1300 tools in their library. Although Off the Hook no longer exists, Interviewee F stated that profits and public reach are much better with Afishianado and Hooked Halifax.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Future Research

Consumption in a systems of provision lens takes into consideration all stakeholders involved in the consumption of goods and services, including the producer, distributor, retailer, consumer, etc. Alternative systems of provision provide new opportunities for consumption focusing on ecological sustainability, greater sense of community, economic benefits, and social equity (Seyfang & Pavaola, 2008). Alternative systems of provision offer opportunities to mitigate the impacts of mass consumerism that contributes to climate change; it offers alternatives to a capitalist economic system and localize economic activities into communities.

This study aimed to obtain a greater understanding of alternative systems of provision and the successes and obstacles they face. Through studying CarShare Atlantic, the Halifax Tool Library, and Off the Hook, this contributes to the literature on alternative systems of provision. Identifying the goals, challenges, and successes of the organizations is useful to inform understandings of alternative systems of provision. The goals of the case studies were focused on ecological sustainability, social equity, and providing economic benefits for the consumers (HTL and CarShare Atlantic) and producers (Off the Hook). Their challenges are difficulty spreading awareness, financial barriers, lack of human capital, and government policy. Their successes are an introduction of new consumption opportunities, organizational growth, and social benefits through providing economic benefits (affordable and livability for consumers and producers), striving for societal prosperity (CarShare Atlantic), and working to engage marginalized communities (HTL). Partnerships with business, community groups, and government were established as integral for each case study to gain awareness and diffuse their ideas outside of their niches..

The case studies aim to provide various opportunities for consumers to acquire more ethical and, in some cases, affordable goods and services. CarShare, the HTL, and Off the Hook focus on the social and economic barriers that limit consumer accessibility to products. CarShare Atlantic aims to create and contribute to a multi-mode transportation system. HTL is attempting to reduce raw material consumption and increase accessibility of goods. Off the Hook sought to increase sustainable fishing practices and change the commodity chain of seafood. These goals are concerned with structural problems in consumption and do not solely focus on individualism, which is a common approach in mitigating excessive consumerism. Encouraging sustainable consumption through a systems of provision lens can give a more holistic understanding of the entire process of consumption.

Alternative systems of provision are commonly found in niche spaces. Strategic niche management (SNM) is useful in understanding alternative systems of provision and their relationship with the dominant sociotechnical regime (Kemp et al., 1998; Seyfang & Longhurst, 2015). Off the Hook and HTL were most relevant to early stages of SNM existing in smaller niches to foster community acceptance and to work out any initial challenges that surfaced. HTL did this through slowly increasing tool donations and volunteer capacity while Off the Hook did work to build institutional partnerships. CarShare Atlantic was at an advantage because of the higher demand and knowledge of car sharing organizations. Despite these advantages, CarShare Atlantic still faced challenges of diffusing their ideas. CarShare Atlantic's are the most successful regarding strategic niche management because of their high levels of growth from 2008 and numerous partnerships. Overall, the organizations are operating in niche spaces and are attempting to create alternative systems of provision to allow for consumption oriented around ecological sustainability, social equity, and economic benefits for consumers and producers.

Alternative systems of provision challenge the culture of individualized and commodified systems of provision. CarShare Atlantic encourages a transgression of car ownership in hope that a multi-mode transportation culture will emerge with a greater focus on transit, active transportation, and car sharing over individual car ownership. Off the Hook sought to provide alternatives to the dominance of the industrialized fishing market so that the small-scale sustainable fishing industry could continue. The Halifax Tool Library is providing tool accessibility and is subsequently reducing the need for individual ownership of tools. Through disrupting the dominant systems of provision, CarShare Atlantic, Off the Hook, and Halifax Tool Library create market spaces that can allow for various, more sustainable consumption and decrease the ecological impacts of consumption.

Future research is needed to account for the limitations of this study. Due to time restraints, the scope of the study was limited to three case studies and a small number of participants. Further research should be done to gain a greater understanding of the case studies, alternative systems of provision, and the Halifax sharing economy. The sharing economy's contribution to sustainable consumption should be studied to account for the varying definitions and organizations that participate in it. This study only studied the administrators of the organizations and did not include their memberships. As such, a study focusing on the memberships of alternative systems of provision is integral to investigate the extent that the organizations deliver social benefits and to gain an understanding of their membership demographic. To measure alternative system of provisions diffusion into the sociotechnical regime, a study attempting to measure public perception and awareness of the organization would be useful. In response to CarShare Atlantic's partnership with Communauto, a greater

understanding of this relationship, or ones similar, is important to understand car sharing organizations' position in alternative systems of provision.

This study focused on registered organizations (non-for-profit and social enterprises) that participate in alternative systems of provision. To get a better understanding of alternative systems of provision, non-registered, community-driven spaces should be studied. This includes online trading pages, buy and sell pages, and community clothing swaps. These spaces provide a unique niche that is useful in studying alternative systems of provision. Alternative systems of provision are diverse and this exploratory research contributes to consumption, sustainability, and sociotechnical literature.

Works Cited

- Albinsson, P. A., & Yasanthi Perera, B. (2012). Alternative marketplaces in the 21st century: Building community through sharing events. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(4), 303–315. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1389>
- Clark, B. (2015, October 4). Halifax Tool Library nails its grand opening. *MetroNews*. Retrieved from <http://www.metronews.ca/news/halifax/2014/10/04/halifax-tool-library-nails-its-grand-opening.html>
- Bayliss, K., Fine, B., & Robertson, M. (2013). From financialisation to consumption: The systems of provision approach applied to housing and water. Retrieved from: <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/16844/1/FESSUD-Working-Paper-02-.pdf>
- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2012). Access-Based Consumption: The Case of Car Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(December), 000–000. <http://doi.org/10.1086/666376>
- Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001>
- Boutillier, P. (2011, February 20). Nova Scotia's First Community Supported Fishery. *Halifax Media Co-op*. Retrieved from <http://halifax.mediacoop.ca/audio/nova-scotias-first-community-supported-fishery/6359>
- Brown, H. S., & Vergragt, P. J. (2016). From consumerism to wellbeing: toward a cultural transition? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 132, 308–317. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.107>
- Bundale, B. (2015, May 29). Shared cars could get residential parking passes. *The Chronicle Herald*. Retrieved from <http://thechronicleherald.ca/metro/1289750-shared-cars-could-get-residential-parking-passes>
- B Lab. (2016). Certified B Corps and Benefit Corporations. Retrieved from <https://www.bcorporation.net/what-are-b-corps/certified-b-corps-and-benefit-corporations>
- Cantafio, J. (2015, March 4). Finding a Place for Sustainable Seafood in Nova Scotia's Universities. *Small Scales*. Retrieved from <https://smallscales.ca/2015/03/04/finding-a-place-for-sustainable-seafood-in-nova-scotias-universities/>

- Carcary, M. (2009). The research audit trail-enhancing trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 7(1), 11–24. Retrieved from <http://www.ejbrm.com/issue/download.html?idArticle=198>
- Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding Traps in Member Checking. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1102–1113. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-5/carlson.pdf>
- CarShare Atlantic. (2016). *How it Works*. Retrieved from <https://www.carshareatlantic.ca/how-it-works/>
- Dingwell, R. (2016, April 16). Halifax Tool Library opens new space for growing community. *MetroNews*. Retrieved from <http://www.metronews.ca/news/halifax/2016/04/16/halifax-tool-library-opens-new-space-for-growing-community.html>
- Ecology Action Centre. (2010, June 10). Fresh Off the Hook. *Ecology Action Centre*. Retrieved from <https://ecologyaction.ca/content/fresh-hook-0>
- Feola, G., & Nunes, R. (2014). Success and failure of grassroots innovations for addressing climate change: The case of the transition movement. *Global Environmental Change*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.11.011>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.
- Glott-Richter, M. (2012). Car-Sharing – “Car-on-call” for reclaiming street space. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 48, 1454–1463. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.1121>
- Halifax Tool Library. (2016). *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://halifaxtoollibrary.ca/about-us/>
- Hargreaves, T., Hielscher, S., Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2013). Grassroots innovations in community energy: The role of intermediaries in niche development. *Global Environmental Change*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.02.008>
- Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2015). The Sharing Economy: Why People Participate in Collaborative Consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information*

Science and Technology, 1(1), 1–13. <http://doi.org/10.1002/asi>

Henwood, D. (2015, January 27). *What the Sharing Economy Takes*. The Nation. Retrieved from: <https://www.thenation.com/article/what-sharing-economy-takes/>

Kemp, R., Schot, J., & Hoogma, R. (1998). Regime shifts to sustainability through processes of niche formation The approach of strategic niche management. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 10(2), 175–198. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09537329808524310>

Knox, . (2011, April 28). Catch of the day: Community supported fishing launches in Nova Scotia with Off the Hook: “You’re buying into more than just the fish product.”. *The Coast*. Retrieved from <http://www.thecoast.ca/halifax/catch-of-the-day/Content?oid=2439822>

Luè, A., Colorni, A., Nocerino, R., & Paruscio, V. (2012). Green Move: An Innovative Electric Vehicle-Sharing System. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 48, 2978–2987. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.1265>

Martin, C. J. (2016). The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism? *Ecological Economics*, 121, 149–159. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.11.027>

Metro News Staff. (2016). CarShare Atlantic lowers minimum age requirement, adds car on Saint Mary's campus. *MetroNew*. Retrieved from <http://www.metronews.ca/news/halifax/2016/11/07/carshare-atlantic-lowers-minimum-age-requirement.html>

Mohlmann, M. (2008). Collaborative consumption: determinants of satisfaction and the likelihood of using a sharing economy option again. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 14(4), 193–207. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1512>

Mutton, J. (2016, May 3). 'A mobility love affair:' CarShare Atlantic expansion into residential Halifax faces road blocks. *MetroNews*. Retrieved from <http://www.metronews.ca/news/halifax/2016/05/03/carshare-atlantic-rebranding-and-expanding.html>

Off The Hook. (2016). *Off the Hook: Fair Fish From Nova Scotia*. Retrieved from <http://www.offthehookcsf.ca>

Schor, J. (2014). Debating the Sharing Economy. *Great Transition Initiative: toward a Transformation Vision and Praxis*, (October).

- Schor, J. B., & Fitzmaurice, C. J. (2009). 26 . Collaborating and connecting : the emergence of the sharing economy. *Handbook on research of sustainable consumption*, 410–425.
- Schot, J., & Geels, F. W. (2008). Strategic niche management and sustainable innovation journeys theory findings research agenda and policy. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 20(5), 537–554. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09537320802292651>
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63–75. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-618X.2000.tb00391.x>
- Seyfang, G. (2009). *The New Economics of Sustainable Consumption: Seeds of Change*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seyfang, G., & Haxeltine, A. (2012). Growing grassroots innovations : exploring the role of community-based initiatives in governing sustainable energy transitions, 30, 381–400. <http://doi.org/10.1068/c10222>
- Seyfang, G., & Longhurst, N. (2015). What influences the diffusion of grassroots innovations for sustainability? Investigating community currency niches. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 7325(July 2015), 1–23. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2015.1063603>
- Seyfang, G., & Paavola, J. (2008). Inequality and sustainable consumption: bridging the gaps. *Local Environment*, 13(8), 669–684. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13549830802475559>
- Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots Innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics*, 16(4), 584–603. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09644010701419121>
- Smith, A., Fressoli, M., & Thomas, H. (2014). Grassroots innovation movements: Challenges and contributions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.12.025>
- Witzel, A. (2000). The Problem-Centered Interview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(1), 142–150. <http://doi.org/1438-5627>
- Woodside, A. G. (2010). *Case Study Research : Theory, Methods and Practice*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Appendix

Appendix A: Letter of Invitation

[Date]

Title of Study: Innovations in Consumption: Three case studies of alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Lead Researcher: Chris Dufour, Student Lead Researcher, Dalhousie University

Faculty Supervisor: Anders Hayden, Dalhousie University

Dear [name],

I, Chris Dufour, am contacting you to invite you to participate in a research project entitled *Innovations in Consumption: three case studies of alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia*.

The purpose of this research is to contribute to a greater understanding of alternative systems of provision and opportunities and challenges they face. Systems of provision are the social and technological means through which products and services are acquired. Alternative systems of provision are means of acquisition that differ from the mainstream systems in their emphasis on goals of ecological sustainability, social equity, and a greater sense of community. I am focusing on grassroots initiatives, the sharing economy, and community groups looking to provide alternative ways for consumers to access goods and services.

In participating in this study, I am looking to conduct 45 to 60 minute interviews with individuals active in operations of organizations involved in creating alternative systems of provision. If committing 45 – 60 minutes is not within your capacity but you would like to partake in a shorter length interview, please let me know I will arrange to accommodate your available time.

As little research has been done on systems of provision in Halifax, this will likely contribute to the literature. This is an exploratory study and it is my hope that it will be helpful in directing future research on alternative systems of provision within Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Please let me know if you would be available to participate in this study or have any questions.

Thank you for considering participating in this study.

Best Regards,

Chris Dufour
Student Lead Researcher
Undergraduate Honours Student
(902) 222-3343
Chris.Dufour@dal.ca

Thesis Supervisor:
Anders Hayden
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Anders.Hayden@dal.ca

This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through Dalhousie University's Research Ethics [ethics file number]. If you have any ethical concerns about your participation in this research, you may also contact Research Ethics, Dalhousie University at (902) 494-1462, or ethics@dal.ca.

Appendix B: Consent Form



CONSENT FORM

Project title: Innovations in Consumption: Three case studies of alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Lead researcher:

Chris Dufour
Student Lead Researcher
Undergraduate in the College of Sustainability
(902) 222-3343
chris.dufour@dal.ca

Thesis Supervisor

Anders Hayden
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Anders.Hayden@dal.ca
(902) 404-6602, (902) 420-0468

Introduction

I invite you to take part in a research study being conducted by me, Chris Dufour, a student at Dalhousie University as part of my honours thesis project at Dalhousie University. Choosing to take part in this research is entirely your choice. The purpose of this study will be discussed below, followed by information about what is involved in the research, what you will be asked to do, information about any benefit, risk, inconvenience or discomfort that you might experience, and steps towards privacy and confidentiality.

You should discuss any questions you have about this study with Chris Dufour. Please ask as many questions as you like. If you have questions later, please contact Chris Dufour at chris.dufour@dal.ca or 902-222-3343, or Anders Hayden at Anders.Hayden@dal.ca, (902) 404-6602, or (902) 420-0468, at any time. You may also contact Research Ethics, Dalhousie University at (902) 494-1462, or ethics@dal.ca.

Purpose and Outline of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to gain a greater understanding of organizations participating in alternative systems of provision and the opportunities and obstacles that these organizations face. Systems of provision are the social and technological means through which products and services are acquired. Alternative systems of provision are means of acquisition that differ from the mainstream systems in their emphasis on goals of ecological sustainability, social equity, and

a greater sense of community. Literature surrounding alternative systems of provision, grassroots innovations, and the sharing economy outline several obstacles that these groups face. This research aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the goals, challenges, and areas of success in alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?
2. How have organizational intentions evolved over time and what factors have contributed to this evolution?
3. How can theories on technological and social innovations be applied to alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?

To do this research, interviews will be conducted with individuals from various groups that participate in alternative systems of provision.

Who Can Take Part in the Research Study?

Participants may include individuals who have been involved in administrative, organizational, or leadership roles within the selected organizations. This includes but is not limited to Board of Directors, CEO's (if applicable), administrative staff, or founders.

What You Will Be Asked to Do?

In participating in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview that will take approximately 45 – 60 minutes to complete. This process will occur one time in a predetermined and agreed upon location. The interview will be recorded for transcribing and further use of the study. Prior to publication or distribution of any material from the interviews, you will be asked to review and approve any quotations that the researcher would like to use from the interview.

Possible Benefits, Risks and Discomforts

Participating in this study offers potential benefits for the organization that you're involved with, while it may not directly benefit you individually; there is value in the outcome of the study. This study offers potential benefits to provide information on the state of alternative systems of provision and provide insight into the direction of further studies into alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia. In conducting this research, I hope to contribute to the understanding of alternative consumption initiatives and the opportunities and challenges they face.

The risks from participating in the study should be minimal as the issues addressed are unlikely to be highly sensitive or controversial. That said, the name of the organization that you are involved with will appear in the report. However, these risks are unlikely to have a negative impact on you or the organization. The interview will focus on the organization's development, goals, obstacles, successes, and future. Before the final report is completed, the researcher will send you the text of any quotations that he is considering using. This will give you the opportunity to approve, revise, or withdraw any quotations.

How your information will be protected:

Your information and data provided will be protected by the lead researcher and will be used solely for the purpose of the study. Your involvement in this study will be kept confidential through being kept on a password-protected computer and password protected files. Those who will have access to your information are the Student Lead Researcher and Thesis Supervisor. This information will be kept confidential throughout the duration of this study and upon completion will be coded to ensure that it is unidentifiable (i.e., coding of personal contact information). In the coding and presentation of data, pseudonyms will be used to ensure confidentiality in your participation. In the retention of data, pseudonyms will replace written documentation of your personal information. Any recording of your participation in this information will be encrypted and is only accessible to the research team at Dalhousie University.

Limits to confidentiality pertain to the organizations that you are involved in and those within those settings. As there are few organizations in Halifax, Nova Scotia that participate in alternative systems of provision it is not possible to guarantee confidentiality of the organization that you're involved in. Although negative impacts are unlikely, it is important for participants to be aware of these circumstances. Additionally, although we will be keeping your information confidential it may be possible for your participation to be identified by members of the organization you're involved with.

If You Decide to Stop Participating

Throughout your participation in this study you are free to leave at any time. If you decide to stop participating in this study, you may also choose to have any information provided to us removed from the study. You have the option to remove your data up until March 20th 2017, as data will be presented and published on April 15th 2017. You may contact the Student Lead Researcher, Chris Dufour, with contact information provided on page 1 if you wish to withdraw your participation and data.

How to Obtain Results

Results from this study will be made available to participants in a summary of overall results from the study. This research will also be published on www.dalspace.library.dal.ca. Additionally, if you would like to read the final research project it can be forwarded to you upon its publication. This can be arranged with the Student Lead Researcher.

Questions

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, please do not hesitate to contact Chris Dufour at chris.dufour@dal.ca or 902-222-3343, or Anders Hayden at Anders.Hayden@dal.ca, (902) 404-6602, or (902) 420-0468, at any time.

Additionally, if you have any ethical concerns about your participation in this research, you may also contact Research Ethics, Dalhousie University at (902) 494-1462, or ethics@dal.ca.

Signature Page

Project Title: Innovations in Consumption: Three case studies of alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Lead Researcher: Chris Dufour, Student Lead Researcher, Chris.Dufour@dal.ca

I have read the explanation about this study. I have been given the opportunity to discuss it and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I have been asked to take part in one interview that will occur at a location acceptable to me, and that those interviews will be recorded. I agree to take part in this study. My participation is voluntary and I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, until March 20th 2017

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

In addition, I agree to (please initial or sign next to all those that apply):

- audio recording of the interview
- use of direct quotations in the final report without being identified by name
- be contacted again by email at a later date to review and approve quotations to be used in the final report.

Appendix C: Interview Guide

Interview Guide

Research Title: Innovations in Consumption: Three case studies of alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Student Lead Researcher: Chris Dufour

Thesis Supervisor: Anders Hayden

Research Purpose:

The purpose of this research is to contribute to a greater understanding of alternative systems of provision and opportunities and challenges they face. The research will be done through studying three alternative systems of provision: CarShare Atlantic, The Halifax Tool Library, and Off The Hook. This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the goals, challenges, and areas of success in alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?
2. How have organizational intentions evolved over time and what factors have contributed to this evolution?
3. How can theories on technological and social innovations be applied to alternative systems of provision in Halifax, Nova Scotia?

Interviewee Information

Name:

Position:

Contact Information:

Additional relevant information:

Interview Guide:

Consent form is reviewed, read, and signed by participant before collecting any information or data

Beginning thank you and continuation of consent:

Thank you so much for meeting with me today and agreeing to participate in this study. Before we start, if at any point in the interview you would like to stop, need clarification, have a question, or do not feel comfortable answering please do not hesitate to say so.

Personal Involvement

1. To start, could you tell me a little bit about your position and involvement with
[organization name]?

- a. How did you become involved?
- b. What roles and positions have you held?

Organizational Goals

2. When [organization] began, what were the goals or outcomes that were set?
 - a. How long has the organization existed?
3. What motivated the creation of this organization? Why was this important?
4. How have these goals changed over time?
 - a. Why do you think these changes have been made?
5. Do you feel that some or any of the organizations goals have been met, or are on their way to be met?

Successes, Challenges, and Obstacles

6. Where do you feel your organization has been most successful?
7. How do you think your organization has been interacting with the communities around it?
8. What have been some challenges and obstacles your organization has faced?
9. What steps have been taken to overcome these challenges?
10. What are any problems your organization has working with government or other institutions?

Future Goals

11. How do you anticipate the future of this organization? Changes in operations? Mandate?
12. Do you see any changes that are necessary for the future?
13. Do you feel that this organization has the capacity, resources, and infrastructure to continue to operate?

Halifax and Location

14. Are there any particular advantages or benefits from operating in Halifax?

15. Have you encountered any barriers operating in Halifax?

Secondary Questions (if time permits):

1. Who do you see most involved in the organization and why do you think that they are involved?

2. How do you think your organization has been reaching the communities around it?

3. Do you see any rejection of your organization from the community?

4. Do you have a target demographic?

5. Who is accessing your goods and services?

6. Do you think there are limitations to who can access your organization?

Closing remarks:

Is there anything else you'd like to add about your organization and/or your involvement it or information you believe is important to this study?

I'd like to take the time to thank you for participating in this study, I really appreciate the time you've taken to participate and do this interview with me. If you have any comments or thought after this, you can send me an email at chris.dufour@dal.ca.

Appendix D: Research Design and Audit Trail Guide

