AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ON THE FORMATION OF MODERN STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY USING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY

Saule Rakhimova, Pavlodar State University. S. Toraigyrova
Liudmila Goncharenko, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics
Sergey Sybachin, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics
Ainash Nurgaliyeva, Pavlodar State University. S. Toraigyrova
Kymbat Kunanbayeva, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation
Nurul Mohammad Zayed, Daffodil International University

ABSTRACT

A modern phase of the digital economy is now taking shape. The sharing economy is a prime example of an organization's online platform, the sum of individuals interacting for goods and services. The decentralized economy blurs many digital lines, but has nevertheless paid scant attention to current network philosophy. In order to resolve this discrepancy, we suggest that we find two facets of the economy common and analysis linked the principle. The ultimate objective of this research is to illustrate single-material businesses, such as petrochemical companies, as an indication of their deep reliance on complete incoming goods. First of all, we rekindle the concept of a hybrid community, which reflects the border blurred nature of shared economy. Individuals connect online and offline (instead of only web) in a blended culture and absorb as well as create. Secondly, to reduce a network organization's dependence on its hybrid culture, we examine the variety of policy answers that exist literature propose and show that management analysis needs to adjust, and probably improve existing arguments, for a social economy.

Keywords: Online Platform, Hybrid Community, Digital Economy, Sharing Economy, Social Economy.

INTRODUCTION

The current wave is powered by ICT-based developments, including broad databases, complex algorithms, and cloud computing, which contribute to sharing economy development among others (George et al., 2014; Kenney & Zysman 2016; Yoo et al., 2012). The shared economy is an ICT-based economic environment consisting of a social system through which individuals utilize a range of distribution methods to redistribute and control services via an organization-operated portal (Mair & Reischauer, 2017). In the sharing economy a forum for individuals who give products and services suits customers who seek these resources and goods (Rochet & Tirole, 2003). Take Airbnb's example, which corresponds to those who are seeking a stay for their homes. An online group is the number of people who communicate across a website (Leimeister et al., 2006). An online group is a distinct type of organizational organisation (Puranam et al., 2014; Seidel & Stewart, 2011) that is known in terms of product

demand (Miller et al., 2009) as a supplementary platform (Dahlander & Wallin, 2006). For network organisations of the shared economy, the unique competitive difficulty is that shared economic operation is separated into various kinds of economic existence. In fact, the dividing line is split between output and use, complete and casual labor and private and public life (Mair & Reischauer, 2017).

However, there has been no work to date on the effect of digitalization on economy and the minimize of resource consumption. What are the characteristics of a network corporate digital society in the digital economy? How do we envision the partnership between the internet portal and the social economy? Within this paper we address these problems and re-examine the current framework principle within two main fields. Firstly, the idea of a blended society relives the frontier essence of a sharing economy as a variation of the online culture. In a blended culture people connect online and offline (Fiol & O'Connor, 2005) rather than just online, so they ingest so create instead of consuming just (Scaraboto, 2015). Second, in order to examine the interaction between the network company and its online population in the sharing economy, we follow principle of dependence on capital (Drees & Heugens, 2013; Hillman et al., 2009; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Wry et al., 2012).

We demonstrate and address the dependence on their integrated culture for the network organisation. In examining the range of strategic responses suggested by the theory of resources dependence to minimize dependence, we demonstrate that not all of these responses apply to shared economy platform organizations. They claim that reliance on hybrid models of ICT-based group organisation with a network has significant implications for the selection with possible strategic answers. This paper offers observations into the impact and features of ICT-based group modes of digital economy organisation, resource dependence theory. In the next segment, we summarize briefly the features of the social economy and community organizations active in sharing. Then we develop a hybrid economy as a more appropriate concept to represent the bordering nature of economic operation in the share economy. We address the impacts of an organization's reliance on its hybrid population and explore the continuum of pragmatic approaches to reduce dependency on services. They conclude with a discussion that discusses the repercussions for current and future studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Platform Organizations in the Sharing Economy

Today, a modern era of ICT-driven developments, such as big data and sophisticated algorithms as well as cloud computing, is taking place (George et al., 2014; Kenney & Zysman, 2016; Yoo et al., 2012). Although the social economy often impacts organisation in mainstream business sectors, such as manufacturing and logistics (Reischauer, 2018), the recent web network organising market is a leading example. According to a new Brookings Institute report, the global economy sharing is projected to rise from USD 14 billion in 2014 to USD 335 billion in 2025, accordingly (Yaraghi & Ravi, 2017). In several fields and sectors, the characteristics and market dynamics induced by the sharing economy are projected to radically reshape and redefine the economic-societal partnership (Sundararajan, 2016). The economy discussed thus needs and involves the study of several fields, including economic analysis and management. The features of the sharing economy will be explained in the first phase. Within the private sector, joint use is deemed *"natural"* (Felson & Spaeth, 1978), for example by utilizing a washing machine for family washing.

Multiple phases included the transition of sharing as a form of exchange between the private and economic domains. The introduction of file storage (e.g. Napster), and the distribution of information (e.g. Wikipedia) across the globe is one of the primary periods correlated with the creation of ICT (John, 2013). In tandem with this, the increase of digital innovation and consumer creativity highlighted how companies, through exchanging knowledge and generating progress with others, would develop their creativity (Chesbrough, 2003). These processes are typical of early efforts to incorporate private territories into economic fields and precede the so-called shared economy. Wissenschaftlers and public intellectuals used different words to characterize this dynamic area of economic development. The words *"collaborative marketing"* (Sundararajan, 2016), or *"internet market"* (Kenay & Zysman, 2016) are part of the concept. The word *"crowd-based capitalism"* based on a recent review of these efforts, we give a description which takes into account the main characteristics of this trend and also clarifies its position in the shared economy. We see the digital economy as a network of markets where individuals use specific incentives for redistributing and consuming products and services from an organization's marketplace (Mair & Reischauer, 2017). This perspective contains five characteristics which we briefly examine. First of all, economies, which are known as distribution networks, rely on what is normal and who has a forum for trade, are at the very core of the social economy. The home-sharing industry in Germany, for example, comprises many foreign companies such as Airbnb or HomeAway, organisations located in Germany, such as Flat and Wimdu, as well as the Swiss-focused House Trip organisation. Therefore, the modern economy does not contend as other people claim for a restricted, non-economic sphere from the 21st century (Bradley & Pargman, 2017). Furthermore, the social platform deals are focused on various forms of compensation. While cash rewards in exchange have become a popular method of reimbursement, commerce, selling and donations are still commonly used. Although Airbnb and Uber are the leading examples of payment sharing, Couchsurfing is an example of bartering. Thirdly, the shared economy doesn't involve the possession or production of products or resources, but the redeployment and exposure. It illustrates that the social economy is concerned primarily with sales, a dimension emphasized by the term 'collaborative marketing' (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). Fourthly, usually, but not necessarily, the trade partners are individuals. This is the *"crowd-based economy"*. Fifthly, a central aspect of the social economy is that users communicate exclusively with an organization's networks. A website provides for an offer-side-congestible marketplace. The key function of forums is to mediate between two parties with conflicting desires (Rochet & Tirole, 2003). Take Airbnb's example, which corresponds to those who are seeking a stay for their homes.

Platform Organizations: Powering the Sharing Economy

Cellphone operating systems like Android, motor fuel cell motors and genomic technologies are examples of such platforms (Gawer, 2010). However, websites are not channeling like certain entities in the digital economy they offer networks for a wider community of individuals to exchange products or resources and/or trade. Therefore, a platform organization in the sharing economy mediates between persons offering shared goods and services and people seeking shared goods and services. To explain more how an economic marketplace company varies from an entity that already manufacture products and services, we are utilizing Altman & Tripsas (2015), who suggested three key distinctions. Firstly, the quality of the goods and services offered is special. Traditional companies are investing much time identifying their consumers' expectations in order to provide the goods and services that better serve these

expectations. That is in contrast with marketplace organizations, who strive to build the strongest *"complementary"* network rather than to coordinate the mechanism and offer the strongest products and services. In other terms, in addition to goods and services exchanged or traded on the site, the goal is to have complementarity (Altman & Tripsas, 2015). Consider platform organisations, such as cleaning or babysitting on personal service sharing markets, which require both a pool of people who are able to clean and have babies and a pool of individuals that book them on the web for the sharing industry. The second distinction is that, instead of optimizing the benefit of goods and services, the former is seeking to encourage platform adoption among citizens. In other terms, network companies aim to create up and maintain a vital community of individuals engaging on a site to generate benefit rather than reduce overhead in order to increase income, as conventional organisations do. These efforts are challenging and financially costly, in particular because losses can result in the short term (Altman & Tripsas, 2015). Take the illustration of how individuals will sign up and link to their social network profiles with the shared economy. Another example is the pre-installation on new devices with applications by firms such as Uber or Airbnb. An additional definition is qualities that allow people be convinced to work on either hand, this is to involve and provide products and services (e.g. booking a room over Airbnb) (e.g. providing a room over Airbnb). Second, network organisations, instead of optimizing the units sold, strive to optimize connections among users on their site that ultimately contribute to reimbursement transactions. In comparison to historically efficient forms, such as market share and sales units, this emphasis on experiences is special (Altman & Tripsas, 2015). Consider Uber and Airbnb, which have developed and sustained a strong degree of engagement. This main position in communications underlines the need to examine current data on people who operate on a network, a lively study process that has progressed under the protocol of online groups.

Hybrid Communities in the Sharing Economy

A large group of individuals who interact online through a common interest forum or common problems or common activity that they carry out based on implicit and explicit behavioral codes (Leimeister et al., 2006) are listed in an online community. The C-Form is a distinct mode of economic organisation in online economies. The online community differs from the market, hierarchy and network as a distinct organizing method (Demil & Lecocq, 2006; Faraj et al., 2016; Seidel & Stewart, 2011). Study current studies and propose four attributes typical of an online culture. Informal participation caps are defined. This definition is especially obvious in online open-source communities such as Linux, which often establish shared authority (O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007). This is the case. Second, this is a free online group. As mentioned by Puranam et al. (2014), people participate in an online community because of intrinsic motivation, but also because they are observable within the network. Seidel & Stewart (2011) stress the free exchange of information among online group leaders. In early 2011, Faraj et al. (2011); (Lee & Cole, 2003) played the key role in knowledge sharing.

Some also claim that an alternate mode of development occurs for organizations inside online communities (Ansari & Munir, 2010, Lee & Cole, 2003). Different outlets come from online groups. Organizations will support the online group, which implies they provide an engagement forum and control this network (West & O'Mahony, 2008). Sharing economy online communities are an indicator of online communities funded by the organization (Reischauer & Mair, 2018). In the other side, online societies autonomously arise without an agency that controls and determines the framework of involvement. Open sources are a strong example. In

general, these societies have low rates of influence and poor participation opportunities which at the same time increase the likelihood of creative awareness (Demil & Lecocq, 2006). This research was primarily focused on our perception of online cultures (Demil & Lecocq, 2006; Seidel & Stewart, 2011; West & Lakhani, 2008). This analysis was carried out.

Hybrid Communities: Mirroring the Boundary-blurring Nature of the Sharing Economy

Our global online community awareness focuses on online communities that create information and online interactions between participants. Such areas hinder the portability of previous study results and often help highlight how economic activity is fluctuating within the social economy that is represented by supported societies. First, the economy of sharing blurs the limits between production and consumption. Contrary to conventional markets, sharing economy companies do not manufacture items or services, but instead offer the forum for people to purchase or distribute their own goods and services. This possibility is called *"prospection"* a mixture of output and consumption, that an individual may automatically turn roles (Ritzer et al., 2012). Secondly, the culture of exchange blurs the lines between complete and casual labor. People will determine whether their items should be performed or classified and not the network owner, but a third party. While some argue that arrangements for temporary work are going to lead to a *"share-the-scraps economy"* (Sundararajan, 2016) others are anticipating a job future full of flexibility, creativeness and self-fulfillment at work (Sundararajan, 2016). Thirdly: *"In the digital economy, people call strangers to the home of (home sharing) strangers and to car sharers and buy capital from a huge and unaccounted crowd"* (Mair & Reischauer, 2017). Three waves between private and public spheres are blurred.

In more recent times organizational researchers have used the label of hybrid organisation, describing social enterprises as using practices, principles and assumptions from both domains to blur established borders in the economic and social domains (Ebrahim et al., 2014; Mair et al., 2015). We theorize that a hybrid culture characterizes the shared economy, but is not confined to it, blurs defined boundaries of online societies as individuals connect online and offline (instead of only online) as well as both consume and create (instead of just producing). In a blended culture, people don't communicate solely face to face or in an online environment. Fiol & O'Connor (2005) also stated that the way people interact with an on-line culture influences this kind of hybridity. Grabher & Ibert (2014) have recently discovered that specifically and indirectly regulating norms of conduct within a group represent the cultural rules in the larger geographical set-up under which people in an online network reside. The results are particularly relevant to the shared economy. ICT-based platforms which promote online interactions are, of course, an essential part of the digital economy (Kenney & Zysman, 2016; Sundararajan, 2016). However, there are often face to face interactions between many shared economic services, particularly popular ones such as ridesharing (uber) and home sharing (airbnb). In the same way, the analysis of offline sharing practices by Albinsson & Perera (2012) found that a sense of identity influences engagement and outcomes in these events, which underlines the importance of observing face to face contact throughout the research of sharing groups. Such instances show that network organizations, which operate in a mixed environment, communicate digitally as well as offline with one another. Therefore, people are not simply centered on consumerism or on providing products and services inside a blended culture (Scaraboto, 2015). In other terms, individuals will absorb and distribute services practically simultaneously. This reflects that the shared economy focuses primarily on consumption and supply of goods and services (John, 2013). The social economy is enabled by both the logics of

output and distribution (Sundararajan, 2016) and by contribution to collective use and input from direct products (Ritzer et al., 2012; Scaraboto, 2015). In brief, in a hybrid culture, people do not engage in a strictly aspect or online manner or merely access or provide services. Such ideas are used to apply Leimeister's et al. (2006) concept of an online culture. Consequently, we describe a virtual society as a collective of people communicating online and offline through networks across shared products or services offered and consuming on the basis of implied and explicit standards of behavior. Every network company supports a hybrid society in the sharing economy. Therefore, as many digital societies as companies provide networks operate in a sharing economy environment. Take the example of the mutual rides economy where Uber and Lyft fund hybrid groups of people searching for a lift and cycling. One individual may be part of a variety of hybrid business communities. Take another example of ridesharing where both via Uber and Lyft can be provided. Equally, in various shared economy environments, a individual may be part of a hybrid society. Take the example of a driver who provides a trip via Uber and provides a guest room via Airbnb. This person is a part of the hybrid groups on the market for ridesharing (Uber), the market in room sharing (Airbnb), and the market for personal services (TaskRabbit).

The Form of Hybrid Communities

The virtual group in its hierarchical nature varies from the online culture. We borrow from Puranam et al. (2014), which examine organizational structures with four dimensions. Any of the dimensions suggested by these writers' represents a fundamental challenge for any entity, whether conventional, online or hybrid, to achieve its objectives. Next, work separation involves the problem of converting goals into activities and undertakings. Online groups, including those that endorse Ubuntu or Wikipedia, typically do not allow for a central obligation for a task forum to coordinate conflict among individuals in an online society, rendering it a decentralized operation. It goes toward a collaborative culture in which the company or manager's algorithms, which separate the activities, are utilized by the application organization. Each division's target is focused on the initiative or value on the network that is shared / traded. Consider the example of a modern organizational template for ventures. Depending on the difficulty, the project manager can send a freelancer this job, or split it into multiple parts, each of which involves a specific freelancer. For products, consider the example of home-sharing firms like Airbnb, where the site automates almost completely: prices be recommended, based on where a home is situated, and the step-by - step mechanism guarantees that all the requisite information is supplied by the party willing to rent its house.

When the individual interested in the house will submit a deposit, payment would be automatically withdrawn from the credit card if the order has been approved. The high degree of centralization in the hybrid community is evident in this example. The second aspect is the division of duties; the question of assigning persons separated roles and assignments. Individuals themselves choose activities in online groups focused on abilities and/or personal interests. However, a distributed solution is also possible in a hybrid culture as individuals are paired with assignments through application algorithms and/or network handlers. Although it's always individuals who state their skills and/or preferences while entering a hybrid group, it isn't their duty to determine whether such skills and/or specific desires suit a mission. Second, the allocation of awards relates to the issue of assigning prizes to individuals that will enable them to fulfill the tasks given. The intrinsic encouragement and popularity in the web are a significant incentive for Internet cultures, such as Linux.

Comparison of the Forms of Online and Hybrid Community

Target Online Group Virtual Organization Project Division Decentralized by persons Centralized by application and/or company association manager based on project Job allocation Self allocated depending on expertise or priorities Centrally allocated by application and/or network organisation, according to competencies and/or assets Also relevant are monetary remuneration as decided by the project and algorithms for users utilizing a network in the shared economy (Bucher et al., 2016). So both intrinsic and foreign compensation schemes exist in a hybrid community. Fourthly, the flow of knowledge relates to the issue of individuals getting access to the details required for their activities. Online societies tackle this problem by establishing a shared web network and preserving it. For e.g., blogs, chat rooms or instant messenger services are hosted separately. The organization's platform is the only online infrastructure for a hybrid community. This aspect is thus marked by a more efficient centralization. In short, it is more centralized than the form of an online community that is a hybrid community that interacts online and offline (not just online), both consuming and producing goods and services (rather than just producing). Centobelli et al. (2021) examined blockchain technology and recommended pivotal insights for the policy makers. Altarawneh et al. (2020) reviewed few existing literatures on the characteristics of CEOs and suggested that these characteristics might enhance the performance of CEOs and also the quality of the reporting**.** Almahry et al. (2018) demonstrated theoretical association between Entrepreneurs' Skills and Entrepreneurship Education and highlighted the importance of entrepreneurship education for the development of the entrepreneurs to operate their day-to-day business activities.

METHODOLOGY

Using theory of resource dependency, the interaction between a social economy network company and the hybrid society it supports can be explained in two crucial ways. First, the principle of resource dependency helps one to define the function and hybrid culture of a network organisation. In the digital economy, ecosystem organisations are finding capital. You may not control the products or services that power your company on your website, but have a forum for people to exchange and/or sell the goods and services they possess. The composite culture of network entities therefore makes such individuals the provider of services. For continuous activity of a network organization, they include financial services such as vehicles, residences and intangible capital such as their expertise, skills and staff. Via the ongoing mutual processes of products and services focused on the infrastructure offered and requested by individuals, a network organisation of course has financial capital and human infrastructure in accordance with a conventional company too. Secondly, an analysis into the interaction between a social economy network organization and its hybrid population shows that the network organization relies on the hybrid group. In fact, the network organisations and their hybrid populations have shared dependency (Casciaro & Piskorski, 2005). Firstly, the resource-seeking network organisation, which aims both to offer individuals their goods and services to individuals and to provide goods and services otherwise the company of the platform, cannot work. Owing to this reliance, a company on platform uses complicated processes to manage its hybrid population (Reischauer & Mair, 2018) and establishes its platform to promote individual confidence (Abrahao et al., 2017). In the other side, the individuals who make up the hybrid group still rely on the platforma, because the requesting and delivering citizens on the platform

will not be able to communicate without a workable network. Naturally, we will not recommend that the network organization, as well as the hybrid group, is based solely on its hybrid population. In line with traditional organisations, economic-sharing platform entities, such as traditional organizations, gain financial resources by banks or threaten capitalist assets that reflect the system, the economy and the institutions of networks. However, in comparison to mainstream organisations, they focus on an ICT-based collective organisation which is central to their continuing operations, the hybrid society. We address the next claim by analyzing to what degree the three determinants for resource dependency relate (Pfeffer & Salancik 1978) to our statement on the reliance of a network organisation on its hybrid Culture.

An indication of a strong reliance on aggregate production is when businesses often offer products or services and thus rely heavily on purchasers of such products and services. This condition is common to network organizations, which are very qualified for distributed economies. This point is especially true to network organizations, which specialize on a specific group, such as luxury jets or sailboats. This is not the case in the collaborative economy, where individuals will conveniently have inputs. The criticality of capital is the second aspect of resource quality. The following is evident in the case of a hybrid society: without the likelihood of hybrid group supplying resources and services, a network organization. The research claimed tests the capacity to start functioning in the absence of a tool. There is also a good overall suggestion of a heavy reliance on the definitive value of the tool. Discretion on resource management, the second resource dependence determinant, assesses how many moneys an entity cannot manage it needs. Overall, this flexibility is limited in areas with a range of laws and requirements. Pfeffer & Salancik (1978) distinguish many discretionary bases in order to determine this determinant. Ownership privileges are one pillar. Good proprietary rights usually limit dependency. The power to assign resources is another principle of discretion: as a target agency manages the distribution of resources, it is less contingent. The practical utilization of money is another element of choice. In this scenario, successful or trained providers typically have some control capabilities. Pfeffer & Salancik are pursuing the lead of taxi drivers, who hesitate to travel to places which are considered unsafe as a customer of a vehicle they don't own. The primary power is the capacity to control and implement possession, distribution and usage of capital (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). The study of how a social economy network company utilizes such resource bases again leads to the heavy dependency on hybrid society. While there are cases where a platform entity tries to manipulate policy, as for instance the Airbnb initiative *"Airbnb Citizen",* this enforcement can't be regulated by a platform entity in the decentralized economy as well like a legal monopoly. This indicates a strong degree of dependency. In fact, there are restricted tools accessible to the network company to monitor the practical usage of services. Think how long people, like Airbnb, who have booked a room through sharing platforms stay in a room and use it in reality. Although some companies have the ability to strictly track the usage of capital Uber as a specific example, this budgetary context often suggests a large degree of reliance on the hybrid culture. In fact, the distribution of capital is under no influence by a network organisation in the sharing economy. Although network algorithms satisfy demand and bid, the precise distribution of products or services is up to all sides of the application. The only foundation of the cooperative economy which is used is property rights, which implies a low dependency. Network companies tend to make use of extensive usage arrangements to popular their dependence. In summary, since every other foundation of choice is highly contingent, we may therefore say that a network entity has strong dependency on its hybrid culture for this determinant. The accumulation of resource management is the main determinant of resource

reliance. This determinant explains how little or only a specific entity decides the management of capital. A resource utilization focus at the person level is also necessary. For their period already, Pfeffer & Salancik observed that ICTs allow individuals to concentrate their individual energy on power. In the case that resource management is extremely centralized, an enterprise becomes strongly contingent on the resource control organisation(s) (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). As network companies also perform the position of an opponent, Uber and the taxi sharing economical industries do not represent monopolies that are lawfully secured, but instead uncontrolled. This function is the cornerstone for the measurement of the resource management concentration. At this point, we will confirm for the first time that an organization's ecosystem depends on its hybrid culture in the economic sharing. As stated, there is a large number of people in a hybrid culture. Enabled by a number of ICTs, every person will agree on his or her own way of utilizing resources, such as clothing and skills. There is also a small resource management concentration that leads to a strong degree of flexibility in the hybrid culture. Growing person from a hybrid community will leave a hybrid community with the popular Hirschman (1970) diction. In summary, *"power value"* and *"discretion over resource management"* suggest that a network entity is strongly reliant on its hybrid culture, while only the determinant *"information management concentration"* points to a low degree of dependence. This is why the reliance of a network company on its hybrid group is highly suggested. In the next segment of the Platform Organizing, the dependency specifically affects a platform organisation's strategic responses.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Strategic Implications from a Resource Dependence View

Having specified the nature and form of a hybrid community, we turn to the strategic implications of a hybrid community for a platform organization in the sharing economy. For this purpose, we draw upon resource dependence theory.

Resource Dependence Theory and Its Contemporary Relevance

In both operational and strategic management research (Hillman et al., 2009; Wry et al., 2013), resource dependency theory was developed by Pfeffer & Salancik in 1978. Theory of resource dependence focuses on dependencies generated by exchange relationships as proponents of theory which concepts organizations as open systems (Weber & Waeger, 2017). The key point, while basic, is that the degree to which organizations rely on external support is an indication of organizations strategic actions. With that claim, Pfeffer & Salancik (1978) demonstrated the fact that the external world influences the company by the ownership of capital. In fact, if organization B has the means that the focal organization A needs, B will exert influence and thus have leverage over A. But control isn't a function with a zero number. A and B are growing strong and A and B interdependent (Davis & Cobb, 2010). The principal principle of the theory of resource dependence is that businesses face an unpredictable and dependent setting. This world is not new, however, but consists of entities that have exposure to capital, both immaterial, such as financial resources, intelligence and physical resources (Wry et al., 2013; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Owing to the different methods for accessing funding from such organisation and since the required services are limited, confusion and contingencies arise. The *"relevance of a tool to the operation of the company is, therefore, not the root of the issues*

of the organization" (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). The urgent issue for organisations in an unstable and volatile world is to achieve secure access to capital (Casciaro & Piskorski 2005; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). The theory remains a powerful and precious perspective for a better understanding and understanding of contemporary organization and policy, particularly in the digital economy, although the key theories and the principles of theory of the dependency on resources have been established several decades ago,

The principle of reliance on capital has been used effectively to intersect whether a selective external entity develops control over tangibles and intangibles (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Wry et al., 2013). This problem needs to be solved by natural resources. The principle of resource dependence has been used by Tillquist et al. (2002) for coordinating work into the earlier phase of digital economics. We suggest the principle is also ideal for the study of the present motion. The study of the US computer industry by Xia et al. (2018) and the multiple case studies by Ozcan & Santos (2015) on the global market for mobile payments build on resource dependence theory and illustrate that it is still well suited to attain a better understanding of complex interorganizational relationships in markets of the digital economy. Moreover, the significance of the resource dependency hypothesis for contemporary digital economy is highlighted by our own work on governance consequences of hosting ecosystem societies of strategic value for social economy organizations (Reischauer & Mair 2018) and the quantitative Altman (2016), analysis on dependencies in ecosystems. This lens is used to define the partnership between a shared economy network company and its hybrid culture.

Strategic Responses to Dependency on a Hybrid Community

The principle of resource dependence assumes that businesses need to obtain leverage of the resource supplier to reduce their dependency. Five pragmatic approaches have been established by academics and organisations to accomplish this goal in theory. In this segment, we analyze these answers in response to the details provided by a network company and its hybrid economy. It supports Davis & Cobb (2010)'s recommendation that the growing ubiquity of ICT calls for a study of existing resource dependence assumptions. This process follows Not all approaches apply, as we can illustrate, if a network organization relies more than conventional organizations on a hybrid culture. We begin by recommending the most appropriate strategic responses. Firstly, companies that adopts the strategy of forming joint ventures or entering into inter-organizational ties of other types. Both ways of working together affect the structure of the based entity. The reliance on inter-organisation relations, for example, is likely to encourage institutional separation when such partnerships are governed by divisions and roles (Tolbert, 1985). The secret to the creation of a *"significant secure tool for organizational sustainability"* is broadly to create ties with the dependent organization. We agree that this strategic response is most important for a shared economy network organisation. The key difference in a blended society is that a network organization, instead of other traditional organisations, is largely combined with a large number of people. Consider Airbnb, which has a highly advanced network for linking, upgrading and sharing with its customers. The ties with Airbnb and its websites are also focused on details and monetary rewards, but not conventional contracts of service with *"real"* companies. 128 The second tactic for organizations, such as initiatives aimed at legislative structure, is the concept of policies. As described in Pfeffer & Salancik (1978), a company *"will pursue direct incentives, consumer defense, and mitigate economic uncertainty through threatening rivals with counter-trust infringements"*. It is considered the second most appropriate strategic approach for a sharing economy network organisation. Consider the

example of Airbnb Civilen, an Airbnb movement to encourage the sharing of homes globally by mobilizing and educating citizens who share their homes and/or believe in the principle of home sharing. Another example is the activities of a advocacy community involving many multinational marketplace organisations named the European Digital Economy Industry. This coalition is intended to enable the European Union's legislative bodies to pass regulations not limiting future development or even banning different forms of bid sharing. Thirdly, resource dependency scholars emphasize that the company, when buying suppliers alongside the supply chain, can use the approach of merger and acquisition or vertical integration (Hillman et al., 2009; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This strategic response work is considered a core implementation area of the theory of resource dependency (Hillman et al., 2009). For a network company in the shared economy, we propose that this answer be partly accurate. While vertical integration, such as the introduction of Uber into the autonomous automotive development industry, is not popular, it doesn't extend to a person hybrid group. The incorporation or takeover of a hybrid group is not possible, because a hybrid society does not have a legal name; it is made up of several individuals who are technically separate. This approach has limited relevance in terms of a wider context of fusions and acquisitions, but often includes emerging industry lines in the same market. Consider Airbnb 's case which, in addition to private people, has recently begun approaching business traveler. Airbnb also gives individuals an option to sell and access unique tours and adventures as an indication of diversification. This move brings in a diversification of the tourism market. Fourthly, a resource dependency scholarship argues that companies, in compliance with the demands of the institutions managing capital, will obtain power by removing the head of management (Hillman et al., 2009). We believe that this method has little merit for a shared economy network organization which relies on its hybrid culture. If seen, there is no one leader or power in a hybrid society working on behalf of the hybrid group as is the case for *"ordinary"* organisations. As a result, a significant amount of people determines whether or not the new CEO of a social technology business corporation is up to their standards. Even if individual standards cannot be achieved, it will not result in imminent lack of individuals able to engage effectively in a hybrid culture. Consider Travis Kalanick, Uber CEO, recently assembling a forum subject to heavy criticism after his official disclosure and final denial of his dispute with the Uber drivers. Whilst outrage on social networking platforms soon spread out, it did not threaten the content of Uber's behavior. Fifth, Asset Dependence Theory suggests that the Board of Directors will have a proactive plan that addresses the demands of the company using the services received by representatives of the Committee. In particular, it will reduce the dependency on large-scale operators, banks, government institutions and interest groups (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). They find that a network entity in the sharing economy is null as the first one. For the same explanation as before: The hybrid society is a broad number of individuals who work ad hoc on a forum, not a conventional entity of board members. Although certain Platform organizations are first of all concerned that some Platform organizations, including the board leader of a mainstream entity, are breaking their hybrid populations into groups that are controlled in part by people in these communities with more privileges (Reischauer & Mair, 2018). With a modern phase of the digital revolution, which involves exchanging the internet in particular, our paper has begun to explore the theorization of the web organization. They have selected online cultures in the digital economy to be hybrid societies where people connect online and offline (rather than only online), all consume and create. In fact, we advanced theory of resource dependencies by rethinking the spectrum of strategic reactions to reduce dependency,

which implies that a network entity in a social economy relies on the hybrid culture with that dependence. We retained that not all of the answers still apply.

While joint projects and cross-organizational and political acting ties remain very much applicable, we recommend the replacement of the CEO and the replacement for the board of directors to only partly extend merger and acquisition and/or vertical integration. Four perspectives are provided in this report. First of all, we give insight into the features of ICT-based organizational models in the hybrid culture. Until now, scientists have based their research on online culture characteristics on the premise that encounters exist primarily digitally and are concerned with products and services (Faraj et al., 2016; O'Mahony & Ferraro, 2007; Puranam et al., 2014; Seidel & Stewart, 2011). Nevertheless, 130 mere online experiences are not necessarily the same; they are mixed, in observational environments like the social economy. We addressed the various aspects in which the digital culture is distinct and close to the online world following research of scholars who have studied hybridization with online societies (Fiol & O'Connor, 2005; Grabher & Ibert, 2014; Scaraboto, 2015). Such experiences are not only important to network organizations, but also to many sectors. Find Amazon's case of a grocery seller Whole Foods newly purchased. Second, we offer insights into the impact of network mobilization modes in ICT-based culture by describing their partnership. Further research have been carried out to date, concentrating primarily on the ways in which Group types profit creativity (Dahlander & Wallin, 2006; West & Lakhani, 2008) and the growing demand for goods (Miller et al., 2009). Our review focuses on the hybrid culture which represents the blurry borders of the digital economy and points to the disadvantage of network organizations as they can be built on these models. In brief, the existence of an entity on a network is related to the participation of individuals in a blended group.

CONCLUSION

Owing to the boundary blurring complexity of a blended culture, this target is being drastically reduced in the variety of strategic approaches these organisations will take. In addition to the pragmatic approaches proposed by scientists in resource dependency, this result suggests the need for thought. A very interesting solution will be to connect theory of resource dependency to institutional analysis. Tolbert (1985) and Sherer & Lee (2002), among others, have been able to analyze how companies utilize authority to decrease their dependence strategically. As we otherwise suggested, Mair & Reischauer (2017) offer fertile grounds for such work, in specific structural reasoning and structural perspectives. Thirdly, we offer insights into the theory of resource dependence by explaining in depth the effect of the strategic responses of this theory on ICT-based collective preservation (Drees & Heugens, 2013; Hillman et al., 2009; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Through this way, we respond to Davis & Cobb's proposal (2010) to revisit proven principles in the theory of resource dependency because of the growing ubiquity of ICT. Around the same time, we show that the adaptation to modern scientific phenomena, such as exchanging the market, of existing organizational theory such as resource dependence theory, provides a significant opportunity to rethink current theories. With digital economy and ICT, more general (George et al., 2014), and increased platform-based organization, these practices are both very important and timely, considering the increased importance of this (Gawer, 2010; Kenney & Zysman, 2016). Fourthly, we offer insights into the current organizational theorization of the new economy and the social economy in particular.

Our re-examining the theory which underlines the partnership between a forum and an ICT-based group entity external to such an institution offers fresh insights into the essence of

such relationships and the implications for policy choices. In addition, we also support new research into this topic by clarifying the partnership between some of the main players, network organisations and hybrid societies utilizing the social economy as a leading illustration of the existing digital economy. Thus far, extensive work has been based primarily on fighting about the sharing economy or for it. While this research gives a significant insight into the connection between the economy and society at an overall level, it does not discuss how main actors of the economy are linked and that influence one another. Examination of the unique partnership between a network entity and its hybrid population offers one an understanding of the nature of the market exchanging at ground level and the fluctuation of actual and expected boundaries.

We restrict our study thereby to sites with a financial focus for organizations in the sharing economy. This importance supports a stronger emphasis on profit-oriented network organizations. The first determinant of resource dependency, the value of capital, stresses the sum of external support that an entity requires to function and thrive. Two dimensions, relative trade magnitude and criticality of services may be used to calculate the dependence. The first element, relative scale of the exchange, concentrates on the portion of an entity that is responsible for the exchange's overall input or production.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article was prepared as part of the government contract as requested by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation on the subject formulated as «Structural changes in economy and society as a result of achieving the target indicators of National projects, which provide opportunities to organize new areas of social and economic activity, including commercial, both in Russia and abroad» (project No. FSSW-2020-0010).

REFERENCES

Abrahao, B., Parigi, P., Gupta, A., & Cook, K.S. (2017). Reputation offsets trust judgments based on social biases among Airbnb users. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(37), 9848-9853.

Albinsson, P.A., & Perera, B.Y. (2012). Alternative marketplaces in the 21st century: Building community through sharing events. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 11*(4), 303-315.

Almahry, F.F., Sarea, A.M. & Hamdan, A.M. (2018). A review paper on entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurs' skills. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 21*(1), 1-7

Altarawneh, M., Shafie, R. & Ishak, R. (2020). CEO characteristics: A literature review and future directions. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 19*(1), 1-10.

Altman, E.J. (2016). Dependency challenges, response strategies, and complementor maturity: Joining a multi-sided platform ecosystem. In *Platform Strategy Research Symposium*.

Altman, E.J., & Tripsas, M. (2015). *Product to platform transitions: Organizational identity implications*. The Oxford handbook of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

Ansari, S., & Munir, K. (2010). Letting users into our world: Some organizational implications of user-generated content. In *Technology and organization: Essays in honour of Joan Woodward*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2010). *What's mine is yours: The rise of collaborative consumption*. London: HarperCollins.

Bradley, K., & Pargman, D. (2017). The sharing economy as the commons of the 21st century. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, *10*(2), 231-247.

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., & Lutz, C. (2016). What's mine is yours (for a nominal fee): Exploring the spectrum of utilitarian to altruistic motives for internet-mediated sharing. *Computers in Human Behavior, 62*, 316-326.

Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M.J. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *50*(2), 167-199.

Centobelli, P., Cerchione, R., Esposito, E., & Oropallo, E. (2021). Surfing blockchain wave, or drowning? Shaping the future of distributed ledgers and decentralized technologies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 165*, 120463.

Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Dahlander, L., & Wallin, M.W. (2006). A man on the inside: Unlocking communities as complementary assets. *Research Policy, 35*(8), 1243-1259.

Davis, G.F., & Cobb, J.A. (2010). Resource dependence theory: Past and future. *Stanford's Organization Theory Renaissance, 1970–2000*.

Demil, B., & Lecocq, X. (2006). Neither market nor hierarchy nor network: The emergence of bazaar governance. *Organization Studies, 27*(10), 1447-1466.

Drees, J.M., & Heugens, P.P.M.A.R. (2013). Synthesizing and extending resource dependence theory. *Journal of Management, 39*(6), 1666-1698.

Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 34*, 81-100.

Faraj, S., Jarvenpaa, S.L., & Majchrzak, A. (2011). Knowledge collaboration in online communities. *Organization Science, 22*(5), 1224-1239.

Faraj, S., von Krogh, G., Monteiro, E., & Lakhani, K.R. (2016). Online community as space for knowledge flows. *Information Systems Research, 27*(4), 668-684.

Felson, M., & Spaeth, J.L. (1978). Community structure and collaborative consumption: A routine activity approach. *American Behavioral Scientist, 21*(4), 614-624.

Fiol, C.M., & O'Connor, E.J. (2005). Identification in face-to-face, hybrid, and pure virtual teams: Untangling the contradictions. *Organization Science, 16*(1), 19-32.

Gawer, A. (2010). The organization of technological platforms. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 29*, 287-296.

George, G., Haas, M.R., & Pentland, A. (2014). Big data and management. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(2), 321-326.

Grabher, G., & Ibert, O. (2014). Distance as asset? Knowledge collaboration in hybrid virtual communities. *Journal of Economic Geography, 14*(1), 97-123.

Hillman, A.J., Withers, M.C., & Collins, B.J. (2009). Resource dependence theory: A review. *Journal of Management, 35*(6), 1404-1427.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard university press.

John, N.A. (2013). The social logics of sharing. *Communication Review, 16*(3), 113-131.

Kenney, M., & Zysman, J. (2016). The rise of the platform economy. *Issues in Science and Technology, 32*(3), 61-69.

Lee, G.K., & Cole, R.E. (2003). From a firm-based to a community-based model of knowledge creation: The case of the Linux kernel development. *Organization Science, 14*(6), 633-649.

Leimeister, J.M., Sidiras, P., & Krcmar, H. (2006). Exploring success factors of virtual communities: The perspectives of members and operators. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 16*(3&4), 279-300.

Mair, J., Mayer, J., & Lutz, E. (2015). Navigating institutional plurality: Organizational governance in hybrid organizations. *Organization Studies, 36*(6), 713-739.

Mair, J., & Reischauer, G. (2017). Capturing the dynamics of the sharing economy: Institutional research on the plural forms and practices of sharing economy organizations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 125*, 11-20.

Miller, K.D., Fabian, F., & Lin, S.J. (2009). Strategies for online communities. *Strategic Management Journal, 30*(3), 305-322.

O'Mahony, S., & Ferraro, F. (2007). The emergence of governance in an open source community. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1079-1106.

Ozcan, P., & Santos, F.M. (2015). The market that never was: Turf wars and failed alliances in mobile payments. *Strategic Management Journal, 36*(10), 1486-1512.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Puranam, P., Alexy, O., & Reitzig, M. (2014). What's new about new forms of organizing? *Academy of Management Review, 39*(2), 162-180.

Reischauer, G. (2018). Industry 4.0 as policy-driven discourse to institutionalize innovation systems in manufacturing. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *132*, 26-33.

Reischauer, G., & Mair, J. (2018). How organizations strategically govern online communities: Lessons from the sharing economy. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, *4*(3), 220-247.

Ritzer, G., Dean, P., & Jurgenson, N. (2012). The coming of age of the prosumer. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *56*(4), 379-398.

Rochet, J.C., & Tirole, J. (2003). Platform competition in two-sided markets. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, *1*(4), 9901029.

Scaraboto, D. (2015). Selling, sharing, and everything in between: The hybrid economies of collaborative networks. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *42*(1), 152-176.

Seidel, M.D.L., & Stewart, K.J. (2011). An initial description of the C-form. In *Communities and organizations*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Sherer, P.D., & Lee, K. (2002). Institutional change in large law firms: A resource dependency and institutional perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(1), 102-119.

Sundararajan, A. (2016). The sharing economy. *The End of Employment and the Rise of*.

Tillquist, J., King, J.L., & Woo, C. (2002). A representational scheme for analyzing information technology and organizational dependency. *MIS Quarterly*, *26*(2), 91-118.

Tolbert, P.S. (1985). Institutional environments and resource dependence: Sources of administrative structure in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*(1), 1-13.

Weber, K., & Waeger, D. (2017). Organizations as polities: An open systems perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(2), 886-918.

West, J., & Lakhani, K.R. (2008). Getting clear about communities in open innovation. *Industry and Innovation*, *15*(2), 223-231.

West, J., & O'Mahony, S. (2008). The role of participation architecture in growing sponsored open source communities. *Industry and Innovation*, *15*(2), 145-168.

Wry, T., Cobb, J.A., & Aldrich, H.E. (2013). More than a metaphor: Assessing the historical legacy of resource dependence and its contemporary promise as a theory of environmental complexity. *Academy of Management Annals*, *7*, 441-488.

Xia, J., Wang, Y., Lin, Y., Yang, H., & Li, S. (2018). Alliance formation in the midst of market and network: Insights from resource dependence and network perspectives. *Journal of Management*, *44*(5), 1899-1925.

Yaraghi, N., & Ravi, S. (2017). *The current and future state of the sharing economy.*

Yoo, Y., Boland, R.J., Lyytinen, K., & Majchrzak, A. (2012). Organizing for innovation in the digitized world. *Organization Science*, *23*(5), 1398-1408.