Turun yliopisto
University of Turku

ABSTRACT

Abstract

Sharing economy as a phenomenon has encountered major growth within the recent years. Consumers are increasingly keen in participating in different sharing economy services as owning is decreasing its importance and people prefer to share and gain experiences by accessing. The rise of sharing economy can be explained by multiple factors. Firstly, the global financial crisis has encouraged people to find alternative ways to consume. Secondly, people are increasingly reluctant in owning and attaching, since it doesn't fit the modern consumer's fast-moving and flexible lifestyle. Thirdly, major technological development has enabled sharing economy services to flourish by connecting people more broadly than ever before. Especially, the rise of the Internet has helped to overcome barriers such as transaction costs, trust and reputational factors that have once limited sharing activities. Even though the rise of sharing economy is clearly justifiable, there is still a lack of understanding why consumers participate in sharing. Therefore, this research aims to contribute in the understanding of consumers motives in taking part in sharing economy services, especially in peer-to-peer sharing.

The research question was answered with the theoretical framework introduced in the research as well as conducting an empirical case study. The theoretical framework consists of sharing economy, motive and sharing behavior theories. The empirical data was collected by ten semi-structured thematic interviews with Airbnb users. Since the aim of this study was to gain understanding of the motives of both participants, providers and users, both sides were interviewed. The data collection was limited to Finnish users and host's that hosted in Southern Finland.

When discussing the motives to participate in sharing economy financial and social motives repeatedly rose. Additionally, experience and trend orientation acted as a motive especially for guests. The main conclusions of this study demonstrate that participants of P2P sharing platforms are motivated by various factors, which may differ in priority and emphasis. The findings clearly demonstrate, that providers balance between social and financial motives, which shouldn't be seen as crowding out each other, but rather as supporting each other in forming a holistic motivation. Additionally, cost-utility relation as well as personal values were found to drive sharing behavior. This research demonstrates that values can explain the consumer's attitudes towards a purchase decision and act as a driver for action, since it is found that sharing is strongly driven by values.

Turun kauppakorkeakoulu • Turku School of Economics

![University of Turku logo] **Turun yliopisto**
University of Turku

TIIVISTELMÄ

Tiivistelmä

Jakamistalous ilmiönä on kasvanut huimasti viime vuosien aikana. Kuluttajat ovat yhä halukkaampia osallistumaan erilaisiin jakamistaloudenpalveluihin, kun asioiden omistaminen vähentää merkitystään. Jakamistalouden kasvua selittää moni tekijä. Ensinnäkin, maailmanlaajuinen talouskriisi on kannustanut ihmisiä löytämään vaihtoehtoisia kuluttamistapoja. Toisekseen, asioiden omistaminen ei välttämättä sovi modernin kuluttajan joustavaan ja nopeatahtiseen elämäntyyliin. Kolmannekseen, teknologian kehittyminen yhdistää kuluttajat keskenään laajemmin ja helpommin kuin koskaan ennen, joka on edesauttanut jakamistalouden palvelujen syntymistä. Etenkin Internetin kehittyminen on auttanut ylittämään tiettyjä esteitä, jotka ovat ennen rajoittaneet jakamista, kuten maksujen hoitamisen ja luottamuksen rakentamisen. Vaikka jakamistalouden kasvu on ilmeisen perusteltua, on silti hieman epäselvää miksi kuluttajat ovat halukkaita osallistumaan jakamistalouteen. Täten tämän tutkimuksen tavoite on selventää ja edistää ymmärrystä siitä, mikä motivoi kuluttajia osallistumaan jakamistalouden palveluihin, etenkin ihmisten keskinäisiin jakamisalustoihin (P2P-jakaminen).

Tutkimuskysymykseen vastattiin sekä tutkimuksen teoriaosassa esitetyn aikaisemman tutkimuksen läpikäynnillä sekä empiirisen tapaustutkimuksen avulla. Teoreettinen viitekehys koostuu jakamistalouden, motivaation sekä jakamiskäyttäytymisen lähestymistavoista. Empiirinen tutkimus toteutettiin tekemällä kymmenen puolistrukturoitua teemahaastattelua Airbnb-käyttäjien kanssa. Tutkimuksen tavoite on ymmärtää molempia osallistujapuolia, käyttäjiä sekä tarjoajia, joten molempia osapuolia haastateltiin. Datan keräys rajattiin suomalaisiin käyttäjiin ja Etelä-Suomen alueella isännöiviin Airbnb-tarjoajiin.

Motiiveista keskustellessa haastatteluissa nousivat vahvasti esille sosiaaliset sekä taloudelliset motiivit. Näiden lisäksi, etenkin käyttäjien haastatteluissa tärkeäksi nousivat kokemus- sekä trendiorientoituminen. Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat, että P2P-jakamisalustoihin osallistumisen taustalla on monia motiiveja, jotka vaihtelevat painotukseltaan sekä tärkeysjärjestykseltään. Tulokset indikoivat selkeästi tarjoajat tasapainottelevan sosiaalisten ja taloudellisten hyötyjen välillä, joiden ei pitäisi nähdä poissulkevan vaan lähinnä tukevan toisiaan, muodostaen kokonaisvaltaisen holistisen motivaation. Näiden lisäksi kustannus-hyöty -suhteen sekä arvomaailman nähtiin vaikuttavan jakamiskäyttäytymiseen. Arvomaailma voi selittää kuluttajien asenteita jakamispalveluita kohtaan ja näin toimia myös osallistumisen selittäjänä.

EXPLORING THE MOTIVES TO PARTICIPATE IN
THE SHARING ECONOMY

Case Airbnb

Master´s Thesis
in Marketing

Author:
Roosa Antila

Supervisor:
Rami Olkkonen

17.3.2017
Turku

2

Table of contents

4

List of tables

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 New era of sharing

In the recent years there has been a tremendous change in how people consume and how they think about ownership. The attitudes towards consumption are shifting and concerns over ecological, societal and developmental impacts of consuming are increasing. Especially millenials are not only raised digital but also raised thinking differently about ownership. (Botsman and Rogers 2010, 97). Due to these changes, new business models based on the sharing economy and collaborative consumption are flourishing all over the world. According to a recent report that PwC conducted for the European Commission, five key sectors of the sharing economy have generated platform revenues of nearly 4€ billion and have facilitated 28€ billion of transactions within Europe alone in the year 2015. The same report estimates that by 2025, these five sectors will generate Europe-wide revenues worth over 80€ billion and facilitate nearly 570€ billion of transactions. (PwC 2016.) This recent report indicates that the sharing economy is expanding double the pace, that was anticipated in 2014 (PwC 2014). These reports indicate that the revenue growth of the sharing sector will be significantly faster than the growth of traditional sectors as well as more apace that was ever expected. Thus, Botsman and Rogers (2010) propose that the phenomenon of sharing economy could be even as important as the Industrial Revolution in terms of how we consume and think about ownership.

There are multiple reasons why people are keen in participating in the sharing economy. Determinants such as sustainability, enjoyment and financial benefits (Hamari, Sjöklint & Ukkonen 2015) as well as social benefits (Botsman & Rogers 2010, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Belk 2014) are motivating people to consume collectively. Additionally, the boom of sharing economy can be explained by changes in the society and the environment we live in. Firstly, the global financial crisis and recession has pressured consumers to find alternative ways to consume. Secondly, researchers suggest that people prefer to access and share over ownership in an increasing manner, since ownership is no longer seen as the ultimate expression of consumer desire (Bardhi & Eckhart 2012). And most importantly, major technological advancement and innovations enable new ways for people to interact with each other. Therefore, people are more and more socially connected all over the world. According to Belk (2014) we are entering what he calls the "post-ownership economy", where the wisdom "you are what you own" is converting in todays modern society to "you are what you share".

Considering the enormous growth and expected development of sharing economy, the European Commission published a European Agenda for the Collaborative Economy in June 2016, which communicates a strong support for the sharing economy. The

European Commission considers that collaborative economy enables new opportunities for consumers and entrepreneurs and therefore, it may contribute significantly to the employment, as well as to the European economic growth and competitiveness, if developed and supported in a responsible manner. However, the agenda aims to clarify the rules and obligations applying both citizens and businesses related to the sharing economy. When embracing the new opportunities and benefits that the sharing economy brings, it is essential concurrently to keep in mind things such as fair working conditions and sustainable and adequate consumer and social protection. (European Commission 2016.) These kind of declarations prove that sharing economy is not just a trend, but a new economy boosting consuming alternative that is here to stay and thus, should be taken seriously.

Sharing economy can be defined as: "People coordinating the acquisition and distribution of underused resources for a fee or other compensation." (Belk 2014; Botsman & Rogers 2010). This particular research focuses examining peer-to-peer sharing models (P2P), where people, rather than businesses, coordinate the sharing of idle assets. This differs from previous research, since many studies explore the various other forms, where for example businesses rent to consumers. P2P sharing is however, an action where private individuals temporarily dispose and acquire assets with peers through an online network usually operated on a platform (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). This makes sense since, the fundamental idea of sharing economy is to enable a more efficient use of resources and to utilize idle capacities more purposefully. For example, an average car in the United States and Western Europe is used 8% of the time and the average power drill is used somewhere in between six and thirteen minutes in its whole lifespan (Belk). Sharing economy aims to enable the use of this idle capacities and consequently create value, for the user, for the person owning the asset, for the economy and for the environment. The thought of ownership is deeply embedded in our cultures and therefore attitudes and thoughts needs to be changed in order for sharing economy to increase its popularity as a consuming alternative. Sharing is gradually becoming a very compelling alternative to traditional forms of ownership. Since, in the end of the day sharing makes a tremendous amount of practical and economic sense for the consumer, the environment, and the community (Botsman & Rogers 2010).

1.2 Purpose and structure of this study

The purpose of this study is to examine sharing economy, especially to explore the motivations of different actors to participate in peer-to-peer sharing. The significance of this research topic is supported by many authors. Sharing economy is a phenomenon that has encountered major growth within the last few years and is estimated to grow

consistently (European Commission 2016; PwC 2014). However, there is a lack of understanding why people participate in the sharing economy (Hamari, Sjöklint & Ukkonen 2015; Hartl, Hoffman & Kirchler 2015), particularly in the peer-to-peer sharing context (Philip, Ballantie & Ozanne 2015). Also, previous research primarily focuses on isolated determinants, rather than exploring motives and their relative strengths holistically. Moreover, earlier research doesn't always distinguish between different kind of forms of sharing economy, but discusses it as one phenomenon. And as will be presented later in this study, there are various forms of sharing economy that differ quite a lot in their nature. And due to the differing nature, motives behind participation may also vary. Therefore, it is essential to distinguish different forms and examine then separately. Additionally, this research aims to contribute to the understanding of both sides of the sharing transaction. In other words, to examine the motives to provide as well as the motives to use.

These findings, arguments and suggestions found in previous research, presents a very clear research gap. Even though sharing economy has encountered a lot of academic interest, the literature on motives, especially in the peer-to-peer context has remained rather low. Consequently, examining sharing economy with a less-studied perspective in peer-to-peer models, brings up a very interesting topic that can offer novelty value for this field of research. Considering the found research gap, the following research problem was constructed:

To examine the sharing economy, especially to explore the motivations to participate in peer-to-peer sharing

This research problem is further divided into two sub research questions:

1) What kind of motives exist in participating in peer-to-peer sharing models and how are these motivation types emphasized?
2) What kind of other meanings are related to sharing?

The research is conducted by examining the motivations that arise in participation in the Airbnb platform. Airbnb is a collective peer-to-peer marketplace founded in 2008 that aims to connect people's needs and to provide a unique accommodation experience all over the world (Airbnb, About Us). When choosing the platform to be examined in this particular research Airbnb was chosen, since it has the largest user base of all P2P sharing economy platforms in Finland. Airbnb has encountered major growth in Finland within the past few years, and for example in Helsinki the amount of rented apartments increased to 2.100 apartments in the year 2015, which indicates a 71% growth (Koivisto 2016). Today, globally apartments are rented through Airbnb in over 34.000 cities and 191 countries (AirBnb, About Us).

Limiting the focus to exploring specifically P2P sharing economy services is justified by multiple factors. Firstly, it is essential to isolate different sharing economy models from each other and not talk generally about one phenomenon. Secondly, previous literature suggests that participation in P2P sharing economy platforms can be highly driven by social factors (Botsman & Rogers 2010, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, Belk 2014), which makes exploring both sides of the transaction highly interesting. And this leads us to the third factor of choosing P2P sharing economy services: It is highly interesting to explore the motives of both participants, the users and the providers and explore what similarities and what differences there are in the motivation to participate. Additionally, interacting with people and not with a business may trigger different kind of behavior, and since this research aims to explore what kind of meanings are related to the sharing activity, this aspect found rather interesting. Also, in previous research on Airbnb participation, the user perspective has remained quite low, since focus has been on exploring the host behavior (Lampinen & Chesire 2016; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015). Therefore, this research explores both, user and host motivation and aims to contribute to the understanding of behavior on both sides of the sharing transaction.

The research is divided in to four main chapters. Chapter two covers the literature review on the participation in the sharing economy, which consists of defining and delving in to sharing economy, motivation theories as well as other meanings related to sharing. Chapter three covers the methodology of this research and presents the research strategy, the case, the data collection, the data analysis and the trustworthiness of this study. This chapter aims to give a comprehensive understanding of how the empirical research was conducted. Chapter four presents the empirical findings of this study and the final chapter presents the conclusions, which consist of theoretical contributions, managerial implications, limitations and suggestions for further research.

2 PARTICIPATION IN THE SHARING ECONOMY

2.1 Defining sharing economy

Sharing as a phenomenon has existed since the beginning of mankind, however "sharing economy" and "collaborative consumption" are terms that have risen in the Internet age (Belk 2014, 1595). Sharing economy and collaborative consumption are often used as synonyms as well as interchangeably. However, there isn't one clear definition for either of them, which is why it is important to clarify the terms as well as the focus of this research. Hamari, Sjöklint & Ukkonen (2015) define collaborative consumption as: *"The peer-to-peer activity of obtaining, giving, or sharing access to goods and services, coordinated through community based online services"*. While Belk (2014) defines collaborative consumption as: *"People coordinating the acquisition and distribution of a resource for a fee or other compensation."* Botsman (2015) sees collaborative consumption as: *"The reinvention of traditional market behaviors—renting, lending, swapping, sharing, bartering, gifting—through technology, taking place in ways and on a scale not possible before the internet"*.

Then again, Botsman (2015) defines sharing economy as: *"An economic system based on sharing underused assets or services, for free or for a fee, directly from individuals."* However, Hamari et al. (2015) sees it more as an umbrella concept that consist of several other terms such as collaborative consumption. Botsman (2015) also makes a difference between collaborative economy and sharing economy, where collaborative economy is defined as: *"An economic system of decentralized networks and marketplaces that unlocks the value of underused assets by matching needs and haves, in ways that bypass traditional middlemen."* Often meaning the exact same phenomenon, sharing economy is named with different terms such as collaborative consumption, collaborative economy, peer-to-peer sharing and so on. However, an important notice to make is that Internet is in the center of most of the definitions. The fact that Internet plays a significant role in enabling sharing economy is something that most researchers agree upon. This is due to the fact that Internet has enabled people to connect with each better and more broadly making it possible to coordinate their activities and share things with each other. (Belk 2013; Henten & Windekilde 2016). Due to the significance, we will delve deeper into the role of technological development later on in this research.

In this research we will adapt the definitions by Belk (2014) and Botman (2015) when referring to the sharing economy. Thereby, sharing economy is defined as: "People coordinating the acquisition and distribution of underused resources for a fee or other compensation." Therefore, the term sharing economy eliminates such sharing activities where no compensation is given and where ownership is permanently transferred

like as in gift giving (Belk 2014) and emphasizes the distribution and acquisition of underused, idle assets. Also, this description encompasses the P2P (peer-to-peer) companies, where the transaction takes place between people (Bardhi & Eckhart 2012; Botsman & Rogers 2010, but is often facilitated by an external provider such as an online platform (Möhlmann 2015). This organizational form will be discussed in more detail later as it is the focus of this research. Other organizational forms of sharing economy, B2P (business-to-peer) (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012; Möhlmann 2015) and P2B2P (peer-to-business-to-peer) will not be examined in this research. However, to clarify the difference between P2P, B2P and P2B2P, the latter ones will be described briefly.

An example of the B2P business form is Zipcar (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012), which is a car hiring service, where a company provides consumers a temporal access to cars in return for a monthly fee. Here the company acts as the provider of the product as well as the provider of the platform. Whereas, the P2B2P model is similar to the P2P model, but users do not meet each other face to face, while the interaction is managed by middlemen, usually the platform provider. New P2B2P models are rising and becoming popular due to their convenience. However, there is a concern, that when the face-to-face interaction is replaced with a middleman, it might take away an important human element. This may lead to undesired end results, when people feel that they are operating with a company rather than an individual. (ShareNL 2015.) The core of sharing economy and what will be examined in this research, is the process of people sharing their idle capacities, such as houses, cars, bicycles or other goods to strangers by communicating with each other using different kinds of P2P platforms and charging a fee or another compensation for the exchange. In this research Airbnb will be used as a case company to enhance the understanding on peer-to-peer sharing.

To clarify further what sharing economy encompasses in this research, "on-demand-economy" and "semi-sharing" are introduced, which are not a part of sharing economy discussed in this paper. On-demand-economy covers platforms that match directly customers needs with a provider in order to instantly deliver goods and services (Botsman 2015). An example of an on-demand platform is Uber, which is an alternative taxi-service, where anyone can register as an amateur taxi driver. The whole transaction from ordering to paying is handled via Uber application, the platform that matches the customer with the provider. (Botsman 2015; Meelen & Frenken 2015.) Uber is a good example of semi-sharing as well. Semi-sharing occurs when consumers engage in a sharing platform to share their capacities that are not idle. This is the case in Uber, since the driver only makes the trip to take someone from A to B, as acting like a regular taxi driver. Uber would be considered a part of the sharing economy only if the driver would have been doing this trip from A to B anyway. Then, there would have been some idle, underused capacities utilized, since the empty seats would've had a useful purpose.

Therefore, Uber shouldn't be considered as a part of the sharing economy. Also, AirBnb can not always be considered as a part of the sharing economy, since in some occasions it tilts more towards a semi-sharing model. When people share their house or room to others, when they are not using it themselves lets say when going for a holiday or they happen to have an extra room, the process is considered a part of the sharing economy. This is because, then the person is sharing idle capacity, that would not be used otherwise. However, when people live permanently somewhere else and rent out constantly a house they are not ever actually using themselves, they are not participating in the sharing economy, but rather running an apartment-rental service. (Meelen & Frenken 2015.) Clarifying the difference between sharing economy and semi-sharing and on-demand services, is rather important, in order to emphasize what sharing economy is. When sharing economy is growing rapidly, success-stories related to it can be read every other day and more and more companies want to be a part of this positive and progressive phenomenon, it is important to keep in mind what is actually a part of the sharing economy and what is not. According to the definition used in this research sharing economy is: People coordinating the acquisition and distribution of underused resources for a fee or other compensation (Belk 2014 and Botman 2015) and this is worthwhile bearing in mind, since it will be used throughout this research.

2.1.1 Drivers behind the rise of sharing economy

There are multiple drivers that have influenced the rise of sharing economy. Firstly, in the recent years there has been a great change in how people consume and think about consuming. The attitudes towards consumption are shifting and concerns over ecological and societal impacts of consuming are increasing and sharing economy is sometimes seen as a more sustainable way to consume. (Bardhi & Eckhart, 2012; Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015; Hamari et al 2015.) Secondly, the global financial crisis and recession has pressured people to find alternative ways to consume. (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012; Henten & Windekilde 2016.) And most importantly, major technological advancement and innovation enables new ways to interact with each other. Therefore, people are more and more socially connected via mobile devices all over the world. Due to these shifts and developments, new business models based on the sharing economy are flourishing all over the world.

In the sharing economy ownership of a good is replaced by the access of the good (Belk 2014). This is why it can also be defined as access-based-consumption. Access and sharing are rather close terms, as in both forms of consumption the ownership isn't transferred (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012). Botsman & Rogers (2010, 97) describe that the rising phenomenon is that people do not ecessarily want to own stuff, but rather want to

have the experience that the stuff fulfils. Bardhi and Eckhart (2012) agree on this and propose that, todays consumers prefer to get access to goods and pay for the experience of temporally accessing them instead of buying or owning them. Further, it is proposed that ownership is no longer the ultimate expression of consumer desire. This is due to many factors. Bardhi & Eckhart (2012) propose the idea of liquid relationship to possessions: People are more and more reluctant in owning and attaching to things in an increasingly liquid society. Liquidity refers to the current social circumstances in which social structures and institutions are increasingly unstable. Access is seen as a more temporal form of consumption, which adapts better to the liquid consumer's fast-moving and flexible lifestyle and identity. (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012.) The boundaries between "what is mine", "what is yours" and "what is ours" is fading and we are shifting towards a thought that "access is better than ownership" (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 97). According to Belk (2014) we are entering what he calls the "post-ownership economy", where the wisdom "You are what you own" is converting in todays modern society to "You are what you share"

The popularity with accessing and not owning things can also be related to macroeconomic factors, particularly the global economic crisis starting in the years 2008 (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012; Henten & Windekilde 2016.) Several researchers indicate that sharing economy started flourishing as a response to the global financial crisis as, in moments of scarcity consumers start to re-examine spending habits as well as their values, including their thoughts on ownership. Financial crisis may also increase the skepticism towards capitalistic structures and people prefer to shift towards alternative forms of sustainable consumption (Möhlmann 2015, 194). Sharing platforms such as car-sharing and house-sharing, become more and more convenient for consumers in uncertain financial times. People participating in the sharing economy believe that they can gain economic benefits, since it can be a low-cost alternative for users as well as an additional income for providers. (Hamari et al 2015; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Moeller & Wittkowski 2010.) Researches also suggest that sharing economy will keep on growing even when the economy is recovered and will maintain as a significant new consumption model (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012;) Additionally, Botsman and Rogers (2010) believe that sharing economy could be as important as the Industrial Revolution regarding how we think about ownership.

Technological improvement plays a significant role in the development of sharing economy. The development and increased use of information technologies together with the rise of web 2.0 has created online platforms that encourage user-generated content, sharing and collaborations and changes the way people consume online. (Kaplan & Haenlein 2010, 62; Belk 2010). Web 2.0 is defined as an interaction environment enabled by the development of online technologies, that is characterized by user-control, freedom and dialogue (Tuten & Solomon 2014, 7). It is a technology designed and built

to enable a new architecture of participation, that encourages users to contribute. (Greif, Hjorth, Lasén & Lobet-Maris 2011, 22). Sharing economy operates through these kind of technological platforms, such as websites or mobile applications. The technological development and rise of the Internet has helped to overcome barriers such as transaction costs, trust and reputational factors that have once limited sharing activities (Henten & Windekilde 2016; Botsman & Rogers 2010). Developments such as GPS that enable people to see where the nearest rentable good is, social networks that build trust as well as online payment systems that handle the billing has all made sharing more convenient (The Economist 2015). Before the Internet, the transaction costs of people coordinating their wants and needs, were high and sharing was simply too inconvenient. As transaction cost doesn't only refer to the financial cost of a product, but also to the energy used and the hassle required in getting it. Even notifying other people of idle capacities without the Internet is rather troublesome, but finding someone who needs that same item is even more challenging. The probability of being able to match needs with wants without the help of Internet is quite low and the effort required for the match to happen is relatively high. Consequently, without the Internet renting and sharing would most likely be more trouble than its worth. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 126). Internet provides people the technology to match wants and needs inside a network of like-minded people. Therefore, technical development plays a huge role in the rise of the sharing economy, since it eliminates a lot of the previous inconvenience related to it. Thus, many researchers on their studies emphasize the importance of the Internet in facilitating the sharing economy. (Belk 2010; Belk 2013; The Economist 2015; Kaplan & Haenlein 2010, 62.)

2.1.2 *Four principles of sharing economy*

Botsman and Rogers (2010) introduce four core principles that are present in all collaborative consumption models: critical mass, idling capacity, belief in the commons and trust between strangers. Even though there are multiple forms and modes of sharing economy and collaborative consumption, these principles are always present, with varying emphasis and importance depending on the situation. In order to understand the core of sharing economy, these principles will be introduced next.

Critical mass refers to the existence of enough force in a system in order to make it self-sustaining. In the case of sharing economy critical mass is essential for a couple of reasons. Firstly, choice plays an important role when consumers make consumption decisions. When people shop, they seek for convenience and satisfaction, which means that there has to be enough options available in order for consumers to fill their needs. This is as important in sharing economy forms as it is in traditional consumption forms.

(Botsman & Rogers 2010, 75). In order for example Airbnb to work, there has to be an adequate amount of apartments and rooms available for people to choose from to become satisfied. In addition to choice, critical mass plays a vital role in attracting a core group of loyal and frequent users. This is highly related to "social proof". The early users of a certain sharing economy service, provide the vital social proof for others, that this form of sharing economy is something they should get involved too. Gaining a critical mass of these early adapters is essential in order to get others to cross the psychological barrier of trying something new. This is not a new phenomenon or something that occurs only in sharing economy forms, but is rather a human primitive instinct to copy the actions of others in order to survive. However, in the case of sharing economy the role of critical mass and social proof is emphasized, since participation requires people to change their old habits and do things a bit differently. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 81–82.)

The second principle, idling capacity refers to resources that people have that are underused. For example, cars, bikes, bedrooms, tools and gardens are frequently idling. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 83). An average car in Western Europe and North America is used 8% of the time (Belk 2014, 1599) and a power drill somewhere between six and thirteen minutes in its whole lifetime (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 83). And yet, there are approximately 255.8 million cars (Statista 2015) and 50 million power drills (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 83) in the United States. When you think of for example the cost of buying a power drill, the space needed for storing it, the hassle of maintaining it and the six to thirteen minutes of using it in its lifespan, it doesn't sound very smart or cost-effective.

The unused potential of these underused assets is called idling capacity. In the core of sharing economy is finding out ways how to utilize this idling capacity. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 83). Like learned before, technological development including the rise of the Internet, social networks and devices with GPS have all played a huge role in contributing to this problem. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 83; The Economist 2015.) Without the extent to which Internet enables people to connect via social networks, participating in the sharing economy would probably be too big of a hassle compared to what it gives. Internet enables people to connect easier and more broadly than ever before and offers the fastest way to match wants and needs. (Belk 2013; Henten & Windekilde 2016; Botsman & Rogers 2010, 89.)

The third principle, belief in the commons refers to the network effects of sharing economy and is related to the critical mass principle. This becomes notably important in the digital age, where providing and gaining value from online communities with shared interests become more and more common. People become increasingly programmed to think that when you give, you get. Like how one phone without other phones is useless, similarly Airbnb with one house is useless. The more people participate in the sharing

economy services, the better the system works, the more value is gained and the bigger the network effect becomes. Fundamentally the idea relies on the fact that by providing value for the community, your own social value increases as well and every single person who participates in sharing economy creates value for others, whether they intend to or not. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 88–91.)

Last, but certainly not least, there is the fourth principle, trust between strangers. In P2P sharing individuals may encounter feelings of uncertainty, because of operating with unfamiliar people (Lampinen & Cheshire 2016), hence trust building is extremely important. In fact, trust is researched to be a principle determinant for people to actively participate in sharing economy (Möhlmann 2015; Botsman & Rogers 2010) as well as an important determinant on the satisfaction with a sharing option (Möhlmann 2015). When having trust amongst peers, members operate more responsibly. Since, lack of trust between peers may lead to opportunistic and selfish behaviour. (Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015; Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012.)

Hunt and Morgan (1994) define trust as "the confidence in an exchange partner's reliability and integrity". In traditional consuming models these exchange partners are usually the consumer and the so called middleman, who is an actor between production and consumption, such as a sales assistant, manager, broker, negotiator and distributor. This means that the consumer doesn't have to trust the producer, but only the middleman. In sharing economy, especially in the peer-to-peer models, the middleman is eliminated, and people are required to interact with each other, since exchange is often made peer-to-peer and middlemen are not supervising the trade. Therefore, trust between strangers has to exist. For example, Airbnb hosts have to trust the visitors to keep the house in a good condition and Airbnb guests have to trust that the house is what they expect and that for example the description isn't misleading.

Trust between strangers can be fostered in many ways. First of all, P2P sharing is considered as a social and communal way of sharing and research suggest that communal feeling builds trust, which concludes to responsible behaviour (Belk 2014, 8; Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012). However, in order to gain adequate amount of confidence in the exchange partner and to overcome the culturally embedded idea of not trusting strangers, P2P models often utilize some kind of a reputation system such as assurance systems, public recommendations and guarantees operated by third parties (Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015; Belk 2014; Botsman & Rogers 2010). Reputation systems enable people to get insight on the other person and their past behavior. They include usually the possibility to give information of yourself such as your interests, preferences and location as well as the possibility to give reviews of others. With the help of this kind of information, people can make an educated decision of whether they want to operate with this person and whether they trust them. In a way this reputation system then functions as a

tool for creating a more familiar and trustworthy environment. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 91–93.)

Based on the research by Lampinen & Chesire (2016) Airbnb provides guarantee for hosts in two ways: by facilitating the core transaction and by resolving conflicts between hosts and guests. By facilitating the transaction between the parties, both host and guest feel confident that the payment will be completed successfully. And additionally, the platform keeps record of all financial exchanges, which helps in resolving possible conflicts between hosts and guests. The platform becomes the middleman, to ensure and facilitate the transactions, without getting involved in the interaction unless problems occur. This is in line with, Botsman and Rogers (2010, 13) who propose that the "trusted intermediary" and secure payment systems was the determinants that made it possible to build trust between people on Airbnb.

Trusting strangers is highly related to technological development, since this kind of trust building was almost impossible before Internet age. The digital world we are living in now, makes it harder for people to free ride or abuse, since when something goes wrong, the whole community will become aware of that. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 93.) Botsman & Rogers (2010, 14) summarize the phenomenon really well by stating that "technology is re-inventing old forms of trust".

2.1.3   Peer-to-peer sharing model

Peer-to-peer (P2P) sharing is an action, where private individuals temporarily dispose and acquire assets with peers through an online network usually operated on a platform (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). The purpose is to redistribute the "idling capacity" of underused assets and offer people a chance to earn money by renting out their items that were earlier just sitting idle. This could be anything from renting rooms and houses to loaning power drills, cooking equipment and bikes. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 106.) P2P is characterized by strong user self-organization and organic growth (Rodrigues & Druschel 2010). Among P2P sharing models there are two types of participants: the providers, who share their underused assets and the users, who borrow these assets. It is also possible to participate as a both, but some people are more comfortable on only the other side of the exchange. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Botsman & Rogers 2010,70.) In this chapter P2P sharing will be examined in detail, introducing the different participants in the model as well as the nature of the model.

Engaging in consumer disposition – offering underused assets for others – can be explained by three factors: 1) individual characteristics, 2) situational factors and 3) product qualities (Paden & Stell 2005, 109–111). Research on consumer identity distinguishes two types of consumer identities; "purgers" and "packrats" (Coulter & Ligas

2003). Drivers behind temporal disposition can be understood by examining the characteristics of purgers. Purgers usually identify themselves as clean and organized and are eager to get rid of old things that are no longer being used (Coulter & Ligas 2003, 41). Whereas packrats are more likely to hold on to old belonging and store them. Disposing old items is driven also by trend consciousness and offers a way to make room for new items. Furthermore, purgers are less likely to be possessive and attached to their items, which makes temporary disposition more likely. Purgers rarely attach sentimental meanings to their belongings or feel that they are a part of their extended selves. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, 1312–1313.) There are also situational factors explaining the willingness to participate in temporary disposition. The individuals thinking of temporarily disposing, consider if the time and effort required in this high-involvement activity is worth the trouble. In other words, is P2P sharing seen better and preferable than other disposition activities. However, since P2P sharing is a fairly new model, and consumers are lacking prior experience of it, they might overestimate the efforts required in participating. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, 1313.)

Some research has been done on product qualities affecting the willingness of permanent disposition, for example people are likely to get rid of goods that are broken or in bad condition. (Albinsson & Perera, 2009, 348–349). However, it is still unclear how product quality is related to temporal disposition, which sharing is. Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015, 1322; 1317) found that some providers found it really important to only rent out goods that are in good condition, but this couldn't be generalized to all providers. Also the perceived feeling of possession and attachment affects the willingness to share. People are generally more hesitant to share their items that they feel emotionally attached to. (Belk 2010; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). This is in line with Moellers & Wittkowskis (2010, 185) findings where they found that people who attach importance to their possession were relatively reluctant to participate in non-ownership models. Also Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015, 1318) found that the providers would not want to share their items that were important or private to them such as laptops or iPads. Sharing important or private products involved concerns like "someone messing up with the settings" or "someone finding out something embarrassing." These worries were highly related to the individual's level of risk aversion, since the fundamental statement was that the providers did not want to share anything that they were not willing to risk, whether it was an economical, a functional or an emotional risk. As far as product attributes goes, both providers and users have preferences. Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) found that both providers and renters prefer the item to be a pricey, high-involvement item. For the users this was for example due to the desire to try out costly products before making own purchase decision about them. For the provider this was due to economical benefits, since they could profit more when renting costly items.

However, both participants also preferred to share unbreakable and durable items, that were less likely to brake in use.

The other actor participating in the P2P sharing is the user, who temporally acquires the good. Consumers who participate in the P2P as users are driven by multiple factors. As presented before todays consumers prefer to get access to goods and pay for the experience of temporally accessing them instead of buying or owning them (Bardhi and Eckhart 2012). How we think about possessing is changing and this drives consumers in participating in the sharing economy as users. (Belk 2014). Hamari, Sjöklint & Ukkonen (2015) propose that participation in the sharing economy is motivated by factors such as sustainability, enjoyment, reputation and economic benefits. Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) also find that participating is motivated by economical benefits, however they emphasize the desire for community, political consumerism and recreation.

The P2P market sector is estimated to be worth $26 billion and is expected to grow during the next years (Botsman & Rogers 2010). In order for consumers to continue sharing as well as new consumers to start sharing, people need to become comfortable with sharing their possessions, which means sharing has to be convenient, secure and more cost-effective than owning. Many P2P sites offer convenience, since they gather the people together on a platform, so that offerings and needs can meet in an efficient and easy manner. This provides people with choice and accessibility, which is important since people often require to have the certainty that they get things when they need them. Another hurdle, that has to be overcome, is security. Most P2P platforms use different kind of systems to secure transactions. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 107–108.) For example, Airbnb provides a secure platform in multiple ways: all participants confirm their identity by using an official ID card, Airbnb operates a secure payment between parties and also Airbnb hosts are protected with a guarantee up to 800,00€ (Airbnb, Trust). In addition, feeling of security is fostered by review and rating tools, which helps the community to evaluate who can be trusted (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 108). The last burden to overcome is that sharing has to be more cost-efficient than owning. Renting something is more cheap than buying it. However, if renting is found difficult and inconvenient, the cost-utility relation is not satisfying. Usually though, by participating in sharing, consumers get access to more product variety, with lower cost and without the burden of ownership, which includes for example, maintaining, storing and risk of product obsolescence. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, 1313). In this sense, ownership becomes a burden and sharing becomes an advantage.

There are quite inclusive results that participating explicitly in P2P models is highly driven by social and communal factors. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, Belk 2014). Botsman & Roger (2010 tsekkaa) suggest that people are more motivated by social factors and desire to interact with each other. Research also suggest that communal feeling builds trust, which concludes to responsible behaviour

(Belk 2014, 8; Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012). Trust plays a significant role in the choice to participate in the sharing economy as well as with the satisfaction with a sharing option. In addition to trust, there are multiple factors that determine whether a person desires to participate or not. In the next chapter we will delve into the motivational factors behind participating in P2P sharing models, in order to understand how P2P sharing operates and why it is so successful.

2.2   Motivation theories and motives behind sharing

According to Ryan and Deci (2000, 54) "to be motivated means to be moved to do something". Therefore, a person who feels energetic and active towards a goal is regarded as motivated and a person who feels no push or stimulation to do something is regarded as unmotivated. However, motivation is a quite scattered phenomenon and not as simple as that. Not only does the amount of motivation vary, but also the type of motivation. Hence, the level as well as the orientation of motivation fluctuates amongst people and situations. The orientation of motivation regards the reason and goals behind an action. It answers the question "why is someone doing something". (Ryan & Deci 2000, 54–55.) A student may be studying because of the interest towards the topic, or because studying a certain field will result in a good career and all the privileges this may offer. The amount of motivation may be the same in both cases, just the orientation of the motivation differs. The Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci 1985) distinguishes two different types of orientations of motivation: extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. This sorting is rather common in understanding different motivations (Hamari et. al 2015; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015; Lampinen & Chesire 2016). Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because of its inherent satisfaction and enjoyment. Whereas, extrinsic motivation refers to doing something, because it leads to a desired separable consequence, such as reputation or monetary gain. An individual motivated extrinsically acts in order to gain its instrumental value where as intrinsically motivated acts in order to enjoy the act itself. (Ryan & Deci 2000, 56–60.) In the example presented before, the person studying because of the interest towards the topic in concerned as intrinsically motivated, whereas the person studying in order to gain a career and other benefits is seen extrinsically motivated.

In addition to the Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci 1985), Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow 1943) is probably one of the most famous motivation theories. In the hierarchy, Maslow presents five different levels of needs, where the lower level of needs has to be fulfilled before the higher ones can be articulated. In the hierarchy, physiological needs are placed at the bottom, followed by safety, then love and belonging, esteem and at the top is self-actualization. Since, this is a well-established and sup-

ported theory in understanding human motivation and the drivers between activity, it is essential in understanding the participation in the sharing economy, especially in P2P forms, which offer a way to satisfy needs from the bottom to the top (Bellotti, Ambard, Turner, Gossmann, Demkova & Carroll 2015).

Previous research on motivation to participate in the sharing economy has been presented. (Hamari et al 2015; Möhlmann 2015; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). However, there is still a lack of understanding why consumers desire to participate (Hamari et al). Firstly, because research has mainly focused in exploring motives as isolated determinants, rather than evaluating them and their relative strengths holistically. For example, research by Lampinen & Chesire (2016) shows that different motives does not necessarily crowd out each other, but rather may strengthen each other. Therefore, it is highly important to understand the holistic manner of the motives that arise. Secondly, previous research does not necessarily distinguish between different sharing forms, such as P2P and B2P. And as we learned before for example in the case of Zipcar, motives may vary quite a lot when operating with a business or when operating with a person (Möhlmann 2015) Therefore, it is important to limit the research in one form of sharing and that is why this research focuses on exploring P2P sharing.

As discussed earlier sharing economy is driven by numerous factors, such as changes in the society, technological development and new ways for building a sense of community. In addition to these societal sharing economy drivers, consumers are driven by various motives, both intrinsic and extrinsic, in participating in P2P sharing models (Hamari et. al 2015; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015; Lampinen & Chesire 2016). Extrinsic motivation such as gaining personal financial benefits is often emphasized when talking about sharing economy participation. However, intrinsic motivation such as sustainability or social motives are as important and should be discussed in the same extent as extrinsic motivation. Some authors propose that sharing economy platform providers as well as the media focus too much in promoting the extrinsic benefits and neglect the intrinsic benefits involved. Undeniably of course, sharing economy does provide financial savings and this may be an important driver for many consumers. Yet additionally, it is important to recognize the various intrinsic motivations involved in sharing economy. (Makwana 2013)

Based on earlier research, the following motives will be discussed in the next chapters in detail: financial benefits, sustainability, experience and trend -orientation and social motives (Möhlmann 2015, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015; Lampinen & Chesire 2016; Moeller & Wittkowski 2010; Hamari et. al 2015). These motives have been researched and explored in the P2P context, hence they are suitable for this study. c

2.2.1 Financial benefits

Generally speaking, price is seen as one of the most powerful marketing tools and it has a significant influence on consumer behaviour (Han, Gupta & Lehmann 2001). This holds true on traditional markets as well as in sharing economy models. Many P2P sharing platforms strive to motivate participants by allowing them to monetize their resources (Lampinen & Chesire 2016). Financial benefits are often seen as an essential motivator participating in sharing activities (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Hamari et al 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015). Participation in sharing activities can be seen as rational utility maximizing behavior, where benefits of sharing are seen greater than the costs involved (Lamberton & Rose 2012). Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) found that providers and users mainly participated in P2P sharing for economic reasons, in order to maximize profit and savings. Monetary incentives were emphasized as the primary motivation for participating in P2P sharing for nearly all participants in their research.

Sharing is seen as frugal behavior, since both parties gain economic benefit of the transaction: Providers earn money for sharing their underused assets and meanwhile users pay less when renting a product rather than buying it themselves from the traditional market (The Economist 2015). Study suggests that, 86% of Americans who are familiar with sharing economy agree it makes life more affordable (PwC 2015). Hamari et. al (2015) found a significant positive influence of anticipated gain of economical benefits on the intention to participate in sharing. Also, Möhlmann (2015, 199) found that cost savings has a significant positive influence on the satisfaction of the sharing option. In contrary to what they expected Moeller and Wittkowski (2010) found no significant positive influence of price consciousness on a consumer's preference for non-ownership models. They explain it by proposing that some respondents in their research perceived renting as being more expensive than buying at least in the long-term.

Lampinen and Chesire (2016) found that for hosts on AirBnb, earning money is a motivator, but it is seldom the only reason to participate. Many of the participants saw hosting as a way to gain increased income and helped them to pay for example their rent or mortgage. For some participants hosting was a way to finance greater things as well like education or medical bills. However, gaining profit and making ends meet was not seen as the sole reason to participate for all participants. Some of the participants stated that gaining money was not important at all, but they were still happy to gain some extra income by hosting.

2.2.2   Social benefits

The core of intrinsic motivation is the enjoyment gained of an action. Hamari et. al (2015) found that perceived enjoyment affected both attitudes towards sharing as well as behavioral intention to participate in the sharing. It is suggested that participating in P2P sharing models is highly motivated by social factors (Botsman & Rogers 2010, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Belk 2014). In fact, 78% of American adults who are familiar with sharing economy, believe that it builds a stronger community. Hars & Ou (2002) discuss "community identification" as an internal motivation for participation and suggest that it is related to Maslow's needs for belonging and love. Many sharing economy businesses satisfy the needs on lower parts of Maslow's pyramid like physiological and safety needs but also play an important role in satisfying the higher levels of needs, like belonging, love and esteem. This is due to the shift from "me" brands of hyper-consumerism to "we"-based brands of sharing economy. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 199). For example, in the case of Airbnb, the image of warm and authentic community has been vital to engage both users and providers in the network. One key to their popularity was the successful establishment of trust in the marketplace, through engagement and a sense of community. (Oskam & Boswijk 2016, 27.)

Sharing is seen as a communal act that brings people together and creates feelings of bonding, solidarity and trust (Belk 2010, 717). Bardhi & Eckhardt (2012) propose that participating in self-regulating communities like P2P sharing models is a more social type of collaboration than B2P sharing models, due to the fact that consumers feel more responsible for the community and its members when interaction happens peer to peer. Whereas, in the case of Zipcar, a B2P car sharing system, Bardhi & Eckhard (2012) found a lack of care. Zipcar is an example of a sharing model where the business provides the shared items and customers interact with the company and not with each other. In the case of Zipcar, efforts to adopt a sense of mutual identity and brand community was fundamentally failed. Members did not want to meet each other and they operated mainly from selfish, rational and individualistic motivations rather than altruism, sustainable or collective motivations. Members preferred to have a governance system for example to penalize members who returned cars late or dirty, because they did not trust other members to behave responsibly. Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) suggest that shared products are taken better care of in P2P models than in B2P models due to the social nature of the transaction. When the user and provider meet face-to-face, even though initial contact might have been online, users feel more responsible of the rented item and want to take good care of it. Consequently, trust plays a major role between the community members (Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015). When having trust amongst peers, members operate more responsibly and they do not necessarily see the

need for a governance system. Where as the lack of trust, may call for a regulation or governance system. (Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015; Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012.)

Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) found that some participants in sharing economy highlighted the importance of social connections. Where they saw participating in P2P sharing models as a way to connect socially and get to know new people. Also, Ikkala & Lampinen (2015, 1034) found that in the case of AirBnb even though earning money is seen as an important motivator for hosts, the social factors play a central role in sustaining the motivation to keep participating. Hosts described participating being a good way to gain enjoyable moments with new, interesting and unfamiliar people from all over the world. Hosts often saw the possibility to make profit as supplementary to the social motives for being a host. However, even though people are motivated to meet new people, it was found that people tend to want to share their apartment to people who are similar to them and share the same interests. For example, some age, ethnic and racial discrimination was found to take place and many respondents stressed the importance of being able to choose who to host by looking at people's profiles. (Ikkala & Lampinen 2015)

Multiple previous studies show that reputation is an important external motivational influence determining participation in online communities and collaborative activities Especially, people feel it is important to gain reputation amongst like-minded people. (Hamari et al 2015, 6.) Regarding to a study by Hars & Ou (2001) self-marketing and reputation building are important motivators in collaborating online. Like stated earlier, some consumers represent their choice of mode of consumption – access vs ownership – in order to promote their ideological interests. Participating in the sharing economy rather than traditional consuming economy, can be motivated by the desire to promote other consumers the consumption choice that the individual has done. (Barhi & Eckhart 2012.) This is in line with, Botsman & Rogers (2010, 201–202) who suggest that people want to announce their participation in sharing activities to others. People want to tell people that they were staying in an Airbnb over their weekend holiday in order to boost their reputation amongst like-minded people.

Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015, 1325) found that some providers saw sharing as a channel for altruistic behaviour. Also, Lampinen & Chesire (2016) found that AirBnb hosts were motivated by the gratification of being a good host. Being able to offer guests some additional convenience or surprises was told to be very rewarding. Hosts also felt it to be very gratifying to be able to give local expertise such as giving tips and maps. In cases where hosts could not meet guests face-to-face, the hosts still described a need to make an effort in order for the guests to enjoy their stay. Hosts described to be incredibly grateful if they had received a handwritten note that had acknowledged their efforts. These notes were described to be very meaningful and even one of the most rewarding aspects of hosting, since it created a sense of warmth and connectedness.

(Ikkala & Lampinen 2015.) In addition, the gratification of seeing their underused assets used and enjoyed, was working as a motivator to share products. Providers mentioned for example, that it was a pleasure to make better use of their possessions rather than having to necessarily getting rid of them completely. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015, 1317)

2.2.3 *Experience and trend -orientation*

Sharing economy has become a tempting consumption option to feed consumers' increasing desire for experiences (Pine & Gilmore 1998). In the core of experience-oriented consumption is the seeking for entertainment and enjoyment. Hamari et. al (2015) suggest that feeling enjoyment plays an important role in sharing and that some people participate in sharing purely for the fun of it and for having meaningful interaction with other people. It is found that 67% of Americans who are familiar with sharing economy perceive sharing more fun than engaging with a traditional company (PwC 2015). Also, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) found that sharing was regarded appealing, because it enables a short-term experience with trying out unique and novel products. Users for example found it desirable to be able to rent temporarily unique products such as an ice-cream machine or a chocolate fountain. By participating in sharing, consumers can also experience a bigger selection of products without the burdens of ownership. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015.)

These findings differ from Moeller and Wittkowski (2010), who found rather unexpectedly that experience orientation did not have a positive influence on the preference for renting. However, they suggested three possible explanations for this result. Firstly, experience-oriented consumers may not be able to let go and enjoy in the same extent with rented items, due to the penalties that may occur if the item is damaged. These kind of limitations can constrain and decrease the experience of the consumption. Secondly, because renting has traditionally been associated with more utilitarian and functional products, some people may not be able to associate it with hedonic products that offer enjoyment and excitement and therefore sharing is not seen as experience-oriented consuming. Thirdly, they suggest that the fact that short-term rental can be a very exciting experience, is not marketed well enough on behalf of the rental providers and is therefore not regarded as an experience benefit. Moeller and Wittkowski (2010, 186.)

Trend orientation is somewhat linked to experience orientation. Trend orientation refers to the desire of consumers to get access to novel and trendy products. Therefore, consumers with a high level of trend orientations are more keen to consume fashionable products. Moeller & Wittkowski (2010) found that trend orientation has a positive influence on non-ownership preference in a P2P online sharing network. This suggests

that consumers who seek to consumer trendy and fashionable items were more likely to share products than own them. However, Möhlmann (2015) found no significant effect of trend orientation on either satisfaction with a sharing option or likelihood of choosing a sharing option again. The research was conducted both in B2P and P2P contexts and neither of them showed any results of trend orientation affecting sharing activities. All of these studies presented above, measured trend orientation according to the latter trend interpretation, which means desire for trendy and novel products. However, it is also highly interesting to explore in what extent is participating motivated by the desire to be a part of the sharing economy, because it is trendy itself.

2.2.4 *Sustainability*

The negative consequences of modern consumerism, industrial mass-production and hyper consumption have for a long time been ignored (Botsman & Rogers 2010; Shah 2005). Research suggests that since the early 1970s human consumption has been exceeding the Earths actual resource capacity and this is due to two factors: global growth in population and the high increase of consumption around the world (Oltermann 2016). Due to the high increase of consumption people are producing more waste (Shah 2005; Howard 2015) and storing more stuff than ever before (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 12). And as Botsman & Rogers (2010) state: trash and storage are just two different results of the same problem.

Big part of the environmental problem is that a lot of the behaviors, which have a negative impact on the environment, have become habitual and deeply embedded in our cultures. Consumers are not always aware of the environmental impact of their actions, since the consumption patterns have become so big part of their lives. Some psychologists refer to this as the "lock-in", since some routines, norms and habits may "lock" people in behaving in an unsustainable manner. Since the behaviors might be so deeply embedded, changing them may require cultural as well as economical renovations. (Botsman & Rogers 2010, 5–6; Shah 2005.) However, the way people think about the environment and sustainable living are changing gradually. Concerns over environmental issues are increasing and people are becoming more conscious of how their actions affect the environment. Alternative consumption forms such as sharing economy are surfacing and meanwhile skepticism towards modern consumerism and hyper consumption is increasing (Möhlmann 2015).

Participation in sharing economy is commonly seen as highly sustainable (Hamari et al 2015). 76% of American adults who are familiar with the sharing economy agree that it is better for the environment than traditional consuming (PwC 2015). Since sharing enables both temporary access to a good as well as multiple users during its lifespan,

sharing has an influence on the quantity of products that are purchased and produced. While the decrease of production is often associated with less environmental damage, it can be noted that sharing goods is characterized as an environmentally friendly way of consumption. (Moeller & Wittkowski, 2010.) The positive environmental effects of sharing economy are substantial. The British Waste & Resources Action Programme (Wrap) propose that overcoming the obsession towards ownership could play a vital role fighting against climate change. Furthermore, their study suggests that if households in Britain would shift a fifth of spending from purchasing to renting, they could cut emissions by about 2 percent which equals 13 million tons of CO2 a year. (The Times 2009)

Sustainability is seen as a motivation that is linked to a person's ideology and norms (Hamari et al 2015). Philip et. al (2015) found that most users participating in a P2P platform used it as a form of political consumerism and found it as a more sustainable option than the traditional way of consumption. Users considered P2P sharing to be far more efficient, ecologically friendly and responsible in the long run. Users also desired to move away from materialism and overconsumption by using P2P models. These findings are in line with Bardhi & Eckharts (2012) argument that some consumers represent their choice of mode of consumption – access vs ownership – in order to promote their ideological interests. Participating in the sharing economy rather than traditional consuming economy, can be motivated by the desire to introduce others a more environmentally sustainable or anti-market consumption alternative. Contrary to majority of study results, Möhlman (2015) did not find any affect of sustainability on the satisfaction with a sharing option or on the likelihood of choosing a sharing option again. And neither did Moeller & Wittkowski (2010, 186), who found no positive influence of environmentalism on a consumer's preference for non-ownership. These results may vary for example due to the different natures of P2P sharing services

2.2.5   *Crowding out*

Examining the extrinsic and intrinsic motivations is highly interesting due to the "crowding-out" phenomenon, where extrinsic motivations begin to dominate the initial intrinsic motivations. This means that people may have started participating in the sharing economy due to intrinsic reasons for example for the fun of it or because it is a sustainable way of consuming, but their motivations are shifting towards extrinsic ones for example gaining profit. (Hamari et al 2015, 10.) This is for example the case of AirBnb in some cities, where providers started renting their houses purely for economical reasons, even though the original idea of Airbnb was to build a sharing community for renting houses when they were not used by the owner. Due to the shift to extrinsic mo-

tivations, many cities had to start regulating Airbnb renting. (The Guardian 2015.) However, according to Lampinen and Chesire (2016) the economical motivations of hosting on AirBnb does not necessarily crowd out the intrinsic motivations, but rather can enable further social exchange and interaction between peers.

Yet in the case of crowding-out Hamari et. al (2015, 10) propose that there are two ways to avoid the economical motivations becoming the dominant factor for participating. Either the intrinsic motivations need to be increased or the extrinsic motivations need to be restricted. Increasing the intrinsic motivations such as enjoyment means trying to make the sharing more enjoyable and communal in order to create a fun experience that enhances the intrinsic motivations. The other alternative is to limit the extrinsic motivations with different kind of governance systems. Crowding-out is seen generally as a negative motivational phenomenon. However, high utilitarian motives can also work in favor of disposing possessions and therefore encouraging to participate in the sharing economy. Pure utilitarian and economical motivations does not need to be seen generally as negative, since it could be the case that different motivations in participating can end up in mutually beneficial outcomes. (Hamari et. al 2015, 10.)

2.3 Meanings and drivers behind participation behaviour

To understand why people are participating in sharing economy, it is essential to understand some behavior drivers that take part. First of all, the benefit that people gain from certain kind of behavior act as a driver. Since it is generally agreed that consumers seek products that offer the greatest amount of benefit with the lowest cost possible. (Lamberton & Rose 2012), it is important to identify the gained benefits as well as the costs required for an action. Another factor affecting consumer behavior is the values that a person has. Values influence behavior, since people want to act in a way that they find valuable and that benefits them most. These two behaviors will be examined next, starting with the cost-utility relation and followed by value drivers.

2.3.1 Costs-utility relation of sharing

Lamberton & Rose (2012) use the idea of cost-benefit relation as a criterion in understanding consumers' tendency to share. They propose that while costs of sharing are minimized and utility is maximized compared to ownership, the tendency to choose a sharing option will increase. However, it needs to be further explored which specific costs and benefits affect the tendency in choosing sharing.

There are various types of costs that affect the perceptions of overall utility of sharing. Like learned before, transaction cost doesn't only refer to the financial cost of a product, but also the energy used and the hassle required in getting it (Botsman & Rogers 2010). Internet has played a vital role in decreasing transaction costs in sharing, however, still various costs do exist. Lamberton & Rose (2012) identify three kind of costs: "price of sharing", "technological costs" and "search costs". The "price of sharing" refers to the monetary fee that is paid either one-time or periodically, depending on the sharing system. "Technological costs" encompasses the nonmonetary costs related to the hassle of getting to know a new product and learning how to use it. In ownership this is most likely a one-time cost, since people have to learn how to use the product once. However, with shared products "technological costs" may occur multiple times, because customers may have to operate with unfamiliar time and again. "Search costs" arise from the money and effort required to search products and sharing options as well as making the purchase decision.

Especially in P2P sharing models participants have a very active role in creating value. Therefore, in P2P sharing both users and and providers are required to be highly involved as well as responsible of the efforts of co-creation. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine (2015) found that the high-involvement that sharing demands, is seen as a major deterrent for participants and this could be seen as a cost of sharing. Providers need to for example take photos, post them, write a description, determine a price, response for any inquiries and also set up a meeting with the user for drop-off of keys or the product as well as pick-up. On the other hand, high-involvement is also required on the user side. Users need to search and request what they want, contact the provider and agree on a time and place for pickup and drop-off, pay the transaction, return the rented item in the same state it was and usually give feedback for the provider after the transaction. However, this perceived cost and inconvenience was generally related to "smaller ticket items". Therefore, if the item was worthy enough, high-involvement wasn't seen as insurmountable cost.

In addition to the benefits that arise from the motivations presented in this study: sustainability, financial motives, experience and social motives some other benefits are identified as well. Lamberton & Rose (2012) identify five different sources of utility which are "transaction utility", "sources of utility related to flexibility", "storage utility", "anti-industry utility", "social utility" and "moral utility" related to sustainability. "Transaction utility" refers simply to the perceived value gained from making the deal. The "sources of utility related to flexibility" refers to the amount of experienced flexibility with the system. Flexibility refers to for example good availability and convenience of the product as well as the absence of restrictions concerning the product. (Lamberton & Rose 2012, 111.) For example, in a peer-to-peer sharing marketplace, there has to be enough products available and in many locations in order for people to gain

high flexibility utility. Storing is recognized as one of the burdens of ownership (Botsman & Rogers 2010, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015). Therefore, "storage utility" is seen as an advantage of sharing, which refers to the benefit of not having to store items yourself (Lamberton & Rose 2012, 111). For example, the power drill that is used approximately 6 to 10 minutes on its lifespan, is taking up space in a storage rest of the time. Whereas, when renting it in the first place instead of buying it, no storage would have been needed. The "anti-industry utility" refers to a psychological benefit, where people feel gratified when not supporting the traditional ownership market. This is derived for example by the raising negative thoughts towards hyper-consumption and unsustainable consumption. (Lamberton & Rose 2012, 111;…) In a sense, people gain emotional value by being able to penalize the the traditional ownership market that promotes unsustainable use of products and idle capacities. The "social utility" indicates the possible gains that people may gain in the form of approval in the specific group of people, in this case in the sharing community. People find it important to gain reputation amongst like-minded people, (Hamari et al 2015, 6) therefore, if the approval is gained inside the reference group, people feel gratified. (Lamberton & Rose 2012, 111). For example, by using a car sharing service, people may seek for social approval from others that they are consuming sustainably. The final source of utility is the "moral utility", which refers to consumer's interest towards environmentally friendly and prosocial options. Therefore, by using sharing options some consumers gain utility of the feeling that they are protecting the environment and reducing waste.

In contrast with Philip et. al (2015) findings of inconvenience due to high involvement, Moeller & Wittkowski (2010) found that sharing can be seen as a convenient form of consumption and therefore highly beneficial behavior. Their findings suggest that convenience orientation has a positive influence on non-ownership preference and therefore supports the proposal that convenience-oriented consumers are more like to take part in the sharing economy. In addition, it is found that, 83% of Americans who are familiar with sharing economy, believe that sharing makes life more convenient and efficient (PwC 2015). Morganosky (1986) defines a convenience-oriented consumer as someone who seeks to "accomplish a task in the shortest time with the least expenditure of human energy". In the context of sharing economy, convenience orientation is related to the desire to save time and energy when consuming (Moeller & Wittkowski 2010). Taking part in sharing economy can be highly convenient while it enables the access to desired goods without the burdens of ownership. These burdens can be for example the maintaining of products, the risk of products getting old as well as having to store all the items. (Moeller & Wittkowski 2010; Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015).

2.3.2   *Values drive sharing behavior*

Values refer to conceptions of a desirable end result, that influence peoples action selections and event evaluation (Schwartz & Bilsky 1987). People tend to refer to their own values or to other peoples values in order to characterize themselves or other people and groups. Values affect the attitude and behavior of consumers as well as their decision making styles. Therefore, values can explain the consumer's attitude towards a purchase decision and act as a driver of action. (Yilmaz, Gungordu & Yumusak 2016.) This is highly important in the context of sharing economy, since consumer values may define if they want to choose this kind of consuming option or not.

List of Values (LOV) is a scale introduced by Kahle (1983) and is based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) among other theories. The scale includes the following nine values: self-respect, security, warm relationships with others, sense of accomplishment, self-fulfillment, sense of belonging, being well respected, fun and enjoyment in life, and excitement. Kahle, Beatty & Homer (1986) suggests that these values can be used to classify people and determine people's different desires and values in life. Kahle et al (1986) proposes for example, that people who value sense of accomplishment have high incomes, people who value sense of belonging enjoy group activities and people who value warm relationship with others have many friends and often offer gifts for no special occasion. According to Kahle et al (1986) these values can be classified as external values or as internal values. Where external values are sense of belonging, being well respected and security and internal values are warm relationship with others, sense of accomplishment, fun and enjoyment in life, self-respect, self-fulfillment and excitement. Similar to the extrinsic and intrinsic motivations learned before, the classification of values is determined by its orientation.

Consumer values are linked to their social identities as well as their personal identities (Oyserman 2009). Social identity constructs of different components. The membership component refers to the awareness of being part of a group or becoming part of a certain group. The beliefs component consists of the beliefs that the group has of its place in the world. This includes things such as how members of the group act, what their values are and what they believe in. The readiness component refers to acting in a way that is congruent with the beliefs of the group. (Oyserman 2009.)

Values are also linked to the personal identity. Similar to social identity, personal identity consists of three components: membership, beliefs and readiness. Membership component refers to the goal of becoming a desired person or avoiding becoming an undesired person. Beliefs components consist of the norms, values, goals and strategies that demonstrates the desired and undesired identities. Readiness component refers to the readiness to act in a way that is congruent with the desired identity. (Oyserman 2009.)

This demonstrates that consumer behavior can be influenced by appealing to identity-congruent values. (Oyserman 2009). Bellotti et. al (2015) found that in sharing economy platforms people prefer to interact with people who share the same values. Ikkala and Lampinen (2015, 1042) propose that even though people who participate in Airbnb want to meet new people from other cultures, they are also selective of which people to engage with, often preferring to host people who are in some ways similar to them. Also users explained that they participate in the sharing economy service, because they feel that it matches their values. Generally, people seek to be a part of an activity that matches their values in order to build their social identity.

Due to the economic crisis as well as other factors consumers are reconsidering their values and spending habits. Values such as frugality, convenience, freedom and flexibility are emerging and making sharing a very tempting consumption alternative. (Bardhi & Eckhardt 2012, 883; 891.) Like mentioned before, sharing can be seen as a sustainable consuming (PwC 2015; The Times 2009) and this may act as a motivator for some people (Hamari et al 2015). Research suggests that sharing economy attracts especially environmentally and ecologically conscious consumers (Hamari et. al. 2015), because it enables them to live a more environmental friendly lifestyle that is consistent with their values (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 1325). This would indicate that consumers whose behaviour is driven by sustainable values would more likely take part in sharing.

Therefore, it is important for the P2P system providers to recognize their users' values and beliefs. This way it is possible promote identity congruent personal standards that consumers can accomplish by using the sharing economy service (Bellotti et, al 2015). For example, as many consumers perceive sharing as sustainable and in line with their values, system providers should promote the environmental benefits involved to engage new users. (Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 1325). And like discussed earlier, many sharing economy service providers promote the extrinsic benefits such as financial profits and leave out all the intrinsic benefits gained like sustainability. However, it is important to recognize the various intrinsic benefits, since according to many studies promoting intrinsic values will in the long run encourage far more likely to pursue a sustainable lifestyle than when focusing on talking about the extrinsic values like financial benefits. (Makwana 2013.) For example, on the Airbnb platform the financial benefits for hosts are clearly promoted. "Earn money buy being a host" states on the front-page, when registering as a host. However, the front page for user's state "live like a local" (Airbnb 2016). These both slogans promote certain kind of values and if the users and hosts relate to the ideology behind these statements, they will most likely participate. However, for both parties there are various different kind of motives and drivers behind their behavior, which could also be taken into account. These motives and drivers will be examined in the empirical findings of this research.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research strategy

Since the purpose of this research is to get a holistic understanding of the motives, benefits and meanings of sharing rather than examine isolated motives separately, this research is qualitative by nature. Qualitative research methods enable to get a holistic understanding of an issue. Moreover, qualitative research understands that reality is socially constructed and created and interpreted through embedded cultural meanings (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 5). Also, since the previous study of sharing economy motivation is rather limited, qualitative research suits this study well. According to Eriksson & Kovalainen (2008, 6), qualitative research is especially relevant when previous understanding of the phenomenon is modest and problems are rather unstructured, since qualitative research tends to be more flexible and exploratory in nature.

According to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2009, 324) qualitative research methods are most suitable, when the aim of the research is to understand motives for the decision that the participants have taken or to understand the meanings of their attitudes and opinions. Moreover, qualitative approaches are interested in interpretation and understanding (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 5). These qualities make qualitative research methods suitable for this study, since the aim is to understand the beliefs and attitudes behind sharing and these can be explored most carefully through respondent's perceptions and experiences on sharing participation.

In a qualitative research, the research process is seldom very straightforward and linear. Instead, realistically the research process is more circular, which means that it is often necessary to move back and fourth between different phases of the research. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 32.) Compared to a quantitative study, where modelling, mutual correlation and causality of variables are preset, qualitative study strives for constant circularity where empirical analysis is linked to more flexible and unstructured theories. Related to the circularity, qualitative study is characterized with process of reflexivity. This refers to reflecting the research process as a whole and relating each step of the research to the previous ones, as due to the circularity they are not predetermined or linear as in a quantitative research. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 32–33.)

Qualitative study is characterized by interpretivism and constructionism and a concern over subjective and shared meanings. The philosophical base of these ideas arise from hermeneutics and from phenomelonogy, which encompasses the ideas of social construction of reality. Therefore, a qualitative study is interested in how people, individually or in groups, interpret and understand social events and situations. Moreover, qualitative study has a focus on human action and consequently, understanding and in-

terpretation is an essential part of any qualitative analysis. As this research focuses in understanding human action in a sharing context, this research method is the most suitable. Also qualitative methods can provide the most holistic and in-depth description of the studied problem.

3.2   Introducing Case Airbnb

What makes case study a highly considerable choice of research is its ability to present complex and hard-to-grasp issues in a handy, rich, personal and practical manner. The focus of case study is to produce detailed and holistic knowledge, based on analyzing various empirical sources in a context. Generally, the aim of case study is not to offer a very simplistic research design, but rather leave room for diversity and complexity. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 116–117.) Yin (2003, 9) proposes that case study is a relevant research approach when (1) a "how" or "why" question is being asked, (2) the researcher has little or no control over events and (3) when the focus is on a current phenomenon. Since all these qualities apply to the researched subject in this study, case study is a relevant research approach.

Case study research has encountered also some criticism, mostly relating to lack of rigour, problems in terms of scientific generalization and too long-lasting research process that results in too extensive data (Yin 2003, 11). However, when being aware of these hurdles, is is easier to overcome them. Firstly, following systematic procedures and being aware of existing biases, the researcher can operate in a more rigorous manner. Also, as far as concerns over scientific generalization goes, case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to universal truths. The aim of a case study is analytical generalization, which expands and generalizes theories rather than statistical generalization, which counts frequencies. (Yin 2003, 11.) In this research Airbnb platform is presented and explored in order to expand the theoretical propositions within peer-to-peer sharing literature. The third hurdle of long-lasting and extensive research process, can be prevented by careful planning and data organizing.

When choosing the case for this research, the Finnish P2P sharing economy services market was researched. Airbnb was considered the most relevant due to its extensive user base in Finland. Other P2P sharing services have maintained quite low-key and have not gained any or as extensive usage in Finland as they have elsewhere in Europe or in the United States. However, like mentioned Airbnb is used actively in Finland and therefore, it is suitable to be the focus of this research. In only Helsinki, Airbnb has encountered major growth, as the amount of rented apartments increased to 2 100 apartments in the year 2015, which indicates a 71% growth (Koivisto 2016). Airbnb is defined as a collective peer-to-peer marketplace that aims to connect people's needs and to

provide a unique accommodation experience all over the world. The idea for this sharing based community was created when two designers accommodated some travelers, who were in the need of a place to stay and as a result Airbnb was founded in 2008. Today, apartments are rented through Airbnb in over 34 000 cities and 191 countries. (AirBnb, About Us.)

What makes Airbnb also an interesting subject for examination, is the fact that the peer-to-peer-accommodation sector has facilitated transactions of total of €15billion in 2015, covering over half of the total commerce generated across all five sharing sectors in Europe (PwC 2016). This indicates that the peer-to-peer accommodation sector, which Airbnb belongs to, has encountered major growth and also, is expected to increase in the following years. The same report also states that the European region now encompasses more than half of Airbnb's global property listings, which points out that Europe has become a very important market for this American rooted sharing platform.

3.3   Data collection

The data collection process in conducted in line with the research strategy and the theoretical framework of the research (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 48). Qualitative research offers various alternatives for data collection from interviews to observation to more creative methods such as requesting participants to draw or write. Within academic research interviews have gained an overwhelming popularity (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 78–79, 125) and is considered as the most used method of data collection in Finland (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 86). This research follows this trend and data is collected by semi-structured interviews. There are three types of typologies of interview studies: positivist, emotionalist and constructionist, that focus on different kind of research questions. This study approaches an emotionalist interview research, where interviews are considered as a way to understand participant's authentic experiences. Here the focus of questions is on people's perceptions, conceptions, understanding and viewpoints rather than on information. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 80.) Eskola & Suoranta (1998, 86) indicate that the idea of an interview is really simple and smart: When we want to know something about a person – what he or she thinks, what kind of motives he or she has – why wouldn't we just ask them directly? This definition of an interview hereby encapsulates the reason why this method is chosen for this research.

In a semi structured interview, the themes and topics that are wished to be discussed are prepared, but room for variation is left. For example, the wording and order of questions can vary. Also presenting additional questions might be necessary depending on the nature of the particular interview in order to get a deeper understanding of the issue (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2008, 320). Due to the circularity and flexibility of quali-

tative methods as well as the conversational nature of semi structured interviews, these kind of customizations are acceptable and even encouraged (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 33, 80–82). In this research, the themes for the semi-structured interviews were predetermined according to the sub research questions and the background literature. The following four themes were determined to be discussed due to their significance in answering the research problem: 1. Use of the service and concept of sharing economy, 2. Motivation towards the service 3. Sharing economy and the benefits gained and 4. Sharing economy and values. The themes according to the research problem and sub research question is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1   Operationalization table

Research problem	Sub research questions	Background literature	Interview themes
To examine the motives behind sharing economy participation	What kind of motives exist in peer-to-peer sharing participation and how are they emphasized?	Defining sharing economy (2.1) Motives behind sharing (2.2)	Theme 1: Use of the service and concept of sharing economy
			Theme 2: Motivation towards the service
	What kind of other meanings are related to sharing?	Cost-Utility relation (2.3.1) Value driven behavior (2.3.2)	Theme 3: Cost-utility relation of the service
			Theme 4: Values behind service use

Table 1 aims to demonstrate how the research problem, the background literature and the empirical research are linked. The first sub question is divided in to two interview themes, that are based on previous literature presented in chapters 2.1 and 2.2. The second sub questions is also divided in to two interview themes, that are based on literature presented in chapter 2.3. The translated interview themes and questions can be seen in Appendix 1.

Semi-structured interviews and interviews in general concern a lot of interpretation. The results from the interview are products of the interpretations and understandings of social events and settings of the respondents, since according to social constructionist view reality is always about individuals' and groups' interpretations. Interpretation takes place also by the interviewer when making decision such as, how will the data be analyzed, how they are interpreted, and how the conclusions are presented. (Eriksson &

Kovalainen 2008, 17–23.) In addition, some biases can take place in the way how the interviewer interprets responses (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2008, 326), but this will be examined more closely with the trustworthiness of this study. Semi-structured interviews also offer the possibility for the interviewer to 'probe' answers, since the interviewer is making sense of the meanings of the responses. This is important in qualitative research methods, since the aim is to understand the meanings that the participants assign for the particular phenomenon. These meanings add depth and significance to the results. (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2008, 324.)

In this research all together ten semi-structured interviews were conducted. These interviews consisted of five host interviews and five guest interviews. However, most of the hosts had also used Airbnb as a guest, but hosting was their primary role at the moment. Respondents were recruited in two ways. The respondents in the 'host' role were recruited through the Airbnb platform. The potential participants were contacted by sending them an e-mail via the Airbnb platform and proposing to schedule an interview regarding a research about sharing economy and Airbnb. The e-mail was sent to hosts who had been active hosts in the Helsinki city area and who had gotten multiple reviews. Also, hosts who rented a part of their apartment and not the whole apartment were preferred to participate in the interview. This is because, in some occasions hosting on Airbnb tilts more towards semi-sharing and is more related to an apartment-rental service than sharing economy (Meelen & Frenken 2015), as learned before. In order to rule out the possibility of interviewing hosts who are not engaged in sharing, but rather running an apartment-rental business, only hosts who shared their apartment with the renters were interviewed. The user recruiting was not as straightforward, since users can not be contacted on the Airbnb platform the same way hosts can be. Therefore, users were recruited through a Facebook post. The post reached enough people to be able to choose the most active participants. The prerequisite in order to participate in the research was that they had used Airbnb at least 5–10 times. Additionally, one host was found via Facebook post.

The interviews were all held during October–November 2016 in Helsinki, except for one that was held in Amsterdam, since at the time it was more convenient for the interviewer and for the respondent. The interviews were conducted in a location of the respondents choosing, either in a public place such as a coffee place or in their home. No compensation was offered, but a small thank you gift was given after the interview. The conducted interview consisted of both open and closed questions in order to get a comprehensive understanding of the subject. The emphasis of the interview was on open questions, since they produce usually more detailed responses and they give the respondent more control as well as space to answer. Questions and themes were predetermined, but some additional questions were asked in most interviews. Additional questions were asked when interesting viewpoints rose during the interview and these

viewpoints wanted to be discussed in more detail. There are various ways to record interviews (Eriksson & Kovalainen 84). In this research interviews were recorded with a phone application. Permission was asked before recording from all respondents, since some respondents may prefer for the interviewer to take notes rather than record. However, this is usually the case only in situations were the topic of the interview is very sensitive (Eriksson & Kovalainen 84). Due to the low level of sensitiveness of this topic, all respondents agreed to be recorded. Respondents and the interview procedure are presented in the table 2.

Table 2   Description of respondents and interview procedure

Respondent	Age	Primary role	Gender	Activity (times used/times hosted)	Date of interview
Respondent A	26	Guest	Male	8–10	26.10.2016
Respondent B	25	Guest	Male	10	2.11.2016
Respondent C	27	Guest	Male	7	2.11.2016
Respondent D	26	Guest	Female	5	3.11.2016
Respondent E	27	Guest	Female	10	10.11.2016
Respondent F	23	Host	Male	60–70	1.11.2016
Respondent G	38	Host	Male	60–100	1.11.2016
Respondent H	28	Host	Female	50	4.11.2016
Respondent I	33	Host	Male	75	4.11.2016
Respondent J	65	Host	Female	26	7.11.2016

3.4   Analysis of data

The purpose of a qualitative research is to provide clarity to the gathered material and therefore, offer new information on the researched topic. The aim of the data analysis is to compress the research material in to a form where it is possible to make rich interpretations and conclusions without loosing any important information. This is most likely the most challenging phase of a qualitative research. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 100–105.)

Interpretations can not be made before the raw data has been reduced in a way that it provides only the necessary material for answering the research question. This implies that after the data is gathered and transcribed it has to be screened and organized in an appropriate manner, in other words it needs to be coded. Coding refers to a process where the themes, issues, features and instances of the empirical data are categorized and given a label, a code (Eriksson & Kovalainen 126). For coding there are generally

two different approaches: data-driven analysis and theory-driven analysis. In data-driven analysis any former theoretical presumptions are not taken in to account, whereas in theory-driven analysis a theoretical framework is taken consciously in to the core of the research. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998; Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2002, 97–99.)

This research was analyzed in a theory-driven manner, since it is suitable for a semi-structured thematic interview as well as case study research. A thematic interview forms already itself a parse, which enables coding according to the themes. And since the themes of the interview were grounded on the theoretical framework, coding the material in to these themes results in theory-driven analysis. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998.) This kind of preplanned systematic coding is used most often in a case study research when the research is based on existing theory and the aim is to improve the theory (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 126). The framework of the interview and predefined propositions of the existing literature operate as an excellent tool for thematic coding. In which case, with the help of the interview framework the material is been screened in order to find parts of the text which refers to each part. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998; Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 126.)

In this particular research, the data reduction was done with the help of Excel. After transcribing all of the interviews in to a Word document, all of the material was copied to an Excel sheet. The copied answers were organized according to the interview themes. Then in order to make more clarity to the material and to know which answer referred to which respondent, all the respondents were marked with different color codes. After this the material was processed, most important parts of expressions were underlined and with the help of the underlining's, reduced expressions were formed next to the original expressions. It was ensured that the reduced expressions maintained descriptive and that they held all necessary information. Then next to the reduced expression was mentioned in which theme the expression belongs to.

3.5   Evaluation of Trustworthiness

When examining the trustworthiness of a qualitative study, it is essential to acknowledge that the basis of any research is the open subjectivity of the researcher and that the researcher is a crucial research instrument. In a qualitative research the main trustworthiness criterion is the researcher itself and hereby the evaluation of trustworthiness concerns the whole research process. This is a significant difference compared to quantitative research methods, where trustworthiness refers to the trustworthiness of the measures not the whole research process. (Eskola & Suojärvi 1998, 211–212.) Therefore, the trustworthiness evaluation criteria used traditionally in a quantitative research, validity, reliability and generalizability, can not be applied as such to a qualita-

tive research (Saunders et al. 2008, 156–158; Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 291; Lincoln & Guba 1985, 290; Eskola & Suojärvi 1998, 212). Hence, other trustworthiness evaluation criteria for qualitative research has been created. One of the trustworthiness evaluation criteria that fits a qualitative research better consist of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Cuba 1985, 300; Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 294). These criteria will be applied in the evaluation of the trustworthiness of this research.

Credibility reflects to which extent are the findings coherent with reality (Lincoln & Guba 1985, 301). The researcher must make sure that the conceptualizations and interpretations that has been made corresponds with the perceptions of the respondent (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 152–154). According to Eriksson and Kovalainen (2008, 295) credibility presents whether the researcher is familiar with the topic and whether the data is sufficient to support the statements that are made. Also credibility refers to the fact that any other researcher could on the basis of the material presented, come relatively close to the the same interpretations or agree with the statements that are made. In order to enhance credibility, it is essential to make strong logical links between observation and categories. (Eriksson & Kovalainen (2008, 295). In this particular research credibility has been build by multiple ways. Firstly, the operationalization table aims to present how the research problem, sub questions, theoretical background and empiricism of this research are connected to each other. Secondly, triangulation of theories was used in the research to improve credibility. Triangulation refers to the use of several theories and viewpoints in explaining, understanding and interpreting in order to gain a holistic understanding of the researched field (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 293). In addition to triangulation, an adequate amount of empirical data was gathered in order to enhance credibility. Defining what is an adequate amount of empirical data in a qualitative study can be rather troublesome. Therefore, technique of saturation was applied in this research. The idea of saturation is that data is collected until the interviews yield no novel information and same ideas and themes start to repeat themselves. (Eskola & Suoranta 1998, 152–155.)

Dependability refers to being able to show that the findings are consistent and can be repeated (Guba & Lincoln 1985). This means also providing the reader information, about the logicality and traceability of the research process (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 295). To ensure the dependability of this research a comprehensive and logical description of data collection and data analysis is presented (see 3.3 and 3.4). Moreover, the conducted interviews were recorded and transcribed, in order to easily have an access to the data always when needed. Dependability in this research is enhanced together with the open descriptions, data collection and appendixes provided for the reader. However, it is important to notice that the interviews were conducted in Finnish, tran-

scribed in Finnish and then translated in to English. To some level, this may influence the trustworthiness of this study, since translations may be subjective in nature.

According to Eskola & Suoranta (1998, 212) even though generalization isn't possible in a qualitative study due to the diversity of social constructs, transferability is possible under some conditions. Transferability indicates that the findings are applicable in other contexts (Guba & Lincoln 1985). This is presented by showing the level of similarity between the conducted research, or parts of it, and other research. This is done in order to establish a connection between the findings of the research and previous results. (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 295.) In this particular research the transferability is created by maintaining a strong frame of reference throughout the study and emphasizing the links towards existing literature in the empirical findings of this study. However, authors emphasize that the idea of transferability is not to replicate, but more to show to what extent some similarity in other research contexts is found (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2008, 295).

Establishing confirmability in a study refers to the degree of neutrality also described the extent to which the findings of the study is formed by the respondents and not the researchers interest, motivation or bias. Therefore, it presents the level to which the findings are congruent with reality and which degree can the results be confirmed by the audience (Guba & Lincoln 1985, 295). Eriksson & Kovalainen (2008, 295) discuss conformability when referring to the same trustworthiness evaluation criterion. According to them it refers to linking the findings and interpretations to the collected data in a manner that it is easily understood by the reader. In other words, presenting the data and the interpretation in a way that it is not just the researchers imagination. In a qualitative research there are various types of bias that needs to be taken into account. The interviewer bias refers to the amount of influence of the interviewer on the respondent through comments, tone of voice or non-verbal behavior. For example, the beliefs of the interviewer may affect the manner how questions are asked. Also, it is possible that the interviewer has bias in the interpretation of the responses (Saunder et al. 2008, 326). Also, it is important to hold in mind that coding, organizing and labeling the empirical data contains always some level of interpretation (Kovalainen & Eriksson 126). Another bias to consider is response bias, which may occur due to perceptions about the interviewer. However, the perceptions are not always related to the interviewer, but to the interview itself. Some people may find the interview process to be intrusive and therefore, some respondents may be reluctant to discuss some topics. The result of this might be that the respondents offer an incomplete biased picture of the discussed topic, because they feel this presents them in a manner that is socially desirable. (Saunder et al. 2008, 326.)

4 MOTIVATION OF PEER-TO-PEER SHARING PARTICI-PANTS

4.1 Description of Respondents

The empirical data was collected by ten semi-structured thematic interviews conducted with Airbnb users. Five of the respondents (A–E) represented Airbnb guests and five of the respondents (F–J) represented Airbnb hosts. Four of the hosts (G, H, I and J) had also used Airbnb as a guest, but were primary participating as a host at the moment of the interview. Then again, none of the guests had hosted on Airbnb. Respondents age varied from 23 to 65. Guests age varied less, from 25 to 27, which may be due to the manner of recruitment via Facebook or due to the fact that Airbnb attracts generally younger users (Pwc 2016). Hosts age varied more, from 23 to 65, majority of them being around 30-years-old. Six of the respondents were male (A, B, C, F, G and I) and four female (D, E, H and J). Three of the respondents were full-time students (B, C and F), five of the respondents were working full-time (D, E, G, H and I), one was working and studying full-time (A) and one respondent (J) was retired.

Two of the hosts (H and G) had hosted for three years, two of the hosts (I and J) had hosted between six months and a year and one of the hosts (F) only hosted for four months during the summer of 2016. Four of the hosts (F, G, H and I) had hosted somewhere between 50 and 100 times and one of the hosts (J) had hosted for under 50 times. Four of the apartments located in Helsinki (G, H, I and J) and one located in Naantali (F). All of the hosts (F–J) rented a part of their own house or property. This is referred to as on-site-hospitality and means that the host is physically present and shares the apartment with the guest (Lampinen & Chesire 2016). Most of the hosts were renting out an extra bedroom in their house (G, H, I and J). One host was renting a villa or parts of it, and staying on the same property himself. Therefore, majority of the time all hosts were present when accommodating guests. Some hosts also rented the house occasionally when being out of town (H, I and J), but some preferred always to be present (F). Two of the respondents (H and J) lived alone, two (F and H) shared the house with roommates and one (G) shared the house with a girlfriend.

All of the guests (A–E) had been using Airbnb for at least a year. Also, all of the guests had used Airbnb for holiday accommodation purposes, and two of the guests (D and E) had additionally used it for long-term renting. Guests had used Airbnb all over the world, mostly in Europe, in Asia and the United Stated of America. All of the guests had once or more rented a whole house, three of the guests (B, C and D) had rented once or more a room in a house so that the host had been present and two of the guests (A and E) had always preferred to rent the whole house and not share it with the host.

An interesting characteristic that connected all of the respondents was a very open and curious mindset towards the world and other people and a desire for humanity. Guests were especially very curious of finding an authentic and personal accommodation and most of them also valued the human interaction with the host. Especially, all of the hosts weighed the importance of humanity in the transaction and in the service they were giving. Table 3 and 4 presents a more detailed description of the guests and the hosts.

Table 3   Description of guests

Respondent	Age	Gender	Activity (times used)	City of residence
Respondent A	26	Male	8–10	Amsterdam
Respondent B	25	Male	10	Turku
Respondent C	27	Male	7	Turku
Respondent D	26	Female	5	Helsinki
Respondent E	27	Female	10	Helsinki

Table 4   Description of hosts

Respondent	Age	Gender	Activity (times hosted)	City of the Airbnb house
Respondent F	23	Male	60–70	Naantali
Respondent G	38	Male	60–100	Helsinki
Respondent H	28	Female	50	Helsinki
Respondent I	33	Male	75	Helsinki
Respondent J	65	Female	26	Helsinki

4.2   Characteristics of sharing economy and Airbnb

The first theme in the interview covered the respondents use of the service as well as their thoughts on sharing economy. When asking respondents what they think about sharing economy in general, similar kind of characteristics to describe sharing economy repeatedly rose, weather the respondent was a host or a guest. All of the respondents found that sharing economy is a positive phenomenon. Also, all of the respondents saw sharing economy as a new and modern way of doing things. Four respondents (A, G, D, J) mentioned that sharing economy enables a more efficient use of existing resources.

The respondents regarded it as a positive quality to be able to better utilize under-used capacities that would otherwise just be sitting idle. As respondent J puts it:

I concern sharing economy as a very positive phenomenon. I find the traditional way of thinking ridiculous: that you have to own every tool and commodity, which you use a couple of times in a year. It doesn't make any sense.

Some respondents suggested (C, D, J and E) that it would be a good idea to extend sharing to other things than houses as well, for example to cars, clothes or commonly-used tools in a housing cooperative. They all agreed that too much of potential capacity is wasted, because no one is using it. Respondent C gave an example of his acquaintance who drives a car from Helsinki to Turku every Monday morning and drives it back to Helsinki on Friday afternoon. The days in between the car is never used. Which means, if a platform for car sharing would exist, it would be possible to utilize this idle capacity during the gap days and the car owner could benefit financially.

Reciprocity was another characteristic that was mentioned multiple times when respondents described sharing economy. Reciprocity was seen appearing in a couple of ways: reciprocal benefits and reciprocal rules and norms. Three respondents (A, C and E) mentioned reciprocal benefit when asking what they think of sharing economy in general. Respondents mentioned especially a mutual economical benefit, since guests often get better value for their money compared to choosing a traditional accommodation such as a hotel, and the hosts earn money when accommodating guests. Therefore, many times sharing economy is seen as a win-win situation. Then again, reciprocal behavior rules and norms were mentioned to be in the core of sharing economy. For example, respondent J stated the following:

Sharing is grounded on strong reciprocal trust and mutual understanding, and a requirement for the system to work is that both parties agree on the rules and also, obey these rules.

Another feature of sharing economy that rose multiple times in the interviews was the presence of a community. Four respondents (B, G, F and I) saw it in the core of the definition of sharing economy. Two of them mentioned the importance of sharing economy in bringing people together in times of urbanization where people tend to more and more recede from each other rather than to come together. As respondent I express it:

Along with urbanization people don't know each other anymore and people become robots. I feel that in a way Airbnb answers to that problem by creating a new kind of sense of community.

When asking respondents what they think is the most important quality of Airbnb, similar responses rose multiple times. Eight (A, B, C, D, F, H, I & J) of the respondents mentioned the importance of the Airbnb platform itself, in other words the importance of the presence of a third-party. Respondents found it essential to have a third-party present for multiple reasons. Firstly, many of the respondents saw the platform as a tool for minimizing the risk involved, building trust and creating a sense of safety. People often behave better, when there is a third-party involved and bad behavior results in consequences. Respondent J for example described a situation where her guest had had a very bad experience with her previous host and after she made a complaint about it to Airbnb, this host was removed. Most hosts (H, I and J) mentioned that the Airbnb platform works as some kind of safety net, to ensure the money transaction, to guarantee if something breaks or is stolen or to act as a mediator if an argument occurs. For example, respondent H stated that she is completely fine that Airbnb charges a few percent of every transaction when that means that Airbnb will work as an assurance if something happens. Also, some guests mentioned the platform being important for ensuring that everything goes like expected. Respondent A for example described a time when he and his party were travelling and the host never came to drop the keys for them. In this kind of situation, it was important to have Airbnb present, to mediate the situation as well as compensate for the accommodation. And respondent D saw Airbnb as the assurance that the rented apartment actually exists and is not just a fraud. She saw that Airbnb in a way removes the possibility of abuse.

Secondly, many respondents (B, C, D, G) highlighted the importance of the review system of the platform. The review system makes the system transparent by giving information and therefore, builds trust between strangers and decreases the possibility of abuse. Many of the guests emphasized that reading past reviews of the hosts is an important determinant when choosing an accommodation. And for example respondent B stated that the review system makes it feel safe and ensures that the quality maintains on a high level. Hosts also saw reviews important, even though some of the hosts (F, G and I) had a so called "instant booking" system, which means that anyone can book the room without the host having to first confirm it. However, some hosts found it important to first read the reviews and to do some research on the guests and then confirm the booking. Even though some hosts (F, G and I) would not always read the previous reviews of the guests, they still highlighted the importance of themselves getting feedback after the stay. This allows them to react fast if something is wrong, if the Wi-Fi isn't working for instance. For both parties, hosts and guests, the review system was in an important role to exchange information and to build trust and feeling of safety. All in all, it was stated multiple times, that it is especially the platform and the technological development behind it that works as an enabler for people to trust strangers. As respondent G puts it:

You can create mechanisms for trust. You can servitizate the trust between people, and its incredible where that can lead. Soon we don't need banks, since we can start loaning to one another.

And he continues:

If someone would've told me 10 years ago that: "you will open the door for some guy called Nacho from Argentina and his girlfriend, who you've never met, and you know nothing about them, and they come to your house." I would've thought no way, that is an insane idea. It is so interesting to live at a time, where digitalization is changing social constructs.

Thirdly, some respondents (B, D and F) mentioned that what makes the existence of the platform essential, is that it works as a connecter of the needs and the idle capacities. Airbnb enables the hosts to reach the potential guests and the guests to find the most pleasing accommodation. For example, respondent F as a host mentioned that it is very important that Airbnb has a wide user-base, which means that you don't have to perform marketing of the house yourself, since Airbnb does it for you. Also responded D as a guest emphasized the importance of the platform in reaching the right people in order to have a lot of selection to choose from. In other words, respondents saw it as an important quality that the platform can reach the critical mass. This states the importance of the belief in commons, since the more people participate in the platform, the better the system works and the more value is gains. Therefore, it is essential that the platform users believe that Airbnb reaches an adequate amount of people and can connect the idle capacities with the needs.

4.3   Motives in participating

Earlier research has found the following motives in participating in the sharing economy: financial benefits, sustainability, experience and trend -orientation and social motives (Möhlmann 2015, Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine 2015; Ikkala & Lampinen 2015; Lampinen & Chesire 2016; Moeller & Wittkowski 2010; Hamari et. al 2015), which were presented in chapter 2.2 to provide the theoretical framework for the first sub question.

In order to answer the first sub question of this research, second theme of the interview covered the respondent's motives to participate in Airbnb. Questions were asked about the first phases of participation, what first caught respondents interest, does he or

she feel the motives have changed from the beginning and what is the most motivating factor at the moment.

4.3.1 *Balancing between financial and social motives*

When discussing the motives to participate in sharing economy and Airbnb financial and social motives repeatedly rose weather the respondent was a guest or a host. However, some differences in the shades and nuances of motives were found between the two different participant roles and therefore, they are examined separately.

When asking hosts what tempted them to start hosting in the first place, all of them mentioned financial as well as social motives with having different kinds of emphasis on them. For very few of the respondents the motive to start hosting was purely for financial reasons. For respondent F financial motives played a great role in the beginning. Since he was hosting only for the summer, he saw it as a summer job: a way to earn money in a tempting entrepreneurial manner. He points out that the money motivated especially in the beginning, since he simply needed a means to earn money. However, even though money was an important determinant, he mentioned social benefits were various times. He stated that hosting was a fun experience, since you could meet a lot of new people. He described the experience to have been very rewarding, since they met hundreds of people, gained a lot of fun acquaintances and he believes they will be in contact with some of the people still later on in life.

As said, in addition to financial motives, social aspects rose multiple times, when asking what tempted the hosts to start hosting. Many of the hosts (G, I and J) linked social aspects to hosting and saw it as a major determinant for deciding to start hosting on Airbnb in the first place. In two cases (G and I) Airbnb hosting came along when moving to a new house with a roommate or roommates and then pondering what to do with some extra space in the house. They decided to offer the idle space in their house for Airbnb guests, since they saw it as a fun and social way of living. They emphasized the possibility to meet new people and to gain interesting and meaningful contacts with unfamiliar or foreign people. Respondent I stated that the motive in the beginning was clearly not money, but rather the opportunity to meet new people and have fun. He mentioned also that they both travel a lot themselves and therefore, have a very open and international mindset. This makes it natural for them, to meet and get along with new and foreign people. Similar kind of personality traits rose in multiple host interviews. Most respondents shared a very open and curious mindset and a desire to meet new people. Respondent G encapsulated the social aspect of hosting as follows:

I had a thought about what if interacting with people and being social would be already built in the form of living, and thereby increase the quality of life. For this reason, we decided to move in with a couple of friends and then Airbnb came along and was strongly linked to the social aspect. Because, if you think about it, when you ask people what was the best part of their trip, they often answer the people they met. So in a way, when being a host, I travel without having to actually travel, because I meet constantly new people from all over the world. So for me, this has certainly not been only a means of earning money, since the social side of it has always been essential."

Respondent J states that her primary motive to start hosting, was to meet people, gain company, being able to be social and feel useful. After retiring she said Airbnb was a pleasant way to get meaningful contacts with other people and also a way to make herself feel important and less lonely. Especially she enjoyed talking with young people and people from abroad. All of the hosts said that they have gained meaningful contacts with people and most of the hosts even stated to have become friends with some of the guests. For example, Respondent J stated that now she has a place to stay in cities like Berlin, Rome, Seoul and Shanghai, due to acquaintances made through hosting. Also respondent H mentioned that she was planning to visit a woman in her home town, who she had hosted herself recently. She mentioned financial motives to have been the most important determinant especially in the beginning when she was still a student. However, she also mentioned the sociality of hosting to be very important and she enjoys the cultural exchange that this enables. At the moment she saw the financial benefits and the social benefits to be as important.

It is interesting, since many of the respondents clearly balance between financial and social motives. Respondents who started for purely social reasons, also mention the financial motives to have been on the background or have become a motive after starting to host. Respondent G for example states that in the acute situation, where the room rented for Airbnb is covering some of their rent, money is an essential factor. He continues that, if money wouldn't be an issue he would anyway rent the room, but probably not as extensively. As he puts it:

"*Even though it would make no financial difference is there someone living in that room or not, I would still prefer to have people staying in it*"

Respondent I stated that money was never a motive in the beginning, since the idea was just to have people around and have fun. However, after starting to host they realized that it brings quite an extensive financial addition to their monthly earnings. At the time of the interview, after hosting for six months, he says that money has become a motive,

but as important is the people who come over. He states that the motives haven't changed, but rather they have expanded. He describes it as follows:

So then after hosting for a while, we figured out that you actually earn some money of this.. // like last month we earned €2000 extra and it's not even high season now // and it wasn't our primary motive, but yes it has become one ...but it's still about the nice people who come over. Like last week we had two great Italian guys, with who we had great conversations every night.

Also respondent J whose primary motive was to gain contact with people, stated the importance of also earning money of it. After she retired and consequently her income decresead enormously, hosting has been a way to earn some extra money, for example to cover the maintenance charge. Also she feels that the money she gains from it, in a way coveres the effort she puts in it.

Another social aspect of hosting in addition to meeting new people, was found to be gratification that is gained of being a good host. Several hosts described that they felt gratification when being able to be a good and competent host. Like respondent H mentioned that in a way hosting is also an egoistic action, since she gains a good feeling of it herself. Respondent F described it also as a self-esteem elevation, since if the guests left the place being happy and satisfied, it felt really gratifying and made the hosts feel good about themselves. Also, respondent J described that what made her especially happy was the possibility to make someone else breakfast, so in a way making her feel useful and having company and in the breakfast table. Respondent G stated that a layer of care taking and love is definitely in the core of hosting. He described it as follows:

This (Airbnb) is linked strongly to trust, and to the fact that you want to get along with people and take care of them. I have thought about it, that what I gain from this, and it is the lovely feeling of being responsible of something, being responsible that the guests have a place to stay and that they get on well and enjoy the stay. Also, if the situation allows, I always try to give the guests something extra. Whether it is posting them a sweater they forgot, picking them up from the airport if I happen to have the time or offering them a nice glass of wine. For me at least, hosting definitely has a layer of care taking and love.

Many hosts (G, H, I and J) described that they want to give their guests often something extra, whether it is giving local expertise and practical tips or picking them up from somewhere. Respondent I for example mentioned that they give a lot of local expertise and explain them how to get by in the city. He said that they don't want to provide maps

or seem too professional, but rather give the information in a way that it feels authentic. In a way that's how they want to brand themselves as hosts:

We explain about Helsinki and what you should see. Depending on the amount of days they are staying, we give them ideas for what to do. Also, we provide lists of good restaurants, depending on what they prefer, from fine-dining to street food. Then of course we also provide the basic information, where is the closest grocery store, tell them how to check the public transport and where to find city bikes.

Also respondent J mentioned that she enjoys helping people to get a good start for their stay in Helsinki. She always starts with the guests by showing them on the map where they are and then asking what are they interested about so she can recommend places to go and also guide them how to get there.

When asking guests, what triggered their interest towards Airbnb, financial benefits rose in every interview. Airbnb is seen as a cheaper accommodation alternative, where you can get more worth for the money compared to a hotel or a hostel. Some respondents mentioned especially that when being a student Airbnb is a better alternative, because of its lower price. In addition to the price, the social aspects as well as the possibility to live in a more authentic manner, rose multiple times. Guests (B, C and D) that had participated in on-site-hospitality; stayed in a house where the host had been physically present, valued social benefits of Airbnb. However, they all mentioned Airbnb to be a cheaper accommodation alternative and had affected their willingness to participate. Respondent D mentioned that one of the best experiences had been, when she rented a room and the host was present. In her opinion when the host is present, the sociality aspects becomes very important and can bring a lot of added value. As Respondent C puts it:

"..then I checked the prices and compared to hostel prices and Airbnb was cheaper, so there was a price motive definitely. However, another motive was to be able to see more of the authentic and local life, especially when renting a room and meeting the host. A few times when I have travelled alone, it has been awesome, because you get to talk with other people and for example in Barcelona my host gave me a lot of advice on where to go and even invited me for dinner. It was very fun."

Respondent B mentioned that the most important reasons for using Airbnb is that you get closer to the culture and the local people, but also that Airbnb is often cheaper. He emphasized that Airbnb offers a more authentic way to travel. In fact, in various interviews came up the possibility to travel in a more authentic manner. Also respondent G mentioned that when he himself had travelled and used Airbnb as a guest, the reasons

had been financial as well as social. He admitted that it is a cheaper alternative, but also especially when he had travelled alone, he specifically chose Airbnb houses where the hosts were present. He saw it as a great way to meet new local people and get to know the culture better.

4.3.2   *Experience and trend orientation*

Experience and trend orientation acted as a motive especially for guests. Being able to get a more authentic or personal experience when renting someone's house, rose in multiple guest interviews. Also, staying in an Airbnb was seen many times to be more fun. Many guests (A, B, C and E) mentioned that an important determinant why to use Airbnb is that you get access to very unique and distinctive houses. Respondent A mentioned that the most important determinant for him to participate in Airbnb at this moment, is the experience it provides. He stated that by using Airbnb he gets an access to nicer and more unique locations. Respondent E says that she was triggered to continue using Airbnb after staying at a very cool and unique house in Berlin. She states that getting access to these kind of distinctive houses is the most important determinant for her to participate in Airbnb at this moment. And as she puts it:

When I had stayed a few times in very fancy Airbnb flats, I got very excited of the possibility it offers to stay in very unique places for a reasonable price, so I started to search for cool Airbnb apartments. Sometimes now, I have even first searched for a cool house and booked it and only afterwards booked the flights. Funny, that it´s changed, because earlier I would always first book flights and then book accommodation. Now with Airbnb, if I come accross a cool house I might want to travel to that location purely because of the house.

Respondents B and C mentioned that in Airbnb they especially enjoy that it provides a more authentic experience and you feel more like a local. Respondent A and C emphasize the perk of Airbnb, that when you rent a whole house for yourself you can live in a more normal manner, you have more space to do things, you can cook yourself and also, there might be a terrace or a courtyard that often lacks in other accommodation services. For respondent C it was also important that with the same money you are able to get a very nice and fancy accommodation, compared to traditional accommodation. Respondent E mentions that with Airbnb you can get the most of a city, because you see someone's house, the culture and often you interact with a local host. She describes that with Airbnb you are able to get better access to the core of a city. Many respondents (A, C and E) emphasized that Airbnb often offers better locations, which improves the ex-

perience. They state that Airbnb often provides apartments in the center or in areas that are up and coming, where hotels or hostels aren't necessarily present as much or at all.

In multiple interviews surfaced thoughts of wanting to use novel services that utilize new technology. Many respondents (B, C, D and E) mentioned that the fact that Airbnb offers a new way of doing things, triggered their interest towards using Airbnb. As respondent C puts it:

I have always wanted to be a part of new things, like Uber or Airbnb. I guess in a way I am keen in utilizing new technology, and it (Airbnb) seemed like a new innovation that provides a smarter option for accommodation.

Airbnb was often seen as an enabler to do things in a smarter or flexible manner, which at least for young people made Airbnb a very tempting option. Many of the guests stated that they often like to use new applications and if they prove to be easy-to-use it may trigger future usage.

4.3.3   Sustainability

When asking respondents, what motivated them to use Airbnb, sustainability rose very rarely. Actually, only once sustainability was brought up proactively. However, when respondents were asked in what extent do they think that Airbnb is a more sustainable consumption option, some respondents admitted that they had though about it. Then again, some respondents stated that sustainability has not ever crossed their minds when thinking about Airbnb. However, many of the respondents, whether it was a guest or a hosts and whether they had thought about sustainable aspects or not, had some opinions and sentiments about it.

Respondent C mentioned the ecological side of sharing and Airbnb, when asked about what he thinks characterizes sharing economy and how it is seen in Airbnb. In his opinion sharing economy makes a lot of environmental sense, because it prevents everyone buying their own car or a tool that they use once a year. This aspect of sharing came up in other interviews as well. He stated that the ecological aspect of Airbnb can be seen in the small things: For example, in a hotel the garbage is emptied every day or when the guest leaves, what is completely unnecessary if the garbage isn't even full. Whereas if you stay at someone's house, the garbage is thrown out when it is actually full.

When respondents were asked in what extent do they think Airbnb is a more sustainable consumption option, four of the respondents (A, C, D and F) said that it in some scale it has been on their mind. Respondent F did state that being environmental friend-

ly was a detail on the background, when they thought about hosting. Most of them described that in a sense it can be more environmental friendly, because it enables a more efficient use of existing resources. As respondent J put it:

Well it is a way to use existing properties in a more efficient manner. Of course it is sustainable development that I offer a room that I am not using rather than building new buildings from nonrenewable material.

Some of the respondents did admit that Airbnb might be more sustainable and environmental friendly, when they were asked about it, but it had never crossed their minds before. All in all, the sustainable aspect of Airbnb did surface in some interviews when asked, but very rarely it was an active determinant in participating in Airbnb. Also, mostly sustainability was seen as a result of using existing capacities in a more efficient manner.

4.4   Meanings of sharing

To understand why people are participating in sharing economy, it is essential to understand some behavior drivers that takes part. First of all, the benefit that people gain from certain kind of behavior act as a driver. Since it is generally agreed that consumers seek products that offer the greatest amount of benefit with the lowest cost possible. (Lamberton & Rose 2012), it is important to identify the gained benefits as well as the costs required for an action. Another factor affecting consumer behavior is the values that a person has. Values influence behavior, since people want to act in a way that they find valuable and that benefits them most. These two behaviors will be examined next, starting with the cost-utility relation and followed by value drivers.

To answer the second sub-question of this research, respondents were asked questions regarding what benefits and costs they relate in the usage of Airbnb and do they feel that their values are linked in the use of Airbnb and sharing in general.

4.4.1   *Cost-utility relation in sharing and Airbnb*

In addition to the benefits that rose when discussing motives: social benefits, financial benefits, gaining experiences and sustainability, some other utilities were mentioned in the interviews as well. Utility related to the flexibility and convenience of the service was mentioned multiple times especially in the guest interviews. All of the guests (A, B, C, D, E and F) mentioned Airbnb to be handy and convenient, and therefore beneficial.

Three of the guests (A, D and E) mentioned convenience and handiness when describing what determined them to continue using Airbnb. Respondent A described that the decision to start using Airbnb was highly triggered by its convenience and handiness. Also respondent G mentioned that Airbnb and other sharing economy platforms makes life a lot more convenient. As he described how inconvenient traditional car rental services are, since it involves always an enormous hassle with insurances and different kind of forms. Where as a car sharing service that he had used had worked a lot more conveniently. He stated that this is the case very often also with hotels, and that he sees Airbnb as a much more user-friendly service than a hotel. The fact that Airbnb seemed like easy-to-use rose also in one host interview (F). This had acted as a determinant in deciding to start hosting.

Utility related to flexibility rose in multiple interviews as well. Especially some guests (B, D and E) felt that Airbnb provides flexible solutions that had been very beneficial for them. All of them had had for example a situation where they had needed a temporal living solution for a longer time, like 2 weeks, a month or three months. In these situations, Airbnb had solved the problem, since they could've arranged a longer stay with the hosts. They stated that this kind of flexibility had been very helpful and beneficial.

Some hosts (I and J) also mentioned that being a host had sometimes thought them something, because they had met so many different people. And also respondent J said that it had been very good for her language skills, since she has to speak English with her guests. Therefore, she has been able to improve and maintain her English, what she found to be very beneficial. Some of the guests saw it very beneficial that hosts have provided them with information and helped them with practical things. And many of them stated that communication with hosts had always been easy and that hosts often took an extra step when providing guidance or tips. Respondent B described it as follows:

Last month I was in Moscow and I was staying in an Airbnb room. It was vey nice, since we were staying with locals who spoke English so they could help us with a lot of things like registration, which would've been very difficult other wise, because we didn't speak any Russian.

When asking respondents what kind of costs they related to using Airbnb or to hosting on Airbnb, it was clear that hosting required more time and effort costs than being a guest. This is of course natural since the hosts gain financial benefits of hosting. Costs that were mentioned in the host interviews most often related to the effort and time, in other words to some inconveniences related to hosting. In guest interviews did not rise any great costs, rather some minor costs relating to some inconveniences.

All of the hosts mentioned that there are some costs related to the time or effort that is required. Some hosts (F and G) mentioned for example that you have to be available all the time, answering to requests and messages from potential guests. And like respondent F put it, you have to be all the time on standby and that creates some feeling of pressure. Then related to this, many hosts mentioned that the communication with the quests requires sometimes a lot of their time. The host and the guest needs to communicate before the arrival, for example to give directions to how to get to the house and to agree on the arrival time. Also communication is required upon arrival, when the host has to explain everything necessary to know about the apartment and the room, and perhaps tell about the area and offer some tips on what to do. Some hosts mentioned also that some extra hassle sometimes came from agreeing on the arrival time. This also requires the host to always be there then on the agreed time to open the door. Or if the host would not be able to be at the apartment at that certain time, he has to arrange someone else to come open the door for the guest. This kind of extra hassle that sometimes hosting involves was described in a couple of host interviews (G, H and I).

Another cost that was often mentioned, related to the effort and time, was the cleaning and laundering that hosting requires. Like respondent J described, that before every guest she makes sure that her house is clean, that there are all the ingredients in the fridge for a breakfast, that the bed is made and there are clean towels available. Then after the guest leaves, she needs to clean the room, wash the sheets and towels and make the bed again. Also respondent I stated that hosting definitely has some side effects regarding the tidiness of the house. He said hosting on Airbnb requires for example the bathroom to be cleaned almost daily, what would not be the case normally in an apartment with two young single men. He also mentioned the constant changing and laundry of sheets. However, he also stated that when you then get nice guests over you don't really think of the negative sides, like cleaning or changing sheets.

However, when discussing the costs with hosts, every one of them believed that the benefits they gain from hosting cover the required costs. In other words, they saw the required effort and time been justified, because they gain financial benefit as well as social benefit. As respondent H mentioned that, she doesn't want to ask a very high price, but rather a price that she feels covers the time and effort. Also respondent J, felt that the financial benefits are justified, even though she started hosting for social reasons. And how she puts it:

In my opinion, if I am visiting someone and being someone's guest weather it is at a friend or a person I don't know, I always bring them something, coffee, cheese, bread or give them ten euros for the laundry. This is how I am raised and in my way of thinking this is normal. And if I clean, make the bed, offer fresh sheets and towels, offer break-

fast and clean after them and do their laundry, I find it reasonable that I get a compensation for it.

Hence, the hosts did not seem to have a problem with going through some trouble for the guests. Also, many of them mentioned that they want to provide a humane feeling for the guests and therefore help them and prepare things for them. Like as respondent H mentioned that she has always wanted to keep it as humane as possible and not make it seem like she is doing it as a business. However, she said that of course keeping the humane feeling is also more exhausting, because you need to organize yourself always according to the timetables of the guests and remember to tell them all the necessary things of the house and area. She also stated that since she has hosted for already quite a long time, she has become a bit tired of the hassle it requires and because for her the humane feeling is so important she doesn't want to keep hosting if that starts rustling off since her social motivation decreases.

Perceived costs by guests were often related to some practical problems or some inconveniency. Respondent D stated that sometimes searching for the right apartment is really time consuming, but she did not see it as a problem. Most of the guests did not relate a lot of costs to using Airbnb, and stated that some inconveniences with language barriers or waiting for keys is just a part of the adventure and that they accept these kind of minor practical problems. Respondent A described, that some practical problems had occurred, which had required some additional time or effort during his trips. For example, there had been trouble with the key exchange with the hosts, one time it had resulted in waiting for five hours for the host to bring the keys and the other times they had eventually not gotten the keys at all. Both of these times had been solved, other time with the host himself and other time with Airbnb, who had compensated their stay. These inconveniences were accepted, especially because they were solved in the end:

The other time we had to wait in Antwerpen for five hours to get the keys, so we sat in a bar and waited, and actually we had a very great time. So yes sometimes there occurs these kind of practical problems. You can't expect that it operates in the same reliability as hotels.

When asking respondents, do they think Airbnb is a better option than traditional accommodation such as hotels or hostels, interesting thoughts rose. All of the respondents stated that using Airbnb or using a hotel depends on the person and on their motives. They stated that they are not necessarily ruling out each other, but rather for different purposes. A lot of the respondent's whether they were hosts or guests (A, B, E, G, H and I), described Airbnb to be a more authentic or enjoyable way to travel. However, many of them (A, H and I) stated that it depends a lot of what is the purpose and the

motive of the travel. They mentioned that depending on the nature of the trip, they prefer either Airbnb or a hotel from the beginning, since they see them fulfilling different kind of needs. Airbnb was stated to be the preferred choice for example, when the motive of the trip is leisure, the nature of the trip is flexible and you travel alone and you appreciate getting guidance. Also it was stated to be the preferred choice, when you are looking for an adventure and want to explore the culture and people. Like respondent G stated that it is a more interesting and authentic way of travelling.

On the other side, hotel or hostel accommodation was the preferred choice, when the respondents had looked for for reliability and homogeneous, which is important when you are for example travelling with a short notice or for business. Then the respondents brought up that they value the low involvement required and that they don't need to sort out any timetables or do any extra communication with any one. Like respondent I put it:

If I travel for work, I don't want to have to think about anything extra. When I choose hotel accommodation I pay for the fact that I can go there whenever my flight arrives, I am able to take a cab to the hotel and don't need to text with some one to come open the door, because there is a reception and I don't have to think of things like Wi-Fi and does it work. Also, if I am travelling for work I don't want people to make noise next to me and if someone is noisy I want to be able to complain to the reception and get another room. So I think Airbnb is an alternative for more chill travelling, it's many times a cheaper option and you get in a way your own tourist guide. I usually seek for hosts who have got good reviews about helping and guiding in the city. Like in Valencia I chose a host, who most likely knew something about the city.

Like many respondents mentioned, they find Airbnb to be their preferred alternative when they are travelling on leisure and when they are seeking to explore and get a small adventure. In addition to the purpose of the trip, many respondents mentioned that it is also depended on the person, if they prefer Airbnb over traditional accommodation. Some respondents (B, H, I and J) mentioned that using Airbnb is also related to the personality of the person. Like respondent J stated, that some people generally seek for anonymity, solidarity and standardized hotel service when they travel. And then some other people seek for cosyness, social interactions and living in someone else's house. Also like respondent B mentioned Airbnb is maybe not the first choice for families with kids or for people who are afraid to interact with foreigners. Respondent J also mentioned that it has a lot to do with the fact that can the person manage the fact that hosting requires to be very social. She mentioned that she was doubting first, will she be able to be social enough, but after a while she realized that she can and that she really enjoys it.

4.4.2   *Values related to sharing and Airbnb*

When asking respondents about their values and if they thought that their values were some how linked to the use of Airbnb, being a host or using Airbnb as a guest, interesting value connections rose repeatedly. Many of the respondents found Airbnb to be in line with their value of wanting to be a part of change and new and smarter way of doing things. Also many of them saw that being a part of sharing economy is supporting their values such as using resources more efficiently and challenging old conventions. In addition, many of the respondents mentioned that they are eager to support new technology and were often keen to try new innovations. Like respondent G put it:

I very strongly tilt towards new things, change and fracture and want to be a part of supporting them. I get very excited of services that somehow rationalize and make the world better, smarter, cheaper and easier. For that reason, I am very keen in trying out these kind of new services. And for example when I was travelling in America, I found an Airbnb for cars and it was super convenient. I kind of hate car rentals and hotels, because they are related to certain outdated conventions. I like it when things are done in a smarter way in terms of what is possible.

This was something that rose multiple times in the interviews. Respondents (A, B, C, D and E) saw Airbnb being something that challenges the old ways of doing things and they wanted to be a part of modern technologies, because it supports their values. Also respondent D mentioned, that she sees technology to be an enabler of a lot of great new things and she finds it important to utilize new technology and develop novel ideas. From an economical perspective, they saw it is as a better way of using resources. Like respondent E mentioned, she doesn't care whether it is a clothing sharing service, Airbnb or Uber, she wants to support sharing economy platforms that make better use of resources. And as respondent A mentioned, even though these kind of sharing economy services aren't necessarily realized to the gross domestic product, it still improves the services and experiences that people get and consequently enhances the quality of life.

Related to this, some respondents (C, D and I) also brought up the fact that in a way using Airbnb rather than a hotel, you are supporting a person and not a corporation. Like respondent C and D mentioned, for them it feels better to pay for an individual person, because then you are supporting an individual human and not an impersonal hotel chain. As respondent D mentioned that in a sense there is a small anarchist inside of him who prefers to avert supporting big corporations, and rather give the money to some one more in need. And respondent I mentioned that he doesn't have pity for big hotel chains, because it is inevitable that new players come on the market and when new innovations like Airbnb occur, you can't turn back time. Linked to this, some respond-

ents (A and B) stated that Airbnb is just a good example of modern market economy. There is wants and needs, and the market will make sure these two find each other. Like respondent B puts it:

I think sharing economy is definitely a good thing. We live in a market economy, where new actors come on the market, because that's how it works. And for example, in moments where there is a lot of immigration, sharing economy services, like Uber or Airbnb provides immigrants a new way to employ themselves. Even though for taxi companies, hotels and restaurants this might not be the best thing, when new competition comes on the market, since it pressures them to lower their prices. But that is kind of the idea of market economy, since that is how it works. I am definitely a supporter of the sharing economy.

Another thing that surfaced repeatedly is the communality aspect of Airbnb and sharing that they found to be in line with their values. Respondents (A, B, D, F, G, H, I and J) saw hosting or being a guest supporting their social values in terms of meeting new people and being able to be hospitable. All of the hosts described some sort of care taking or hospitality aspects that were involved in taking part in Airbnb. They valued the fact that they could offer guests a cozy and welcoming feeling, because in their view of the world that is the right thing to do. And like respondent J put it:

This kind of empathy and sociality are strongly related to my values, and also my values are strongly against a selfish lifestyle. I am raised in a way that being connected to other people is a good thing, I got already used to sharing when I was young, since in the where I grew up the city provided the machines for the harvest like tractors and plowing machines for the inhabitants to share. So there were only one of each machines in the village, everyone used them after each other and everyone got their harvest done.

Hosts emphasized that it comes naturally from them to act in a way that makes the guests feel comfortable. Like respondent I stated, since he has been working in the hospitality field and in addition travelled a lot himself, he has grown to know what people expect and want when they are travelling. He continued that, he knows how to give people a welcoming feeling and he enjoys giving people something extra.

In addition to the fact that hosts found being hospitable to be in line with their values, many respondents (A, B, D, F and I), both hosts and guests, valued the sense of community of Airbnb and the possibility to interact with new people. Respondent A stated that he values about Airbnb the fact that it enables a social interaction between strangers, and especially that it enables people from all around the world to become a part of a friendly interaction and gain positive experiences of it. Respondent B described

that what he values about travelling, is that he gets to know the local culture and people, and Airbnb provides a way to travel according to his values. Also respondent D emphasized the importance of Airbnb in connecting people and enabling social interactions. It was also mentioned (G and I) that Airbnb enables people to become closer to each other in a world where urbanization is constantly pushing people away from each other. And like respondent F put it, a sense of "sharing is caring".

When discussing values, respondents were asked that do they find it important that they share the same values with the guests that they host or with the hosts they visit. They were also asked that do they somehow select the guests or hosts. Since most of the interviewed hosts valued the opportunity to engage in social interaction with foreign and new people, it was interesting to examine in what extend the hosts then chose who to interact with. Some of the hosts (F and I) were using "instant booking", which meant that the potential guests could book the room without the host having to confirm it. In these cases, the hosts did not select the guests. However, they found important that they could create a warm and approachable atmosphere with everyone. Hosts that did not have instant booking, did check the profiles of the guests to some extent, read some reviews or just trusted the gut feeling that they got after sending messages with the guest. Also hosts emphasized, also them using instant booking, that if a guest would stay for a longer time, they would do a better background check. This included reading reviews and even doing some research on their social media accounts, to get a feeling of the person.

What came up in most host interviews, was the fact that they did not necessarily care who the person was, where they were from or what they were interested about, but rather they found important that they shared some universal values like respect, openness, curiosity, friendliness and courtesy. Some hosts (H and I) even emphasized that having diverse guests, with different interests and different career backgrounds was rather interesting and inspiring. Respondent I for example, described two guests he had recently had over, with who he had very differing opinions on politics and immigration, but it wasn't a problem. He stated that it was in fact rather interesting. Many hosts agreed that being different was not the determinant of selection or thoughts on the guest, but rather what determined the thoughts on the guest was their values and motives that they had for using Airbnb. Some respondents also mentioned that, people using Airbnb often share the same values and this kind of feeling of sharing the same values and norms inspired them to start as well as continue hosting. Like Respondent J stated, that she often asked guests that why did they choose Airbnb as their accommodation and guests often answer that because they are interested in people and they want to feel like home. Also some hosts, like respondent I, mentioned that they chose Airbnb and not for example couch surfing, because they had an idea that Airbnb user base is more in line what

they are looking for. Moreover, hosts found it important that guests are using Airbnb from same basis that they are. As respondent G stated:

With some quests I form no connection with and I realize that they are using this service (Airbnb) from a different basis, not from openness and curiosity. This kind of feeling comes across from the way these guests act, and then I think, if all guests would be like this, I wouldn't be a host. Like I don't want strangers in my house if I get nothing from them. And this is also related to trust, like would this person take care of me? Is this person at all interested who I am or how I am doing? And if the answer is no, I think that is quite repulsive.

Also, many hosts emphasized that if they have gotten very well along with the guest, shared the same values as well as interests they have occasionally formed friendships with the guests. All of the hosts mentioned that with some guests they have become friends and have stayed in contact. As respondent G described that he has had guests with who he has shared the same sense of humor and they have a had a lot of fun together as well as shared the same universal values and therefore they became good friends. He mentioned that for example with one guest from San Francisco he stayed in contact and when he was travelling himself he stayed at her place. Many of the hosts had similar kind of experiences and had visited or are planning on visiting people that they had hosted. It all depends on the level of valuing the same things and same interests. As respondent H put it:

I find Airbnb to be a very interesting way of meeting people. Of course sometimes there are guests who I just don't click with and the relationship is a purely host-guest. But then again with some guests I have more in common and we have became good friends.

Some hosts (H, G) also mentioned that they might offer more likely something extra or go through more trouble and effort for the guests that they identify with and share the same values with. These hosts described that if they feel that they get along with the guests, they would more likely also invite the guests to join in activities with them, like having a dinner or exploring the city together. Some hosts (H and J) also felt that even though they did not necessarily select the guests, they felt that some how certain types of guests are selected for them. So in a way they thought, that some guests select them, because of their characteristics. Like respondent H stated that she had hosted a lot of academic guests and people travelling on business, so she though that maybe her description text some how attracts these kind of people without her making the choice. Where as respondent J as an older woman, mentioned that she feels that she attracts

some how younger men, maybe because she can be seen as a mother figure and she seems like a comfortable host for younger men.

Also guests were asked that do they some how select the hosts according to the impression that they get from the profile. Respondent C mentioned for example that he pays attention to the fact that is the apartment really a home or is it purely for business use. He stated that the hosts that clearly rent their home are also more hospitable and eager to help, where as hosts renting a house for business usually just drop the keys and that's it. Also a few hosts (I and J) that had used Airbnb as a guest also, wanted to choose Airbnb apartments where they felt that the host was present and eager to help. Some guests (B, D and E) also mentioned that they do pay attention to some characteristics of the hosts and they prefer to stay at a house where the host seems to be for example young, clean, interested in travelling and open-minded. All the guests mentioned that they do to some extent browse through the profile and old reviews.

5   CONCLUSION

5.1   Theoretical contribution

The terms sharing economy and peer-to-peer sharing tend to vary in their meaning and thoughts on the motives to participate in these services are often rather ambiguous and even contradictory. Also, there is a lack of understanding of the motives of different roles as well as different forms of sharing. Therefore, this study contributes to the understanding of peer-to-peer sharing economy, especially the motives and meanings of both participants, the users and the providers. The findings of this study demonstrate that the empirically collected data and the provided theoretical framework of the study support each other in many sections. However, some disparity between previous literature and the empirical findings in this research is found. Overall the motives and meanings behind participating in peer-to-peer sharing found in this research are convergent with earlier research, yet enhanced with some novel emphasis and aspects. Both, empirically collected data as well as the theoretical framework, indicate that people are motivated by certain motive types and that sharing is driven by cost-utility thinking as well as their values. Also respondent's thoughts on the characteristics of sharing economy were found to be convergent with the literature.

The four core principles of sharing economy models, critical mass, idling capacity, belief in the commons and trust between strangers, introduced by Botsman and Rogers (2010), were considered to be essential factors in peer-to-peer sharing. Respondents emphasized the importance of Airbnb providing and reaching the critical mass by connecting the hosts with the guests. This is strongly connected with the importance of the belief in commons, which was also found essential. Fundamentally the idea of sharing relies on the fact that by providing value for the community, you increase your own value as well and every single person who participates in sharing economy creates value for others, whether they intend to or not. Both respondent parties believed that they create value for others as well as for themselves, since sharing is seen to be a reciprocal act. Idling capacities were considered to be in the core of the idea of sharing economy and Airbnb. Respondents regarded it to be an essential quality of Airbnb to be able to better utilize under-used capacities that would otherwise just be sitting idle. Moreover, it was also considered to be a much more efficient way of using resources.

The findings support largely the importance of having trust between strangers. Trust between strangers was mainly built with the help of the Airbnb platform, in other words with the help of the third party. The platform was considered to be a tool that minimizes the risk involved, builds trust and creates a sense of safety. As presented in earlier literature (Hartl, Hofmann & Kirchler 2015; Belk 2014; Botsman & Rogers 2010), assurance

systems, public recommendations and guarantees are seen as a major determinant in building trust. For both parties, hosts and guests, the review system of Airbnb was in an important role to exchange information and to build trust and feeling of safety. In addition, Airbnb platform was seen as an important middleman. Botsman and Rogers (2010, 90) state, that in sharing economy, especially in the peer-to-peer models, the middleman is eliminated, and people are required to interact with each other, since exchange is often made peer-to-peer and middlemen are not supervising the trade. However, in this study the platform itself was considered to take the role of the middleman and facilitate trust. Various respondents mentioned the importance of having Airbnb as a middleman, to provide a safety net, to ensure the money transaction, to guarantee if something breaks or is stolen or to act as a mediator if an argument occurs. Hence, in terms of interaction the middleman is not necessary, but in terms of supervising the transaction the middleman still maintains a very important role.

These empirical findings are compatible with the propositions of Lampinen & Chesire (2016), which state that Airbnb provides guarantee for hosts in two ways: by facilitating the core transaction and by resolving conflicts between hosts and guests. The findings of the research demonstrate, that guests as well consider that Airbnb provides guarantee. Guests considered that Airbnb fosters a sense of guarantee in four ways: by acting as an assurance that everything goes like expected, by solving possible problem situations, ensuring that the quality maintains on a certain level and by preventing abuse. In relation to technology fostering trust, respondents agreed that it is the platform and the technological development behind it that acts as as enabler of trust building. Respondents supported the thought of Botsman and Rogers (2010, 14) that "technology is re-inventing old forms of trust" and they believed that digitalisation is chancing social constructs in a manner that people come more together and may foster trust with each other.

The findings of this research demonstrate that participants of P2P sharing platforms are motivated by various factors. Also findings clearly demonstrate, that these motives shouldn't be seen as crowding out each other, but rather supporting each other in forming a holistic motivation. In line with the previous literature, all respondents were motivated by social as well as financial motives with different kind of emphasis on them. For hosts, it was often either social or financial motives that initially triggered them to start hosting on Airbnb. The findings of this research support the propositions of Lampinen and Chesire (2016) who found that for Airbnb hosts earning money is a motivator, but it is seldom the only reason to participate. For some hosts earning money had been the initial driver in the beginning, but over time social aspects tended to gain more importance. Moreover, in some cases social aspects had been the initial motivator, but it was currently not the only reason to participate. In cases where social motives had been the primary motive, financial motives had gained importance over time. Therefore, in

line with the findings of Lampinen and Chesire (2016) the financial motivation of hosting on AirBnb does not necessarily crowd out the intrinsic motivations, but rather can enable further social exchange and interaction between peers. This research further suggests that in the similar way the initial social motivation of hosting on Airbnb does not necessarily crowd out the extrinsic motivations of earning money, but rather creates an additional benefit on the side of the social motives. The findings of this research are in contrast with Hamari et al (2010, 10) who suggest that extrinsic motivations crowd out the initial intrinsic motivation, because respondents in this research considered often social motives as important as financial motives and that these motives motivated them simultaneously. Moreover, the findings of this research indicate that the hosts saw the financial gains justified, because these gains covered the efforts and time that was required in hosting. And moreover the financial gains could help the hosts in their effort of being a good host and in accomplishing the amount of sociability that they desired. Also this study supports the previous propositions of social gratification. All of the hosts described the gratification of being able to be a good host and the desire of offering something extra for guests.

For guests it was mostly financial motives that had triggered them in to using Airbnb. Airbnb was often seen as a cheaper alternative. However, in addition to the financial motives, social motives were present as well. Respondents considered that Airbnb offers a possibility to meet new people, get closer to a culture and travel in a more authentic manner. Especially guests who had been a part of on-site-hospitality, appreciated the social benefits of Airbnb and considered these benefits as motivating them in using Airbnb. Guests appreciated having a local host when travelling in order to get tips and help when needed.

The findings of this research are as well compatible with the propositions of previous academic research on experience and trend orientation acting as motives in participating in P2P sharing. The findings of this research support Philip, Ozanne & Ballantine's (2015) findings that sharing is regarded appealing, because it enables a short term experience with trying out unique and novel products. Especially guests considered that Airbnb offers a more unique, distinctive and interesting way of travelling. Some guests even considered the experience that Airbnb provides is the most important reason to participate. Also this research supports Moeller & Wittkowski's (2010) findings that trend orientation has a positive influence on non-ownership preference in a P2P online sharing network. The empirical findings of this research demonstrate that guests were motivated by the possibility to use a novel service that utilizes new technology. They considered that Airbnb offers a new, flexible and smarter way of doing things and saw it as a very tempting alternative, since they are keen in trying out new applications and services. This suggests that consumers who seek trendy and novel products are more

likely to share products than own them and hence this finding supports Moeller's & Wittkowski's (2010) earlier research.

In contrast with majority of previous research, sustainability was not seen as an important motive to participate in P2P sharing, neither for the guests nor for the hosts. This supports Möhlman's (2015) and Moeller's & Wittkowski's (2010) findings, who found no affect on sustainability or environmentalism on the preference of choosing a sharing option. In this particular research, it can be explained by the characteristics of this particular service, Airbnb. As often sustainability of sharing is related to the fact that temporary access to a good as well as having multiple users during the lifespan of the good affects the quantity of purchased and produced products. And the decrease of production is often associated with less environmental damage. However, in the case of Airbnb where the service isn't related to consuming goods, but rather a space in a house, it lacks this perspective on sustainability. In other words, something is not produced or purchased less, because of the use of Airbnb and therefore, it isn't associated with less environmental damage. However, in some interviews surfaced thoughts on not having to build new hotels, because people are more and more using Airbnb. Also something that did surface multiple times, was that respondents considered that Airbnb offers a more effective use of idle capacities. And the better and more effective use of existing resources, can of course be seen as a more sustainable way of consuming. However, this wasn't seen as a primary motive in participating in the P2P sharing.

As Lamberton and Rose (2012) demonstrated, consumer's tendency to share can be understood by examining the cost-benefit relation of sharing. The findings of this research support the propositions of Lamberton and Rose to some extent. Guests considered that sharing involved a monetary cost as well as search costs, since sometimes they had to go through some effort to find a suitable house or room to rent. In addition to these some guests considered that using Airbnb involved sometimes some minor inconveniences and practical problems, but they accepted these flaws, since they considered that it was justified, due to the humanity of sharing. Then on the other hand, guests considered that sharing involved some benefits. Transaction utility was considered to be present, since guests perceived that they gain value of using Airbnb. Also, guests considered that using Airbnb had resulted in sources of utility related to flexibility and convenience, since for many times it had fulfilled their flexible needs. Interestingly anti-industry utility rose in some interviews when discussing values, since some respondents felt that they gain psychological benefit by supporting Airbnb. Thus they felt that they can in a way penalize the traditional ownership market and consequently feel gratified when not supporting big corporations. Additionally, guests perceived gaining social benefits, when getting to know new people and cultures.

Additionally, hosts considered that Airbnb involves costs as well as benefits. Costs that were mentioned were mainly related to the time and energy that hosting required.

Also, supporting Lamberton's and Rose's (2012) propositions, hosts considered that Airbnb required technological costs in a sense. Not learning how to operate with unfamiliar things, but learning to operate with unfamiliar people. In other words, always informing guests about the house rules and other practical things as well as getting to know the person. Regarding benefits, hosts considered gaining utility related to the flexibility and convenience as well. In addition to this hosts also considered gaining social benefits and learning something new from the guests. Moreover, financial benefits gained was seen as important and justified.

After examining the costs and benefits that were considered to be present on both sides of the transaction, it was found that Airbnb participants feel that the benefits that are gained cover the costs that are involved. Moreover, hosts emphasized that the financial benefits that they gain of hosting are justified, due to the cost related to effort and time that is required for hosting. Thus, the findings of this research are compatible with the proposition of Lamberton and Rose (2012) that tendency to choose sharing surfaces from the balance where costs of sharing are minimized and utility is maximized compared to ownership.

The findings of this research support largely the studies of Ylimaz, Gungordy and Yumusak (2016) that values can explain the consumer's attitudes towards a purchase decision and act as a driver for action, since it is found that sharing is strongly driven by values. Since there is a limited amount of research on to what extent values drive sharing behavior, this research aimed to contribute to this field. It was found that, Airbnb participants are highly driven by values. Values such as wanting to be part of change, a sense of community, being able to use resources more efficiently, being able to support individual people rather than big corporations, being able to take care of others and to be hospitable as well as being able to meet new people and being social surfaced in this research. From the List of Values introduced by Kahle (1983) surfaced noticeably values such as warm relationships with others, self-fulfillment, being well respected, fun and enjoyment in life and excitement. Especially hosts valued having warm relationships with others and they felt gaining self-fulfillment and being well-respected as hosts. Many guests valued fun, enjoyment and excitement.

The findings of this research support the proposition of Bellotti et. al (2015) that on sharing economy platforms people prefer to interact with people who share the same values as them. The findings demonstrate that hosts considered important that they shared they same universal values like respect, openness, curiosity, friendliness and courtesy with the guests. Also guests mentioned paying attention to the hosts values, especially on on-site hospitality, but they did not consider shared values to be as significant. Guests considered values such as interested in travelling and openness to be important. However, in contrast to Ikkala's and Lampinen's (2015) proposition, hosts did not seem to be selective in only hosting people who are in some ways similar to them.

In fact, conversely some hosts even emphasized that hosting people who are very different to them, was quite interesting and inspiring. Moreover, hosts did not consider the characteristics or interests of the guests important, but rather their universal values.

Overall, the findings of this research demonstrate that peer-to-peer sharing and the motives and meanings driving it, are diverse and strongly related to people's values and thoughts about the world. This study demonstrates that participating in the sharing economy, especially in Airbnb is driven by both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, which should be examined and understood holistically.

5.2   Managerial implications

In addition to the theoretical contributions presented previously, the research provides some insights that can be useful for not only Airbnb but other peer-to-peer service providers. Understanding the user's motives, values and beliefs is very important in order to engage people in using sharing economy services. When understanding what drives people in engaging in to peer-to-peer sharing, the platform providers can promote these kind of identity congruent personal standards that the users can accomplish by using the service. The findings of this research demonstrate that Airbnb participants are driven mostly by financial and social motives as well the desire to seek experience and to utilize novel products. Additionally, Aibnb participants are driven by certain values such as wanting to be part of change, a sense of community, being able to use resources more efficiently, being able to support individual people rather than big corporations, being able to take care of others and to be hospitable as well as being able to meet new people and being social, which need to be taken into consideration. As many sharing economy service providers tend to promote solely the extrinsic benefits such as financial profits (Makwana 2013), it would be rather important to recognize and keep in mind also some intrinsic benefits, beliefs and thoughts that consumers have on sharing. Understanding the motivation of peer-to-peer sharing service users is essential in order to connect with customers. Encouraging people in using a service, is quite impossible if consumer's motives and values are based on a guess.

There has been some debate about Airbnb distorting the rental markets in big European cities like Berlin, Amsterdam and Barcelona. This debate surfaces from the phenomenon, where landlords have started renting their whole apartments on Airbnb for tourists rather than renting the house for inhabitants on the free rental market, in order to gain bigger income. This has frustrated inhabitants, due to decrease of supply on the rental market that has lead to higher rents. Therefore, some cities such as Berlin have made a decision to set boundaries for the use of Airbnb in order to protect affordable renting for inhabitants. In Berlin this means that Airbnb hosts can not rent more than

50% of their apartment on a short-term basis, in other words they can still rent individual rooms as long as they still utilize at least 50% of the house themselves. (The Guardian 2015.) Since the original idea of Airbnb is to accommodate travelers who are in the need of a place to stay, rather than enabling individual landlords to run an apartment rental business, these kind of regulations are necessary not only for protecting affordable renting, but also to maintain the core idea of sharing. It is rather important to keep in mind why people choose to use Airbnb or other peer-to-peer sharing services. In this research surfaced multiple times that Airbnb users are keen to use Airbnb, because it enables a humane and authentic way to travel and where the host may act in a way as a private tourist guide. Some Airbnb guests even mentioned, that they avoid renting Airbnb apartments that are clearly made for business. Therefore, participant's motives and values for using sharing economy services are noteworthy to identify in order to utilize them in marketing communication.

In Finland, consumers are becoming more and more interested in sharing economy services and adopting fast to new consumption options. This research demonstrates that Finnish people are keen in trying out new technology and new applications and are fascinated in exploring new ways of doing things. This and the fact that the global revenues of sharing economy are estimated to grow at a much faster pace than the revenues on traditional markets (PwC 2014) demonstrate that is is highly advisable for managers to drive their businesses in to a more collaborative direction and create new peer-to-peer sharing models. Moreover, it seems like new peer-to-peer sharing services are very welcome to the Finnish market.

5.3   Limitations and suggestions for further research

This research expands the knowledge on sharing economy generally, and especially the motives and meanings behind peer-to-peer sharing. However, like every research, there are some limitations that this research encounters and that need to be taken in to consideration when interpreting the findings. Firstly, it is important to bear in mind that when interviewing people from a certain geographical area, in this case Southern Finland, some cultural or geographical characteristics or settings may take place. Peer-to-peer sharing participants can behave differently and value different things according to cultural or demographical standards. Factors such as hospitability and openness, which are in the core of Airbnb, are characteristics that can be strongly embedded in the norms and manners of a culture. Secondly, the selection of participants can be biased in a way that people who have positive experiences with Airbnb are more likely to agree in taking part in the interview. Also, since this research explores a certain peer-to-peer platform, the findings can not necessarily be generalized to describe all peer-to-peer plat-

forms, since Airbnb can be considered to have some distinct characteristics, since it is a question of sharing a home and not for example cars or goods. Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that even though peer-to-peer sharing can be generalized in to some extent, still every platform and service has some distinct aspects and characteristics that may affect participation. Also, since this research is qualitative by nature and conducted by interviewing people, it is important to be aware of the subjectivity of the responses.

Since sharing economy is a rising trend, future research is encouraged in order to improve the understanding of this growing phenomenon. Especially, improving the understanding of why consumers on both sides of the transaction participate in peer-to-peer sharing. This research points out that it is essential to understand the nuances of motivations as well as the meanings and values that drive consumers in choosing a sharing option. Future research should explore the values found in this study more thoroughly and examine how they effect the participation behavior. Also an interesting direction for future research could be to examine how different motives evolve in the long term. Exploring motivations periodically, in different stages of participation, would give a better understanding on how motives might develop over time and this could contribute to the understanding on the crowding out phenomenon. Additionally, when examining specifically Airbnb, there is a lack of understanding guests' motives in participating. Previous research on Airbnb has primarily concentrated on examining the motives of hosts'. Therefore, this research aimed to contribute to the understanding of the motives on both sides of the transaction. As it is important to understand the differing motives of different roles, further research on this area is highly encouraged.

6   SUMMARY

Sharing economy as a phenomenon has encountered major growth within the recent years. Consumers are increasingly keen in participating in different sharing economy services as owning is decreasing its importance and people prefer to share and gain experiences by accessing. The rise of sharing economy can be explained by multiple factors. Firstly, the global financial crisis has encouraged people to find alternative ways to consume. Secondly, people are increasingly reluctant in owning and attaching to things and access is seen as a more temporal form of consumption, which adapts better to the modern consumer's fast-moving and flexible lifestyle and identity. Thirdly, major technological development has enabled sharing economy services to flourish by connecting people more broadly than ever before. Additionally, the technological development and rise of the Internet has helped to overcome barriers such as transaction costs, trust and reputational factors that have once limited sharing activities.

Even though the rise of sharing economy is clearly justifiable, there is still a lack of understanding why consumers participate in sharing. Therefore, this research aims to contribute in the understanding of consumers motives in taking part in sharing economy services, especially in peer-to-peer sharing. Peer-to-peer sharing can be defined as people coordinating the acquisition and distribution of underused resources for a fee or other compensation. In peer-to-peer sharing there are two types of participants, the users and the providers. This research aims to contribute to the understanding of both participants' motives in taking part in the service. Previous literature suggests that determinants as financial benefits, enjoyment and experience seeking, sustainability and social motives are driving consumers to participate. However, previous research primarily focuses on isolated determinants, rather than exploring motives and their relative strengths more holistically. Consumers motives should be explored more widely, because different motivation determinants can influence behavior simultaneously and also, sharing behavior is driven by other meanings as well, like consumers' values. As a result of this presented research gap, this research aims to answer to the following research question:

To examine the sharing economy, especially to explore the motivations to participate in peer-to-peer sharing

This research problem is further divided into two sub research questions:

1) What kind of motives exist in participating in peer-to-peer sharing models and how are these motivation types emphasized?
2) What kind of other meanings are related to sharing?

The literature review was constructed according to the two sub questions. The chapter two begins with delving in to the definition, characteristics and background of sharing economy. This is followed by presenting motivation theories and introducing previous motivation research within the field of sharing economy. Thus, this lower chapter aims to create a theoretical framework for the first sub research question. Chapter two ends with delving in to certain meanings related to sharing behavior, cost-utility relation and value driven behavior, which acts as a base for answering the second sub research question. Chapter three presents the research methodology, in which the research strategy, case Airbnb, data collection, data analysis and trustworthiness of the study are presented. Chapter four presents the empirical findings according to the sub research questions and chapter five presents the conclusions, that consist of theoretical contributions, managerial implications and limitations and suggestions for future research.

The empirical data was collected by ten semi-structured thematic interviews with Airbnb users. Since the aim of this study was to gain understanding of the motives of both participants, providers and users, both sides were interviewed. Five of the respondents acted as hosts and five of the respondents acted as guests. The data collection was limited to Finnish users and host's that hosted in Southern Finland. The findings are presented in chapter four, which is organized according to the interview themes, which are based on the literature review.

The main conclusions of this study demonstrate that participants of P2P sharing platforms are motivated by various factors. Hosts and guests are motivated by financial and social benefits, which may differ in priority and emphasis. The findings clearly demonstrate, that these motives shouldn't be seen as crowding out each other, but rather supporting each other in forming a holistic motivation. An important finding is that, the financial motivation of hosting on AirBnb does not necessarily crowd out the intrinsic social motivations, but rather can enable further social exchange and interaction between peers. This research further suggests that in the similar way the initial social motivation of hosting on Airbnb does not necessarily crowd out the extrinsic motivations of earning money, but rather creates an additional benefit on the side of the social motives.

Additionally, the findings of this research are as well compatible with the propositions of previous academic research on experience and trend orientation acting as motives in participating in P2P sharing. Especially guests considered that Airbnb offers a more unique, distinctive and interesting way of travelling. Some guests even considered the experience that Airbnb provides is the most important reason to participate. Also, the empirical findings of this research demonstrate that guests were motivated by the possibility to use a novel service that utilizes new technology. They considered that Airbnb offers a new, flexible and smarter way of doing things and saw it as a very tempting alternative, since they are keen in trying out new applications and services.

Additionally, this research demonstrates that values can explain the consumer's attitudes towards a purchase decision and act as a driver for action, since it is found that sharing is strongly driven by values. Values such as wanting to be part of change, a sense of community, being able to use resources more efficiently, being able to support individual people rather than big corporations, being able to take care of others and to be hospitable as well as being able to meet new people and being social surfaced in this research. Also people prefer to interact with people who share the same universal values as them.

REFERENCES

Airbnb, About Us – <https://www.airbnb.fi/about/about-us>, retrieved 15.10.2016

Airbnb, Trust – <https://fi.airbnb.com/trust>, retrieved 15.10.2016

Albinsson, P. – Perera, B. Y. (2009) From trash to treasure and beyond: the meaning of voluntary disposition. *Journal of Consume Behaviour*, Vol. 8 (Nov-Dec), 340–353.

Bardhi, F. – Eckhardt, G. (2012) Access-Based Consumption: The Case of Car Sharing. *Journal of Consumer research*, Vol. 39 (Dec), 881–898.

Belk, R (2014) Sharing Versus Pseudo-Sharing in Web 2.0. *Anthropologist*, Vol. 18 (1), 7–23.

Belk, R. (2013a) Extended Self in a Digital World. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 40 (3), 477–500.

Belk, R (2013b) You Are What You Can Access: Sharing and Collaborative Consumption Online. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 (8), 1595–1600.

Belk, R (2010) Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 36 (5), 715–734.

Bellotti, V. – Ambard, A. –Turner, D. – Gossmann, C. – Demkova, K. – Carroll. J. (2015) A Muddle of Models of Motivation for Using Peer-to-Peer Economy Systems. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '15),* (April), 1085–1094.

Botsman, R. (2015) *Defining The Sharing Economy: What is Collaborative Consumption and What Isn't.* Fast Company. <https://www.fastcoexist.com/3046119/defining-the-sharing-economy-what-is-collaborative-consumption-and-what-isnt/3> retrieved 22.8.2016

Botsman, R. (2013) *The Sharing Economy Lacks a Shared Definition*. Fast Company. <http://www.fastcoexist.com/3022028/the-sharing-economy-lacks-a-shared-definition> retrieved 22.8.2016

Botsman, R. – Rogers, B. (2010) *What's Mine is Yours: The Rise of Collaborative Consumption.* HarperBusiness 1st Edition.

Coulter, R. – Ligas, M. (2003) To Retain or to Relinquish: Exploring the Disposition Practices of Packrats and Purgers. *Advances in Consumer research,* Vol. 30, 38–40.

The Economist (2015) The Rise of the Sharing Economy: On the Internet everything is for Hire. <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21573104-internet-everything-hire-rise-sharing-economy>, retrieved 23.9.2016

European Commission (2016) *Communication on a European Agenda for the Collaborative Economy.* <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/16881>, retrieved 13.12.2016

Greif, H. – Hjorth, L. – Lasén, A. – Lobet-Maris, C. (2011) *Participation in Broadband Society. Cultures of Participation. Media Practices, Politics and Literacy.* Peter Lang AG, Frankfurt am Main.

Eriksson, P. – Kovalainen, A. (2008) *Qualitative Methods in Business Research.* Sage Publications, London.

Eskola, J. – Suoranta, J. (1998) *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen.* Vastapaino, Tampere.

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,* Vol. 14 (4), 90–103.

Han, S. – Gupta, S. – Lehmann, D. (2001) Consumer Price Sensitivity and Price Tresholds. *Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 77, 435–456.

Hars, A. – Ou, S. (2002) Working for Free? Motivations for Participating in Open-Source Projects. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, Vol. 6 (3), 25–39.

Hartl, B. – Hofmann, E. – Kirchler, E. (2015) Do we need rules for "what's mine is yours"? Governance in collaborative consumption communities. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 (8), 2765–2763.

Henten, A. – Windekilde, I. (2016) Transaction costs and the sharing economy. *Info (Bingley).* Vol. 18 (1), 1–15.

Howard, E. (2015) – *Humans have already used up 2015's supply of Earth's resources* <https://www.the.com/environment/2015/aug/12/humans-have-already-used-up-2015s-supply-of-earths-resources-analysis> retrieved 20.9.2016

Hunt, R. – Hunt, S. (1994) The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing.* Vol. 58 (July), 20–38.

Ikkala, T. – Lampinen, A. (2015) Monetizing Network Hospitality: Hospitality and Sociability in the context of Airbnb. *CSCW.* March 14–18, 1033–1044.

Kahle, L. – Beatty, S. – Homer, P. (1986) Alternative Measurement Approaches to Consumer Values: The List of Values (LOV) and Values of Life Styles (VALS). *The Journal of Consumer Research.* Vol. 13 (3), 405–409.

Kahle, L. (1983) *Social Values and Social Change Adaption to Life in America.* New York, Praeger.

Kaplan, A. – Haenlein, M. (2010) Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, Vol. 53 (1), 59–68.

Koivisto, M (2016) – *AirBnb:n suosio Helsingissä rajussa kasvussa – jo neljännes kaupungin hotellikapasiteetista löytyy kotisohvilta* <http://yle.fi/uutiset/3-8731613>, retrieved 15.11.2016

Lamberton, C. – Rose, R. (2012) When Is Ours Better Than Mine? A Framework for Understanding and Altering participation in Commercial Sharing Systems. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 76 (July), 109–125.

Lampinen, A. – Chesire, C. (2016) Hosting via Airbnb: Motivations and Financial Assurances in Monetized Network Hospitality. *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing System,.* 1669–1680.

Lincoln, Y. – Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.

Makwana, R. (2013) *Values and the Sharing Economy*. <https://ourworld.unu.edu/en/values-and-the-sharing-economy> retrieved, 23.9.2016

Maslow, A. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review,* Vol. 50 (4), 370–396.

Meelen, T. – Frenken, K. (2015) *Stop Saying Uber is Part of the Sharing Economy.* <https://www.fastcoexist.com/3040863/stop-saying-uber-is-part-of-the-sharing-economy>, retrieved 13.9.2016

Moeller, S. – Wittkowski, K. (2010) The burdens of ownership: reasons for preferring renting. *Managing Service Quality,* Vol. 20 (2), 176–191.

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

Morganosky, M. (1986) Cost- Versus Convenience-oriented Consumers: Demographic, Lifestyle and Value Perspectives. *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 3 (1), 35–46.

Oltermann, P. (2016) – *Berlin ban on Airbnb short-term rentals upheld by city court.* < https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/jun/08/berlin-ban-airbnb-short-term-rentals-upheld-city-court>, retrieved 5.12.2016

Oskam, J. – Boswijk, A. (2016) Airbnb: the future of networked hospitality businesses. *Journal of Tourism Futures,* Vol. 2 (1), 22–42.

Oyserman, D. (2009) Identity-based motivation: Implications for action-readiness, procedural-readiness, and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology,* Vol. 19 (3), 250–260.

Paden, N. – Stell, R. (2005) Consumer Product Redistribution: Disposition Decisions and Channel Options. *Journal of Marketing Channels,* Vol. 12 (3), 105–123.

Philip, H. – Ozanne, L. – Ballantine, P. (2015) Examining temporary disposition and acquisition in peer-to-peer renting. *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 31 (11–12), 1310–1332.

Pine, B. – Gilmore, J. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 97–105

PwC 2016 – Future of the Sharing Economy in Europe <http://www.pwc.co.uk/issues/megatrends/collisions/sharingeconomy/future-of-the-sharing-economy-in-europe-2016.html>, retrieved 19.12.2016

PwC 2015 – *The Sharing Economy* – Consumer Intelligence Series <https://www.pwc.com/us/en/technology/publications/assets/pwc-consumer-intelligence-series-the-sharing-economy.pdf> retrieved 15.10.2016

PwC 2014 – *The Sharing Economy* – Sizing the revenue opportunity <http://www.pwc.co.uk/issues/megatrends/collisions/sharingeconomy/the-sharing-economy-sizing-the-revenue-opportunity.html> retrieved 23.9.2016

Rodrigues, R. – Druschel, P. (2010) Peer-to-peer systems. *Communications of the ACM,* Vol. 53 (10), 72–82.

Ryan, R. – Deci, E. (2000) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol 25 (1), 54–67.

Saunders, M. – Lewis, P. – Thornhill, A. (2009) *Research methods for business students*. 5th ed. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.

Schwartz, S. – Bilsky, W. (1987) Toward a Universal Psychological Structure of Human Values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 53, 550–562.

Shah, A. (2005) *Effects of Consumerism.* <http://www.globalissues.org/article/238/effects-of-consumerism>, retrieved 20.9.2016

ShareNL 2015 – *The Rise of the Peer-to-Business-to-Peer Marketplace.* <http://www.sharenl.nl/nieuws/the-rise-of-the-peer-to-business-to-peer-marketplace> , retrieved 23.8.2016

Statista 2015 – *Number of vehicles in the United States from 1990 to 2014.* <https://www.statista.com/statistics/183505/number-of-vehicles-in-the-united-states-since-1990/> retrieved 21.9.2016

The Times 2009 – *Rent Clothes to Cut Carbon Emissions, says Green Watchdog.* <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/environment/article2144757.ec>, retrieved 23.9.2016

Tuomi, J. – Sarajärvi, A. (2002) *Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi.* Tammi, Helsinki.

Tuten, T. – Solomon, M. R. (2014) *Pearson new international edition. Social Media Marketing.* Pearson Education Limited, Edinburgh Gate, Harlow.

Yilmaz, K. –Gungordu, A. – Yumusak, T. (2016) The Relationship between the List of Values and Consumer Decision Making Styles in the Context of Clothing Products. *Business Management Dynamics*, Vol. 5 (9), 1–14.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and method. 3rd ed. London: Sage.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Translated interview themes and questions

<u>Background questions</u>
- Please tell your name, age and city you live in
- Please tell your current life situation (employed, unemployed, student, retired)

<u>Theme 1: Sharing economy and use of Airbnb</u>
- Do you use Airbnb primarily as a user or as a host?
- How often have you used Airbnb?
- For hosts: Please explain briefly how did you end up as a host?
- For guests: Please explain briefly how did you end up as a guest?
- Please describe briefly your history and experience with Airbnb?
- What comes up in your mind when you think about sharing economy? How can that be seen in Airbnb in your opinion?
- In your opinion, what is an important characteristic of Airbnb?

<u>Theme 2: Motivation and motives</u>
- Initially, what made you participate in Airbnb? What sparked your interest towards it?
- What made you continue the use of Airbnb?
- To what extent did sustainability affect your participation?
- Do you feel that your motives to participate have changed during the use? If yes, how?
- Do you feel that the use of Airbnb has fulfilled your expectations? Or exceeded or beaten your expectations?
- At this moment, what is the most important reason to participate in the use of Airbnb?

<u>Theme 3: Cost-Utility relation of the use of Airbnb and sharing economy</u>
- What benefits do you feel that you gain from the use of Airbnb?
- What costs are related to the use of Airbnb?
- In your opinion, does the benefits that are gained cover the costs that are required?
- In your opinion, is a service like Airbnb better than a similar service on the traditional market (ex. Hotel)? If yes, why?

Theme 4: Sharing economy and values
- Do you feel that your values are some how connected to the use of Airbnb? If yes, how?
- To what extent is the use of Airbnb connected your identity building or your identity expression?
- For hosts: Do you find it important that the guests that you accommodate share the same values with you?
- For hosts: Is all guest inquiries accepted or is there some kind of a selection of guests? Based on what are the guests selected?
- For guests: Do you find it important that the hosts who you choose to stay with share the same values with you?

- Is there anything else about sharing economy, Airbnb, motives, benefits, costs, values or anything that you would want to share?