Meshing with your home : Seeking trouble in sharing dwelled spaces

The Growing Trend of Living Small

Wagner, Lauren; Driessen, Clemens

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003173052-14

10 Meshing with Your Home

Seeking Trouble in Sharing Dwelled Spaces

Lauren Wagner & Clemens Driessen

Guests of Guests

This paper started on an airplane. On the way to the Association of American Geographers annual meeting in Chicago, in addition to being sandwiched together in a middle and aisle seat, Clemens and Lauren were enmeshed in some problems of temporary housing. Clemens was paying for part of a shared Airbnb, but only starting the following night; Lauren was paying for part of a shared Airbnb, but some of the other sharers were not arriving until the following night. The question arose of where Clemens would be sleeping that night (as well as what address he would put on his arrival card). And so we began to consider the negotiations and tensions of sharing dwelling space.

We first wondered who in fact 'owns' the housing space available in Lauren's shared Airbnb that night – the owner of the house, who might seem to have a right to know who is staying there, or the designated user in their Airbnb sharing group, whose arrival a day later left 'his' room open for this night? What about the other sharers in the Airbnb rental – do they own the use of that room as much as Lauren or the designated user? If Clemens were to be invited to stay – if Lauren were to invite him – whose permission should be sought? Obviously Clemens' occupation would not be limited to that room only. He would be present in other shared spaces, like the bathroom and the kitchen. His presence would be materially manifest: he would eat food, take a shower, sleep on the sheets, and leave all the normal traces of a human animal in a dwelling space. We wondered how extending a gesture of hospitality to Clemens, by offering this space to sleep which would otherwise be empty, is also an act of invasion and encroachment into the comforts, habits, and microbiomes of dwelling afforded by a home. We wondered how the intimacies of dwelling are becoming an exchangeable commodity, itself a complex of social and material ways that individuals take up space in housing, alongside the ways that housing is becoming segmented for exchange.

As we sat battling over 'personal space' in our overnight airline chairs, we thought this kind of battle is playing out at (slightly) larger scales – or

at the same scale but in ever growing variety and numbers of instances – through home-sharing platforms like Airbnb. Such platforms enable us to compartmentalize a 'home' into shareable and non-shareable housing space, based on the premise that those spaces can be commodities for temporary use by others. Yet when it comes to genuinely sharing housing space, this premise of treating housing as a commodity pitches the sharers, perhaps unknowingly, into negotiations of the many tentacles and footprints of dwelling. They throw into relief the tension between a house as a network of objects, with discrete purposes and actions of use, and as a meshwork of things, assembled and embodied with users and activities of dwelling (Knappett, 2011). In recognizing how we were struggling ourselves to tease apart dominion over things in a dwelling meshwork which we had not yet even entered, we decided to experiment with this problem together.

In the following sections, we elaborate on the 'experiments' we conducted in sharing dwelling space. For a series of work-related trips, we chose offerings from a home-sharing platform that involved sharing domestic space with the owners or with other renters. We reported back to each other on our experiences and the interactions we had with the owners and other occupants, and particularly our own discomforts and the instinctive limits we reached – and occasionally crossed – in meshing with the social and material dwellings of others. By pushing these limits, ethnomethodologically, we aim to probe the intimacies of dwelling that are presumed to be segmented and compartmentalized alongside the subunits of housing offered for hire. While many critical responses to the rise of home-sharing seem to affirm taken-for-granted notions of the home imbued with practices of privacy, owner-ship, and control of space and stuff, we take this as an occasion to probe assumptions of domesticity and how it borders. Building on Knappett's (2011) and Ingold's (2007) sense of meshwork, we are exploring how dwelling intimacies ebb and flow, expand and shrink, and are especially visible as such in the brief overlapping encounters between home-sharing guests and hosts. Thinking of domesticities as meshing or meshed means getting away from the domestic as a discrete ('personal') space with a certain dimension, but as something produced in materially mediated relations and affective practices. In this sense, we are considering not only how the eco-nomics of Airbnb shrinks home into commodifiable elements, but also how all kinds of actors – social and material – expand, contract, and enmesh with each other in the practice of sharing.

Units of Domesticity

"Home is where dependencies within and among species reach their most stifling" (Tsing, 2012:141). From nomadic shared mobile dwellings to neo-lithic longhouses, people have long lived in groups under the same roof (Fortunato, 2017). Modes of sharing dwelling space therefore not only pre-date but also persist after the arrival of the single 'nuclear' family house.

That discrete domestic form arguably emerged in early modern times in Western Europe (Stone 1975), though shifts in the character and composition of (extended) family and household structures have been debated (Smith, 1993; cf Braudel, 1981, p. 280). Domesticity could be unpacked as a particular "combination of the features of separation of living space from that of work, and its valuation of privacy, comfort and family-centredness" (Morley, 2000, p. 60). As such, assumptions about domesticity as 'private comfort' of a nuclear family is arguably a "specifically modern phenomenon, a product of the influence of capitalist economics, breakthroughs in technology and enlightenment notions of individuality" (Reed, 1996, p. 7, cited in Morley, 2000, p. 60) together with associated 20th-century gender roles and tasks in suburban nuclear family dwellings (Schwarz-Cowan, 1983).

That said, home-sharing platforms are often discussed from an assumed foundation of domesticity as something essentially private and non-commercial, which can – or, following some ideals, cannot – be segmented to 'share' in a neoliberal economy (Gibson-Graham, 2008). While we could question whether single-person, couple, or nuclear family households should be understood as a given or 'natural' unit defined by a strictly bounded private sphere, instead we allow this as a premise of what about the domestic house is considered 'under threat' from neoliberal intrusion and commodification. If domesticity has come to mean something about the intimacies of dwelling among a (nuclear) family, then our interest is in the frictions produced at the 'unruly edges' (Tsing, 2012) of that intimacy in home-sharing.

Whereas hotel rooms, at least historically, are purpose-built for the non-domesticating, transient dweller (van Lennep, 1987), home shares are, in principle, already-dwelled spaces, made specially available to welcome the guest seeking a temporary place to call home (Molz, 2012). Staying in a hotel room makes no requirements for social or material cohabitation with other dwellers or for revealing one's 'private' life – the raw needs of eating, sleeping, and shitting – with unknown others. Staying in an Airbnb – especially those where hosts are also resident – does demand this. So beyond the fulfilment of basic dwelling needs, the 'unit' being exchanged in home-sharing is arguably the *process of sharing*: the alternating acts of hospitality and appreciation, the delineations of access and allowable behaviour, the allowance for private or 'personal space' behaviour, and the development of mutual understanding and friendliness (or not) that facilitate cohabitation.

It seems to be no accident that these elements are highly regulated and surveilled by Airbnb through the training and monitoring of hosts (Roelofsen & Minca, 2018), and that the regulation thereof is part of what makes it a successful platform (Gallagher, 2017). In a sense, hosts are asked to de-personalize through commodified personalization; they have to 'shrink' their own practices of dwelling to the service of the home product they are offering. For example, hosts – who presumably are owners and occupants

of these already-dwelled-but-available spaces – are encouraged to produce a House Manual to guide guests on how to function in their new home (Airbnb, 2020), which makes that home accessible to any possible user. Starting with the Wi-Fi password (recommended as a first item to share), these instructions become necessary as a quick introduction to how to function in one's new home, which may be both familiar – containing recognizable features like a bed, a light switch, a trash can – and challenging. How does the hot water work? Where is the coffee maker? Which floorboard creaks badly? All the rough edges that would be quietly humming in the background in familiar homespaces as idiosyncrasies that our bodies have grown accustomed to become a feature to learn in the new environment. Likewise, the problems of living with the host and struggling over the footprint of one's 'personal' space becomes explicit and immediate. Whereas in other kinds of communal or cohabitational households, the understandings and dynamics of relationships between members would be worked out over time (Jarvis, 2011), here instructions for how the resources of the home are to be shared can be prescribed.

This practical work of sharing a home can be understood as a problem of stranger intimacy. Koch and Miles (2020) propose this framework as characteristic of digital technologies that facilitate encounter, especially those involving exchange of personal intimacies, like sex or friendship, or of resources like housing accommodation or a car. Through these exchanges, moments of potentially profound and intense intimacy – including openness of self, body, and property – can be produced as relationships are created, whether temporarily or durably, through matching preferences on a platform. Inevitably, these moments come with risk and vulnerability, and often the platforms involved mediate by building trust and promising security. This stranger intimacy is crucial in the process of home-shared dwelling, as it involves not only the host producing a space that is open to other selves and bodies, but also the guests adapting themselves to (temporarily) mesh into dwelling it.

The particular economy that produces, commodifies, and feeds on this process of meshing, in which personal relations and sociable encounters are part of the exchange of access to spaces and objects, could be thought to resonate with the accounts of the intricacies involved in alternative or diverse economies (Gibson-Graham, 2008). This arguably encompasses practices and relations that move beyond those strictly defined by capital and private ownership and as performed by neoliberal subjects that work on themselves to be the most value adding hosts (Roelofsen & Minca, 2018). What happens in commercial home-sharing practices then may not just be a matter of alienating people from their own pure zone of domesticity, as something produced in a supposedly non-labour environment of the domestic – something long contested in debates over gendered inequities and issues of unpaid housework. Domesticity is indeed something that, through platform capitalism, can be found to have surplus value that can

be marketed and exchanged – but in the process there may also emerge more broadly positive, creative, and mutually meaningful forms of sociality. Focusing on the details of such processes could help move away from the assumption of private spaces as strictly bound, individualist, inherently colliding, and either expanding or shrinking, in favour of more complex and nuanced interminglings of practicing domesticity.

The paradox of sharing intimacies with strangers overlaps with the tension between objects and things: a stranger becomes intimate through accessing networked objects – such as a car, or a bedroom – as things, meshworked in a confluence of materiality and activity along with other bodies and entities (Knappett, 2011: 45–6). Though the product offered may seem spatially and temporally borderable and discrete – a 'home' or a 'room' in a home, for a fixed period of time – the structures for making that function as an economic exchange are meshworks full of ambiguous and interwoven overlaps, along trajectories of intersecting lifestories (Ingold, 2007: 80). These enmeshings may be temporary, but become encoded and adapted to by the species and the stuff that are involved, as part of the vibrancy of matter (Bennett, 2010) and the productive unruliness of edges that generates new possibilities at the margins of practice (Tsing, 2012).

These dwelling meshworks become especially visible through the use, arrangement, repair, and avoidance of stuff in our examples below. We were struck by the ways that stuff – like closets, tools, trinkets, and appliances – were repeatedly a site for working out the edges of sharing, and beyond that to weave and adjust ways of being in domestic spaces and its endlessly entangled sociomaterial character. This extended beyond just the access to storage or control of certain objects and the affordances that these may offer – the use of a saucepan, the leaving of clutter. What we found was also the vibrancy of objects as 'things' through the role they played in making houses sites where dwelling intimacies enmeshed as loaded with meaning, sense of self, relations with a variety of others, and being at home. The three narratives below show, in their own ways, how our tanglings over stuff included both moments of shrinking and compacting practices of dwelling and moments of enmeshing and expansive dwelling, making a home at once owned and shared.

Empirical Entrance: Experimenting with Sharing

Our autoethnographic 'experiments' (Latham & Wagner, 2021), in probing this process of meshing, form the empirical basis for this chapter. Starting from our initial experience in Chicago, when we noticed the trouble we were having in separating out our respective positions as dwellers and sharers, we decided to use further opportunities of Airbnb stays to explore how we ourselves engaged in these positionings.

Our approach to what we observed is both ethnographic and ethnomethodological. Related to the former, we are cognisant of our embodied

positioning and perspectives in the global cultural empire of Airbnb: we are reasonably 'desirable' guests who are white, educated, and middle class, with (mostly) good reviews for our cleanliness and friendliness. With respect to the latter, we are treating the whole construct of home sharing as a set of social norms that can be ruffled. With these observations, we hope to bring attention to the unspoken rules and understandings that enable Airbnb transactions to take place, and especially to the unruly edges that emerge through them. Ethnomethodologically, we consider these edges as signs of 'trouble' (Greiffenhagen et al., 2015), or the telling disruptive interactional moments that reveal implicit social norms, through how they manifest as friction in our recounting of them in the vignettes below. Furthermore, in both of these traditions, we are attending to human and more-than-human elements as agents in vibrant assemblage (Bennett, 2010) – that is, as both ourselves and our hosts, but also stuff, pets, and affects that play into these dynamics.

To that end, we organized ourselves to be faced with troublesome encounters in shared homespaces. We reported to each other before and after work-related trips about our plans and intentions, sometimes also asking the other to evaluate options or choose the Airbnb, to disallow ourselves choosing only 'comfortable' accommodation without obligations to share. We tried to select accommodations that involved sharing space with the owner themselves, or which were normally inhabited by an owner and vacated for the purpose of home sharing, rather than homes dedicated exclusively to Airbnb rental, though this is not always possible to determine based on the information on the platform. The trips were usually oriented around conferences, though included accompanying family members or leisure time.

What follows is a series of vignettes, each showing a brief version of our experiences in different Airbnb encounters. They are narratively written and edited to focus on moments that evoke the evolving meshworks we made with different owners during some of the trips. We are not able to include all trips due to space, but have chosen ones that particularly illustrate how intimacies of dwelling evolved between ourselves and our hosts. Each vignette shows some elements of our own expectations about a kind of dwelling we anticipated in the home, along with how that sense of one's 'own' domestic space was challenged, perturbed, opened up and/or sometimes violated by hosts. In some cases, we were also the ones doing the 'violating' of meshed edges, whether purposefully or accidentally. Through meshwork, we do not seek to define private spaces with clear boundaries, rather to emphasize the productive frictions resulting from the impossibilities of clear boundaries.

Eventually, after our elaborate discussions on the plane, we resolved our qualms about who 'owned' the vacant-for-one-night bedroom, and Clemens did stay in Lauren's shared housing. The following day, he moved into his own Airbnb-to-be-shared.

Clemens in Chicago: Weirdly Personal Stuff

I was first to do the handover with the owner. On arriving, the owner lady asked me to repair her toilet paper holder, so within five minutes I was on the floor with tools next to her toilet, while she was walking around and we were making small talk.

And then she just strangely wouldn't leave for a full hour. She kept on explaining in ever more exquisite detail the rules of the house, repeatedly asking whether I wanted the leftover food in the fridge from the previous guests, how to operate every appliance from the TV, DVD player, to the bath, etc., not held back by my interjections that I really had no intention of using any of these.

When she finally left, I fell asleep on the sofa, to be woken up by Lauren and her buddies, together with the lady coming back in – she was still in the area and felt she had to bring more toilet paper.

Lauren in Los Angeles: Feeling Violated

Jody's two-bedroom apartment has two Airbnb listings: one for the independent second bedroom and another for a sort of mattress/daybed situated, as I discovered upon my arrival, on one end of the living room/office/central room of the apartment. That was the bed I had rented for 37 US dollars a night.

She let me bring my folding bike into the kitchen, barring against possible theft outside, and complimented my dedication to bring the bike transatlantically (she complimented this on her Airbnb review as well). I settled in, so to speak, even though there was no real space for me to settle into: this central living working space consisted of two long tables on one side of the room with her computer workstation; a large armchair, covered in dog hair and often occupied by her large companion dog; and the daybed, occupying a sort of corridor between the entry from the front door and the kitchen, and the back hallway towards the bathroom and bedrooms. There was nowhere to stow my stuff next to that bed that would not be in the way, so I started caching my things on the opposite end of the long table from her computer, next to the dog's chair. She suggested I take a shower (probably because of the hour of biking), and we could go out to eat. In order to do so, I rummaged through my bag to try to extract the necessary soaps and changes of clothes without exploding everything onto the workspace. Even that felt invasive.

We walked down the street to the closest branch of a local fast-food chain, and she carefully ordered and paid for herself separately from me, though we shared one of the laminate cafeteria tables. I found myself entering into some personal topics within the first hour of meeting Jody. Starting from being carless in Los Angeles, we went into husbands, boyfriends, and partners; careers, aspirations, and frustrations; philosophies of life and

semi-spirituality. When we got home, she sort of cut off the conversation to get to work on something. I felt vaguely like I had been violated, convinced by a sweet-talker to reveal intimate information in exchange for staying in her living room. I forgot that I was also paying for it.

Over the next two days, I was hanging out in Los Angeles and staying in Jody's living-and-working room, though not staying there much during the day as that was one of her conditions for people renting this space. I continued to struggle with where to store my belongings. She had instructed me to keep my bag in that place next to the dog's dedicated chair, but when I left late one morning having opened it and arranged some items on the table, I came back later to find them rearranged. She had shown me a spot in the kitchen where I could store some of the food I had purchased at the supermarket she recommended; again, I found them moved around when I came home, and started gathering them together again, trying to make sure nothing had gone missing. Was she tidying my stuff for me? Or tidying her areas from my invasion of stuff? These rearrangements again felt like a violation that I had implicitly allowed by renting a bed in her apartment, but which emphasized my discomfort at occupying this semi-public space. I had no door to close, no cabinet to shut, no key to lock that could prevent her from fully exploring my travel bag and its precious contents when I left the house. I felt like I needed to carry my passport and cash around for safe keeping.

When I came home at night, I discovered the daybed turned down and ready for me.

Before I left, there were a couple of hours I found myself alone in the house. I took a nap on top of the duvet in the private bedroom, since it was between tenants – a chance for a little privacy. I took a shower and carefully hung her towels. I peeked into her bedroom where the dog was sleeping on her bed, and noted how she had decorated her personal space, now the only remaining space in the house that she did not share.

Clemens in Paris: Presence of Absent Owners

When we arrived to receive the key and instructions for living in the home for the next five days, the owner was on a little stepladder wiping the windows; he was deep cleaning his home. We were actually a few hours early, we had agreed that it was OK to drop off our baggage, but now our young daughter had to use the bathroom so we asked if it was OK for the two of us to already enter the home briefly for that.

In this way, we entered the space that was being prepared for the transition towards being our apartment.

The owner was very friendly, but there was also a bit of a sense of intrusion, an awkwardness of seeing our 'landlord' in his own home, in his 'cleaning attire' holding a mop. It was clearly an 'actual home' that this man normally lived in with his family. He was wiping away the fingerprints of his

children from the windows, as a ritual perhaps to make the space more neutral, as part of cleanliness standards that Airbnb would survey us on after our stay. But also to generate privacy of sorts: our children were going to sleep in the beds of his children, with their trinkets, their posters.

We walked around, and after receiving instructions on how to use the kitchen, where the plates and pans were, there was a solemn final instruction. In the living room, there were various cupboards containing things we could use: board games, wine glasses. "But do not open this closet please", the man said, gesturing to two relatively large doors a bit higher up than the others.

I looked at these doors for the next five days and didn't open them. Throughout our stay, we were aware of being in the space of another family, gradually getting used to the appliances and furniture, making it our own. And we were inevitably curious about its 'real', actual residents now absent.

One evening, entering the apartment I bumped against a wooden structure on the wall with little carved birds. One small bird broke off, from what appeared as a personal and unique item. I felt very bad and decided to mention it on the 'check out phone call'. I was quite relieved when the man said it was not a problem.

Before leaving, we had ample time to clean – and I thought it was our turn to do some deep cleaning. Their dishwasher happened to be the same as ours. There was a switch inside that got stuck, so I managed to repair it. Then I got into deep cleaning it, going behind rubbers and in corners. I was really proud then, it felt like reparation and a contribution to the household which we were about to leave behind again.

Discussion

We want to bring attention to a few threads that connect these vignettes of our experiences in terms of our engagement with stranger intimacy through household stuff. By exploring moments of 'trouble', or where our narratives show discomfort and irritation in how we were interacting with the host and home through stuff, we notice how these meshworks of dwelling are produced in home-sharing. Drawing together the three narratives, as well as other examples which space has not allowed us to share here, there are recurring questions that emerge in how our presence in the home meshed with its sharer: through our own intrusion into their space; through their encroachment into our sense of domestic intimacy; and through how our presence made traces on household things.

Our feelings of being intruders become most apparent in Clemens' entrance to the Paris apartment and Lauren's occupancy of the Los Angeles living room. We are both viscerally conscious of how we are taking up space in the 'wrong' places or at the 'wrong' times. Clemens arrives 'too early', interrupting the backstage work of clearing traces of the house's normal occupants; Lauren struggles with finding a place to leave her stuff in the

host's workspace. The normal routines of the household – like the innate domestic privilege of leaving unwiped smudges on windows or of using the desk as a platform for work – become moments where we notice how our meshing into the household is taking place through the permission and active adaptation of someone else. These intrusions may be the most common story of home-sharing experiences in the unintended or some-times unwanted intimacy of encountering the deeply personal domestic scenes of others. Airbnb's advice to personalize home space without being too personal (Airbnb, 2021) and to keep certain spaces of deeply personal items – like Clemens' unopened closet – inaccessible to visitors, is perhaps there to reduce that sense of over-intrusiveness.

Yet we also felt our own domestic intimacies encroached upon, and the pressure of shrinking one's own practices and things into what others might allow, or expanding into what others expected of us. Clemens' adventure in bathroom repair contorted him into the most awkward place in the house, on the floor in the toilet, while requiring him to manifest a home repair skill which he may reserve, in his own proficiencies and shortcomings, for his own family. Lauren, more strongly, felt 'violated' by the intimacy of the conversation instigated by her host, but carefully constructed to take place outside the home and without sharing other aspects of the experience, like the restaurant bill. The back-and-forth rearrangements of her things, like food and toiletries, generated some inexplicable panic of vulnerability through her stuff as a meshed extension of her 'space' and its tendency to be repositioned from where she had last left it. Clemens, on the other hand, was drawn into an intimate project of home repair, which meshed him into the background hum of the household more quickly than he was prepared for. In these moments, something about entanglements between home and bodies becomes visible in what we were expected to perform and to allow, in that we may become involved – comfortably or uncomfortably – in how the household works.

In recording and telling each other these experiences, we also became more aware of having left a mark on these households, and on ourselves, by engaging through stuff. For Clemens, the dishwasher provided a sense of familiarity and – paradoxically perhaps – giving it a thorough cleaning left a mark in him by encouraging him to commit to making a mark in the house. Lauren left a more transgressive and less permanent mark, as the imprint of a body on the top of a duvet and a towel moist after a shower. Clemens felt the effect of breaking an object more intensely than the owner seemed to; Lauren found herself surprised by a 'turn-down service' of preparing the daybed for sleep, as a material gesture towards her stuff-based comfort while she struggled in all other corners to find space. As much as this stuff 'belongs' to the sharing host, we came to occupy it, and inhabit that occupa-tion in ways that resonate beyond the moment of contact.

What this discussion demonstrates is how we experienced moments seeming to revolve around binary oppositions with clear demarcations that

produce a home: the personal idiosyncratic trinket is perceived as dusty clutter; the curiosity of a host sensed as an invasion of privacy; objects showing traces of use and amateur maintenance perceived as homely by some or as dirty, unhygienic, or impractical by others. But simultaneously, familiarity and interaction – both with people and everyday objects – generate different ways in which stuff starts to grow into you, accruing meaning through a brief and bounded interval of familiarity and use, and connecting to intimate knowledges a dishwasher or a decorative item has for those occupying the place at other times. Domesticity becomes an experience and a set of relations that does not just expand or shrink as a border zone between dwellers (as minimally simulated by Airbnb entrepreneurs), but is something that generates new meshworks of being at home with the traces of others.

Conclusion

Undoubtedly, these privileged, pre-Covid domestic mobilities reflect no more than a slice of what goes on in the messy dynamics of home-sharing. We have not had space to do justice to discussions on diverse economies and the problematic role that home-sharing occupies in neoliberal commodification of not just neighbourhoods but also homes and previously non-professional hospitality. Nevertheless, we propose that these experiments do offer some insight into how home-sharing and norms of domesticity – starting from a modern assumption of home as a private space that can shrink for sharing – are evolving as we learn to practice different modes of dwelling.

By drawing attention to the paradox of stranger intimacy and the process of sharing as the central functions under investigation, we aim to demonstrate how home-sharing – no matter which platform mediates it (Molz, 2012) – may hold the potential of opening up a seemingly simple liberal sense of the private home that can be shrunk or expanded, towards more complex types of relations, gestures of care, and sociability. In mundane everyday practices around dwelled spaces that caused us 'trouble', we see relations as meshing rather than occupying, encroaching, or even necessarily shrinking. That is, we see that while an individualist sense of one's 'personal space' may seem encroached upon, there is some potential in understanding the expansion of a sense of the home and what it means to (co)dwell with familiar and unfamiliar others through enmeshed, vibrant, material relations created by stepping on each other's toes. To that extent, we bracket the term 'personal space' because of its presumed boundedness, while we have attempted to recognize how it seeps in and gets rearranged and reconfigured through things and stuff.

To conclude, what we try to show here is how objects become things through the process of sharing, and how dwellers' things are in danger of being used merely as objects by guests. Through this engagement through stuff, precarious tensions multiply in shared homes, where relations between materiality and the conviviality of homes continuously risk falling apart

through the intimacies being created between strangers who may feel intruded and encroached upon while trying to expand into dwelling. For that it is important to understand the home as meshworks – precarious assemblages of objects and affects and things with meanings and instrumental objects – to see the intricacies of the process of maintaining the value and meaning of dwelling.

References

Airbnb. (2020). "House Manual: Help Guests Get Comfortable in Your Space – Resource Center." November 18, 2020. www.Airbnb.com/resources/hosting-homes/a/house-manual-help-guests-get-comfortable-in-your-space-22

Airbnb. (2021). "Tips from Airbnb Plus Hosts: Design Your Space for Comfort – Resource Center." April 21, 2021. www.Airbnb.com/resources/hosting-homes/a/tips-from-Airbnb-plus-hosts-design-your-space-for-comfort-105

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Braudel, F. (1981). *Civilization and capitalism 15th-18th Century, vol. 1. The structures of everyday life*. London: Collins.

Fortunato, L. (2017). Insights from evolutionary anthropology on the (pre) history of the nuclear family. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 51(2), 92–116.

Gallagher, L. (2017). *The Airbnb story: How three guys disrupted an industry, made billions of dollars … and plenty of enemies*. New York: Random House.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2008). Diverse economies: Performative practices for other worlds. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(5), 613–632.

Greiffenhagen, C., M. Mair & W. Sharrock. 2015. Methodological troubles as problems and phenomena: Ethnomethodology and the question of 'method' in the social sciences. *British Journal of Sociology*, 66(3), 460–485. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12136

Ingold, T. (2007). *Lines: A brief history*. London, New York: Routledge.

Jarvis, H. (2011). Saving space, sharing time: Integrated infrastructures of daily life in cohousing. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(3), 560–577.

Knappett, C. (2011). Networks of objects, meshworks of things. In: Ingold, T. (Ed.), *Redrawing anthropology: Materials, movements, lines*. Farnham: Ashgate, 45–63.

Koch, R. & S. Miles. (2020). Inviting the stranger in: Intimacy, digital technology and new geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, October, 0309132520961881. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520961881

Latham, A. & L. B. Wagner. (2021). Experiments in becoming: Corporeality, attunement and doing research. *Cultural Geographies*, September. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474020949550

Lennep, D. J. Van. (1987). The hotel room. In: Kockelmans, J. J. (Ed.), *Phenomenological psychology*. Phaenomenologica, vol. 103. New York; Netherlands: Springer, 209–215. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3589-1_10

Molz, J. G. (2012). CouchSurfing and network hospitality: 'It's not just about the furniture'. *Hospitality & Society*, 1(3), 215–225.

Morley, D. (2000). *Home Territories Media, Mobility and Identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Reed, C. (1996). *Not at home: The suppression of domesticity in modern art and architecture*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Roelofsen, M. & Minca, C. (2018). The superhost. Biopolitics, home and community in the Airbnb dream-world of global hospitality. *Geoforum*, 91, 170–181.

Schwarz-Cowan, R. (1983). *More work for mother*. New York: Basic Books.

Smith, D. S. (1993). The curious history of theorizing about the history of the Western nuclear family. *Social Science History*, 17(3), 325–353.

Stone, L. (1975). The rise of the nuclear family in early modern England: The patriarchal stage. In: Rosenberg, C.E. (Eds.), *The family in history*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 13–58.

Tsing, A. (2012). Unruly edges: Mushrooms as companion species for Donna Haraway. *Environmental Humanities*, 1(1), 141–154.