

Title of the Full-Paper

**Consumers' Drive to Share Knowledge Within a Green Clothing Online Community:  
Exploring the Roles of Hedonic, Functional, Psychological and Social Participatory Benefits**

List of Authors

Dr Rebecca Beech – beechr@uni.coventry.ac.uk

Dr Anvita Kumar – ab3512@coventry.ac.uk

Dr Carlos Ferreira – ab6859@coventry.ac.uk

Prof Lyndon Simkin – ac0953@coventry.ac.uk

Contact Address for all authors

Jaguar Building, Coventry University, 113A Gosford St, Coventry, CV1 5DL

## Title and Summary

### **Consumers' Drive to Share Knowledge Within a Green Clothing Online Community: Exploring the Roles of Hedonic, Functional, Psychological and Social Participatory Benefits**

The article explores, what roles do hedonic, social, functional and psychological participatory benefits play within consumers' knowledge sharing within a green clothing online community on Twitter. Prior literature demonstrates the importance of understanding consumers' knowledge sharing online, as the latter influences consumers' decision making and potential attitude and behaviour change. Considering the article context, green clothing, a handful of studies emphasise the prominence of how knowledge shared about pro-environmental behaviour can impact consumers' adoption of a greener conscience. However, there is a paucity of literature that investigates the consumers' drive to share knowledge within the context of green clothing. A qualitative research design, entailing two focus groups and 20 semi-structured interviews, is used to gain an in-depth comprehension to understand what drives consumers to share knowledge.

## Word Count

7,000

## 1. Introduction

The widespread development of the internet has led to the ubiquitous nature of communication between consumers, with the subsequent creation of online communities. As a result, online communities have become a haven of activity that encompasses the sharing of knowledge between consumers via an array of technological advancements. Previous studies determine the importance of understanding consumers' knowledge sharing online, due to a variety of advantageous outcomes that can have implications for marketers. For instance, information sharing about a product or service leads to knowledge sharing amongst users, consequently the knowledge shared assists consumers' decision-making (De Valck et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2014). Despite the abundance of insightful conversations and behaviours displayed by consumers within an online community, there is still a limited academic and managerial understanding about what drives consumers' knowledge sharing within an online community. The research to date has tended to focus on the individual behaviours within an online community (Moisander, 2007; Rokka and Uusitalo, 2008), rather than a collective comprehension regarding how consumers interact with one-another. Whilst a small body of literature has explored collective communication within an online community (Rokka and Moisander, 2009; Cervellon and Wernerfelt, 2012), there is still a lack of understanding concerning what factors drive consumers' knowledge sharing within a green clothing online community.

Considering the advanced technological landscape that has led to prolific knowledge sharing between consumers within online communities, this study explores the phenomenon via a current context that has been gaining traction and importance within academia and industry alike: *green clothing*. Prior literature stresses the importance of consumers' knowledge sharing about green clothing. For instance, eco-fashion-related information supports consumers in selecting alternative consumption behaviour to traditional consumption such as fast fashion (Joergens, 2006). Eco-fashion-related information also assists consumers' adoption of a 'greener' conscience (Anson, 2012). Thus, this study contributes to future work exploring the interplay between knowledge sharing and the positive impacts on consumers' green conscience and behaviour.

This article is organised as follows: Section 2 introduces the concepts of knowledge sharing and online communities, and highlights the paucity of literature that explores consumers' drive to share knowledge. The section builds upon prior literature to deliver an understanding into the four participatory benefits that lead to consumers' knowledge sharing in an online community. Section 3 discusses the methodology entailing focus groups and semi-structured interviews undertaken and illustrates the selection criteria along with the chosen participants and interviewees and the use of thematic analysis. Sub-sections 3.1 and 3.2 deliver an analysis of the data and reveals the participatory benefits that led to consumers' knowledge sharing, and identifies the integral aspects that encourage consumers to share knowledge alongside the rationale of the least important drivers. The article concludes in Section 4, outlining the discussions and conclusions of the article followed by the academic and managerial implications.

## 2. Knowledge Sharing within an Online Community: Factors that Drive Knowledge Sharing

The significant growth of the internet has resulted in an online platform which allows consumers and organisations to obtain and share information (Shen et al., 2014). The vast growth of the internet has paved the way for an abundance of online communication between consumers, which has shaped into OCs. Within the digital era there are many facets, in particular, this article explores online communities. To date several studies suggest that an online community can be defined as a

group of people online who share defining practices and norms of behaviour, and actively promote their moral standards (Komito, 1998; Kozinets, 1999; Cheung et al., 2015). In the same vein, an online community is defined as a group of consumers assembled within an online platform whom exchange information about their similar and common interests (Kozinets, 1999; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). An online community is often termed as a virtual community (Kozinets, 1999; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004; Ridings and Gefen, 2004). A prior study by Ridings and Gefen (2004) discuss the essence of a virtual community which is similar to an online community definition. The study states that a virtual community consists of a group of people with similar interests who interact regularly in an organised way within a common location (Ridings and Gefen, 2004). Considering existing literature that interchangeably uses the concepts, this article uses the following definition:

An online platform which is used as a social environment consisting of people who gather together, based upon their shared practices and norms of behaviour. The communal atmosphere provides a space for people to interact and share information, ideas, advice and common interests.

Academic literature that introduced online community research in the early 1990s primarily discussed the concept within an evolving digital era, the benefits of an online community for organisations and consumers, and the emerging member roles (Rheingold, 1993; Komito, 1998; Kozinets, 1999; Fox and Roberts, 1999). Recent research has shifted towards the examination of what drives consumers to share knowledge within an online community, and what factors impact on consumers' reciprocating behaviours (Wang and Fesenmaier, 2002a; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2002b; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004; Chan and Li, 2010). However, current literature focuses on measuring consumers' intention to share knowledge and the impacts on reciprocity in a quantitative manner and from a managerial perspective.

According to Ardichvili et al. (2009), knowledge sharing is defined as presenting people with the opportunity to distribute and internalise their knowledge via experiences, and to share knowledge to help others overcome a problem. Furthermore, the aspect of information sharing is discussed as a prior activity to knowledge sharing, in relation to consumers who share information about a product or service which leads to knowledge sharing about the products or services characteristics (Shen et al., 2014). Prior research reveals that the process of information sharing resulting in knowledge sharing, informs consumer's decision-making and influences consumption choice or consumer attitude (Williams and Cothrell, 2000; Kim et al., 2008; De Valck et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2014). Thus far, several studies have indicated that knowledge sharing is an important online feature, because an online communities' success originates from consumers distribution of information with one-another (Hsu et al., 2007; Shen et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2014). According to Qu and Lee (2011), the accumulation of information and knowledge distributed by consumers reveals a successful online community.

This article considers two well-known studies by Wang and Fesenmaier (2004) and Chan and Li (2010) to comprehend what factors drive consumers to share knowledge within an online community. A previous study by Wang and Fesenmaier (2004) explored what participatory benefits drove consumers' knowledge sharing within a travel online community. The research found both social and hedonic participatory benefits as the most important drivers that explained why consumers shared knowledge. A social participatory benefit indicated that consumers were driven by a desire to provide support and help to others, form relationships, share ideas and share

experiences as a result of trusting others (Preece, 2000; Wang et al., 2002; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). Users' drive via a hedonic participatory benefit meant that users shared knowledge for enjoyment purposes, entertainment, amusement and for fun (Wang et al., 2002; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). The remaining participatory benefits, psychological and functional, were found to be insignificant. The latter revealed that, users were not driven by a psychological participatory benefit that entailed a drive to fulfil basic psychological benefits, such as, a sense of belonging and an affiliation to an online community and self-expression within the community (Rheingold, 1993; Walther, 1996; Bressler and Grantham, 2000). Alongside, members hope to share specialised language, concepts and cultural norms related to the topic of an online community (Kozinets, 1999). A functional participatory benefit meant that users were not driven to partake in transactions such as buying and selling a product via the exchange of information (Armstrong and Hagel, 1996; Preece, 2000). Alongside, users were not driven by a hope to pursue knowledge exchange by asking for information for convenience and efficiency, and gathering knowledge to aid their own decision-making and learning (Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). In particular, the findings reveal that members do not wish to satisfy functional benefits, because they have no desire for task-orientated deeds, rather they want to partake in social activities (Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). A rationale was delivered by Wang and Fesenmaier (2004) regarding why the findings did not identify a psychological participatory benefit as an important driver to consumers' knowledge sharing. The latter was due to the study investigating consumers' drive to share knowledge within an online travel community that did not entail a sense of belonging and affiliation, Wang and Fesenmaier (2004) suggested that future studies exploring an online community with a supportive milieu could reveal consumers' drive to share due to a psychological participatory benefit. Similarly, Chan and Li's (2010) study concludes consumers seek hedonic and social benefits in the hope to reciprocate with online community members. The study finds that a hedonic and social relationship and enjoyment lead to greater engagement within an online community (Chan and Li, 2010). In particular, the construct of enjoyment is revealed as a pivotal factor that results in consumers' reciprocity, when both concepts of enjoyment and an emotion concept are present, engagement is further heightened.

Nevertheless, a recent study by Cervellon and Wernerfelt (2012) evidence that users are driven by a functional participatory benefit to share knowledge. The study's findings reveal that users are driven to share knowledge because of their desire to become knowledgeable and gain expertise about sustainable fashion (Cervellon and Wernerfelt, 2012). The latter is due to users demonstrating that they share objective knowledge that entails factual and expertise content (Cervellon and Wernerfelt, 2012). Similarly, prior literature that explores consumers' drive to share knowledge within an online community related to sustainability, indicate that consumers are driven by a desire to share accurate information alongside collecting factual content to educate themselves about sustainability (Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003; Kong et al., 2016). Likewise, previous studies evidence that users are driven by a desire to gather knowledge that is credible due to their need to be informed by trustworthy content (Ayeh et al., 2013; Bilgihan et al., 2014). Consumers are driven by a desire to gather information because they want to learn and aid their decision-making about a product or service (Clark and Goldsmith, 2006). The former findings align with Wang and Fesenmaier's (2004) definition of a functional participatory benefit. Thus, current literature demonstrates that a functional participatory benefit is an additional driver alongside social and hedonic participatory benefits, that encourage consumers to share knowledge within an online community. Henceforth, this article aims to understand what roles do hedonic, social and

functional participatory benefits play within consumers' knowledge sharing within a green clothing online community.

### 3. Exploration of Consumers' Knowledge Sharing: Preliminary Scoping and Further Exploration

This empirical article analysed data from two focus groups with participants who were avid users of social media and had sustainable and environmental concerns. The focus groups were held on the 25/10/2017 and the 15/11/2017. Prior to the focus groups, an initial observation of YouTube vides was conducted for the purpose of understanding consumers' language, behaviour and green terminology used within YouTube videos that discuss green clothing. Subsequently, stimuli from the preliminary understanding informed the two focus groups, which entailed four videos that discussed green clothing and screenshots of the videos' comments section to encourage participants to provide their thoughts on how they would share knowledge about the videos. Due to the non-sensitive and non-complex discussion of the study, six participants were used within the two focus groups (Saunders et al., 2019). A chosen criterion informed how the researcher selected the focus groups' participants, this is shown in Table alongside a rationale.

**Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Selecting Focus Group Participants**

<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion criteria</b>	<b>Justification</b>
The participant is 18 years of age and over, and is not a vulnerable adult.	The participant is below the age of 18 and is a vulnerable adult.	This study complies with Coventry University's Ethics, that requires the participants to be 18 years of age and over and not a vulnerable adult.
The participant has a social media account(s).	The participant does not have a social media account.	The purpose of the focus groups is to explore consumers' knowledge sharing on social media. Thus, it is vital that the participants have a social media account.
The participant deems themselves as a regular user of social media account (sharing comments, posting text or images, and using the private messaging tool).	The participant does not refer to themselves as a regular user of social media.	The purpose of the focus groups is to understand consumers' knowledge sharing activity and empowerment. Empowerment literature evidences that users must have been active within an online community for a lengthy amount of time to be empowered. Thus, it is important that the participants consider

		themselves as a regular user of social media.
The participant is aware of negative impacts on the environment and is conscience of their environmental footprint.	The participant is not aware of negative impacts on the environment and is not conscience of their environmental footprint.	This study intends to explore consumers' knowledge sharing within a green context. Initial observations on YouTube found that consumers are not aware of the term green, instead they use the term environmental. Thus, the researcher asked the prospective participants if they regarded themselves as having an environmental conscience rather than having green concerns.
The participant considers themselves to have concerns and an interest towards sustainability and the environment.	The participant does not have concerns or an interest towards sustainability and the environment.	This study's context is green clothing and is concerned with consumers who have an environmental concern. The YouTube observations found that consumers are not aware of the meaning of the term green, however, terms such as sustainability and environmental are discussed by participants. Thus, the researcher asked the participants if they consider themselves to have concerns and interests towards sustainability and the environment.
The participant is available to participate within a focus group held in Coventry, UK.	The participant is not available to participate within a focus group held in Coventry, UK.	This study intends to undertake a traditional focus group that is face-to-face. Also, complying with Coventry University's Ethics, the focus group must be conducted on University campus, for the safety of the researcher and the participants. Thus, it is important that the

		participant is available to join a focus group held in Coventry, UK.
--	--	--

A follow up study of 20 semi-structured interviews was conducted with participants from the #sustainablefashion online community on Twitter. The further exploration provided a richer and in-depth comprehension of consumers’ drive to share knowledge within a green clothing online community. Prior to the semi-structured interview, an initial observation was undertaken on Twitter to identify a suitable green clothing online community. Informed from the YouTube observations and preliminary findings, 269 terms were developed which were structured around the following overarching concepts, green consumption and greening of consumption. A total of 18 hashtags derived from the latter, the #sustainablefashion online community was chosen due to entailing current conversations about green clothing, the majority of members were consumers and over 200 tweets a day were contributed to the online community. A pilot interview was further carried out to validate the structure and content of the questions. The semi-structured interview questionnaire entailed of the following literature themes to understand the roles of the participatory benefits that drive consumers’ knowledge sharing, green clothing consumption, social media and knowledge sharing. Table 2 demonstrates the selection criteria proposed to select the 20 interviewees.

**Table 2: Selection Criteria for the 20 Semi-Structured Interviews**

<b>Selection criteria for interviewees</b>	<b>Description of criteria</b>	<b>Challenges or limitations</b>
Membership of the #sustainablefashion online community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviewees used #sustainablefashion in a ‘tweet’ or reciprocated within a ‘thread’ which used #sustainablefashion.</li> <li>• Interviewees had an active Twitter page and were not deemed to be a ‘troll’ or ‘bot’.</li> <li>• ‘Bots’ and ‘trolls’ were identified as automated accounts, which undertook the following actions: sponsoring activities, selling products/services, or spamming unsuitable content (Chavoshi et al. 2016).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was difficult to judge how long the interviewees had been a part of the online community.</li> <li>• Some ‘tweets’ that used #sustainablefashion were not directly linked to sustainable fashion (fast fashion impacts on the environment and sustainable alternatives to consumption).</li> </ul>

<p>Active membership within the #sustainablefashion online community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prospective interviewees were classified as ‘heavier’ or ‘lighter’ users. This was based on their knowledge sharing and reciprocity within the online community.</li> <li>• Heavier users engaged with other users recurrently and habitually shared knowledge.</li> <li>• Lighter users did not engage with other members frequently and did not share knowledge often.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some prospective interviewees did appear to be ‘heavier’ users, but were in fact using an ‘automated system’.</li> </ul>
<p>Suitability of ‘tweet’ content.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All ‘tweets’ were in English.</li> <li>• ‘Tweet’ content discussed sustainable fashion, either concerning the negative impacts of clothing/fast fashion or alternative activities (mending, upcycling, swapping, making, charity shopping, DIY, capsule wardrobe, and buying less).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interesting ‘tweets’ in another language may have been overlooked.</li> </ul>
<p>Mix of occupation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the online community attracted industry professionals and experts, it was important to ensure a mix of experts and non-experts. This was intended to minimise bias.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checking of Twitter profiles was essential to understanding the Twitter user’s occupation.</li> <li>• This was a challenge when prospective interviewees were vague about their occupation on their profile.</li> </ul>
<p>Mix of gender.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The online community demonstrated both men and women sharing knowledge about sustainable fashion. Thus, a mix of genders was chosen to ensure the study provided an accurate depiction of engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of members were women; therefore, the majority of participants were women. However, a selection of male participants was included.</li> </ul>

Below, Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the participants from the two focus groups, along with Table 5 which demonstrates the semi-structured interviewees. The demographics shown demonstrate the range of participants chosen whom fit within the chosen criteria.

**Table 3: Focus Group 1: Selected Participants and Demographics**

Focus group participant number	Demographic details			
	Age	Ethnicity	Education	Profession
1	35-44	Asian	Medical degree	Professional occupation
2	55-64	British	Degree	Professional occupation
3	35-44	British/Asian	Postgraduate	Associate professional and technical occupation
4	18-24	Asian	Degree	Masters student
5	25-34	British	Postgraduate	PhD student
6	25-34	British	Doctorate	Professional occupation

**Table 4: Focus Group 2: Selected Participants and Demographics**

Focus group participant number	Demographic details			
	Age	Ethnicity	Education	Profession
1	18-24	English/white	Degree	Associate professional and technical occupation
2	35-44	Asian	Postgraduate degree	Sales and customer service occupation
3	18-24	English/white	Degree	Sales and customer service occupation
4	25-34	Black/African	Degree	Marketing
5	18-24	English/white	Degree	Caring, leisure and other service occupation
6	25-34	European	Degree	Professional occupation

**Table 5: Chosen Interviewees for the 20 Semi-Structured Interviews**

<b>Interview Participant (ITP)</b>	<b>Twitter number</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Online community usage</b>
<b>ITP 1</b>		Female	Charity shop volunteer	Heavier user
<b>ITP 2</b>		Female	Part-time mature student	Heavier user
<b>ITP 3</b>		Male	PhD, eco-influencer, lecturer, and sustainability consultant in Tourism	Heavier user
<b>ITP 4</b>		Male	Sustainable textile producer	Lighter user
<b>ITP 5</b>		Female	Researcher about microplastics from synthetic clothes	Lighter user
<b>ITP 6</b>		Male	CEO of second-hand textiles company	Lighter user
<b>ITP 7</b>		Female	Employee at a textiles company	Lighter user
<b>ITP 8</b>		Female	Sustainable fashion business owner	Lighter user
<b>ITP 9</b>		Female	Podcaster and blogger about sustainability	Heavier user
<b>ITP 10</b>		Female	Artist	Heavier user
<b>ITP 11</b>		Female	Co-founder of a sustainable bags and accessory business	Heavier user
<b>ITP 12</b>		Female	Fashion blogger	Heavier user
<b>ITP 13</b>		Female	Works within the textile industry	Heavier user
<b>ITP 14</b>		Female	Co-founder of litter picking business	Heavier user
<b>ITP 15</b>		Female	Design and technology teacher	Lighter user
<b>ITP 16</b>		Female	Fashion lecturer and researcher	Heavier user

<b>ITP 17</b>	Female	Fashion consultant and business owner upcycling garments	Heavier user
<b>ITP 18</b>	Male	PhD and CMO of Vegan clothing website	Lighter user
<b>ITP 19</b>	Male	Freelance photographer and social media manager	Heavier user
<b>ITP 20</b>	Male	Programme manager	Heavier user

The data from the focus groups and interviews was analysed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis. In recent years, Braun and Clarke (2006) have addressed the lack of rigour when undertaking thematic analysis, subsequently, their research paper is now widely acknowledged and is continuously cited within recent literature that uses this analysis technique (Caton and Chapman, 2016; Clarke and Braun, 2017; Castleberry and Nohlen, 2018). Thus, the latter evidences the credibility and quality of Braun and Clark's (2006) six steps shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Six Steps of Thematic Analysis**

<b>Steps</b>	<b>Description of the process</b>
1. Familiarising yourself with your data	Transcribing the data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.
2. Generating initial codes	Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set and collating data relevant to each code.
3. Searching for themes	Collating codes into potential themes and gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.
4. Reviewing the themes	Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (step 1) and the entire data set (step 2), and generating a thematic 'map' of the analysis.
5. Defining and naming themes	Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme and the overall story the analysis tells. Subsequently, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6. Producing the report	This is the final opportunity for analysis. This step entails, the selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

The following sub-section 3.1 discusses the analysis from the focus groups by delivering an initial understanding. Sub-section 3.2 comprises of the analysis derived from the 20 semi-structured interviews and further provides an in-depth comprehension of what participatory benefits drive consumers' knowledge sharing.

### **3.1 Preliminary Understanding of Factors that Drive Consumers' Knowledge Sharing**

#### **3.1.1 Professional Identity**

Users demonstrate a drive to present a professional identity when knowledge sharing online. In order to present a professional image, users modify 'tweet' content, seek validation for their perceived identity from others, and distribute content to demonstrate their professional roles on social media.

The importance of maintaining a professional image on social media is demonstrated by participant 2 by sharing knowledge on one account rather than via multiple accounts. As a result, of participant 2 learning about her/his friends' negative experiences when using multiple accounts, s/he solely shares knowledge that is orientated to their profession. The participant evidences that s/he manages how her/his social media followers view them on one platform, because s/he desires to communicate a professional persona and wants to avoid a problematic situation of 'posting' unsuitable comments:

*I have some friends and colleagues who maintain multiple accounts but there's actually a high error rate associated with that. And the consequences of posting something personal on a professional account and vice versa. As such I took the view to keep it simple, one account of each platform and keep it solely for business purposes... Like I said right at the output I limit my comments for professional reasons. (FG1, P2)*

The statement reveals another underlying rationale to 'post' on one platform, for instance, the participant shares knowledge on one social media because it is easier to present a professional image that way.

A participant portrays the following roles when sharing information, these are, opinion leader, influencer, information sharer and networker. All four roles are presented individually but unite for the purpose of portraying her/his professional identity on social media. Participant 1 discusses that s/he plays the character of opinion leader and influencer, as s/he perceives herself/himself as a user who others will listen to and can provoke a movement to 'raise issues'. Information sharer and networker roles are conveyed by the participant, when s/he states 'getting information' and 'opinions' results in sharing information and connecting with others who are perceived as an 'opportunity' to interact with:

*Part of it is getting information and getting opinion and the opportunity to interact and influence opinion perhaps. Especially if it's a professional group or group's that have 10,000 people... If people make enough noise about a particular problem it gets looked at and addressed. And I find that social media is a good platform to raise issues, because it's instant to more public. Therefore, it gets looked at sooner. (FG1, P1)*

The role of networker was discussed as an integral reason to why one participant shared knowledge about her/his business on Twitter. The participant revealed that s/he was driven to share knowledge

because s/he wanted to connect with perceived experts associated to her/his business. The participant argued that when s/he created her/his own company, networking with related specialists was an important aspect for establishing a successful venture and reflecting a professional identity online:

*And I used to have Twitter when I started my own company, because I found that that was a good way to follow and interact with people that you wouldn't normally have access to. And I use to go to a big event, which had a tiny proportion of a huge bunch of people. So, if you start to follow people (on Twitter) and say you have been to this conference, and saw you speaking then people respond. I found that as a way to get to know people, since my business. (FG2, P6)*

The role of promoter is evidenced as a pivotal persona by a participant, who shares knowledge on social media to endorse the products s/he sells as an entrepreneur. Subsequently, the participant distributes information to be perceived as a professional to prospective customers. The participant discussed that s/he perceives Twitter and LinkedIn as professional platforms that allow her/him to promote health and wellness products, in the hope to sell them to potential buyers. The participant shares information consistently by sharing the same message across social media to promote the products. The participant states that s/he hopes to position herself/himself as a professional in order to create her/his own future jewellery business online. Moreover, the participant signals that s/he seeks validation for her/his professional identity from other users, in the pursuit to create her/his own business:

*I think Twitter and LinkedIn are more professional. It's more communicated between people in a professional way, or to present your business. That's taken more positively. Then the people who want to engage with you, really engage with you... I do sell health and wellness products, so basically, I use social media to promote those products... So why I got into that, is because I want to sort of expand my own business, I will do jewellery in the end. So, I will do network marketing and connect and see how that works first. (FG2, P4)*

### **3.1.2 Desire to Educate**

A desire to educate emerges from the analysis as a driver that motivates users to share knowledge, in the hope to teach others about a topic related to the users' profession. Users depict altruism when sharing knowledge to support others, whilst not expecting a personal gain. Alternatively, users distribute information to teach others for the desire of behaviour change.

Participants gather knowledge from Twitter profiles that they perceive as professional and legitimate sources of information. Certain 'posts' trigger the participants' interest and inspire them to exchange knowledge within the conversation. The information gathered provides participants with a richer understanding associated to their profession, in turn, the participant feels a sense of duty to educate other users by circulating what they learnt. Gathering knowledge is deemed as being very important to one participant, who reveals that s/he gathers knowledge related to her/his profession and distributes the information to educate her/his followers. Thus, demonstrating that as a result of the participant collecting information for her/his own learning, this influences her/his desire to educate others. The participant discussed that s/he accumulates information online nowadays, whereas previously s/he gathered knowledge by 'joining a club or society' or via monthly newsletter subscription. During the focus group, the participant recalled the expansive

network s/he has on Twitter, which is a positive for her/him because s/he can gather information from experts associated to her/his professional interest. Subsequent to gathering information, the participant circulates knowledge for the purpose of supporting others who may be interested. Therefore, the participant portrays that s/he has a sense of responsibility to share information s/he has found to help her/his followers, for the purpose of educating others:

*So, 25 years ago before we were all online if you had hobbies or interests you had to join a club or society. You might get a monthly newsletter... There were bulletin boards... Same interests 20 years ago but the way that I am communicating and sharing those interests is actually just completely different... I am actually following people that are regarded as specialists in the field that I am interested in, I only follow a couple hundred people on Twitter but they very clearly fall into a number of categories... Then I have subject matter experts who perhaps through developing their Twitter or Facebook account have developed some reputation for being a leader in that field. (FG1, P2)*

*So, I tend to use Twitter as an information flow primarily for me... I do a lot of other research and if I think that something that I have read elsewhere is of interest to people who follow me then I will tweet that. (FG1, P2)*

The second statement above evidences the participant's altruistic behaviour driven by her/his motivation to educate and to share information that may be of interest to others.

### **3.1.3 Personal Interest**

A personal interest is demonstrated as a driver that motivates users to share knowledge, because of their curiosity and enjoyment with the content of a conversation. For instance, the latter entails the participant distributing information to respond to a conversation that intrigues them or is affiliated with their family or friends. A higher level of engagement is reflected when the content appeals to the user and fits their interest

Knowledge exchange is heightened when the conversation appeals to the participant's cognition. For instance, the participant evidences engagement with 'posts' to learn more and to display her/his appreciation of the information shared. Participant 6 expresses an expected outcome when s/he exchanges information for her/his personal interest, which includes, a desire to acquire a useful contact or gather information related to her/his personal interest. The participant disregards how s/he may help the user, demonstrating that her/his hope is to only fulfil a need for information to benefit herself/himself:

*I see good initiatives or good projects or community projects. And I mentioned that I work for a charity it's a local mental health charity... And when I see something that is interesting or I could potentially benefit from just from knowing somebody in that group or getting a bit of knowledge. And I would comment and say I find that interesting let's get together and chat. It's easy to engage with people and see what they are up to. On those platforms (Twitter and LinkedIn). (FG2, P6)*

Moreover, users demonstrate their motivation to engage with users that they know on social media, such as, family or friends, to either support or acknowledge content shared by them. A participant states that s/he reciprocates on 'posts' to support and encourage a family member, for instance, s/he comments on her/his cousin's YouTube page to acknowledge career achievements. The

participant demonstrates her/his motivation to only comment on a ‘post’ or share knowledge to support a family member or friend. Thus, the latter reveals that a higher level of engagement occurs when the content corresponds with the participant’s desire to encourage a family member or friend:

*Yeah sometimes (comment). It’s more like friends that have YouTube channels, or family. I have a DJ’ing nephew; he is DJ’ing around the world. So, commenting and supporting like that. (FG2, P4)*

### **3.2 Further Exploration of Aspects that Drive Consumers’ Knowledge sharing**

#### **3.2.1 Lobbying**

Users’ lobby other community users by raising awareness about sustainable fashion with the intention to change others’ mindset and behaviour. In particular, raising awareness about how individuals’ actions can be altered, by championing green clothing consumption activities. The latter includes the following, mending and making. An interviewee demonstrates that s/he lobby’s others because of her/his sense of responsibility to raise awareness within the online community. Interviewee 1 claims that her/his role is an ‘awareness bringer’ and someone who observes the growing dialogue about sustainability. As a result, the interviewee evidences her/his hope to contribute to the developing consciousness of green clothing. A desire to sew for the purpose of mending or making clothes is stated by interviewee 1, as a result of the latter, the interviewee hopes to reduce her/his clothing consumption. Thus, the interviewee reveals a personal experience regarding a changed behaviour that can contribute to being more sustainable:

*As an awareness bringer and as a viewer to sustainability (her/his role). And starting to see where else it is growing. It’s only started in small areas, and its growing and growing and growing. And therefore, where else can I contribute by retweeting and incorporating new hashtags. And again, it’s about raising awareness so we change our behaviour. And hopefully, I learn to sew as a result. That’s where I would really struggle. I have to buy my clothes because I can’t make them. (ITP 1, Charity shop volunteer)*

The statement above reveals that the interviewee has strong concerns for green clothing and examines information to learn more. Henceforth, the interviewee’s involvement entuses her/him to lobby others and advocate change.

Likewise, users share knowledge to lobby others to change others’ mindsets towards greening their consumption, in particular, wearing what they have and not consuming. During the interview, ITP 2 was asked why s/he ultimately shared knowledge within the online community, s/he revealed that a desire was to encourage others to think the way s/he does in relation to green clothing. The interviewee evidenced that s/he accomplished the latter by sharing her/his personal experiences online, such as, charity shopping, donating garments and using what s/he has. In particular, ITP 2 states that s/he strategically distributes personal ‘tweets’ to appeal to the online community. The quote below, demonstrates the interviewee’s hope to alter others’ behaviour by sharing an example about how they could green their consumption:

*So, if I can make someone think on Twitter, about not getting some new heels for a Friday night. If I can make them think you know what I’ll wear a pair from the wardrobe... I would say that probably it’s the personal tweets that get more attention*

*from other people... And I think that the greatest change would be people adopting the sustainable lifestyle. (ITP 2, Part-time mature student)*

Users' lobby for the desire to inspire others to act differently via engagement with a Twitter user. For instance, interviewees stress that reciprocation is more important than receiving a 'like' on their 'post', this is due to the interviewees' hope to have a conversation with others to raise awareness. ITP 9 explains that s/he wants to 'reach people that aren't actively engaged', and to 'make them aware of the problem, and then the power that they've got will make them part of the solution'. The latter, evidences the interviewee's hope to encourage others to think differently and alter their behaviour. Likewise, ITP 5 argues that s/he wants to engage with others rather than receive a 'like' on her/his 'tweet', the latter is described as not being a 'real interaction'. The interviewee evidences that as a result of information exchange between herself/himself and a user, s/he hopes that the conversation will influence the users' rationale towards green clothing:

*But that's why I talk to people in the first instance, because I want to share knowledge and raise awareness... So, if they like my tweet, okay, but I'm more interested in interaction on Twitter. And maybe they can email me. And we can spark some collaboration. Or even if they ask for some information. A like is okay, but it's not enough, it's not real interaction. (ITP 5, Researcher about microplastics from synthetic clothes)*

*I want to share because the information about microplastic pollution from synthetic clothes is quite important (her/his research). And a lot of people are not aware of this problem. And now there is a lot of talk more than previous years about this particular issue... So, since I work on this topic, I think it's useful that my research is more approachable for the people within this community. And useful anyway to reach more people, and familiarise them with the environmental program. (ITP 5, Researcher about microplastics from synthetic clothes)*

The second statement by ITP 5 demonstrates that s/he shares her/his research to make others more aware of her/his work, in order to educate users about the subject. For instance, ITP 5 distributes information about the environmental programme associated to her/his research, in order to 'familiarise' others with the concept and improve their understanding:

### **3.2.2 Work Agenda**

An interviewee argues that s/he feels a sense of responsibility to distribute correct sustainable fashion information from her/his professional Twitter page, because of her/his environmental conscience. During the interview, ITP 11 discussed her/his concerns for the environment which originated from reading as a young child and has amplified since s/he created the business in 2005 with her/his partner. Thus, the interviewee evidences a drive to promote her/his business because of the green initiatives that form the company and due to her/his conscience. ITP 11 discusses her/his experience working in the sustainable fashion industry for 'over 20 years', and argues that s/he has connections with academic and scientific communities. The interviewee states that as a result of her/his broad perspective about sustainable fashion, s/he shares knowledge with a 'careful balance' that is factual about green clothing and about her/his business:

*Because of the industry that we are in, and what we have been doing for over 20 years now. We have a lot of links into academia into scientific communities. We see studies*

*coming out that other people are not aware of.* (ITP 11, Co-founder of a sustainable bags and accessory business)

*I guess you're using it (online communitiy) to share information, but there is a very careful balance between that (factual information about sustainable fashion) and communicating pure stories about what we are doing as a company. And how we're responding to that information. It's a way of locating us in the wider environmental movement. So, people know where we sit in that space.* (ITP 11, Co-founder of a sustainable bags and accessory business)

Both statements evidences that ITP 11 is mostly driven by her/his environmental concerns which is then followed by her/his desire to promote her/his business that advocates green initiatives. The interviewee demonstrates an awareness to how s/he controls how her/his followers perceive the knowledge that is shared. For instance, the purpose of the content is to circulate information that is not biased towards her/his company but also to provide factual environmental content.

### **3.2.3 Belonging**

Interviewees evidence a desire to reciprocate with like-minded others who share the same concerns towards green clothing. The online community is portrayed within the analysis as a safe-space for users to distribute their personal opinions and thoughts, without the consequence of receiving backlash from opposing views. A sense of purpose and fitting in is revealed by an interviewee when s/he discussed how s/he benefitted from the online community, for instance, by engaging with others on the same wave length. ITP 9 expresses her/his belonging when stating that 'you're all reaching for the same cause, you're all interested in the same thing', further emphasising that engaging with like-minded others drives her/his sense of belonging:

*I am very aware that my social media feeds are an echo-chamber. They are full of people that think like I do and agree with me. So, it's easy to feel like everybody feels the same way when clearly most of the population don't.* (ITP 9, Podcaster and blogger about sustainability)

A sense of belonging is derived from not just exchanging information about shared interests, but also from having a heated discussion with others and users providing the interviewee with information. ITP 2 shared knowledge within the online community for the purpose of having 'a good rant' and to connect 'with people who are like-minded'. The interviewee shares an analogy about the shared mindset within the online community, 'it's like opening a door to a room where people are speaking about the same thing'. A reliance on the community is portrayed, when ITP 2 states how users are supportive of her/his concerns, compared to negative comments that s/he receives from outside the OC:

*You can get negative comments outside the community. Everybody inside of the community tends to be really eager, and willing and helpful. And quite giving with information.* (ITP 2, Part-time mature student)

ITP 2 expresses that s/he wants to be supported and to engage with others who share the same concerns, unlike in her/his offline life where s/he receives negative comments. The interviewee further emphasises her/his reliance when describing that a sustainable lifestyle is 'a really boring way to live' and that 'it can be a really hard way to live'. Hence, ITP 2 frequently shares knowledge to overcome the hardship of her/his lifestyle, for instance, s/he states 'it's definitely great to share

the fun victories of what I do'. The 'fun victories' relates to purchasing 'dresses from Monsoon for only £2 each' from a charity shop which would have originally cost '£40 or £50'.

Similarly, an interview expresses that a sense of belonging is felt via engagement by using the #sustainablefashion 'hashtag', as the 'hashtag' gives users a role to contribute their perspective. ITP 8 indicates a desire to encourage others to change their behaviours, and expresses that s/he does not feel alone in her/his journey as there are others who are joining the cause:

*Once you use a hashtag, I think everybody has a role. Whether positive or negative. For me I use the positive stance of it. The latest report reading I have done was about the whole environmental change. There's 12 years that we might not be able to turn it around. It's important, I'm a one band woman I need to get it out there. But I'm not a one band woman because there's millions of tweets out there. (ITP 8, Sustainable fashion business owner)*

#### **4. Discussions and Conclusions: The Interplay of The Participatory Benefits**

This article discussed the interplay between participatory benefits and consumers' knowledge sharing and the role that the factors play when consumers shared knowledge within a green clothing online community. The analysis reveals that the majority of participants and interviewees are driven by a social participatory benefit, a psychological participatory benefit and a functional participatory benefit to share knowledge. Whereas, a minority expressed a hedonic participatory benefit. A social participatory benefit is indicated when users share knowledge for the purpose of providing help to other online community users, forming relationships and sharing ideas along with personal experiences (Preece, 2000; Wang et al., 2002; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). A psychological participatory benefit is evidenced when users portray a desire to distribute information to demonstrate their belonging or association to the online community, and to share specialised language or concepts related to the community (Rheingold, 1993; Walther, 1996; Kozinets, 1999; Bressler and Grantham, 2000; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004). A functional participatory benefit is displayed by users who are driven to gather information from the online community to inform their decision-making, in addition for the purpose of convenience and ease, and to discuss consumption activities (Hagel and Armstrong, 1997; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2004).

The study's findings contrast to previous studies. For example, Wang and Fesenmaier (2004) argue that a hedonic participatory benefit and a social participatory benefit are two factors that drive users' knowledge sharing. Chan and Li (2010) concur by stating that hedonic social relationships and enjoyment are determinants of online community engagement. A functional participatory benefit and a psychological participatory benefit are found within Wang and Fesenmaier's (2004) study as insignificant. However, the study suggests that support online community may require a sense of belonging, affection, relationship and affiliation. Considering the present study's exploration of knowledge sharing, the analysis evidences that the online community encouraged users to support one-another and fostered belongingness. A rationale to support the importance of a psychological participatory benefit entails that the #sustainablefashion online community provides a safe-space for users with green concerns to discuss their opinions and share information about how others can reduce their environmental footprint. For instance, users exchanged knowledge to support others by raising awareness about green clothing, and they asked for help or gathered information to learn. The analysis reveals that users require others to support their green concerns and wish to associate with like-minded others. Thus, the findings provide an in-depth understanding that builds upon Wang and Fesenmaier's (2004) study. For instance, the findings

underscore the importance of a psychological participatory benefit as a driver that leads to users' knowledge sharing, due to users belonging to a green clothing online community that provides support and a sense of affiliation.

A social participatory benefit is evidenced within the findings, exemplified by users' altruistic act of sharing knowledge to help others know more about and better understand green clothing, alongside users gathering information to inform their learning. Prior studies demonstrate that altruism, moral obligation and care for the community are important drivers of users' knowledge sharing (von Krogh, 1998; Wasko and Faraj, 2000; Utz, 2009). Specifically, users' knowledge sharing for no personal or monetary reward, is symptomatic of what is referred to in the literature as knowledge embedded within an online community for the purpose of 'public good' (Wasko and Faraj, 2000). Information shared for 'public good' entails 'posts' that provide support or ask for help, the sharing of personal experiences, and discussions relevant to the community's interest (Wasko and Faraj, 2000). The latter is evident within the analysis, which shows the existence of users who are driven by a social participatory benefit purpose to share 'tweets', podcasts and blogs to help others, alongside 'retweeting' articles which may be of interest to others. Interviewees further display social participatory benefit connotations when sharing or relaying personal experiences related to organisations or companies that have reneged on their sustainable initiatives and sustainability promises.

The analysis demonstrates that a functional participatory benefit drives users' knowledge sharing within an online community. The findings are in stark contrast to those by Wang and Fesenmaier's (2004) study, which dismisses the role of a functional participatory benefit. On the other hand, the findings correlate with those by Cervellon and Wernerfelt (2012), who found that users' motivation to share knowledge is for functional reasons. For example, users share factual and scientific information alongside content related to consuming green fashion, and search for knowledge about green alternatives. Several past studies have suggested that users who gather information within an online community are 'lurkers' (Kozinets, 1999; Nonnecke and Preece, 2000; Mo and Coulson, 2010). The findings contribute to Nonnecke and Preece's (1999) study, by providing an understanding into how users 'lurk' in order to gather information because they lack confidence or want to learn. Users are shown within the analysis to 'de-lurk' once they perceive themselves as knowledgeable, and subsequently, share knowledge to support others and distribute information related to green clothing concepts. However, the analysis shows that users return to 'lurking' to validate what they know. Thus, the findings offer additional, important insights regarding the activity of a 'lurker' within an online community.

Future research is warranted to undertake a follow-up study that uses a quantitative method to empirically validate the participatory drivers that lead to consumers' knowledge sharing. Future academic work should further explore users' intention to share knowledge in relation to participatory benefits within an online community within an under-researched context of pro-environmental behaviour.

The findings delivered managerial contributions that have implications for industry and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). First, the findings offer valuable insights to social media managers associated with a brand that prides itself of a sustainable supply chain and claims to encourage pro-environmental behaviour. For instance, the findings show how social media managers can harness the online community to encourage users to share knowledge. To accomplish this goal, a gatekeeper should provide an online community that enables users to share

content and help others along with the ability to share personal experiences, which fulfils the social participatory benefit. Alongside the gatekeeper delivering a community that fosters a sense of belonging and allows users to share knowledge and reciprocate with others about concepts, cultural norms and language that affiliates to the community context. The latter would meet users desire for a psychological participatory when sharing knowledge. Lastly, the role of the gatekeeper could consist of promoting a collegiate atmosphere that enables users to share their knowledge for others to learn to aid their understanding or decision-making in regards to green clothing. Hence fitting a functional participatory benefit. Implications for NGOs, specifically, charities and civil societies with a sustainable agenda that endorse public pro-environmental behaviour, include how the charities and civil societies' gatekeeper should harness the online community. The gatekeeper of an NGO online community should strive for users' sense of belonging within their online community, due to the competitive nature of NGOs as non-profit organisations that require funding in order to survive (Aldashev and Verdier, 2010; Nunnenkamp and Öhler, 2012). Thus, the gatekeeper of the NGO online community should encourage users to share their pro-environmental behaviours and develop an environmental conscience via sharing posts that foster interaction from users and create discussion. However, the gatekeeper should be mindful of the importance of getting the balance right between sharing enough content to foster belonging and, concomitantly, not distributing too many posts that may deter users from sharing knowledge.

## References

- Aldashev, G., and Verdier, T. (2010) 'Goodwill bazaar: NGO competition and giving to development'. *Journal of Development Economics*, 91(1), 48-63
- Anson, R. (2012) 'Editorial: Can the shift of textile and clothing production to Asia be reversed?'. *Text. Outlook Int.* 19, 4-9
- Ardichvili, A., Page, V., and Wentling, T. (2003) 'Motivation and barriers to participation in virtual knowledge-sharing communities of practice'. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(1), 64-77
- Armstrong, A., and Hagel, J. (1996) 'The real value of online communities'. *Harvard Business Review* 74, 134-141.
- Ayeh, J.K., Au, N. and Law, R. (2013) "'Do we believe in TripAdvisor?'" Examining credibility perceptions and online travelers' attitude toward using user-generated content'. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(4), 437-452
- Bilgihan, A., Peng, C. and Kandampully, J. (2014) 'Generation Y's dining information seeking and sharing behavior on social networking sites: An exploratory study'. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 349-366
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology'. *Qualitative Research in Psychological* 3 (2), 77-101
- Bressler, S.E., and Grantham, C. (2000) *Communities of commerce: Building internet business communities to accelerate growth, minimize risk, and increase customer loyalty*. London: McGraw-Hill
- Caton, S., and Chapman, M. (2016) 'The use of social media and people with intellectual disability: A systematic review and thematic analysis'. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability* 41 (2), 125-139
- Castleberry, A., and Nolen, A. (2018) 'Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds?'. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning* 10 (6), 807-815
- Cervellon, M.C. and Wernerfelt, A.S. (2012) 'Knowledge sharing among green fashion communities online: Lessons for the sustainable supply chain'. *Journal of fashion marketing and management: An International Journal*, 16(2), 176-192
- Chan, K.W. and Li, S.Y. (2010) 'Understanding consumer-to-consumer interactions in virtual communities: The salience of reciprocity'. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(9-10), 1033-1040
- Cheung, C.M., Liu, I.L., and Lee, M.K. (2015) 'How online social interactions influence customer information contribution behavior in online social shopping communities: a social learning theory perspective'. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(12), 2511-2521
- Clark, R.A. and Goldsmith, R.E. (2006) 'Interpersonal influence and consumer innovativeness'. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(1), 34-43

- Clarke, V., and Braun, V. (2017) 'Thematic analysis'. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 12 (3), 297-298
- De Valck, K., Van Bruggen, G.H. and Wierenga, B. (2009) 'Virtual communities: A marketing perspective'. *Decision Support Systems*, 47(3), 185-203
- Fox, N., and Roberts, C. (1999) 'GPs in cyberspace: the sociology of a 'virtual community''. *The Sociological Review*, 47(4), 643-671
- Hsu, M.H., Ju, T.L., Yen, C.H. and Chang, C.M. (2007) 'Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations'. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65(2), 153-169
- Joergens, C. (2006) 'Ethical fashion: myth or future trend?'. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 10(3), 360-371
- Kaiser, F.G. and Fuhrer, U. (2003) 'Ecological behavior's dependency on different forms of knowledge'. *Applied Psychology*, 52(4), 598-613
- Kim, J.W., Choi, J., Qualls, W., and Han, K. (2008) 'It takes a marketplace community to raise brand commitment: the role of online communities'. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(3-4), 409-431
- Komito, L. (1998) 'The net as a foraging society: Flexible communities'. *The Information Society*, 14(2), 97-106
- Kong, H.M., Ko, E., Chae, H. and Mattila, P. (2016) 'Understanding fashion consumers' attitude and behavioral intention toward sustainable fashion products: Focus on sustainable knowledge sources and knowledge types'. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 7(2), 103-119
- Kozinets, R.V. (1999) 'E-tribalized marketing?: The strategic implications of virtual communities of consumption'. *European Management Journal*, 17(3), 252-264
- Lee, H., Reid, E., and Kim, W.G. (2014) 'Understanding knowledge sharing in online travel communities: antecedents and the moderating effects of interaction modes'. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 38(2), 222-242
- Mo, P.K., and Coulson, N.S. (2010) 'Empowering processes in online support groups among people living with HIV/AIDS: A comparative analysis of 'lurkers' and 'posters''. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 1183-1193
- Moisander, J. (2007) 'Motivational complexity of green consumerism'. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(4), 404-409
- Nonnecke, B., and Preece, J. J. (1999) Shedding light on lurkers in online communities. In Paper presented at the Ethnographic Studies in Real and Virtual Environments. Edinburgh: Inhabited Information Spaces and Connected Communities.
- Nunnenkamp, P., and Öhler, H. (2012) 'Funding, competition and the efficiency of NGOs: an empirical analysis of non-charitable expenditure of US NGOs engaged in foreign aid'. *Kyklos*, 65(1), 81-110

- Preece, J. (2000) *Online communities: Designing usability, supporting sociability*. Chichester: Wiley
- Qu, H., and Lee, H. (2011) 'Travelers' social identification and membership behaviors in online travel community'. *Tourism Management*, 32, 1262-1270
- Rheingold, H. (1993) *The virtual community: homesteading on the electronic frontier reading*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley
- Ridings, C.M., and Gefen, D. (2004) 'Virtual community attraction: Why people hang out online'. *Journal of Computer-mediated communication*, 10(1), JCMC 10110
- Rokka, J. and Moisander, J. (2009) 'Environmental dialogue in online communities: negotiating ecological citizenship among global travellers'. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(2), 199-205
- Rokka, J. and Uusitalo, L. (2008) 'Preference for green packaging in consumer product choices—do consumers care?'. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 32(5), 516-525
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2019) *Research methods for business students*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited
- Shen, B., Wang, Y., Lo, C.K. and Shum, M. (2012) 'The impact of ethical fashion on consumer purchase behavior'. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 16(2), 234-245
- Shen, B., Zheng, J.H., Chow, P.S. and Chow, K.Y. (2014) 'Perception of fashion sustainability in online community'. *The Journal of the Textile Institute*, 105(9), 971-979
- Utz, S. (2009) 'Egoboo'vs. altruism: the role of reputation in online consumer communities'. *New Media & Society*, 11(3), 357-374
- von Krogh, G. (1998) 'Care in knowledge creation'. *California Management Review* 40 (3), 133-153
- Walther, J.B. (1996) 'Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction'. *Communication Research*, 23(1), 3-43
- Wang, Y. and Fesenmaier, D.R. (2004) 'Towards understanding members' general participation in and active contribution to an online travel community'. *Tourism Management*, 25(6), 709-722
- Wang, Y., and Fesenmaier, D. R. (2002a) Measuring members' needs and their effects on involvement in a virtual community: An empirical study of an online travel community. Proceedings in ENTER 2002 conference, Innsbruck, Austria.
- Wang, Y., and Fesenmaier, D. R. (2002b) Understanding the motivation of contribution to online communities: An empirical investigation of an online travel community. Proceedings in the 33rd travel and tourism research association conference, Washington, D.C.
- Wasko, M.M., and Faraj, S. (2000) "'It is what one does": why people participate and help others in electronic communities of practice'. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 9(2-3), 155-173.

Williams, R. L., and Cothrell, J. (2000) 'Four Smart Ways to Run Online Communities'. *Sloan Management Review*, 41 (4), 81-91