Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD)
Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics (EJRSE)
ISSN:2148-9963 **www.asead.com**

COMPARISON OF GLOBAL AND LOCAL CONSUMERS' ATTITUDE TOWARD CAR AND RIDE SHARING SERVICES

Prof. Dr. Süphan NASIR[1]
Aycan BUL[2]

ABSTRACT

Advancements in digital and mobile technologies lead to emergence of new business models such as sharing economy services. In sharing economy, individuals borrow or rent assets owned by someone else, and in turn make money from underused assets. The main aim of this study is to compare worldwide and Turkish consumers' familiarity, knowledge and experience about car sharing services as well as compare their attitude toward sharing economy services. This study also tries to find out whether there are differences between two samples' motives toward using car sharing services. Two online survey was conducted in May, 2017. The first survey was conducted among Turkish LinkedIn and Facebook users, and the second survey was conducted with worldwide users through Amazon Mechanical (MTurk) platform, which is mainly representative of the U.S. population. Although there is no significant difference between Turkish and worldwide users with regard to familiarity, worldwide participants are more experienced and have used car and ride sharing services much more than Turkish participants. Both samples have slightly positive attitude toward sharing economy services. However, Turkish participants value sustainability, economic benefits, social experience they can achieve through car and ride sharing services more than worldwide participants. Although Turkish respondents have favorable attitude towards sharing economy services as worldwide respondents; compare to worldwide respondents, Turkish respondents have significantly low usage rates. The most important factor behind low usage rates of Turkish respondents have lack of trust in others and privacy concerns.

Key Words: Sharing economy, Sharing platforms, Sharing services, Car and ride sharing, Motives for sharing economy

INTRODUCTION

The sharing economy as a trending business concept begins to attract a great deal of attention in recent years and sharing economy services has become a part of modern life. Making use of digital and mobile technologies, sharing economy seems to have the power of changing consumption patterns. Individuals prefer alternative versions of consuming and consumption gets cheaper as the cost of doing business decreases through platform technologies.

Sharing economy platforms such as US based Airbnb and Uber are experiencing explosive growth. The popular accommodation sharing platform, Airbnb, with its 4 million listings in 191 countries, and 100 million bookings, begins to challenge the industry leader, InterContinental Hotels Group, which had 177 million bookings in 2014 (PwC&BBVA Research, 2015) and has a market value of $31 billion (Fortune, 2017). Uber, is operating in 734 cities at 84 countries (Uber Estimate, 2017) and has captured a market value of approximately $70 billion in only 7 years of life span (Reuters, 2016). French startup BlaBlacar with its 35 million members in 22 countries provides ride sharing services that pairs people travelling among cities with drivers who have free seats in their car (BBC, 2017).

[1] Süphan NASIR, Prof. Dr., Istanbul University, Turkey, suphan@istanbul.edu.tr
[2] Aycan BUL, Ph.D. Student Istanbul University, Turkey, aycanbul01@gmail.com

Although there is no common definition for sharing economy (Botsman &Rogers, 2010), it can be defined as a business model of marketplaces that bring together individuals to share or exchange underutilized assets. Sharing economy includes all manner of goods and services shared or exchanged for both monetary and nonmonetary benefits (Koopman, Wang, & Wei, 2014). The economy created by these business models is named as sharing economy. Emergence of sharing economy is accepted to begin with the sharing music and videos through social media, and followed by the physical goods sharing (Gansky, 2010). Number of goods and services shared increase tremendously, however, travel and accommodation are the stars of sharing economy (Ert, Fleischer & Magen, 2016).

The success of sharing economy platforms largely depends mostly on understanding the motives, i.e., the underlying drivers and impediments for users to engage with sharing economy platforms. Thus the main aim of this study is to compare worldwide and Turkish consumers' familiarity, knowledge and experience about car sharing services as well as compare their attitude toward sharing economy services. This study also aims to find out underlying motives and impediments of using car and ride sharing services from the local and global users' perspectives.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Sharing economy, not a niche business anymore with its rapid growth, but, is still new to consumers. Research on consumers' attitude and motives towards sharing economy is still limited. The sharing economy is not only a technological innovation, but is accepted as an interdisciplinary phenomenon that is affected by new ways of business administration, servicing, marketing, consumer psychology and behavior, and computer science (Hawlitschek, Teubner, &Gimpel, 2016). So, many researchers (Bellotti et al., 2015; Hamari, Sjöklint, &Ukkonen, 2015; Möhlmann, 2015), focus on underlying motives and impediments of sharing economy services, instead of technology acceptance models. Technology behind the sharing economy services is composed of internet, web sites, mobile applications, online catalogues, secure payment and communication systems, which are not new to consumers anymore, but now has a new expression of "Platform Technologies".

Hawlitschek, et al. (2016) conceptually based their research on the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and its decomposed extension which originates from a psychology research. Impeding factors as are found to be the effort required to use the related services, process and privacy risks, lack of trust to other peers and knowledge which effects negatively the sharing economy usage. On the other hand, benefit-related drivers like ecological sustainability, cost advantages, and the expression of a modern lifestyle, as well as product-related drivers which include variety and ubiquitous availability motivate the consumers to use such platforms. Socially-related drivers like sense of community belonging, social interactions, enjoyment of helping others, and social influence exerted by one's peers are motivators, too. These factors altogether lead to behavioral intention for sharing economy usage (Hawlitschek et al., 2016). The basic mechanism of sharing economy services is composed of the process flow between peers (provider and the consumer) through the technological platform. The peers find each other at online platforms but the whole process involves not only online but also offline social interactions (Möhlmann, 2015). Transactions are not on transfer of ownership (Bardhi&Eckhardt, 2012; Fraiberger & Sundararajan, 2017), but on sharing, and sharing involves more personal characteristics (Lusch & Nambisan, 2015). That's why trust in other peers is much influential on the usage decision of sharing economy services, than other retailing models as eBay or Amazon (Hawlitschek et al., 2016) .

Participation in sharing economy is motivated by its sustainability, too. Use of sharing economy services is expected to be highly ecologically sustainable. Sharing economy services encourages a sustainable marketplace that "optimizes the environmental, social, and economic consequences of consumption in order to meet the needs of both current and future generations" (Hamari, Sjöklint, &Ukkonen, 2015, p.5). On the other hand, sustainability might only be an important factor for those people for whom ecological consumption is important (Hamari, Sjöklint, &Ukkonen, 2015, p.9). This finding is supported partially by Möhlmann's (2015) study about the determinants of using sharing services of the B2C car sharing service Car2go and the peer-to-peer accommodation platform Airbnb. Sustainability is found to be one of four proposed determinants that had no influence on using sharing services. The others are internet capability, smartphone capability, and trend affinity. Instead, satisfaction and the likelihood of choosing a sharing option are explained by factors, serving users' self-benefits for both user groups; utility, trust, cost savings, and familiarity. Further, service quality and community belonging is important for car sharing service users (Möhlmann, 2015). Users are looking for services that provide increasing value and convenience (Bellotti et al., 2015). On the other hand, there are some researches suggesting that environmentally conscious consumers are more likely to participate in environmentally friendly behaviors (Hwang et al., 2016).

Sharing economy is not only perceived as ecological but also financially economic and time saving. People share goods and services in lower costs and furthermore providers can earn money from sharing their ownings, peers find each other very easily and fast in the sharing platforms. Especially in peer-to-peer sharing, increasing scale does not necessarily mean additional investment, as the existing possessions are shared (Airbnb is 30% cheaper than hotel accommodation), business models are generally self-served (Zipcar) and operational costs are lower (Kavadias, Ladas, &Loch, 2016). So, extrinsic rewards of sharing economy, in the form of money and time saving, influence attitudes toward sharing economy and intentions to participate in it positively.

Belk, who conceptualized materialism as "dominant consumer ideology and the most significant macro development in modern consumer behavior", theorized that "you are what you own" (Belk, 1988). Although, now within sharing economy and with internet in general, we have others ways to express our identity without ownership (Belk, 2014), materialism remains having negative impact on participating the sharing world (Akbar, Mai, & Hoffmann, 2016). According to Belk, materialism has two dimensions; possessiveness and non-generosity (Belk, 1984). Possessiveness refers to the need to have the ownership of one's possessions (Belk, 1983) and the consumers' possessiveness disposition reduces their sharing tendency (Akbar, Mai, & Hoffmann, 2016). Non-generosity, as the second dimension, is the unwillingness to share or to give possessions to others (Belk, 2014), and is not found to be negatively effecting the participation in sharing economy in some research (Akbar, Mai, & Hoffmann, 2016).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study puts its focus on car and ride sharing, which is one of two featured business models of sharing economy. The aim of this study is to compare worldwide and Turkish consumers' familiarity, knowledge and experience about car sharing services as well as compare their attitude toward sharing economy services. This study also tries to find out underlying motives and impediments of using car and ride sharing services from the local and global users' perspectives. So, two online surveys were conducted. The data collection process in Turkey was conducted among social media users, mainly LinkedIn and Facebook. To reach the worldwide population, the second survey was conducted through Amazon Mechanical (MTurk) platform.

The Mechanical Turk marketplace is estimated to have 500,000 registered workers worldwide, although not all of them are active, and have approximately 750,000 unique visitors worldwide in December 2015 (Hiltin, 2016). According to findings of recent studies, the majority of Mechanical Turk workers are from the United States (ranging from 46.80% to 57%), but a significant majority is now coming from India (approximately 35%) and the remaining respondents are from various countries ranging from France to Malaysia (Ipeirotis, 2010; Ross et al., 2010). Thus the survey that was conducting with Mechanical Turk works, mainly representative of the U.S. population and 391 MTurk participants responded the survey. Worldwide sample of this study has a nationality distribution of 41% US, 43% Indian, 5% European and 11% other nationalities, similar to general profile of Mechanical Turk workers. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. In the first part, a brief information on sharing economy and car and ride sharing services was given. The second part aimed to find out familiarity, knowledge and experience of respondents about sharing economy services, and factors that may affect participants' usage of sharing services. The third part questions tried to discover respondents' attitude towards sharing economy, and behavioral intention of using car sharing services in the future. In the fourth part, demographic questions were asked. Table 1 illustrates the demographic profile of respondent.

Table 1: Demographic Profiles of Respondents

	Worldwide Users		**Turkish Users**	
Age	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
18 and younger	4	1	0	0
19-25	85	21,7	4	2,1
26-35	188	48,1	43	23,0
36-45	65	16,6	77	41,2
46-55	30	7,7	56	29,9
56-65	14	3,6	6	3,2
65 and more	5	1,3	1	0,5
Total	*391*	*100,0*	*187*	*100,0*
	Worldwide Users		**Turkish Users**	
Education	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Less than high school degree	3	0,8	0	0,0
High school graduate	45	11,5	5	2,7
Undergraduate	128	32,7	125	66,8
Graduate	215	55,0	57	30,5
Total	*391*	*100,0*	*187*	*100,0*
	Worldwide Users		**Turkish Users**	
Gender	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Female	183	46,8	79	42,2
Male	208	53,2	108	57,8
Total	*391*	*100,0*	*187*	*100,0*
	Worldwide Users		**Turkish Users**	
Maritual Status	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Married	213	54,5	135	72,2
Not Married	178	45,5	52	27,8
Total	*391*	*100,0*	*187*	*100,0*

Nationalities of Worlwide Users			**N**	**%**
USA			162	41%
India			168	43%
Europe			19	5%
Other			42	11%
Total			*391*	*100%*

Table 2 illustrates the scales that are used in this study in order to determine familiarity, knowledge and experience of respondents about sharing economy services; factors that may affect participants' usage of sharing services; and respondents' attitude towards sharing economy, and behavioral intention of using these sharing services in the future.

Table 2: Scales Used in This Study

Economic Benefits	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Utility of sharing	Lamberton & Rose 2013
Sustainability	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Social experience	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Impediments (Privacy, Effort Expectancy, Process Risk)	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Trust in other users	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Atttitude	Hawlitscheck, et al. 2016
Behavioral Intention	Lamberton & Rose 2012

Information about the scale reliability is given in the Table 3. Cronbach's alpha value of all scales are above 0.70 so it can be said that all scales have high reliability. Five point Likert-type scale (1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree nor disagree, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree) was used to measure the scales in this study. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 21.0 was used to analyze the data.

Table 3: Reliability of Scales: Cronbach's Alpha Scores

Economic Benefits	,813
Utility of sharing	,824
Sustainability	,900
Social Experience	,896
Impediments (Privacy, Effort Expectancy, Process Risk)	,873
Trust in other users	,827
Attitude	,919
Behavioral Intention	,897

FINDINGS

As can be seen from the Table 4, 81.1% of worldwide respondents and 79.7% of Turkish respondents are familiar with sharing economy. There is no significant difference between two samples with regard to familiarity. However, respondents from worldwide (63.7%) are more experienced with sharing economy services compared to Turkish respondents (37.4%). Approximately 45% of respondents from Mechanical Turk agree or strongly agree that they have satisfactory knowledge about sharing economy services; this figure is approximately 26% for Turkish respondents.

Table 4: Familiarity, Experience & Knowledge about Sharing Economy

		Worldwide Users			**Turkish Users**	
Familiarity with sharing economy services						
		Frequency	**Percent**		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Yes		317	81.10		149	79.7
No		74	18,90		38	20,3
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0
Experience with sharing economy services						
		Frequency	**Percent**		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Yes		249	63,7		70	37,4
No		142	36,3		117	62,6
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0
Knowledge about how sharing economy services works						
		Frequency	**Percent**		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Strongly disagree		38	9,7		27	18,5
Disagree		63	16,1		32	17,0
No idea		115	29,4		73	38,6
Agree		117	29,9		45	18,5
Strongly agree		58	14,8		10	7,4
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0

As it is presented in Table 5, 42.5% of worldwide participants rented out their cars to other people, 50.1% share their rides, 57.8% rent cars from others and 48.1% are car club members. On the other hand, Turkish participants did not rent their car to other users and only small portion of them share their rides (1.6%). Compare to worldwide respondents Turkish respondents have significantly low usage rates.

Table 5: Usage of Car/Ride Sharing Services

		Worldwide Users			Turkish Users	
From a provider perspective, I rent out my car to other users						
		Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Yes		146	42,5		0	0,00
No		225	57,5		187	100,0
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0
From a provider perspective, I find car passengers accompanying me as a driver						
		Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Yes		196	50,1		3	1,6
No		195	49,9		184	98,4
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0
From a consumer perspective, I rent a car from other users						
		Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Yes		226	57,8		21	11,2
No		165	42,2		166	88,8
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0
From a consumer perspective, I rent a car as a program member (Zipcar, e.g.)						
Yes		188	48,1		25	13,4
No		203	51,9		162	86,6
Total		391	100,0		187	100,0

The factors underlying the differences in usage rates of the two samples were investigated. Factors that motivate users to use sharing economy services are grouped as positive drivers, while factors that impede the usage of sharing economy services are grouped as negative drivers. Positive drivers are sustainability, economic benefits, utility of sharing, social experience and trust in others. Negative drivers are effort expectancy, risk perception and privacy concerns. Further attitude, and behavioral intentions of the participants for the use of car/ride sharing services were also analyzed. Table 6 compares the mean scores of worldwide and Turkish users' perceptions about positive and negative drivers for the usage of car/ride share services. In addition, Table 6 also compares the mean scores of worldwide and Turkish users' the attitude towards car/ride sharing services and behavioral intention about using these services. Table 7 illustrates the result of difference tests that reveals whether these two samples are significantly different from each other with regard to positive and negative drivers, and as well as attitude and behavioral intention to use.

As it can be seen from the Table 7, except for social experience and utility of sharing, Turkish users'perceptions about positive drivers of using car/ride sharing services are statistically different from worldwide users' perceptions. Turkish users have more favorable perceptions about economic benefits and sustainability advantage of sharing economy services; however, they have low trust to these services compared to worldwide users. On the other hand, Turkish users have more privacy concerns about the usage of car/ride sharing services. Although Turkish users' risk perceptions are higher that worldwide users' risk perceptions; this difference is not statistically significant. However Turkish users' effort expectancy perceptions are lower than worldwide users' perceptions.

Both Turkish and worldwide users have similar and slightly positive attitudes towards the car/ride sharing services. However, Turkish users' have low intention to use the car/ride sharing services compared to worldwide users' behavioral intention.

Table 6 Comparison of Worldwide and Turkish Users' Attitude towards Car/Ride Sharing Services

		Worldwide Users		**Turkish Users**	
		Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Positive Drivers					
	Economic Benefits	3,87	0,80	4,15	0,71
	Sustainability	3,72	0,83	4,09	0,74
	Social Experience	3,67	0,82	3,64	0,85
	Utility of sharing	3,55	0,85	3,52	0,85
	Trust in other users	3,35	0,81	2,67	0,82
Negative Drivers					
	Privacy Concerns	3,28	0,80	3,63	1,13
	Process Risk	3,24	0,89	3,41	0,90
	Effort Expectancy	3,17	0,95	2,83	0,95
	Attitude	3,81	0,80	3,90	0,89
	Behavioral Intention	3,26	0,99	3,11	0,93

Table 7: Difference Tests Results

	Scale	Data Distribution	Difference Test	Asymp. Sig.	Difference
Positive Drivers					
	Sustainability	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.003	Yes
	Economic Benefits	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.000	Yes
	Utility of sharing	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.067	Yes
	Social Experience	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.230	No
	Trust in other users	Normal	T-Test	0.000	Yes
Negative Drivers					
	Effort Expectancy	Normal	T-Test	0.033	Yes
	Process Risk	Normal	T-Test	0.554	No
	Privacy Concerns	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.000	Yes
	Attitude	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.295	No
	Behavioral Intention	Not Normal	Mann-Whitney U	0.007	Yes

Detailed descriptive statistics information about trust in sharing economy users was given in Table 8. Turkish people have low level of trust to other users that are in the sharing economy service system and they have a low level of belief in other users interms of keeping their promises and commitments. However, worldwide users find other users more trustworthy than Turkish users. Worldwide users have high level of belief in other users compare to Turkish users.

Table 8: Trust in Sharing Economy Users

Trust in other users	**Worldwide Users**		**Turkish Users**	
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Other sharing economy users are trustworthy.	3,36	,934	2,64	1,081
Other sharing economy users keep promises and commitments.	3,35	0,895	2,74	1,048
Other sharing economy users usually keep my best interests in mind.	3,34	0,960	2,64	0,942

Detailed descriptive statistics information about privacy concerns of sharing economy users was given in Table 9. Turkish people feel uncomfortable to be seen by others on sharing platforms and find disclosing personal data when sharing unpleasant. Worldwide users also think disclosing personal data is not pleasant, but are not feeling uncomfortable to be seen in the platforms when using sharing economy services.

Table 9: Privacy Concerns

Privacy	**Worldwide Users**		**Turkish Users**	
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
It feels uncomfortable to be seen by others on sharing platforms.	2,89	1,249	3,56	1,257
It feels unpleasant to disclose personal data when sharing.	3,45	1,051	3,71	1,193

Although Turkish users have low level of trust to other people in the system, as worldwide users, they have favorable attitude to sharing economy services. As it can be seen from Table 10, Turkish users as well as worldwide users find slightly wise, positive and good thing to participating sharing economy. Turkish people perceive sharing economy as positive, wise and good as a worldwide participants, but this positive attitude do not turn into an action and do not end up with usage. Table 10 reveals the fact that worldwide users are much more willing to continue to use sharing economy services in the future**.**

Table 10: Attitude Towards Sharing Economy Services

Attitude	**Worldwide Users**		**Turkish Users**	
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
All things considered, I find participating in sharing economy to be a wise move.	3,74	0,961	3,90	0,934
All things considered, I think sharing economy is a positive thing.	3,85	0,892	3,97	0,915
All things considered, I think participating in sharing economy is a good thing.	3,85	0,912	3,87	0,959
Overall, sharing goods and services within a sharing economy community makes sense.	3,93	0,920	3,86	0,981
Sharing economy is a better mode of consumption than selling and buying individually.	3,68	0,989	3,60	1,044

Finally, two samples are different in behavioral intention, too. Going in detail through scale items, difference tests reveal that two samples are statistically different in expecting to continue to use sharing services often in the future, and participating in sharing economy communities in the future. Actually the findings are in parallel with today's usage rates, and consistent with lack of trust of Turkish participants in other users. On the other hand, both users are reluctant to prefer sharing option to owning a car, as Table 11 shows.

Table 11: Behavioral Intention to Use Sharing Economy Services in the Future

Behavioral Intention	Worldwide Users		Turkish Users	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
All things considered, I expect to continue to use sharing economy services often in the future.	3,50	1,030	2,95	1,181
In the future, I would prefer a sharing option to an own car.	3,07	1,270	2,95	0,999
I can see myself engaging in sharing economy more frequently in the future.	3,35	1,146	3,35	1,093
It is likely that I will frequently participate in sharing economy communities in the future.	3,35	1,142	3,19	1,060

CONCLUSION

The sharing economy as a trending business concept begins to attract a great deal of attention in recent years and Turkey with its young population is a potential market for sharing economy services. The success of sharing economy platforms largely depends mostly on understanding the drivers and impediments for users to engage with sharing economy services. Thus this study aims to find out underlying motives and impediments of using car and ride sharing services from the local and global users' perspectives. This study is also aiming to compare worldwide and Turkish consumers' familiarity, knowledge and experience about car sharing services as well as compare their attitude toward sharing economy services.

There is no significant difference between Turkish and worldwide users with regard to familiarity. However, respondents from worldwide sample are more experienced with sharing economy services compared to Turkish respondents. Moreover, they are more knowledgeable about sharing economy services than Turkish respondents.

Turkish participants value sustainability, economic benefits, social experience they can achieve through car and ride sharing services more than worldwide participants. Although Turkish respondents' attitude towards sharing economy services are as favorable as worldwide respondents; Turkish respondents have significantly low usage rates compared to worldwide respondents. The most important factor behind low usage rates of Turkish respondents have lack of trust in others and privacy concerns. Turkish participants do not trust in the peers of car and ride sharing services and avoid sharing their personal data in related platforms. Trust and privacy concerns are the most critical usage impediment for Turkish participants. In order to have high usage rate of sharing economy services in Turkey as in worldwide usage, sharing platforms have to maintain trustworthiness and minimize privacy concerns.

REFERENCES

Akbar, P., Mai, R., & Hoffmann, S. (2016). When do materialistic consumers join commercial sharing systems. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(10), 4215-4224.

Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *39*(4), 881-898.

BBC, 2017. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/business-38597504.

Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(8), 1595-1600.

Belk, R. W. (1983). Worldly possessions: Issues and criticisms. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research Volume 10*.

Belk, R. W. (1984). Three scales to measure constructs related to materialism: Reliability, validity, and relationships to measures of happiness. *NA-Advances in Consumer Research Volume 11*.

Belk, R. W. (1985). Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world. *Journal of Consumer research*, *12*(3), 265-280.

Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of consumer research*, *15*(2), 139-168.

Bellotti, V., Ambard, A., Turner, D., Gossmann, C., Demkova, K., & Carroll, J. M. (2015, April). A muddle of models of motivation for using peer-to-peer economy systems. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1085-1094).

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

Ert, E., Fleischer, A., & Magen, N. (2016). Trust and reputation in the sharing economy: The role of personal photos in Airbnb. *Tourism Management*, *55*, 62-73.

Fortune, (2017). Retrieved from http://fortune.com/2017/03/24/airbnb-brian-chesky-worlds-greatest-leaders/.

Fraiberger, S. P., & Sundararajan, A., 2017. Peer-to-peer rental markets in the sharing economy, NYU Stern School of Business Research Paper (First version March 2015; current version September 2017).

Gansky, L. (2010). *The mesh: Why the future of business is sharing*. Penguin.

Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2015). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*.

Hawlitschek, F., Teubner, T., & Gimpel, H. (2016, January). Understanding the Sharing Economy--Drivers and Impediments for Participation in Peer-to-Peer Rental. In *System Sciences (HICSS), 2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on* (pp. 4782-4791). IEEE.

Hawlitschek, F., Teubner, T., & Gimpel, H. (2016, September). Motives in the Sharing Economy--Drivers and Impediments Peer-to-Peer Sharing. Institute of Information System and Marketing.

Hawlitschek, F., Teubner, T., Adam, M. T. P., Borchers, N. S., Moehlmann, M., & Weinhardt, C., 2016. Trust in the Sharing Economy: An Experimental Framework, Conference: International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS), Volume: 37, 2.

Hiltin, P. (2016). The size of the Mechanical Turk marketplace. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/07/11/the-size-of-the-mechanical-turk-marketplace/

Hwang, J., Lawson, S. J., Gleim, M. R., Perren, R., (2016). Freedom from ownership: An exploration of access-based consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(8), 2615-2623.

Ipeirotis, P. (2010). Demographics of Mechanical Turk. CeDER-10–01 working paper, New York University. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/acdd/ ce5288bb36bf7b636f7 09c00e00e22a02d07.pdf

Kavadias S., Ladas K., & Loch C. (2016). The Transformative Business model. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from http://www.apdata.com/upload/file/ Edition _October_2016.pdf.

Koopman, R., Wang, Z., & Wei, S. J. (2014). Tracing value-added and double counting in gross exports. *The American Economic Review*, *104*(2), 459-494.

Lamberton, C. P., & Rose, R. L. (2012). When is ours better than mine? A framework for understanding and altering participation in commercial sharing systems. *Journal of Marketing*, *76*(4), 109-125.

Lusch, R. F., & Nambisan, S. (2015). Service Innovation: A Service-Dominant Logic Perspective. *Mis Quarterly*, *39*(1), 155-175.

Möhlmann, M. (2015). Collaborative consumption: determinants of satisfaction and the likelihood of using a sharing economy option again. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *14*(3), 193-207.

PwC, BBVA Resarch (2015). Technology and Trust: How the Sharing Economy is Changing Consumer Behavior. Retrieved from https://www.bbvaresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/151119_US_SharingEconomy.pdf.

Reuters, 2016. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uber-valuation-breakingviews/ubers-70-bln-value-accrues-mainly-to-customers-idUSKBN14B23A

Ross, J., Irani, I., Silberman, M. Six, Zaldivar, A., and Tomlinson, B. (2010). "Who are the Crowdworkers?: Shifting Demographics in Amazon Mechanical Turk". In: CHI EA 2010. (2863-2872) Retrieved from http://ginnyandsheryl.typepad.com/files/socialcode-2009-012-2.pdf

Shih, Y. Y., & Fang, K. (2004). The use of a decomposed theory of planned behavior to study Internet banking in Taiwan. *Internet Research*, *14*(3), 213-223.

Uber Estimate, 2017. Retrieved from https://uberestimator.com/.