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Abstract

**Keywords** Car sharing, ownership allocation, sharee motivations

**Background** Traditional consumption is increasingly replaced by sharing behavior which led to companies entering the peer dominated market with sharing service offers.

**Purpose** The purpose of this thesis is to explore how sharee motivations differ towards car sharing platforms with different allocations of car ownership.

**Methodology** This thesis follows an interpretivist and inductive approach to pursue a grounded theory strategy. Qualitative data was collected through three focus groups and transcripts were coded into motivational themes using the Gioia method with respect to the two car sharing sample cases of car2go and Getaround as part of the analysis process.

**Empirical Findings** Seven motivations to partake in car sharing were identified: trust, community, sustainability, functional convenience, experience, lifestyle, and monetary value. Ownership allocation leads to different levels of trust that motivate sharees to partake in car sharing. While company-owned cars do not require peer interaction, the sense of community was deemed more motivating to use Getaround. Both car sharing platforms were perceived sustainable in different ways. The functional convenience of Getaround and car2go was perceived differently depending on the purpose. Less respect was felt for company property which lead to a better driving experience with car2go, whereas the thought of true sharing of peer-owned cars added to the car sharing experience as such and motivated participants to use Getaround. No specific motivational differences regarding ownership allocation were identified in regard to lifestyle. The monetary value of car sharing motivated participants to use both cases due to the overall affordability and lower costs compared to car ownership.

**Conclusion** This thesis contributes to research by taking ownership allocation into account as a defining characteristic within car sharing platforms. Ownership allocation resulted in an interconnectedness of all motivations to partake in car sharing which are dictated by the individual sharee framings. Each participant’s motivations differed in regard to platforms with varying ownership allocation although no motivational patterns emerged. Thus, ownership allocation adds relevance in efforts to define the sharing economy.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

While it has always been human nature to share, the recent years witnessed a steep growth of sharing platforms that developed into a sizeable sharing economy. Botsman and Rogers (2011) were among the first to address collaborative consumption in literature and have sparked the interest in researching this new phenomenon. The desire among consumers for constantly wanting to possess new things created by the marketing and advertising industry has led to a questionable state of consumption. The issues arising from hyperconsumption have led some consumers to reconsider how they consume goods and the innovations in technology turned it into a global mass movement (Botsman & Rogers, 2011). However, with sharing economy being already an emerging trend in many parts of the world, it has the potential to disrupt traditional forms of business. Especially the increasing dispense of private ownership leads to an increase of sharing behavior that replaces traditional consumption. Many companies that are faced with the necessity to compete with sharing services are adapting and have found their way to commercialize sharing. This adds another point of access for consumers in the previously peer dominated sharing economy. Based on this multifaceted, dynamic, and impactful nature of the sharing economy it is a frequently discussed topic in various research fields.

1.2 Research Problem

Lamberton (2015) identified that the dispersive theory on sharing economy is a hindrance to providing deep insights for research. Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) have called for more research to distinguish boundary conditions that clearly define the sharing economy through a distinction between the terms ‘sharing’ and ‘forms of access’. In the same way, Lindblom and Lindblom (2017) consider it a problem that much of the existent theory is overly diffuse to fit, amongst others, the purpose of consumer studies. Möhlmann (2015) shows that different ‘forms’ of the sharing economy or collaborative consumption exist, thus stressing the importance to conduct studies to understand their differences, in order to add depth to the research field and relevance to future research. One of these ‘different forms’ includes the differences in platforms between P2P and B2C (Schaefers, 2013; Möhlmann, 2015; Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015; Stephany, 2015; Davidson, Habibi, & Laroche, 2018). A defining characteristic between these two types is the allocation of ownership of the shared good.

Davidson et al. (2018) acknowledge different forms of the sharing economy by pointing out that motivations to partake in the sharing economy as studied by Botsman and Rogers (2011) vary. The authors further acknowledge the statement of Belk (2014a) that treating all sharing
economy programs and vocabulary the same would be a mistake. This leaves Davidson et al. (2018) to conclude that the different factors in the forms of sharing economy have to be studied in isolation to understand different attitude formations. The need to distinguish between types of sharing and the extension of vocabulary can be refined by taking ownership allocation into consideration.

In regard to the example of car sharing, Prettenthaler and Steininger (1999) identified the emergence of car sharing and defined this phenomenon. While Prieto, Baltas, and Stan (2017) differentiate between the different types of car sharing, the distinction remains narrow. The rapid emergence of car sharing platforms includes models of varying ownership allocations (peer-owned and business-owned models).

As one of the first researchers, Schaefers (2013) highlights the importance of non-observable aspects of consumer behavior with the study on underlying motives and motivational patterns in car sharing. Especially the consideration of cognitive processes in regard to attitudes and motives has the potential to add value to this specific research field. Böcker and Meelen (2017) recently criticised the lack of a deep understanding of motivations in the sharing economy literature, revealing the still existing need for further research. Acquier, Daudigeos, and Pinkse (2017) also identify this problem and argued motivational studies are too broad and lack a clear distinction between the dynamic field of the sharing economy. Hence, a majority of research has focused purely on attitudes and motivations in the general sharing economy (Schaefers, 2013; Hamari, Sjöklint, & Ukkonen, 2016; Buda & Lehota, 2017) or compared the differences of sharing models (Belk, 2014a; Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015), but never a combination of both. Ownership allocation represents such a difference of sharing models that can be included in sharee motivational studies to add to existing literature.

1.3 Research Purpose

The aim of this thesis is to explore how sharee motivations differ towards car sharing platforms with different ownership allocations. This study seeks to review the current state of car sharing through two car sharing platforms based on their type of ownership allocation, namely providing access to company-owned and peer-owned vehicles.

Based on the development of car sharing literature and the sharing economy as such, this study acknowledges the need to unveil consumer motivations in various aspects of car sharing. Differences in access platforms are investigated through the exploration of ownership allocation of the accessed goods. In addressing the aspect of ownership allocation, this research will compare two car sharing providers, similar in operation to the greatest possible
extent, with the key difference being the aspect of asset ownership. The contribution to research made in this thesis focuses on the differences in consumer motivations to access cars owned by a single entity in comparison to peer-owned cars.

1.4 Research Outline
This thesis consists of six chapters, including the first introductory chapter. The second chapter reviews extant literature in three different sections regarding the sharing economy as a whole (chapter 2.1), the role of ownership in the sharing economy (chapter 2.2), motivations to partake in the sharing economy (chapter 2.3), and lastly introduces the guiding research questions (chapter 2.4). The third chapter contains the methodology of this thesis. The first section (chapter 3.1) shows the subjective and interpretive research philosophy, followed by the inductive research approach (chapter 3.2). The research design (chapter 3.3) adopts a grounded theory strategy (chapter 3.3.1), qualitative research choices (chapter 3.3.2) and a cross-sectional time horizon (chapter 3.3.3), as well as the sampling description and introduction of the car sharing platform cases car2go and Getaround (chapter 3.3.4). The chapters data collection (chapter 3.3.5), data quality (chapter 3.3.6) and analysis process (chapter 3.3.7) conclude the research design. Thereafter, the research ethics guiding this thesis (chapter 3.4) are outlined. The fourth chapter presents the findings and is divided into four parts. The first part reveals the identified motivations to partake in car sharing and the importance of sharee framings (chapter 4.1). The chapter is followed by a description of findings that relates to the perception of ownership allocation (chapter 4.2). Thereafter, a thorough analysis of differences in motivations is laid out to identify the motivations of sharees to partake in car sharing (chapter 4.3). The findings chapter is closed with a visualization of the differences in sharee motivations for each platform case (chapter 4.4). The thesis proceeds with a detailed analysis and discussion of the findings in the fifth chapter by identifying motivations in the context of ownership allocation. The conclusion forms the sixth and final chapter of the thesis and is divided into four sections, beginning with the contribution of this thesis to research (chapter 6.1). After this, managerial implications are derived (chapter 6.2) as well as the limitations of this research (chapter 6.3). Finally, areas of future research are identified (chapter 6.4).
2 Theoretical Background

2.1 The Sharing Economy

2.1.1 Scattered Definitions

The attempts of defining the term ‘sharing economy’ in extant literature are scattered into various directions that each highlight a different aspect as the focus of definition. Murillo, Buckland, and Val (2017) refer to the sharing economy as a diverse landscape heading to answer the key questions of where the boundaries and limitations of the sharing economy lie. One of the agreements in research in regard to sharing economy is the fact how difficult it is to define the sharing economy (Acquier et al., 2017). Acquier et al. (2017) distinguish existing definitions in regard to their broadness, classifying previous research into narrow and broad definitions of the sharing economy. Buda and Lehota (2017) suggest a consensus on the definition of sharing economy has not been reached yet due to the dynamic development of the new phenomenon. Either way, it has become evident that some parts of the sharing economy have already “disrupted the traditional rules of the game” (Acquier et al. 2017, p.1).

One particular attempt of classifying studies on the sharing economy has been made by Cheng (2016). The researcher identifies three main areas of existing studies: first the sharing economy as a business model and its' impact, second the nature of the sharing economy, and third the sustainable development of the sharing economy. Within these main areas, he recognizes five research fields (lifestyle and social movement, consumption practice, sharing paradigm, trust, and innovation). The author criticizes the lacking interconnectedness of trust and innovation with the remaining fields and calls for future research to connect the currently isolated research fields (Cheng, 2016).

As Schor (2016) points out, it is nearly impossible to develop a definition of sharing economy that represents the ‘common usage’. The researcher highlights not only the importance of defining the phenomenon as a whole but in particular challenges future research to adequately define the participants in the sharing economy and their multifaceted roles (Schor, 2016). Due to the aforementioned complexity of the sharing economy, the subsequent section provides a review of the main aspects, including participants, characteristics, objectives, and evolution.

2.1.2 Terms for Sharing Economy Participants in Extant Literature

As the sharing economy questions ownership in regard to consumption, Weber (2015) derives the participant distinction between owners and non-owners. With ownership in the focus of this definition, owners are those who made the decision to buy an item and to own it. Their willingness to share the item with others who do not own is the basis non-owners rely on to
obtain access. Non-owners are those who decided not to buy an item but instead - if needed - access it through owners (Weber 2015). Kochan (2017) also highlights the participant terms from an ownership view but from a legal perspective. The author derives the ‘right to share’ from ownership. Hence, a property owner can become a ‘sharer’ by allowing a ‘sharee’ access to his property (Kochan, 2017).

Another way of describing the participants is through a value-focused approach. The terms of de-ownership orientation and ownership orientation are used in this regard by Lindblom and Lindblom (2017). Hence, a de-ownership orientation is a reflection of an individual’s importance that he or she assigns towards the consumption through sharing. Access is valued higher than ownership among those with a de-ownership orientation and vice versa for those with an ownership orientation (Lindblom & Lindblom, 2017).

As the sharing economy includes multiple participants with different roles and relationships, Belk (2010) expands the terms for participants through the idea of sharing-in and sharing-out. In this view, sharing consists of givers and receivers in which givers decide on the circle of receivers. Sharing-in involves the sharing of a resource within the family level of the extended self (those who share a family identity). On the contrary, sharing-out does not expand the sphere of the extended self and retains the self/other boundary. However, the expansion of the sphere of the extended self is considered sharing-in if the non-family members involved (such as close friends) can be considered part of the family identity (Belk, 2010). In more recent research, Belk (2014b) acknowledges that his previously described idea excludes the non-volitional choices to share such as a common language. Hence, the author introduced two terms for sharing: one that is requested by someone else (demand sharing) and another which often occurs with family members or friends, involving several resources indirectly offered for sharing (open sharing). Both studies place the central focus in their definition of participants on the relationships between givers and receivers (Belk, 2014b).

2.1.3 Characteristics and Frameworks of the Sharing Economy

A key characteristic of the sharing economy is the information and communications technology (ICT). The rapid growth of the internet has given consumers the opportunity to interact online in a global network that not only establishes nonlocal trust, but reduces transaction costs, increases the speed of transactions, and gives access to a mass market - all accelerating the development of the sharing economy (Botsman & Rogers, 2011).

Across research fields in the sharing economy, researchers agree with Botsman and Rogers (2011) that the sharing economy is an ICT phenomenon (Cusumano, 2014; Benjaafar, Kong,
Li, & Courcoubetis, 2015; Möhlmann, 2015; Hamari et al., 2016; Kathan, Matzler, & Veider, 2016; Buda & Lehota, 2017). The disruptive effect of exponential growth in the sharing economy facilitated by ICT has the potential to harm company profits (Cusumano, 2014). In contrast to this economic view, Light and Miskelly (2015) picture current developments as the rise of sharing cultures (rather than sharing economies) in which local becomes global through the aid of ICT.

More specifically concerning ICT, John (2013) notes that the term ‘sharing’ is predominantly used in regard to Web 2.0 and that sharing characteristics have changed over time. The Web 2.0 started out by offering users the ability to share and distribute ‘concrete objects’ such as pictures or files on social networking sites. The study argues that once users became familiar with the concept of sharing, the sites’ focus changed towards the idea of sharing with no object at all. The research of John (2013) points out that the previous functionalities of the sites were now marketed through a “rhetoric of fuzzy objects of sharing” (John, 2013, p. 175) by using terms such as ‘Share your Life’. Sharing became a communication form of ‘telling’ rather than a form of distribution (John, 2013). In addition, Laurell and Sandström (2018) observed that social media favors the coverage of disruptive innovations, hence likely inducing their growth, in comparison to traditional media.

It becomes clear that the ‘sharing economy’ is merely an umbrella term for the multiple characteristics of the phenomenon (Hamari et al. 2016; Acquier et al., 2017). As Botsman and Rogers (2011) point out, one characteristic that unites most forms of the sharing economy is the collaborative aspect. As a society, we have long shared roads, parks, schools and other public spaces and developed into cooperatives, collectives, and communal structures to share a commonly needed resource. Certain areas of life were not always shared, but with the rise of collaborative consumption systems, new platforms unlocked these. These include land share, clothing swaps, toy sharing, Couchsurfing and many more (Botsman & Rogers 2011; Möhlmann, 2015). Hamari et al. (2016) additionally define social commerce, online sharing and some form of ideology as characteristics of the sharing economy. In a partial overlap, Davidson et al. (2018) show a variance in the sharing economy among the degrees of market mediation, money, socialization and community involvement. Light and Miskelly (2015) identify commercialization, loss, trust, and maximization of resources to avoid waste next to collaborative consumption as the common characteristics of the sharing economy.

In light of the varying characteristics, Belk (2014a) argues that a boundary has to be established between collaborative consumption and ‘coordinated consumption’ in regard to how the consumption takes place. Whereas collaborative consumption involves the joint
acquisition and distribution of a product (e.g. sharing a pitcher of beer), coordinated consumption merely describes separate consumption acts that are coordinated to occur at the same time and place (e.g. ordering individual beers).

In an effort to categorize the various characteristics previously described, a few noteworthy frameworks have emerged in literature. Acquier et al. (2017) organized a framework consisting of the three foundational cores of access economy, platform economy, and community-based economy. The access economy focuses on sharing of underutilized assets to optimize their use, while the platform economy core revolves around the initiatives that “intermediate decentralized exchanges among peers through digital platforms” (Acqueir et al. 2017). The community-based economy represents a coordination of sharing interactions without the use of contracts, hierarchies or money. Acquier et al. (2017) argue that an ideal initiative in the sharing economy consists of a balance of all three cores, but the escalation of tensions among them would result in failure of the initiative. While a dual-core initiative is possible, the challenging attempt of a three core initiative is coined as the “paradoxical nature of the sharing economy” (Acquier et al, 2017, p. 8)

Kassan and Orsi (2012) developed another concept that centers around the community characteristic. Their categorization of sharing economy platforms is split into four levels that are not stages of progression but instead take place simultaneously. The first level describes the building of relationships with the aim to result in casual, spontaneous and one-time transactions. The second level consists of building long-term agreements to secure an availability for future need. The third level includes the building of organizations as lasting institutions that endure the coming and going of individuals (e.g. in neighborhoods). The fourth and last level is comprised of building larger-scale platforms that involve the cooperation of stakeholders and governments to integrate them into existing city or regional infrastructures. Even though the levels occur simultaneously, their increase in relationships and communities throughout the levels represents the evolving of community in the sharing economy (Kassan & Orsi, 2012).

One approach is taken on by Cheng (2016) in the call for a three-level micro-meso-macro typology to understand the complexity and changing nature of the sharing economy. The agents (e.g. individual suppliers and consumers) are assigned to the micro level, whereas the macro level deals with large scale-patterns of communities and governments. In between, groups and their interactions (start-ups and traditional firms) find a place in the meso level. Cheng (2016) concludes that additional multi-level frameworks are necessary to cope with the characteristic changes of the sharing economy.
In perspective of the aforementioned central characteristics of the sharing economy, being the accessibility through ICT, the commercial value derived from it, the use of underutilized assets, the dominant role of community as well as the decline of ownership, Stephany (2015) includes the various aspects into one definition: “the sharing economy is the value in taking underutilized assets and making them accessible online to a community, leading to a reduced need for ownership of those assets” (Stephany, 2015, p. 9). Nonetheless, the definition links sharing economy conclusively to a reduced need for ownership, while the purpose of this research requires an inclusive interpretation as recently presented by Laurell and Sandström (2017). The definition refines the version in the study of Möhlmann (2015) by defining forms of sharing economy activities as ‘ICT-enabled platforms’ that are organized under non-market and market logics as followed: “ICT-enabled platforms for exchanges of goods and services drawing on non-market logics such as sharing, lending, gifting and swapping as well as market logics such as renting and selling.” (Laurell & Sandström, 2017, p.63).

2.1.4 Objectives of Participants in the Sharing Economy

The differences in characteristics and their mapping in the form of definitions highly influences the objectives associated with the sharing economy. Schröder and Wolf (2017) assign great importance to what they refer to this as ‘framing’ due to the influences of framing on the objectives. Light and Miskelly (2015) highlight the issue of influential framing through their focus on culture, resulting the authors to re-define the term ‘sharing economy’ into ‘sharing cultures’.

In a recent ethnographic study, Martin (2016) identifies six different framings of the sharing economy depending on the actor involved. Framings of actors seeking to empower the sharing economy include (1) an economic opportunity, (2) a more sustainable form of consumption and (3) a pathway to a decentralized, equitable and sustainable economy. Actors resisting and criticizing the sharing economy movement relied on the framings of (4) creating unregulated marketplaces, (5) reinforcing the neoliberal paradigm, and (6) an incoherent field of innovation (Martin, 2016).

As part of those actors seeking the empowerment of the sharing economy, Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) establish the central characteristics of saving or earning money, providing a novel consumer experience, reducing the environmental impact and building up social bonds. In this context, Benjaafar et al. (2015) add that the underutilization of resources is partly due to infrequent demand. Thus, the objective of the sharing economy is trying to overcome
this problem. Kathan et al. (2016) and Buda and Lehota (2017) share the agreement on the environmental sustainability of the sharing economy of the aforementioned definitions.

2.1.5 The Evolution of the Sharing Economy from P2P to B2C

A key issue in the state of P2P collaboration was the uncertainty of accessibility for those who decided not to own, and the need of a non-owner by those who owned and wanted to share (Benjaafar et al, 2015). Nonetheless, the exponential growth of the P2P platforms and their alternative mode of consumption has the potential to harm the profits of established firms (Cusumano, 2014). One example constitutes the platform Airbnb whose presence in Austin, Texas has decreased hotel room revenue by 10% in five years, according to a study by Zervas, Proserpio, and Byers (2017). The authors further discovered that a 10% increase in Airbnb supply resulted in a 0.39% decrease of hotel revenue (compared to 1.6% from a 10% increase of hotel room supply) (Zervas et al., 2017). The disruptive potential can also be seen in the car industry, where despite the steady production increase of European carmakers since 2009 and doubling global operating profits of carmakers (from 2009 to 2016), recent studies show that 59% of today’s car owners do not want to own a car in 2025 (McGee, 2017).

In the past years, a growing number of B2C platforms have therefore emerged, addressing the issue of availability to benefit from the profit potentials of the sharing economy (Buda & Lehota, 2017). New sharing businesses no longer address the sharing of already existing assets but instead promote the best utilization of a product portfolio tailored to the phenomenon (Buda & Lehota, 2017).

In consideration of the for-profit business infiltration of the sharing economy, Botsman and Rogers (2011) organize the collaborative consumption platforms into a system of three terms: product service systems, redistribution markets, and collaborative lifestyles. Product service systems define the monetary exchange for the benefit of the product, rather than the ownership thereof. Redistribution markets appear in free exchanges, sales of goods or a mix thereof for pre-owned goods. In collaborative lifestyles, physical goods, as well as less tangible assets, can be shared among like-minded people with a focus on social connectivity (Botsman & Rogers, 2011). In a more recent study, Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) extend and rephrase the terms to: re-circulation of goods, exchange of services, optimizing the use of assets and building social connections. The profit orientation leads to a new characteristic of consequence in the sharing economy: P2P or B2C operations (Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015). Stephany (2015) prefers the term P2P over consumer-to-consumer (C2C) as the term ‘peer’ implies the double role of lenders/investors and consumers.
In a later study, Schor (2016) introduces a framework of two dimensions to organize the advancements in the sharing economy. The author argues that the market orientation (for-profit or non-profit) and market structure (P2P or B2C) influence the social economy platforms' business models, logics of exchange and potential for disrupting traditional business (Schor, 2016). On the contrary, Aloni (2016) disputes that the ‘access to excess’ is solely a part of the P2P economy.

Akbar, Mai, and Hoffmann (2016) derived ‘open and closed commercial sharing systems’ due to the involvement of B2C platforms in the sharing economy. As a result of the evolution of the sharing economy, only some consumers have access to the closed commercial sharing systems through the forms of membership (Akbar et al, 2016). Davidson et al. (2018) introduce the term ‘level of mediation’, describing the level of involvement of a platform in the mediation process: the bipolar level of mediation ranges from high (B2C) to low (P2P).

Belk (2014a) describes that “it is sometimes difficult to discern where sharing ends and commerce begins” and that new platforms arise under this socially desirable term. Light and Miskelly (2015) derive an even more critical view from the current evolution of the sharing economy: “These earlier tools are disappearing from public awareness, superseded by the arrival of glossier, for-profit rivals that use advertising to promote their offerings and invest in taking the risk out of the ensuing interactions.”.

2.1.6 Emerging Controversies

The evolution of the sharing economy towards profit-oriented platforms have been discussed in regard to pseudo sharing. Among the most influential researchers to review the issue and define it in further detail was Belk (2014a). The author identifies four common types of “business relationships masqueraded as communal sharing” (Belk, 2014a, p. 11): long-term renting/leasing, short-term rental, online social network sites, and online facilitated barter economies. In the case of long-term renting/leasing, the lacking sense of communal belonging or ownership is evident. The profit motivation of short-term rentals reduces the feeling of sharing when trust is considered the basis of sharing. The trust from familiarity/closeness is not present in short-term rentals due to the anonymity in connection to the scale of operations, therefore relying on trust through a pre-screening process and insurance guarantee. Belk (2014a) further notes the issue of online social network sites in which the focus is not on sharing information with friends but rather on providing the platform with data to attract more participants and sell it to third parties. Lastly, online facilitated barter economies are another form of pseudo sharing as a reciprocal exchange is required and barters in the transactions can be converted into actual currency (Belk, 2014a).
The fact that firms use the term ‘sharing’ in their marketing activities despite the questionable belonging to the sharing economy reveals the self-interest that fuels the sharing economy (Aloni, 2016). Therefore, some researchers make a clear distinction in their studies to exclude pseudo sharing and focus on ‘real’ sharing (Davidson et al., 2018). Schor (2016) credits platforms with an intent of goodwill in the early stage, but counter-argues that those intentions disperse once the business progresses. In Schor’s (2016) opinion, pseudo sharing leads to a greenwashing effect as the increase in platforms offering access to goods is leading to an increase in the consumption of goods and therefore lacks sustainability. In addition, income earned from sharing economy activities is spent on other items, also leading to an overall consumption increase, referred to as the ripple effect (Schor, 2016).

Böcker and Meelen (2017) take a social approach in their definition of pseudo sharing. According to the authors, ‘true sharing’ relates to social concerns, while pseudo sharing is based on economic benefits. Although a monetary motivation may drive the participation, other drivers such as sustainability and social motivations can still be of importance (Böcker & Meelen, 2017). Malhotra and Van Alstyne (2014) referred to the lacking social concern and greater community good in the sharing economy as the ‘skimming economy’. The researchers raise concerns about the motivation to share if monetary reasons are present. As the case with Netflix, it is questionable whether underutilized assets are shared for their best use or whether they are exploited for profit because they are shareable (Malhotra & Van Alstyne, 2014).

Besides the aforementioned aspects of pseudo sharing and lack of dominant objectives other than profit, Murillo et al. (2017) review the main controversies of the sharing economy in a recent study. These aspects include the distribution of the market, involvement of governments, workers’ rights, consumer trust and care for the sharing economy, and the actual sustainability of the phenomenon.

Despite the controversies, some researchers have argued that the sharing economy actually creates new markets instead of driving away existing markets (Miller, 2016; Zervas et al., 2017). As the study on Airbnb has shown, not all Airbnb stays substitute a hotel stay, but instead contribute new revenue to the hospitality industry (Zervas et al. 2017).
2.2. Ownership in the Sharing Economy

2.2.1 Origins of the Shift in Ownership

According to Kochan (2017), ownership and an individual’s awareness thereof are the pre-existing conditions necessary for sharing. The author argues that only what is owned can be shared. However, it requires the individual’s understanding of the rights that stem from ownership: the right to not share and the right to share under certain conditions. From this understanding of ownership, the individual is able to develop a willingness to share (Kochan, 2017).

Other reasons for willingness to share are the ‘burdens of ownership’, as refined by Möller and Wittkowski (2010) into the context of the sharing economy. The author’s study assumes a link of the following burdens of ownership with people’s preference for non-ownership: (1) risks in regard to product alteration or obsolescence, (2) risk of incorrect product selection, (3) responsibility of maintenance and repair, and (4) the full cost despite infrequent use. Based on the burdens of ownership, the researchers investigated six determinants on the preference of non-ownership. The study of Möller and Wittowski (2010) concludes that convenience orientation and trend orientation positively influence the preference to access over ownership, while the importance of ownership showed a negative influence.

A more recent study by Schaefers, Lawson, and Kukar-Kinney (2016) adds to the research on the burdens of ownership in the access economy. They introduce more detailed risk dimensions (financial, performance, and social risk) in an effort to contribute towards the understanding of “subsequent changes in ownership decisions” (Schaefers et al., 2016). Their empirical findings reveal, that the high financial risk resulting from ownership is positively linked to the consideration of access over ownership. Positive correlations were also proven between performance and social risk, although noting the importance of ownership for the social status.

Literature has examined ownership of social status in regard to materialism. Davidson et al. (2018) examine the three dimensions of materialism: the importance of ownership, happiness from ownership, and the definition of success. The study notes, that the link between happiness and ownership remains disputed in research. The research identifies the dimension’s influence on the motivations to share. Davidson et al. (2018) have conducted studies on Indian and North-American consumers and found that materialism does indeed have the effect to drive people to share. However, the motives varied between the cultures: North-Americans seek to experience all aspects of the good through not only owning but also
through sharing it. In Indian collectivist culture, sharing a good to ensure its’ most efficient use is the main aspect, offering the highest utility to society (Davidson et al., 2018).

This review of ownership and materialism illustrates where the shift from ownership to access is emerging from, despite the ownership-reinforcing presence of materialism in several cultures. However, materialism can serve as a foundation and motivation to participate in the sharing economy.

2.2.2 The Shift of Ownership towards Access

Weber (2015) argues it is not definite, that people will need their belongings at any given time in the future. On the other hand, those who do not own will have a need to access in the future. This long-term match of supply and demand is referred to as ‘mutual insurance’ (Weber, 2015). The mutual insurance indirectly lowers the burdens of ownership long-term in regard to the aforementioned financial risk and performance risk.

To understand the shift of ownership towards access, it is necessary to separate ownership from access. Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) review the two major differences between ownership and access: firstly, the nature of the object-self relationship and second the rules that govern this relationship. While in ownership, the owner holds full property rights and is subject to the responsibilities and freedom thereof, access is lacking this form of object-self relationship and requires further exploration. The commonality of access and sharing is the absent transfer of ownership but they differ in the perception of ownership. In sharing, ownership is shared along with the acquisition cost, usage and caretaking responsibilities. In access there is no joint ownership, the consumer simply gains access to the item without any attached caretaking responsibilities (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012).

With the aim of determining when the decision to share takes place, Chi, Zhou, and Piramuthu (2016) define the term ‘temporal ownership boundary’. An individual has the ability to freely decide whether to use, share, give or sell a good’s remaining value, but there is a point of indifference to any of these options. Their findings suggest that the point in time in which the decision to share is made is influenced by the following: the value of the good, inventory holding cost, transaction cost and good-will rewards (Chi et al., 2016).

The aforementioned developments in the shift of ownership towards access allow researchers to divide sharing activities in terms of ownership. Hamari et al. (2016) consider ‘access over ownership’ the most common activity (such as renting or lending). The second sharing activity represents a ‘transfer of ownership’ such as swapping, donating or selling second-hand
products (Hamari et al., 2016). In essence, Aloni (2016) describes access as an ‘access to excess’, as previously mentioned.

With the emergence of access platforms, Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) describe three forms: through membership, redistribution markets, and collaborative lifestyles. More importantly, dimensions of access are defined: temporality, anonymity, market mediation, consumer involvement, type of accessed object and political consumerism. These dimensions illustrate various types of ‘access consumptionscapes’ that each center around different dimensions (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012).

A shift in consumption towards access naturally triggers issues in regard to ownership perception, re-assignment of responsibilities and legal aspects of it. Paundra, Rook, Van Dalen, and Ketter (2017) investigated the effect of psychological ownership on the preference of sharing services. Psychological ownership refers to the sense of actual ownership that individuals can develop while they merely access a good owned by someone else. While most dimensions of the access economy previously explored appeal to all participants (such as cost savings or convenience) in a similar way, psychological ownership is highly individual and found by Paundra et al. (2017) to moderate the intention to use access based platforms.

The blurry lines of ownership in the access economy lead Malhotra and Van Alstyne (2014) to explore the exploitation of rules and taxes that potentially harm the producer of a good who expected a more profitable usage by the consumption through ownership. As the access economy typically involves the owner, an access-gaining party, and a facilitating platform, the question of responsibility arises unanswered yet (Malhotra & Van Alstyne, 2014). Therefore Kochan (2017) points out that any legal regulations and laws created to govern the shift of ownership towards access actually represent a regulation of property ownership instead of business activity.

As stated by Botsman and Rogers (2011), the new emerging forms of access allow participants to define ‘who they are’ and ‘what they like’ without the need of ownership. Instead, the demonstration of use reflects status or group belonging without the need to purchase the object. The shift towards access might question ownership in the future (Botsman & Rogers, 2011).
2.2.3 Ownership Allocation

As illustrated in chapter 2.1.5, extant literature acknowledges the addition of businesses in the access economy (Botsman & Rogers, 2011; Benjaafar et al., 2015; Acquier et al., 2017; Laurell & Sandström, 2017). Stephany (2015) refers to it as two ‘flavors’: business-to-consumer and peer-to-peer. Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) consider P2P a traditional idea of sharing, whereas “Business-to-Peer exchanges have the tendency to assume the form of more conventional rental arrangements” (Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015, p. 23). Several studies do so by including the business models of operations (B2C, P2P), but do not explicitly include the ownership retaining party of the shared good.

Murillo et al. (2017) call for further exploration of the ‘distribution of wealth’ in the sharing economy. Although wealth does not link to ownership it hints towards this issue. Some of the extant literature superficially touches upon accessed goods with different owners. Botsman and Rogers (2011) only refer to “multiple products owned by a company to be shared” (Botsman & Rogers, 2011, p.71) in regard to service systems and “products that are privately owned to be shared or rented” (Botsman & Rogers, 2011, p.72) in the context of P2P systems. Acquier et al. (2017) refer to an ‘asset centralization’ by for-profit providers and an ‘asset decentralization’ among P2P transactions. Benjaafar et al. (2015) define on-demand businesses as single entities which own the physical assets but is missing a contrasting definition of P2P platforms.

To investigate differences in ownership allocation in reference to the definition of Laurell and Sandström (2017), market logics need to be explored and defined for the purpose of this thesis. Market logics are the focal point for ICT-enabled platforms and how goods and services are exchanged. These logics are multi-faceted within the sharing economy. Therefore, this study seeks to make a clear distinction between: (1) companies operating a sharing economy platform that draws on market logics that provide access to the company-owned goods, and (2) sharing economy platforms drawing on market logics that provide access to peer-owned goods.

2.2.4 Car Sharing as a Form of Access

In extant literature, car sharing has consistently been a platform example of the sharing economy (Belk, 2007; Kassan & Orsi, 2012; Belk, 2014a; Belk, 2014b; Benjaafar et al., 2015; Light & Miskelly, 2015; Schor & Fitzmaurice, 2015; Akbar et al., 2016; Kathan et al., 2016; Acquier et al., 2017; Böcker & Meelen, 2017; Murillo et al., 2017). Furthermore, many researchers focus on car sharing as an individual phenomenon (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012;

In 1999, Prettenthaler and Steininger described that the car sharing industry was among the first to shift from ownership to service orientation. According to the authors, car sharing dates back to the 1950’s and it filled the gap between car rentals and taxi rides. It is designed to be complementary to other modes of transportation (Prettenthaler & Steininger, 1999). Belk (2007) defines car sharing as an example of individuals uplifting their lifestyles beyond what they alone could be capable of achieving.

In the beginning, car sharing used to be neighborhood-based, as in the case of “Majorna” in Gothenburg, Sweden (Belk, 2014a). Benjaafar et al. (2015) states, that businesses adapted the idea and started to offer on-demand access to consumers next to regular sales that target the need for possession and ownership. The phenomenon of businesses offering sharing services is often referred to as servitization and differs from P2P sharing as companies retain ownership and charge consumers by use (Benjaafar et al., 2015).

With regard to commercial car sharing, Belk (2014b) describes the example of Zipcar to highlight the popularity of ‘short-term car sharing’. The growing mutual transportation need between suburbs and cities leads the study to introduce the simultaneously emerging car sharing concept of ‘ridesharing’ / ‘carpooling’ using the example of RelayRides. The study references key automotive manufacturers entering both car sharing type markets and outlines the attractiveness of the concept for both consumers and manufacturers.

Le Vine and Polak (2017) offer a more general distinction of car sharing: Free Floating Car Sharing (FFCS) and the traditional ‘round-trip’ sharing. FFCS refers to a mobility service platform that allows users to rent a nearby vehicle for the amount of time it takes to finish the journey (one-way). After the usage, consumers can park the car in any parking spot. A close variant of FFCS is station-based, where vehicles have to be dropped off at specific locations. In contrary, round-trip sharing refers to services with advance reservations and pay-by-the-hour usage (Le Vine & Polak, 2017).

Adding to the discussion, Prieto et al. (2017) recognize the difference between what they call ‘car sharing’ and ‘car clubs’ which differ in their operations. Car sharing is defined as a short-term P2P activity, whereas car clubs are a form of servitization, using annual payments or pay-per-use systems (Prieto et al., 2017). In accordance with this need for recognition, Schor
and Fitzmaurice (2015) have recognized the difference between Zipcar’s (B2C) and RelayRides’ (P2P) operations.

Murillo et al. (2017) recognize the same issue of commercialization from businesses entering the car sharing market. While sharing economy business models started out to be disruptive forms of alternative consumption, the adoption by profit-centric and traditional companies raises the question in which ways car sharing can still be part of the sharing economy. Some researchers do indeed think that this form of servitization is still a part of the big picture of the sharing economy (Fraiberger & Sundararajan, 2017; Le Vine & Polak, 2017). However, as discussed before, those operations may be also considered pseudo-sharing (Belk, 2014a; Aloni, 2016; Schor, 2016; Davidson et al., 2018).

Psychological ownership is an issue of the access economy and also present in car sharing. Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) concluded that no perceived sense of ownership is present in car sharing. Instead, the lack of ownership perception actually results in a different amount of care or stewardship that car sharing users show. If the amount of care demonstrated is lower than towards the individual’s own goods, it is referred to as ‘negative sharing’ (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012).

The idea of community is in question within car sharing as a whole. Light and Miskelly (2015) compare car sharing with a shared laundry facility. There is no need for peers to meet in person in order to exchange a car. The authors mention the example of Zipcar, which lacks the social element of sharing. The avoidance of a social element to simplify the sharing process will harm the idea of sharing. On the contrary, incorporating a sharing culture to appeal towards the social element of the business is not possible (Light & Miskelly, 2015). While Zipcar tried to build up a brand community, they have failed to do so. The researchers discovered that the sharee might even feel embarrassed using a branded car or waving to fellow users as a cultural practice (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012).

While the social aspect of car sharing is questioned, studies have shown that each vehicle in a car sharing club can replace 9 to 13 privately owned vehicles and reduce car usage by 31% (Martin, Shaheen, & Lidicker, 2010). Nonetheless, car sharing as such is questioned by Kathan et al. (2016) in regard to sustainability since other forms of collaborative transport such as public transportation already exist. Furthermore, the commercial offering of cars for sharing can be considered greenwashing as the availability of access is increased, which in turn increases use and therefore emissions instead of utilizing already existing assets (Schor, 2016).
2.3 Motivations to Partake in the Sharing Economy

According to Lindblom and Lindblom (2017), attitudes are the root of behavioral intentions. These intentions, or motivations, are more unstable than the attitudes since they can change alongside social or economic shifts.

Malhotra and Van Alstyne (2014), who recognize that sharing economy also has the potential for negative outcomes, suggest that consumers should not solely use sharing economy providers for individual benefits, but also consider gains for the community. Self-benefit must not be the main reason to partake in sharing economy. It is rather the idea to include the societal benefit when using sharing economy providers. Given this 'right' motivation to partake in the sharing economy will, in turn, support the sharing idea and benefit the whole society (Malhotra & Van Alstyne, 2014).

A deeper analysis of motivations to partake in sharing economy is exerted by Schaefers (2013). They use the semantic analysis ‘means-end-chain’ (MEC) as proposed by Aurifeille and Valette-Florence (1995). Within MEC it is assumed that values of consumers are linked to their motivations. Thus, Schaefers (2013) describes how the attitudes of consumers are linked to functional features of car sharing, which are then supported by psychological consequences that can be traced down to values. Within this path of motivational aspects, Schaefers (2013) detects four motivational patterns, which are the most dominant tracks throughout the prior mentioned linkages: (1) value seeking, (2) convenience, (3) lifestyle and the role of community, and (4) sustainability. While the intensities of these motivational patterns are varying, Schaefers (2013) concludes that motivational factors within the sharing economy are coexistent and all add up towards a consumer’s behavior in one way or another.

Similar to those findings, Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) define three main patterns of motivation: (1) economic: since ‘middlemen’ are eliminated through the P2P aspect, sharing economy has the potential to create value for sharees as well as sharers; (2) ecological: referring to resource efficiency; (3) social connection, even though people seldom meet in car sharing. Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) add further motivations, namely technophilia and the ideology of sharing - the latter being especially present with early adopters of sharing economy services since the sharing economy provides an alternative to existing, traditional business models.

Hamari et al. (2016) cluster motivations in accordance to the self-determination theory (SDT) model, which was developed by Deci and Ryan (1985). They cluster motivations as intrinsic
and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivations refer to values and enjoyment that go along with a practice. Extrinsic motivators are defined by forces that lie outside the self, such as social pressure or the need to earn money. Thus, Hamari et al. (2016) cluster enjoyment, and sustainability together as intrinsic motivators and define economic benefits and reputation as extrinsic motivations. The researchers found that intrinsic motivations are strong determinants of consumer attitudes, while extrinsic factors are not. More specifically, sustainability is a strong attitude formator. Economic benefits, however, are strong influencing factors of behavior. Furthermore, attitudes do not necessarily lead to behavior.

A study conducted by Yang and Ahn (2016) also differentiates motivators through the use of SDT, while researching these motivators towards attitude formation of the sharing service Airbnb. In a slight contrast to the findings of Hamari et al. (2016), the internal motivator enjoyment had an influence while sustainability and economic benefits did not. Besides, Yang and Ahn (2016) included security policies in their study and concluded that a people-centric security system based on user trust is necessary rather than absolute control through corporate and government regulations and policies.

Along with the two studies mentioned prior, Böcker and Meelen (2017) identify the need to cluster motivations through the SDT model. However, they rearrange the clusters, with internal motivations consisting of social and environmental factors while external motivations are purely economical. The researchers argue that a more in-depth understanding of motivating factors to partake in sharing economy is needed in literature. Thus, they differentiate various aspects that can change the context of motivational factors such as the type of good and the characteristics of the sharee. Böcker and Meelen (2017) found that environmental motivations are specifically important for car sharing. However, motivations are never singular drivers and are, as already described by Schaefers (2013), coexisting within the sharees’ decision process and can change over time. In line with this finding, the distinction of pseudo-sharing and ‘true’ sharing in consumer behavior cannot be simply explained by social or economic motivations but results from a mix of all factors.

However, Möhlmann (2015) concludes from her review of recent literature that the skepticism towards capitalistic organizations, which arose through economic downfalls, does drive consumers to use alternative consumption modes. Lindblom and Lindblom (2017) disagree partly with this conclusion since economic crises can disrupt the development of alternative consumption modes such as the sharing economy. In such challenging situations, less-advantageous groups are more willing to stick to traditional consumption-modes (Lindblom & Lindblom, 2017).
Buda and Lehota (2017) identified general attitudes (attitude towards sustainability, sensitivity of cost, activeness on community platforms, level of trust towards private individuals) and sharee-centric attitudes (enjoyment, economic gains, appreciation, and use of evaluation systems). These attitudes are used to identify user groups with varying motivational patterns, namely: (1) ‘enthusiastic and open private individuals’, (2) ‘price-sensitive consumers’, (3) ‘environmentally conscious people’ and (4) ‘occasional users’. Although the researchers recognize the difference between B2C and P2P providers, they do not distinguish between the two types of owners and providers of the car in the attitude formation of their respondents (Buda & Lehota, 2017).

The term ‘sharing cultures’ is highlighted in the definition of sharing economy by Light and Miskelly (2015). This need for the inclusion of society in motivational studies is also recognized by Schröder and Wolf (2017), who investigate the effect of society on the formation of attitudes through the social environment. While the framing in which the sharing economy is defined poses an important basis, Schröder and Wolf (2017) use framing to identify needs of consumers: safety, no stress, eco-friendliness, driving experience, image, cost avoidance, comfort, and independence, connecting those needs to car sharing. The results of the simulation that is used in this study show that consumers perceive independence, avoidance of stress and safety as paramount. Those perceived factors also outweigh the sustainability thought, even though all defined needs are in favor of de-owning a car.

Referring back to Böcker and Meelen (2017), consumers can change their driving factors for motivations towards sharing over time, for example from sustainable towards economic motivations and vice versa. This movement of motivational aspects can also be found in the study of Prieto et al. (2017), which reveals that consumers who use P2P car sharing are likely to also use B2C sharing models and the opposite. Möhlmann (2015) conducted two studies: one with a focus on the P2P platform Airbnb, the other on the B2C service car2go. The aim is to unveil the customer satisfaction and likelihood of repurchase. This study finds the respondents were mostly motivated by self-benefit in combination with utility, trust, cost savings, and familiarity essential in both studies. In the case of car2go, quality of the service and the feeling of belonging to a community were of additional significance (Möhlmann, 2015).

2.4 Research Questions
The literature review shows a gap in defining car sharing in terms of ownership allocation. In particular, motivations require additional research in the context of car sharing. Hence, the aim of this study to explore differences in sharee motivations in regard to ownership allocation is
of relevance for the research field. For instance, Belk (2014b) lacks to highlight differences regarding ownership between peer-driven concepts of short-term car sharing, ridesharing/carpooling, and commercial manufacturer concepts. In addition, the study by Prieto et al. (2017) calls for a distinction of the terms ‘car sharing’ and ‘car clubs’, which differ in the allocation of ownership. Thus, the following research questions are formulated in accordance to the aim of this study:

1. How do sharees perceive differences in car ownership of car sharing platforms?
2. What are the motivations of sharees to partake in car sharing?
3. How do sharee motivations differ in regard to ownership allocation?
3 Methodology

3.1 Philosophy

The decisions on a methodology to convey a study are more complex than a mere choice of methods. This is due to the philosophical assumptions which researchers rely on when defining a phenomenon to investigate and decide on the methods and processes of investigation (Gill & Johnson, 2010). Hence, research philosophy is the underlying frame of research, which aims to develop knowledge. A researcher’s values possibly impact the outcome of knowledge formed through the research process. The relation between knowledge and the knowledge-developing process has to be plausible and transparent (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). Thus, it is necessary to address and describe the underlying ideas and motivations and values which guide this thesis.

Two main examples of philosophical approaches in research are defined as Ontology and Epistemology. Ontology refers to the nature of reality. Reality can be perceived in two ways, objectively or subjectively. Objectivism is based on explicit observations and the definition of the way things are while considering whole social entities. However, objectivism leaves aside the role of the individual within social entities. The subjective reality that is perceived by each individual is a factor which cannot be neglected when a deep understanding of individuals is desired. Subjectivism consists of interpretations and meanings that are projected towards things form the perceived reality of each individual within a social entity (Saunders et al., 2016). Extant sharing economy literature has stressed the importance of framing in regard to motivations to partake in sharing economy. Hence, this thesis is conducted on the basis of subjectivity, by analyzing the content provided by the research subjects in an interpretative and contextual manner.

Epistemology provides criteria, in what ways knowledge creation can be justified (Johnson & Duberley, 2000). It distinguishes between three approaches: positivism, realism, and interpretivism. Positivism relates to facts and measurables, which are value free and cannot be interpreted in different ways. Realism can be subdivided into direct realism and critical realism. Direct realism assumes that senses reflect things exactly as they are, while critical realism argues that senses influence perception leading to a gap between things and cognitive processing. Realism, as well as positivism, strive to observe things the way they are perceived. Interpretivism differs from the other two approaches by considering individuals as ‘social actors’. It aims to reveal how a society is formed by differing individuals. Interpretivism seeks to unveil deep insights, which include interpretations by the researchers demanding a high level of empathy (Saunders et al., 2016). Within this study, since motivations and values of
individuals are the key element, an interpretivist approach is most suitable. The collected data from research subjects is interpreted and grouped by the researchers under consideration of the contextual meaning conveyed by the subjects.

### 3.2 Approach

The research philosophy of a study defines its research approach. Generally, a deductive approach or an inductive approach can be chosen. A deductive approach is based on existent theory, seeking to falsify hypotheses (Gill & Johnson, 2010) and is generally used in a positivist study. Inductive approaches, on the other hand, are generally used for studies guided by interpretivism through the formulation of theories based on observations (Saunders et al., 2016; Malhotra, Birks, & Wills, 2012). Inductive approaches can be utilized if a field of research is identified, but the theoretical framework concerning this field is limited or nonexistent (Malhotra et al., 2012). As outlined in the literature review, many studies aim to explain motivations to partake in the sharing economy. Thus, this study seeks to explore the differing motivations related to the factor of ownership allocation, which has so far not been assessed in research. This follows an exploratory classification of the research purpose rather than a descriptive or explanatory classification (Saunders et al., 2016). Within inductive approaches, probing and in-depth questions aid participants in elaborating the nature of a broad theme (Malhotra et al., 2012). This study seeks to use those methods to grasp the complex theme of motivations in the context of ownership allocation in car sharing.

### 3.3 Research Design

#### 3.3.1 Strategy

Each research requires a clear research strategy, but no strategy is exclusive to a certain research approach. Instead, the different research strategies available (experiment, survey, case study, action research, grounded theory, ethnography, and archival research) can be used to complement each other in pursuit of answering the research questions (Saunders et al., 2016). This study adopts a grounded theory strategy. In grounded theory, data generated from multiple observations is used to constantly test predictions in order to derive a theoretical framework. Grounded theory is considered a ‘highly creative’ process, but ‘not perfect’ (Saunders et al., 2016). Grounded theory provides the researchers with a strategy, which is highly interpretative and based on high amounts of qualitative data. The key to succeeding when applying grounded theory is ‘distilling the essence’ of the gathered data. Thus the data needs to be structured and grouped in themes which form the core of the theoretical contribution to research (Langley and Abdallah, 2011). This thesis seeks to establish the gap in research considering the ownership allocation of goods within the sharing economy. Thus,
the collected data is critically interpreted in terms of ownership allocation to unveil whether it has an effect on sharee motivations to partake in car sharing activities.

3.3.2 Research Choices
Data collection can be distinguished between qualitative and quantitative data collection. While quantitative refers to data collection of numeric data, qualitative data collection generates non-numerical data such as words, pictures or videos. Each collection technique can be used individually (mono-method) or in combination (mixed-method) in research design. Within each data collection technique, one or multiple analysis procedures can be utilized (Saunders et al., 2016). Qualitative research is typically used to understand a phenomenon by exposing an individual’s experience or behavior and is suitable to study organizations, groups, and individuals (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). The flexibility of qualitative data collection allows researchers to explore several aspects of a problem area to derive in-depth insight, whereas quantitative data collection is a logical and controlled approach (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). This study utilizes a qualitative mono-method to collect in-depth data. Qualitative in-depth data enables the researchers to unveil the range of meanings that research subjects associate with ownership allocation within the sharing economy. Those meanings (in positive, negative or indifferent expression), lead to the understanding of behavioral motivations to partake in the sharing economy.

3.3.3 Time Horizons
The time horizons of research studies can be cross-sectional or longitudinal but independent of research strategy and method. The longitudinal research investigates change and developments over time, whereas cross-sectional research is the study of a particular phenomenon at a particular time (Saunders et al., 2016). Due to the time constraints of this research and the dynamic development of the sharing economy, this thesis seeks a cross-sectional study of the phenomenon.

3.3.4 The Cases of car2go and Getaround
3.3.4.1 Case Sampling
As outlined in the literature review, extant studies have so far not compared sharing economy platforms with high degrees of similarity. The car sharing cases of this study are sampled based on similarity and dissimilarity criteria. Primarily, sample cases are required to be a form of free-floating-carsharing-services (Le Vine & Polak, 2017). Secondly, the technological usage needs to be similar. This usage refers to app-based user interfaces to search, reserve and rent cars. The similarity in price is an additional criterion of similarity that sample cases need to fulfill. Severe differences in price may result in economic participant motivations to
overshadow the data collection process. Another sampling criteria require the cases to be existing, market established platforms in order increase the relatability for participants. Nevertheless, this research requires the case sample to differ in the aspect of car ownership allocation. One case platform is required to offer access to peer-owned cars for sharing, whereas the other is required to be single-entity that owns and offers access to the cars for sharing.

Two cases were chosen based on the criteria mentioned above: car2go and Getaround. Both cases fulfill the above criteria of similarities as well as dissimilarities. car2go is the worldwide market leader in the FFCS industry and is present in various metropolitan areas. Getaround is a leading FFCS platform in the United States of peer-owned vehicles and operates on similar technological grounds as car2go. Both cases hold a sizeable market presence with users in several locations or countries that participants can relate to. car2go and Getaround are similar in their service portfolio except for the characteristic of the ownership allocation of the cars. Minor differences between both cases are present but acceptable as a limitation of this research. Considering that this research seeks to explore real motivations with regard to ownership allocation instead of providing a experimental research with hypothetical cases, the minor differences in the cases are acceptable as a limitation of this research.

3.3.4.2 car2go

The platform car2go is the market leader in the free-floating car sharing industry and was founded in 2008 as a wholly owned subsidiary of Daimler AG. The car sharing platform offers Mercedes-Benz vehicles in 26 international metropolitan areas (including 14 in Europe, 11 in North America and 1 in China) as of February 2018 (Daimler, 2018). In total, 14,000 vehicles are available ranging from the initial category of ‘Smart Fortwo’ cars to an extension in 2016 to Mercedes-Benz A-Class, GLA, CLA and B-Class with a total of 1,400 purely electric vehicles. car2go claims to have increased the number of customers by 30% in 2017 up to a total of 2.97 million users, resulting in 24 million car2go vehicle rentals in 2017. In the same year, the platform achieved a utilization rate of 38% of their vehicle fleet (car2go, 2018a).

To start using car2go, the customer can register online or through the car2go app and will be required to scan their driver’s license for validation. The registered users are now able to use any available car2go vehicle within the ‘home area’. The home area typically covers the broader metropolitan area of the city while usage beyond the home area involves additional cost. The map on the car2go app allows users to search for available vehicles (showing data on the interior and exterior condition of the car and fuel level) and reserve them for up to 30 minutes for free. After users have arrived at the location of the vehicle, the rental period is
activated on the app through a personal pin code that triggers a unit in the windshield to display an access code. Upon entering the access code, the car unlocks and users will find a key located inside in a key holder to start using the car. To end the rental period, the car can be parked in any public parking spots within the home area without a fee. After placing the key back into the holder and closing the door, the rental period is ended through the car2go app, locking the car and making it available to the next user. The rental fees are charged by the minute, ranging from 0.26 Euros to 0.45 US-Dollars depending on the location and car size. However, car2go users can free minutes through re-fueling the car (fuel level must be lower than 25%) using the prepaid fuel cards located in the holder along with the key (car2go, 2018b).

3.3.4.3 Getaround

Getaround is a P2P car sharing platform founded in 2009 by Sam Zaid, Jessica Scorpio and Elliott Kroo that began operations of on-demand sharing in 2013. Getaround currently operates in 23 locations within the United States (Getaround, 2018). Getaround currently has 500,000 members. The term ‘members’ includes ‘owners’ of cars who offer their private vehicle on the platform for paid rentals by the hour as well as the ‘renters’. Getaround is unable to disclose the ratio of owners and renters as well as any utilization rates of cars (Tanzella, J., personal communication, March 31, 2018).

Users can register using their Facebook account as a form of an 18-point verification process but are required to be at least 19 years old and hold a valid driver’s license. As with car2go, renters can book cars through an app that shows available cars and their details based on the entered pick-up and return time. To pick up the car, users can access most of the cars in the same way as with car2go while some vehicles are accessed through a lockbox. The rental period is insured through Getaround and at the end of the rental period, users need to return the car refueled within a 0.25-mile radius of the car’s home location. Renters pay an administrative sign-up fee but no annual fee. The platform charges renters a fee of 3% of the booking total (or a minimum of 1 US-Dollar). Owners also pay an initial sign up fee for the setup and registration of their car and continue to pay a 20 US-Dollar monthly subscription fee to list their vehicles. Similar to car2go, Getaround vehicles are branded with the platform logo on the body of the car (Getaround, 2018).

3.3.5 Data Collection

Focus groups are the mode of data collection chosen for this study. Focus groups are a direct form of qualitative research, in contrast to indirect forms where the purposes of the study are not presented to the participants (Malhotra et al., 2012). Focus groups are non-standardised,
one-to-many interviews (Saunders et al., 2016), in which one or multiple moderators guide a
group discussion consisting of six to ten participants in a timeframe of one and a half to six hours. In focus groups, participants engage with each other which leads to a creative process
that might unveil ideas otherwise not expressed in a one-to-one interview. This further enables
snowballing effects, where an idea mentioned is expanded by others, or serendipity effects,
where questions arise that the researchers might have otherwise missed (Malhotra et al., 2012).

Group interviews can be executed in a structured or semi-structured manner, whereas the
latter supports an exploratory nature (Saunders et al., 2016). Therefore, this study will use a
semi-structured focus group to enable an understanding of relations between the aspect of
ownership allocation and motivations in car sharing. The researchers will be stimulating the
discussion by probing and through a prepared set of questions in form of a topic guide, which
add flexibility to the data collection process. The topic guide ensures that the conversational
flow of the focus group is controlled and all participants are able to contribute. One
experimental pilot focus group will be conducted prior to the three main focus groups, to unveil
and cancel controllable mistakes, and to test the setting and the topic guide (Malhotra et al.,
2012). All interviews will consist of six participants and will be scheduled for a duration of one
and a half to two hours moderated by one researcher.

Sampling issues, such as who to include, are important to consider (Ghauri & Grønhaug,
2010). The participants of each group are prescreened and selected based on key
demographic characteristics (Saunders et al., 2016; Malhotra et al., 2012) that have already
been unveiled in literature with regard to usage of car sharing (Stephany, 2015; Böcker &
Meelen, 2017; Prieto et al., 2017).
Table 1. Participant Characteristics.

Based on a participant questionnaire which was filled in by every participant at the beginning of each focus group, Table 1 shows a general homogeneity of the sampling, while maintaining a heterogeneity necessary for discussions. To further stimulate the discussion, each focus group session starts off with two brainstormings to cover features of the sharing economy and car sharing. The brainstormings are documented in the form of mind maps before subsequently introducing the two companies car2go and Getaround. Each company is introduced using one brand and one usage-related company video. Participants receive an information sheet for each company to use for the remainder of the discussion. After watching the videos and reading the information sheets, each company was discussed in depth to reveal motivations and values of the participants.

3.3.6 Data Quality

The collection of data raises the issue of data quality, in particular with regard to semi-structured interviews. The key concerns are the reliability and validity of the data. Reliability refers to the consistency of findings derived from the data collection techniques and analysis procedures. Notably, reliability questions the consistency of results in regard to other occasions, other observers and whether the process of deriving findings from raw data is transparent. Threats to reliability include subject/participant error, subject/participant bias, observer error and observer bias (Saunders et al., 2016).

In contrast, validity questions the causality and truth of the findings. This is further divided into data obtained from the study (internal validity) and the generalisability of the findings (external validity) to other populations, settings, periods or beyond the study. Therefore, threats to validity include history (e.g. external events affecting responses), maturation (other processes...
during the study), test effect (results of tests affect the responses) and selection bias (subjects not assigned randomly) (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). In regard to reliability and validity, this research aims to primarily overcome quality issues by gaining an extensive knowledge of the sharing economy through a detailed literature review. Participants are supplied with relevant information on the topic at hand within an appropriate focus group location.

3.3.7 Analysis Process
In preparation for the analysis process, the audio-recordings of the conducted focus groups were transcribed into written accounts. Following the inductive approach, the transcribed data is analyzed to identify relationships that can be organized into a theoretical framework to match the research purpose. Three main qualitative data analysis types are available: summarizing (condensation), categorization (grouping), and structuring (ordering) (Saunders et al., 2016). This study seeks to use a categorization type in the data analysis process. In the literature review, a variety of research on motivations has been identified. As described, consumer motivations have been investigated from different angles using attitudes, values, and cultures to explain consumer behavior. Motivations are not part of the conscious thought process of individuals and therefore need to be uncovered by researchers (Schaefers, 2013).

Qualitative data is not as uniform as quantitative data and thus it is more difficult to define rules for the analysis. Thus, in terms of data analysis strategy, this thesis draws from the Gioia method, as suggested by Langley and Abdallah (2011). The Gioia method is built on the foundation of epistemological interpretivism and follows the strategy of grounded theory. It is based on interpretive assumptions and searches for meanings of participants with the goal of developing novel theories. In the process of the Gioia method, ‘first-order perceptions’ and ‘second-order interpretations’ are formed. First-order perceptions are in vivo codes collected from the spoken words of research subjects. These first-order perceptions are then interconnected through axial coding, leading to second-order themes, which are overarching and more abstract categories. Those form the core of the emerging theoretical model (Langley and Abdallah, 2011).

Car sharing mind maps were formulated by the participants at the beginning of each focus group, to collect first-order perceptions. Through logical grouping of first-order perceptions, second-order themes which guide this study are derived. These second-order themes are grouped under consideration of the purpose of this thesis, thus displaying potential participant motivations to partake in car sharing as well as one ownership allocation-related category.
The transcripts of the in-depth discussions about the cases car2go and Getaround are then coded according to the second-order themes by using the software program MAXQDA Analytics Pro 2018 (Release 18.0.7). The coding process is executed with both researchers present, enabling the discussion of each coding. Furthermore, the basis of the codes, derived from the second-order themes, is under constant review and refinement, enabling the analysis of sharee motivations to participate in car sharing, as well as the perceived differences of car ownership allocation.

By considering the number of mentions and the qualitative importance of motivational codes with regard to the cases car2go and Getaround, the researchers seek to answer the three research questions, which aim to explore how sharee motivations differ in regard to ownership allocation. Thus, each motivational code is subcoded with ‘positive’, ‘negative’, or ‘indifferent’. The extracted data is then visualized through an alluvial diagram and discussed in-depth by relating the number of mentions with an interpretive analysis of each subcoding.

3.4 Research Ethics

The access to data that is required to conduct research raises the issue of ethics. The methodological research design is equally important as the moral defensibility to involved organizations and participants. Social norms dictate behavior but leave a choice of several ethical positions to take (Saunders et al., 2016). Two streams of ethics are defined: the deontological view in which research results do not justify unethical means, and the teleological view in which the benefits of the results outweigh the costs of unethical acts, hence justifying the means. To prevent misconduct, ethical codes outlining principles and procedures of conducting research serve as guidelines (Saunders et al., 2016).

In particular for researchers, the respect and credibility of business research are at stake if an ethical awareness is lacking. Among the influencing factors on ethics are the interests and biases of the public, companies, and researchers as well as government rules and regulations, and peer pressure (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010).

Ethical issues particularly arise in the research design. Data collection requires the maintenance of objectivity, anonymity, and confidentiality. Sensitive personal data obtained is required to be processed and stored in an ethical way. The level of care in regard to objectivity, anonymity, and confidentiality has to be extended into the analysis and reporting stage also (Saunders et al., 2016). Applying the above, this study ensures to be ethically and methodologically correct in each step of the research process.
4 Findings

4.1 Identified Motivations

Seven motivations were identified using the Gioia method. The mind maps created by participants during the focus group sessions formed the first order perceptions (right side) listed and grouped into second-order interpretations (left side) in Figure 1 below. The in-depth analysis of each focus group transcript did not reveal additional motivations. The participants mentioned four first-order perceptions related to ownership allocation. Thus, this code was included in the first order and second order listing of motivations to investigate the role of ownership allocation in relation to other motivations and as a potential motivation on its own.

The motivations discussed during the three different focus groups varied in intensity and distribution of mentions. As Figure 2 below shows, the first focus group (left) predominantly discussed trust and functional convenience. On the other hand, focus group two (middle) centered around functional convenience and community, while the last focus group (right) expanded on functional convenience and experience the most.
It is evident that functional convenience is a recurring theme throughout all focus groups, whereas lifestyle and monetary value were the least discussed themes in all focus groups. An additional finding from the focus groups was that each participant displayed a unique individual motivational composition to partake in car sharing. Within this composition, each participant valued motivations differently.

### 4.2 Perception of Ownership Allocation

The exploration of ownership allocation in car sharing showed that participants are aware of who owns the property they share. People who have their own and other’s best interest in mind are considered the basis of sharing. The involvement of companies in the sharing economy triggers a conflict about ‘true sharing’ for participants and expands towards the shared property that is either owned by a company or peers. Having access to peer-owned property is perceived more as ‘sharing’ than having access to company-owned property. For some participants, this difference is largely due to the service appearance of company-owned property. In addition, the perceived closeness between people is decreasing with service offerings. On the other hand, participants describe sharing another person’s property to be the ‘ultimate perspective’. In view of the above, participants felt Getaround closer to ‘true sharing’ than car2go. “2M1: It feels like Getaround is really someone’s property they are putting out there to share. With this [car2go] it is just a company that puts out cars to lease.” The perception of ‘true sharing’ is clearly rooted in the ownership allocation of the shared property as described by two participants: “2M4: It is peer-to-peer and the object is not owned by the company, that is the difference. 2F2: Hm, which makes it more sharing.”

Despite the identification of the difference in ownership allocation, participants found both concepts to be profit-oriented. Nevertheless, some participants thought that benefits to the
sharing community resulted in more positive sharee feelings: “3F3: I mean it could help the community much more, but I also feel like I would feel better giving the money to an individual ...” On the contrary, one participant believed that employees of a car sharing company would benefit in a similar way as they also try to make a living.

Participants were divided on the matter of profit orientation, with some believing it leads to trust, but not to credibility in terms of ‘true sharing’ in the sharing economy. On the contrary, some participants argued that any indicator of company involvement leads to distrust. Some participants acknowledged that a profit orientation in both sample cases was visible, but perceived it as a necessity of mediation: “1M2: It says they are a sharing platform, so they are a middleman and they make it work. There are people behind this that have to be paid and if not you would be within a self-sustained community that works.”

The ownership allocation also has implications for the use of property, but who owns it is not relevant to some participants. However, participants felt the sense of actually owning the product they shared and showed a stronger perception of ownership when using peer-owned goods. Sharing company-owned goods with company branding and logos represented a hindrance of perceived ownership. Furthermore, the awareness of ownership allocation leads a majority of participants to show lower levels of respect towards company owned products. On the opposite, using peer-owned products leads to higher levels of respect: “3F2: The way I behave when I am in someone else’s car is very respectful, but in sharing a car that is belonging to a corporation, I wouldn’t feel like the need to respect the space. It would be just like ‘I am paying for this, it is service, that’s it’.”

The role of trust in regard to ownership allocation is two-sided as it represents a form of brand trust and trust into people. However, being able to see the face of Getaroud car owners on their public profiles is an added concern for some participants: “3M2: I think having a face associated with the car, adds a new layer of concern. It is like ‘I am going to let this poor man down’. With car2go it is just ‘Oh, it’s some German company, nobody cares’.” Despite the concerns, other participants argued that the feeling of trusting a person is better compared to trusting a company, but the role of people as company employees was perceived as mixed and hints at corporate distrust: “1M2: But what is a company if not a group of people serving one purpose and doing the best they can to provide you with their service? 1M1: Do you still believe that?” In contrast, trust in companies was higher for some participants due to the governmental regulations and independent control mechanisms such as social media and the free flow of information facilitated by the Internet. Social media further increases familiarity with companies when friends are publishing their experiences using it. Overall, participants
viewed companies as a conflict resolving mediator between peers. The need for mediation is rooted in the trust issues towards peers resulting from the ownership allocation.

Another issue arising from the concept of ownership allocation is professionalism. Participants found the level of professionalism to be a form of desired reassurance that is perceived to be higher with company-owned property. “3M2: ‘...I want to get from A to B’ and I want it to sort of be reassured that the company is going to do the job I require [...]’” The level of professionalism appeared lower with peer-owned property which could result in stress. “3M2: Sometimes too much sharing is not so good, like you still want a little bit or level of professionalism. [...] I would rather have some sort of reassurance of the state of the car or the like... just so that my mind is at peace, if that makes sense?”

Companies are considered more professional due to their visibility and efficiency as well as the formality of the relationship with the user. This also expanded towards the role of the mediating company: “1F1: I think the most important factor is just the company behind it, because if there is a person in between, that is the one point, but it matters how professional the company handles it. It is not dependent on the person who owns the car, I guess.” In the case of car sharing, participants specifically demanded professionalism in regard to the shared goods, in particular to the safety of cars.

In conclusion, participants perceived various differences in ownership allocation of car sharing platforms but shared a uniform opinion on the mediation role of companies as well as the increasing proximity to ‘true sharing’ without company involvement. An awareness of ownership allocation is present among participants, but the perception of differences greatly depends on the individual’s framing.

4.3 Differences in Motivations

4.3.1 Trust

In the role of trust as a motivation to participate in car sharing, prominence of the platform is an important aspect for several participants. Lesser known platforms such as Getaround can cause confusion: “1M1: I didn’t hear about Getaround either. Immediately when I saw the video, it pops up so many questions.” For others, the newness of the platform also questioned the safety of it and lead to usage of a known alternative: “2M1: This [Gearound] appears to still be really new, so that might put me off and I would just go for the safer option that would be car2go.” However, participants also believed that usage can turn newness into familiarity and ultimately lead to more trust: “1F2: I think it is actually really, really different, because I actually only used it like two or three times. And for you, it is so many times so it is maybe a
different kind of connection because it is something you do on a regular basis. For me it was just a few times, so it is different, but you probably trust it much more. “The lower forms of trust associated with low familiarity also play a role when comparing options of other means of transport such as taxis, Uber or public transport.

Overall, participants viewed car2go and Getaround generally as trustworthy due to their company status. The user’s ability to reach out to the company directly and the company’s ability to deal with problems create trust. Both companies were also perceived as reliable because both provide insurance. Reliability and trust turn into a form of trust in brands for one participant: “3F1: I think that the fact that car2go is backed by Mercedes, counts a lot. You know the brand already and you trust it.” The involvement of a brand further provided participants with a sense of security. On the other hand, the involvement of a company or brand offering a good in the form of a service, meant for participants that they are able to blame them for problems: “1F1: Here [car2go] I would know I could blame them but if you have a direct person… I mean I don’t know how everything works around it.” However, paying a fee for the service of Getaround as a mediator was also perceived negatively and resulted in one participant to trust Getaround less.

In comparison to brands, the pictures of car owners can also create trust according to one participant: “1M2: You have got profiles, you got people behind it, the car is named probably. It just gets more, way more personal.” Another participant disagreed and noted that users would not trust ‘the unknown’. Yet another participant would be more trusting towards closer friends that already use the platform.

Even though the community on Getaround is close and may include own friends, participants still felt less trusting, because the owner is not present during the usage situation. People on Getaround never meet which results in more trust for a brand in the case of one participant: “3M3: Yeah, I trust the brand more than a person I have never met.” Another issue for participants was that people are more difficult to deal with than corporations. The uncertainty of the sharer behavior on Getaround as well as the behavior of unknown fellow members on car2go represented trust issues for participants. Ratings available on both platforms were perceived to convey trust although, beyond that, some participants believed the basis of trust to be the common interest in sharing the car.

Several discussions evolved from trust onto the state of the peer or company-owned car. Participants associated the potential of broken cars with Getaround: “3M2: With this [Getaround] there is so many things that you could run into. You don’t know how the car drives
At the same time, some participants noted that maintenance is also required by law and trusted in the effectiveness of such regulations towards companies and sharers alike. Cleanliness of the interior of the car was also discussed, but found to be a potential issue with both platforms. Similarly, a poor state of the car on either platform was feared by participants to be dangerous or lead to getting stuck somewhere with a broken car.

Overall, participants found reviews on Getaround helpful to review the state of the car. However, some distrusted the reviews to represent the actual state of the car. The possibility of having ‘random cars’ in poor condition on a mediated car sharing platform such as Getaround, resulted in some participants to prefer sharing a company-owned car that they associate with higher safety standards. On the contrary, one participant argued the opposite for Getaround: “1M1: I would trust Getaround more than car2go, because I think people are a lot more careful with their own cars if you rent it out.”

4.3.2 Community

In regard to community, participants agreed that the characteristics of users depend on the platform. Whereas Getaround can offer a higher closeness with neighbors, participants felt no sense of community with car2go and solely considered it a generational movement. Some participants also observed that car2go appears to not be fostering a community. Instead, one participant points out that there is a difference between actual active members on car2go and those that simply signed up when it was free. “2M4: ...most people barely ever use it [car2go] and still have a [membership] card. At some point they make it free to sign up for a week and everyone signs up.” Participants perceived that users become members of car2go to use the product, but not to be part of a community. This guided some participants to perceive car2go as less authentic in terms of real sharing, whereas Getaround was considered more authentic: “1M2: If I watch the car2go video, I really didn’t like it. I mean it was ‘We are all dreamers, we share, blabra’ and all that... The other one was way more authentic and I just instantly connected with the fact it’s real people…” The perception of a higher user activity on Getaround results in a stronger sense of community for most participants.

Another reason that makes a sense of community difficult for participants was the size and level of company involvement: “3F1: I also think it depends on the company and the platform size. When you have a big corporation like car2go, for it seems they do not have a strong community. It is getting bigger and it is hard to have a community with that.” The growing size of car2go leads to anonymity. Due to the anonymity and involvement of the company,
participants cannot solve problems that emerge from each other. “1F4: Once, I was driving ... someone claimed I did something, but I never did, even though I had someone with me witnessing, I didn’t do anything. But I was so annoyed, so I kind of stopped using that kind of car sharing.” As in the case of participant 1F4, helplessness and annoyance are the results of problems that can influence users to stop sharing company owned cars.

Despite all anonymity, users still affect each other in both platform concepts: “2M2: If there is a really disgusting person that has driven the car, I am directly affected by that other person having been in the car or whatever.” One participant notes that anonymity is prevented in other sharing platforms such as Airbnb where people meet in person. As this is not necessary on Getaround it creates a form of distrust. The distrust towards Getaround expressed by participants also referred to non-likable people who could either be exploiting the platform solely for their own greed interests or simply be ‘weird’: “1F1: Now, I think what are their reasons to put their car on there to make money. Maybe they are some kind of weirdos?” Conflicts that arise from the impact of users among each other can quickly result in a ‘word against word’ situation, which participants believe, can be taken care of by the mediator, possibly with technological help for proof in the future.

Participants acknowledge the aspect of ‘giving and taking’ in a community and hence, perceive car2go as a one-way relationship of ‘taking’ as in making use of a service. There is no strong sense of community with car2go so the purpose outweighs the importance of community for some participants: “3M2: I don’t think I would get a sense of community so much with this. It is more just that I am trying to get from A to B. It is not like I am nodding my head at other car2go drivers on the way, no.” In opposition, the thought of giving money back to the community by using Getaround strengthens the sense of community: “2M3: With Getaround it’s like even better, because I am giving it back to the person” The benefit of both parties (sharer and sharee) is a common purpose of Getaround in contrast to the one-sided user purpose of car2go: “1M2: Exactly. It is actually a nice idea, because you can both save money and be kind.”

Participants also feel the sense of community through the personalization of cars available on Getaround: “1M2: It is just more personal, it is more community-based. You have got profiles, you got people behind it, the car is named probably. It just gets more, way more personal.” For one participant, the sole online existence of the community and physical absence of the sharer was a reason not to use Getaround: “3F2: The fact that with ride sharing you know the person who drives the car, knows how the car works and is in the car. If there is a problem, they are in trouble as well, but having a car without the owner and without the driver, I wouldn’t
use it.” However, most participants agreed that the ratings provide a certain level of trust, but moreover, that common decency is more present if a person is the owner instead of a firm.

As a consequence, the common decency of both, sharer and sharee lead to an increased reliability in the community. A majority of participants admitted to show less respect for company-owned goods, but more respect for belongings of another person. Participants agreed that the increased respect is mainly due to the potentially negative impact on the sharer and their car. Even though most participants agreed that the community is conveying the true sense of sharing, some were particularly cautious about Getaround and questioned for it: “1M2: ...this one [Getaround] is one is way more social and way more personal ... Isn't that what sharing is all about? Now, you [1F1] are the one who is particularly conservative when talking about sharing.”

4.3.3 Sustainability

Sustainability as a motivation to participate in car sharing predominantly revolved around the basic idea of the idleness of cars. “3F1: The thing about cars is, they are idle a lot of the time. It is just sitting in parking spots and nobody uses them ... If I could use like my neighbor’s car and not only cars from a company, because it is not only companies that do that.” Participants acknowledged and enjoyed that Getaround allows users to take the neighbor’s car that is already there: “1M1: If you are looking at car sharing and want it to be as sustainable as possible, the feeling with Getaround of people using it would be better. You are actually using a car that is idle in the city, that is already there.” In contrast, some participants blamed car2go for their concept of adding cars on the road which is not sustainable: “2M1: They [Getaround] just don’t put another fleet of cars on the street to rent or lease.” and “1F1: I would still use car2go over Getaround, but I think it is a good point to say that with car2go they place the cars there and don’t necessarily have to be there.”

In addition to the idleness of cars, participants discussed the sustainability of producing new cars. A majority of participants agreed that the production of two-seater cars or electric cars are a necessary investment car2go has to make to be sustainable in the future despite the required resources: “3M1: Yeah, but that’s all about investments. You have to invest that money now to ensure sustainability in the long run. To me it is justifiable that way.” In regard to Getaround, some of the existing cars were seen as potential cars to be scrapped. The fact that sharers might offer old cars that are already beyond the point of intended use, thus damaging the environment, was perceived as unsustainable. With the trend of electric cars, participants expect most new investments of car2go to be in electric cars, making car2go more sustainable in the future. The resource consumptive production of electric cars remained an
unsolved matter of discussion among some participants and upheld the questionable sustainability of car2go.

The two cases combined result in a mixed market offer of differently aged and sized cars. Participants concluded that the variety of choices on Getaround may not always be the most sustainable option as the age or size of some cars could be surpassing the required purpose. On the other hand, most participants agreed that the majority of car2go cars still use fuel and the widespread availability may lead to more usage of cars in the city. One participant raised the concern of dysfunctional user behavior due to the car2go car sharing offer: “1F3: I think it also could trigger like dysfunctional behavior. I recognized it, a friend of mine he has this car2go and he uses it quite often when he could also go by bus, but it’s just easier. So, I am thinking that he could also like cut back on using car2go.” Most participants agreed with 1F3 that such behavior represents an overall move away from the already sustainable form of public transport. Especially the convenience of car sharing leads to a decreasing use of public transport: “2F2: In this case, no, because I could have taken the public transport, which I think is more sustainable.”

The view on the importance of the sustainability in car sharing varied among participants. Some considered sustainability to merely be a side effect, while others expected car sharing to be sustainable even though it was not the reason they chose it. The expectation of car sharing to be sustainable also stems from car sharing being a part of the sharing economy: “1F3: Just that in the Getaround case, it is more of the sharing economy thought, it’s more the good sustainability thing.”

While some participants are convinced Getaround is more sustainable than car2go, others have argued that the smaller scale of Getaround is a reason the platform is not yet sustainable. The company involvement is associated with a higher sustainability of the company owned cars in the case of car2go, but simultaneously results in uncertainty regarding the sustainability of Getaround: “3M2: I think it is definitely more sustainable than everybody having their own car. I just think car2go seems a little bit more efficient, because the cars are managed and up to date and they might become electric… we don’t know what sort of screening they have on the cars, but again it feels like with Getaround you could just leave some cars on the road whose time is actually up which makes it a bit less sustainable for me.”

4.3.4 Functional Convenience

The general perception of car sharing for some participants relates back to the convenience of the ability to solely decide on which route to take. Whereas some perceive the technology-based usage as convenient, others argue it is unnecessary. Overall, the convenience of cars
in cities was predominantly debated as a motivation to use car sharing. On one hand, some participants argued there was no necessity for car sharing in big cities, but rather in smaller cities: “1F2: I think it really depends where you live. If I would live in Stockholm somewhere in the city, a car wouldn’t really be necessary. But in Jönköping, I would definitely want a car.” On the other hand, some participants viewed car sharing as a compliment to public transport: “2M3: I would never take car sharing in Jönköping, because I could just take public transportation and everything is super close by. But if I were like in Stockholm, I would certainly do it besides taking public transportation.” Especially the small-sized cars of car2go (Model: Smart) were predominantly discussed as convenient due to parking issues: “3F3: Less cars in the city is already good. I am also from a big city and I think it is super hard to find a parking spot.” The short distances required in city travel were also considered ideal for electric cars by some participants. A majority of participants agreed that congestion and traffic in the city are a key issue when using a car: “1F1: Just drives me crazy to be stuck in traffic.”

In regard to functionality, participants had split views on the application of Getaround and car2go. “1M1: Especially with Getaround, because people in the countryside would probably offer their car and it could be a solution for the countryside. I don’t think car2go would plant their cars in the middle of nowhere, because they cannot earn money from it … Maybe Getaround even gives more opportunities than car2go.” Some participants felt that the ‘in-between areas’ (suburbs) were neglected in the city focussed business model of car2go: “2M4: Yeah, so you can’t just go to the suburbs [with car2go] and leave the car there.” On the whole, participants said the flexibility of car sharing depends largely on the ‘context’, ‘situation’, ‘goal’, and ‘purpose’. As there are different kinds of trips (one-way, multi-stop, round trip), car2go requires a higher degree of mobility. As cars on Getaround need to be returned within the owner’s proximity, participants examined Getaround to be more inflexible inside city limits.

The variety of cars offered by both platforms was another widely reviewed functional convenience of car sharing. The different Mercedes models offered by car2go fit various purposes in the same way as different brands and models offered on Getaround: “2M1: I mean just the fact that you can choose between so many options if they are available, that definitely would be a plus.”

Not only the choice of alternatives within the two car sharing platforms was discussed, but also car sharing as a more convenient alternative to public transport. Participants thought car2go would be faster and cater towards the user’s comfort. As parts of cities may not always be well connected, car2go has been viewed particularly convenient: “2F1: …certain areas that are not well connected and it is way easier to just take a car2go for 2 minutes than to take
public transport." Altogether, the freedom that car sharing offers compared to public transport is a main motivational convenience to use car sharing. Despite the convenience, one participant felt that car sharing is also associated with financial and time opportunity costs compared to public transportation: “2M4: Then I figured in the end I just paid like €5 or even more for a trip that I could have have had for free or faster because I searched for a parking lot way too long. In the meantime, I could have been there with public transportation already.” Another participant mentioned that cars may not always be necessary for big cities and that bike sharing can be a valuable alternative for shorter distances. Lastly, the participant opinions on whether car sharing can be considered a substitute or complementary to public transport were mixed. A need for more shared cars could reduce long wait times or broken cars, making it more competitive according to some participants. Participants further acknowledged that even though cars on Getaround are maintained by private people who expect them to function for themselves, the cars may still break down in a similar frequency as the offering of car2go.

4.3.5 Experience

The experience of car sharing is identified as a motivation to use car sharing. The general enjoyment of car sharing is higher than with public transportation as described by some participants. However, as most car sharing takes place in cities, especially with car2go, some users recognize that driving in cities is generally not fun due to traffic. Another form of enjoyment with car sharing was mentioned in a brand-related context as car2go allows users to enjoy driving a Mercedes.

Specifically, the variety of cars available was considered an experience by most participants. Enjoyment of the variety ranged from the fun in trying out electric vehicles, which represents an experience as such for some, over to test driving vehicles they have never driven before: “1F3: I used it in Hamburg with a friend. He rented an electronic car which was quite nice because I never drove an electronic car before. We were so fascinated that there was no sound.” As Getaround offers more options than car2go, some participants also enjoyed the variety of different brands: “3F1: I like that it is more diverse. I don’t only have to share a C-class, I can find a Porsche or who knows.” The inconsistency of brands or models, as well as different owners on Getaround, may result in a good or bad experience with Getaround: “1M1: Getaround is more of a trial and experience.”

In addition to the variety of cars offered, affordable prices add to the experience of cheap luxury in the eyes of some participants: “3M2: I mean you can go for a 20 minute drive in a C class for what…? 9 Dollars..? That’s crazy.” car2go usage can lead to feelings of luxury and variety that users may not be able to buy for themselves. From that idea of cheap luxury, a
few participants agreed that users will be showing off cars they share while pretending to actually own it. “3M3: I guess also some kind of people want to drive cars in the city center to like show off...” The branding on cars of car2go in the form of logos may pose to be a hindrance in that experience aspect.

The ownership allocation has a clear consequence of lower respect for the shared property which enhances the experience of car2go in regard to enjoyment. “3M2: Not that you’d drive stupidly but it is not your car so you have a bit more fun with it.” On the contrary, participants agreed they would show more respect if the face of the owner is known through the platform or the car has a personal touch as it might be the case with Getaround. The awareness of the owner adds an additional layer of concern which decreases the enjoyment during the usage of the car: “2M2: I think that I would drive a lot more carefully.” This layer of concern is not present with car2go due to the anonymous owner characteristics of the company as well as the standardized vehicles that make the shared good itself anonymous: “3M2: ...whereas car2go is just a C-class. The owner is faceless, he doesn’t exist.” As the Getaround community is not anonymous, one participant views sharing within a community as part of the sharing economy experience: “1M1: Getaround is more displaying the sharing economy, so it would definitely make a difference for me experience wise. In the long-term, I wouldn’t even consider it anymore as an experience.” Other participants agreed that familiarity through usage decreases the experience of both platforms: “1F1: Once it is normal, it is not an experience anymore.”

4.3.6 Lifestyle

Lifestyle as a motivation was rarely centered around one of the two cases, but rather on car sharing in general. A key aspect of lifestyle for participants was traveling and frequent moving and referred to as a lifestyle of the younger generation. Especially the movement between small and big cities affected the need for a car: “2F1: I come from a small city and I didn’t have a car when I was living in a big city. Now that I am back in a small city, I have a car so if I will go, which I aim to, live in a bigger city again, I think I would sell my car.”

While participants found younger people to have mainly integrated car sharing in their lifestyle, this may not be the case for everyone. “1M1: Maybe it has also something do with that we are not far ahead yet as a daily life thing … Yeah, I mean if it becomes part of really your daily life, maybe you can use it for everyday experiences or conveniences.” While the integration of car sharing represents a form of freedom when moving and traveling, some participants disagreed and found car sharing also restricting compared to car ownership: “1F3: Like if I would have my own car, I can just drive wherever and whenever I want. This I don’t have with car sharing.”
On the other hand, car ownership represents a burden which motivated some participants to use car2go. For some participants, the decision to own or share is perceived as money-driven, while others argued it is a decision based on convenience instead of affordability. However, participants agreed that car ownership may play a bigger role later in life with the increased dependability of age. Settling down with age instead of moving and traveling around would also contribute to the preference of car ownership over car sharing for some participants. The effect of ownership allocation on lifestyle also led one participant to question the perception of owning cars as a status symbol. On the contrary, car sharing through Getaround was considered ‘young’ and ‘cool’ in an isolated comment of another participant.

4.3.7 Monetary Value

The basic monetary value in car sharing was perceived by participants to be in comparison to car ownership. For some, the purchase of a car represents an investment which is not necessary with car sharing. In addition to saving an investment sum, participants also named the savings of costs from otherwise required parking space or storage associated with a car. Participants struggled to compare costs due to the obvious cost structure of car sharing and the unclear costs associated with owning a car.

In comparison to alternative means of transport such as public transport or Uber, car sharing (in particular car2go) posed as a cheaper alternative for some participants, especially when considering carpooling. Even though inconvenient parking situations left one participant to consider public transportation as a cheaper and faster option: “2M4: Then I figured in the end I just paid like €5 or even more for a trip that I could have have had for free or faster because I searched for a parking lot way too long. In the meantime, I could have been there with public transportation already.” In regard to Getaround, participants enjoyed the idea of flexibility in price due to the flexibility in the choice of vehicles. However, some participants feared that cheaper cars could also be a trade-off for quality.

One participant noted that the cheapness of car sharing largely depends on the situation: “1F4: I have always used car sharing because I needed to go from point A to point B … It’s not about like going on a trip, going shopping like leaving the car there. Probably you can do that, but that’s also like adding up all the costs and going back.” The purpose clearly influences how participants view the price in regard to flexibility and cheapness. Getaround was generally perceived as more inflexible due to the rental charge by the hour. In comparison, the pay-per-minute charge of car2go gave some participants a dangerous impression. In their view, paying by the minute would be dangerous in regard to speeding and the increase of usage that
endangers the environment: “3M2: ...but again, if you are offering cars in the city for that cheap, I am probably going to. And that kind of works against where most governments are working towards.” The cheap offering of car2go and Getaround was perceived similar by participants even though Getaround further includes a rental fee that participants appeared to be willing to pay in exchange for the mediator services of the platform. The vast majority of participants of the first focus group agreed that: “1M1: Getaround will be in the long-term a lot more sustainable and better economic alternative than car2go.”

4.4 Visualization of Motivational Differences

To visualize the transcript codings, the alluvial diagrams in Figure 3 and Figure 4 separately depict the differences in the motivation of each investigated case in an alphabetical order. The boldness of color flows in the alluvial diagrams is based on the frequency of codes. Overall, more codes are included in the diagram for car2go (159 codes) than for Getaround (99). This may largely be due to the higher familiarity of participants with car2go and sequential discussion order. The following alluvial diagram visualizes the differences in sharee motivations to use car2go:

![Alluvial Diagram of Sharee Motivations (car2go).](image)

Overall in regard to car2go, functional convenience was discussed the most (30% of mentions), followed by trust (16%), community (14%), experience (14%), and sustainability (13%). The motivations of lifestyle and monetary value were discussed the least (both 7%). The motivation of community with car2go was mainly perceived as negative (68%) and is therefore not a strong motivational factor for sharees to use car2go. Instead, experience was perceived mainly positive (77%) and appears to be a motivation to use car2go. The motivational factor of functional convenience is relatively evenly distributed (47% positive, 34% negative). Lifestyle and monetary value show rather positive characteristics (both 73%) and
appear to both be motivating factors to use car2go. Lastly, the motivational factor of trust is largely positive (64%) and represents another motivation to participate in car2go.

The following alluvial diagram visualizes the differences in sharee motivations to use Getaround:

![Alluvial Diagram of Sharee Motivations (Getaround)](image)

In regard to Getaround, trust (29% of mentions) is the most discussed motivation, followed by community (21%), sustainability (17%), and functional convenience (15%). The least discussed motivations include experience (9%), monetary values (7%), and lifestyle (1%). Even though community is an overall positive motivation to participate in Getaround (67%), a considerable share of negative aspects remains (33%). Experience is an evenly distributed motivation (positive 44%, negative 22%, indifferent 33%), similar to functional convenience as it is dependent on the situation (positive 20%, negative 27%, indifferent 53%). Lifestyle is almost negligible due to the single code included in the diagram. The motivation of monetary values shares almost equally positive (43%) and negative (57%) aspects, whereas sustainability is rather positive motivation (59%) to use Getaround. Trust is an evenly distributed motivation in regard to Getaround (positive 45%, negative 32%, indifferent 22%).

![Table 2. Distribution of Codings.](image)
5 Analysis and Discussion
The findings show that motivations to partake in car sharing are either directly or indirectly influenced by ownership allocation. Thus, the influence of ownership allocation leads to an interconnectedness of all motivational factors. Furthermore, the framing of each participant defines each individual’s weighted composition of motivational factors. Thus, each motivation has to be individually examined in-depth to display variant characteristics resulting from different ownership allocations.

Trust
Botsman and Rogers (2011) identify trust as an enabling factor for the sharing economy. Referring to the findings of this thesis, trust was the basis of participant perception of prominence, professionalism, and community that motivate car sharing behavior. In B2B car sharing business models as well as mediated P2P car sharing platforms the prominence of the company and platform is an important factor in trust building. A high prominence enables higher levels of trust, which can be further accelerated through people based control mechanisms, such as social media. The prominence of a company or a brand further dictates the perceived professionalism of sharees. Based on public control mechanisms and the professionality related to companies, sharees draw positive implications on the maintenance and performance status of a company-owned car, which stands in a negative contrast to the status of peer-owned vehicles.

Besides the prominence and professionalism of a platform, the virtual presence and physical absence of peers on P2P platforms also influence trust levels. Since the sharing economy is an ICT phenomenon, most interactions of peers are purely virtual. As seen in the case of Getaround, review systems can benefit the trust formation on a P2P car sharing platform, while the absence of the car owner during the usage situation can lead to distrust. On the other hand, in the case of car2go, the anonymity of peers who share the company-owned car can be either positive or negative.

This distinction of differences in trust formation with company and peer-based trust can be strongly influenced negative or positive way through the ownership allocation of the shared good. Prominence, professionalism, and the concept of anonymity or community in the design of car sharing platforms are linked to ownership allocation. Whether one trust factor outweighs another is not identified in this small-sample thesis since such a weighting heavily depends on the general framing of the sharee. Thus, the role of trust could be investigated in a quantitative
research to find clear evidence of the distribution of company and peer trust with regard to ownership allocation in different car sharing concepts and usage situations.

Community
Community was perceived as a motivating factor in car sharing. With regard to the findings of this thesis, the motivation of community plays a bigger role on access platforms for peer-owned cars when compared to platforms providing access to company-owned cars. Hence, community is a more important motivation to use Getaround over car2go. This is mainly due to the fact that the sharee anonymity of car2go hinders a feeling of community. In this case, the focus is on the relationship between the user and the company instead of the relationship users. Getaround, in turn, displays profiles with pictures and personal information of sharees and sharers. This display fosters trust on one hand but on the other hand, leads to more concerns regarding the motives of the community in terms of true sharing.

Furthermore, the participants of this study perceived different levels of user activity with the sample cases. car2go users seem less involved since membership on the platform does not imply usage. Due to the P2P-based business model, users of Getaround seem more active and involved. This strong activity of the Getaround community is centered around sharing the community-owned product whereas car2go is perceived as a convenient company provided service with company-owned cars. The standardization of a company provided service not only leads to an anonymous community but also an 'anonymous product', whereas the peer-owned cars convey a sense of personalization. Furthermore, sharees might feel a stronger identification of community with regard to peer owned cars due to the necessity of interconnectedness (concerning solving potential problems, review systems to ensure the quality of shared cars, the general impression of the sharer, and experience exchange). This interconnectedness is perceived as ‘true sharing’. In this context, motivations differ as to either participating in a sharing economy platform (more in the case of Getaround) or making use of a service offer (more in the case of car2go).

Overall, a weak sense of identification with platform communities based on company-owned cars is observed, due to the perception of the servitization aspect. Servitization requires no interconnectedness between users since the focal relationship is between the company and the individual sharee.

Sustainability
Sustainability was deemed an important factor in the sharing economy, especially considering the underutilization of assets. In the case of car sharing, this refers to the idleness of cars.
P2P car sharing as in the case of Getaround means fewer cars on the streets due to sharing existent idle cars. The business model of car2go was perceived to add new cars, instead of making use of already existent idle cars. These different ways of utilization of idleness are the main perceived difference between the two cases. Thereby, Getaround is perceived as overly positive, while mixed motivations emerge for car2go. The controversy circulates around either utilizing older, more inefficient vehicles of Getaround versus utilizing newly produced, but more efficient and sustainable vehicles.

In both cases, the mixed market offer of various cars might lead to dysfunctional behavior. Car sharing, in general, is perceived as sustainable, but other motivations (functional convenience, monetary value, experience) can result in increased car usage and outweigh the sustainability thought to result in non-sustainable usage. In this sense, sharing company-owned vehicles can add to motivational feelings of sustainability through the innovative capacities to add and operate modern vehicles. Brand values such as sustainability and corporate social responsibility are transferred onto the perception of the sustainability of a company-owned car. In contrary, by utilizing peer-owned idle cars for more specific purposes, users get the feeling of being more sustainable. The widespread availability and flexibility of car2go’s company offer were perceived as potentially triggering dysfunctional behavior and thereby replacing more sustainable alternatives of transportation (e.g. public transportation, bikes, etc).

**Functional Convenience**

Besides sustainability, the functionality of car sharing was discussed as a questionable advantage with reference to the availability of public transport as an alternative. Car sharing usage is perceived similarly problematic as the usage of an owned car within cities due to traffic and parking. However, both car-related means of transportation are considered a convenient way of moving within a city.

In this regard, car sharing is mostly compared to public transport instead of owning a car. In references to the functional role of car sharing, it seems to be both a substitute and complement to public transport rather than a substitute for car ownership. Regarding the investigated cases, company-owned cars are perceived to be solely dominant in cities, whereas Getaround would also be convenient in rural areas. The P2P business model was perceived not to depend on large amounts of users in densely populated areas such as car2go. On the other hand, car sharing servitization offers higher flexibility with company-owned cars than peer-owned cars in innercity situations. Participants perceive a more limited convenience with cars provided on Getaround compared to car2go-vehicles, such as the need
to return a peer-owned car to a specific area. Subsequently, ownership allocation results in differences in the design of the sharing platform or service offering leading to differences in convenience-related motivations of sharees.

**Monetary Value**

Monetary value has not been discussed in-depth by participants, although it was perceived as a motivating factor. A general comparison of car sharing costs versus investment in cars or costs of alternative forms of transport dominated the discussions on this motivational factor. Getaround seems to be perceived as the better economic alternative because of the variety of cars offered on the platform that include cheaper cars and consequently older or lower-end models. Furthermore, the profit orientation of the community can be perceived weaker than company profit orientation. In contrary, a lower price is associated with lower quality of peer-owned cars, whereas company owned-cars provide consistent quality for a steady price and thus display a consistent price-performance ratio. Another monetary consideration is related to companies backing car sharing platforms. Paying for a mediator when sharing peer-owned cars is perceived as a necessity to increase trust in the community, whereas this type of willingness to pay was not separately observed in regard to company-owned cars. This may be largely due to other trust expectations towards the service character of the offering.

**Experience**

Experience as a motivation has been largely discussed in the context of car2go. The reason might be that the participants have already made experiences with the more prominent platform. Participating in car sharing is based on the experience of enjoyment to drive cars as well as the feeling of an otherwise not affordable luxury. Regarding this, company-owned cars lead to more enjoyment during the usage, since less responsibility and respect is felt towards the owner and the car itself. In contrary, using peer-owned vehicles adds an extra layer of concern and responsibility which reduces the enjoyment of driving. However, participation in the sharing economy is perceived as an experience in itself. This experience is based on the feeling of exclusivity and anti-mainstream consumption. While this sort of experience might become normality through frequent usage, participants would still consider using Getaround an experience, because of the lower prominence of the platform. Furthermore, the experience perceived with Getaround is beyond the plain experience of sharing economy participation. It also relates to the experience to use a car because it is owned by someone else. Thus, the thought of ‘true sharing’ also influences the experience that motivates car sharing participation.
Lifestyle

Lifestyle as a motivation was mainly discussed with general regard to car sharing rather than case-specifically as well as in the context of ownership allocation. The lifestyle of a person is strongly dominated by their framing. These may include sustainable or cost-saving lifestyles. However, lifestyle in this thesis was generally referred to the demand of freedom when traveling or frequently moving, which matches the supplying convenience aspect of car sharing. With regard to ownership allocation, lifestyle might be influenced by the individual’s importance of involvement in a P2P community and the desire for experiences in the sense of ‘true sharing’ with peer-owned vehicles.
6 Conclusion

6.1 Contribution to Research

The purpose of this thesis was to distinguish between car sharing platforms in terms of ownership allocation regarding access to peer-owned and company-owned vehicles and to explore the differences of sharee motivations towards both types within car sharing.

The findings revealed that the perception of ownership allocation of participants is evident through the consciousness of ‘true sharing’, the level of perceived professionalism as well as how participants use the accessed cars. Seven sharee motivations to partake in car sharing have been identified including trust, community, sustainability, functional convenience, experience, lifestyle, and monetary value. Differences were identified among each motivation without a general consensus among participants.

The case-based findings suggest that ownership allocation leads to an interconnectedness of all motivations which largely depend on the framings of individuals. These framings varied greatly, leading to multiple compositions of motivations to share cars. However, no motivational patterns of participants were equally applicable to both models of ownership allocation.

In conclusion, ownership allocation is identified as an influencing factor on sharee motivations. This influence is independent of sharee framings. As an overarching contribution to this field of research ownership allocation adds relevance in efforts to define the sharing economy.

6.2 Managerial Implications

This research concludes two crucial implications for the car sharing economy in regard to platform concepts and branding. The findings suggest that a combined offering of company-owned and peer-owned cars on a single platform may be a middle-ground that benefits from the positive sharee motivations of both ownership allocations while reducing motivational issues related to them. In the case of car2go, the platform could allow sharers to offer privately owned Mercedes cars on car2go. This would allow car2go members to choose between company-owned and peer-owned vehicles on one mobile app. A combination of company-owned and peer-owned car offers could cater to different consumer framings without altering the main functional convenience and marketing positioning of car2go. The findings further suggest the role of brands as a basis of trust to be of importance in any car sharing concept due to the trust issues related to the state of the car as well as the company role as mediator.
The aforementioned combination of company-owned and peer-owned cars on one platform will allow trust in brands to be transferred to peer-owned vehicles.

6.3 Limitations
Although this research was conscientiously designed and executed, three unavoidable limitations of this research have to be taken into consideration.

First, in regard to the sampling of cases, minor differences between the two cases are present, which include different levels of prominence. car2go is established in several countries and metropolitan areas, whereas Getaround currently only operates within the United States and was therefore unknown to all participants prior to conducting the focus groups. Differences between the cases further include functional aspects that have led to differences in the perception of usage purpose by participants.

Second, in regard to research design and analysis, some aspects mentioned by participants in regard to car2go may be equally applicable to Getaround. Motivational aspects which were not explicitly mentioned in a Getaround context were therefore not coded. This may be a result of the dissimilarities in prominence and the sequential introduction of the cases (starting with car2go) during the focus groups.

Third, the scope of this thesis constitutes a limitation in regard to the applicability of the findings. Only three focus groups were conducted with predominantly young participants with varying levels of university education. The identified motivations and differences discussed within this thesis may differ among other generations or educational groups.

6.4 Future Research
The findings in this study stem from qualitative data of a small-scale sample. Hence, this thesis calls upon future studies to conduct additional quantitative research in regard to differences in sharee motivations to participate in the sharing economy under consideration of ownership allocation. This could also include different generations and educational levels. Future research can further investigate the case of governments or other (non-profit) organizations as sharers or suppliers of access-based car sharing as well as in the role of mediators between peers.

The relationship of ownership visibility in objects and its influence on experience as a motivation to participate in the sharing economy could also be explored. Furthermore, experience is a motivation which appears to decrease over time, a determination of saturation
of experiences in a longitudinal study could reveal additional valuable insights on the motivational nature of experience. Besides experience, the role of lifestyle as a motivation to participate in the sharing economy requires additional attention in future research.

The investigation of ownership allocation in future research can potentially lead to a clearer distinction of sharing economy platforms from servitization. While this thesis focuses on car sharing, future research should explore the applicability of findings in regard to other shared goods with different values (higher versus lower value goods) or different levels of potential personalization.
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