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# Article summary:

1. The article examines the impact of peer-to-peer online evaluations on neoliberal subjects and collectives, using Airbnb as a case study.

2. The evaluation process on these platforms serves as a mechanism for self-promotion and narcissism among entrepreneurs.

3. The article calls for a critical examination of the sharing economy and highlights the importance of trust in evaluation infrastructure cultivated through self-love relationships among users.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article "Point-to-Point Evaluation as a Narcissistic Device: Building Entrepreneurial Communities" by Van den Bussche and Dambrin explores the impact of online peer evaluation on neoliberal subjects and collectives. The authors use Kozinets' netnography to study Airbnb's online community, along with interviews and quantitative data on reviews.

The article argues that peer evaluation on platforms like Airbnb creates a life-political infrastructure that reinforces self-centered entrepreneurship. The authors identify three features that make evaluation a powerful neoliberal agent: shifting the focus from services to users' self-worth, the public nature of evaluations, and the symmetrical responsibility between evaluators and evaluated leading to overly positive reviews.

While the article makes some interesting points about the impact of peer evaluation on entrepreneurial communities, it suffers from several biases and limitations. Firstly, it focuses solely on Airbnb without considering other platforms or industries where peer evaluation is prevalent. This narrow focus limits the generalizability of their findings.

Secondly, the authors' use of terms like "narcissism" and "neoliberalism" suggests a bias against these concepts rather than an objective analysis. They also fail to provide sufficient evidence for their claims about how peer evaluation reinforces these ideologies.

Thirdly, while they acknowledge that peer evaluation can have positive effects such as building trust among users, they do not explore these benefits in depth or consider potential counterarguments.

Finally, the article lacks a balanced perspective as it only presents one side of the argument without exploring alternative viewpoints or potential risks associated with peer evaluation.

In conclusion, while this article provides some insights into how peer evaluation can reinforce neoliberal subjectivity in entrepreneurial communities, its biases and limitations undermine its credibility as an objective analysis. Future research should consider a broader range of platforms and industries where peer evaluation is prevalent and explore both positive and negative effects in more depth.

# Topics for further research:

* Alternative perspectives on peer evaluation in online communities
* Positive effects of peer evaluation on trust-building and social capital
* Critiques of neoliberalism and its impact on entrepreneurship
* Comparison of peer evaluation across different industries and platforms
* Risks and limitations of relying on peer evaluation for decision-making
* Ethical considerations in designing and implementing peer evaluation systems.
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