

Chapter 3

The Influence of Demographics, Attitudinal and Behavioural Characteristics on Motives to Participate in the Sharing Economy and Expected Benefits of Participation

By Julijana Angelovska, Anita Čeh Časni and Christoph Lutz

The sharing economy is a relevant economic phenomenon of recent times and important for sustainable economic growth. This chapter considers the motivational factors that drive and hinder participation in the sharing economy. It investigates the impact of both economic or non-economic drivers and what role demographics, attitudinal and behavioural characteristics play as antecedents of those drivers. We rely on rich data from a 12-country survey to conduct our analysis, and we distinguish between three categories of respondents: providers, consumers and aware non-users. Trust, innovativeness and materialism are considered as important attitudinal antecedents, while volunteering is used as the key behavioural antecedent. We find that economic motives outperform non-economic motives overall. However, compared with providers and aware non-users,

consumers are more strongly driven by economic motives, especially those who are more educated and trusting. Additionally, younger, more educated, more innovative, materialistic and volunteering respondents are driven more than others by non-economic motives. Finally, providers with lower household income, who are more educated and innovative are more likely to be driven by economic motives, while providers that have more trust in people and volunteer more frequently are more likely to be driven by non-economic motives. Overall, the chapter contributes to a more differentiated understanding of participation in the sharing economy in terms of motives and their antecedents. We discuss theoretical and practical implications of the findings.

3.1 Introduction

As discussed in the introduction to this volume (Introduction, this volume), the sharing economy is a broad concept that lacks a commonly accepted definition. It is sometimes referred to as collaborative consumption (Botsman and Rogers, 2011), access-based consumption (Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012), or commercial sharing systems (Lamberton and Rose, 2012). The sharing economy has the potential to create substantial value, by promoting economic growth, technological innovation, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion; factors central to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; Boar *et al.*, 2020). In this context, the sharing economy is of particular interest, because, in contrast to many other sustainable innovations, certain sharing economy sectors are scaling up rapidly.

This study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the motives for participation in the sharing economy. Synthesising previous studies, and in line with a holistic approach to the topic, both economic and non-economic motives are considered. Particularly, we understand non-economic motives broadly to include hedonic (fun), social (social interaction/meeting people) and social responsibility aspects. The chapter does not only investigate the key motivational factors for sharing economy participation in Europe but also the relative importance of demographics and selected attitudinal and behavioural characteristics in shaping motives. The analysis draws on data from a large survey conducted in 12 European countries on the state of the sharing economy (Andreotti *et al.*, 2017). Using univariate and multivariate statistical methods, we investigate the role of demographics, three relevant attitudinal constructs (trust, innovativeness, materialism) and one important behavioural correlate (volunteering). We study their influence on both economic and non-economic motivational factors among providers, consumers and aware non-users. The analysis reveals distinct differences between these three groups. Consumers tend to be driven mostly by economic motives, and this is particularly

the case for consumers with high levels of trust and innovativeness. Providers, by contrast, are also motivated by non-economic factors. Trust and volunteering are identified as antecedents of non-economic factors. The findings allow for a holistic understanding of how social characteristics shape motives for participation in the sharing economy.

Studying antecedents of motives is important because it deepens our understanding of the dynamics of participation and how motives might themselves be socially differentiated based on power relations (Eichhorn *et al.*, 2020). Thus, our study contributes to sociological and psychological literature on the sharing economy.

The rest of the chapter is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on sharing economy motives and develops hypotheses about the relative importance of these motives under various circumstances. Section 3 discusses the data collection and analytical strategy. Section 4 presents the results. Section 5 concludes by discussing limitations of the study as well as implications for research on the sharing economy.

3.2 Literature Review

3.2.1 The Sharing Economy in Context

Regardless of the term used, the mutual focus when it comes to the sharing economy is on collaborative use of slack and poorly utilized assets and services, and how they can be used more efficiently (Stephany, 2015). In the sharing economy, ordinary people act as providers and offer services to consumers that used to be offered only by professional sellers (Narasimhan *et al.*, 2018; Sundararajan, 2016). Thus, the sharing economy is an economic system with emphasis on peer-to-peer exchange and sharing of slack and unutilized assets or services for free or for a fee. In this contribution, we follow Gerwe and Silva's (2020) definition of the sharing economy as "*a socioeconomic system that allows peers to grant temporary access to their underutilized physical and human assets through online platforms*" (p. 71).

(Belk, 2007, p. 126), in a frequently recalled definition, describes sharing as the "act and process of distributing what is ours to others for their use and/or the act or process of receiving or taking something from others for our use." Subsequent literature has differentiated the sharing of tangible or physical goods, such as cars, bicycles and apartments, and intangible goods, such as knowledge, emotions and ideas (Belk, 2010; Bucher *et al.*, 2016; Botsman and Rogers, 2010; Gansky, 2010; John, 2013). Sharing resources, whether they are tangible or intangible, is not a new phenomenon (Kemp and Olson, 2015), but rather something humankind has always been doing. The sharing economy in its present form is

thus a technological transformation of an old phenomenon. More specifically, it is the result of a transformation of long existing concepts, such as flea markets, ride-sharing agencies, and neighbourly help, by information and communication technologies. ICT-enabled sharing allows strangers to share cars, homes, food, and tools with unknown individuals through online platforms, while previously sharing was mostly happening between known people. In this context, Belk (2014a) distinguishes 'sharing-in' and 'sharing-out'. Sharing within the family or between friends can be defined as 'sharing-in'. By contrast, when sharing involves strangers, it can be described as 'sharing-out'. The two types differ substantially in the degree of intimacy in the sharing process (Narasimhan *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, ICT-enabled sharing economy is characterized by online platforms, hence two-way transactions turn into three-way transactions, where the platform acts as an intermediary between providers and consumers. Despite many benefits, which will be discussed in more depth below, sharing is tied to material and personal risks as it exposes one's possessions to the hazards of loss, damage and decreased utility (Bucher *et al.*, 2018; Lutz *et al.*, 2018). Sharing economy platforms attempt to address these risks leveraging ratings and reputation mechanisms (Frenken and Schor, 2017; Newlands *et al.*, 2019).

3.2.2 Motives for Sharing Economy Participation: Economic vs. Non-Economic

Considering its scale and growth, it is important to study the motives of participation in the sharing economy. The literature differentiates a plurality of motives, which depend on the kind of platform used for the exchange and on whether the exchange involves monetary compensation or not (Edbring *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, both non-economic and economic motives have been identified. Cost-savings and convenience (i.e., efficient access to goods and services) are classified as economic (Heo, 2016; Tussyadiah and Pesonen, 2016). The need for social interaction, the intrinsic and hedonic enjoyment of sharing, and intentions to help others and/or protect the environment are classified as non-economic. We will discuss economic and non-economic motives in turn.

Regarding economic motives, a major benefit for consumers in the sharing economy is the access to broader options and lower prices (Sundararajan, 2016). This is corroborated by substantive empirical research. A Eurobarometer study (2016) found that the benefits of sharing are largely monetary or related to convenience, and a Deloitte study (2015) on the sharing economy in Switzerland found that 65% of respondents considered lower costs as a key benefit of the sharing economy. Böcker and Meelen (2017) found that economic motives were

particularly important for low-income users. [Bardhi and Eckhardt \(2012\)](#) showed how self-interest and utilitarianism (i.e., reducing expenses and increasing convenience) are frequent motives for access-based car sharing and that these motives were found to be more important than considerations about collective utility. [Lamberton and Rose \(2012\)](#) identified cost and utility factors, the perceived risk of product scarcity, and familiarity with sharing as key drivers. The studies by [Bellotti et al. \(2015\)](#), [Möhlmann \(2015\)](#), and [Hawlitschek et al. \(2018\)](#) also identify economic motives as the key drivers of sharing economy participation.

However, [Botsman and Rogers \(2011\)](#) argue that collaborative consumption is driven by motives that extend beyond economic considerations. [Gansky \(2010\)](#) suggests changing consumer attitudes towards consumption as a motivational factor that drives the sharing economy, as consumers are willing to try out new brands ([Gansky, 2010](#)) and are more open to new ways of accessing what they need ([Botsman and Rogers, 2011](#); [Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012](#)). Additionally, consumers are increasingly aware of the pressure that (over)consumption can pose to the environment. The idea of sharing excess capacity to reduce environmental concerns, the renewed belief in the importance of community, and cost-consciousness move consumers towards the practice of sharing, openness and collaboration ([Gansky, 2010](#); [Walsh, 2011](#)). [Botsman and Rogers \(2011\)](#) suggest that social motives impact sharing economy participation as well. Sharing one's possessions with others is generally considered an inherently pro-social or even non-economic act, marked by feelings of solidarity and bonding ([Belk, 2010](#); [Benkler, 2004](#)). Numerous studies refer in some ways to an alleged underlying anthropological or neuroscientific tendency for sharing (e.g., [Schmidt and Sommerville, 2011](#); [Tomasello and Warneken, 2008](#)), showing the sharing economy's benefits for community building, social participation, and the creation of social capital ([Belk, 2007, 2010](#); [Botsman and Rogers, 2010](#); [Hamari et al., 2016](#)). A study by [Möhlmann \(2015\)](#), for instance, on German users of Airbnb and the business-to-consumer service Car2Go, found that community belonging was a key driver for repeated use. In the context of accommodation sharing, [Tussyadiah \(2015\)](#) suggests that people engage in these activities because they want to interact with their local hosts. [Benkler \(2004\)](#) also stressed the importance of non-monetary factors such as social reputation, cooperation, and satisfaction. Applying qualitative research methods, [Albinsson and Perera \(2012\)](#) investigated drivers for participation in the sharing economy and identified a sense of community as both a driver and an outcome of participation. Furthermore, a variety of ideological and practical reasons was identified.

Previous research has also shown that motives to participate in the sharing economy can depend on the type of platform used and whether the exchange is

commercial or non-commercial (Bucher *et al.*, 2016; Edbring *et al.*, 2016; Hawlitschek *et al.*, 2018). According to Edbring *et al.* (2016), non-profit platform participants are driven by factors such as the desire to belong to a community, the need for reciprocity, and political and environmental ideals. Instead, in for-profit platforms, economic and convenience-related reasons together with the search for novelty and the desire for variation prevail over motives related to reciprocity and sustainability.

Taken together, the findings suggest the co-presence of economic and non-economic motives as drivers of participation in the sharing economy (Bellotti *et al.*, 2015; Shih *et al.*, 2015). The importance of each depends on the context (e.g., type of platform) and the characteristics of the participants (Davidson *et al.*, 2018). However, most previous research focuses on either consumers or providers but does not systematically contrast these groups. Moreover, aware non-users and their expected benefits are neglected in previous research. In the next sub-section, we will thus make the case that motives of consumers, providers and expected benefits of non-users should be differentiated. We will also introduce a rationale for studying the antecedents of motives.

3.2.3 Differentiating Providers, Consumers and Non-Users

Little research has differentiated user roles and compared providers and consumers as distinct groups. As an exception, Bellotti *et al.* (2015), through interviewing both users/consumers and providers of 46 different sharing economy systems, identified eight distinct motives for the use of sharing economy services: value/morality, social influence, status/power, empathy/altruism, social connection, intrinsic/autotelic reasons, safety, and instrumental motives. In their interviews of both consumers and providers, they found that while providers tend to stress idealistic motives, consumers are strongly driven by value and instrumental motives.

On the provider side, a frequently heard argument by sharing economy advocates is its expansion of micro-entrepreneurship opportunities. Sharing platforms can create new sources of employment and enable previously un-tapped sources of income (Ikkala and Lampinen, 2015; Lampinen and Cheshire, 2016). The relatively low entry-barrier is particularly beneficial for marginalized populations who may be traditionally excluded, such as those with criminal records or low education. Smith (2016), based on a representative survey in the United States, found that 80% of respondents identified job opportunities as a major benefit of ride-hailing services, whereas 85% of respondents considered a major benefit of home-sharing services to be a convenient source of income.

However, the public debate has been increasingly critical towards the greater proliferation of sharing platforms, with their legitimacy and practices frequently

called into question (Newlands and Lutz, 2020). While the sharing economy has shown to open up new opportunities to make money, earnings on platforms are subject to significant diversity. In smaller scale initiatives, for instance, Fuster Morell *et al.* (2016) report that earnings are low and, in some cases, not even enough to cover basic needs. Critics have also argued that sharing services will undermine traditional employment relationships, leading to greater income inequality, poorer working conditions, labour uncertainty, and a tilt of power in favour of platforms in the creation of a 'new precariat' (Murillo *et al.*, 2017; Slee, 2013).

Economic motivation can be seen in people with lower involvement and commitment tied to their participation. This argument is supported by Shih *et al.* (2015) in the context of the less commercially-oriented sharing economy area of time-banking. The authors found that highly active time-bank users were more idealistic and participated because they believed in "equal time, equal value", whereas less active time bank users, who were mostly regular members, more frequently utilized time-banking in order to fulfil instrumental needs. Even in more commercially-oriented areas, such as peer-to-peer accommodation, the same pattern might hold. Dann *et al.* (2019), in a systematic overview of research on Airbnb, identified motives as a key theme. Out of 118 articles analysed in total (including topics other than motives), 31 look at motives from the guest (consumer) perspective and 16 from the host (provider) perspective. Among guests, "cost savings still remain the dominant motive" (p. 450) but for hosts, the motives seem to be somewhat more diverse, even though financial benefits play a key role. Extrapolating from these last elements, we question if consumers are exhibiting higher levels of economic motives compared to providers and providers to have higher levels of non-economic motives.

Beyond users, in the form of providers and consumers, non-users are also considered in studies on the sharing economy, even though rarely. However, an identification of their expected benefits should complement the analysis. Non-users constitute the largest group, as only a minority of the population uses sharing economy services. While the sharing economy has seen widespread growth and spans all socio-demographic categories in the European context, only 17% have used such services at least once (Eurobarometer, 2016). Thus, more than 80% are non-users. However, the majority (52% of the total population) of all EU citizens were aware of the services offered by the sharing economy, thus making aware non-users a key category. In our data, aware non-users and non-aware non-users are differentiated but we only include aware non-users in the analysis. Importantly, the term "motives" might not be appropriate for aware non-users since they have not experienced participation first-hand and could thus not give a substantiated account of motive-related questions. Therefore, we use the term expected benefits, rather than motives, when talking about aware non-users in the following.

While substantial research has looked into the question how motives affect sharing economy participation, less is known about the factors that affect participation motives themselves. In the next section, we present the research design and discuss our rationale for including demographics, three attitudinal antecedents – namely, trust, technological innovativeness, materialism, and a behavioural correlate, i.e. volunteering.

3.3 Methods: Data, Measures and Research Approach

3.3.1 Data

The analysis draws on a large survey conducted in 12 European countries on the state of the sharing economy (Andreotti *et al.*, 2017; Newlands *et al.*, 2018). A consortium of international researchers based in Norway, Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Denmark, and Switzerland conducted the survey in summer 2017. The cross-national questionnaire was constructed to explore the prevalence, antecedents, and outcomes of participation, privacy, and power in the European sharing economy, and involved 6111 individuals across 12 countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom). This selection includes countries with both a higher and lower average income, as well as countries with a varied uptake of sharing economy services. The respondents were divided into users, who were further categorized into providers and consumers, and non-users, who were further categorized into aware and non-aware non-users. The research in this chapter is focused on the respondents who are either users ($n = 1699$) or aware non-users ($n = 3983$). Among the users, there were 1143 consumers and 556 providers.

3.3.2 Measures

The analysis considers demographics, three relevant attitudinal antecedents and one behavioural correlate as predictors of participation in the sharing economy.

We used the following demographics as independent control variables: age in years, grouped in five categories, gender, education based on the ISCED categories, and yearly gross household income in four categories (quartiles). These variables were selected because they represent the most common demographic indicators used in survey research on the sharing economy. For household income, originally between 13 and 17 relatively narrow categories in the respective local currencies in the survey were used, subsequently grouping the respondents based on the distribution and their distance from the mean in standard deviations for each country.

Trust, innovativeness and materialism were included as relevant attitudinal antecedents and volunteering as a behavioural one. Trust has been shown to be a key construct in the sharing economy (Ter Huurne *et al.*, 2017) and was measured based on the general disposition to trust, using the scale of McKnight *et al.* (2002). We expect trust to have a positive effect on motives or expected benefits, as it serves as a pre-condition for even being willing to participate in the sharing economy and develop motives. For technology innovativeness, which could indicate a higher propensity to try out sharing services, the scale by Agarwal and Prasad (1998) was adopted. Technology innovativeness should equally increase motives or expected benefits. As a key aspect of the sharing economy is platform mediation, those who exhibit higher levels of technological innovativeness should show stronger motives or expected benefits from participation. To measure materialism and volunteering, both attributes shown as important in the context of the sharing economy (Akbar *et al.*, 2016; Davidson *et al.*, 2018; Kornberger *et al.*, 2018; Lutz *et al.*, 2018), the scales from Bucher *et al.* (2016) were used. Materialism is particularly important for commercial sharing services and economic motives/expected benefits (Davidson *et al.*, 2018), while volunteering should play a key role for non-commercial sharing services and non-economic motives/benefits (Bucher *et al.*, 2016). Table 3.1 displays the individual items and measurement. All scales showed high loadings and good measurement properties (Cronbach's α between 0.74 and 0.90). The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) of the items are presented in Table 3.1.

The questionnaire used four items to assess motives or expected benefits of sharing economy participation: financial, meeting people/social interaction, fun, and social responsibility (Bellotti *et al.*, 2015; Bucher *et al.*, 2016; Möhlmann, 2015). Provider and consumers were asked about their motives for participation and non-participants about which benefits they would expect from using sharing services. The question prompt for providers and consumers was: *"How much did the following considerations affect your decision to use the sharing platform?"* The question prompt for aware non-users was: *"If you decided to use an online sharing platform, to what extent would you expect the following benefits?"* Respondents answered for each of the four items on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1-not at all, 2-to a small extent, 3-to a moderate extent, 4-to a large extent, 5-very much. For each item, some additional explanation was available in brackets: "Financial benefit (e.g., for additional income)", "Meeting people (e.g., to find company, to feel part of a community)", "Fun (e.g., adventure, distraction, entertainment)", "Social responsibility (e.g., contribution to healthy environment, helping others)". While the literature has stressed environmental aspects of sharing economy participation, the questionnaire unfortunately did not include a dedicated and separate item on environmental motives or expected benefits. Social responsibility carries a moral dimension and environmental considerations are mentioned in brackets for this item but overall, this item is

Table 3.1. Descriptive statistics of constructs and items.

Factor/Cronbach's α	Variables	Mean	St. Dev.	Factor Loadings
1. Innovativeness/0.90	Look for ways to experiment	3.24	1.14	0.908
	The first to try out	2.90	1.21	0.866
	Like to experiment	3.47	1.13	0.909
2. Trust/0.88	General trust in people	3.35	1.02	0.899
	General faith in humanity	3.34	1.01	0.875
	General reliability of people	3.30	1.00	0.907
3. Volunteering/0.83	Volunteering to help	2.59	1.32	0.830
	Getting involved in issues	2.70	1.22	0.845
	Working with a group to solve a problem	2.37	1.20	0.875
4. Materialism/0.74	Happier if I could afford more	3.33	1.19	0.747
	Like a lot of luxury	2.70	1.17	0.795
	Admire people with expensive things	2.48	1.19	0.831

Note: $N = 5682$.

more about the societal aspects rather than environmental ones. This is a limitation of the study.

3.3.3 Research Approach

We used descriptive analysis, one-way ANOVA and binary logistic regression to analyse the data. First, descriptive statistical analysis (mean and standard deviations for providers and consumers) was conducted. Then, the data was analysed to find whether there were statistically significant differences between providers and consumers (one-way ANOVA). Finally, two multivariate methods were used. Factor analysis was employed to reduce the number of variables and to determine the underlying structure of relevant self-reported attitudinal (trust, innovativeness, materialism) and behavioural (volunteering) constructs. This helped to find out whether the factors correspond to the pre-determined suggested structures. To test

convergent and discriminant validity of the scales used to measure the independent variables, a principal component analysis with Varimax rotation was employed. The second multivariate method used was binary logistic regression. The binary logistic regression generates predicted probabilities of a case being in the category labelled (1) and is predicting the logit, that is, the natural log of the odds of having used sharing economy services.

3.4 Empirical Analysis and Results

The descriptive statistics for age, gender, household income and education by each category (providers and consumers, aware non-users) are shown in Table 3.2.

One-way ANOVA was used to detect if there are statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of demographics. Providers are younger and more likely to be male. Consumers have the highest level of household income and education. By contrast, aware non-users have the lowest level of household income and are less educated than providers and consumers.

The descriptive statistics of the four components by each group revealed statistically significant differences. Consumers are most innovative, they showed the most general trust in people, they are most materialistic, but they volunteer less frequently than providers (Table 3.3). By contrast, aware non-users are least trustful, innovative, materialistic and volunteer least frequently of all three groups.

Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics (demographics).

Provider, Consumer, Aware Non-user		Age Band	Gender	Household Income	Education
Provider*	Mean	2.54	1.59	2.33	4.73
	N	556	556	556	556
	Std. Deviation	1.194	0.492	0.983	1.135
Consumer*	Mean	2.76	1.48	2.41	4.78
	N	1143	1143	1143	1143
	Std. Deviation	1.297	0.500	1.013	1.026
Aware non-user*	Mean	3.36	1.50	2.24	4.31
	N	3983	3983	3983	3983
	Std. Deviation	1.295	0.500	1.020	1.062
Total	Mean	3.16	1.50	2.28	4.44
	N	5682	5682	5682	5682
	Std. Deviation	1.323	0.500	1.017	1.083

Note: * statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.

Table 3.3. Descriptive statistics of factors.

Provider, Consumer, Aware Non-user		Trust	Innovativeness	Materialism	Volunteering
Provider* (<i>n</i> = 556)	Mean	3.32	3.42	2.98	2.93
	Std.	0.985	1.023	0.953	1.045
	Devia- tion				
Consumer* (<i>n</i> = 1143)	Mean	3.43	3.46	2.99	2.78
	Std.	0.913	1.004	0.955	1.022
	Devia- tion				
Aware non-user* (<i>n</i> = 3983)	Mean	3.31	3.11	2.78	2.43
	Std.	0.932	1.065	0.956	1.070
	Devia- tion				
Total (<i>N</i> = 5682)	Mean	3.34	3.21	2.84	2.55
	Std.	0.935	1.060	0.960	1.074
	Devia- tion				

Note: * statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.

Descriptive statistics of the motives/expected benefits for each group are shown in Table 3.4. Despite the differences in how the questionnaire assessed motives among users (providers and consumers) and expected benefits among non-users (see 3.2), we think that the values are somewhat comparable, although we have to stress that motives were assessed in a past-directed way while expected benefits are future-directed. The ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences, with both providers and consumers mostly motivated by financial benefits. This could be caused by the pre-dominant platforms used. Most of the users (73%) declared that their most frequently used platform was Airbnb, Uber or BlaBlaCar, all of which are profit-oriented platforms.

Financial motives or expected benefits are apparent in all three groups. Even though (expected) financial benefits dominate in all groups, consumers showed more financial benefits as motives than providers. It seems that consumers are dominantly motivated by economic reasons and they declared more use of Airbnb and Uber. By contrast and in comparison to consumers, providers are more motivated by meeting people, fun and social responsibility. Interestingly, aware non-users expect more benefits from social responsibility and social interaction than consumers are motivated by these factors.

Table 3.4. Descriptive statistics on motives of users (providers and consumers) and expected benefits of aware non-users.

Provider, Consumer, Aware Non-user		Financial Benefit	Fun	Meeting People	Social Responsibility
Provider* (n = 556)	Mean	3.29	2.87	2.90	3.04
	Std. Deviation	1.19	1.12	1.16	1.18
	Consumer* (n = 1143)	Mean	3.68	2.70	2.38
	Std. Deviation	1.07	1.12	1.13	1.11
Aware non-user* (n = 3983)	Mean	2.92	2.61	2.68	2.87
	Std. Deviation	1.12	1.07	1.08	1.09
	Total (N = 5682)	Mean	3.11	2.65	2.64
	Std. Deviation	1.12	1.09	1.11	1.11

Note: * statistically significant at $p < 0.01$.

To further analyse the influence of demographics, the three attitudinal constructs and volunteering on motives/expected benefits, we used factor analysis to explore whether the motives can be reduced. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion and Bartlett's test were used to assess the goodness-of-fit of the solution. In our sample the KMO value was 0.770 and Bartlett's test was significant ($p = 0.000$), showing that the principal component analysis was appropriate. This analysis resulted in two components: the first one described economic aspects and consisted of financial motives with a loading of 0.971. The second component was named non-economic and included meeting people, fun and social responsibility. Convergent validity of the scales is supported by a Cronbach's α of 0.83 for the non-economic motives component. The factors are turned into binary variables by assigning a value of 1 if answers have a value of 3 or higher, and 0 for values below 3. Thus, the scale mid-point served as the split-point.

Logistic regression was then performed to test the predictive power of the demographic characteristics (gender, age, household income, education) as well as the three attitudinal constructs (trust, innovativeness, materialism) and volunteering as a behavioural correlate on economic and non-economic motives/expected benefits. This analysis was conducted separately for providers, consumers and aware non-users. Table 3.5 shows that providers with lower household income, who are more educated and innovative are more likely to be driven by economic motives. Moreover, providers who are younger, have higher trust and

Table 3.5. Results of logistic regression for providers.

	Economic				Non-economic			
	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	0.10	1.25	0.26	1.10	-0.17	4.55	0.03	0.84
Gender	0.15	0.55	0.46	1.17	0.03	0.02	0.88	1.03
Income*	-0.21	3.80	0.05	0.81	-0.11	1.30	0.25	0.89
Education	0.26	7.67	0.01	1.30	0.11	1.76	0.18	1.12
Trust	0.21	3.53	0.06	1.24	0.37	12.58	0.00	1.45
Innovativeness	0.31	6.89	0.01	1.37	0.17	2.43	0.12	1.18
Materialism	0.08	0.47	0.49	1.09	0.18	2.50	0.11	1.19
Volunteering	0.03	0.07	0.79	0.97	0.47	21.08	0.00	1.60
Constant	-1.97	7.22	0.01	0.14	-3.20	21.30	0.00	0.04

Note: $N = 556$, * in the analysis we used household income.

Table 3.6. Results of logistic regression for consumers.

	Economic				Non-economic			
	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	-0.08	1.42	0.23	0.92	-0.14	6.97	0.01	0.87
Gender	-0.16	0.77	0.38	0.85	0.03	0.06	0.81	1.03
Income*	-0.06	0.43	0.51	0.94	-0.06	0.95	0.33	0.94
Education	0.17	3.90	0.05	1.19	-0.15	5.36	0.02	0.86
Trust	0.20	4.60	0.03	1.23	0.19	6.31	0.01	1.20
Innovativeness	0.20	4.65	0.03	1.23	0.27	13.44	0.00	1.31
Materialism	0.09	0.81	0.37	1.09	0.30	16.41	0.00	1.34
Volunteering	0.03	0.12	0.73	1.03	0.48	48.47	0.00	1.62
Constant	-0.05	0.00	0.94	0.95	-3.00	31.92	0.00	0.05

Note: $N = 1143$, * in the analysis we used household income.

volunteer more frequently are more likely to be driven by non-economic motives.

Among consumers, economic motives are positively associated with education, trust and innovativeness. Thus, more educated, more trusting and more innovative consumers are motivated more strongly by economic benefits. By contrast, consumers who are younger, more educated, more innovative and volunteers are more likely to be driven by non-economic motives (Table 3.6).

In the group of potential users (in the survey recognized as aware non-users), income, gender and trust do not affect expected benefits that are economic, while

Table 3.7. Results of logistic regression: expected benefits among aware non-users.

	Economic				Non-economic			
	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Age	-0.25	72.75	0.00	0.78	-0.16	37.93	0.00	0.85
Gender	-0.10	1.89	0.17	0.91	-0.20	8.95	0.00	0.82
Income*	0.02	0.23	0.63	1.02	-0.08	5.32	0.02	0.93
Education	0.10	8.85	0.00	1.11	-0.03	1.09	0.30	0.97
Trust	0.02	0.36	0.55	1.02	0.15	16.58	0.00	1.16
Innovativeness	0.16	20.57	0.00	1.17	0.20	37.31	0.00	1.23
Materialism	0.23	32.93	0.00	1.26	0.11	8.92	0.00	1.12
Volunteering	0.11	10.12	0.00	1.12	0.31	89.52	0.00	1.36
Constant	-0.12	0.20	0.66	0.89	-0.85	11.20	0.00	0.43

Note: $N = 3983$, * in the analysis we used household income.

only education does not impact the expected benefits in non-economic terms. (Table 3.7). Younger, more educated, more innovative, materialistic and volunteering aware non-users expect more economic benefits, while younger, female, with low household income, more trusting, innovative, materialistic and volunteering aware non-users expect more non-economic benefits.

3.5 Discussion and Conclusion

Based on an existing large survey, we studied demographics (age, gender, education, household income) as well as relevant attitudinal (trust, innovativeness, materialism) and behavioural (volunteering) antecedents of economic and non-economic motives or expected benefits in sharing economy participation. Using descriptive, univariate and multivariate statistics, we found that economic (expected) benefits outperform non-economic ones among providers, consumers and aware non-users. One-way ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences in demographic characteristics between providers, consumers and aware non-users. The analysis showed that the providers are younger and more likely to be male. Consumers have the highest household income and education level, while aware non-users are the oldest group and have the lowest household income and education levels. In terms of attitudinal and behavioural differences, we found that consumers are most innovative, they showed the most general trust in people, they are most materialistic, but they volunteer less frequently than providers. Thus, to a certain extent, the sharing economy seems to perpetuate existing inequalities and benefit those who are already privileged (Eichhorn *et al.*, 2020; Lutz, 2019; Schor *et al.*, 2016).

When it comes to the motives for participation, consumers were mostly driven by financial benefits. Economic motives were particularly prominent among more educated and trusting consumers, while younger, more educated, more innovative, materialistic and volunteering consumers were more likely to be driven by non-economic motives. This shows that economic and non-economic motives are not mutually exclusive and sharing economy participants can accrue multiple type of capital at the same time (Ladegaard, 2018). Users who are economically motivated can also be motivated by non-economic criteria and there can be a plurality of motives. We found that providers with lower household income, who are more educated and innovative are more motivated by economic benefits, while providers that are more trusting and that want to help voluntarily are more driven by non-economic motives.

Economic motives or expected benefits are obvious in all three groups of respondents. However, consumers had more pronounced economic motives, compared with providers. By contrast and compared with consumers, providers are more motivated by meeting people, fun and social responsibility. This is in line with Böcker and Meelen (2017), who found similar differences between providers and consumers in their study in the Netherlands. In our analysis, providers seem motivated by a broader set of motives, reflecting the results of Ladegaard (2018) from their interviews with Airbnb hosts. Interestingly, aware non-users expect more benefits from social responsibility and social interaction than consumers are motivated by these factors. Overall, economic motives are most prevalent among consumers, while non-economic motives tend to be more salient among providers and aware non-users.

Our findings have *implications* for theory and practice. In terms of theory, our study identifies important antecedents of motives, something which previous literature (Albinsson and Perera, 2012; Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012; Bellotti *et al.*, 2015; Bucher *et al.*, 2016; Hawlitschek *et al.*, 2016a, 2018; Tussyadiah, 2015; Tussyadiah and Pesonen, 2016) has mostly overlooked, as it focused more on the types and outcomes of motives in different sharing economy domains and contexts. Analysing not only motives but also their antecedents enhances our knowledge of sharing economy participation and allows for a more holistic understanding of its social dynamics. Particularly, our study contributes to research that studies the sharing economy in terms of power dynamics and digital inequalities (Eichhorn *et al.*, 2020).

The importance of trust across the analyses, with significant effects for all three groups considered (providers, consumers, aware non-users), solidifies the crucial role of this construct in the sharing economy (Hawlitschek *et al.*, 2016b; Ter Huurne *et al.*, 2017). Particularly, the fact that trust mattered not only for aware non-users but also for users indicates that trust constitutes an important

pre-condition for continued motivation to stay active in the sharing economy. Innovativeness proved similarly important, as it had a significant – and positive – effect on economic motives across all three groups, and only proved to be insignificant for non-economic motives among providers. Thus, the sharing economy seems to cater particularly well to technologically innovative groups and might leave behind those who lack the drive to try out new technologies, thus *potentially exacerbating social inequalities* between different social groups (Ladegaard, 2018; Lutz, 2019; Schor *et al.*, 2016). This conclusion is supported by the demographic profile of aware non-users, who are older and have lower levels of household income and education than providers and consumers.

Volunteering was the strongest predictor of non-economic motives/expected benefits across all three groups. Non-economic sharing economy motives or expected benefits are particularly prominent among individuals who engage civically by volunteering and helping others (Kornberger *et al.*, 2018). This indicates that *different segments of the sharing economy follow partly different logics*, with certain platforms – and service categories within platforms – catering to a more bottom-up, non-commercial and social experience, while others target a more convenience-oriented and materialistic audience (Guttentag *et al.*, 2018; Lutz and Newlands, 2018). This is to be taken into consideration in any design and/or policy intervention.

A further contribution of our research to the sharing economy literature is the differentiation and comparison of providers, consumers and aware non-users. Previous research on motives for sharing economy participation has either looked at providers or consumers (Dann *et al.*, 2019) but rarely contrasted these two groups systematically (see Böcker and Meelen, 2017, for an exception), let alone included aware non-users. Our results show that the expected benefits of aware non-users are similarly pronounced as the motives of users. This is somewhat surprising as we had expected lower values. Future research could follow up on this and compare providers and consumers for specific services as well as the transition from consumers to providers (Angelovska *et al.*, 2020) and what makes individuals transition from aware non-users to users (as either consumer or provider), and from non-aware non-user to aware non-user.

The findings have *practical implications* and relevance for platform managers, policymakers and users. Platform managers can foster desired motives by leveraging key antecedents identified in our analysis. For example, a platform such as Uber can tap into heightened economic motives among young, educated, innovative, materialistic, and volunteering groups (e.g., students) that do not yet use the platform. Uber could leverage the motives of such aware non-users by designing targeted promotions and campaigns specifically for that group, for example student discounts or recommendation rewards. Similarly, a bottom-up sharing platform

that caters strongly to non-economic motives should create a climate of trust and volunteering, potentially encouraging and supporting such volunteering outside the platform to keep their providers motivated in the long run. For policymakers, our findings might prove useful to steer the growth of platforms through supporting conditions that tap into distinct motives. For example, if a city wants to promote non-economic motives and participation (and corresponding platforms), it can drive up such motives by creating a climate of trust, offering skill training and information to foster innovativeness, as well as lowering the threshold for volunteering. Finally, users themselves might find the results helpful to reflect on their own practices. Those who use sharing platforms as consumers might be confronted with a broader range of benefits, especially non-economic ones, that could be reaped if they started using the platform as a provider.

This study comes with several *limitations*. Namely, our survey is cross-sectional and does not allow for temporal and strong causal claims. Moreover, it lacked a strong comparative framing. Future research should use longitudinal data to study participants' and potential participants' demographics, trust, innovativeness, materialism, volunteering and motives over time. Such research could adapt a comparative scope to map the differences in the adoption of the sharing economy across different industries or countries.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution of – From Sharing to Caring: Examining Socio-Technical Aspects of the Collaborative Economy – (COST Action, CA16121://<https://www.cost.eu/actions/CA16121/#tabs|Name:overview/>). They would also like to thank the editors of the volume, Chiara Bassetti and Maurizio Teli, for their excellent organization of the review process, for giving very helpful feedback throughout the revision process and for making this volume possible in the first place through their commitment and hard work. Finally, they would like to thank the peer reviewers who critically assessed this chapter and made valuable suggestions that increased the quality of the chapter: Filip Majetic, Rodrigo Perez Vega, Eglantina Hysa, Sindiola Koka and Alba Demneri Kruja.

References

- Agarwal, R. and Prasad, J. (1998). A conceptual and operational definition of personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology. *Information Systems Research*, 9(2), 204–215.

- Akbar, P., Mai, R., and Hoffmann, S. (2016). When do materialistic consumers join commercial sharing systems. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(10), 4215–4224.
- Albinsson, P.A. and Perera, B.Y. (2012). Alternative marketplaces in the 21st century: Building community through sharing events. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 11(4), 303–315.
- Andreotti, A., Anselmi, G., Eichhorn, T., Hoffmann, C. P., Jürss, S., and Micheli, M. (2017). European perspectives on participation in the sharing economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 17 October 2017. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3046550
- Andreotti, A., Anselmi, G., Eichhorn, T., Etter, M., Fieseler, C., ... and Vermeulen, I. (2017). Ps2Share – Participation, Privacy, and Power in the Sharing Economy (Version 1.0) [Data set]. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1122633>
- Angelovska, J., Čeh Časni, A., and Lutz, C. (2020). Turning consumers into providers in the sharing economy: Exploring the impact of demographics and motives. *Ekonomiska Misao i Praksa*, 29(1), 79–100.
- Balck, B. and Cracau, D. (2015). Empirical analysis of customer motives in the shareconomy. *Working Paper Series, University of Magdeburg*. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/mag/wpaper/150002.html>
- Bardhi, F. and Eckhardt, G. (2012). Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 39(4), 881–898.
- Belk, R. (2007). Why not share rather than own? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611(1), 126–140.
- Belk, R. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 715–734.
- Belk, R. (2014a). Sharing versus pseudo-sharing in web 2.0. *The Anthropologist*, 4(2) 7–23.
- Belk, R. (2014b). You are what you can access: sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1595–1600.
- Bellotti, V., Ambard, A., Turner, D., Gossmann, C., Demkova, K., and Carroll, J.M., (2015). 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). ACM.
- Benkler, Y. (2004). Sharing nicely: On shareable goods and the emergence of sharing as a modality of economic production. *Yale Law Journal*, 114, 273–358.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. Yale University Press.
- Boar, A., Bastida, R., and Marimon, F. (2020). A systematic literature review. Relationships between the sharing economy, sustainability and sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 6744.

- Böcker, L. and Meelen, T. (2017). Sharing for people, planet or profit? Analysing motivations for intended sharing economy participation. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 28–39.
- Botsman, R. and Rogers, R. (2010). Beyond Zipcar: Collaborative consumption. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(10), 30.
- Botsman, R. and Rogers, R. (2011). *What's Mine is Yours: How Collaborative Consumption is Changing the Way we Live*. Harper Collins.
- Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., and Lutz, C. (2016). What's mine is yours (for a nominal fee) – Exploring the spectrum of utilitarian to non-economic motives for Internet-mediated sharing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 62, 316–326.
- Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., Fleck, M., and Lutz, C. (2018). Authenticity and the sharing economy. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(3), 294–313.
- Constantinides, E. and Fountain, S.J. (2008). Web 2.0: Conceptual foundations and marketing issues. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 9(3), 231–244.
- Dann, D., Teubner, T., and Weinhardt, C. (2019). Poster child and guinea pig—insights from a structured literature review on Airbnb. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 427–473.
- Davidson, A., Habibi, M.R., and Laroche, M. (2018). Materialism and the sharing economy: A cross-cultural study of American and Indian consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 82, 364–372.
- Dervojeda, K., Verzijil, D., Nagtegaal, F., Lengton, M., and Rouwmatt, E. (2013). The sharing economy: Accessibility based business models for peer-to-peer markets. *European Commission. Business Innovation Observatory*. http://ec.europa.eu/growth/industry/innovation/business-innovation-observatory_en
- Dillahunt, T.R. and Malone, A.R. (2015). The promise of the sharing economy among disadvantaged communities. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 2285–2294). ACM.
- Edbring, E.G., Lehner, M., and Mont, O. (2016). Exploring consumer attitudes to alternative models of consumption: motivations and barriers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 123, 5–15.
- Eichhorn, T., Jürss, S., and Hoffmann, C.P. (2020). Dimensions of digital inequality in the sharing economy. *Information, Communication and Society*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1791218>
- Eurobarometer. (2016). The use of collaborative platforms. *Flash Eurobarometer: Vol. 438*. Luxembourg: Publications Office. <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/FLASH/surveyKy/2112>
- Frenken, K. and Schor, J. (2017). Putting the sharing economy into perspective. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 23, 3–10.

- Fuster Morell, M., Salcedo, J. L., and Berlinguer, M. (2016). Debate about the concept of value in Commons-Based Peer Production. In *International Conference on Internet Science* (pp. 27–41). Springer.
- Gansky, L. (2010). *The Mesh: Why the Future of Business is Sharing*. Penguin.
- Gerwe, O. and Silva, R. (2020). Clarifying the sharing economy: Conceptualization, typology, antecedents, and effects. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1), 65–96.
- Grassmuck, V.R. (2012). The sharing turn: Why we are generally nice and have a good chance to cooperate our way out of the mess we have gotten ourselves into. In Sützl, W., Stalder, F., Maier, R., and Hug, T. (eds.), *Cultures and Ethics of Sharing* (pp. 17–34). Innsbruck University Press.
- Gurven, M. (2006). The evolution of contingent cooperation. *Current Anthropology*, 47(1), 185–192.
- Guttentag, D., Smith, S., Potwarka, L., and Havitz, M. (2018). Why tourists choose Airbnb: A motivation-based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(3), 342–359.
- Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., and Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(9), 2047–2059.
- Hawlicschek, F., Teubner, T., and Gimpel, H. (2016a). Understanding the sharing economy – Drivers and impediments for participation in peer-to-peer rental. In *2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)* (pp. 4782–4791). IEEE.
- Hawlicschek, F., Teubner, T., and Weinhardt, C. (2016b). Trust in the sharing economy. *Die Unternehmung*, 70(1), 26–44.
- Hawlicschek, F., Teubner, T., and Gimpel, H. (2018). Consumer motives for peer-to-peer sharing. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 204, 144–157.
- Heo, Y. (2016). Sharing economy and prospects in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58, 166–170.
- Holmström, J. and Stalder, F. (2001). Drifting technologies and multi-purpose networks: the case of the Swedish cashcard. *Information and Organization*, 11(3), 187–206.
- Ikkala, T. and Lampinen, A. (2015). Monetizing network hospitality: Hospitality and sociability in the context of Airbnb. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing* (pp. 1033–1044). ACM.
- John, N.A. (2013). The social logics of sharing. *The Communication Review*, 16(3), 113–131.
- Kemp, J. and Olson, M. (2015). Sharing economy: An in-depth look at its evolution and trajectory across industries. <http://collaborativeconomy.com/research/sh>

aring-economy-an-in-depth-look-at-its-evolution-and-trajectory-across-industries/

- Kornberger, M., Leixnering, S., Meyer, R.E., and Höllerer, M.A. (2018). Rethinking the sharing economy: The nature and organization of sharing in the 2015 refugee crisis. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(3), 314–335.
- Ladegaard, I. (2018). Hosting the comfortably exotic: Cosmopolitan aspirations in the sharing economy. *The Sociological Review*, 66(2), 381–400.
- Lamberton, C.P. and 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.
- Lampinen, A. and Cheshire, C. (2016). Hosting via Airbnb: Motivations and financial assurances in monetized network hospitality. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1669–1680). ACM.
- Luchs, M., Naylor, R.W., Rose, R.L., Catlin, J.R., Gau, R., Kapitan, S., ... and Subrahmanyam, S. (2011). Toward a Sustainable Marketplace: Expanding Options and Benefits for Consumers. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, 19, 1–12.
- Lutz, C. (2019). Digital inequalities in the age of artificial intelligence and big data. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 1(2), 141–148.
- Lutz, C., Hoffmann, C.P., Bucher, E., and Fieseler, C. (2018). The role of privacy concerns in the sharing economy. *Information, Communication and Society*, 21(10), 1472–1492.
- Lutz, C. and Newlands, G. (2018). Consumer segmentation within the sharing economy: The case of Airbnb. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 187–196.
- Lutz, C., Newlands, G., and Fieseler, C. (2018). Emotional labor in the sharing economy. In *Proceedings of the 51st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/49968>
- McKnight, D.H., Choudhury, V., and Kacmar, C. (2002). Developing and validating trust measures for e-commerce: An integrative typology. *Information Systems Research*, 13(3), 334–359.
- 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.
- Mont, O. (2002). Clarifying the concept of product–service system. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 10(3), 237–245.
- Murillo, D., Buckland, H., and Val, E. (2017). When the sharing economy becomes neoliberalism on steroids: Unravelling the controversies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 125, 66–76.
- Narasimhan, C., Papatla, P., Jiang, B., Kopalle, P.K., Messinger, P.R., Moorthy, S., ... and Zhu, T. (2018). Sharing economy: Review of current research and future directions. *Customer Needs and Solutions*, 5(1–2), 93–106.

- Newlands, G. and Lutz, C. (2020). Fairness, legitimacy and the regulation of home-sharing platforms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, online first. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08--2019-0733>
- Newlands, G., Lutz, C., and Fieseler, C. (2018). European perspectives on power in the sharing economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 3 January 2018. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3046473
- Newlands, G., Lutz, C., and Fieseler, C. (2019). The conditioning function of rating mechanisms for consumers in the sharing economy. *Internet Research*, 29(5), 1090–1108.
- Novel, A.S. (2014). Is sharing more sustainable? The environmental promises of the sharing economy. In Grosclaude, J.-Y., Pachauri, R.K., and Tubiana, L. (eds.), *Innovation for Sustainable Development* (pp. 139–144). IDDR SciencesPo.
- Schmidt, M.F. and Sommerville, J.A. (2011). Fairness expectations and altruistic sharing in 15-month-old human infants. *PloS One*, 6(10), e23223.
- Schor, J.B., Fitzmaurice, C., Carfagna, L.B., Attwood-Charles, W., and Poteat, E.D. (2016). Paradoxes of openness and distinction in the sharing economy. *Poetics*, 54, 66–81.
- Shih, P.C., Bellotti, V., Han, K., and Carroll, J.M. (2015, April). Unequal time for unequal value: Implications of differing motivations for participation in timebanking. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1075–1084). ACM.
- Slee, T. (2013). Some obvious things about Internet reputation systems. *Tomslee.net*, 29 September 2013. <http://tomslee.net/2013/09/some-obvious-things-about-internet-reputation-systems.html>
- Smith, A. (2016). Shared, collaborative and on demand: The new digital economy. *Pew Research Center: Internet & Technology*, 19 May 2016. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/05/19/the-new-digital-economy/>
- Stephany, A. (2015). *The Business of Sharing: Making it in the New Sharing Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sundararajan, A. (2016). *The Sharing Economy: The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-Based Capitalism*. MIT Press.
- Ter Huurne, M., Ronteltap, A., Corten, R., and Buskens, V. (2017). Antecedents of trust in the sharing economy: A systematic review. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 16(6), 485–498.
- Tomasello, M. and Warneken, F. (2008). Share and share alike. *Nature*, 454(7208), 1057–1058.
- Tussyadiah, I.P. (2015). An exploratory study on drivers and deterrents of collaborative consumption in travel. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015* (pp. 817–830). Springer.

- Tussyadiah, I.P. and Pesonen, J. (2016). Impacts of peer-to-peer accommodation use on travel patterns. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1022–1040.
- Walsh, B. (2011). Today's smart choice: Don't own. Share. *Time*, 17 March 2011. http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2059521_2059717_2059710,00.html