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Abstract

The sharing economy has become an increasingly popular phenomenon across society and academia. Engagement in the sharing activities has been previously studied but lacks a focus on the practical aspects of sharing activities in specific segments of the sharing economy. The aim of this study was to explore the practical aspects meal sharing. Specifically, this research was set out to study the role of meal sharing in people’s everyday life. This was done by both exploring the practical aspects of meal sharing and motivations for participation in meal sharing. Social practice theory, which centres around the reality of everyday life, and how people shape and give meaning to that reality, has been used as theoretical lens to guide data collection and analysis. This study concerned an explorative case-study using semi-structured interviews with users of the platform, a review of social media and participant observations. Overall, it can be concluded that meal sharing plays an instrumental role in people’s everyday life: meal sharing serves a practical solution as one method for food provisioning, amongst other options, to provide an evening meal in a convenient and enjoyable way where ideological motivations do not play a prominent role.
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1 Introduction

Sharing is as old as mankind and can be traced back to ancient times where sharing happened among close kin family members and friends (Belk, 2014; Schor, 2014). However, more recently, in early 2000, technological innovations made it possible to transform this activity to new spaces and scales (Belk, 2014). The internet has enabled people to share goods and services via online platforms with people they have never met before. This new way of sharing is better known as the hallmark activity of a phenomenon referred to as ‘the sharing economy’ (SE) (Botsman & Rogers 2010).

The central idea behind sharing in this sharing economy is that of resource optimization, as sharing provides open access to under-utilised resources (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). This way of consuming is proposed to lead to a society that (1) has a lower environmental impact, (2) is more social, and (3) is economically more efficient (Botsman & Rogers, 2010).

The sharing economy is rapidly growing in popularity. In the past years, in a variety of consumption segments numerous sharing schemes and platforms have emerged (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). Prominent examples include sharing schemes covering a broad range of activities from renting rooms (e.g., Airbnb) and cars (e.g., Zipcar) to sharing tools (e.g., Peerby) and food (e.g., Thuisafgehaald [Shareyourmeal]). This rapid emergence of schemes and platforms has not remained unnoticed by society, media and academia. Over the years, the sharing economy has received considerable attention for its impact, opportunities and challenges (e.g., Heinrichs, 2013; Federal Trade Commission [FTC], 2016; Zervas, Proserpio & Byers, 2014).

A prominent example of a frequently discussed implication of the sharing activities in the sharing economy is their disruptive nature for conventional businesses. Two platforms that have sparked interest in this aspect of the sharing economy are Airbnb and Uber. These platforms have recently been focus of discussion in both the media (e.g., CNBC, 2015; Lubach, 2017) and the academic literature (e.g., Schor, 2014). Concerns are, amongst others, about the increasing market share of Airbnb which has led to decreasing hotel revenues in the same markets. Similarly, Uber and similar companies (e.g. Lyft, Sidecar) seem to pose great challenges for the taxi industry, especially regarding regulations (Slee, 2014).

Another topic for discussion concentrates on the proposed revolutionary and social nature of the sharing economy. Critics challenge the romanticized view of the sharing economy being led by environmental and social motivations, or also referred to as ideological motivations (Slee, 2014; Schor, 2014). These critics are supported in their views by studies that have shown that some types of sharing economy practices do not necessarily exhibit these proposed ideological qualities. For example, Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) studied how consumers think, feel, and act in the context of car sharing. They found that participants are looking out for their own best interest rather than connecting to other consumers, or the company. This, they argue, implies that participants are more driven by economic and pragmatic motivations (e.g., lower costs and convenience) than social motivations (e.g., fostering social relationships with other participants) (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012).

---

1 In this thesis sometimes also referred to as ‘collaborative consumption’, see chapter 2.
Lastly, a point of interest has been the observation, as noted by Vezzoli, Ceschin, Diehl and Kohtala (2012, p. 288), that ‘the introduction of these alternative forms of consumption require fundamental changes in consumer’s habits, company organisational structures and regulatory frameworks.’ It seems that many sharing platforms struggle with reaching critical mass (Collaborative Lab, 2014; Schifferes, 2013). Despite the increasing public interest in the sharing economy and the mainly positive attitudes of consumers towards the phenomenon, behavioural patterns are not univocally consistent with these attitudes. These new ways of sharing are not simply taken up by consumers as business as usual (Piscicelli, Cooper & Fisher, 2015). It seems that these alternative forms of consuming have not become mainstream yet (Piscicelli et al., 2015). In the shadow of the success stories, this has been exemplified, in past years, by multiple new ventures (e.g., ShareSomeSugar.com) that have emerged just to fail shortly after, or had difficulties in establishing themselves (Collaborative Lab, 2014; Owyang, Samuel & Grenville, 2014; Piscicelli et al., 2015).

1.1 Problem statement and knowledge gaps
As described just before, there is a growing interest in the sharing economy for its implications, its potential, and the challenges faced with becoming more mainstream. This growing interest is mainly illustrated by the rapid proliferation of sharing platforms and the attention paid to the phenomenon in both media and academic literature. However, despite the sharing economy being a popular subject in public and academic discourse, it is still not well understood in research or practice. Over the years, the sharing economy has rapidly grown. However, it seems that academic discourse on sharing economy is lagging public discourse and practice as research seems to have fallen short to investigate its various aspects and implications (Belk, 2014; Heinrichs, 2013).

Codagnone and Martens (2016) argued that to date empirical evidence is very limited and inconclusive. In their critical review of the available empirical evidence on the sharing economy, they show that there currently are no unambiguous answers to some of the fundamental questions about the sharing economy (e.g., regarding sharing economy’s impact, and real motivations of consumers for participation) (Codagnone & Martens, 2016). Moreover, current research seems only to address a few broad areas of interest: sharing economy business models (e.g., Cohen & Kietzmann, 2014), sharing economy impacts (e.g., Zervas et al., 2016), and people’s engagement in sharing economy practices with a focus on their motivations for participation (e.g., Böcker & Meelen, 2017; Hamari, Sjöklint & Ukkonen, 2016; McArthur, 2014). This, however, leaves other aspects of the sharing economy, such as the practical aspects of these sharing activities, understudied. It has also been noted that certain sharing economy segments have received considerable more research attention than others. Previous studies have often been performed in the context of car-sharing (e.g., Joo, 2017), or accommodation-sharing (e.g., Tussyadiah, 2015), whereas other segments, such as the food segment, seem to have received less attention (Davies, 2015). As the sharing economy is very fragmented and each domain differs considerably from the others, it is important not to translate conclusions from one domain to another, and thus to study these separately (Böcker & Meelen, 2017).

These observations highlight the need for research that addresses these knowledge gaps to increase our understanding of the sharing economy phenomenon.
1.2 Research aim
The aim of this study is to contribute to the exploration and identification of the practical aspects of sharing practices regarding an understudied, but upcoming segment of the sharing economy: food sharing. Since food sharing, comprising a variety of sharing practices, has received little research attention until now, I have chosen to start exploring one specific case in this domain: meal sharing (see chapter 2 for a further elaboration).

The focus of this study is to get an understanding of the practical aspects of meal sharing in people’s everyday lives. Specifically, I am interested in what role meal sharing plays in people’s daily lives by particularly looking at how people perceive meal sharing, how often they make use of meal sharing, and to what extent meal sharing is embedded in the rhythm of their daily lives. Moreover, looking at the role of meal sharing in daily life, it is intended to investigate if meal sharing is perceived as a method to act upon ideological values and thus to what extent motivations for participation in meal sharing are of ideological nature. The latter refer to either social (e.g., meeting new people), or environmental motivations (e.g., contributing to a better environment).

Accordingly, the central research question has been formulated as follows:

What role does meal sharing play in people’s daily lives, and to what extent is participation driven by ideological motivations?

This central research question will be studied following a set of sub-questions that have been constructed based on the theoretical lens of the current study described in chapter 4.

1.3 Thesis outline
In chapter 2 relevant concepts (the sharing economy, the food sharing segment and meal sharing) that have been introduced in this introduction, will be further described, elaborated, and operationalised. Additionally, the central case of this study will be presented. In chapter 3, it is described how the sharing economy topic has been studied in past years. In chapter 4, the theoretical lens that has guided data collection and analysis will be presented. In this chapter, further elaboration of the central research question will be presented. Thereafter, chapter 5 discusses the research design and methodology. The results and the key findings of this study are presented in chapter 6. I conclude this thesis with a discussion of the results and a conclusion that gives answer to the central research. Moreover, I discuss both the implications and limitations of this study.
2 The sharing economy

The sharing economy refers to a phenomenon in which people engage in sharing activities in organized systems or networks. The main idea behind the sharing economy is that of sharing of access to underutilised goods and services, which prioritizes utilization and accessibility over ownership (Botsman, 2013). As no clear definition and conceptualization of the sharing economy has yet been developed, this chapter will shortly discuss the conceptual issues related to the sharing economy (2.1). Then, current approaches for studying engagement in the sharing economy will be described (2.2). Next, I will elaborate on how it is aimed to extend current knowledge in this study (2.3). Finally, I will elaborate further on the specific segment of the sharing economy that will be focus of investigation in this thesis: the food sharing segment (2.4), and present the specific central case (2.5).

2.1 The sharing economy: conceptual issues

As the concept of the sharing economy has evolved over past years, several labels linked to the notion of the sharing economy have emerged (Botsman, 2013). Examples of the different labels used to refer to the sharing economy include ‘collaborative economy’, ‘on-demand economy’, and ‘peer-to-peer economy’ (Chase, 2015; Jaconi, 2014; Owyang, 2015). Up till now, there is no universal label used to refer to the sharing economy, and as such these labels are often used interchangeably in current literature (Codagnone & Martens, 2016). Botsman (2013) argues that this is not correct as the various labels often refer to slightly different conceptualizations of the sharing economy.

The sharing economy is used as an umbrella term for referring to a wide range of sharing activities. However, along with lacking a universal label to refer to these sharing activities, there is also no shared consensus on which exact sharing activities the sharing economy comprises. More specifically, there is no consensus on which activities can be perceived as ‘sharing’ in the sharing economy and what not. For example, in their conceptualization of sharing activities Botsman and Rogers (2010, p. 9) include activities such as ‘traditional sharing, bartering, lending, trading, renting, gifting, and swapping’, organized in three broad organizational systems: ‘product service systems’ (access to products or services without need for owning the underlying assets), ‘redistribution markets’ (i.e. re-allocation of goods), and ‘collaborative lifestyles’ (i.e. exchange of intangible assets (e.g., skills). Belk (2014) criticises this conceptualization. He argues that this view is too broad and mixes marketplace exchange, gift giving, and sharing. Belk (2014) defines sharing, also referred to as ‘collaborative consumption’, as: ‘people coordinating the acquisition and distribution of a resource for a fee or other compensation.’ (p. 1597). He argues: ‘by including other compensation, the definition also encompasses bartering, trading, and swapping, which involve giving and receiving non-monetary compensation.’

It is beyond the aim of the current study to elaborate further on this conceptual discussion concerning labelling and defining the sharing economy. In this study, I follow Botsman and Roger’s (2010) definition of the sharing economy. The term ‘sharing economy’ is used as a general umbrella term to describe the phenomenon. I use this term interchangeably with ‘collaborative consumption’. However, sharing economy is common in most of the academic

---

2 For an extended review of current discussions mentioned in this section as well as a tentative conceptual mapping of sharing platforms, I refer to the Working Paper by Codagnone and Martens (2016).
journals. Moreover, in this thesis, I adapt a practice-oriented definition of the sharing economy, as provided by Codagnone, Biagi & Abadie (2016). They state that the expression sharing economy is ‘commonly used to indicate a wide range of digital commercial or non-profit platforms facilitating exchanges amongst a variety of players through a variety of interaction modalities (e.g., peer-to-peer and business-to-peer) that all broadly enable consumption or productive activities leveraging capital assets (money, real estate property, equipment, cars, etc.) goods, skills, or just time.’ (p. 22). This definition covers a myriad of platforms with diverse business models from different consumption segments.

2.2 The food sharing segment: meal sharing

As described in the previous section, the sharing economy is an umbrella term including different sharing practices, which vary in ways of organisation and operating in different domains. Because of this wide diversity, it is an absolute necessity to study each segment separately. I have specifically chosen to study the practice of meal sharing, which is part of the food sharing segment. This practice from the food sharing segment was chosen, because it is an important element in a relatively new domain of the sharing economy, which is gaining momentum, but yet little described in current research literature (Davies, 2015). Moreover, food sharing practices are highly related to everyday activities (Davies, 2015), and are thus interesting to study to gain more insight into the practical aspects of sharing in daily life.

In the next section, I will first go more into detail about the food sharing segment as part of the sharing economy (2.2.1) and then present the central case of this study (2.2.2).

2.2.1 Food sharing segment: conceptualisation

The general idea of food sharing is using a social network, or an online platform to share goods (i.e. food items), services, or experiences related to food (Davies, 2015). As such, food sharing is part of the sharing economy as all food sharing platforms involve a socio-economic model in which people connect through online platforms to conduct transactions involving goods and services. In recent years, numerous food sharing platforms have emerged (e.g., Thuisafgehaald.nl [Shareyourmeal] [founded in 2012], FoodSharing [founded in 2014], Mealby [founded in 2015] and AirDnD [founded in 2015]).

Following the dictionary definition of sharing, sharing related to food can be defined as:

‘have a portion of food with another or others; give a portion of food to others; use, occupy, or enjoy growing/cooking/eating jointly; possess an interest in growing/cooking in common; or tell someone about growing/cooking.’

What is shared (e.g., things, services, experiences) and with how many people (e.g., individuals, collective) varies amongst the different food sharing initiatives. In addition, the diversity of food sharing projects can be divided into various modes of sharing (e.g. gifting, bartering, enterprise) and funding models (e.g. not for profit, for profit).

Food sharing is proposed to be a way to address several societal problems. One problem that is specifically related to the food sharing is that of food waste. Globally one-third of food
produced for human consumption (about 1.3 billion tons) is yearly lost, or wasted somewhere between production and consumption (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO], 2011). Food loss occurring at the household level is often referred to as ‘food waste’, which relates to consumers’ behaviour (FAO, 2011). On a consumer level, food waste is the result of consumers being quick to throw away edible food, consumers over-buying groceries, inappropriate storage of food products, and preparing meals that are too large. It is at this level that food sharing is proposed to be able to play a role in reducing food waste (FAO, 2011; Lipinski et al., 2013).

Another opportunity of food sharing is that it promotes a more social way of living together. The act of sharing requires people to interact with each other. Food sharing creates time and space for people to connect both on and offline in the most traditional way possible, over food. Moreover, as with other sharing activities, it can be argued that by fulfilling each other’s needs - for a meal - people re-humanise the de-humanised economy by sharing food. Furthermore, as people are getting involved in networks where goods and services are traded and exchanged amongst people they trust, it is proposed as solving the social ‘flaws’ of the current economic system (Botsman & Rogers, 2010).

2.2.2 Introducing the case: meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald

As I have argued before, I have chosen one specific form of food sharing: meal sharing. Meal sharing in the context of the sharing economy is a relatively new concept, no definitive definition exists in the literature. For this reason, I define meal sharing in the context of the sharing economy as: people cooking - an extra portion of - a meal for their neighbours. When I refer to meal sharing, I specifically refer to meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald [TA].

To study meal sharing, one Dutch online meal sharing platform, ‘Thuisafgehaald.nl’, was chosen to provide an extensive and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of interest, i.e. the role of meal sharing practices in daily life. TA serves as a platform where people who like to cook (i.e. cooks) can share their meals with others, i.e. foodies, for a monetary compensation. The central idea behind TA is that ‘eating brings people together’ (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.).

Multiple reasons make this specific case interesting to investigate in the current study. First, TA is a good example of a sharing economy activity as it involves the collaborate use of resources - skills and meals - as well as the interaction between participants who are - initially - strangers to each other, facilitated by on-line technology for matching supply and demand. Secondly, TA is the biggest meal sharing platform in the Netherlands, currently consisting of approximately 10,000 cooks and 70,000 foodies (Hart & Dagevos, 2017). Thirdly, it serves as an illustrative example of the earlier described challenge of the sharing economy becoming main stream. Thuisafgehaald.nl was established in 2012, and thus exists for five years now, but is still striving to become more established (Hart & Dagevos, 2017).

The platform operates in Wageningen as well as in other readily accessible locations in the Netherlands, which made it appropriate for field work in this study. Moreover, already existing connections with TA participants assisted in the recruitment of foodies to participate in the interviews.
TA is organised by a not-for-profit foundation called ‘Stichting Social & Green Innovation’. The foundation works with the principles of a social enterprise, taking a professional approach. Profit is defined in social and sustainable terms with the chief aim to improve the world by contributing social and sustainable added value to society (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.). The founders of the platform formulate their aim as: ‘All about making something valuable (like left-over food) end up where it is needed (with hungry neighbours)’ (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.).

Three aims are formulated for the platform:

- **Social**: to connect neighbours
- **Environmental**: to prevent food wasting
- **Health**: to encourage people to eat healthily

Following these three aims, TA is framed by the founders as a ‘healthy, tasty and connecting alternative for the evening meal’ (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.).

Participants can participate on the platform as a **foodie** - a person who orders and picks-up meals, a **cook** - a person who cooks and offers meals - or both: foodie and cook - a person who both cooks and offers meals and picks up meals (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.). Compared to other sharing initiatives that fit in the sharing economy, TA has distinctive characteristics. Whereas most sharing platforms are demand-oriented, TA is mainly guided by the supply-side of the platform. The cook plans the meal, decides the time slot and location for pick-up, as well as the price and portion size.

There are multiple modes of meal sharing on the platform:

- **Meal offer**: the cook offers a meal that can be picked up by foodies;
- **Meal on request**: foodie picks a meal from the menu offered by the cook and requests the cook to make this meal;
- ‘**Bordje over**’ (left-overs): a foodie sends out a request on the platform to cooks in the neighbourhood to question whether they have left-overs;
- **Food event**: events where both foodies and cooks can participate. During these events, cooks initiate and organize activities ranging from cooking workshops to shared dinners.

The option ‘meal offer’ is the most opted for option. As such, meal sharing is represented by this option. Moreover, there is the option ‘**Bijzonder Thuisafgehaald**’ which refers to a special service for foodies who are not able to prepare a meal themselves due to for example a physical disability. In this mode of meal sharing, a foodie gets assigned to a cook in their neighbourhood who cooks, according to an agreement, for the foodie on a regular basis and delivers the meals to the foodies.

The website of TA itself is designed in such a way that foodies can browse for cooks and meals by location (postal code or city). Based on location, foodies are presented with a list of meals. The selected meals are all offered by cooks who live in a certain range (mostly three kilometres) from the foodies’ own location. The presented meals are either offered for the same day, or planned for one or two days in advance. Either daily or weekly, foodies receive an e-mail from

---

4 All quotes and Dutch terms used on the website are translated from Dutch to English for this thesis.
TA in which the meal offers for each week and/or day are presented. Moreover, foodies receive separate e-mails when cooks they follow offer a meal.

After selecting a meal of choice from the list, foodies can sign up for this meal. To do so, they must fill in a form on which they indicate a time for meal pick-up. There is also space to leave remarks for the cook, e.g. certain dietary preferences. After the request is sent, the foodie needs to wait for the cook to respond positively to the request. The foodie receives a confirmation of the request from the cook via an e-mail. This message is the first confirmation of the agreement for what meal, where and when to pick up the meal. Via this e-mail, foodies as well as cooks can pose further questions to each other to make further arrangements regarding for example the time of pick-up or other agreements (e.g. how many meal containers to bring to transport the meal).

The price of a meal is often set at an amount that covers the grocery costs made by the cook. On average this comes down to € 4.20 per meal. The original purpose of the monetary compensation paid by the foodie to the cook is to make sure that the cook gets compensated for involved costs such as grocery costs. The foundation takes a commission of 10 percent from the costs of each transaction (with a maximum of € 0.25). This goes unnoticed by the foodie as this percentage is already included in the meal price. These earnings are reinvested back into the platform, mainly for platform maintenance (Thuisafgehaald, n.d.).

In the current study the focus will be on the perspective and motivations of the TA participants who fulfil the role of a foodie (i.e. those who pick-up meal) rather than those who fulfil the role of a cook, as was investigated in previous research on participation in meal sharing via TA (M. Dagevos, personal communication, March 10, 2017).
3 Studying the sharing economy

As described in the introduction, there is both academic and societal interest for sharing practices. One point of interest is participants’ engagement in the sharing economy. In this study, the focus is specifically on engagement in meal sharing. However, as no previous research has been conducted focused on people’s engagement in meal sharing from the consumer's perspective - foodies - specifically, I reflect on previous research of studying engagement in sharing activities in other segments of the sharing economy and aim to apply the corresponding insights gained from previous research in this study.

First, I will elaborate current approaches to study the engagement in the sharing economy (3.1 and 3.2). Subsequently, I discuss limitations of previous research (3.3) and suggest an alternative focus for studying participation in the sharing economy (3.4).

3.1 Current approaches to studying engagement in the sharing economy

In the studies concerning engagement in the sharing economy, attention has been paid to both sharing economy participants and their motivations for participation in sharing economy and non-participants and their intentions to participate and attitudes towards participating in the sharing economy. In this thesis, I combined research from both fields and perceived motivation as a multidimensional concept including: attitudes, intentions, values.

Botsman and Rogers (2010) proposed a categorization of the identified motivations for participation which include economic, environmental and social motivations. Economic motivations relate to economic benefits such as saving money. Environmental motivations relate to being ‘green’ and doing good for the environment and social motivations concern meeting like-minded people or feeling part of a community (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). After reviewing the literature on motivations for participation, however, this categorization seemed not to suit for covering all motivations for participation that were found in previous studies. For this reason, I have added the categories instrumental, e.g., people seeking a practical end such as time saving, and personal, e.g., people seeking personal reward such as enjoyment, to the categorization proposed by Botsman and Rogers (2010). Social and environmental motivations are by some also referred to as grouped under the notion of ideological motivations (e.g., Schor, 2014). Economic motivations are in the literature also often referred to as instrumental motivations. Therefore, I have eliminated economic as a separate category and placed it under instrumental motivations. In Table 1 an overview of my amended categorization of possible motivations for participation in sharing activities based on the corresponding reviewed literature is presented.

---

5 In academic literature also often referred to as ‘pragmatic’ or ‘utilitarian’.
Table 1. Categorization of motivations for participation in sharing activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Conceptualization/examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Related to environmental concerns (sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Botsman &amp; Rogers, 2010)</td>
<td>- Being green (Piscicelli, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Doing good for the environment (Piscicelli, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Related to increasing social connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Botsman &amp; Rogers, 2010)</td>
<td>- Increase social connection (Schor, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting like-minded people (Piscicelli, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feeling part of a community (Piscicelli 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Related to seeking a practical end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Van de Glind, 2013)</td>
<td>- Getting a service/thing (Bellotti, Ambard &amp; Carroll, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The quality of the service/product itself (Owyang et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Convenience (Owyang et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to find something they could not find elsewhere (Owyang et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Economic benefits (Bardhi &amp; Eckhardt, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Related to self-serving needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Collom, 2007)</td>
<td>- Enjoyment (Hamari et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Current understanding of participation in the sharing economy
Looking at the different studies investigating participation in sharing economy activities, it appears that there is much variation between different platforms in different segments of the sharing economy. Bellotti et al. (2015) refer to this observation as ‘a muddle of models of motivation.’

For example, Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) concluded, in the context of car-sharing, that consumers are not looking for social value out of rental exchanges with strangers. Whilst Tussyadiah (2015) found that the participants of accommodation sharing do engage in accommodation sharing because of social motivations (e.g., wanting to interact with their local hosts).

The observation that differences in motivations exist across different sharing segments is replicated in a study of Böcker and Meelen (2017), who investigated multiple segments at once. Moreover, they also noted differences within specific segments. In their study, they found that variations exist between platform users encompassing different roles within the same platform. As shown by Bellotti et al. (2015), there are substantial differences in activities of providing and using in sharing platforms. For example, where providers spoke more of ideological motivations, such as increasing sustainability and creating a better community, users on the other hand mentioned to be motivated for participation to fulfil instrumental needs.
3.3 Limitations of current studies on engagement in sharing activities

Studies of engagement in the sharing economy have typically been approached from a social psychological approach, focused on the individual as a rational choice agent (Piscicelli et al., 2015). Within this established approach, mainly structured questionnaires and surveys have been used to examine individual’s motivations, intentions, attitudes and values related to sharing as well as investigating people’s sharing behaviours (e.g., Collom, 2007; Owyang et al., 2014). Sharing behaviour in these studies is viewed as an expression of these values and attitudes as conceptualized in social psychological models, such as the dominantly used Attitude-behaviour model by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975).

Moreover, current knowledge on engagement in the sharing economy is largely based on quantitative data. Its limitation is that quantitative data collection methods are not geared to in-depth understanding. For example, the data might show why people participate, or why they intend to participate in the sharing economy, but not their broader conceptualization of these motivations. Also, surveys and structured questionnaires contain fixed questions and predetermined answer options, which may lead to leaving interesting alternative insights out because of this predetermined lens through which motivations are investigated. Moreover, the focus on the individual as rational choice agent has been criticised for being oversimplified (Piscicelli et al., 2015). The choices we make daily and the behaviour we are engaged in are shaped by a range of various factors broader than motivations, values and attitudes. The focus on values and attitudes overlooks the realities of everyday life, such as dealing with day to day time management (Connolly & Prothero, 2008).

3.4 Going beyond motivations: extending understanding engagement in sharing economy activities

The literature reviewed in the previous sections concerning people’s engagement in the sharing economy show that there exists a general understanding that motivations for participation in the sharing economy activities differ amongst various segments of the sharing economy as well as amongst participants from different roles in platforms within one segment. However, as discussed in section 3.3, previous studies have some methodological and theoretical limitations. As a result, we still lack a full understanding of engagement in the sharing economy.

To expand our understanding of engagement in sharing economy activities, the application of other methods and theoretical lenses may be useful. Before I go more into detail about an alternative way of looking at people’s engagement in sharing activities, I want to point out that in this study I still aim to investigate motivations for participation as this provides insight into what role meal sharing activities play in people’s lives. However, I also intend to go beyond investigating motivations.

Another way to look at people’s engagement in sharing activities, is to view behaviour as an observable expression of a social phenomenon rather than as expressions of individual values and attitudes. Framed this way, behaviour is viewed as underpinned by socially shared tastes and meanings, knowledge and skills and materials and infrastructures.

For the current study, this shifts attention from concentrating on the individual and viewing engagement in sharing activities as based on individual choice to a focus taking into account the social context in which these sharing activities are performed. Accordingly, I propose to
explore engagement in sharing economy activities with a focus on the performance of engagement in sharing economy activities, and thereby including the context of everyday life in combination with exploring people’s motivations for participation.

For this purpose, I propose the use social practice theory, or the theory of practice, as theoretical lens to guide data collection and analysis. In the chapter 4 I will go more into detail about social practice theory and elaborate on its usefulness for the current research.
4 Social practice theory
In this chapter I will first introduce and explain social practice theory and its key concepts (4.1). Then, I will explain why this is a useful lens for the current research (4.2), and how I will use the lens in the current research. This is based on the relevant practices which will be the units of analysis for this study as well as how theory of practice is used as theoretical lens guiding data collection and analysis in this study (4.3). Lastly, I present a further elaboration of the research questions into specific research questions (4.4).

4.1 Social practice theory
Social practice theory centres around the reality of everyday life, and how people shape and give meaning to that reality. In this theory, the central idea is that from day to day, people are involved in so-called practices (Røpke, 2009). Amongst different theorists, there is a great variation in what is considered to constitute a social practice. A common used definition in literature is that of Reckwitz (2002), who defined a practice (as-entity) as:

‘a routinized type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one other: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge.’ (p. 249).

In other words: a practice can be understood as a nexus of ‘doings’ and ‘sayings’ that hold together collective understanding, procedures and engagements (Warde, 2005). A practice can be conceived as an entity by looking at the coordination and interdependence of a variety of elements that form a part of, and shape a certain activity. Each social practice theorist has its own unique understanding of how practices (as-entities) are constituted and reproduced. For example, Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012) proposed a conceptualization of practices consisting of three elements: materials involved in the practice such as objects, tools and infrastructures related to the practice, competences needed such as skills and know-how, and meanings about how and why to do things (e.g., cultural conventions, expectations and socially shared meanings). To illustrate this, I provide a simple example: the practice of eating involves a specific set of meaning (e.g., what to eat), competences (e.g., cooking skills), and materials (e.g., kitchen, appliances) (Figure 1).
Figure 1. Shove and Pantzar’s (2005) material-Competence-Meaning model: Eating as practice.

The actual *doings* of the practice (i.e.behaviours) in everyday life is often referred to as the *practice-as-performance* (Warde, 2013).

Practices are reproduced by recurrent performance. Through constant recurrent reproduction of practices, people actualise and sustain them. This reproduction of practices leads to routinized forms of behaviour, also referred to as routines (Shove, 2012). Routines can be described as established sets of understandings, procedures and engagements, which combined lead to a practical sense for what is to be done in a situation (Bourdieu, 1998). These routines play an important role in daily life. From day to day, people are faced with having to manage and organise a wide variety of practices. The routine nature of practices allows performance in familiar practices without being constantly fully conscious, or reflective about it. In other words: due to the routine nature of practices, people do not constantly have to make decisions when engaging in these day to day practices. These practices are rather mostly based upon unconscious motivations and practical consciousness (Giddens, 1984).

Practices, however, are not static and can change over time. Practices are subject to change through two dynamics. First, circumstances under which people perform practices are never the same; institutional arrangements characteristic of time, space and social context are constantly changing (Warde, 2005). Consequently, people need to adapt, improvise and experiment accordingly (Warde, 2005). As a result, the reproduction of practices always differs slightly, and transforms the practice-as-entity over time (Shove & Spurling, 2013). Secondly, practices are also subject to change through the creation of new links between meanings, materials and competences, or through the breaking-up of existing links between them (Shove et al. 2012).
If new practices are introduced to the daily routine of people, these new practices face the challenge of competing with existing practices for them to be integrated in everyday life (Røpke, 2009). Since time is limited and it is impossible to simultaneously participate in multiple activities that fulfil a similar purpose at once, practices must compete for practitioners’ resources. A new practice can only be taken up by pushing aside existing practices. This poses a challenge that is shaped by the extent to which people can revise the texture and rhythm of their daily lives (Shove & Walker, 2010).

Social practice theory acknowledges that in this manoeuvring of the organization of practices, individuals have agency and make choices, but that they do so within the restrictions of everyday life. This way, social practice theory accounts for social conditions, context and the practicalities and complexities of everyday life (Warde, 2013).

4.2 Meal sharing from a theory of practice perspective

As introduced in the previous sections, I will apply social practice theory as theoretical lens to guide data collection and analysis. Social practice theory is a useful theoretical lens for studying practices that are embedded activities of everyday life. Food practices such as meal sharing are examples of highly embedded activities in people’s everyday life (Davies, 2015).

Applying social practice theory to study meal sharing implies a focus on both the doings and sayings of the practice. It steers attention to how the practice is perceived by practitioners (sayings). I aim to investigate this by exploring their motivations for participation as well as providing a descriptive account of the performance of meal sharing. Moreover, social practice theory steers attention to study the doings or performance of meal sharing in practice. Taken together, social practice theory enables me to investigate how this meal sharing is shaped in the flow of daily life, and to decompose the practice to smaller constituting elements, and shape this activity: material, competences, and meaning (Shove & Pantzar, 2005). As such, a practice perspective allows studying the meal sharing practice in the context of everyday life in which meal sharing is performed.

As described in 4.1 social practice theory decentres analysis from the individual. The practice becomes the centre of attention, which provides the opportunity to collect an extended account of the practice by considering both practical activity and its representations (Warde, 2005). However, in this study, rather than completely decentring the individual from analysis I aim to take a middle stance where I assume that both structure and agency are important in understanding practices. This means that I will combine studying the motivations for participating in meal sharing and zoom in on the context of daily life while studying the practice of meal sharing.

I choose not to decentre the individual from analysis as I think that knowledge on the motivations for participation can aid in a better understanding of how people perceive the practice and what the practice means to them. I see both as related to each other.

4.3 Unit of analysis: food provisioning and meal sharing

As practices play out alongside each other in day to day life, these can relate to each other in the sense that some practices can be considered sub-practices in relation to a more general heading. For example, washing the car can be considered as an element of car driving (Røpke,
2009). It is thus important for this study to delimit the practices under investigation. Two practices take a central role in this study. The focus of this study is on the practice of meal sharing. However, as I want to analyse how this practice fits in the structure of people’s daily life, the practice of food provisioning is also considered.

Food provisioning practices are defined as a range of activities, ‘including the acquisition, preparation, production, consumption and disposal of food.’ (McIntyre & Rondeau, 2011, p. 118) (Figure 2). This definition includes several activities, ranging from shopping for food to eating food. This implies that food provisioning can be considered as a more general practice where meal sharing is an element of food provisioning. In other words: the practice of meal sharing is one of the practices that people can choose to engage in within the wider set of food provisioning practices available to them. The practice of meal sharing via TA on its own can also be characterized by involving a range of activities, including: registering for a food sharing project, planning (the moment of exchange), transferring to location of exchange, the actual transaction, preparing food for consumption, consuming the obtained food and disposal (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Activities related to food provisioning (McIntyre & Rondeau, 2011, p. 118) and meal sharing.

4.4 Studying food provisioning and meal sharing
As illustrated in the previous section, food provisioning practices involve a whole range of activities (Figure 2). Related to these activities several considerations are made on a day to day basis. Consequently, as these food provisioning practices play out alongside other everyday activities, people are constantly choosing from this range of activities, and negotiating between preferred and actual activities (Reckwitz, 2002). Food provisioning practices can thus be understood as both the decision process and the acts of people involved in food provisioning.

As described before, social practice theory acknowledges this complexity of everyday food practices and its embeddedness in the flow of our day to day life (Warde, 2014). Hence, social practice theory is a useful guidance for studying food provisioning practices by approaching it as integrally linked to its context (Halkier & Jensen, 2011). However, as mentioned before, food provisioning entails all food and meals. However, in the current study I only focus on food provisioning regarding the evening meal.
substantial variation exists in what is considered to constitute a social practice. It is beyond the aim of this research to present and discuss all existing views on different versions of theories of practices, but of course it is important to explain which definition and conceptualization are used in this study. In the current study the framework used to inform the research design is based on the conceptualisation by Shove and Pantzar (2005). In their conceptualisation, a practice is comprised of:

- **Materials**: objects, tools and infrastructures
- **Competences**: skills and know-how
- **Meanings** about how and why to do things (cultural conventions, expectations and socially shared meanings)

Following this conceptualization, Shove and Pantzar (2005) elaborated a simple model of social practices as composed of these three elements (Figure 3). Subsequently, these elements have guided both data collection - by forming the basis of the interview guide - as well as data analysis - by forming the basis of the coding guide and analytical lens. In this way, the practice of meal sharing was studied and analysed through a social practice theory lens with the aim to develop an understanding of how the practice is performed by its practitioners and integrated in their daily lives.

![Figure 3. Shove and Pantzar’s (2005) Material-Competence-Meaning model.](image-url)
4.5 Research questions

The central research question has been formulated as follows:

*What role does meal sharing play in people’s daily lives, and to what extent is participation driven by ideological motivations?*

To investigate what role meal sharing plays in people’s daily lives, I will first look at what motivations people have for participating in meal sharing. Then I will look at the performance of meal sharing alongside daily food provisioning activities with focus on frequency of use, and impacts on habits and routines. Finally, I will look at meal sharing as practice-as-entity.

Using the theoretical lens and the previous mentioned study objectives, the central research questions has been divided into the following sub-questions:

1. Why do people get involved in meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald? What are their motivations?
2. What does *performance* of meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail in practice?
3. What *changes* has meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald caused in people’s food provisioning habits and routines?
4. What does meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail as *practice-as-entity*?
5 Methodology
In this chapter I describe the research design employed in this study (5.1) and the outline of the research (5.2). Moreover, the applied methods for data collection and analysis (5.3 and 5.4) will be discussed.

5.1 Research design
To investigate the practicalities of meal sharing and motivations that play a role in this, a single-case study has been employed (Bryman, 2012). I chose for a case study design as case studies have been argued to be ideal for researching ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions (Yin, 2009). This case study was of explorative nature, as not much previous research has been done on the practical aspects of meal sharing. Specifically, this study was the first to explore users’ participation in meal sharing through a social practice theory lens. As the research is of explorative nature, one single case of meal sharing is sufficient to explore the field (Yin, 2009).

The adoption of social practice theory to guide this research implies a focus of attention towards both the ‘doings’, i.e. practical activity/performance, and ‘sayings’, i.e. its representation, of the practices under investigation (Warde, 2013). No single method of data collection can address both aspects - doings and sayings - of a practice at once. For this reason, a research design that combines multiple data generation methods was required. Qualitative data collection methods were chosen for this study as these enable the generation of an intensive, detailed examination of a phenomenon of interest (Bryman, 2012). As qualitative data collection methods are often criticized for their reliance on the interpretation of the researcher, I have chosen to use multiple methods, and to triangulate the data to increase the data credibility. Semi-structured interviews have been chosen as the main source of data. A review of social media and participant observations have been used as supplementary data sources (Jick, 1979) (Table 2).

With the selection of data collection methods both practical and ethical considerations must be considered. First, even though observations are argued to be the ideal method for collecting data regarding behaviour (Bryman, 2012), due to limited resources it was not feasible to follow fooodies around in their daily life to observe their participation in meal sharing. Secondly, as data collection mainly relied on input from the fooodies themselves, I had to choose methods that were not too demanding - in terms of time and effort - for fooodies. Weighing these considerations against each other has led to a blend of data generation methods that allowed me to mainly investigate the verbal representation of meal sharing (i.e. sayings). To capture the actual behavioural aspects of the practitioners while engaging in meal sharing, i.e. doings, this study relied on what fooodies said they do while participating in meal sharing as well as actual observations of thesebehaviours.
Table 2. Research questions and methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub question</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Why do people get involved in meal sharing? What are their motivations?</td>
<td>Interviews, Social media review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What does performance of meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail in practice?</td>
<td>Interviews, Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What changes has meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald caused in people’s food provisioning habits and routines?</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What does meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail as practice-as-entity?</td>
<td>Interviews, Social media review, Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Research outline
Throughout the research, I simultaneously conducted online fieldwork - desk research - consisting of a literature and social media review, and offline fieldwork consisting of semi-structured interviews and participant observations. I started the research with desk research combined with participant observations with the aim to explore the field. The purpose of this so-called ‘initial exploratory phase’ was to become familiar with relevant theories, concepts as well as an experiential understanding of the practice. Following this phase, the focus of data collection was on conducting semi-structured interviews. Along with the interviews, I continued with both the desk research and participant observations. Thus, empirical data is mainly collected through semi-structured interviews and participants’ observations - offline fieldwork - supplemented with a review of the literature and a social media review.

5.3 Data collection
In this section, I will first elaborate on the semi-structured interviews as these are the main source of data collection. Then I will continue with an explanation of the social media review and the participant observations.

5.3.1 Semi-structured interviews
Fifteen face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted from April to June 2017 in three different Dutch cities (Wageningen, Utrecht and Amsterdam). All interviews were executed in Dutch and lasted 20 to 80 minutes.

5.3.1.1 Recruitment and sampling
Recruitment of foodies started through convenience sampling via personal networking and a post in the Thuisafgehaald Facebook group. My supervisor brought me in contact with three cooks in Utrecht who allowed me to recruit foodies during pick-up moments (yielded twelve foodies in total). In addition, I visited cooks in Wageningen during own participation in meal
sharing. One cook in Wageningen referred me to one of her foodies. Lastly, I made use of the snowball-sampling method. Two foodies who agreed to participate in an interview provided me contact details from other foodies. All foodies who were interested and willing to participate were eligible to take part since the aim was to achieve as much diversity in the sample of foodies as possible. In total eighteen foodies agreed to participate, of which fifteen were interviewed. The remaining foodies who agreed to be interviewed withdrew from the study for personal reasons.

The final sample of foodies consisted of four men and eleven women. I did not collect further demographic information from these foodies. However, from the interviews some indications were obtained, such as their age range (25 - 90 years). Moreover, variations existed amongst foodies in household type, e.g., single person household and family household, and working situation, e.g., fulltime employed and unemployed.

5.3.1.2 Procedure
At the start of each interview, the interviewee was provided with an information sheet and a consent form (Appendix A). After written consent was given, the recording via mobile phone started. The interviews were semi-structured and guided by an interview guide to make sure all relevant topics were covered (Appendix B). The interviews involved open questions about both meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald and everyday food provisioning practices. All daily food provisioning activities were discussed step by step: from planning the meal to acquire food and from cooking to discarding. Follow-up questions were used to build a detailed picture of the decision process involved in the activities. In the interviews the foodies were specifically asked to describe their most recent experiences with TA. This ensured that the analysis is based on concrete descriptions of practical events. Moreover, this helps to ensure that statements from foodies are in accordance with what they do in practice. The interviews were structured in an open and flexible way, allowing new questions to be brought up during the interview.

The interview guide was centred on the following topics:

- Activities related to food provisioning
- Participation in meal sharing, e.g., motivation for participation
- Activities related to meal sharing
- Meaning, materials and competences of meal sharing

At the end of each interview the interviewees were thanked for their time and the recording stopped. With some interviewees, I continued conversations about Thuisafgehaald, meal sharing and the sharing economy after the interview ended, and the recording was stopped. Because these conversations yielded additional insights, I made notes after each interview. After every interview moment, I manually transcribed the interviews using intelligent verbatim style. In addition, I added notes about what was discussed during these conversations that were not part of the recorded interview.

5.3.2 Social media review
For the social media review, the Dutch website www.thuisafgehaald.nl, the private Facebook group for platform users - which includes both foodies and home-cooks- and online published

---

7 I use 'interviewee' to refer to every foodies who agreed to participate in the interview.
articles about TA were used to collect relevant written posts. The Facebook group acts as a platform for both foodies and cooks on which they can share pictures of meals as well as ask for advice about how to navigate on the website. A selection from posts was made from posts dating from February 2016 until June 2017. I chose to pick a range in dates from 1.5 years as I noticed that going back into time further did not yield additional information.

During the review of the social media I initially looked for two types of posts: posts in which foodies themselves share their experiences with meal sharing in a descriptive way, or in which they asked questions regarding meal sharing, and online articles that discuss meal sharing, and in which quotes from foodies are used. In these descriptive posts, I looked if I could derive motivations for participation, the meaning of the practice as well as decisions made during meal sharing. Moreover, I looked in these posts for activities related to the practice. An example of a post that was selected from Facebook concerned a foodie who responded to a question from a cook on ‘how other cooks deliver meals to their foodies’. One foodie responded to this post by describing what her experience is with picking up a meal at a cook:

‘I am a foodie and I always bring my own container. I choose a meal considering who lives nearby and what meal is offered at what price.’

All posts from foodies were transported from the website and Facebook page to a Word document. In total 5 online articles and 20 Facebook posts were selected for data analysis.

During the social media review I discovered that the Facebook page is currently mainly used by cooks for posting questions related to advice for marketing their cooking, or sharing advice about practical issues such as how to organize the use of meal containers. Foodies are also active in the Facebook group, but to a far lesser extent. They mainly seem to make use of the Facebook group to ask questions about how to navigate on the website, or when there are difficulties, with the use of the mobile phone application. This explains why this review yielded only a small amount of additional data.

5.3.3 Participant observations
From March till July 2017, participant observations were conducted to experience meal sharing myself and to get in contact with other foodies. I have taken part in the practice of food sharing as a foodie (n = 5), and observed foodies during pick-up moments (n = 3). This way I got familiar with the activities related to meal sharing, and concepts embraced by the users of the platform. This helped me as a researcher to gain an experiential understanding of the practice. Moreover, it helped me to communicate in the language as used in the community, and to be more sensible for certain remarks made by users during the interviews.

I have participated in the practice as I would have done if I had joined the platform out of the context of the present research. The selection of what, where and when to pick up a meal during this period was not based on pre-specified criteria. The only criteria set was to take away a meal once in every two weeks to ensure to reach a minimum of five pick-up moments. Other factors that determined selection of meals included meal preference, convenience, price and my own meal planning. These examples are based on what I intuitively thought would come into play when deciding to participate in meal sharing. In total I participated in meal sharing five times. These observation moments where I performed meal sharing myself lasted for about
30 minutes, which included every moment from the decision-making process involved up until eating the meal. After each of these observation moments, I wrote down my experiences after the pick-up. I noted how I felt during each experience of meal sharing. For example, the first time that I tried meal sharing, I felt excitement and curiosity. Curiosity mainly related to thoughts if I would enjoy the meal’s taste as well as what kind of person I would encounter during the pick-up moment. Feelings of excitement were mainly because of the thought to have to talk to a stranger. In addition to my feelings, I also wrote down other thoughts such as considerations when deciding to use meal sharing as method for food provisioning. Finally, I noted events that happened during the pick-up moment such as the topics discussed during the conversations with the cooks.

In addition to participant observation, I have overtly observed during the transaction moments of meal sharing (pick-up moment). These observations at the pick-up moments lasted about 60 minutes. They provided a physical demonstration of how foodies and home cooks interacted during the transaction moment ($n = 3$). Via my supervisor, I got in contact with cooks who allowed me to observe during a pick-up moment. There were no objections to my presence at any time, nor were any questions about my presence raised. During the observation moments, I made notes whenever I had the chance. However, most of the observation reports consists of notes of my experiences and observations that I wrote after each observation. During the observations of the pick-up moments, I especially paid attention to the interaction between the cook and the foodie. My focus was on the foodie and how the foodie acted during the pick-up moment. For example, I wrote down how both approached each other and what topics were addressed in their conversations. After each of the observations during the pick-up moments I shortly discussed the pick-up moment with the cooks. I made notes of these short reflections as well.

5.4 Ethics
The collected data was stored in a password protected computer and will be retained for five years, after which the data will be destroyed. During the fieldwork, the researcher was open about the research purposes towards all people involved. At every first contact moment, I introduced myself and explained the outline and purpose of the research. To preserve anonymity of all people who collaborated in this research, no names will be used. I refer to all interviewed participants as ‘foodies’ or ‘interviewees’. In cases where the writing of names could not be avoided, I use fictional names.

5.5 Data analysis
After the data collection process was finished, I collected all data in one document and manually coded this data set, i.e. interviews, participant observation and social media review. The final data set consisted of data in several formats: field notes, downloaded text and interview transcripts. I based the coding procedure on the Framework Method (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The procedure that I followed was based on the procedure as proposed by Ritchie and Lewis (2003) (Appendix C). The Framework Method was chosen because it is a flexible approach to data analysis that enabled me to use a combination of inductive and deductive coding (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Using a combination of both ways of coding allowed to leave space to discover unexpected aspects by first identifying themes in data - inductive - and next by deductively coding the data based on codes from a prepared codebook to help further explain certain themes (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003).
I started analysis following a pre-set coding scheme informed by the interview guide. This coding scheme focused narrowly on collecting statements from the transcripts as well as posts from social foodies in which foodies made comments regarding how they encountered TA. Other aspects I looked at during coding were their main motivations for participation in TA, information about the performance of meal sharing (e.g., frequency), their food provisioning and lastly changes over time in their meal sharing and food provisioning. During data analysis, I particularly paid attention to the foodies’ perspectives. Next, I read through the data again to code the quotes in more detail. I coded each marked quote with a second code that represented the theme of the quote. I added these codes to the initial coding scheme.
6 Results: meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald

In this chapter I present the key findings of the research. To structure this chapter, I draw on the sub-questions formulated in chapter 3:

1. Why do people get involved in meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald? What are their motivations?
2. What does performance of meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail in practice?
3. What changes has meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald caused in people’s food provisioning habits and routines?
4. What does meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald entail as practice-as-entity?

First, the findings regarding foodies’ motivations for participating in meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald (TA) will be described (6.1). Then, I will elaborate on the practical aspects of meal sharing by describing foodies’ daily food provisioning activities (6.2). Next, I will describe the performance of meal sharing (6.3). Together these two sections (6.2 and 6.3) answer sub-question 2. Then I will present what changes meal sharing caused in foodies’ daily routines and habits (section 6.4), which will answer sub-question 3. Finally, meal sharing will be described as practice-as-entity in terms of the configuration of the three elements: meaning, materials and competences (6.5), which will answer sub-question 4.

6.1 Motivations for participating in meal sharing

Multiple motivations for joining TA were brought up by foodies during the interviews as well as in posts on social media. I have categorized these motivations into four categories, resembling the four categories of motivations described in chapter 2: environmental, social, instrumental and personal.

6.1.1 Environmental motivations

No explicit environmental motivations for participation were mentioned. When I described the aim of the foundation to contribute to less food waste, the foodies mentioned that this link between meal sharing and environmental sustainability had not come to their minds, and that this link was not clear for them. One foodie for example explicitly mentioned that he did not perceive meal sharing as a method to be environmentally more sustainable:

‘Well apart from the social aspect, I don’t know, I don’t believe it is more environmentally friendly. Well, maybe... I don’t know. Anyhow, the environmental advantage is not very big I think.’

6.1.2 Social motivations

The extent to which the social aspect of meal sharing is an explicit motivation for participation seemed to vary amongst different foodies. For example, a great part of the foodies interviewed explicitly mentioned that socially connecting with neighbours (i.e. the cooks), or other social motivations were not an explicit motivation for them to participate in meal sharing. These foodies explicitly mentioned that participation in meal sharing does not have a social function for them. For example, one foodie mentioned:

‘I am not looking for new friends, as I have enough myself.’
Other foodies mentioned that social motivations do play a role in their participation in meal sharing. This is illustrated by the following fragment of an article that appeared on Trouw.nl about TA:

‘Also, the social aspect plays a role for Anna. She regularly meets Sophie [cook] on the street and then they have a conversation. ‘I know my down- and upstairs neighbours, but it is nice to know more people in the neighbourhood. Say there is an emergency or something like that, then I would feel comfortable with ringing Sophie’s doorbell. This way the city feels less anonymous.’

‘On my free days, I often cook myself, but it is also nice to order a meal. Also, since at the end of the day I like to have a conversation with someone.’

At the same time, most foodies in the interview explicitly emphasized that, if social motivations played a role at all, this is only a small part of their motivation for participation:

‘Even though it [meal sharing] is very social, I would say it is 80% pragmatic for me and I would say that for 20% I like the social aspect of it.’

Despite the varying finding regarding the extent to which foodies explicitly mentioned social motivation as driver for participation, all foodies did acknowledge the social aspect of meal sharing as important aspect of the practice. All foodies perceived meal sharing as a social activity that enables social connections with neighbours as well as providing opportunities for social interaction moments. I will go more into detail about this social meaning of the practice in section 6.5.3.

6.1.3 Instrumental motivations
The interviews revealed that most foodies are in the first place instrumentally motivated to participate in meal sharing. ‘Getting a meal’ was mentioned as main driver for participation. In addition to this, a second driver for participation was that it saves them effort. Foodies referred to saving effort as ‘using meal sharing to make food provisioning more convenient.’ Lastly, meal sharing was mentioned to meet foodies’ requirements for food provisioning, also referred to as food values. These included: health, price and taste. The meals provided via meal sharing are perceived as a healthy meal for a reasonable price and of good quality. One foodie explained:

‘It is a way to have a healthy meal without having to invest the effort of having to cook and thinking of what to cook. Well at least that is effort for me.’

Most foodies mentioned that they were not willing to compromise their food values to save time or effort in their food provisioning. One foodie for example explained that if there are no meal offers that are sufficiently meeting her food values, she refrains from using meal sharing via TA as method for food provisioning.

Interviewer: So, if you feel the need to eat vegetables to have a healthy balance in your meals for that week and you see your cook offers for example lasagne, would you not sign up for this meal?
Foodie: ‘Indeed, I would choose not to order that meal.’
Interviewer: You would choose for an option that enables you to have more balance [referring to eating a healthy meal instead of an unhealthy meal]?

\[8\] In this fragment the author cites how the foodie described her experience with TA. Remarks between quotation marks are literal quotations from the foodie as cited by the author.
Foodie: ‘Yes, I would take a recipe book [to cook for herself].’

During the interviews, the motivation related to saving effort made me wonder what distinguished meal sharing from other alternative methods providing convenience in food provisioning such as Thuisbezorgd.nl, or Deliveroo. This interest particularly came from my own experiences. On one hand, I perceived meal sharing as more convenient in terms of saving physical effort, as it replaced the need for having to do groceries and own cooking, but on the other hand, I experienced that meal sharing did require time and effort related to activities such as registering for a meal and picking up the meal. As such it appeared to me that meal sharing via TA may not be more effort saving when comparing absolute effort required for meal sharing with cooking, or other alternative food provisioning methods. When I discussed this during the interviews, foodies argued that other alternative food provisioning methods which they also perceived as fulfilling a demand for convenience related to saving effort, do not sufficiently match their personal food values. Foodies mentioned that with these alternative methods there is always at least one value that is underrepresented. For example, one foodie explained that a tasty or healthy meal from Deliveroo is often too expensive, whereas a cheap meal from Thuisbezorgd.nl is often perceived as unhealthy.

6.1.2 Personal motivations
Two often mentioned personal motivations included curiosity and enjoyment. Curiosity and enjoyment both related to three aspects of meal sharing. First, its non-commercial character. Foodies saw TA as something non-commercial because of the idea that the participants - both cooks and foodies - of the platform do not participate to make profit. This assumption is based on the rule for the cooks of the platform to offer a meal for prices that do not exceed costs for groceries. Secondly, specifically curiosity related to the expectation that meal sharing offers opportunities to discover and experience new recipes and flavours. Some foodies liked the idea of discovering and experiencing new recipes because they like food and they like to try new flavours. For others, this trying new recipes and tastes was related to the objective of adding more variety to their diet, e.g., more vegetarian meals. Thirdly, the social aspect of ‘connecting with neighbours’ was mentioned as an appealing aspect of meal sharing what made meal sharing perceived as an enjoyable practice. This aspect will be discussed in more detail in section 6.5. These three aspects of meal sharing especially appealed to the foodies and made them curious about meal sharing, and these aspects make meal sharing an enjoyable experience for them.

6.1.5 Summary of motivations for participation
To summarize, the overall motivation for foodies to participate in meal sharing is instrumental, related to getting a meal and fulfilling a demand for convenience in food provisioning whilst preserving food values. In addition to instrumental motivations, important personal motivations for joining TA are related to both curiosity and enjoyment. Curiosity was mainly driven by the fact that the concept of meal sharing appealed to them because of three aspects: the non-commercial character of the platform, the possibility of opportunity of discovering and experiencing new recipes and flavours and the social aspect of meal sharing. Finally, foodies

---

9 Thuisbezorgd.nl and Deliveroo are examples of commercial meal delivery services.
did not link meal sharing with environmental motivations such as sustainability. All motivations are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Identified motivations for participation in meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Connection with neighbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Getting a meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Saving effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserving food values</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Curiosity and enjoyment</td>
<td>Non-commercial character of the platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiencing new recipes and tastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social aspect of meal sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Food provisioning
In the following sections I present the findings related to foodies’ daily food provisioning by first elaborating on how foodies described food provisioning in everyday life (6.2.1), people’s considerations in food provisioning (6.2.2), and the performance of food provisioning activities (6.2.3). This provides a context for section 6.3, in which I will go into more detail on the performance of meal sharing.

6.2.1 Food provisioning: daily life
Most foodies described their daily lives as characterized by unpredictability. Factors related to this unpredictability varied from varying working hours, varying - spontaneous - social activity planning, and other unexpected events. Foodies mentioned that this unpredictability is reflected in the organization of their food provisioning activities. This unpredictability mainly seemed to influence their meal planning in that foodies are not able to plan their meals too far ahead, with a maximum of one to two days. In addition to unpredictability, most foodies identified their lives as busy. In line with this, perceived time pressure was mentioned as one of the factors that influenced their daily food provisioning activities.

10 No explicit motivations were mentioned.
6.2.2 Food provisioning: considerations

During the interviews, multiple considerations related to food provisioning were mentioned. These can be categorised as instrumental, ethical, political, and quality considerations respectively. First, instrumental considerations relate to time efficiency and effort efficiency. Foodies underlined that their food provisioning needs to be efficient in terms of time and effort. Especially in meal preparation (cooking) this consideration is accounted for. This is mainly related to either the foodie disliking to cook, or physically not being able to cook. Secondly, health considerations related to the nutritional value of food products. Foodies rationalized food provisioning practices by categorizing them in dichotomous categories such as ‘healthy’ and ‘unhealthy’. Meals from TA are home-made which most foodies categorize as a ‘healthy option’, whereas a pre-made meal from the supermarket is often referred to as ‘unhealthy’. Ethical and political considerations related to animal welfare and environmentalism. Most foodies mentioned aspects of environmentally/sustainability conscious behaviour during acquisition (grocery shopping), such as consciously buying and wanting to eat as much organic produce as possible, and buying the right amount of groceries to prevent food waste. Moreover, when talking about meal planning and preparation, some foodies mentioned consciously planning meatless meals into their weekly meal schedules. Finally, quality considerations related to the taste of the meal. Most foodies mentioned the importance of a good tasting meal.

6.2.3 Food provisioning: activities

As described in chapter 3, food provisioning can be perceived as existing of different activities. Before the field work started, I adopted the conceptualization of food provisioning as proposed by McIntyre and Rondeau (2011) (Figure 4), and based the interview guide on this conceptualization. However, during the interviews as well as during further review of the literature, my perception of what daily food provisioning entails in terms of related activities slightly changed, mainly because my focus was on food provisioning specifically related to the evening meal. For example, I found meal planning to be an important activity in people’s everyday food provisioning practices. The activities of production, e.g., gardening, and consumption, i.e. eating the food, were not mentioned during the interviews at all. For this reason, I have left out these activities in the presentation of the study findings. This led to a new conceptualization of food provisioning related activities as depicted in Figure 5.

Figure 4. Food provisioning activities (McIntyre & Rondeau, 2011).
In this section part I will summarize the performance of food provisioning activities. The activities that are highlighted serve to provide the context of everyday food provisioning in which meal sharing takes place. It exemplifies the considerations foodies take into account regarding food provisioning and their daily - food provisioning - routine and habits that allow them to handle food provisioning as an ordinary, everyday activity. These considerations are not listed in a specific order as no specific order of priority exists in these considerations. Every time foodies engage in food provisioning practices this starts with meal planning. This is a decision process both about what to eat and about what method of food provisioning to choose. Following this, they engage in a flow of other activities, dependent on the chosen method for food provisioning.

In general, most foodies described their food provisioning as consisting of the application of different methods throughout the week, e.g., eating out, cooking, home delivery meals.

‘I divide it over the week, sometimes we go out for dinner, sometimes we have take-away, sometimes we cook ourselves or just provide an easy meal.’

**Meal planning**

As mentioned before, foodies described their meal planning as a decision process about both what to eat and what method of food provisioning to choose. Most foodies described their lives as busy and unpredictable, and for this reason most foodies plan their meals and the method for food provisioning from day to day. It varied per foodie at what specific time of day (s)he actively starts thinking what and where to eat, and how to provide the evening meal. For some it is one of the first things they think about at the beginning of their day. For others, meal planning is something they do at the end of the day after work.

**Acquisition**

Foodies described a range of strategies for food acquisition. Most foodies mentioned that they do the majority of their grocery shopping in a regular supermarket. Some foodies mentioned that they occasionally visit local markets or specialized supermarkets, such as an organic greengrocer or the organic market. Some foodies do their grocery shopping once a week for the whole week, and throughout the week they often go to the grocery store for small
additional groceries. This weekly grocery shopping often globally determines the meal planning in terms of what to eat in that week. However, foodies mentioned that they do not strictly follow this and most of the time choose a meal ‘they feel like eating’ at a moment.

Specifically, for the acquisition of convenience meals, foodies mentioned to make use of options such as pre-made meals from the supermarket, a take-away meal from a restaurant, ordering a meal via home delivery or ordering a meal via TA (i.e. meal sharing).

Preparation
Most foodies mentioned not to enjoy the preparation of food, i.e. cooking, or perceive themselves as not possessing sufficient cooking skills. Moreover, foodies described how cooking requires effort in terms of physical energy. Also, cooking results in dirty pans and dishes which require additional effort needed for cleaning the dishes. Despite foodies' disliking to cook and a perceived lack of cooking skills, foodies do not refrain from cooking meals themselves when it comes to meal preparation. Most foodies explicitly mentioned not wanting to make use of a take-away meal, or buying pre-made meals to replace the need for cooking themselves. Foodies mentioned that meals from these alternative methods are rarely consistent with their provisioning ideals and food values. Moreover, most foodies perceive it as some sort of obligation to cook themselves. Hence, most foodies aim to cook the greater part of the week themselves, and use alternative food provisioning methods to replace cooking at moments that they really do not feel like cooking, or when they feel like eating a certain meal that they are not able to cook themselves. The importance of a ‘home-cooked meal’ is also reflected in the finding that even foodies with a physical disability who are unable to cook themselves, explain how they organise alternative food provisioning methods for cooking so that that they can provide themselves with meals that closely resemble home-cooked meals. For example, by making use of meal sharing or similar initiatives.

Disposal
Finally, with regards to food disposal, foodies mentioned that they are keen on never throwing away food remains. This also determines their decisions related to food provisioning. For example, if there is still food left in the fridge, eating a left-over is prioritized over preparing a new meal.

In this section I explained what food provisioning in general entails in people’s daily life. The next section describes how the specific practice of meal sharing - as one of the potential food provisioning activities - is performed.

6.3 Meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald: performance in everyday life
As came forward in the previous section as well as what was expected before the start of the interviews, foodies have several methods for food provisioning of which meal sharing is one of these. In the next sub-sections I will describe what practising meal sharing entails regarding how foodies got involved and got started with the meal sharing practice (6.3.1), and detail further what involvement in meal sharing entails in practice (6.3.2).

6.3.1 Getting involved and getting started
Most foodies had difficulties with remembering when and how they first heard about TA. Several ways in which foodies encountered TA were mentioned during the interviews. For some
foodies, the first time they heard about TA was when they were purposely looking for methods that replace the need for cooking. For example, one foodie formulated it as follows:

‘I am always consciously looking for alternatives for food provisioning: where can I find a tasty meal or well an easy meal, so that I do not have to cook myself [...] it is so stupid that I cannot remember how I have come to TA.’

Another group of foodies mentioned that they were made aware of the website via friends, family or social media, e.g., TV, newspaper or Facebook. One foodie mentioned that she came across the TA website of when looking for new sharing initiatives to join.

Foodies described how after registering for TA, a learning process started that involves getting familiar with navigating on the website and/or mobile phone application. Foodies mentioned that before meal sharing delivers the expected benefits of convenience, they first need to invest effort - energy - to get skilled in navigating the website, using the smart phone application, and building a network of cooks that match their individual preferences in terms of what meals they offer, what price they ask for a meal, and at what distance they live. Also, experiencing meal sharing in practice and with this getting to know the community’s ways of talking and acting, is part of this learning process. This process is mostly referred to as ‘a search for the right cook’. One foodie described this search for cooks as a process of trial and error:

‘On a certain moment, you find a certain cook or more cooks who appeal to you, and then you go more often [to that cook] and if there is a cook I have no connection with at all, I just don’t go there again.’

Some foodies mentioned that they have gone through this search process only once at the beginning of TA participation. This search process and experimenting with cooks increases their knowledge on which cook provides meals that match their food values regarding taste, health and price. For some foodies, this search process ended when they had found one to three cooks. This selection, as foodies describe it, ‘represent TA for them’. Other foodies perceived the search process as a continuous activity related to meal sharing. These foodies do not have a fixed group of cooks, rather they continuously experiment with different cooks:

‘Well, I change cooks all the time. I do not have a specific cook of whom I specifically enjoyed the meal so that I only pick up meals from that cook. If there is another cook who offers a meal that appeals to me I will go, there. I am not dependent on one cook, no, that is not convenient because if that person does not cook then I do not have a meal so to say.’

6.3.2 Performance of meal sharing
The performance of meal sharing via TA is described by foodies as a series of 3 steps that occur in successive order: planning of meal sharing, the pick-up moment and the moment after the pick-up. I will first describe these three steps (6.3.2.1). Then I will go into more detail about the frequency of use of meal sharing (6.3.2.2) as well as the development over time (6.3.2.3).

6.3.2.1 Steps in meal sharing
In chapter 3 meal sharing was described as set of subsequent activities. Instead of discussing the performance of meal sharing as separate activities, I follow the global structure of the main themes - the three steps - that I have identified in the interviews as this closely resembles the structure used by the foodies themselves to describe what meal sharing entails in practice.
Planning: decision for meal sharing

As indicated by foodies in the interviews, the practice of meal sharing starts during meal planning with experiencing a need for organising the evening meal, and remembering the possibility, amongst other options, of using TA to fulfil this need. For some foodies, TA is the first option they think of when they need to select a food provisioning method. For others, TA is only occasionally an option which is taken into consideration during meal planning. The decision to choose TA as food provisioning method involves a broader decision process in which the decisions that must be made vary from situation to situation. As one foodie formulated:

‘Sometimes it is a matter of convenience, but in other instances it is when I think a meal sounds tasty, I would like to eat this meal and then I change my schedule around it.’

In most cases, before deciding to use TA, foodies look at their activity planning of that day and whether picking-up a meal fits their activities’ schedule of that day. This varies amongst foodies, depending on their ability to cook for themselves. For foodies who are physically able to cook themselves, daily activity planning is a primary aspect which is taken into consideration, followed by other aspects such as meal availability and related choices. For foodies who cannot cook themselves on the other hand, TA is in most cases regarded as the default method for food provisioning. In these cases, foodies mention that they plan their daily activities in such a way that TA fits their activity planning. For these foodies, the decision to make use of TA or not is not so dependent on their activity planning, but rather mainly dependent on meal availability as well as what meals are offered, at what distance, and at what price.

Subsequently, if TA is decided as an option for meal provisioning, foodies open their mail to check for a TA message. Alternatively, foodies open the smart phone application to check for meal availability. This is when the decision process for choosing a meal starts. Foodies mention that every time they receive an e-mail from TA, they screen the e-mail content for a meal that appeals to them. However, foodies do not always act upon it when they see a meal that appeals to them. During this decision process, foodies look at (1) what meals are offered that day, (2) at what distance from their house, (3) at what time the meals can be picked up, and (4) the price of the meal. All these considerations are weighed against each other. These considerations are not presented in a certain order, as each foodie has different priorities. Moreover, each foodie has its own requirements regarding these criteria. Overall, most foodies are looking for a healthy convenience meal. For most foodies, a maximum travel time of fifteen minutes is perceived as acceptable. Regarding pick-up time, somewhere between 18:00 - 19:00 hrs. fits most foodies’ daily activities’ schedule best. Finally, for most foodies a meal price within the range of € 4 - 5 is perceived acceptable. Foodies do not perceive meal sharing as a significantly cheaper option compared to alternatives for convenience meals.

After the decision to use meal sharing as food provisioning method, foodies plan and order the meal. When a meal is picked, a request is placed by filling in an online form. After the request is sent to the cook, the cook needs to respond positively to the request. A positive response includes an e-mail with an agreement on pick-up date and time.

Pick-up moment

At the agreed upon date and time, the foodie goes to the cook’s house to pick up the meal. Most foodies travel to the cook either by bike or by foot. Other transport methods that were
mentioned included by wheel chair, or by car. Which transport method is used, mainly depended on the distance between foodie and cook, which varies from several hundreds of meters to one or several kilometres.

When foodies are asked to describe the pick-up moments, overall, they mention that how the pick-up moment goes is dependent on the cook who makes decisions regarding, for example, where the transaction takes place, e.g., in the kitchen, or at the front door. Thus, in the interviews foodies’ descriptions of the pick-up moments slightly varied in terms of routines, rules and behaviours. Common elements in the descriptions of the pick-up moments are meeting - sometimes for the first time - and greeting the cook, waiting for the cook to fill the meal container with the meal, and at the same time having a conversation with the cook. The pick-up moment is concluded with the foodie paying for the meal with cash money. After payment, the foodie leaves to eat the meal at home.

During my observations, I noticed that most transactions took place in the kitchen of the cook. Most pick-up moments lasted no longer than five minutes, including the cook filling the meal container, conversations between cook and foodie, and the moment of payment. I observed one pick-up moment where the foodie was invited to join dinner with the cook and his family. This exemplifies how different cooks shape the pick-up moment in different ways. However, during the interviews it appeared that this latter example was more an exceptional case as no other foodie mentioned to be invited to stay for dinner. Another example of how pick-up moments differ is that foodies described how the conversations during the pick-up moment varied per cook, both in length and with respect to topics discussed. Some foodies mentioned that the conversations were of short duration, whereas for others longer conversations occur. During my observations at different pick-up moments I noticed these differences as well. The following extract from my observation notes illustrates this.

‘When observing the conversations during this pick-up moment I notice that most conversations are about either TA or the meal. For example, one foodie receives instructions from the cook about heating up the meal. Also, personal issues are shared during the conversations. For example, the foodie that arrives a few minutes later to pick up the meal immediately starts talking with the cook about their holiday plans. After all foodies picked up their meal, the cook tells me that the topic of the conversations depends on whether he is familiar with a foodie or not. With foodies who are familiar to him, he also discusses non-food or non-TA related topics.’

For most foodies, the conversations during the pick-up moments are described as a ‘nice additional benefit’ and they understand it as something that belongs to the practice.

**After the pick-up moment**

After each pick-up moment, foodies are asked to thank the cook for the meal and rate the meal. The rating options range from ‘Finger licking good’, ‘Tastes good’ and ‘Not really my taste’. Moreover, foodies can leave a comment under the heading ‘Share your thought about the meal’. This last part of the rating will be published on the profile page of the cook. Even though foodies are asked to thank the cook and rate the meal after each meal they picked up, foodies mention that they only occasionally make use of this option. Moreover, if foodies have feedback for the cook they contact the cook in person via their personal e-mail without interference of the platform.
6.3.2.2 Frequency of use

The frequency of use of meal sharing varies from once every week to two to three times per month. When looking at the overall sample of foodies, the general tendency seems to be that meal sharing is something that is done on an irregular basis. Multiple explanations have come up during the interviews for the irregular use of TA. This irregularity is mainly because foodies are highly dependent on the supply-side of the platform, i.e. how often and how many meals are offered by cooks.

‘I am not a frequent user. So not every week or something like that. But I must say, the number of meals offered in this neighbourhood is also not very extensive.’

This supply-side is described by foodies as being very variable in terms of when, how often, and with what frequency meals are offered on the platform. Some foodies mentioned that they would make more use of TA if there was more - regular - supply. The review of the social media also showed multiple posts in which foodies for example mention to have noticed that cooks suddenly stopped offering meals or posts saying that ‘supply is very low’ in a certain postal area. Moreover, from my own participation I observed an irregular supply. For example, over five months of my own participation in meal sharing, there have been certain weeks in which I received multiple e-mails with meal offers, whereas there have also been multiple weeks in which no meals were offered at all.

Another reason for the irregular use of meal sharing is more related to the activities of foodies themselves. For example, foodies mentioned that the search process for expanding their network of cooks requires conscious effort that they are not willing to invest as for these foodies, meal sharing does not have enough value/priority, or they do not perceive enough need to do so. Consequently, these foodies only have a limited network of cooks, which results in limited use of TA as food provisioning method.

‘You know, there are probably more suitable cooks, but I do not have a lot of time or I do not feel like making time to search for new ones, I simply do not invest the effort to sort out which cooks are also worth the effort.’

6.3.2.3 Development over time

Foodies described how they become skilled practitioners as they are engaged in the practice of meal sharing over a longer period: they learn the rules and routines of the practice. An illustrative example of the required competences and development of these competences for meal sharing is that of one foodie who describes how, for example, he now makes less mistakes with picking-up meals compared to at the start of meal sharing:

‘Well, I less often forget to bring meal containers. I used to forget them in the beginning. Also, I have sometimes mistaken the agreed upon date of the pick-up. You receive a standard email when a cook offers a meal and then I most of the time I think that the meal is offered for the same day but sometimes the meal is offered for the day after tomorrow. So, there have been moments that I stood at someone’s front door at the wrong date. There have also been moments that I could not find the address or something like that. Well those moments happen less often now. Beginners mistakes so to say.’

People’s general diets also change over time because of meal sharing. I will discuss this in section 6.4.
Hence, the performance of the practice of meal sharing exists of several subsequent steps. Within the first of those steps, meal planning, the decision to acquire food via TA is made based on several characteristics of the meals offered as well as on other considerations not related to TA, such as the rhythm of that day. As soon as this step has been taken, however, and foodies have chosen to acquire their food via TA, the next phases of food provisioning - acquisition, preparation and disposal - relate to meal sharing only. These come with their own rules and routines. I also showed that frequency of use is irregular and varies among foodies, and that foodies develop their ‘pick-up skills’ over time.

6.4 Changes in habits and routines
When foodies were asked about changes in their food provisioning habits and routines since they started with meal sharing, most foodies responded that meal sharing has not significantly impacted their lives, nor has it taken up an important part in their food provisioning activities. Importantly, foodies who are physically disabled and thus rely on alternatives to replace food provisioning practices, often mentioned meal sharing as one of the default options for their daily food provisioning, and thus as a part of their food provisioning routine. Foodies who are physically able to cook themselves, however, did not mention meal sharing as part of their routine. One of these foodies explicitly mentioned:

‘For me it is not really a routine.’

Thus, the extent to which meal sharing has become part of food provisioning habits and routines varies over the different foodies.

Foodies described how, over time, meal sharing does not change their food provisioning, diet habits and routines as meal sharing becomes one of the options they integrate within their wider set of options. However, meal sharing does seem to cause changes in foodies’ diets. These changes include more meatless meals in the diet, more meal variation in the diet, and diminished usage of other alternatives providing convenience meals. One foodie for example described how meal sharing has changed his diet in multiple ways:

Foodie: ‘Whether my diet has changed? Well maybe a little. So, like I said, I now more frequently eat more vegetarian meals. It’s [diet] more varied. In the supermarket, I used to pick pre-made salad meals, once or twice a week, which is super healthy, because you don’t eat too much, and it is often also vegetarian, or at least there is little meat in it. Now I think of it, that actually has become less often because of T.’
Interviewer: You mean you buy less supermarket salads now?
Foodie: ‘Yes. Well maybe I was a little fed up with those salad meals anyhow... It [TA] does have an impact. Yes, I think I eat more TA meals rather than supermarket meals. I think they really replace supermarket meals. And, what I said earlier, I never go and I have not been for a long time, last time was maybe one and a half year ago, to a snack bar for example.’
Interviewer: So, that habit has really been replaced?
Foodie: ‘Yes, before [TA] every now and then I made use of take-away from a shop or a snack bar, but now that rarely happens anymore.’

6.5 Practice as entity: materials, competences and meaning
In the previous sections, I have focused on foodies’ motivations for participation in meal sharing as well as the performance of the practice in daily life and its impacts on daily habits and routines. This mainly illustrated how deciding to make use of meal sharing involves a process
of decision-making in which multiple trade-offs occur as well how the performance of meal sharing looks like in practice.

In the next section I will describe meal sharing as *practice-as-entity* by decomposing the practice into the configuration of the three elements: materials, competences and meanings, which link the different doings and sayings that have been presented in the previous sections (Figure 6).

![Figure 6. Shove and Pantzar’s (2005) Material-Competence-Meaning model: Meal sharing.](image)

### 6.5.1 Materials

Meal sharing relies on a set of technologies. The main technology used in practice is the platform’s website. To access this website, an internet connection as well as a computer are required. Additionally, there is the option to make use of the mobile phone application to access the platform. To be able to make use of the smartphone application requires a smartphone. As the mobile phone application is an additional method for accessing the platform, the latter is not a strict prerequisite for performance of meal sharing. Moreover, there is also a Facebook group that is open to all TA participants.

Moreover, important - offline - material arrangements where foodies rely on are most importantly the meal itself as well as the meal containers which are used to transport the meal. In addition to serving a practical function, the meal containers represent symbolic value. The ‘bakjes’ [meal containers] are part of common language amongst practitioners. Everyone knows what is meant with a ‘meal container’. Finally, important required materials are the different methods for transport, which vary amongst the practitioners from a bike, wheelchair, car, or by foot.
6.5.2 Competences
Moreover, meal sharing requires certain competences. First, foodies are required to either develop or possess planning, organisation and coordination skills that enable them to find a way to combine meal sharing with involvement in other daily practices, e.g., sports, work and household activities. In the interviews foodies described tactics for the organisation of meal sharing alongside other daily activities. For example, to tackle the extra time investment related to travel for meal collection, many foodies organise the pick-up in such a way that it can be combined with traveling from work to home. Moreover, basic ICT skills are indispensable to create an own profile and navigate on the website/mobile phone application.

Another important competency relates to social skills and the ability to learn social rules, also as the first time of engaging in meal sharing requires the practitioner to explore what social rules apply during the pick-up moment.

6.5.3 Meanings
I first turn to an analysis of the meaning element of meal sharing. To analyse the meaning element of meal sharing, I drew from both foodie’s description of meal sharing in practice and their motivations for participation. People’s motivation(s) for participation can be perceived as representing the meaning of the practice for its practitioners as both are associated with perceived - perceived - benefits of the practice.

From the finding that foodies are mainly instrumentally motivated to participate in meal sharing with the aim to get a meal (6.1), it follows that the practice is perceived as a method for food provisioning. In addition to this, foodies’ motivations for participation relate to the practical benefit of meal sharing of yielding convenience in food provisioning activities. What distinguishes meal sharing as method for convenience in food provisioning compared to other convenient food provisioning methods, such as home delivery, e.g., Thuisbezorgd.nl, is that meal sharing meets the requirements related to foodies’ food values such as health, an acceptable and affordable price, and the quality of the meal, i.e. taste.

Foodies related convenience to three aspects: saving time, reducing effort and the experience of the practice bringing enjoyment. In what exact way meal sharing offers convenience is perceived differently by every foodie as well as what reasons foodies have to look for convenience in food provisioning activities. This varies per foodie from not liking to cook, to not having enough time to cook, not having the skills to cook a certain dish, or not being able to cook due to physical disability.

For some foodies, it relates to saving absolute time when there is perceived time scarcity. For others, it relates to saving mental and physical effort required for cooking. One foodie explained:
'And I don’t have to cook and that is really important for me. Also, I don’t have to do the dishes. We only have a small kitchen and there is no space for a dish washer so if there are any dirty plates or pans, I have to do the dishes myself but if Eric comes [to deliver a meal]¹¹, then I don’t have to do the dishes.'¹²

From this quote, it appears that convenience for this foodie is perceived in terms of saving - physical - effort related to meal preparation: cooking and cleaning-up.

However, from the field work it became clear that meal sharing is not always time and effort saving in absolute sense, as picking up a meal sometimes may take an equal amount of time and required effort. This leads to the conclusion that when referring to convenience, this can thus be perceived, or experienced in other ways than in terms of saving absolute time or effort.

For example, convenience is also referred to in relation to the transference of culinary skills. In other words, being able to eat dishes that one is not able to prepare themselves, or not willingly to invest effort in preparing a certain dish. Another foodie explained how meal sharing for her replaces the need for cooking, which particularly comes in handy when she wants to eat a meal for which she lacks skills to cook the dish herself:

‘It [meal sharing] is really a solution so that I don’t have to cook myself. Also, I choose meals that I cannot cook myself. For example, a good stew or something like that. I cannot mash potatoes myself, so I look for meals like that. If I do cook, I cook meals that I can cook myself and with TA I look for meals that I am not able to cook myself.’

Another example is the finding that the required mental and physical effort as well as time that is required to perform the practice might be similar, if not more, to what would be required for other meal preparation activities such as cooking. What is interesting about this finding is that even though some foodies mentioned to explicitly choose for meal sharing to relieve them from the mental and physical effort related to having to cook themselves, they were at the same time willingly to invest similar mental and physical effort to participate in meal sharing and specifically in the activity of picking up a meal. This indicates that it may not be a matter of reducing effort, but rather of willingness to invest effort in one practice and not the other.

The variation in situations leading to convenience as well as how convenience is defined is not surprisingly as convenience has been found to be a multifaceted phenomenon, and therefore does not have a clear definition (Grunert, 2003). The term ‘convenient’ implies that something can be done with reduced effort, e.g., saving time, physical energy or mental energy, as was partly found in the current study. In the food domain, convenience usually suggests that effort is saved or reduced. In the case of meal sharing what makes this practice perceived as convenience might not be as straightforward, or to point out in terms of saving absolute time and effort. This is where social practice theory offers a useful lens, diverting attention away from moments of individual decision-making, which in this case suggests dominance of the convenience motivation, towards the ‘doing’ of the practices. When looking at the doing of the

¹¹ The cook in this fragment delivers the meal to the foodie, whereas in most cases the foodie picks up the meal at the cook’s place. As such, the fragment may appear to be an example of ‘Bijzonder Thuisafgehaald’ (BTA). This is not the case as the foodie is not connected to the cook via BTA. This fragment exemplifies how cook and foodie together organize the meal sharing and that meal sharing may be performed slightly different by different foodies.

¹² All quotes ‘...’ as well as other fragments from the interviews are translated from Dutch to English by the researcher.
practice it seems that as foodies invest effort in meal sharing, but not in cooking delivers enjoyment that comes from meal sharing, and which is not received with cooking.

Looking at the practical aspects of meal sharing and the performance in daily life, the ‘convenience’ aspect of the practice seems only to apply when the practice is perceived to fit in within people’s daily activity schedule. Thus, for the performance of the practice it needs to fit in with rhythm of daily life, otherwise it does not work. This suggests that there is an interaction between people’s motivations and the structure of daily life. In other words, the choices made by foodies are framed by what is possible within the structure of their daily lives. This is illustrative for the earlier observation of Candel (2001) that convenience is a relative construct. Meal sharing is perceived to be more convenient than for example cooking, but only if picking up the meal can be combined with commuting from work to home. Moreover, meal sharing can be perceived to be more convenient than for example cooking because meal sharing is perceived as a more enjoyable practice compared to the activity of cooking. Most foodies perceive meal preparation in terms of cooking as food provisioning activity as a necessity. Foodies speak of cooking as a necessary everyday chore in line with other everyday routine chores. Some even mentioned not to like cooking, but they feel that cooking is the norm, and therefore they aim for a minimum amount of cooking per week. However, this is not true for every foodie. This relates to the extent to which one enjoys the activity of preparing meals (Candel, 2001). Some foodies do enjoy cooking. For them, convenience is purely related to saving mental and physical effort, or because they simply enjoy the practice. Either way, meal sharing as food practice is spoken of as a practice that has both practical advantages, and is also something enjoyable to do.

**Enjoyable experience**
From the previous description, it appears that convenience is not fully explanatory for what meal sharing means to foodies. As indicated, meal sharing is perceived as an enjoyable activity to do. The fact that meal sharing brings enjoyment is another reason for foodies to opt for meal sharing.

This enjoyment is related to both non-instrumental, non-food and food-related aspects of the practice. First, the non-commercial character and the social aspect of the practice. These make practicing meal sharing perceived as a sympathetic thing to do. Moreover, the social aspect of meal sharing, which relates to the social interaction during the pick-up moment, suggests that meal sharing also has a social meaning for foodies. Foodies regularly mentioned that they like the social talk during the pick-up moment as well as the part where they get to meet new people or get in touch with people living nearby. Even though foodies explicitly mentioned not to be socially motivated for participation, this social aspect of meal sharing is undeniable an important aspect of the practice. The social aspects as well as the non-commercial character of the platform are what makes meal sharing a distinctive from other food provisioning practices.

Secondly, enjoyment of the practice also comes from the food itself. What makes the practice interesting for foodies is that it evokes their curiosity. Curiosity relates to interest in trying new dishes and recipes as well as curiosity for the concept of meal sharing.

Thus, the meaning of the practice seems to be more than just convenience. The practice of meal sharing is perceived as convenient not because it is perceived to save absolute time and
effort, but rather because it replaces cooking as food provisioning activity (i.e. meal preparation), which is by most foodies perceived as something they do not enjoy to do. It seems that while foodies aim to save the mental and physical effort of having to prepare a meal themselves, they are willing to invest - a similar amount of - mental and physical effort, and time in a replacing practice that brings convenience while enjoying performing the practice.

**Convenience and enjoyment**

In summary, there are two prevailing meanings associated with meal sharing. In the first place that it is a method for replacing other food provisioning activities, such as cooking, and thus serves as a practical solution to provide an evening meal. Related to that, it is perceived as providing convenience in food provisioning activities. Secondly, meal sharing is distinctive from other methods of food provisioning because food values are preserved, and because it is an activity that is enjoyed whereas with other methods of food provisioning this enjoyment is not experienced.
7 Discussion and conclusion
The aim of this study was to yield knowledge about what role meal sharing via Thuisafgehaald plays in people’s everyday life, and to explore to what extent their participation is driven by ideological motivations. This led to the central research question: what role does meal sharing play in people’s daily lives, and to what extent is participation driven by ideological motivations? I addressed this question by investigating the practical aspects of meal sharing, and people’s motivations for participation in meal sharing.

In the next sections I present the discussion of the findings to the central research question in two parts: the role of meal sharing in everyday life (7.1), and the motivations for participation (7.2). Then I present an overall conclusion (7.3) and the implications of the study findings for theory, research and practice (7.4). To conclude I discuss the limitations of the methodology used in this study and present recommendations for further research (7.4).

7.1 The role of meal sharing in daily life
Social practice theory was chosen as theoretical lens for the study, especially for exploring the practical aspects of meal sharing. Social practice theory provided a lens that steered attention during data collection and analysis to both the representation of meal sharing - practice-as-entity - and the performance of the practice - practice-as-performance (Warde, 2013).

When turning to the question ‘what role meal sharing plays in people’s everyday life’, I have focused at three aspects of the practical aspects of meal sharing to determine the role of meal sharing: foodies’ perception of meal sharing (7.1.1), the frequency of use in daily life (7.1.2), and the structural embeddedness of the practice in relation to daily food provisioning habits and routines (7.1.3).

7.1.1 Perception of the practice
This study reveals that foodies perceive meal sharing via TA as a method for food provisioning. As method for food provisioning it replaces the meal preparation activity, i.e. cooking. Meal preparation is the most time- and energy-consuming stage in the food provisioning process and for many, one of the most regular and time-consuming activities in their day to day household activities (Candel, 2001). As meal sharing replaces this activity, it is perceived as a practical solution to provide convenience in the food provisioning process.

Moreover, this study has shown that it varies amongst individuals when and why meal sharing is performed. Different situations lead to different values and considerations to be taken into account and prioritized when performing meal sharing. This implies that people’s behaviour cannot be properly understood when disconnected from its context. This context is shaped by the everyday activities and sites where the routines of daily live are enacted.

As acknowledged in social practice theory, individuals have distinctive needs, wants and values. However, in what way and to what extent individuals act upon these is framed by the contexts of everyday consisting of a variety of elements such as behavioural routines. This social context can both constrain and enable individuals when performing their daily lives. This has been illustrated in this study where - even though people are motivated to participate in meal sharing - this does not always fit the structure of their everyday life. Hence, participating in meal sharing is not only determined by their motivation, but also by the structure of everyday life.
### 7.1.2 Frequency of use

As described in chapter 3, both food provisioning practice and meal sharing can be perceived as consisting of several interconnected activities: from meal planning to disposal. The present study mainly addressed the activity of meal preparation. Meal preparation refers to the activity of producing an evening meal for himself/herself and/or others, e.g., cooking.

Concerning the frequency of practising meal sharing in daily life, this study reveals that meal sharing occurs on an irregular basis with an average frequency of once to twice a month. Moreover, meal sharing is not as regularly applied as other methods for meal preparation such as cooking, which most foodies apply at least two to three times per week. As such, meal sharing seems to have become part of people’s daily life as an incidental used method of food provisioning available to them. This is in line with the general pattern where home-made meals are almost always the most likely choice for dinner during the whole week.

### 7.1.3 Structural embeddedness: integration in people’s daily life

As has been discussed before, meal sharing is characterised by material elements that are available to almost everyone and easily learned skill requirements. Moreover, it is characterized with a shared meaning of the normalization of replacing meal preparation with more convenient methods of food provisioning while also preserving food values such as price, health and taste. For example, in this case of meal sharing there is the shared idea that home-made is healthy (e.g., Costa, Schoolmeester, Dekker & Jongen, 2007; Dervojeda, Verzijl, Nagtegaal, Lengton & Rouwmaat, 2013). This specific configuration of the practice elements make that meal sharing has the potential to recruit a diverse group of practitioners and thus seems to be applicable for a wide public.

However, when looking at the structural embeddedness of the practice in people’s everyday lives it seems that there are certain barriers that inhibit actual structural embeddedness of the practice, and therefore the reproduction of the practice over time. As argued in social practice theory, any emerging practice needs to find its place within the context of already existing practices by competing with these practices for the attention of the practitioner (Røpke, 2009).

In this study, barriers have been identified that complicate the process of meal sharing practice finding its place within the context of already engrained food provisioning practices, and thus from becoming regularized in everyday life structure.

A barrier identified in this study is that possibilities for making use of meal sharing are highly dependent on the activity level of the supply-side of the platform (i.e. the cooks). Foodies’ food provisioning activities are described as activities that are often planned from day to day. The activities are scheduled in such a way that they are tied into the temporal ordering of other daily activities such as work and social life events. Meal sharing, as method for food provisioning, requires planning regarding when and where to pick up a meal, and when and how to organise the pick-up moment. Scheduling meal sharing into the daily structure thus requires planning ahead. However, foodies described how the supply of meals is very irregular and unpredictable, which limits the possibility for foodies to plan meal sharing ahead. This unpredictable and irregular supply of meals from the cooks complicates the possibility for the foodie to regular schedule the use of meal sharing.
From this it seems that motivation of foodies to participate in meal sharing are not the only factor that have influence on their participation. From the above it appears that this method of food provisioning is only perceived as more convenient when it can be tied into the daily activity structure. As such, it is only an option foodies can actually choose from when their daily activity structures allow them to fit all related activities into their daily activity structure. This illustrates that there seems to be an interplay between people’s motivations and the structure of daily life influencing the participation in meal sharing.

In addition, related to being motivated to participate, the extent to which a foodie integrates the practice into daily life is also dependent on to what extent the practice is perceived as playing an important role in people’s everyday life. This for example determines foodies’ willingness to put effort into integrating the practice in their daily activity structure. A lack of this perceived importance and willingness can explain the limited integration of meal sharing practice in foodies’ everyday life. In this case of meal sharing, even though most foodies spoke enthusiastically about the concept of meal sharing, meal sharing, for most, was not perceived as having enough priority to invest their time and effort in it. This aligns with the finding from an earlier study from Havas Worldwide (2014). In this study, it was found that collaborative consumption is something people ‘would like to do’, but are not - yet - prepared or able to restructure their lives to accommodate this practice. Accordingly, it appears that adaption of the practice partly relies on the willingness of consumers to embark on new ways of doing things that are often less convenient than engrained habits and behaviours (Goulden, 2014).

The previous is illustrative for the fact that people do have ‘agency’. In other words: individuals can be perceived as skilled agents who actively negotiate and perform a wide range of practices in the normal course of everyday life (Hargreaves, 2011). The presence of the influence of everyday life indicates that this agency is embedded in a certain structure and thus under the influence of contextual factors. This points at the role of ‘structure’ in the performance of practices. For example, even though a foodie might want to opt for meal sharing as method for food provisioning, the final choice to opt for meal sharing is determined by his or her daily activity schedule, and whether corresponding arrangements can be made to make it fit in this schedule. Moreover, it is determined by the availability of meals, i.e. if any meals are offered that day. It shows how the context intervenes with if and how people can, or not, take hold of the opportunities offered.

7.2 Motivations for participation: participation for ideological motivations?
When turning to the motivations for participation, I asked the question whether people participate in meal sharing for ideological motivations. I studied this by looking at what were the primary reasons for people to participate, and to what extent meal sharing is perceived, i.e. meaning, as a method to act upon their ideological - social and environmental - values.

I conclude that foodies are not driven to participate in meal sharing by ideological motivations. As discussed in the previous section, foodies do not perceive meal sharing as a method to act upon their social and environmental values. Foodies are mainly motivated to participate for the instrumental reason to provide convenience. This does not align with meal sharing being framed by its initiators in terms of carrying ideological values, such as contributing to a socially better world or a better environment. However, it does fit in the contemporary food domain trend
indicating that increasingly people prioritize convenience and efficiency in terms of both time and effort related to their food provisioning activities (Ohler, 2013).

These findings partly echo the findings from a study from Van de Glind (2013). Van de Glind (2013) also interviewed TA users regarding their motivations for participation in meal sharing. Similar to what was found in the current study regarding the instrumental motivations, it was found that instrumental motivations related to time efficiency, disliking cooking, and having irregular working hours were the most dominant motivations of foodies to participate in meal sharing. In line with this, Bellotti et al. (2015) also concluded that ‘users [of sharing economy services] are looking for services that provide what they need whilst increasing value and convenience.’

Regarding the social motivations for participation, although most foodies are not motivated to participate out of ideology, this should not lead to the conclusion that these ideological aspects do not play a role in participation at all. Specifically, the role of the social aspect in meal sharing should not be neglected. Even though the findings of the current research do not provide strong enough evidence to make definitive conclusions, based on some of the study findings I do assume that the social aspect of meal sharing does play an important role in motivation for participation in meal sharing. This assumption is based on the fact that the social aspect is found to be an important aspect of the practice-as-performance of meal sharing. Foodies have the shared meaning that the social aspect of the practice is an important element of the practice. Foodies relate the social aspect to the enjoyment of performing meal sharing. As such, the social aspect of the practice is what makes meal sharing an enjoyable experience for most foodies, and what distinguishes it from alternative methods for - convenient - food provisioning such as Thuisbezorgd.nl and Deliveroo. In earlier studies, enjoyment of participation in sharing activities was found to be a strong determinant of participation (e.g., Hamari et al., 2016). So, while not directly related to motivation for participation there seems to be an indirect link between the social aspect of meal sharing and motivation to participate. Therefore, I assume that there is more to participation than instrumental motivations. This potential relation could be studied in more detail in further research.

Van de Glind (2013) also found a more nuanced finding regarding the role of social motivation in meal sharing. In his study, users mentioned that they were primarily instrumentally motivated and that social motivations such as connecting with neighbours, were mentioned a second dominant motivation for participation. This conclusion that social reasons does play a role in participation in meal sharing is also confirmed in a more recent study by Böcker and Meelen (2017). They concluded that social motivations play a large stimulating role for intended participation in meal sharing. An explanation for the contradicting finding of the current study where foodies explicitly mentioned not to be socially motivated, may be the fact that in the study of Böcker and Meelen (2017) both providers - cooks- and users - foodies - of meal sharing were simultaneously investigated, and conclusions were drawn without distinguishing between both groups of participants. As noted before in this thesis, engagement and motivations for participation may vary between platform participants encompassing different roles within the same platform (Bellotti et al., 2015). Hence, aggregating information where both roles are integrated may have hidden these potential differences and consequently lead to different outcomes. Moreover, their conclusions refer to motivations for intended
participation. Whereas the current study focused on motivations from people who are actually participating in meal sharing.

Regarding the environmental motivations for participating, Hamari et al. (2016) found that perceived sustainability plays a lesser role when people consider actual participation in collaborative consumption. However, perceived sustainability was found to positively influence attitudes towards collaborative consumption. They suggest that this may be the result of a shift in motivations from environmental reasons, e.g., because of perceived sustainability, towards more instrumental ones, e.g., perceived convenience, during participation in collaborative consumption. However, this shift was not addressed in the current study and as suggested by Hamari et al. (2016) this shift can be investigated by longitudinally monitoring motivations for participation in the sharing economy.

### 7.3 Conclusion

Coming to an overall answer for the central research question: **what role does meal sharing play in people’s daily lives, and to what extent is participation driven by ideological motivations?**

I conclude that meal sharing plays an instrumental role in people’s everyday life where ideological motivations do not play a prominent role in their participation. In other words: meal sharing serves a practical solution as one method for food provisioning, amongst other options, to provide an evening meal in a convenient and enjoyable way. The convenience of reducing mental and physical effort combined with the social aspect of this practice are aspects distinguishing it from other methods for food provisioning, such as cooking or eating out. So, even though foodies do not explicitly have social motivations to participate in meal sharing, the social aspect of meal sharing does play an important role in their participation in meal sharing. Lastly, the irregularity of use and limited structural embeddedness in daily life, makes meal sharing a practice that is perceived as something ‘special’ to do compared to more regular used methods of food provisioning.

### 7.4 Implications of the research

The current study has resulted in an explorative view of practical aspects of meal sharing in daily life as well as motivations that drive meal sharing participation. It has created a first understanding of both the representation as well as the performance of meal sharing in practice. This has implications for both theory and practice.

#### 7.4.1 Theory

From a social practice theory point of view, this study contributes to the so-called ‘agency-structure’ debate. As I both focused on motivations for participations and went beyond these motivations by also studying the social and material context, the importance of human agency was emphasised, and at the same time close attention was paid to the role the social context in which these behaviours were enacted. This has led to the finding that there is an interplay between motivations and the structure of daily life. This finding is illustrative for what is acknowledged in social practice theory that practitioners do have agency and that this agency is always depending upon the specific social and practical constellations, i.e. daily life (Hargreaves, 2011).
7.4.2 Research
From an academic point of view this study points towards new approaches for sustainability research as well as new starting points for further research. First, the current case is illustrative for the food domain as area of interest as it contains specific sets of social practices, e.g., cooking, which form the key units for politics directed at sustainable consumption (Spaargaren & Mol, 2008). This supports Heinrich’s (2013) call for the sharing economy to become subject of sustainability research exploring its potential as a new pathway to sustainable developments.

Secondly, the current case illustrated the importance to look beyond individual decision processes, and start to appreciate the ways in which social and material structures, amongst other factors, are intrinsic to the performance of social practices (e.g., Shove, 2003). As shown in the current study, the daily considerations made by people in their food provisioning behaviour reflect certain values they have. However, what is also shown is that not always the same values play a role in people’s everyday practices. Even within the same method of food provisioning, it varies per situation which values are considered and prioritized. For example, foodies described multiple environmental and sustainability values, which played a role in food provisioning activities such as cooking themselves and grocery shopping. However, these values were in most cases not considered in the performance of meal sharing. From this observation, it appears that individuals act differently in different contexts, considering certain aspects, e.g., certain values, almost automatically in some practices, whilst ignoring them in others.

Finally, based on the deconstruction of the meal sharing practice elements (i.e. material, competence and meaning), I have proposed that meal sharing is a practice with the potential of reaching and recruiting a wide variety of practitioners. However, this assumption is based on theoretical grounds, whereas it is still unclear whether this is the case in practice as well. For example, on the one hand, meal sharing indeed fits in current consumers’ increasing demands for healthier food as home-made meals are perceived as more healthy options than alternative ready-made meals from, for example, the supermarket. However, on the other hand, Böcker and Meelen (2017) found that people are less likely to share meals compared to sharing for example drills or accommodation, which indicates that the sharing of meals is not yet fully normalized as a practice compared to sharing practices of other goods and services. As argued by Heinrichs (2013), growing acceptance and normalization of shared access are a promising path towards sustainable consumption. This poses the question whether enough people can overcome this reluctance in the same way as has happened with for example their perceptions about sharing spare bedrooms. Further research could be conducted to explore this in more detail. For example, by investigating the extent to which non-practitioners feel attracted to the practice, and to what extent they perceive themselves as possessing the necessary skills and materials.

7.4.3 Practice
From a practice point of view, the current study indicates potential points of interventions for the TA developers, or similar sharing platforms, which can contribute to further development of the meal sharing concept. For example, this study has identified some possible barriers that hinder the potential of meal sharing to become an integrated practice into people’s daily life and making it a sustained part of people’s habits and routines. For example, foodies described how the supply of meals is very irregular and unpredictable, which makes practising on a regular basis for them difficult. More regularity and predictability in the supply of meals on the platform
could enhance more regular use of meal sharing. However, as this study was not set out to explore barriers or facilitating factors related to the integration of meal sharing in people’s everyday life, more systematic research on this topic is needed to draw final conclusions and propose concrete suggestions for changes. Nonetheless, based on what I experienced during the fieldwork, I suggest to transform the platform towards a more even distribution of dependency in supply and demand. This might be achieved by adding options for the demand, i.e. foodies, side of the platform to promote their wants and needs.

Moreover, this study showed that recruiting people for - intended sustainability activities does not necessarily have to have green credentials for people to engage in them. As such, I want to point to the suggestion of Bellotti et al. (2015) for service providers to switch focus, and to concentrate more on encouraging and rewarding more personal and instrumental motivations (such as curiosity and convenience) rather than focusing on promoting sustainability ideals. I suggest to focus on promoting these social ideals of social connection as in this case of meal sharing was shown, the social aspect seems to play an important role in the performance of the practice as it contributed to the enjoyment of the practice.

### 7.5 Study limitations and suggestions for further research

Certain aspects of the applied methodology may have implications for the findings and conclusions from this study. It should be noted that the conclusions drawn in this research are specific to the sample group recruited. The study sample consisted of foodies who were recruited through personal networking and snowball sampling. Snowball sampling as method for recruitment is criticised for possibly introducing bias as this method relies on referrals from initial subjects to generate additional subjects, which reduces the likelihood that the final sample will represent a good cross-section of the total population (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). When looking at the composition of the sample of foodies in the current study, it can be argued that this sample indeed potentially does not represent a proper cross-section from the population as the sample consisted mainly of foodies from one city region (Utrecht), whereas the total population of TA foodies located throughout the Netherlands. It is realistic to assume that differences may be found between different city-regions. It would therefore be interesting to replicate this research in other cities in the Netherlands. Moreover, as only one specific example of meal sharing has been studied, this study yielded data on this case of meal sharing. The results cannot be generalized to other cases of meal sharing. However, as this study focused on one specific case, I could get an in-depth understanding of this single case, which can serve as a starting point for further research on meal sharing.

A limitation that I would like to mention is that data is collected by only one researcher (myself). Consequently, data collection as well as analysis depend on my own research skills and my own frame of reference, such as background, beliefs, and interests. On the one hand this has enhanced interpretation of the data because specific contexts could be considered. To address this limitation as much as possible, I have discussed my findings and thoughts with my supervisor before coming to the definitive conclusions in this thesis. Another way to increase validity of data analysis could have been by involving multiple coders in both the process of coding and data analysis (Olson, McAllister, Grinnell, Walters & Appunn, 2016). However, due

---

13 The word intended refers to the finding that Thuisafgehaald is framed as a sustainability activity whereas it is not perceived as such by its users.
to limited time and resources it was not feasible to involve multiple people in this research project.

Finally, a limitation of the applied methodology was the use of interviews as main source of data collection. With the use of interviews, I was only able to capture the verbal representation of the meal sharing. In the light of social practice theory, for a full account of the practice to be investigated, it should be represented by the practical activity as well as its representation (Warde, 2013). I did make efforts to complement interview data with various other methods for data collection, with the aim to also capture the behavioural representation of the practice. For example, the participant observations during the pick-up moments did provide verification between the foodies’ ‘sayings’ - through self-reported accounts in the interviews - and their ‘doings’ - through demonstration as observed during observations - of part of the practice. However, in the end this did not yield enough data to provide a full account of the practice in terms of both types of representations (performance and representation). Until now, there is no univocal agreement on what is the best way to examine practices (Warde, 2013). A suggestion to further complement data collection that has come up during the research was to complement interview data with diary notes in which foodies capture their food provisioning practices for seven days including related thoughts, feelings and events. I was not able to set this up in my research because of limited time and resources. For future research, this could be a valuable additional method to collect data on the behavioural representation of the practice without having to observe this behaviour.
Summary

The sharing economy has become an increasingly popular phenomenon across society and academia. Interest in this concept is fuelled by its promises to tackle problems related to unsustainable consumption as well as the claims made that sharing is overall beneficial to the economy, the environment and the society.

Previous research on the sharing economy has concentrated on a few research foci ranging from its business models, the impacts of the sharing activities and motivations of participations for participation. This, however, has left other aspects of the sharing economy, such as the practical aspects of these sharing activities, understudied. Moreover, previous studies have been conducted in a selection of all existing sharing economy segments, such as accommodation sharing (e.g., Airbnb) and car-sharing (Zipcar). Consequently, specific sharing segments seem to have received considerable less attention. One example of an understudied segment is the food sharing segment. Till date, little literature has been done addressing the food segment of the sharing economy.

These two observations highlight the need for research that addresses these knowledge gaps to increase our understanding of the sharing economy phenomenon. The aim of this study is exploring the practical aspects of sharing practices in an understudied, but upcoming segment of the sharing economy: food sharing. As food sharing, comprising a variety of sharing practices, has received little research attention until now, I have chosen to start exploring one specific case in this domain: meal sharing.

Specifically, this research was set out with the aim to investigate what role meal sharing plays in people’s everyday lives. Subsequently, two objectives were developed for this study: (1) to explore the practical aspects of meal sharing in the context of people’s everyday life; and (2) to analyse to what extent ideological motivations play a role in participation in meal sharing. This led to the following central research question:

*What role does meal sharing play in people’s daily lives, and to what extent is participation driven by ideological motivations?*

Theoretical lens

The literature concerning people’s engagement in the sharing economy mainly focused on motivations for (intended) participation in sharing economy activities. From these studies, it can be concluded that there exists a general understanding that motivations for participation in the sharing economy activities differ amongst various segments of the sharing economy as well as amongst participants from different roles in platforms within one segment. The sharing behaviour in these studies is viewed as an expression of these values and attitudes as conceptualized in social psychological models, such as the dominantly used Attitude-behaviour model by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). Moreover, current knowledge on engagement in the sharing economy is largely based on quantitative data. Its limitation is that quantitative data collection methods are not geared to in-depth understanding.

Another way to look at people’s engagement in sharing activities, is to view behaviour as an observable expression of a social phenomenon rather than as expressions of individual values.
and attitudes. Framed this way, behaviour is viewed as underpinned by socially shared tastes and meanings, knowledge and skills and materials and infrastructures.

In this research, engagement in sharing economy activities was studied with a focus on both motivations for participation as well as on the practical aspects of engagement in sharing economy activities, and thereby zooming in on the context of everyday life in.

Social practice theory, or the theory of practice has been used as theoretical lens to guide data collection and analysis. Social practice theory centres around the reality of everyday life, and how people shape and give meaning to that reality. As food practices, such as meal sharing are examples of highly embedded activities in people’s everyday life, Social practice theory is a useful theoretical lens for studying these practices.

Methods
An explorative case-study was conducted to explore the practical aspects of meal sharing in people’s everyday life. Multiple qualitative data collection methods have been chosen for this purpose: semi-structured interviews with users of the platform were chosen as the main source of data. A review of social media and participant observations have been used as supplementary data sources.

Main findings
The overall motivation for foodies to participate in meal sharing is instrumental, related to getting a meal and fulfilling a demand for convenience in food provisioning whilst preserving food values. In addition to instrumental motivations, important personal motivations for joining TA are related to both curiosity and enjoyment. Curiosity was mainly driven by the fact that the concept of meal sharing appealed to them because of three aspects: the non-commercial character of the platform, the possibility of opportunity of discovering and experiencing new recipes and flavours and the social aspect of meal sharing. Finally, foodies did not link meal sharing with environmental motivations such as sustainability.

Meal sharing as practice was described as involving a process of decision-making in which multiple trade-offs occur. It varied amongst individuals when and why meal sharing was performed. The performance of meal sharing via TA is described by foodies as a series of 3 steps that occur in successive order: planning of meal sharing, the pick-up moment and the moment after the pick-up. From a practice point of view, meal sharing can be viewed as configured by material elements that are available to almost everyone and easily learned skill requirements. Moreover, it is characterized with a shared meaning of the normalization of replacing meal preparation with more convenient methods of food provisioning while also preserving food values such as price, health and taste.

Conclusion
Overall, it can be concluded that meal sharing plays an instrumental role in people’s everyday life: meal sharing serves a practical solution as one method for food provisioning, amongst other options, to provide an evening meal in a convenient and enjoyable way where ideological motivations do not play a prominent role. The convenience of reducing mental and physical effort combined with the social aspect of this practice are aspects distinguishing it from other methods for food provisioning, such as cooking or eating out. So, even though foodies do not
explicitly have *social* motivations to participate in meal sharing, the social aspect of meal sharing does play an important role in their participation in meal sharing.
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Appendix A: information letter and informed consent form

Informatiebrief [information letter]

Wageningen, mei 2017

Betreft: afstudeeronderzoek naar het delen van maaltijden via een online deelplatform

Geachte heer/mevrouw,

Ik ben een masterstudente Gezondheid en Maatschappij aan de universiteit van Wageningen. Voor mijn afstudeerscriptie doe ik onderzoek naar het delen van maaltijden via online deelplatformen. Met dit onderzoek probeer ik inzicht te krijgen in wat redenen zijn voor gebruikers van Thuisafgehaald om maaltijden af te halen via een online deelplatform. Daarnaast wil ik inzicht krijgen in hoe het afhalen van maaltijden via Thuisafgehaald deel uitmaakt van het dagelijks leven van deze gebruikers.

Voor dit afstudeeronderzoek ben ik op zoek naar afhalers die een bijdrage willen leveren aan mijn onderzoek. Dit kan door deel te nemen aan een kort interview waarin we in gesprek gaan over je motivatie voor deelname aan Thuisafgehaald en je ervaringen met het afhalen van maaltijden via Thuisafgehaald.

Voordat u beslist of u wilt meedoen aan dit onderzoek, krijgt u uitleg over wat het onderzoek inhoudt. Lees deze informatie rustig door en vraag mij gerust om nadere uitleg als u vragen heeft.

Hoe wordt het onderzoek uitgevoerd en wat wordt er van u gevraagd?

Voor dit onderzoek zal er, op een locatie en tijdstip afgestemd op uw beschikbaarheid, een interview worden gehouden over uw deelname als afhaler aan Thuisafgehaald. In dit interview zullen er vragen worden gesteld over uw redenen voor deelname aan Thuisafgehaald, uw ervaring met het afhalen van maaltijden via Thuisafgehaald en wat er zoal komt kijken bij het afhalen van een maaltijd (van het kiezen van een maaltijd tot het moment van afhalen). Het interview zal ongeveer 45-60 minuten van uw tijd in beslag nemen.

Wat gebeurt er met uw gegevens?

Tijdens het interview zullen er geluidsopnames worden gemaakt. Deze geluidsopnames zullen worden gebruikt om na afloop van het interview het gesprek uit te kunnen werken op de computer in de vorm van een geanonimiseerd gespreksverslag. Indien gewenst, heeft u de mogelijkheid om het uitgewerkte gespreksverslag in te zien en hier eventueel commentaar op te leveren.

Elke respondent krijgt een aparte code toegewezen. Uw naam (en eventuele andere namen die tijdens het gesprek aan bod komen) wordt in het gespreksverslag dus volledig weggelaten. Alleen de ikzelf als onderzoeker weet welke naam bij welke code hoort.

De onderzoeksresultaten zullen, volledig geanonimiseerd, in de vorm van citaten in de vorm van een onderzoeksverslag worden verwerkt. Het uiteindelijke onderzoeksverslag wordt
opgenomen in een scriptie- en stageverslagendatabase van de universiteit van Wageningen (http://tip.wur.nl/).

Al uw gegevens en het gespreksverslag blijven vertrouwelijk en alleen beschikbaar voor de onderzoeker van dit onderzoek. De onderzoeker bewaart de gespreksverslagen 5 jaar.

Wat wordt er van u verwacht als u mee wenst te doen met dit onderzoek?
U beslist zelf of u meedoet aan het onderzoek. Deelname is vrijwillig. Ook nadat u besloten heeft mee te doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u zich tijdens het interview altijd nog bedenken. U kan tijdens het interview dan op elk moment stoppen en hoeft daar geen reden voor op te geven.

Om mee te doen is het belangrijk dat u toestemming geeft voor deelname. U kunt hiervoor gebruik maken van het bijgevoegde toestemmingsformulier.

Tot slot
Indien u nog vragen of opmerkingen heeft over dit onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met ondergetekende via telefoonnummer: 06-27927924 of u kunt een e-mail sturen naar: lian.angelino@wur.nl

Met vriendelijke groet,

Lian Angelino
Masterstudente Gezondheid en Maatschappij (Universiteit van Wageningen)
Toestemmingsformulier [informed consent form]

Thuisafgehaald: een onderzoek naar het delen van maaltijden via een online deelplatform

Bij deze verklaar ik vrijwillige deelname aan het onderzoek.

Ik heb de informatiebrief gelezen en ben op deze manier ingelicht over de methode en het doel van het onderzoek. Ik kon aanvullende vragen stellen en mijn vragen zijn voldoende beantwoord.

Ik had genoeg tijd om te beslissen voor deelname. Ik weet dat deelname helemaal vrijwillig is. Ook weet ik dat ik op ieder moment kan beslissen om toch niet mee te doen of te stoppen met het onderzoek. Daarvoor hoef ik geen reden te geven.

Ik geef toestemming om mijn gegevens te gebruiken, voor het doel en op de manier zoals in de informatiebrief staat beschreven. Ik geef toestemming om mijn gegevens nog 5 jaar na dit onderzoek te bewaren.

In te vullen door de respondent

Naam:

Handtekening:

Datum: __/__/__

In te vullen door de onderzoeker

Ik verklar dat ik deze respondent volledig heb geïnformeerd over het genoemde onderzoek.

Als er tijdens het onderzoek informatie bekend wordt die de toestemming van de proefpersoon zou kunnen beïnvloeden, dan breng ik hem/haar daarvan tijdig op de hoogte.

Naam onderzoeker:

Handtekening:

Datum: __/__/__
## Appendix B: interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onderwerp</th>
<th>Hoofdvragen</th>
<th>Vervolgvragen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deelname TA</td>
<td>Hoe ben je terechtgekomen bij TA?</td>
<td>Motivatie voor deelname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Hoe heb je van TA gehoord?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Wanneer heb je je aangemeld?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Wat heeft er uiteindelijk tot deze keuze geleid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Afhalen&quot;</strong></td>
<td>Kun je wat vertellen over het afhalen van een maaltijd?</td>
<td>Frequentie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Beschrijven hoe het afhalen via TA verloopt/wat erbij komt kijken</td>
<td>□ Hoe vaak heb je tot nu toe al afgehaald?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Hoe vaak haal je gemiddeld af?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Wekelijks/Maandelijks/jaarlijks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wat zijn gebruikelijke aanleidingen om te kiezen om een maaltijd af te gaan halen?</td>
<td>Keuze om af te halen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ In wat voor situaties besluit je om een maaltijd af te halen? En in wat voor situaties niet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Welke overwegingen spelen een rol bij je beslissing om wel of niet een maaltijd te gaan afhalen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Heb je nu andere redenen om een maaltijd af te halen dan toen je begon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Wat zouden redenen zijn om te besluiten om niet meer af te halen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Het afhalen van een maaltijd begint met de keuze om een maaltijd af te gaan halen. Als je eenmaal hebt besloten dat je gaan afhalen, wat zijn dan de volgende stappen die je zet? Hoe ga je te werk?</td>
<td>Afhaalverzoek/Maaltijd op verzoek/Bordje over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Hoe maak je een keuze tussen de optiemogelijkheden van het platform?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Verschilt dit per keer dat je besluit af te halen of kies je altijd voor dezelfde optie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kok kiezen</td>
<td>Maaltijd kiezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Kun je beschrijven hoe je een keuze maakt uit het aanbod aan maaltijden? Welke overwegingen spelen hierbij een rol? (dieetwensen, prijs etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Zijn er bepaalde drempels die je weerhouden van het kiezen voor een specifieke maaltijd?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kok kiezen</td>
<td>Kok kiezen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Als je hebt besloten om af te halen en aan het kijken bent wat voor maaltijd je wil kiezen, speelt het dan ook een rol bij wie je een maaltijd afhaalt? In hoeverre speelt dit een rol?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Zijn er bepaalde drempels die je weerhouden van het kiezen voor een specifieke kok? (onbekende kok, bekendheid van kok op platform, afstand van kok tot eigen huis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Wat zouden oplossingen zijn voor jou om deze drempels weg te nemen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overige overwegingen</td>
<td>Overige overwegingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Zijn er nog andere overwegingen, waar we het nog niet over hebben gehad, voordat je daadwerkelijk een afhaalverzoek plaatst?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zou je kunnen beschrijven hoe zo’n afhaalmoment verloopt?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Hoe verplaats je je meestal naar het huis van de thuiskok?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Als je eenmaal bij de kok thuis bent, wat gebeurt er dan tijdens de transactie? (maaltijd en geld uitwisselen/praatje maken)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Kun je beschrijven wat bepaalt hoe zo’n transactie verloopt? (wie/tijd/etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zou je kunnen beschrijven wat er gebeurt na het afhaalmoment?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact na afhaalmoment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Heb je nog contact met de kok na het afhaalmoment? Waarom wel/waarom niet? Stuur je de kok altijd een bedankje? Waarom wel/waarom niet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Consumptie en disposal van de maaltijd</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Eet je de maaltijd thuis op? Met wie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Heb je vaak etensresten over? Zo ja, wat doe je daarmee?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zijn er nog andere belangrijke gerelateerde activiteiten die we niet besproken hebben?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Meal sharing</strong></th>
<th><strong>Benefits</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Praktisch:** Minder boodschappen doen? Meer tijd over voor andere zaken? Geld besparen? Gemak?
- **Sociaal:** Meer sociale contacten?
- **Overig:** Anders eten? Nieuwe gerechten leren kennen?
- **Anders?** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wat heb je nodig om afhaler te zijn?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Materials</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Zijn er specifieke benodigdheden waar je over moet beschikken om gebruik te kunnen maken van het platform en om maaltijden af te kunnen halen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Competences</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ En heb je bepaalde vaardigheden nodig? (vb: sociaal, planning etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Food provisioning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maaltijd planning:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kun je beschrijven hoe jij in een gemiddelde week ervoor zorgt dat er eten op tafel komt?</td>
<td>□ Wanneer bedenk je wat je gaat eten? Hoe ver van tevoren? (Ergens op de dag zelf/rond etenstijd, de avond van tevoren)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Verschilt het nog tussen het weekend of werkdagen op wat voor momenten je nadenkt en besluit maakt over wat je gaat eten?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ En hoe zit dit met beslissen om een maaltijd af te halen? Is TA er voor avonden dat je niets gepland hebt? Of is TA juist iets wat je van tevoren hebt ingepland?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Food provisioning/Eating**

**Voedselbereiding:**
- □ Kun je wat vertellen over je gewoontes rondom het bereiden van je maaltijden?
- □ Hoe vaak kook je per week (verschilt dit nog tussen werkdagen/weekend) en Hoe veel tijd kost het koken van maaltijden je gemiddeld?
- □ Wat vind je ervan om zelf te koken?
- □ Hoe ziet een gemiddelde maaltijd eruit?

**Food storage:**
- □ Veel/weinig plek voor het bewaren van voedsel?
- □ En in hoeverre beïnvloedt dit je gedrag rondom boodschappen doen en plannen van maaltijden?

**Food disposal:**
- □ Heb je als je zelf kookt vaak eten over? Hoe ga je om met deze voedselresten?
- □ Heb je na TA vaak eten over? Wat doe je hiermee?

---

**Zijn er veranderingen geweest in de hiervoor beschreven activiteiten sinds je bent gaan afhalen?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcription</td>
<td>Read the transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Familiarisation</td>
<td>Use margins to record an analytical notes, thoughts or impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coding / Indexing (open coding)</td>
<td>Read transcripts line by line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply codes that describes what is interpreted in the passages as important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing a working analytical framework</td>
<td>Group codes together into categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applying the analytical framework (closed coding)</td>
<td>Indexing transcripts using the existing categories and codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charting data into the framework matrix</td>
<td>Summarizing the data by category from each transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interpreting the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>