

## PRACTICE OF *DOKOK* TRADITION IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF SHARING ECONOMY

<sup>1</sup>Rahoyo <sup>2</sup>RR. Lulus Prapti NSS

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Semarang University

Email : <sup>1</sup>rahoyo@usm.ac.id <sup>2</sup>lulusprapti@usm.ac.id

### *Abstract*

*The term of sharing economy became very popular, especially after the 2007-2008 economic and financial crisis. While the term sharing economy is problematic in itself, the practice of sharing has actually been practiced by our society for a long time.*

*This study aims to examine whether the practice of dokok tradition can be categorized as a sharing economy or not. If the practice of dokok can be categorized as a sharing economy, the logical consequence is that the conception of the sharing economy which has been known must be expanded.*

*With a qualitative approach, this research concludes that dokok tradition is a practice of sharing economy. The research was conducted in Meteseh Village, Semarang City, Central Java, where the local community still practices the dokok tradition to this day.*

*As far as the authors have explored, there has been no research linking the practice of a tradition with the sharing economy. Thus, it will be a theoretical relevance or novelty of this research.*

**Keywords:** *sharing economy, digital economy, trust, economics, tradition.* **JEL Classification:** *Z100; Z130*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since the 2007-2008 financial crisis, the term of sharing economy has become a popular term (Gorog, 2018). This term has become a new perspective in economics that leads to the birth of a new economy based on trust (Cornejo-Velazques, Clavel-Maqueda, Perez-Lopez-Portillo, & Lyubimova, 2020). This new economy is phenomenal, supported by advances in internet technology as an infrastructure that mediates all activities (production, consumption, distribution) in the sharing economy (Celata, Hendrickson, & Sanna, 2017).

Interestingly, the term of sharing economy, which has recently become very popular, is actually not a new economic practice in our society. Celata said the age of sharing economy practice is as old as human age. The difference is, in the past, this practice was carried out without media so that it was limited in scope, whereas now the practice of sharing is done with internet media (Celata, Hendrickson, & Sanna, 2017).

In the context of the sharing economy, the *dokok* tradition that is still practiced by the people of Rejosari Village, Meteseh Districts, Semarang (Nawir, 2020) is interesting to research. In short, the *dokok* tradition is a tradition where people donate to each other when a member of the community performs a celebration (for example: marry their child off). Donations are usually in the form of goods (rice, sugar, etc.). What someone donates in a celebration, one day will be returned to him in the same type and amount by the person previously donated.

Various questions arise to be explored: How can this traditional practice still be carried out during an increasingly advanced community economic life? Why

are people still willing to practice it? How would the donor respond if one day the donation was returned with a smaller amount? What happens if someone is being in economic trouble even though he/she should donate because he/she has received a donation before?

Apart from the empirical questions mentioned above, theoretical questions need to be asked: does the *dokok* tradition meet the criteria as a sharing economy? If the practice of *dokok* tradition (and perhaps the practice of other similar traditions) can be categorized as a sharing economy practice, the implication is that the conception of the sharing economy needs to be expanded or even redefined because so far the conception of sharing economy tends to always be associated with digital information technology as a medium of the transaction while the practice of *dokok* is without a technological medium.

This article attempts to answer all of the questions above. First of all, the authors will briefly describe the discourse on the sharing economy as a basic discussion and continue with an explanation of how the authors conduct research (methodology). Furthermore, the authors will describe in as detail as possible the field findings regarding the practice of *dokok*. In the final section, the authors will discuss the practice of *dokok* and the sharing economy.

As far as the authors have explored, there has been no research linking the practice of a tradition with the sharing economy. Thus, it is at this point that this research finds its theoretical relevance.

### **Sharing Economy**

The 2007-2008 financial crisis has left some people out of work. Those who lose their jobs end up wanting a new job. In a situation of economic hardship, including the high number of people looking for new jobs because they lost their jobs, in

America comes the Uber application. Uber is an attractive alternative for these unemployed people because with this application unemployed people who own a car that initially did not make money can capitalize their car to make money. Since then, the term of sharing economy has become popular (Gorog, 2018). As a new term, the sharing economy has become a material for studies in various fields: economics, information technology, environmental science, and tourism (Decrop & Graul, 2019). Uber in the context of Indonesia is like Grab, Gojek, and Gocar.

However, there is no agreed-single concept regarding the sharing economy. The conceptualization depends on the area of origin: human ecology, computer science, neoclassical economics, anthropology, postmodern sociology, philosophy, political science, and cultural theory (Dredge and Gyimothy 2015 in Gorog, 2018). Gorog (2018) found 17 terms related to this sharing economy, including collaborative consumption, access economy, moral economy, alternative post-capitalist economics, circuit of commerce, peer economy, hybrid economy, and the sharing economy itself. Cornejo-Velazquez, for example, defines “sharing economy as an economic system based on people sharing positions and services, either for free or for payment....”

The most important thing in the context of this research is that in the sharing economy there is a relationship between trust, reciprocity, and belonging (Celata, Hendrickson, & Sanna, 2017).

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted with a qualitative approach. To get a detailed story about the practice of *dokok* tradition, the

researchers conducted in-depth interviews with key informants to whom the researchers considered competent to answer the researchers’ questions. The research was conducted in Rejosari Village, Meteseh Sub-district, Tembalang District, Semarang City. In this village, the *dokok* tradition is still practiced today.

Because the research locus was an unfamiliar area, the researchers did not have key informants that had previously known. Therefore, to gain access to the research locus, the researchers first visited the Meteseh Sub-district office (the sub-district where Rejosari Village is located). In the sub-district office, the researcher was welcome by the sub-district secretary. Besides asking permission to conduct a research in Rejosari Village, the researcher explored preliminary information from the sub-district secretary. Coincidentally, the wife of the head of Rukun Warga 10 (RW-an administrative area one level below sub-district) Rejosari Village is working as a staff in Meteseh Sub-district. The researcher had opportunity to have a brief dialogue with her. From the secretary and the wife of the head of RW 10, the researcher got an initial explanation of *dokok* tradition. The wife of the head of RW 10 even gave the names of people in Rejosari Village that can be candidates of key informants.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face and recorded using a recorder device. The results of the interview were then transcribed by the transcript assistant. The results of the transcripts were then classified based on the questions. The Covid-19 pandemic is the main obstacle for researchers to get key informants. Not all residents indicated by the wife of the head of Rukun Warga 10 were willing to be interviewed.

The purpose of this research is to look at the *dokok* tradition from the perspective of sharing economy. For this purpose, at the same time as field data collection and especially when starting to process field data, researchers read various research journals on the sharing economy. The analysis is carried out by dialoguing field findings regarding the *dokok* tradition and the sharing economy theory as an analytical tool.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### *Dokok* Tradition

*Dokok* or *dokokan* tradition which is still practiced today in Rejosari Village, Meteseh, Semarang can be traced to its meaning from the meaning of the word “*dokok*” itself. The term “*dokok*” (Javanese) in Indonesian means to put: people put something to be taken back at another time. This tradition specifically refers to celebratory events: marriage, circumcising, etc.

*Dokok* means someone donates to a neighbor who is having a celebration. Unlike the general “donating” which is done on the day of celebration, *dokok* or *dokokan* is done about a week before the day of the event. So, the residents of Rejosari Village differentiate between *dokokan* and donating. It is common for a resident of Rejosari Village to do *dokok* for a neighbor who is marrying off his/her child, then on the day of the wedding, they still come to the wedding and still make a donation.

If on the day of the wedding people make donations in the form of money, the donations at the *dokokan* are usually in the form of goods (rice, dry noodles, sugar, etc.). By the person holding a celebration, the name of the donor will be recorded, along with the type and amount of the

contribution. Therefore, every family in Rejosari Village has a notebook containing the names of the donors, the types and amounts of their donations when they hold a celebration. If a family has married off 3 children, this family will have three notebooks. The benefit of this notebook is to “return” a donation of the same type and amount when someone who is recorded in the donation book one day has a celebration. A concrete example is as follows: when family A married off their child, family B gave (*dokok*) rice totaling 25 kilograms. In family A's notebook, family B will be recorded *dokok* 25 kilograms of rice. If later family B married off their child, based on the notebook they had, family A would *dokok* with 25 kilograms of rice in family B.

With such a practice, *dokok* is substantially different from donations because *dokok* contains an obligation to return while donations do not. The obligation to return with the same type and quantity of goods is evident in the social sanctions that a person will receive if he/she returns a “donation” of an amount smaller than the “donation” he/she has ever received. The person will be the talk of the villagers. So, actually, the meaning of *dokok* is in certain limits closer to the meaning of lending. People lend (*dokok*) 25 kg of rice when their neighbors hold a celebration. When this person has a celebration, the neighbor “to whom he/she lent 25 kg of rice” must return the same amount. Local people call the activity of “lending each other” in a celebration as a form of *gotong royong* or mutual assistance.

As a tradition that has been passed down through generations, the practice of *dokok* or *dokokan* tradition has been around for a very long time. A native Rejosari informant who admits that she is currently

approximately 76 years old, said the following.

*It's a tradition ... it's been hereditary, that's how it was. (Since) my parents have been like that.*

If the informant's age is currently 76 years, it means that she was born around 1945. Even though she admits that this tradition has existed since the era of his mother and father. That means, the existence of *dokok* or *dokokan* tradition did not only exist in 1945 but long before that.

In contrast to *dokokan* tradition that has existed and is popular in Rejosari Village since tens or even hundreds of years ago, the term of sharing economy has only become popular since the 2007-2008 financial crisis (Gorog, 2018). Huurne specifically mentioned that the terminology of sharing economy has become popular especially since Rachel Botsman and Roo Rogers popularized the term in their book entitled *What's Mine Is Yours*, published in 2010 (Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020). Likewise, Mallinson noted that based on his search for articles published between 2006 and 2018, publications regarding the sharing economy only jumped rapidly starting in 2014 (Mallinson, et al., 2020). However, in 2013, *The Economist* magazine had published an article entitled *The Rise of the Sharing Economy*.

Quoting Kathan (2016), Gorog tells of the origins of this sharing economy. According to him, during the financial crisis of 2007-2008, many people faced financial difficulties. Since then people have re-evaluated consumption patterns and ownership values. The people who lost their jobs due to the crisis mentioned above certainly need new job opportunities. Companies like Uber offers an attractive (job) alternative (Gorog, 2018). That is, people who are unemployed have been laid off due to the crisis and happen to own

private cars, with the existence of Uber they can get income. In other words, Uber is helping these people capitalize on their private cars by “turning them into taxis”.

The birth background or more precisely the popularity of the sharing economy as described by Gorog is different from the *dokokan* tradition. As a community service tradition, *dokokan* is first intended to ease the burden on the person or family who will have a celebration. The celebration can be in the form of marrying off her child, circumcision, etc. Without or with “help from neighbors”, in time a person or a family will marry off their child. However, with the *dokokan* tradition, the burden on families to entertain their neighbors in their child's marriage will be lighter or more precisely distributed over time, not all at once. Another background of the *dokok* tradition is togetherness. “You know, if you don't participate (doing the *dokokan* tradition) it will be people talking about it.” The word “talk” means to be gossip in a negative context. Thus, the informant's sentence implies that families or residents who do not follow the *dokokan* tradition will be negatively labeled by their social environment, namely as an antisocial family or resident. This is of course very different from the sharing economy phenomenon. People will be involved or not in the phenomenon, there is no social sanction whatsoever.

### **Conception**

There are no fundamental disputes regarding the meaning and practice of the *dokok* tradition among the actors (the people of Rejosari Village). The informants consistently explained that *dokok* or *dokokan* is a local tradition that is carried out before a family performs a celebration (for example circumcision, but generally marriage). *Dokok* in Indonesian means 'put'

(Prawiroatmojo, 1993). When a family in Rejosari Village will hold a celebration, the neighbors “put” goods (in the form of rice, sugar, etc.) on the family. Families who are holding a celebration may use the items placed by their neighbors to entertain guests who come for the celebration they hold. The items that are placed by the neighbors must be returned by the family who owns the celebration when the neighbors hold a celebration later. In this respect, *dokok* is substantially different from donating or giving. The word which is substantially closest to *dokok* is entrusting it. Therefore, from the side of the neighbors that do *dokok* (putting things in a family holding a celebration), this tradition is similar to saving in the form of goods. “I have married off my 3 children, *alhamdulillah* I have no shortage (in entertaining the guests) ... (Even) after the wedding, sugar, and rice are still a lot left in the kitchen. That's because since was young, I always *dokok* to my neighbors hold the celebration.” This conception is clearly understood by the residents of Rejosari Village.

Not so with the sharing economy! Even though the phenomenon itself is very real, there is no clear understanding among academics and practitioners (Gorog, 2018). Gorog (2018) states, “Various definitions of the sharing economy are found in various kinds of literature, but most of these definitions are different from one another.” Sundararajan, the author of *The Sharing Economy* himself is not even sure about the terminology of sharing economy he is using. He uses the sharing economy for the title of his book simply because many people use the term. How ironic! Sundararajan actually prefers to use the term crowd-based capitalism (Gobble, 2017; Heinrichs, 2013). What Sundararajan calls crowd-based capitalism is the way

through which platforms such as Uber and AirBnB draw resources from the crowd to serve the needs of the crowd (Gobble, 2017). Due to the absence of a clear and single understanding of the sharing economy, it is not surprising that various criticisms have attacked the sharing economy from various sides (Schor, 2017). Apart from terminology, Schor (2017), for example, questions whether “renting” and “providing labor services” are suitable to be categorized as sharing.

Various terms can be used interchangeably to point out the practice and phenomenon of the sharing economy: collaborative consumption, crowd-based capitalism, on-demand economy, gig economy, access economy, crowd economy, the digital economy (Gorog, 2018; Ravenelle, 2017; Heinrichs, 2013; Mallinson, et al., 2020). One definition states that the sharing economy is an economic model based on the sharing of underutilized assets between peers without transfer of ownership, covering space to skills and goods for either monetary or non-monetary benefit through online platforms (Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020). The various definitions put forward by researchers in this field can be found in various literatures. From these various definitions, it is found that the same keywords are underutilized assets, peer-to-peer, and platforms or digital technology or online Information technology (c.f. Gazzola, Vatamanescu, Andrei, & Marrapodi, 2019; Gorog, 2018; Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020; Ravenelle, 2017; Albescu & Maniu, 2017; Heinrichs, 2013). It seems that what has been popularized as the economic model of sharing is actually capitalizing underutilized assets and not sharing in a substantial sense; such asset capitalization is carried out between consumers through

economic transactions (called peer-to-peer to distinguish between individual-company transactions) and these transactions are carried out through digital technology. At this point, we do have to draw a clear dividing line between the practice of sharing which is truly sharing (for example Benihbaik.com; Dompot Dhuafa; KitaBisa.com; etc.) and economic practice which is essentially asset capitalization through digital technology above.

Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens (2020) more specifically states that there are three consumption systems that make up the sharing economy, namely (1) product-service system (for example AirBnB, Booking.com, Agoda, GoCar), (2) redistribution markets (for example Craigslist, olx, marketplace), and (3) collaborative lifestyle (for example ParkAtMyHouse). If the *dokokan* tradition can be categorized as a sharing economy practice, this tradition seems most likely to be included in the first system wherein the *dokokan* practice there is the provision and distribution of goods even though it is without online information technology as an intermediary. Completing the description of Huurne et al above, Sundararajan identified 5 main characteristics of the sharing economy, namely (1) the sharing economy is a free market phenomenon, (2) the sharing economy is based on the placement of underutilized capital for use, (3) the sharing economy develops in crowd-based networks, (4) the sharing economy transcends traditional boundaries between personal and professional, and (5) the sharing economy blurs the dividing line between full-time employment and casual work (Albescu & Maniu, 2017). Furthermore, Sundararajan stated 4 features of crowd-based capitalism. (a) Broadly based on the market, (b) using high-impact capital, (c) using broad community-based

networks, and (d) blurring the boundaries between full-time workers and ordinary workers (Heinrichs, 2013). Unlike Sundararajan, but it seems to be complementary, Chen and Wang propose 5 characteristics of the sharing economy, namely (1) temporary access, (2) there is a transfer of economic value, (3) using platform mediation, (4) the wider role of consumers, and (5) supply where the resources come from the crowd (crowdsourcing) (Chen & Wang, 2019). The wider role of consumers in this context means that they do not only act as buyers (consumers) but also as sellers (producers), as users as well as providers. In relation to the increasingly broad role of consumers, Eckhardt introduced the term *prosumer* (producer who is also a consumer) (Eckhardt, et al., 2019).

Even though the sharing economy is recognized as being able to reduce transaction costs (Schor, 2017), improve quality and access, and better increase creativity (David, 2017); the same economic model, according to Schor (2017), can actually widen the income gap among the lower middle class. Sutton conducted his research on providers of goods/ services in America for-profit platforms (AirBnB, RelayRides, and TaskRabbit). He found that these providers included highly educated people and that many of them already had good-paying steady jobs. They use these platforms to increase income. Moreover, many of them participate in manual work including cleaning services, moving goods, and other jobs traditionally done by low-educated workers (Schor, 2017). Obviously, in the case of TaskRabbit, for example. This platform connects people who need labor, from installing door handles, cleaning bathrooms, cutting plants, to installing or assembling tables with people who provide

services for these jobs (providers). In the traditional economic model, cutting crops or grass, for example, would be done by a gardener; cleaning the bathroom will be done by the people who work for it every day. However, with the TaskRabbit platform, people who actually already have a permanent job have the same opportunity to offer services to complete the work above. Those who have fixed income will get additional income by selling services through TaskRabbit platform; while gardeners, carpenters, etc. due to the existence of the same platform now have to compete with people who are already on a regular income. This is how the income gap becomes wider.

Does *dokok* or *dokokan* have the same effect? This research doesn't explore it. However, to the income gap, the practice of *dokok* clearly does not have any effect because this practice does not open up opportunities for the actors to earn income. If the practice of *dokok* wants to be criticized from an economic point of view, one of which is the real value of money due to the increase in the price of goods. If A *dokok* or put 25 kg of rice for B's celebration; and B returned the same amount of rice at a A's celebration two years later, B had to spend more than A to get 25 kg of rice due to the rice price increase. However, this case is relevant only if B's income does not increase. Another practice from *dokok* tradition that can have negative implications for actors of the *dokok* tradition is debt. The person who has been donated must return the same contribution even though he/she has no money and for that he/she is forced to go into debt. From this point of view, it is clear that debt is used (indirectly) for consumption, not production.

### **Trust and Reputation**

No relationship can happen without trust. This is also very clear in the practice of *dokok* and sharing economy. When the researcher proposes a hypothetical case that is someone will return the contribution with a smaller value, with the reason that each of the informants said "impossible".

In the practice of *dokok* or *dokokan*, each person will record the contribution given by each neighbor. If he/she marries off his/her 3 children even at different times, his/her family will have 3 notebooks of donations from his/her neighbors. The informants believed that everyone he/she had ever donated would correctly record his/her donation and "would return" to him/her the same amount. The practice of reciprocity is strictly applied in the practice of *dokok*. Is it true that he/she always remembers exactly how much he/she contributed to each of his/her neighbors? Even if the neighbor he/she donated has recorded the correct amount of his contribution, will the neighbor definitely return the same amount? These questions were completely unthinkable. In essence, they believed that everyone they had ever donated would return the same amount.

Where did this trust come from? Correctly taking notes and returning the same amount has been the norm for generations in *dokok* practice. The notebook becomes an instrument for every family in Rejosari to maintain the above norms. Because of this norm, trust was born in the Rejosari community.

If a notebook is an instrument or a tool, the desire to remain a part or be considered as part of society is the basic motivation for community members to comply with existing norms. "If that happened (dared to return the donation with an amount smaller than the amount he had received), you will be the talk of the villagers," answered an informant when



asked: what will happen if I returned the donation with a smaller amount.

The dynamics of trust, norms, and a sense of being a member of the community in the practice of *dokok* above are in line with what was stated by Huurne et al (2020). According to Huurne, the sense of community (the individual feeling that someone in a community belongs and counted to each other) tries to maintain the community norms. On the other hand, these community norms also create social pressure for community members. The well hold and maintained community norms will birth trust between members of the community itself. Fukuyama defines trust as “... expectations that arise in a community that behaves in an orderly, honest, and cooperative manner, based on shared norms ...” (Fukuyama, 2010). However, on the other hand, trust can also mean the willingness to be vulnerable to other people and their behavior that deviates from the expected performance, naturally risk becomes part of the relationship (Ferrari, 2016). Because of trust, a person as a member of the community has positive expectations that members of the community will not harm each other. Thus, trust encourages individual members of the community to rely on results and consequences to other members and encourages them to participate in the community (Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020).

Trust in the sharing economy is really important because transactions are carried out in an online context where consumers cannot first check the product they are buying, personal interactions are only possible to a very limited degree, and often no regulations are governing them (Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020). In the context of this sharing economy, trust is different from traditional transactions due

to the following reasons (Huurne, Ronteltap, & Buskens, 2020). First, consumers are less protected by rules and regulations than traditional transactions. Second, trust has moved from dyadic relationships, namely the relationship between consumers and providers to triad relationships in which there is a platform that facilitates transactions. Third, transactions always carry information barriers and possibly personal risks. Fourth, consumption has shifted from “owning the product” to “temporary use” and consumers are paying to access the product (not to own it). Fifth, when the exchange of services is included in the definition of sharing economy (eg accommodation services, taxi services, cleaning services) some activities are much more complex than transactions of goods.

If trust in the *dokok* tradition is built because of the obedience of community members in implementing existing social norms; in a sharing economy, trust is built by ensuring the reviews and ratings that are posted and made online by users (Mahadevan, 2018; Arcidiacono & Podda, 2017). Once a platform is found to be detrimental to users and users review it by giving negative comments and suggestions and posting them online, the platform's reputation will be damaged and users' trust in the platform will diminish. On the other hand, once a provider is caught harming consumers, then the consumer reviews and gives a bad rating to the provider and uploads it online so that it becomes viral; the reputation of the provider will damage and the consumer's trust in the provider will destroy.

In terms of “recording” the reputation of the perpetrators, the *dokok* tradition has a similar mechanism to the sharing economy. The norm is to return donations in the same amount. If someone

is caught behaving defiantly from this norm (returning a smaller amount of donations), he will become the subject of a gossip throughout the village. The beginning of this bad reputation, of course, comes from the person who first finds out about someone's disobedience to *dokok* norms (a kind of review and rating in the context of the sharing economy), then the first person who knows it tells anyone in the community (a kind of viralizing in the context of the sharing economy) and finally the person's reputation fell. On the other hand, the neighbors' trust in that person also drops. The difference between the sharing economy and the *dokok* tradition in terms of the reputation of the perpetrators is only in the means: the sharing economy viralize reputation via online, while the *dokok* tradition by word of mouth.

### **Motivation**

The striking difference between the practice of sharing economy and the practice of *dokok* lies in the motives of the actors. Arcidiacono & Podda (2017) concluded that economic and instrumental reward is certainly the most important motivation among the sharing users. He studied the users of the largest online platform of a time bank, that is TimeRepublic. Gazzola (2019) also states that economic motivation forms the basis for participation in the sharing economy. The findings of Sijabat (2019) in his research on the motivation of ride-sharing users (Uber, Grab, Ojek) also emphasize that the economy (in addition to social, environmental, and technological factors) has a significant effect on the choice of online transportation services by users. What are referred to as economic motivations or economic rewards are (a) people can get access to goods easily and cheaply, (b) as a result, consumers can save money and (c) in the end all these

contribute to reducing demand towards material and energy use. These findings also refute some analysts who state that the main interest in the sharing economy is to build human connections (Arcidiacono & Podda, 2017). Supporting Arcidiacono and Podda's arguments against the above analysts, Belk (2017) even poetically writes: we are not only playing bowling alone but also riding, driving alone, living alone even in what is known as the sharing economy. The economic motive which is called the most important motivation in the sharing economy must of course be read in the context of for-profit platforms because the fact is that there are not-for-profit platforms, namely the time bank platform, Majorna (as an antithesis to Zipcar) or in the Indonesian context, for example, Benihbaik.com.

Even though the economic activity is real in the practice of *dokok* tradition (at least it is the consumption aspect), the economic motive is not the motivation (all the more it is the main motivation!) for the local community in doing *dokok*.

*(Dokok or dokokan is) actually a form of gotong royong (mutual assistance). In the gotong royong, there are no calculations like that ... It doesn't matter, for example, my children are only two but I have to dokok the neighbors three times. This is community service!*

For residents of Rejosari Village, *Dokok* is a form of gotong royong (mutual assistance). Gotong royong means hard to bear together, happy to be enjoyed together. Because *dokok* is essentially a form of community service, people will not calculate the advantages and disadvantages. In the interview above, a person who has two children may have to donate 3 times to a neighbor who has three children. From economic calculations, the person who has two children is actually lost. However, it

did not count at all. The feeling of being a member of the community (neighbors) or a sense of community is the main basis for Rejosari Village’s residents to continue carrying out the *dokokan* tradition.

Based on all the descriptions above, the authors compile the similarities and differences in the practice of *dokok* practice vis a vis sharing economy as shown in table 1 below.

Table 1  
*Dokok Practice vis a vis Sharing Economy*

ASPECTS	<i>DOKOK PRACTICE</i>	<i>SHARING ECONOMY</i>
Existence	Dozens and even hundreds of years	Popular since the 2007-2008 financial crisis
Nature	Non-transactional (communal)	Can be transactional-commercial, can be non-commercial
Motivation	Non-economic	Economic
Scope	Only covers a certain area or bordered area (Rejosari Village).	Borderless area
Transaction media	Oral	Through an online digital technology platform
Role of trust	The main basis	The main basis
Reputation	Through reviews and ratings that are disseminated	Developed through reviews and ratings which are been viral

	by word of mouth.	through online media
Sanction	Social sanctions, informal	Formal sanctions based on existing rules and regulations
Object	Goods, money	Goods, service, skill, space
Actor	Peer-to-peer	Peer-to-peer
Interaction base	Social relation	Market (demand and supply)

#### ***Dokok Practice = Sharing Economy?***

The Oxford Dictionary defines ‘sharing’ as follows (Dictionary, 2021): (1) to have, use, or experience something at the same time as somebody else; (2) to have part of something while another person or other people also have part; (3) to divide something between two or more people; (4) to give some of what you have to somebody else; to let somebody use something that is yours. In the context of sharing economy, definition number 4, according to the author, is the most relevant definition. Albescu provides a slightly more philosophical definition of sharing as follows: sharing means being able to give, namely detach, a form of hard ideas about ownership (Albescu & Maniu, 2017). The main keyword from the Oxford and Albescu definition of sharing is ownership. Therefore, Albescu and Maniu (2017) further explain that sharing always means giving (to others). How can people give when they don't have? If on the one hand there are those who are giving, on the other hand, there are those who are receiving. The idea of a couple of sharing (giving) and receiving in economics is parallel to the idea of supply and demand (Albescu &

Maniu, 2017). In short, there will be no receiving without sharing/ giving, no sharing/ giving without ownership.

Within the framework of all the descriptions as above, can the practice of *dokok* be categorized as sharing or more specifically, the sharing economy? To answer this question, the author takes the starting point from the natures and characteristics of the sharing economy put forward by Sundararajan as quoted by Albescu & Maniu (2017) and by Chen & Wang (2019) as presented in table 2 below.

Table 2  
 The Practice of *Dokok* vs Characteristics of Sharing Economy

CHARACTERISTICS	YES	NO
Market	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy if the meaning of market is expanded not only in terms of supply-demand but also sharing/ giving-receiving	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if the sharing economy is defined as a limited transaction in the context of the market (demand-supply)
Online information technology	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy if online informati	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if online informati

	on technology is only seen as a sharing medium.	on technology is an absolute requirement for the sharing economy.
Underutilized assets as objects of sharing	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy if the assets distributed are not limited and are merely underutilized assets.	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if the object of sharing absolutely must be underutilized assets.
Temporary access	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy when the practice of entrusting goods in the <i>dokok</i> tradition is considered a temporary access to use an item and it must be	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if access is temporarily restricted to the same product or goods.

	returned even with other goods of the same type and quantity.	
Transfer of economic values	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy because of actors “exchange” goods of the same type and quantity.	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if the transfer of economic value is limited to an exchange of goods for money.
The role of consumers at a time producers ( <i>procumers</i> )	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a sharing economy because each actor has a dual role: as a recipient as well as a giver.	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a sharing economy if the roles of consumers and producers are limited to commercial transactions.
<i>Crowd-sourcing</i>	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is a	The <i>dokok</i> tradition is not a

	sharing economy if the local community is seen as a “crowd”	sharing economy if what is meant by the crowd is a society without borders.
--	---	---

### Pseudosharing

Several researchers have raised criticisms of whether the sharing economy phenomenon and practice is really sharing. Some of which are Albescu & Maniu (2017), Mallinson, et al., (2020), David (2017), Schor (2017), Pallesen & Aakjaer (2020), Ryu, Basu, & Saito (2019). David (2017), for example, states that the term “sharing” is problematic in relation to the financialized modes of allocation. Meanwhile, Pallesen (2020) considers that sharing in the sharing economy seems to be implicitly explained in the forms of new transactions (switching from transactions of individual companies to transactions of peers). Mallinson and Kalamar made a rather harsh criticism. Mallinson (2020) says that platform companies like Uber and AirBnB actually serve their own economic interests. Meanwhile, Kalamar argued a little harshly, “These exchanges (which occur in the sharing economy) deprive the original meaning of sharing and those profit-oriented companies are share washing, that is using the positive association of the word “sharing” to hide their activities which is full of personal interests. (Kalamar in Schor, 2017).

Gorog defines digital economy as... the economic activity with help of mobile technology and the internet of things (Iot) that result from billions of everyday online connections among people, businesses, devices, machines, data, and processes

(Rahoyo, Prapti, & Niati , 2020). What has been popularized as the sharing economy (in this context is a for-profit platform) has actually been included in the definition of digital economy by Gorog above. In addition, the economic motives are the basis for the formation of a sharing economy. At this point, the authors agree with the terms used by Belk (2017) that the sharing economy is actually pseudosharing. Basically, there is nothing shared when everything is done against a backdrop of financial expectations! (Kovacs, Morris, Polese, & Imami, 2017).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In a broad sense, it can be seen that the practice of *dokok* is actually a practice of sharing economy. By the word “broad” the authors mean that sharing can be done not only through online media. The advancement of information technology is undeniably very helpful in broadening the opportunities and scope of sharing. However, digital information technology is only the media, not the substance of the sharing itself. The substance of sharing is giving ownership. Moreover, sharing activities are not only for underutilized assets.

By limiting itself to underutilized assets as objects of sharing and digital technology as media sharing, let alone emphasizing the practice of commodification of these underutilized assets, the sharing economy which has been popularly understood as a new economic model is actually no different from traditional commercial transactions. The only difference between the two lies in the use of the internet or digital information technology as a medium of transaction. In this case, the sharing economy is exactly the same as the digital economy!

#### APPRECIATION

This research was fully funded by the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM), Semarang University (USM). We express our sincere appreciation for this.

#### REFERENCES

- Albescu, O., & Maniu, M. (2017). Sharing Economy: Evaluating Its Structural Dimensions for Policy Design Purposes. *On-line Journal Modelling the New Europe*, 85-103.
- Aquier, A., Carbone, V., & Masse, D. (2019). How to Create Values (s) in the Sharing Economy: Business Models, Scalability, and Sustainability. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 5-25.
- Arcidiacono, D., & Podda, A. (2017). Sharing time: new forms of reciprocity in the digital economy. *Work organization, labor & globalization*, 39-58.
- Bachnik, K., & Szumniak-Samolej, J. (2018). Social Initiatives in Food Consumption and Distribution as Part of Sustainable Consumption and Sharing Economy. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management & Innovation*, 101-122.
- Belk, R. (2017). Sharing without caring. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 249-261.
- Bradley, K., & Pargman, D. (2017). The sharing economy as the commons of the 21st century. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 231-247.
- Celata, F., Hendrickson, C. Y., & Sanna, V. S. (2017). The Sharing Economy as Community Marketplace? Trust,

- Reciprocity and Belonging in Peer-to-peer Accommodation Platforms. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society Vol. 10*, 349-363.
- Chen, Y., & Wang, L. (2019). Commentary: Marketing and the Sharing. *American Marketing Association*, 28-31.
- Cornejo-Velazques, E., Clavel-Maqueda, M., Perez-Lopez-Portillo, H., & Lyubimova, E. (2020). Business Model of Learning Platforms in Sharing Economy. *The Electronic Journal of E-Learning Vol. 18*, 102-113.
- David, M. (2017). Sharing: post-scarcity beyond capitalism? *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 311-325.
- Decrop, A., & Graul, A. R. (2019). The Role of System Trust and Risk Perception in Providing Assets for Collaborative Consumption Schemes. *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability Vol 7*, 131-153.
- D'Hauwers, R., Bank, J. v., & Montakhabi, M. (2020). Trust, Transparency, and Security in the Sharing Economy: What is the Government's Role? *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 6-18.
- Dictionary, O. L. (2021, January). *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved from Oxford Learner's Dictionary: [https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/share\\_1?q=sharing](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/share_1?q=sharing)
- Duerringer, C. M. (2019). Rhetorical Arbitrage: The Rhetoric of the Sharing Economy. *Communication Theory*, 383-400.
- Echhardt, G., Houston, M., Jiang, B., Lamberton, C., Rindfleisch, A., & Zervas, G. (2019). Marketing in the Sharing Economy. *American Marketing Association*, 5-28.
- El Fikri, I., Koubaa, S., & Belhcen, L. (2019). The Motivations to Engage in Sharing Economy: A Case Study of Uber Morocco. *International Journal of Business & Administrative Studies*, 272 - 281.
- Ferrari, M. Z. (2016). Beyond Uncertainties in the Sharing Economy: Opportunities for Social Capital. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 664-675.
- Fukuyama, F. (2010). *Trust (terj)*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Qalam.
- Gazzola, P., Vatamanescu, E.-M., Andrei, A. G., & Marrapodi, C. (2019). Users' motivations to participate in the sharing economy: . *Corporate Social Responsibility & Environmental Management*, 741-751.
- Gobble, M. (2017). Defining the Sharing Economy. *Research Technology Management*, 59-61.
- Gorog, G. (2018). The Definitions of Sharing Economy: A Systematic Literature Review. *Management Vol 13*, 175-189.
- Heinrichs, H. (2013). Sharing Economy: *GAIA: Ecological Perspectives for Science & Society*, 228-231.
- Huseynova, U. (2015). Trust: The Social Virtues and The Creation of Prosperity. *Academic Research Journal Vol. 3 No. 7*.
- Huurne, T. M., Ronteltap, A., & Buskens, V. (2020). Sense of Community and Trust in The Sharing Economy. *Tourism Analysis Vol 25*, 43-61.

- Kovacs, B., Morris, J., Polese, A., & Imami, D. (2017). Looking at the 'sharing' economies concept through. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 365-378.
- Mahadevan, R. (2018). Examination of motivations and attitudes of peer-to-peer. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing&Mangement*, 679-692.
- Mallinson, D. J., Morcol, G., Yoo, e., Azim, S. F., Levine, E., & Shafi, S. (2020). Sharing economy: A systematic thematic. *Information Polity*, 143-158.
- Midgett, C., Bendickson, J., Muldoon, J., & Solomon, S. (2017). The Sharing Economy and Sustainability: A Case for Airbnb. *Small Business Institute*, 51-71.
- Nawir, M. (2020, January). Retrieved from Kompasiana:  
<https://www.kompasiana.com/masnawir7439/5e161634d541df4034582012/mengenal-tradisi-dokok-di-kampung-rejosari-meteseh-kota-semarang?page=1>
- Pallesen, E., & Aakjaer, M. (2020). More for Less? Sharing Economy as a Driver of. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, 19-27.
- Prawiroatmojo, S. (1993). *Bausastra Jawa Indonesia*. Jakarta: CV Haji Masagung.
- Rahoyo, Prapti, R., & Niati, A. (2020). Worthlessness Is A Power: Mengapa Orang Bersedia Menaruh Uang di Aplikasi Go-pay. *Solusi*, 89-99.
- Ravenelle, A. J. (2017). Sharing economy workers: selling, not sharing. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 281-295.
- Reddick, C. G., Zheng, Y., & Liu, T. (2020). Roles of government in regulating the sharing economy: A case study of bike-sharing in China. *Information Polity*, 219-235.
- Reiersen, J. (2019). Drivers of Trust and Trustworthiness. *International Journal of Social Economics*.
- Ryu, H., Basu, M., & Saito, O. (2019). What and how are we sharing? A systematic review of the sharing. *Sustainability Science*, 517-527.
- Schor, J. B. (2017). Does the sharing economy increase inequality within. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy, and Society*, 263-279.
- Sijabat, R. (2019). Sharing Economy: A Study on the Factors Influencing Users' Motivation to Use Ride-Sharing Platforms. *DeReMa: Jurnal Manajemen*, 65-87.