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ABSTRACT

Customer behavior has always been of interest for business researchers. However, it is just in recent years that there has been an increasing interest in the phenomenon of the sharing economy. It has been suggested that there is an ongoing shift in the traditional way of consuming. The idea behind the sharing economy is that two different parties can make use of their underused assets through an online platform. Previous quantitative research in the area of interest mainly focuses on the motivational factors for participation in the sharing economy; four of the most prominent factors were therefore identified and further investigated. In this thesis, these factors are referred to as drivers and more specifically, the drivers of enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits. Further, previous research gives an indication of a discrepancy between customer attitudes and actions when making a decision in the sharing economy. With this in mind, the purpose of this thesis is to describe customer behavior in the sharing economy. More specifically, this thesis seeks to study the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy. Taking this into account, the following research question was formulated:

What is the relationship between attitudes and actions of the customers participating in the sharing economy of Rentl AB?

In order to fulfill the purpose of this thesis, the Swedish sharing economy business Rentl was addressed. To answer the research question a quantitative research strategy was followed where a survey was sent out to randomly chosen customers of Rentl and 145 responses were collected. The collected data was statistically analyzed by the use of Paired T-tests and Regression Analyses. Further, the empirical findings regarding the four identified drivers were analyzed in accordance with the theoretical framework. The identified attitude-action gap is therefore analyzed by the application of basic customer decision-making, the theory of Bounded Rationality, the Theory of Reasoned Action & the Theory of Planned Behavior, and finally the Self-Determination Theory.

The authors established that there is a positive relationship between attitudes and actions regarding the extrinsic drivers, convenience and financial benefits. However, it was further established that the intrinsic drivers, enjoyment and sustainability, do not have a significant influence on the actual actions. In other words, a positive attitude toward enjoyment and sustainability as drivers for participation in the sharing economy does not necessarily translate into actions. Thus, the authors identified that there is an attitude-action gap in the sharing economy.

In addition to the theoretical contributions, this research further contributes with practical aspects. More importantly, the sharing business Rentl is provided with a better understanding for the customer behavior in their business. Considering that the findings of this research identify convenience and financial benefits as significant drivers for participation, this can be emphasized in marketing contexts by managers.
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1. Introduction

This chapter begins with an explanation for the chosen subject. Thereafter the problem background is presented based on both customer behavior and sharing economy. Additionally a presentation of the Swedish sharing business Rentl is provided. This is followed by the stated research question and the purpose of this thesis. Furthermore a discussion regarding the expected contributions of this research is provided. In the end of the chapter a table of terminology is presented in order to clarify the keywords used continuously throughout the thesis.

1.1 Choice of Subject
The authors of this thesis have both studied Business Administration with a focus on entrepreneurship, innovation, strategy, and consumer behavior. The common interest in these fields of study is the main reason why the authors of this thesis wanted to study consumer behavior in a relevant and growing phenomenon. The subject of the current thesis concerns the ever expanding phenomenon of sharing economy, or often referred to as collaborative consumption. This subject has existed for long, but has only quite recently started to grow exponentially (PWC, 2018). However, the rapid expansion and success of sharing businesses has come with the skepticism of many individuals (Zrenner, 2015, p. 1). To this day, the sharing economy is still heavily debated whether or not it is ethical or not (Zrenner, 2015, p. 1). Furthermore, in the literature search of the current thesis, the authors found that there was already an extensive range of qualitative research that had been made on the business-model side of the sharing economy. Moreover, a broad range of qualitative studies had also been conducted regarding customers in the sharing economy. However, the authors of the current thesis did discover that little research had been made on what can be referred to as the attitude-behavior relationship within sharing economy. The authors further discovered that there was a lack of quantitative research on the customer side of the sharing economy. Accordingly, a gap in prior research was identified within the attitude-behavior relationship with a focus on the sharing economy. Furthermore, in order to study the relationship between attitudes and actions, one would measure the subjects’ attitudes and actions in order to obtain a mean indicative value for these variables, and further weigh these against each other. In order to do this, a quantitative study is necessary. Given this research gap, combined with the interest of customer behavior, ongoing debate regarding the sharing economy, and quantitative nature of the topic led the authors to further investigate the current issue with a quantitative approach – the attitude-action gap in the sharing economy.

1.2 Problem Background
This section of the introductory chapter introduces the reader with the broad concept of customer behavior, followed by an introduction to the sharing economy and its background. It further gives an introduction to the sharing business Rentl, whose customer base is sampled and surveyed in order to test the hypotheses of the current thesis.

1.2.1 Customer Behavior
Researchers have long tried to define the way people justify and motivate their behavior in a business environment (Grossack, 1964, p. 67). Grossack (1964, p. 53) explained the
importance of understanding and researching customer behavior by serving as a missing communications link between manager and customer which this thesis seeks to do. Finding answers to why customers behave as they do in a business setting is often far from easy. Going as far back as the eighteenth century, Adam Smith argued that customer behavior can be explained by self-interest (Smith, 2001, p. 30). In other words, peoples’ justifications for making a business transaction are based on individualistic intentions, rather than societal/collectivistic motivations. Richard Thaler (1980) takes a rather unorthodox approach and argues on the contrary to previous research that mankind does not follow a normative model when making a customer decision. The theory of consumer choice is normatively based, i.e. what people *should* do. However, economists argue that these models also serve as a descriptive tool, i.e. what they actually *do*. This leads economists to make systematic errors when predicting and forecasting customer behavior (Thaler, 1980). He further argues for this by stating that all people will behave as rational as they personally can. However as will be further discussed in this thesis, an individual's capabilities to behave rationally is limited by three factors; namely the information they possess, their computational abilities, and/or their individual cognitive limitations (Ballester & Hernández, 2012, p. 29). As such, people will try to maximize their individual decision making capabilities in order to behave rationally, and yet violate a normative model, i.e. how they *should* behave. The reason for this is that these traditional models, which Thaler criticizes, treat the human mind as a “robot-like expert”, and therefore do a poor job of predicting the behavior of the average customer (Thaler, 1980, p. 58). Ultimately, this means that when people try to ration a given decision, much of their decision making criteria will be based on other than logic and rational, but instead on emotions and social influences. Therefore, one’s predictions about the outcome of a given decision making situation may differ from the actual outcome, due to the lack of predictable reasoning.

1.2.2 The Sharing Economy

In many societies people have had the possibility of booking a taxi or renting a book in the library. These are evidence that sharing, as in temporary access, is already a part of our society. Belk (2007, p. 127) defines sharing as “the act and process of distributing what is ours to others for their use as well as the act and process of receiving something from others for our use.”. In recent years there has been a major increase in the appearance of this phenomenon, the sharing economy (PWC, 2018). The rapid expansion of the phenomenon of sharing economy makes it a relevant subject in today’s society. The idea behind the sharing economy is that two different parties can make use of their underused assets through the use of a connecting platform which initiates the transaction (Quinones & Augustine, 2015, p. 1; Stephany, 2015, p. 11; Sundararajan, 2016, p. 3). There is an ongoing debate on whether or not ‘sharing economy’ is a suitable name (PwC, 2015, p. 14). Collaborative consumption, access-based consumption, peer-to-peer sharing, and on-demand economy are some of the terms used to describe the rapidly growing phenomenon (PwC 2015, p. 14; Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012, p. 881; Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 28). PwC (2015) identifies five main sectors within the sharing economy, peer-to-peer accommodation; peer-to-peer transportation; on-demand household services; on-demand professional services; and collaborative finance. This thesis seeks to incorporate the many forms and aspects of the sharing economy, in order to create a consistent research regarding customer behavior in the sharing economy. In order to be as consistent as possible this thesis will maintain the reference to the umbrella phenomenon, the sharing economy.
An interest to investigate the driving factors for participation can also be identified in previous research (Schiel, 2015, p. 9; Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 29; Hamari et al. 2015, p. 2). Studying previous research regarding the drivers for participation in the sharing economy, several motivational factors emerge, with a few being particularly distinguished from the mass. As such, the main drivers for participation in the sharing economy were identified as enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits. These drivers are further to be discussed in the theoretical framework in Chapter 3.

1.2.3 Introduction to Rentl AB
The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the customer behavior in the sharing economy and more specifically the sharing economy in Sweden. With this purpose in mind, the authors found it appropriate to reach out to Swedish sharing economy businesses. In order to gather relevant data, the authors of the current thesis have utilized the customer base of Rentl AB. This company was identified as a sharing economy business given its online platform business model. On this connecting platform, two or more parties can make use of each other’s underused assets through renting. Therefore, this section serves as an introduction to the way Rentl AB operates their sharing economy, and further the way to join the customer base of Rentl, which serves as the sample for the current study.

Rentl AB is a company with its headquarters based in Stockholm, Sweden. It was founded in 2015 and has been active since the time when sharing economy was relatively new to the home market of Rentl - Sweden. Rentl utilizes an online platform business model, and will as such be referred to as a sharing business in this thesis. Through an online platform, accessible on the website (www.rentl.se), the webpage works as both a meeting place and at the same time a marketplace for customers interested in renting or providing an underused asset. On the website one can find anything from apartments in Marbella, to screwdrivers, cars, and camera lenses to rent for a limited amount of time. Unlike some other sharing companies, such as Uber or Airbnb where people can more easily be characterized as provider or user, the people participating in the sharing business of Rentl are often both providers and users at the same time.

As a customer, upon registration you share your name and personal contact information with Rentl and the other customers on the website. Only your name and possibly a picture will be accessible to other people until you make a booking, then your contact information will be exchanged. If you are to rent or lease something, you will also need to register your bank information in order to receive payments from renting customers. The current thesis does not make a distinction between providers engaged in the sharing economy, and their corresponding user. Instead, the term customer will be used to refer to both parties of a business transaction; notably providers and users engaged in the sharing economy as one group. The reasoning behind this is based on the assumption that providers and users are more often than not the same people on sharing platforms in general, and Rentl AB in particular. On the online connecting platform of this sharing company, people are registered as individuals rather than providers and users. This means that each individual is free to provide or use a service respectively without restrictions. It would therefore not be meaningful, or even possible to differentiate between these two groups. Although, if these two groups were to consist of different people, they would arguably still be equally involved the phenomenon of sharing
1.2.4 Perspective

As previously concluded, there is already established research within the area of customer behavior in the sharing economy. According to Grossack (1964, p. 30), behavioral scientists see the world somewhat differently from how business scientists see it, and therefore also represent different ways of thinking. Having recognized this, it is of interest to investigate the area of behavior for the authors, known as business scientists according to Grossack (1964, p. 30). More importantly, this research concerns customer behavior in the sharing economy where the authors want to identify the relationship between attitudes and actions. More specifically, if there is a discrepancy between what people say and what they do. Furthermore, it was of interest to investigate if this discrepancy is applicable for the sharing economy business in Sweden. When investigating the attitude-action gap it is recommended to focus on customers with an already existing knowledge and concern (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 32), and therefore the authors wanted to reach out to customers registered to a sharing economy platform. This was accessed through the Swedish sharing economy business Rentl AB. As previously explained, Rentl connects their customers through an online platform where it is possible to make use of underused assets. Therefore, this thesis also takes the perspective of customer behavior in an online context. With this in mind, the customer perspective will be a focal point throughout the thesis as the authors are studying the attitude-action gap in the sharing economy.

1.3 Theoretical Background

It has previously been hypothesized that customer behavior online differs from traditional retail-settings behavior according to Häubl and Trifts (2000, p. 5). This hypothesis is of interest for this study since the initial phase of a business transaction in sharing economy will most certainly take place online. Since the core of the sharing economy business model is the usage of an online platform in order to connect customers, it is of relevance to primarily describe the attitude-action consistency and inconsistency from a customer perspective. Explaining human behavior and more specifically, customer behavior is difficult (Ajzen, 1991, p. 179). Customer behavior is concerned with how customers make decisions and the underlying factors behind the decision (Grossack, 1964, p. 11). Furthermore, as customer behavior tries to explain the way people make decisions in a financial setting, a crucial explaining factor of this is people’s underlying attitudes, and values. Therefore, when investigating customer behavior, heavy emphasis should be put on people’s often intangible, yet influential underlying attitudes and values (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1988, p. 3). The authors identified an extensive range of previous research regarding how, and if, customer attitudes translate into actual actions. Ajzen (1991, p. 206) argues that attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived control over the planned behavior are factors that can predict the behavioral intentions of the customer. Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) explain how attitudes influence behavioral intentions and as a result a customer acts in a way that is correlating with their respective attitudes related to that behavior. Therefore, it is to an extent possible to predict a customer action based on its attitudes and values (Homer & Kahle, 1988, p. 645).

Although previous research argues that values and attitudes influence behavior (Homer & Kahle, 1988, p. 645), other research suggests that there is a gap between attitudes and
behavior (Hamari et al., 2015, p. 1). Meaning, customer attitudes do not necessarily translate into actual actions. Studies have shown that there is an inconsistency between behavioral patterns and attitudes (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 187). Blake (1999, p. 270) argues that there is a discrepancy between customer attitudes and customer actions. In other words, this discrepancy means that attitudes of the customer do not necessarily translate into actions in line with the individual’s beliefs. This discrepancy is referred to as the value-action gap (Blake, 1999, p. 275), or the attitude-behavior gap (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002, p. 242). Current research regarding the value-action gap focuses mostly on customer behavior regarding environmentally friendly behavior and social psychology - whilst, the theory of value-action gap itself seeks to explain the difference of what customers say and what customers do (Blake, 1999, p. 275).

Attitudes are the product of several factors, including the individuals underlying value structure (Homer and Kahle, 1988, p. 640). Since this thesis aims to describe the relationship between people’s attitudes and actual behavior toward sharing economy, the attitudes of the customers need to be identifiable for the individuals themselves. An individual’s underlying value structure is the most abstract of social cognitions (Homer and Kahle, 1988, p. 138). Accordingly, people can most likely not identify their underlying value-structure with ease. As will further be discussed later on in this study, the current thesis will make use of indicators, referred to as drivers, in order to manage the intangibility of people’s underlying values. As a result, this thesis will refer to the gap between what people say and what they do as the attitude-action gap, rather than value-action gap.

In order to describe the relationship between attitudes and actual behavior of customers in the sharing economy three main theories will be emphasized throughout this thesis. The relationship between attitudes and actions will be investigated from a rational perspective, a non-rational perspective and the perspective of intrinsic- and extrinsic motivation. More precisely, the Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior will be emphasized at first. The Theory of Reasoned Action as well as the Theory of Planned Behavior both make the assumption that people are rational in their decision making (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1988, p. 3). Further the theories argue how people are aware of their implications of performing a certain behavior before the actual behavior enacted (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1988, p. 3). Thus, the theories argue for behavior of customers being predictable. On the other hand, the theory of Bounded Rationality argues that customer decision making is not predictable (Simon, 1955, p. 104). This is because individuals are not perfectly rational in their decision making (Selten, 1999, p. 3). Accordingly, people cannot make a fully rational decision as their cognitive capabilities are limited by several mental constraints. Lastly, the Self-Determination Theory will be emphasized in this thesis in order to describe how motivation for participation in the sharing economy can be either intrinsically motivated or extrinsically driven. The Self-Determination Theory explains how human motivation can be a result of several factors. Individuals can be motivated by external factors, internal factors as well as both at the same time (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

1.4 Research Gap and Research Question
The authors identified an extensive range of previous research regarding the sharing economy, and the business model behind it. Furthermore, the value-action gap has been carefully studied in several different settings. However, due to the relatively recent appearance and growth of the sharing economy, very little research has touched upon a
potential attitude-action gap within sharing economy. Prior studies have been made on the basic incentives behind the engagement in collaborative consumption (Hawlitschek et al., 2016). As such, this thesis aims to investigate whether the individuals’ attitudes toward a certain subject in the sharing economy translate into actions corresponding to that specific attitude. This study will be done through the support of previous studies which have explored the incentives for participation in sharing economy.

The current research seeks to emphasize the customer perspective of the sharing economy. More specifically, this thesis seeks to investigate the relationship between attitudes and actions of the customers participating in the sharing economy of Rentl AB. The context is of particularly great interest since participation in sharing economy is generally depicted as being driven by an obligation to do good for other people and for the environment, such as sharing, helping others, and engaging in sustainable consumption (Prothero et al., 2011, p. 31). The authors of this thesis identified a majority of qualitative studies concerning the motivational factors affecting customers’ attitudes and actions in the sharing economy. In order to study the relationship between attitudes and actions, one would measure the attitudes and actions of a given sample in numerical values and weigh these values against each other. Therefore a quantitative approach is necessary for the study at hand. Furthermore, with a less extensive range of quantitative research regarding the research area, it was of certain interest to further investigate this research gap. Additionally, the authors wanted to contribute to the already existing knowledge by providing better insights in the industry with quantifiable data. The expected contributions of this thesis are to be further discussed in section 1.6. With the interest for customer behavior in the sharing economy and the identified lack of quantitative research, the research question for this study is stated as followed:

What is the relationship between attitudes and actions of the customers participating in the sharing economy of Rentl AB?

1.5 Thesis Purpose
This research is concerned with the customer behavior in sharing economy and aims to describe the relationship between attitudes and actions. Previous research indicates that there is a discrepancy between customer attitudes and actions when making a decision in a financial setting, especially regarding sustainable- or green products. With the rapid expansion of the phenomenon of sharing economy the authors of this thesis wanted to investigate if this attitude-action gap is applicable in the phenomenon of sharing. Therefore, this thesis investigates the customer attitudes and actions when making decisions as a customer for the Swedish sharing economy company Rentl AB. The aim of the thesis will be to fill the above stated and identified research gap; namely if attitudes differ from actual actions when a customer makes the decision to participate in a sharing economy. Knowing the relationship between customers’ attitudes and actions will enable managers to understand what actually drives people to participate in sharing economy, even though their attitudes might potentially contradict this behavior.

1.6 Expected Contributions
The findings of this research are expected to provide better insights in the industry and give quantifiable data as the main theoretical contribution. Additionally, this thesis is expected to contribute with a framework for the motivational factors for participating in the sharing economy. This framework can be used as guidance as to whether or not a certain driver is motivated intrinsically or extrinsically according to the Self-Determination Theory.

Furthermore, the findings are expected to be useful for managers administering a sharing economy business. It will carry the most value to managers of Rentl considering the customers of Rentl is the targeted population. This because it displays in numerical values the way people behave, which enables managers to aim their business models and marketing strategies at those behaviors accordingly. Additionally, it describes people’s attitudes toward sharing economy, which gives managers an indication of the positioning, image and branding wanted by customers. Ultimately, as a result of attitudes, actions and drivers being described, managers can see what attracts customers and as a result, what drives change.

From a societal perspective this research is expected to contribute with increased insight in the attitude-action gap, particularly the attitude-action gap within the sharing economy. As such, the current thesis is expected to provide an understanding of how people behave when engaged in sharing economy. It is expected to contribute to existing literature with insight on what people think about sharing economy, and further how they behave toward sharing economy. In other words, if there is a positive attitude towards the sharing economy and its perceived/expected benefits, and whether or not this positive attitude translates into actual behavior. Therefore, this study will carry relevance to many societies since it studies, inter alia, people’s stance toward environmental questions.

1.7 Terminology
There are several different terms in this research used interchangeably to describe the sharing economy as well as the attitude-action gap and the concepts that come with it. As the attitude-action gap within sharing economy is a considerably new research area, many of the below listed terms will be used in the thesis. In order to avoid confusion and create a consistency throughout the thesis, stated below is a list of terminology.

Table 1: Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Actions are in this thesis referred to as the actual execution of a particular behavior when participating in the sharing economy as a customer. It is referred to as the course of action leading to participation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Attitudes are referred to as the mediating evaluative dimension of a concept, and are considered as positive, negative or indifferent (Fishbein, 1963, p. 233; Fishbein &amp; Raven, 1962, p. 42).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude-Action Gap</td>
<td>Throughout this thesis, the <em>attitude-action gap</em> will refer to the discrepancy between customer attitudes and actual behavior of customers. In other words, the attitude-action gap concerns the human behavior when what people say does not align with what they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>The term <em>customer</em> will be used to describe individuals who are connected or engaged in the sharing economy. This because the use of consumer generally refers to the individual’s use of a tangible output and not necessarily the service between the provider and individual (Grönroos, 2000, p. 13; Vargo &amp; Lusch, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Behavior</td>
<td>In line with the service-dominant logic the distinction of consumer behavior and customer behavior will be made throughout the thesis. <em>Customer behavior</em> will be continuously used in this thesis to refer to the behavior of the customers participating in the sharing economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td><em>Sharing</em> will be referred to as the act of coordinating and distributing tangible and intangible resources between individuals in exchange for a fee or equivalent compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Business</td>
<td>The way individuals connect with each other to engage in sharing economy is through the use of a connecting platform (Quinones &amp; Augustine, 2015, p.1; Stephany, 2015, p. 11). This connecting platform is provided by a business which has as its sole purpose to connect peers with one another for sharing. This business will throughout this thesis be referred to as a <em>sharing business</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Economy</td>
<td>The term <em>sharing economy</em> will be used as a reference for the umbrella phenomenon of taking advantage of an underused asset by sharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Scientific Methodology

This is the first chapter of methodology that concerns the methodological point of departure of the research. It begins with a presentation of the preconceptions of the authors which is followed by the perspective maintained throughout the thesis. Additionally, the approach and strategy of the research is explained and argued for. The subsequent section presents the data and literature sources which are critically reviewed.

2.1 Preconceptions

The values, knowledge and previous experience together shape the preconceptions for any authors conducting a study (Bryman & Bell, 2013, p. 52). This affects both the subject of the study and the choice of methods (Bryman and Bell, 2013, p. 53) and is necessary to discuss. The combination of the mixed areas of educational background of the authors affected and inspired the choice of subject resulting in an interest of studying consumer behavior in the field of sharing economy. Both of the authors are at the time of writing enrolled at the International Business Program with a focus on business administration at Umeå School of Business and Economics. Preconceptions regarding the chosen topic can be found in the courses studied by the authors. One of the researchers studied courses about innovation and entrepreneurship with a focus on the customer perspective. The other researcher studied courses regarding strategic business development with a focus on innovation and strategic decision making. This educational knowledge gained from attended courses provided the authors with a theoretical understanding of both consumer behavior and business strategies. Therefore, the authors of the current thesis were inclined to test the gathered theories in practice.

The aforementioned studied subjects depict a general interest for entrepreneurship and the way markets as well as industries constantly change over time due to innovative concepts redefining the business ambience. Accordingly, regarding practical preconceptions in the field of consumer behavior and sharing economy, lots can be derived from the personal interest of the authors. Both of the authors have engaged in the sharing economy through the well-established firms AirBnB and Uber (Bellotti et al., 2015, p. 1088). This engagement has arguably contributed to the overall interest for the relatively new phenomenon of sharing economy, and has as such influenced the authors to study the customer behavior behind it. However, it is further necessary to clarify that none of the authors have previously been engaged in the Swedish sharing company Rentl AB. Considering this thesis takes the ontological stance of objectivism, the authors of this thesis wanted to have minimal familiarity with the targeted population, which is to be further discussed in 2.2. This resulted in the interest of investigating the phenomenon of sharing economy as it is on the Swedish market.

When conducting a study there is always the risk of values, knowledge and previous experience of the authors affecting the study subjectively (Gilje & Grimen, 2007, p. 183). There is also the risk of taking preconceptions for granted as authors, and therefore not mentioning these (Gilje & Grimen, 2007, p. 183). However, alongside the higher level of education of the authors, the importance of a critical mindset has been addressed. Therefore the authors have critically reviewed their work continuously while writing the thesis in order to deliver it with reliability.
2.2 Research Philosophy
The research philosophy seeks to explain the research process of this thesis by discussing the philosophical points of departure. Research philosophy is of importance since it is an initial step in the research methodology that enables the researchers to properly obtain information relevant to the study. It is of importance for researchers to carefully discuss the research philosophy since this supports the research process and this will as a consequence strengthen the credibility and replicability of the results (Ryan et al., 2002, p. 8). It is concerned with the nature of reality (ontology), and what to be considered as acceptable knowledge (epistemology) (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 47; Bryman, 2013, p. 27).

2.2.1 Ontology
There are two main paradigms as philosophical frameworks for ontology; notably objectivism and subjectivism (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 20; Long, et al., 2000, p. 190). The two paradigms work as a framework explaining how the reality of an individual is created. Subjectivism explains how the reality of the individual is created subjectively and cognitively (Long, et al., 2000, p. 190). On the other hand one can find objectivism, explaining if reality of an individual is objective and external (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 20). The latter mentioned paradigm will be the philosophical point of departure throughout this thesis.

When making the choices of methodological starting points the authors wanted to minimize the risk of personal interpretations and opinions affecting the research which in turn would compromise the reliability of the conclusions. Hence, the authors wanted to use statistical methods when analyzing the findings. With this in mind, this thesis takes the objective ontological position. In other words, the belief that social phenomena being external to social actors was adopted (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 21). The authors of the thesis aim to conduct the research as objectively as possible in order to describe the relationship between attitudes and behavior of customers of the sharing economy.

2.2.2 Epistemology
There are two main philosophical framework paradigms; notably interpretivism and positivism (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 46). Interpretivism holds the philosophical assumption of knowledge coming from subjective evidence from participants where the researchers try to minimize the distance between the objective of the research and the researcher himself by interaction (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 46). Positivism on the other hand assumes that knowledge comes from objective evidence retrieved from observable and measurable phenomena where the researchers are distant from the phenomenon studied (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 46). With this in mind, the authors of this thesis made the choice of positivism for the stance toward epistemology.

The choice of objectivism as ontological positioning and positivism as epistemological positioning is in fact a common choice for researchers (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 27). When conducting research to study the social reality researchers usually adopt the positivistic philosophy and thereby collect data to perform analyses (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15). Using existing theories to develop hypotheses that are to be tested to see
whether or not they will be rejected or confirmed is accordingly a common approach. In other words, positivism as an epistemological stance is often in line with a quantitative study which is the case for this thesis.

With the research question in mind, the authors believe that the choice of positivism as the paradigm for epistemology is the most suitable. During the research process, theoretical knowledge is used and built and then tested when investigating the relationship between attitudes and behavior of customer actions in the sharing economy. This is done in order to describe whether or not attitudes translate into actual actions of sharing economy customers. By adopting these philosophical paradigms in the research process, the researchers can avoid personal opinions biasing the research by distancing themselves from the phenomenon under study.

2.3 Scientific Research Approach

The scientific research approach explains whether a theory is being built or tested. In other words, it concerns the choice of an inductive or a deductive research approach (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11). An inductive research collects data and develops a theory based on the data analysis (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 124). The approach of collecting data and generating a theory is often associated with a qualitative data collection method. A deductive research is a study where a theoretical and conceptual framework is developed as a base for possible hypotheses, and then tested (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 124; Graneheim, 2017, p. 30). This approach seeks to describe a relationship between variables through hypotheses testing (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 125). Therefore it is often associated with the quantitative data collection method. Since this thesis aims at analyzing and explaining possible relationships between variables through quantitative data, the deductive approach was the obvious research approach according to the authors of this thesis. According to Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 151) it is common to outline a quantitative research as hypothesis testing where hypotheses are deduced from theory and tested.

The research process of this thesis (see Figure 2) began by reviewing previous literature in the relevant field of research. Alongside with the suggestions of other authors, the authors of this thesis could identify a research gap. As previous literature tend to focus on motivational factors for participation in sharing economy through mainly qualitative studies, a lack of quantitative studies was identified. The literature review in the current thesis was used to deduct information in order to construct a conceptual model (see Figure 4). The conceptual model was composed and based on previous research in the research areas, customer behavior and sharing economy and will be further discussed in the following chapter. With this in mind, a deductive approach was self-evident for the authors.

It is important that choices regarding all methodological courses of action are consistent with the research question and aim of the thesis. Presented below in Figure 1 are the scientific methodological starting points of this research as a summary of the previous sections.
2.4 Research Strategy

When conducting a research there are two main processes for data collection and analysis - qualitative and quantitative data collection process (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 27; Saunders et al., 2012, pp. 160-161; Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 3). They share the same fundamental concept that both strategies aim at providing an understanding of the society by through a data collection process. Other than that, there are many differences between the two strategies. In a qualitative research, researchers collect nominal data and analyze the new data interpretively (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 6). Thus, a qualitative study emphasizes words rather than numerical values in contrast to a quantitative study. A quantitative research on the other hand, involves collection of numerical data that is analyzed statistically in order to study the relationship between different variables (Collins & Hussey, 2014, p. 5; Muijs, 2014, p. 1; Saunders et al., 2012, p. 162). This thesis takes the approach of the latter mentioned strategy (a quantitative research strategy), as the authors wanted to rely on statistical data collection and analysis in order to provide answer the research question.

With the research question and purpose in mind, the authors found the quantitative research strategy to be the most appropriate for this research. Quantitative studies investigate the relationship between different variables with the purpose of testing objective theories statistically (Creswell, 2014, p. 4). According to Gawlik (2016, p. 4) knowledge gathered from a qualitative research is rather hard to analyze objectively, whilst knowledge gathered from a quantitative research is easier to analyze objectively. Considering the choice of objectivism as a paradigm for ontological position, the authors found the choice of a quantitative research strategy to be the most appropriate. As the purpose of this thesis is to analyze the variables referred to as drivers, and their relationship with customer attitudes as well as actions, a quantitative strategy will be suitable and in line with the research philosophy of the authors.

2.4.1 Research process

Presented below is a visual representation of the research process for this thesis. Showing the initial step of the research where literature review was performed and a research gap was identified. From this step, relevant theories were introduced and a conceptual model was created by the authors with the purpose of creating an understanding of how the drivers influence both the attitudes and actions of a customer. Hypotheses were created by the authors with the aim of testing if the identified drivers for participation translate into positive attitudes towards the sharing economy, and in turn, translate into actions. The following step was the process of data collection. This research collected data through the quantitative method in the format of a survey. The collected data was of numerical data which later was statistically analyzed in order to
test the hypotheses, thus to identify if there is a relationship or not. The conceptual model was then revised to fit the findings of this research.
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Figure 2: Research Process of Deduction
Construct by the authors.

2.5 Research Design
When deciding on how to design a research, there is a wide range of research design the authors can chose between. Some of the most prominent research designs are experimental, longitudinal, cross-sectional, case study, and comparative designs (Bryman & Bell 2011, p. 40). According to Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 40) the most common form of designing your research as a cross-sectional design is by a survey. The research design works as a framework for the collection and analysis of the data and is thus not the same as research method. It is of importance to consider certain dimensions of the research process when making a decision for research design. These dimensions include, connection between presented variables, generalizing from sample to larger groups, creating an understanding for behavior in a specific context, and appreciation of a phenomena temporarily (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 40).
The aim of the current thesis, as mentioned above, is to investigate the relationship between attitudes and actions. However, given that an individual’s personal attitudes can often be of a rather unidentifiable and intangible nature, the current research has made use of indicators (or drivers) in order to put attitudes into quantifiable values. These drivers are as follows: enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits. Given that the aim is to study the effects attitudes have on behavior, through the use of the above stated drivers for participation in the sharing economy, the choice of research design is a cross-sectional study. The authors considered the option of choosing a longitudinal research since it is often used to map a change in the business environment (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 57), which is linked to the purpose of this study. The main reason why this is not appropriate is because it is simply not in line with the research question of this thesis. Additionally, this design requires the researchers to survey the sample of interest at least two times to make a comparison. Thus, the authors found the research design of cross-sectional design to be more suitable with the research question and research purpose in mind since it provides a snapshot of a time period rather than a presentation of events during a certain time period.

Furthermore, as the research design fills the purpose of a framework for collecting and analyzing empirical data there are three main classifications of the purpose; namely exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive (Creswell, 2014, p. 3; Saunders et al, 2009, p. 136). This research is of descriptive nature. Descriptive research is concerned with capturing the “what, where and who of a given situation describing the characteristics of people, events or situations” according to Saunders et al. (2009, p. 140). Considering the aim of this research is to describe the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers participating in the sharing economy based on certain drivers for participation, the classification of this research as descriptive was obvious to the authors.

In this study, the authors believe in testing theories as research approach, collecting numerical data in order to statistically study a relationship between variables as research strategy, and a cross-sectional research design. In summary, this research will follow a deductive approach, with a descriptive purpose that will be conducted with a quantitative research strategy which aims to look for relationships between different variables by a cross-sectional research design.

### 2.6 Data & Literature Sources

The theoretical framework for this study is based on previous research in the relevant areas, customer behavior and sharing economy. The authors conducted the literature search thoroughly and critically. When conducting the literature search both printed and electronic sources were used in order to create a broad knowledge base. The printed material was in forms of books, articles and reports. The books used for this thesis were accessed through the University Library in Umeå. The electronic sources were used to find relevant and up-to-date research. Researchers should value the accessibility the Internet provides (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.104), however a critical mindset is of importance since not all information on the Internet is peer-reviewed. Using peer-reviewed literature fills the purpose of eliminating literature of inadequate quality (Weathington, 2012, p.140-141). The authors have therefore chosen to access literature through online databases with high reliability and credibility, such as, Google Scholar and Business Source Premier (EBSCO).
Additionally, this study is based on carefully selected theories which were chosen by the authors to complement each other guided by the research question. Since this thesis aims to describe the relationship between attitudes toward the sharing economy and the actual action taken when participating, these theories were relevant according to the authors which will be further discussed in the following section. Additionally, these theories were used to create a conceptual model to clarify customer motivation for participation in the sharing economy, and whether or not this in turn affects both attitudes and actions of the customer. When the selection for theories was made, the authors wanted to use mainly original sources even if they were seemingly older.

The keywords used as a basis to find literature of relevance were: sharing economy, shared economy collaborative consumption, access-based consumption, peer-to-peer, consumer behavior, customer behavior, motivation, decision making, bounded rationality, theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behavior, self-determination, value-action gap, attitude-behavior gap, attitudes.
3. Theoretical Framework

This chapter provides the theoretical framework for this thesis. First and foremost it discusses the customer side of what this study aims to research. This is followed by a presentation of theories on the incentives customers have to make a decision, and the attitude-action gap. Furthermore, this section of the thesis explains the phenomenon of sharing economy, followed by four of the most prominent drivers for participation which are of interest to test. The chapter finishes with a conceptual framework created by the authors as a summary of the chapter.

3.1 Customer Decision-Making

Customer behavior is an overarching term which refers to how customers reason their actions when making a decision in a business setting. In current literature, customer behavior is more known as consumer behavior, although in line with service-dominant logic it is hereby referred to as customer behavior. In order to investigate the relationship between attitudes and actual behavior of customers in the sharing economy, one must first understand the underlying factors which influence people's way of making a decision.

To explain the decision making process of a customer is complex, and often it involves a large variety of complicated motivations for decision making (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 173). Vermeir & Verbeke (2006, p. 173) argue that the customer is passive in his role of making a decision. Additionally, even though people have a positive attitude toward sustainable consumption, in the end the available budget will lead the way rather than the following the individual's values (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 173). Basic microeconomics argues that customer choice is based on utility, and the customer makes decisions to maximize their utility (Perloff, 2012, p. 84). Therefore, a specific positive attitude does not necessarily translate into action, if it is not maximizing the utility of the customer. Terlau & Hirsch (2015, p. 2) argues that a customer acting in a responsible way bases their decision on underlying strategies by taking certain aspects into account such as economic, ecological and social aspects. The decision making of the customer is therefore dependent on underlying strategies (Terlau & Hirsch, 2015, p. 2).

According to Adam Smith (2001, p. 30) customers make their decisions based on their self-interests. Simply put, man will make his decision based on what is best for him or her in any given situation. Accordingly, if man were to make his decision solely based on self-interest, this decision is likely to only affect himself and not external factors, such as the environment or other people. Notwithstanding this statement carries a rather simplistic, and arguably a relatively obsolete view of how people behave and reason, it is still of great relevance when talking about the Attitude-action gap. Previous theoretical arguments and empirical findings imply that values may influence behavior both directly and indirectly (Homer & Kahle, 1988, p. 639). Simon (1955) questions the preceding arguments about the way people behave. Furthermore, Thaler (1980, p. 39) refers to these traditional economic theories of the customer as a combination of positive and normative theories. However, these models often fail to depict the human decision making process with accuracy (Simon, 1955, p. 104). Although the traditional theories of the customer are normatively based, many economists claim that they also
act as a descriptive tool. However, Thaler argues that exclusive reliance on the normative theory leads economists to make systematic errors in describing or predicting consumer choice. (Thaler, 1980, p. 39). According to Simon (1955), traditional models about human behavior fail to identify mental biases which very much characterize human behavior. These mental biases can be things like emotions and social factors. As such, the individual might be more willing to behave sustainably rather than achieve financial winnings, given their situational mood. As a result of this, these models fail to predict human behavior. If human attitude toward a certain object was an accurate indicator of behavior, there would be no discrepancy between attitude and action. Therefore, what Thaler and Simon say about human decision making is of great relevance because it very much links to the attitude-action gap, since it questions the predictability of human behavior.

3.2 Theory of Reasoned Action and Theory of Planned Behavior
It is impossible to discuss the attitude-action consistency, and inconsistency, without mentioning the Theory of Reasoned Action and Theory of Planned Behavior according to Enmark & Wånge (2016, p. 21). The two theories were introduced by Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen. This thesis starts by explaining the Theory of Reasoned Action and the The Theory of Planned Behavior since the latter mentioned theory emerged from the former (Bright, 1993). The Theory of Planned Behavior was introduced as an extension and seeks to predict behavior of humans (Madden et al., 1992, p. 8). Both the Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior make the assumption that people are rational in their decision making, as well as considerate of their implications of their behavior before a certain action takes place (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1988, p. 3).

The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) has been widely used to understand motivational influences for human behavior (Madden et al., 1992, p. 3). One fundamental assumption TRA makes is that the most important predictor of behavior is the behavioral intention of the customer (Ajzen, 1985, p. 11; Glanz et al., 2015, p. 98; Madden et al., 1992, p. 4). In other words, the theory assumes that behaviors are performed with a behavioral intention rather than an unconscious action, and can therefore be predicted. Behavioral intentions are referred to as instructions people give to themselves in order to behave in a certain way (Sheeran, 2002, p. 2). They work as a guideline for the direction and the intensity of a customer’s decision (Sheeran, 2002, p. 2). The behavioral intention is in turn affected, as an outcome by two determinants - attitudes and subjective norms (see Figure 3) of the customer (Glanz et al., 2015, p. 98; Ajzen, 1985, p. 12). The attitudes and subjective norms of an individual are a function of his or her beliefs (Fishbein, 1963, p. 233; Madden et al., 1992, p. 4). Attitudes are developed from the behavioral beliefs of the customer, whereas the subjective norms are developed from the normative beliefs (Madden et al., 1992, p. 3). Ajzen (1985, p. 12) refers to attitudes as the positive- or negative consequences an individual perceives when performing a certain behavior. Subjective norms on the other hand are the external pressure an individual perceives from the society or other people who perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1985, p. 12). Ajzen (1985, p. 14) further states how there is little direct effect of variables such as personal characteristics on the performance of a certain behavior. Therefore, variables regarding personal characteristics of sharing economy customers were not included in this study. Ajzen (1985, p. 12) argues that generally,
people perform a certain behavior when they have a positive attitude towards the behavior but also when they believe that other people think they should perform it (Ajzen, 1985, p. 12). A customer is therefore more likely to keep a positive attitude if the consequence of performing a specific behavior is expected to be positive.

TRA continues to explain how intents can change over time, due to new information, unforeseen events or plain habits which kick in at the time of performing the behavior (Ajzen, 1985, p. 19). This is where a gap emerges, when the intention changes as the behavior approaches. A changed intention can decrease the possibility of the primary intention translating into an actual action. If the intention were to change, the customer is more likely to fall back and base the decision on his or her old habits (Ajzen, 1985, p. 19). The emergence of new information and the possibility of an unforeseen event is more likely to occur during a longer period of time from the attitude formation to the behavior enactment. Therefore, there is a bigger risk of an inconsistency if the decision making process is longer.

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) was developed as an extension to the Theory of Reasoned Action (Madden et al., 1992, p. 8). As well as TRA, TPB also acknowledges intentions (as an outcome of the attitudes and subjective norms of the customer) as a predictor for behavior. Although, the Theory of Planned Behavior acknowledges that customers do not always have enough volatile control in order to perform a certain behavior based on their intention (Madden et al., 1992, p. 4; Sheeran, 2002, p. 2). TPB argues that behavioral intentions cannot on their own predict a behavior of the customer since there are factors beyond the perceived control of the individual. Therefore, the determinant Perceived Behavioral Control is introduced in the figure as an exogenous variable; affecting both the intention and the action behavior of the customer (see Figure 3 B). The link from Perceived Behavioral Control to Behavioral intention explains that when customers perceive themselves to have little control their behavioral intentions to enact on the behavior may be low. This may be the case even though the customer may have a positive attitude and or positive subjective norms regarding the performance of the behavior (Madden et al., 1992, p. 4). The direct link from Perceived Behavioral Control to Behavior explains the contrary, the actual control the customer have in order to perform the behavior (Madden et al., 1992, p. 4).

The Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior both note that in order for attitudes to turn into a corresponding behavior, the attitudes towards that specific behavior need to be identified (Mairesse et al., 2012, p. 549). Mairesse et al. (2012) explain the attitude-action gap of interest for this thesis with the previously presented theories from an environmentally friendly car purchasing perspective. With the presented theories in mind by Ajzen and Fishbein, the origins of the attitude-action gap when purchasing an environmentally friendly car can be traced back to constraints in behavioral control. Customers obtain a positive attitude towards the environment and sustainable behavior - although this positive attitude does not necessarily translate into a positive behavior (Mairesse et al., 2012, p. 567). This because the behavioral intention to turn into an actual purchase of an environmentally friendly car can still be constrained by the belief that this action will have a minimal effect on the environment (Mairesse et al., 2012, p. 567). In other words Mairesse et al. (2012, p. 567) concludes, with low perceived behavioral control and high perceived constraints, the likelihood of a positive attitude translating into an actual action is minimal.
3.3 Bounded Rationality

Most classical models on human behavior in social sciences assume that humans can be reasonably approximated or described as rational (Simon, 1955, p. 99). However, these models often fail to depict the human decision making process with accuracy (Simon, 1955, p. 104). Bounded Rationality, a concept coined by Simon Alexander Herbert (1916-2001), refers to the bounds of the human mind to make a perfectly rational decision. When people have to make a decision, most of us would arguably try to be as rational as possible. However, according to Ballester & Hernández (2012, p. 29), it is nowadays a widely accepted claim that human beings are limited to (1) the information they possess, (2) their computational abilities, and/or (3) their individual cognitive limitations. Boulstridge and Carrigan (2000) discovered in their study about corporate responsibility that most customers do not have sufficient information about companies’ activities. In other words, when people make decisions, their ability to make a well justified decision is limited by the three above stated variables. As a result of being limited to these variables, the human being cannot make a fully rational decision, and is therefore not completely rational. Full rationality requires unlimited cognitive capabilities, which is impossible to accomplish by the average human mind (Selten, 1999, p. 3). As a result of this, the human mind applies heuristics to the given problem.
at hand. Meaning that as people are limited to the above three variables, the individual human will try to reason as rationally as he or she individually can, but will fail to manage perfect rationality. Accordingly, information-processing systems do not optimize decisions, but instead satisfices them (Gigerenzer & Goldstein, 1996, p. 651).

Simon (1955) argues that most individuals are not rational, and are instead influenced by emotions and other factors in their information-processing, and thus decision making. The concept of bounded rationality revises the assumption that humans never fail to behave rationally. It does so in order to account for the fact that perfectly rational decisions are often not possible due to the limited computational capabilities of the human mind (Ballester & Hernandez, 2012, p.28), which further is in line with what Selten (1999, p. 3) says about the human mind. As such, Bounded Rationality could serve as one of the explanations to why attitudes potentially do not align with human behavior, since it raises the question of how people can make decision according to their attitudes - if they cannot make them according to their self-interests.

### 3.4 Attitude-Action Gap

During the last couple of years, most societies across the world have seen a major increase in businesses utilizing the sharing economy (PWC, 2018). However, just like most new innovations, the online platform business model has not come without any resistance. To this day, there are debates about whether the sharing economy is ethical or not (Zrenner, 2015, p. 1). These debates generally involve arguments whether the firms utilizing the sharing economy are competing ethically, and under the same laws as their competitors. Notwithstanding this dispute, people are still engaging in sharing economy today more than ever. Although, this does not necessarily mean that the people who believe sharing economy to be unethical are actually the ones who do participate. However, if that is the case, this would suggest that there is an attitude-action gap within the sharing economy - which this thesis aims to test.

As previously mentioned, the attitude-action gap refers to when what people say, does not align with what they do. Attitudes alone, are often a poor predictor of behavioral intention or marketplace behavior (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 170). If an individual’s attitudes are a poor predictor of their behavioral intentions, then their actual behavior must be influenced by other lurking variables. In other words, there is a possibility for unknown variables affecting the customers’ actions, as they are not only influenced by their attitude.

Grossack (1964, p. 16) argues that the actions of a customer is a function of irrational forces, that are often not identifiable and consciously known to the individual. However, there are still to some extent certain predictors for customer behavior (Grossack, 1964, p. 16). Vermeir & Verbeke (2006, p.173) argues that looking at one specific attitude alone might suggest a specific, predicted behavior, although it might not be predictable when considering the entire purchase decision. Hence, it results in a different behavior than expected (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 173). This suggests that an individual’s behavior is to some extent unpredictable and unforeseeable, which brings up the question of what actually controls human behavior. A rational behavior is arguably a predictable behavior. However, “Full rationality requires unlimited cognitive capabilities” (Selten, 1999, p. 3). Accordingly, an individual’s decision making capabilities are not perfectly rational, as argued for in bounded rationality, and are as a
result unpredictable solely based on an individual’s attitudes – hence the attitude-action gap.

Having argued that a gap might exist between a person’s attitudes and actual behavior, the question of why the gap exists remains. As such, in order to describe the relationship between attitudes and actions, and furthermore the attitude-action gap, one must understand some of the major causes behind the attitude-action inconsistency. Different explanations can be suggested for the gap between the attitude of customers and their actual purchase behavior. For example the behavior of a customer can be based on habit or situational factors like situational promotions (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 173). Thus, a person could care very much for the environment but still fail to follow up on this belief by not buying the eco-friendly milk at the store. This can be due to habit of buying the same old milk as he or she always has bought and will therefore, automatically without further thought, fail to buy the eco-friendly milk. Moreover can this behavior be explained by situational factors such as temporary promotions. In this situation, the individual will fail to purchase the eco-friendly milk, because the regular milk is on discount- hence the attitude-action gap.

In a study on the effects of mood it was found that attitudes influenced intentions after the induction of a negative mood, whereas subjective norms influenced intentions after the induction of a positive mood, according to Armitage & Conner (1999). In other words, depending on the situational mood of an individual - their attitudes will have an inconsistent relationship with their intentions, and thereby also behavior, as discussed in TRA. As such, an individual’s situational mood can influence the final product of their decision making process.

3.5 Self-Determination Theory

With increasing interest for motivations driving participation in sharing economy (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 29) there is an extensive range of theories regarding motivation. A recurring motivation theory when discussing the drivers for participating in sharing economy is the Self-Determination Theory (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 29; Hamari et al.,, 2015, p. 2; Schiel, 2015, p. 23). The Self-Determination Theory was developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan in order to explain how humans can be proactive or passive (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 68-69), in other words, to explain human motivation. Human motivation can be due to several factors according to Deci and Ryan (1985). External factors such as rewards tend to motivate humans. Just like external factors, do internal factors also motivate the individual (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Internal motivation comes from within, even though it might not be supported or rewarded by external factors (Deci and Ryan, 1985). When conducting the research, the authors of this thesis found several motivational factors for participation in the sharing economy. As mentioned, these were identifies as enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits. These motivational factors behind the engagement in the sharing economy in turn affect both the attitudes and actions of the customer (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). These motivational factors will be further discussed in section 3.7, hereby referred to as drivers, can be further explained by The Self-Determination Theory (SDT). SDT is a theory of human motivation and refers to internal factors as intrinsic factors, and external factors as extrinsic factors.

The Self-Determination Theory classifies drivers for consumption (in this case, engagement) into two categories, intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors (Deci & Ryan,
The theory explains how behavior is motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically, and sometimes both at the same time (Lee et al., 2005, p. 1097). Intrinsic and extrinsic incentives work as two different types of classifications for motivation, affecting the behavior and thereby the outcome of the decision making (Lee et al., 2005, p. 1097). There is a lack of established framework classifying motivational factors as intrinsic or extrinsic (Yang & Ahn, 2016, p. 5746). Generally, intrinsic factors are about the performance of a customer activity for the sake of it (Lee et al., 2005, p. 1097). The intrinsic factors are identified as it is done since it is interesting, engaging, fun, and satisfying (Lee et al., 2005, p. 1097; Hamari et al., 2015, p. 9). Based on this, the authors have identified the driver enjoyment for engagement in sharing economy as an intrinsic driver (See Figure 2). The driver of sustainability was further identified as being intrinsic, which is in line with Hamari et al. (2015, p. 5). Meanwhile, extrinsic factors concern the customer behavior done for something apart from its own sake according to Lee (2005, p. 1097). Extrinsic factors are performed for its reward or recognition, and are related to external pressure (Lee et al., 2005, p. 1097; Hamari et al., 2015, p. 5). Consequently the driver financial benefits was identified as an extrinsic driver (See Figure 2). Schiel (2015, p. 33) identifies the driver convenience as a rational, or practical driver. Thus, in this thesis it will be argued for as an extrinsic driver for customer engagement in the sharing economy.

According to Payne et al. (1991, p. 52) customers integrate information in the decision making process based on information gathered from present memory and, or external environment. Thus, intrinsic drivers and or extrinsic drivers are taken into consideration when making a decision to perform an act as a customer. Previous studies furthermore show evidence which indicates that there is sometimes a conflict between extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation (Bénabou & Tirole, 2003, p. 490). An example of this could be a person with a boring, but well paid job. Thus, he or she is extrinsically motivated by the tangible reward in terms on money even though there is no intrinsic motivation. This suggests that there might be an identifiable difference between attitudes and actions depending on if it is an extrinsic or intrinsic driver for engagement. According to Böcker and Meelen (2017, p. 29) the SDT explains how behavior of customers in the sharing economy is driven intrinsically, which arises from the satisfaction of performing a certain behavior. The behavior of the customers is also driven extrinsically, which can be explained as motivational factors where profitable outcomes are separated from the behavior (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 29), which in this case are identified as financial benefits and practicalities.

The Self-Determination Theory currently lacks a framework on how to categorize intrinsic and extrinsic factors for motivation (Yang & Ahn, 2016, p. 5746). Further, as previous research categorizes the intrinsic- and extrinsic factors differently, the authors of this thesis have provided a framework suitable for previously explained drivers. With this framework it is possible to make a distinction between the drivers and contribute to the ongoing debate on whether sharing economy is driven by intrinsic, or extrinsic motivations (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 29).

Table 2: Intrinsic Drivers and Extrinsic Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Drivers</th>
<th>Extrinsic Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 The Sharing Economy

Breaking down the phenomenon of sharing economy, one must first distinguish the meaning of sharing. This thesis will not make a distinction between sharing, lending, and borrowing. “Borrowing and lending are borderline cases of sharing that generate an expectation that the object or some equivalent will be returned. Sometimes borrowing is only a euphemism for requested sharing.” (Belk, 2014, p. 1569). In other words, to share does not mean distribute one’s resources, without getting anything in return. “To share does not mean to give away something you value, and get nothing back. [...] To share means, properly, to initiate the process of trade.” (Peterson, 2018, p. 168).

Therefore, continuous sharing must translate into maintaining trade, and arguably, sharing is just another way of trading. This is very much in line with how Belk refers to sharing; namely the acquisition and distribution of a resource and in return receiving a fee or compensation (Belk, 2014, p. 1597). Throughout this thesis, sharing will be referred to as the act of coordinating and distributing services and physical resources between individuals in exchange for a fee or equivalent compensation.

Even though the phenomenon of sharing has long been with humankind, the phenomenon of sharing economy is relatively new (Bazzi & Opie, 2016 p.14). The rapid growth of the popularity of a sharing business model is often explained together with the financial crisis in 2008 (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30). Previous literature argues for a possible relationship between the customer shift towards sharing and the financial crisis without concrete evidence (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30). Alongside with financial difficulties customers would rethink the consumption patterns, shifting from a demand for ownership to a demand for access (Häubl & Trifts, 2000, p. 17; Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012, p. 881; Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30). Whether or not there is an interrelationship between the financial crisis and the expansion of the rather disruptive business model, research shows evidence that it has only been enabled alongside the growing importance of information and communication technologies, i.e. the Internet (Hamari et al., 2015, p. 2; Sundararajan, 2016, p. 52). The possibility of creating an online platform supports the business model of collaboration through different parties (Hamari et al., 2015, p. 2; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p. 65).

Today, having access to many products and alternatives is desirable for the customer, rather than claiming ownership over the product (Häubl & Trifts, 2000, p. 17; Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012, p. 881). Schiel (2015, p. 32) argues how an individual in need of using something only once, does not require the individual to make an actual purchase and claim ownership. In other words, it is about the temporary accessibility rather than the ownership for the customer. Grybaitė & Stankevičienė (2016, p. 8) states that this temporary usage is changing customer behavior. Continuing to argue that there is a new approach to ownership as the business model of sharing economy is continuously growing.

3.6.1 Hypotheses and Conceptual Model

Previous research maintains a focus on motivational factors behind engagement in the sharing economy rather than investigating a possible attitude-action gap. The sharing economy has been argued for to be beneficial for both the economy and the environment (Botsman & Rogers, 2011; Stephany, 2015, p. 9). It is also said to be
socially beneficial (Botsman & Rogers, 2011). When investigating the drivers for customer engagement in the sharing economy several drivers emerged. Taking into account the limitation of time, the authors chose to further investigate four drivers which in previous research have shown to be some of the most prominent motivational factors as drivers for engagement; namely enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits. Furthermore, these drivers will be the base for the presented hypotheses. In other words, the motivational drivers stated below are what this thesis aims to use as a tool in order to discover if an attitude-action gap exists.

As previously discussed, an individual’s personal motivational factors can be explained by the Self-Determination Theory and further categorized into intrinsic and extrinsic drivers (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Therefore, the current thesis makes a distinction between the above identified drivers into intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors (drivers). As discussed in detail, enjoyment and sustainability are in this thesis classified as intrinsic drivers, whereas convenience and financial benefits are categorized as extrinsic drivers. The reason for distinguishing intrinsic from extrinsic drivers in the current study is to study the potential differences they have on human behavior with the research question in mind. Accordingly, the authors of this thesis aim to study if inferences on the target population can be drawn, to see if extrinsic drivers have a different relationship with behavior than intrinsic drivers.

Presented below are the drivers with the argumentation for the classification of either intrinsic or extrinsic. Further on, the hypotheses are presented based on these four drivers and their respective relationship to attitudes and actions.

**Enjoyment**
The most intrinsic driver in this study is the driver of enjoyment. As the nature of this intrinsic driver is the enjoyment derived from the activity (Hamari et al., 2005, p. 6), this thesis further defines enjoyment as the most intrinsic driver for participation in the sharing economy. With this in mind, the authors state the first hypothesis as **H1a** Enjoyment positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy. Lee et al. (2005, p. 1097) classifies the following characteristics interesting, engaging, fun and satisfying, as intrinsic drivers. As previously mentioned regarding the Self-Determination Theory, intrinsic motivation comes from within, although possibly not accompanied by an external reward (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Accordingly, the feeling of enjoyment is arguably a motivation which comes from within the individual, and is seldom supported by an external reward.

In this thesis, the driver of enjoyment refers to when people engage in sharing economy because of they feel joy or amusement when doing so. Enjoyment or feelings of joy of participating in the sharing economy is identified as a main driver for the customer (Schiel, 2015, p. 54). Sharing is, according to Widlok (2013, p.16) driven by an intrinsic motive and an activity for the person’s own benefit. In a study made by Hawlitschek et al. (2016) they found that the enjoyment of sharing is a significant driver toward sharing economy from both sides of the peer-to-peer economy, i.e. both provider and user. They further defined enjoyment in sharing as “the idea that it has a value to help other” (Hawlitschek et al., 2016, p. 2786). Hawlitschek et al. (2016) argues enjoyment as being a significant motivator for participation. As such, the authors of this thesis wanted to investigate whether or not this significant motivator translates into actual actions for participation of customers. Therefore hypothesis H1b was stated.
**H1a:** Enjoyment positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy

**H1b:** Enjoyment positively influences actions towards the sharing economy

**Sustainability**

Sustainable consumption and production is focused on the objective of “doing more and better with less” (United Nations). Since sharing economy aims to make use of underused assets and services, it is argued that sharing economy as a business model comes with environmental and sustainable advantages (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30). The idea of sharing in general is environmentally friendly (Hawlitschek et al. p. 4786). However, it is not possible to predict the effects of the sharing economy on the environment yet (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30). If an individual is in need of using an asset only once, this does not necessarily require him or her to buy it, and thereby possess it (Schiel, 2015, p. 32). From a production perspective, scarce resources will be saved as a consequence of the increased efficiency in the use of the asset (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30).

Möhlmann (2015, p. 195) argues that green, ethical or sustainable consumption is becoming increasingly important for the customers (“in times of skepticism against capitalistic structures and anti-consumption movements”). Further, Möhlmann compares how the sharing economy is generally considered to be more environmentally friendly than non-sharing options, especially from a production perspective as previously mentioned. In other words, the general attitudes towards the sharing economy from a sustainability perspective is generally positive which this thesis seeks to test (see **H2a**).

Schie (2015, p. 54) identifies, regardless of the industry of sharing, environmental consciousness as the top motivational factor. Furthermore, Schiel (2015, p. 32) argues how time and effort spent on maintenance will decrease as a consequence of temporary usage of an underused asset. This will allow the surplus in time, energy and resources to be invested elsewhere. Hamari et al. (2015, p. 5) further supports the argument of sustainability being a top motivational factor for participation. In other words, Hamari et al. (2015, p. 5) argues for ecological sustainable consumption as one key determinant for the intention of customers to share. Hamari et al. (2015, p. 5) further identifies the driver sustainability as intrinsic since it is generally motivated by factors such as norms and ideology. With this in mind, the authors of this thesis argue that the driver sustainability is motivated intrinsically rather than extrinsically according to the Self-Determination Theory.

With increasing interest and attention for sustainable consumption in combination with the phenomenon of the sharing economy, it is of relevance to consider the attitude-action gap once again. The question of whether a positive attitude toward sustainability in the sharing economy translates into an actual action arises. Thus, the hypothesis **H2b** was stated below.

**H2a:** Sustainability positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy

**H2b:** Sustainability positively influences actions towards the sharing economy
**Convenience**

Another driver identified as an extrinsic driver in this study is the one concerning *convenience*. This driver refers to the motive for people to engage in the sharing economy due to sheer practicalities, such as time saving. Schiel (2015, p. 33) identifies *convenience* as a practical, or rational motivational factor. Hence, it is an extrinsic motivational factor (see Figure 2) for engagement in sharing economy. Moreover, Schiel (2015, p. 31) argues for the convenience of sharing since it is favorable in its way of coordination and transaction. With this in mind, time saving and pure practicalities were considered as external rewards of *convenience* when constructing the questionnaire items for this research.

The convenience of the business model of sharing economy allows the customer to engage with little effort and difficulty. Belotti et al. (2015) interviewed both users and providers of peer-to-peer economy and found that *convenience* is a main motivation for users to take part in sharing economy. With this in mind, the hypothesis **H3a** was stated by the authors. As consumption to a large extent is driven by convenience in our everyday life (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006, p. 170), this advantage that the sharing economy brings is a vital driver for customers. According to the research conducted by Schiel (2015, p. 32), the sharing economy provides a reasonable and rational solution to the traditional way of consuming goods and services. Since the driver of *convenience* provides the customer with several practicalities, the authors further classified *convenience* as an extrinsic driver. Additionally, the authors had the interest to investigate if the driver *convenience* for participation in the sharing economy translates into an actual action for participation. Therefore, the hypothesis **H3b** was stated.

**H3a:** Convenience positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy

**H3b:** Convenience positively influences actions towards the sharing economy

**Financial Benefits**

The fourth identified driver for the engagement in sharing economy is *financial benefits*. The driver of *financial benefits* will in this study refer to the engagement in sharing economy due to the possibility of saving money, as well as future economic gains. The rise of the sharing economy and financial crisis of 2008 are often linked. According to (Böcker & Meelen, 2017, p. 30), if people are faced with financial difficulties, they would rethink their consumption patterns and furthermore the value they attach to ownership. Meaning that people’s economic situation is of greater importance than their consumption habits and sense of ownership.

Hars & Ou (2002) concluded in their study about motivations behind engagement in open source-development, that potential future rewards is a strong extrinsic driver. In a study made by Hawlitschek et al. (2016), economic benefits was identified as being strongly positively correlated with collaborative consumption, and furthermore one of the main drivers for engagement in sharing economy. This is further supported by Schiel (2015, p. 54) who states that regardless of the industry of sharing, the intention to save money is the second most motivational factor that drives customer to participation. With this in mind, the authors stated the hypothesis **H4a** in order to investigate this relationship between *financial benefits* and positive attitudes towards the sharing economy. Furthermore, Hamari et al. (2015, p. 6) argues how engagement in the sharing economy can be both rational and utility maximizing as the customer does not claim
exclusive ownership but rather temporary access. In other words, if the customer is rational in its decision making and utility maximizing in terms on financial benefits - a positive attitude towards the sharing economy is expected to translate into an action. Therefore, the hypothesis \( H_{4b} \) was stated to further investigate whether or not financial benefits as a driver for participation in the sharing economy translates into an action for participation.

\( H_{4a} \): Financial benefits positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy

\( H_{4b} \): Financial benefits positively influences actions towards the sharing economy

With the research question in mind the authors for this thesis created a conceptual model including the identified drivers as the core of the model. The purpose of the model is to create an understanding on how the drivers influence both the attitudes and actions of a customer. This will later be used to describe whether or not there is any attitude-action gap. The conceptual model is formed from a customer perspective. These variables are also referred to as the most outstanding drivers for engagement in the sharing economy. In addition, the conceptual model shows how the drivers with a positive attitude, are in the end translated into a customer action as the aim of this thesis is to identify effects attitudes have on actions of customers of the sharing economy.

![Conceptual Model](image)

Figure 4: Conceptual Model

*Created by the authors of this thesis.*
4. Practical Method

This chapter serves the purpose of explaining how the practical method was approached by the authors. The data collection method is introduced as well as the target population and sample of interest for this research. Moreover a detailed description of the survey is provided including the survey construction, pilot survey and distribution of the survey. A discussion of the non-responses is included as well as a subchapter regarding the data analysis. Lastly a thorough discussion of the ethical considerations is taken into account throughout the research process.

4.1 Data Collection Method

It is of great importance for the researchers to carefully consider the type of data that will be collected for the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 335). The most commonly methods are primary data collection and secondary data collection. Primary data is collected for a specific research problem and research purpose (Hox & Boeije, 2005, p. 593). When collecting primary data, new data is added to the already existing knowledge according to Hox & Boeije (2005, p. 593). Additionally, the data composed by the researchers is often made accessible for reuse by other researchers, thus called secondary data collection (Hox & Boeije, 2005, p. 593). Using secondary data comes with the risk that the data collected does not meet the purpose of the given research and therefore does not provide the ability to answer the intended research question (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 270). Therefore, it was clear for the authors to collect primary data in order to avoid any misinterpretations and obstacles in reaching the answer of the research question. Additionally, considering that the sharing economy is a rather new phenomenon expected to significantly expand, the authors wanted to collect primary data in order to meet the purpose of this research. Given that this thesis emphasized a quantitative research strategy with a cross-sectional research design by collecting data through a survey the researchers of this study therefore used the former mentioned data collection method, namely primary data collection.

When collecting primary data the major advantage is that the research construction can be entirely tailored to the research question of interest in order to conduct a coherent research (Hox & Boeije, 2005, p. 294). That is, the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy. On the other hand the main disadvantage with collecting primary data is the aspect of time, cost and accessibility to reach the population (Hox &, 2005, p. 294; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 169). These aspects were taken into consideration when deciding that access to primary data is prioritized even though this data collection method may be more cost- and time consuming. Additionally, collaborating with Rentl AB facilitated this research with great access to the population of interest. Hox & Boeije (2005, p. 294) further suggests for researchers to reuse already established information on the topic in order to smooth the pilot stage of a study when conducting primary data collection. This suggestion was taken into great consideration by the researchers of this study when conducting the practical method. The survey which is to be further discussed in the following sections is constructed based on already established theories and to some extent already tested variables. The choice of primary data collection further enabled the researchers to investigate the proposed relationships between the specified variables in the conceptual model.
4.2 Population and Sample

When conducting a quantitative study, there are two different types of sample selections; non-probability sampling and probability sampling (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 427). There are several different designs for both probability and non-probability sampling, but the far most significant difference between these two designs has to do with whether the participants of the sample are selected randomly or not. As such, the design of the sampling method heavily influences the reliability and validity of the study, since it very much determines whether all members of the population have an equal chance of being selected for sampling. A significant advantage with probability sampling is the wide generalizability that comes with it (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 185).

However, as this method requires the whole population to be available for the researchers at any time to be sampled, it might not be feasible for some business or market researchers. As a result, non-probability might be preferred in some situations (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 233).

In order to reach out to as many sharing economy users as possible, in the most efficient manner possible, the authors of this thesis had the aim of sampling an entire customer base of an established sharing business in Sweden. Therefore, as already introduced, the sharing company Rentl AB was contacted. The population of interest in this research is all the people who actively participate in sharing economy on the platform of Rentl AB, i.e. the customer base of Rentl. As such, these are the subjects this study aims to draw generalizations on. Furthermore, in order to draw inferences about the current population, a sample was drawn (Moore et al. 2011, p. 153). This was done by the use of a simple random sample on all of registered users at Rentl (D. Mattsson, E-mail, April 19, 2018). An online questionnaire was later on sent out to all of these users. Accordingly, the sample of this thesis consists of a portion of the registered users at Rentl. However, the authors of this thesis were not able to obtain data regarding the number of users Rentl AB actually has, i.e. the size of the population. As such, the authors of the current thesis were unable to recognize the proportion of the sample in relation to the population. This was due to the fact that the contact person at Rentl AB did not want to give up this data, as it seemed too delicate (D. Mattsson, E-mail, April 19, 2018). However, the size of the sample was recognizable as 2096 subjects.

In order to sample a population, one must first accurately define the target population. Following this, the researchers need to establish an easily identifiable and relevant sampling frame. (De Vaus, 2002, p. 70). The sample of the current thesis was shaped by first identifying Rentl AB as an established sharing company on the Swedish market. As mentioned in the introduction to Rentl AB, the people who participate in the sharing platform can rent anything from apartments in Marbella, to cars and tools. Moreover, as have already been discussed, the individuals who engage in Rentl’s sharing platform are often both providers and users at the same time. As such, Rentl AB was identified as a typical sharing company on the Swedish market. Following the identification of Rentl AB as the target population of this thesis, a simple random sample was drawn resulting in 2096 subjects constituting the target sample.

As previously discussed, the authors of this thesis decided to not make a distinction between the different kinds of customers that the questionnaire at hand reached out to. This was due to two main reasons; namely time constraint, and relevance of results. As such, the managers at Rentl communicated in an email to the authors of this thesis
that a selection between people who rent, and people who rent out will not be done by the developers at Rentl. The reason for this was that people who rent, and people who rent out are many times the same people. In other words, the users of Rentl both provide and use services interchangeably. Accordingly, the users of Rentl AB are not registered as two separate entities, i.e. providers or users. Instead, they are registered as mere individuals and are therefore not restricted to solely provide a service, or use a service respectively. Furthermore would this selection of providers and users not only be time consuming, but almost impossible since the vast majority of Rentl’s users both provide, and receive services at the same time, (D. Mattsson, E-mail, April 6, 2018) hence the use of the combined term *customer*, rather than provider and user.

The sampled subjects of the current thesis consist of 2096 people, out of which 145 subjects responded to the survey constructed by the authors, (see chapter 4.4 for a response-rate analysis). In order to compute the actual sample size needed for an accurate inference of the population, one must know the standard deviation of the population. However, knowing the standard deviation of a population is often very unlikely. Therefore, calculating an exact sample size needed for any given study is in practice often very unlikely to be feasible. However, if the sample size is large enough, the sample mean and furthermore sample standard deviation will be close to that of the population. (Moore et al. 2011, p. 345). Therefore, with regards to the sample size of the current thesis, the authors refer to the Central Limit Theorem, which states that large enough samples are approximately normally distributed with a finite standard deviation (Moore et al. 2011, p. 276).

The survey was not mandatory to any of customers of Rent, this raises the question of voluntary response sampling. Voluntary response sample consists of people who choose by themselves by responding to a general appeal (Moore et al. 2011, p. 154). All Swedish sharing companies had approximately equal chances of being picked for the sampling of their customer base. Although, in the end only one sharing company was chosen for sampling, all subjects in the population had an equal chance of being sampled, which argues that the chosen method is characterized by probability sampling. Accordingly, the questionnaire made for this study has only been sent out to one group of people, who are arguably rather homogenous, due to the fact that they all come from the same company and are engaged on the same sharing platform. Furthermore, sharing economy per se is neither an industry nor a market. It is merely a way of trading for individuals (Puschmann & Alt, 2016, p. 95). Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that sharing companies take many different forms, in different industries. For example Uber; a sharing company in the transport industry, or Airbnb in the accommodation industry. As such, the data for the current thesis has only been gathered from one group of people, namely people who actively participate in renting and renting out underused objects.

The empirical data for this thesis was collected from the 29th of March 2018 to the 10th of April 2018. The subjects of the previously discussed population all had an equal chance of being selected for sampling. However, the authors of this thesis could not make the assumption that all of the respondents were online, present and able to answer the survey at the time of data collection. This can potentially explain the given response-rate for this thesis, which will be further discussed in chapter 4.4.
4.3 The survey

With the research question in mind and the purpose of the study this current thesis takes the methodological stances of objectivism and positivism. Therefore, the choice of conducting a quantitative research with the help of a survey for collecting the data was made. This section concerns how the survey was constructed, how the pilot survey was carried through as well as the distribution of the survey.

4.3.1 Survey Construction

When gathering data through a survey, there are two main options. These are as follows: sending out the survey on paper manually, or sending out the survey electronically over the Internet. For this thesis the later mentioned option was found to be the most appropriate and efficient in terms of cost savings and time savings according to the authors. Since our sample is rather large (2096 subjects) it would have been costly to mail all of the surveys. It would also have been more time consuming for the authors to first wait for all of the responses, and then manually register them. Another aspect of the disadvantages with paper surveys is that it requires more effort by the respondent. The respondent receives the mail and then has to fill it in, go to the mailbox, and send the survey back to the authors. Taking into account the limitation of money and time, an electronic survey was more suitable. With this in mind, a survey was created through Google Forms in order to answer the research question of this thesis. This electronic survey is therefore more convenient and time saving for the authors and the respondent. By clicking on an attached link sent to them through email, the survey takes about 10 minutes to complete. The authors of this thesis make the assumption that the entire population (the individuals registered on to Rentls site) holds an email since this is necessary when registering for becoming a customer of Rentl. Although, due to technical and trust issues there is also the risk of non-respondents with this method which the authors are aware of.

The survey was created through Google Forms as previously mentioned. According to the authors, Google Forms was an appropriate tool for gathering relevant data to answer our research question since it is conducted electronically and free for anyone with an account on Google. Even though there are several other online forms as options, the choice of Google Forms was clear for the authors since both of them had previous knowledge and experience with it which were to be an advantage. The authors created the survey with its relevant questions and statements, on which the majority of the questions were to be answered on a five-point Likert scale. When the first draft of the survey was created, one can either send the survey straight from Google Forms or simply copy a link which can be pasted in an email. The answers from the respondent are then presented in visually friendly graphs and diagrams, but can also be retrieved and downloaded in an Excel Spreadsheet in order for the researchers to test the significance of the results statistically.

The survey with its questions and statements had the aim of collecting relevant data in order for the authors to answer the research question. When measuring certain persons’ different points of view through statements, it is common for researchers to use a scale for measurement (Likert, 1974, p. 90). In other words, when measuring attitudes of people it is common for researchers to use the Likert Scale. When constructing the survey for this research the variables of interest to investigate were all measured with a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. When constructing the statement measurement with a Likert scale researchers face the option
of including a midpoint response or not. The midpoint reflects a neutral or indifferent response as ‘neither agree nor disagree’ (Raaijmakers et al., 2000, p. 208). Furthermore, the meanings of the midpoint can reflect opinions such as ‘undecided’ and ‘do not know’ (Raaijmakers et al., 2000, p. 208).

There are both advantages and disadvantages with neutral answer options i.e. ‘I do not know’ and ‘I am indifferent’ options. In this case, with a five-point Likert scale, the neutral answer option is the odd number 3. One of the major consequences for choosing a Likert scale with a neutral option instead of an even numbered Likert scale is the drawback that ‘closed-response format’ comes with. However, on an even numbered Likert scale, the respondents may feel a certain pressure to make a choice of the given options even though they may not match their exact opinions (Li, 2013, p. 1610). For this reason, this research makes use of the five point Likert scale. The researchers wanted to diminish the risk of respondents not responding at all to the survey or worse, not answering truthfully leaving the researchers with scattered data. Furthermore, the simplicity of constructing a Likert scale was taken into account when constructing the survey. With a Likert scale it is rather easy for researchers to collect and statistically analyze the data of interest and still retain great reliability (Li, 2013, p. 1609).

**Table 3: Construction of Likert-Scale (English version)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Construction of Likert-Scale (original, Swedish version)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Håller inte med</td>
<td>Håller inte med</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Håller med</td>
<td>Håller fullständigt med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Appendix 2, the color green was chosen for the survey. Since the logo of Rentl is green, the choice of color was intentionally made by the authors for the respondents to perceive familiarity. The survey is split into four different sections; the first section being a map on the demographics and the participations of the participants. Section two is concerned with the attitudes of the customers of Rentl. Section three seeks to identify if there is a positive attitude towards the previously identified drivers for participation in the sharing economy. More specifically, **enjoyment** as question 8a and 8b, **convenience** as question 9a and 9b, **sustainability** as question 10a and 10b, and **financial benefits** as question 11a and 11b (See Appendix 1). Section four seeks to identify the underlying reason behind the actual behavior of the previously engaged customers of Rentl. The advantage of dividing the survey into five sections was mainly the structure. The structure was consistent with the steps of the research which enabled the results to be presented in a logical way for the researchers. For the respondents the division provided them with the advantage of being easy to follow, according to the feedback that is further discussed in the following section.
Both the email and the survey was entirely provided in Swedish since Rentl is a Swedish sharing economy company that utilizes the Swedish language for their customers on their online platform. With this in mind, the authors made the assumption that all participants had the sufficient language proficiencies for conducting the given survey. As the survey was originally constructed in English, the authors considered it important to translate the questions into Swedish. This was in order to decrease the risk of misinterpretations of the questions due to lack of linguistic skills and thereby increasing the probability of a high response-rate. Furthermore the authors both acknowledged the possible drawback of participants not feeling comfortable, or simply not knowing the Swedish language as a disadvantage and something to be improved for further studies.

4.3.2 Pilot Survey
Before sending out the survey to the actual targeted group, the choice of conducting a pilot survey was made. In order to secure that the research would be of high quality this choice carried great importance for the authors. A pilot study is conducted in order to detect and eliminate uncertainties in the chosen data collection methods, in this case the survey (Bryman & Bell, 2013, p. 276). When constructing a survey the provided information as well as the questions might be obvious to the author, although not obvious for the respondents. Therefore the researchers sent out a pilot survey to minimize the risk of misinterpretations. The purpose of this pilot survey was not to test the reliability and validity of the study since the instruments already have been designed tested in previous research (see Appendix 1). The instruments of this research were retrieved from different published researches in order to fit the purpose of the research so that the authors would be able to answer the research question (Coughlan et al., 2007, p. 661). The authors chose to conduct the pilot survey to test if it was easy to understand and well structured. When conducting a pilot survey it is done in a small scale where the participants are supposed to be closely related to the targeted group. Although, it is important to not include anyone from the actual targeted group in the pilot research, in this case, a customer of Rentl. The authors chose to send the survey to 10 individuals with the knowledge that none of them were customers of Rentl. These individuals were personal contacts to the authors who all had participated in a sharing economy before.

The pilot survey was provided with the actual cover letter of the survey to the participants with the request to critically review and fill in the survey. Considering that this survey reached out to the customers of Rentl, the pilot respondents were informed to disregard the questions about being a customer of Rentl since none of them were at that point in time. The authors gathered the feedback provided by the pilot respondents both verbally and written. From the pilot survey the authors gained constructive feedback regarding both the cover letter and the questions and statements of the survey. The general opinion of the pilot respondents was that the survey was easy to understand and straightforward. However, there were some uncertainties and suggestions as well, which were looked into. Feedback was given regarding the wording and phrasing in both the cover letter and the questions. The wording and phrasing were at some parts perceived to be rather complicated. Since the authors wanted to design the survey as straightforward as possible this feedback was taken into big consideration. With this in mind, the authors changed the wording and phrasing at the emphasized parts in order to be more easily understood without any variable tested being perished. In other words, no major changes were made just minor changing in wording in order for the survey to be easily understood. Further, a short definition of what is to be considered as the
sharing economy was added in the cover letter. Some of the pilot respondents seemed to be uncertain of the actual definition even though they are, or have been a participant, which might also be the case for customers of Rentl.

4.3.3 Distributions of Surveys
As this thesis is written during spring, it was of importance for the authors to send out the survey before the holidays of Easter. A first round of emails was sent out on the 29th of March 2018 to the customers of Rentl. Throughout the day, Google Forms calculated 54 received responses. With regards to this being the first day of Easter, the authors made the choice of sending out a reminder when the holidays were over. More specifically, a reminder was sent out at the 6th of April 2018 and Google Forms then calculated the responses to a total of 102. The questionnaire closed at 23:59 the 10th of April with a total of 145 responses collected after a third reminder on the 9th of April 2018.

Table 5: Responses According to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 30th, 2018</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6th, 2018</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10th, 2018</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Response-Rate
After having gathered and coded all data into measurable values, a non-response analysis was conducted. This was done in order to understand how conclusions about the data can be drawn. This is of essence due to the fact that when conducting a quantitative study, the authors shall report any missing responses in the sample as well as to specific questions, and further discuss how this affects their data (Moore et al., 2011, p. 153). The proportion of the original sample that provides data to the study is known as the response-rate (Moore et al., 2011, p. 153). However, some of the selected respondents may not meet the research requirements of the current study. These requirements are as follows (1) the subject must have participated in sharing economy, and (2) the subject must be a registered user at Rentl AB. These excluded respondents are referred to as Ineligible respondents. Furthermore, targeted subjects in the sample which for some reason were not exposed to the survey are referred to as Unreachable respondents. (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 220).

As such, the response-rate is calculated as follows: Active Response-Rate = Number of responses/Total number in sample – (Ineligible + Unreachable) (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 220).

\[
Active Response Rate = \frac{R}{N - (I + U)}
\]
Accordingly, the response rate for the current study is computed below:

\[
Active\ Response\ Rate_{Rentl} = \frac{145}{2096 - (102 + 650)} = \frac{145}{1344} = 0.1079 = 10.79\%
\]

All of the sampled units in the current study are as mentioned registered users at Rentl AB. The survey at hand was further exposed to 2096 of the registered users at Rentl’s website, according to D. Mattsson (E-mail, April 6, 2018). However, some of the respondents do claim to never have participated in sharing economy. Therefore, these responses were considered to have little if no significant value to the results of this study. As such, the authors considered the responses “I have not participated [in the sharing economy]” as over coverage, and have therefore not included these in the statistical analysis. Out of the 145 responses collected after the 10th of April, 77 respondents said that they at some point had engaged in sharing economy. As can be seen in the calculations above, these are the respondents who were deemed to actually provide useful data to the current study.

Non-respondents refer to the respondents from the sample who have refused to take part in a given survey. This refusal occurs in almost every research and can be due to any of the four following reasons: (1) Refusal to respond, (2) Ineligibility to respond, (3) Inability to locate respondent, (4) Respondent located but unable to make contact. (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 220).

4.4.1 Non-Respondents
Sivo et al. (2006, p. 372) discuss the importance of response-rates and further the implications low response-rates might have on a study. As such, if a low response-rate is obtained, the researchers must exhibit that these results potentially show a nonresponse error (Sivo et al., 2006, p. 372). According to Moore et al. (2011, p. 160) non-response can be a critical form of bias for any study. The researchers should give a description of precautions taken in order to avoid non-response errors. They shall furthermore ensure that the implications linked to non-response error are properly addressed in the limitations sections of the research (Sivo et al., 2006, p. 372). Therefore, the authors of the current thesis considered several precautions before handing out the online survey. Accordingly, the subjects participating in the current survey did so completely anonymously. Furthermore, as mentioned, the survey did not require any of the participants of the study to write any answers themselves, as all of the questions were graded on a Likert-scale, or given with multiple choice answers. This was done in order to avoid having respondents feel ladened with too much work (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 233). Additionally, the authors of this thesis wrote a cover letter for the survey which was aimed to look as intriguing and interesting to the respondents. Lastly, a survey reminder was sent out three times during the data collection period, resulting in the questionnaire being available for respondents over a time period of 11 full days. With the limitation of time and money the researchers of this study faced, it was of interest to send out at least one reminder in order to acquire a representative sample. Notwithstanding the aforementioned precautions the authors of this thesis carefully took into consideration, the response-rate obtained from the survey

(R = Number of responses, N = Sample size, I = Ineligible respondents, U = Unreachable)
at hand showed a rate of (10.79%). Fowler (2013, p. 44) claims that there is no widely accepted minimum response-rate which a study needs to have. However, the lower the response-rate, the higher the risk of a response bias. Additionally, response-bias is evident when the sampled subjects are different from the non-respondents, which causes the researchers to not be able to draw accurate inferences about the population (Drauglis et al., 2008, p. 4). Therefore, the researchers need to acknowledge the risk of nonresponse error and response bias which will be further discussed in detail in the following chapters.

4.5 Data Analysis

When analyzing the collected data, the authors had an advantage of using Google Forms. From Google Forms an Excel spreadsheet was downloaded with all data collected and presented in one sheet. According to Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 334) it is important to consider how the data will be analyzed before starting the data collection process. Therefore, the authors made the choice of using statistical software for analyzing the data when making the decisions for the scientific methodology presented in Chapter 2. Consistent with the choice of testing theories as research approach, collecting numerical data in order to statistically study a relationship between variables as research strategy with a descriptive nature, the choice of statistical tools was obvious for the authors. With this in mind the authors used the statistical analysis software Minitab 17, considering the authors had previous knowledge from the program it was the choice came naturally. The Excel spreadsheet was retrieved on the 11th of April 2018, after the questionnaire had been closed for respondents. This spreadsheet with its data was then exported to Minitab 17 where the statistical analysis process started. Several tests were conducted in Minitab in order to test how enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits affect attitudes and in its turn actions of customers in the sharing economy. These statistical tests include Cronbach’s Alpha, Pearson’s Correlation, T-Tests, and Regression Analyses which will be further described in the following sections. Subsequently, chapter 5 further discusses the results retrieved from these conducted tests.

4.5.1 Cronbach’s Alpha

Considering this research is based on measurement through a Likert-Scale, it is of importance to discuss the dependability and accuracy of the research (Gliem & Gliem, 2003, p. 82; Cronbach, 1951, p. 297). This can be done with the help of a reliability coefficient - the Cronbach’s Alpha. The coefficient is used as an index to show inter-item homogeneity (Cronbach, 1951, p. 297). In other words it is used to show internal consistency of reliability (Gliem & Gliem, 2003, p. 82). According to Cronbach (1951, p. 297) the coefficient “demonstrates whether the test designer was correct in expecting a certain collection of items to yield interpretable statements about individual differences.” When using Cronbach’s Alpha, researchers end up with a coefficient in between the interval of 0 and 1 (Bryman & Bell, 2011, 280). 0 indicates that there is no internal reliability whilst 1 indicates an internal reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159). Usually, the coefficient should be above 0.7 in order to be considered as efficient (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 159), whilst a coefficient above 0.8 is considered as an acceptable level of internal reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 158).

4.5.2 Pearson Correlation

According to Bolboaca & Jäntschi (2006, p. 179) the Pearson correlation is a statistical measurement for “the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two
variables, describing the direction and degree to which one variable is linearly related to another”. The coefficient is presented in a value between -1 to +1, where -1 shows a perfectly negative linear relationship, +1 shows a perfectly positive linear relationship, and 0 indicates that the variables are not linearly related to each other at all (Saunders et al., 2012, p. 521). If the coefficient is greater than 0.8 the correlation between two variables is considered to be strong and if the coefficient is less than 0.5 the correlation is considered to be weak (Bolboaca & Jäntschi, 2006, p. 179).

4.5.3 Paired T-Test
A paired t-test is a type of statistical test that is used to compare the means of two groups (Kim, 2015, p. 540). For the current study however, two separate groups were not tested; instead, the same sample was tested twice, in order to describe a potential discrepancy between the attitudes toward sharing economy, and behavior respectively. The formula for a paired t-test is as follows:

\[ t = \frac{\bar{d}}{\sqrt{s^2/n}} \]

Where \( t \) is the test statistic with \( n-1 \) degrees of freedom, \( d-bar \) the average differentiation between the means, \( s^2 \) the variance, and \( n \) the sample size (Moore et al., 2011, p. 744).

According to Moore et al. (2011, p. 404), a situation which calls for the use of a paired T-test is when researchers are doing before-and-after observations on the same sample. Therefore, paired T-tests were conducted on the sampled subjects. Paired T-tests are used in cases where the subjects are not divided into two separate groups (Kim, 2015, p. 540). As such, the subjects are matched in pairs and generate two separate values. These values are then weighed within each pair. Paired T-tests are used because matched subjects are more similar than unmatched subjects, and therefore comparing the outcomes within each pair is more effective (Moore et al., 2011, p. 404).

4.5.4 Multiple Regression Analysis
Multiple regression analysis has been a widely acknowledged statistical procedure in marketing research (Mason & Perreault, 1991, p. 268). In the current study, two multiple regression analyses were made in order to study the relationship between all drivers versus attitudes, and all drivers versus actions respectively. A multiple regression analysis is appropriate when testing whether variables with numerical values can predict a numerical response variable. The formula for a multiple regression is as follows:

\[ \hat{Y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \cdots + \beta_n \]

Where \( Y \) is the response variable, and each Beta a driver for participation in sharing economy (Moore et al., 2011, p. 581).

Practically, what the regression tests does is testing whether the above mentioned Betas have a significantly positive value, on a (0.01) significance level. If the relationship between the each respective explanatory variable and the response seem to be reasonably linear – this suggests that the drivers for participation in sharing economy
may be helpful in predicting attitude or behavior (Moore et al. 2011, p. 581). Accordingly, in this research multiple regression analyses were used to test the conceptual model presented in the previous chapter. As such, the drivers for participation in sharing economy (explanatory variables) are as follows; *enjoyment, sustainability, convenience, and financial benefits*. These are then tested if they can be used to predict attitudes and actions (response variables). Furthermore, the significance level chosen for the current test has a value of 0.01 ($\alpha=0.01$). This value is defined by the researcher, and is weighed against the P-value for the given test (Moore et al. 2011, p. 358).

### 4.6 Ethical Considerations

It is the responsibility of the researchers to consider all possible ethical issues when performing a research in order to contribute with a work of high quality. Ethical considerations are concerned with how researchers should treat participants of the research, and whether or not there are activities in which researchers should not engage in (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 122). When conducting research, the ethical principles can be broken down to four main areas: if there is *harm to the participants*; if there is a *lack of informed consent*; if there is an *invasion of privacy*; and, if there is a *deception* involved (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128).

**Harm to the participants** can be displayed in different forms, in physical harm, harm to self-esteem, harm to career prospects or stress to give a few examples. The MRS Code of Conduct addresses how the researchers need to take all precautions in order to ensure that the respondents are not harmed in any way when participating in the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). Further, the MRS Code of Conduct states that anonymity must be preserved (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). When conducting a quantitative study it is generally easier to remain anonymous as a respondent, and generally harder for the researchers to identify individuals. In this research this aspect has been widely acknowledged. Both the email sent out to the respondents and the cover letter of the survey highlighted the fact that all responses are treated anonymously and will not be possible to distinguish from the results. Another aspect of harm to the participants is the aspect of the company of interest. In order to treat a company with confidentiality pseudonyms can be used for a company to be anonymous (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). Therefore a confidentiality agreement was signed by both the authors of this thesis. The agreement stated that if the authors were to access personal information when conducting the study, it would be treated with complete confidentiality. Furthermore the agreement stated how Rentl AB had the option to be anonymous and treated with confidentiality in the thesis when being referenced to by the authors.

**Lack of informed consent** is another ethical consideration related to business research. It is of particular concern for respondents in a position that does not allow them to give their fully informed consent (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 134). In order to avoid lack of informed consent, there should be enough information available for the respondents to make the decision of participating in the research or not. Lack of informed consent was therefore treated with respect to the respondents by clearly communicating the important aspects of this research. The email sent out to the respondents informed them about who the researchers are and the purpose of the survey that is interrelated with the purpose of the research. This was followed by an indirect question for voluntary participation by clicking on the attached link. Further in the email, and in the cover
letter, it was stated that the responses gathered were treated anonymously and were not possible to distinguish from each other as previously mentioned. With this outline of the email and the cover letter provided, the authors addressed the ethical consideration of invasion of privacy. To deal with the ethical consideration of invasion of privacy, the researchers need to make sure that the privacy of the respondents is not in any way invaded (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). In other words, researchers need to guarantee confidentiality and anonymity to its fullest possible degree (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). With the data collection method in terms of an online survey that was distributed through the company of interest itself these criteria were guaranteed as an advantageous consequence. For the researchers it was impossible to know who answered what since there was no direct contact with any individual. Additionally, the data gathered from the survey is presented in groups and not focusing on individual responses.

The ethical consideration of deception explains how researchers present the research as something different than it actually is which causes deception (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). With this in mind, it is not acceptable as a researcher to misguide or lie to participants in any way. In order to prevent any distrust or suspicions for deception the authors started both the email and the cover letter to the respondents by presenting themselves as fourth year International Business students currently writing a degree project at Umeå University within the field of customer behavior in the sharing economy. It was further presented that if it would be of the respondents’ interest, a short summary of the results or the completed thesis would be accessible.

Bearing in mind, the ongoing debate whether or not the sharing economy is an ethical way of consuming or not as discussed in Chapter 1, the authors wanted to conduct a quantitative study. This was because of the minimum amount of interaction with the respondents as possible in order not to subjectively influence them in any sense. The ethical issue if there is harm to the participants is generally more difficult with a qualitative study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 130)

In summary, most precautions regarding the ethical issues for this study were taken into consideration in the email as well as the cover letter in the survey sent to the respondents. The authors have throughout the entire research process continuously taken the ethical aspects into consideration when making decisions.
5. Empirical Findings

This chapter presents the quantitative results of the research conducted. Firstly, demographics of the respondents are presented alongside with their pattern in customer behavior in the sharing economy. Then the internal reliability, descriptive statistics, and correlation are presented in the same order. Lastly, the results from the t-tests and regression analysis are presented and used in order to support or not support the stated hypotheses. Conclusively a revised conceptual model is presented according to the findings of this research.

5.1 Demographics

In order to get a better view of the respondents, the questionnaire consisted of a number of demographic questions. These questions included questions of gender, age, last participation, and whether the customers had participated as providers, renters or both. Out of the 2096 sampled subjects, the study at hand obtained results from 145 respondents, out of which 77 respondents said that they had at some point had engaged in the sharing economy and were also customers of Rentl. As such, these 77 subjects were of interest for this research. Of the 77 respondents there was about one third (34%) who identified themselves as women, and two thirds (66%) identified themselves as men as can be seen in Figure 5. Regarding age, this gap ranged from 18 years old to 84 years old. The larger portion of the respondents were of an age between 29 and 40, and the smaller of an age between 73 and 84.

![Figure 5: Distribution of Gender](image-url)
Followed by the questions regarding basic demographics were the questions regarding the customer behavior in the sharing economy. In Figure 7 it was identified that a majority of the respondents executed their last participation within the last year as 51% said that they participated less than one year ago. Furthermore, 38% said that their last participation was less than three months ago. At last, 5% said that their last participation took place less than three years ago.
It was of interest to map the activities of the customers even though there was no distinction made between providing customers and renting customers in the analysis of this thesis. Presented below in the pie charts are the shares of customers who have participated as providing customer and renting customer respectively. Of the 77 respondents, 62% had participated in the sharing economy as providing customer by renting out an underused asset or service to someone else for temporary access. 38% had never participated as a providing customer. Further, 79% of the respondents had participated by taking advantage of an underused asset or service, i.e. acted as a renting customer. Out of the 2096 respondents, 21% had never participated as a renting customer.
The demographics were all used to map out customers of Rentl accompanied by their respective behavioral activity. However, the demographics were not used to compare different subgroups of sharing economy customers. This is because this thesis does not
seek to discriminate any subgroups but instead generalize the entire population as a whole with regards to the relationship between attitudes and actions.

5.2 Cronbach’s Alpha
In order to test the internal reliability for the constructs of relevance the authors performed a test for Cronbach’s Alpha. Presented below in Table 6 are the results from the conducted test. The highest coefficient was the coefficient of financial benefits (0.94). The lowest on the other hand was the coefficient of convenience (0.87), which was the only variable with a coefficient less than 0.9. However, considering that all reliability coefficients are above 0.8 one can say that all variables this thesis seeks to study are statistically reliable. In other words, all variables possess an acceptable level of internal reliability according to Cronbach’s Alpha. With all variables being considered reliable, the authors could continue the statistical tests with all constructs in order to answer the research question of the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers participating in the sharing economy of Rentl.

Table 6: Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Descriptive Statistics
Considering that the data was gathered by constructing the questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale, the authors found it necessary to present the descriptive statistics of the key variables. Hence, Table 7 was constructed as can be found below. The descriptive statistics are necessary since they provide an overview of how the means of the variables are distributed according to the answers of the respondents. Additionally, the standard deviation was of interest to include since this provides the information of how much the answers generally deviate/ fluctuate. The variable with the highest mean was the driver sustainability with a mean of (4.49). This means that generally there is a high perception of financial benefits and its impact within the sharing economy. The lowest obtained mean was the driver enjoyment (3.61). As a mean of 3 indicates indifference or neutrality, enjoyment is still above the value of indifference. In other words, there is generally a positive perception of enjoyment and its impact within the sharing economy.
Table 7: Mean of Drivers (based on questionnaire responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Pearson Correlation

A Pearson Correlation test was conducted in order to statistically test the linear relationship between the variables of interest. Correlation between driver and driver is not of interest in this study since they are not investigated against each other and are therefore not to be discussed further. Variables tested against each other such as Attitudes against Attitudes have a perfect correlation of (1.0) and are significant on a (0.001) significance level as a consequence of this. Therefore, they will not be further discussed. All variables tested against each other were significant on a (0.05) significance level according to their P-value. However, not all were significant on a (0.01) significance level.

The weakest relationship was found between the variables sustainability and actions with a coefficient at (0.295). This relationship was the only relationship that was not significant on a (0.01) significance level. In other words the correlation, or linear relationship, is weak between sustainability and actions of customers participating in the sharing economy. Except for the variables tested against each other with a perfect correlation, the strongest relationship was found between sustainability and attitudes (0.766). This was followed by the correlation between convenience and actions with a correlation coefficient at (0.728).

What can be further read from the Pearson Correlation is that the intrinsically motivated drivers, enjoyment and sustainability, both have a higher correlation with attitudes compared to the higher correlation between the drivers and actions (see table 8). Contrariwise, the extrinsically motivated drivers, convenience and financial benefits, both have a lower correlation with attitudes compared to the higher correlation between the drivers and actions.
### Table 8: Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>0.574**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>0.459**</td>
<td>0.570**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain.</td>
<td>0.766**</td>
<td>0.295*</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveni.</td>
<td>0.614**</td>
<td>0.728**</td>
<td>0.335**</td>
<td>0.548**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin. Ben.</td>
<td>0.601**</td>
<td>0.636**</td>
<td>0.264*</td>
<td>0.558**</td>
<td>0.552**</td>
<td>1***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of the correlations according to P-Value

* \( P \leq 0.05 \)

** \( P \leq 0.01 \)

*** \( P \leq 0.001 \)

### 5.5 Paired T-Tests

In order to describe the relationship between each individual driver (explanatory variables) and attitudes, as well as actions (response variables), several Paired T-tests were conducted. This was done by weighing the average score of each driver obtained from the data gathered in the sampling against that of the aforementioned attitudes and actions. As previously mentioned, this score was for each separate variable based on a Likert-scale, generating the authors of this thesis an average value between 1 and 5, for both the explanatory- as well as the response variables. In the test results given in the tables below, one can see that most of the driver means seem to differ from the general attitudes toward sharing economy with rather significant confidence, apart from sustainability versus attitudes. These test showed that the drivers for engagement in sharing economy which are significantly more in line with actual actions, are the drivers of convenience and financial benefits, i.e. extrinsic drivers.

By the use of a paired t-test, the driver of enjoyment displayed an average score of (3.61), weighed against attitudes (4.51), and actions (2.43), exhibiting a clear differentiation between these variables - hence the low P-value of (0.000) for both attitudes and actions respectively. These values indicate that the general attitudes toward sharing economy are positive, while the attitudes regarding enjoyment toward sharing economy might not fully correspond to these general perceptions of the sharing economy. The average score obtained from actions displayed a rather neutral value, with an estimated negative difference of (1.182) vis-a-vis the driver of enjoyment, (3.61). Given below are the results of two Paired T-tests, containing the driver of enjoyment tested against attitudes, as well as actions.
In the table below, one can see the results obtained from a Paired T-test where sustainability is weighed against attitudes, as well as actions. Sustainability versus attitudes showed an estimated negative differentiation of (-0.010) with a corresponding P-value of (0.933), meaning that there is no significant difference between the attitudes toward sustainability in sharing economy and the general attitudes toward sharing economy as a whole. Furthermore, the results gathered from testing the driver of sustainability versus Actions showed an estimated positive difference of (1.799) between the two with a corresponding P-value of (0.000). As such, the mean attitudes toward sustainability in sharing economy differ significantly from actions regarding sustainability in sharing economy.

Given in the table below, one can see two Paired T-tests where the driver of convenience is tested against the general attitudes- as well as actions toward sharing economy. Accordingly, convenience was tested against attitudes which resulted in a negative estimated difference of (-0.847) with a corresponding P-value of (0.000) was obtained. In other words, the average attitudes regarding convenience in sharing economy differs significantly from the general attitudes toward sharing economy as a whole. Furthermore, weighing convenience against actions resulted in an estimated positive difference of (0.026), and a P-value of (0.890), meaning that the average attitudes toward convenience in sharing economy does not significantly differ from actual behavior in sharing economy.
Table 11: Paired T-Test (Convenience vs. Attitudes & Convenience vs. Actions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>SE Mean</th>
<th>Estimate for Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.510</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.847</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Displayed below, one can find the the Paired T-tests where financial benefits is tested against the mean general Attitudes toward sharing economy, as well as the actual behavior, i.e. Attitudes. These tests resulted in a negative estimated difference between financial benefits and Attitudes with a P-value of (0.004), which means that the general attitudes toward sharing economy significantly differs from the driver of financial benefits in sharing economy. Furthermore, one can see that when financial benefits was tested against actual behavior, a negative estimated difference of (-0.104) was given with a corresponding P-value of (0.508). In other words, the perceived financial benefits of participating in sharing economy do not significantly differ from the actual behavior regarding the financial benefits in sharing economy.

Table 12: Paired T-Test (Financial Benefits vs. Attitudes & Financial Benefits vs. Actions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>SE Mean</th>
<th>Estimate Difference</th>
<th>for</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.104</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.510</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Multiple Regression Analyses
In order to determine whether the drivers used in the current study can be used in order to predict attitudes and actions in sharing economy, two multiple regression analyses were conducted. As can be seen in the output given below, all drivers seem to predict the general attitudes of people toward sharing economy, at a (0.01) significance level. Further investigating the VIF-value for each variable, it seems that there is no multicollinearity in the stated regression, as all VIF-values received a score of 1.000. Furthermore, all VIF-values under 5 are considered to have minimal to moderate multicollinearity. Additionally, looking at table (Table 13) below, one can see that the P-values given for drivers versus actions all received values of 0.000. Accordingly, one can see that all drivers seem to be useful when predicting attitudes toward sharing economy.
In table 14 *convenience* and *financial benefits* seem to be the variables that significantly predict actions in sharing economy, given the P-values of 0.000. *Enjoyment* and *sustainability* received scores of 0.294 and 0.853 respectively, meaning that *enjoyment* and *sustainability* do not have a significant impact when predicting the actions in sharing economy, on the (0.01) significance level.

### Table 14: Multiple Regression Analysis - Drivers toward Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>SE Coef</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>32.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>52.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.530</td>
<td>40.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.7 Revised Conceptual Model

Based on the results retrieved from the multiple regression analysis, statistical conclusions could be drawn in order to answer the research question of the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy of Rentl AB. What is of importance to be acknowledged is the low response-rate acquired in the data collection process. The authors of this thesis could neither support nor reject the stated hypotheses with a response-rate which is of inadequacy. However, the results and the hypotheses testing are presented with the assumption of a representative response-rate and sample size. The outcomes of the regression analyses were strongly in line with, as well as supported by, the other statistical tests conducted by the researchers. In order to be able to support or reject the previously stated hypotheses, the P-values retrieved from the multiple regression analysis were used. Presented below in Table 15 are the results of the hypotheses testing accordingly to the conducted statistical tests. Out of the eight formulated hypotheses, two were not supported. The hypotheses that were not supported were H1b *Enjoyment positively influences actions towards the sharing economy*, and H2b *Sustainability positively influences actions towards the sharing economy*. All four hypotheses regarding a certain driver positively influencing the *attitudes* of customers towards the sharing economy were supported. However, two out of the four hypotheses...
regarding a certain driver positively influencing the actions of customers towards the sharing economy were supported. In other words, not all positive attitudes were translated into actual actions of customers in the sharing economy in this study.

Table 15: Results of Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Enjoyment positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Enjoyment positively influences actions towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Sustainability positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Sustainability positively influences actions towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Convenience positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Convenience positively influences actions towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Financial benefits positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Financial benefits positively influences attitudes towards the sharing economy</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the outcomes from the multiple regression analyses, the authors revised the conceptual model of this research. In the revised conceptual model (Figure 9) the black lines represent the hypotheses that were supported by the statistical analysis. The black lines represent relationships between the variables of interest where the relationships are highly significant at a 0.01 level. From all drivers there is a black line towards attitudes, meaning that there is a significant relationship between the identified drivers for participation in the sharing economy and the attitudes of the customers. In other words, there is generally a positive attitude towards the sharing economy based on its identified drivers regardless of whether it is an extrinsically or intrinsically motivated factor for participation. As can be seen in the revised conceptual model there are also two grey lines between enjoyment towards actions, and sustainability towards actions respectively. These lines represent the hypotheses which could not be supported by the performed statistical analysis. Although this research does not manage to support the aforementioned hypotheses, H1b and H2b do not confirm that there is no relationship between the variables. Thus, there is a transparent line drawn between enjoyment and actions, respectively sustainability and actions.
Figure 9: Revised Conceptual Model

*Created by the authors of this thesis*
6. Discussion

This chapter discusses the empirical findings presented in the previous chapter. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss and analyze the results of the study with the research question and the research purpose in mind. In the previous chapter an Attitude-Action Gap was identified which this chapter seeks to discuss based on the theories presented in the theoretical framework. Hence, the Attitude-Action Gap is discussed from a rational perspective, a non-rational perspective, and the perspective of intrinsic- versus extrinsic motivation.

6.1 Attitude-Action Gap According to Customer Decision Making

This thesis studies the relationship between attitudes and actions, more specifically if attitudes toward sharing actually translate into corresponding actions. Therefore, the test carrying the greatest to the hypothesis testing were the multiple regression analyses. The T-tests given in the previous chapter were furthermore used as indicators in order to monitor how the means of attitudes, actions, and divers differ. Therefore, the multiple regression analyses were in this thesis used to test the eight hypotheses given in (Table 15). Looking at the multiple regression analyses in chapter five (Table 13 and Table 14), one can see that all drivers seem to predict the general attitudes toward sharing economy. However, as previously stated, this thesis aims to describe how attitudes toward sharing economy translate into corresponding actions. Accordingly, the most interesting results given in chapter five are when the drivers are weighed against actions through a multiple regression analysis (Table 14). These results show that only two out of four drivers seem to predict the actions in sharing economy. Given that convenience and financial benefits both received P-values of (0.007) and (0.000) respectively, these drivers seem to significantly predict the actual actions on the (0.01) significance level. Additionally, the drivers of convenience and financial benefits are as previously mentioned both extrinsic drivers. However, interestingly, the drivers of enjoyment and sustainability received P-values of (0.294) and (0.853) respectively. In other words, these drivers are by no means significant variables when predicting the actions of people toward sharing economy. What is interesting to notice here is that the drivers of enjoyment and sustainability are both intrinsic drivers. These results give the indication that although intrinsic drivers might not be the actual incentives for participation in sharing economy, the extrinsic drivers might be. As a result, six out of the eight hypotheses in the current thesis were supported by the use of two multiple regression analyses (table 15).

As such, the hypotheses Enjoyment positively influences actions toward the sharing economy (H1b), and Sustainability positively influences actions toward the sharing economy (H2b), are not supported on the (0.01) significance level. These results can be due to several factors, and furthermore described through the theoretical frameworks given in chapter three. Perloff (2012, p. 84) argues that customer choice is based on utility. The customer therefore makes decisions in line with maximizing their utility. In other words, a positive attitude toward a certain subject does not necessarily translate into actions corresponding to these attitudes. Accordingly, what is most crucial for the customer is to maximize utility. As the results show, the drivers of enjoyment and sustainability seem to not be in line with the actual behavior of the test subjects.
Additionally, these drivers are arguably rather intangible and are as such difficult to grasp in terms of valuation of the potential obtainable utility. Therefore, the drivers of enjoyment and sustainability seem to be hard for the customer to fit in to the utility maximization formula, which is in line with Perloff (2012, p. 84). However, the extrinsic driver of financial benefits is arguably rather easily measurable for the customer given its numerical computability. Furthermore, being the second extrinsic driver, the perceived convenience of any form of value transaction is arguably rather evident for the individual conducting the business transaction. Accordingly, regarding the claim for utility maximization, the extrinsic drivers of this thesis seem to be more implementable in the utility maximizing formula.

According to Adam Smith (2001, p. 30), customers make their decisions based on self-interest. In other words, a customer will act in a way which solely benefits oneself. Arguably, a customer's self-interest is of a rather individual nature and will therefore include different interests for each customer. As such, some people will believe e.g. financial benefits to generate more personal satisfaction than sustainability. As shown in the results above, on average people do tend to value financial benefits as generating more personal satisfaction than sustainable consumption. Accordingly, the arguments presented by Adam Smith suggest a potential description of the obtained results regarding customer's actions toward enjoyment and sustainability in sharing economy. These results showed as mentioned that neither enjoyment nor sustainability significantly predicts actions on the (0.01) significance level. Therefore, one might question whether actions toward sustainable consumption and enjoyment in sharing economy actually benefit the customer's self-interest.

As have been mentioned in chapter three of this thesis, Simon (1955) objects against preceding arguments which argue that people's values and attitudes affect behavior both directly and indirectly. Thaler (1980) refers to these traditional views on customer behavior as a combination of positive and normative theories. However, the exclusive reliance on the normative theories leads economists to make systematic errors when predicting customer behavior (Thaler, 1980, p. 39). Therefore, if these traditional models were an accurate predictor of human behavior, there would be no attitude-action gap. This argumentation is very much in line with the obtained results from the current thesis, which give indications of an attitude action gap in sharing economy, regarding sustainable consumption and the enjoyment of participating in sharing economy.

6.2 Attitude-Action Gap According to TRA & TPB

Both the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) makes the assumption that people are rational in their decision making, as well as being considerate of their implications of their behavior before a certain action takes place (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1988, p. 3). With rational decision making it can be expected that what customers say are aligned with what they do. Rationality of customers can therefore lead to prediction of behavior based on their attitudes and norms that both generate the intention for action of the customer in the sharing economy. Thus, TRA argues how the most important predictor for behavioral outcome is the behavioral intention of the customer. In other words, actions of the customer in the sharing economy can be traced back to a behavioral intention rather than an unconscious action. Hence, the assumption of rational decision making of the customers is emphasized according to TRA and TPB.
Hamari et al. (2015, p. 6) argues how engagement in the sharing economy can be both rational and utility maximizing whereas the customer does not claim exclusive ownership but rather temporary access. Thus, in this research a positive attitude would be predicted to translate into an actual action of the customer in the sharing economy according to TRA and TPB. Considering that each of the relationships between the identified variables and the attitudes were statistically supported by the conducted tests it was expected by the authors that no attitude-action gap were to appear. It was expected that there would likewise be a positive relationship between the drivers and actions according to TRA and TPB. The basic assumptions of the theories can therefore not be used in order to describe and support the empirical findings of this research. However, the theories further discuss possibilities for these emerging gaps or inconsistencies in what customers say and what customers do.

Due to new information emerging, unforeseen events or plain habits that kick in at the time of performing the behavior, behavioral intentions can change over time according to TRA and TPB (Ajzen, 1985, p. 19). Thus, a gap emerges if the intention changes as the time for performing a certain behavior approaches and the possibility of the intention translating into an action decreases. Ajzen (1985, p. 19) further supports this statement by arguing that there is a bigger risk for an discrepancy between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy if there is a longer time period between the attitude formation and the execution of the behavior. By incorporating these assumptions of TRA and TPB the inconsistency in the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy can be described. If the attitude formation towards the sharing economy and its main drivers are generated at an early stage, and the execution of the action for participation takes place much later, there is a bigger risk for an inconsistency in the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers.

The Theory of Planned Behavior was developed as an extension to the Theory of Reasoned Action (Madden et al., 1992, p. 8) where the aspect of Perceived Behavioral Control was added to the theory. Mairesse et al. (2012, p. 567) argues how discrepancies can originate from constraints in Perceived Behavioral Control according to TPB. Mairesse et al. (2012, p. 567) further states how a customer has a positive attitude towards the environment and sustainable behavior, although it does not show in their behavior due to low perceived behavioral control and high perceived constraints. Both sustainability and enjoyment share the similarity of having a positive relationship toward attitudes, although this positive relationship does not culminate in a positive relationship between the drivers and actions for participation. Considering that both the driver sustainability and enjoyment are in this thesis categorized as intrinsically motivated drivers for participation in the sharing economy it can be expected to describe the origins of the identified attitude-action gap with constraints in perceived behavioral control.

TPB can thus be emphasized to describe the identified discrepancy. With the belief that an action will have minimal effect on the environment, the customer obtains high perceived constraints and low perceived behavioral control. Likewise, if the belief that an action will lead to minimal perceived enjoyment - the chance of this positive attitude translating into an action is minimal according to Mairesse et al. (2012, p. 567). In order for the behavioral intention to instead translate into an action, there is the need for low perceived constraints and high perceived behavioral control. With the belief that an
action for participation in the sharing economy will result in financial benefits and, or saved time, the likelihood of a positive attitude translating into an action is then rather high.

Interconnecting this discussion with the discussion of the emergence of the attitude-action gap as a consequence of time between attitude formation and behavior execution, another consideration regarding the inconsistency emerges. If the perception of consequences such as environmental impact and increased enjoyment are far away in time, there is a bigger risk for an inconsistency in the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy.

6.3 Attitude-Action Gap According to Bounded Rationality

Bounded rationality, a term coined by Simon Alexander Herbert, refers to the bounds of the human mind to make a perfectly rational decision. As previously mentioned, classical economic models often fail to predict human decision making (Simon, 1955, p. 104), and thereby customer behavior. According to Ballester & Hernández (2012, p. 29), the decision making capabilities of the human mind is limited by (1) the information individuals possess, (2) their computational capabilities, and (3) their individual cognitive limitations. As a result of this, the individual cannot make a perfectly rational decision, since perfect rationality requires unlimited cognitive capabilities (Selten, 1999, p. 3). A such, the concept of Bounded Rationality can be mirrored in the tests results obtained in the previous chapter. Both financial benefits and convenience appeared to significantly predict the behavior of the test subjects toward sharing economy. According to Bounded Rationality, this significance can be due to the assumption that people have the computational capabilities to measure their wealth, and foresee potential future financial winnings. Regarding convenience, most individuals do arguably possess the cognitive capabilities for valuing their perceived convenience for any given value transaction. As a result, the attitudes toward convenience and financial benefits are very much in line with their corresponding actions.

As shown in table (Table 15 the driver of enjoyment showed to not predict actions on the (0.01) significance level, given its P-value of (0.294). People's perceived enjoyment from participating in sharing economy is arguably not something the individual needs to compute in order to comprehend. Although, they do need the experience from participating in sharing economy, hence the limitation (1) the information they possess. However, all tests subjects included in the hypothesis testing of the current study have all participated in sharing economy. Therefore, the results gained from enjoyment versus actions cannot be supported by Bounded rationality.

The driver of sustainability showed a P-Value of (0.853) indicating that the attitudes toward sustainability does not significantly predict actions regarding sustainable consumption in sharing economy. Linking these results to the aforementioned limitations of the human mind, one could argue for the assumption that all customers participating in sharing economy do not possess sufficient information regarding the effects consumption has on the environment. Furthermore, these customers are arguably limited by the information they possess regarding the effects sharing economy has on the environment, and might therefore fail to behave in a manner corresponding to their actual attitudes. In order to comprehend the stress consumption puts on the environment, one needs the computational capabilities for understanding the effects
one's behavior actually has on the environment. However, as mentioned, it is a widely accepted claim that people are limited to their computational capabilities (Ballester & Hernández, 2012, p. 23). Accordingly, although people might believe sustainability to be essential for the society, they do not necessarily act on these beliefs due to the limitations of their minds.

6.4 Attitude-Action Gap According to Self-Determination Theory

The results show that there is a clear discrepancy between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy regarding the drivers of enjoyment and sustainability. Considering that all relationships between the identified drivers and attitudes were statistically significant at a (0.01) significance level, one can say that there is a positive attitude toward the sharing economy and its drivers for participation. However, the results further showed that not all relationships concerning a certain driver with its positive attitude translate into an action of the customer. In other words, the authors identified an attitude-action gap. It is interesting to analyze this identified discrepancy through the use of according to the Self-Determination Theory by Deci & Ryan (1985). As previously presented, the identified drivers for participation in the sharing economy were categorized into intrinsically and extrinsically motivated drivers respectively. Enjoyment and sustainability were categorized as intrinsic drivers, whilst convenience and financial benefits were identified as being extrinsic. What is interesting to observe is how the results of this research indicate that the attitude-action gap is only evident for the intrinsic drivers. A positive attitude does not translate into an actual action as it is driven by enjoyment or sustainability. Customers perceive participation in the sharing economy as an enjoyable and sustainable move, although it does not show in their actual behavior when participation takes place. On the other hand, the extrinsically motivated drivers for participation had both a positive relationship with attitudes and actions. In other words, what people say are in line with how they act in terms of convenience and financial benefits. Customers perceive participation in the sharing economy as both convenient and financially beneficial, and these factors drive the customer to participate.

The Self-Determination Theory explains how intrinsic motivation comes from within even though it is not always compensated by external factors. Meaning, internal motivation does not come with tangible rewards. This research identified internal motivation as: interest, engagement, amusement, and satisfaction (enjoyment). Furthermore norms and ideology (sustainability) were identified as characteristics of internal motivation. Moreover the Self-Determination Theory explains how external motivation comes from external factors such as rewards. In this case, external rewards can be identified as saving and earning money (financial benefits) from participating in the sharing economy. Additionally, time saving and pure practicalities (convenience) were identified as external rewards. Thus, alongside with extrinsic drivers come tangible rewards. Based on these assumptions, the Self-Determination Theory provides a possible explanation for the identified attitude action gap can be the lack of tangible rewards. Considering that the attitude-action gap is only evident for the intrinsic drivers, the lack of tangible rewards can be associated with the discrepancy.

Bénabou & Tirole (2003, p. 490) proposed the possible conflict between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. An example of this is a conflict between
motivation coming from tangible rewards and the desire to perform a certain task for his or her own sake. In this case, motivation comes from tangible rewards rather than the desire to participate for its own sake. With the empirical results of this research in mind, this research supports the contemplations of Bénabou & Tirole.
7. Conclusions

This chapter presents the conclusions that can be drawn from the conducted research. Furthermore, theoretical contributions and practical implications will be presented. The chapter ends with a section for the limitations of this research and a discussion about future research regarding the areas of interest - customer behavior and the sharing economy.

7.1 General Conclusions

In recent years there has been an increasing attention drawn towards the phenomenon of the sharing economy. It is argued that there has been a shift from the traditional way of consuming by purchasing. Instead people are making use of an underused asset by sharing - hence, the sharing economy. There is an ongoing debate on whether or not the sharing economy is an ethical way of consuming or not which interested the authors to further investigate the phenomenon of the sharing economy. Regardless of whether it is an ethical approach to consume or not, people are still participating in the sharing economy today more than ever. Previous research indicates that there is a discrepancy between customer attitudes and actions when making a decision. Taking this into account, the purpose of this research is to describe customer behavior in the sharing economy and more importantly, to describe the relationship between attitudes and actions. In order to meet this purpose, a quantitative study was conducted where data was collected from customers of the sharing economy. This resulted in the following research question that this thesis seeks to answer.

What is the relationship between attitudes and actions of the customers participating in the sharing economy of Rentl AB?

A conceptual model was created by the authors and statistically tested in order to answer the research question of interest. The aim with the conceptual model is to describe if attitudes differ from actions of customers in the sharing economy and thus, identify a possible attitude-action gap. With the findings of this research, there can be a positive relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy regarding the extrinsic drivers for participation. However, as can be observed in the obtained results given above, the intrinsic drivers do not have a significant impact on actual actions when participating in sharing economy. Therefore, it can be concluded that although people might believe that sharing economy contributes to a more sustainable way of consumption, it is not actually the reason why they participate. Furthermore, given the results obtained from testing enjoyment versus actions, it can be concluded that people believe sharing economy to be enjoyable. However, the perceived enjoyment from participating in sharing economy is not a significantly influential factor when actually deciding to participate. Regarding the extrinsic drivers, given the results above, people do believe that sharing economy benefits them financially, while further being convenient. Additionally, both of these drivers greatly influence customers in their decision making regarding participation in sharing economy.

Conclusively, given the above stated results, it is evident that although customers believe sustainable consumption to be of great importance in today’s society, they do
not act on these beliefs (attitudes). Instead, what carries most decisive meaning for customers in the sharing economy is to what extent they can save money, as well as the perceived convenience of their consumption.

7.2 Theoretical Contributions
The study at hand has contributed to existing theoretical frameworks by studying consumer behavior within sharing economy in Sweden. Accordingly, an attitude-action gap was found among the users participating in the sharing economy of Rentl AB. The authors of this thesis have contributed with empirical research and statistically analyzed data to a discussion about the attitude-action gap. This was done by identifying peoples’ attitudes toward sharing economy, and weighed these to their actual actions when engaging in sharing economy. Previous research regarding the attitude-action gap put heavy emphasis on whether or not people act on their intrinsic attitudes, such as sustainable consumption and enjoyment. The thesis at hand has contributed to this research by further strengthening the claim for an attitude-action gap regarding sustainable consumption and enjoyment in sharing economy. The findings suggest that there is an attitude-action gap among the people participating in on the sharing platform provided by Rentl AB. However, further research is required in order to make this claim with significance for other sharing platforms. Lastly, the authors of this research believe to have narrowed a research gap aimed at sharing economy in Sweden and its attitude-action gap.

7.3 Practical Contributions
From a practical perspective, this research will carry the most significance to the managers at Rentl AB, since the population and sample has been drawn from their customer base. Although sharing companies take many different forms, they arguably share similar, if not the same incentives for participation. As such, the research conducted will further be useful for many other managers operating a sharing economy on the Swedish market. The primary practical contribution of this study is the managerial implications provided for Rentl. With statistically analyzed data managers of Rentl are provided with a better understanding for the customer behavior of their customer base. Furthermore, the managers running a sharing business in Sweden will by the use of this thesis obtain an insight on what people think of sharing economy as a whole, and what drives them to participate. With the statistically analyzed data about attitudes and actions of people engaged in sharing economy, this thesis provides a description of how people’s beliefs do not necessarily match with their behavior when engaging in sharing economy. Given the findings presented in the analysis of this thesis, the authors recommend sharing business managers to position their businesses as being financially beneficial and convenient for their users. This recommendation is based on the obtained results which showed that the significant drivers for participation in sharing economy are financial benefits and convenience. However, the drivers of sustainability and enjoyment showed to have no significant influence when individuals decide to participate in sharing economy. Therefore, the current thesis is useful for any sharing company operating in Sweden, as it gives them an insight on the actual behavior of people and can thereby position their business operations accordingly.

7.4 Societal Implications
The authors discuss under theoretical- and practical contributions how the phenomenon of sharing economy, and more specifically this research, is advantageous in many
aspects. This section discusses its societal implications and how the sharing economy is both advantageous and disadvantageous based on societal and ethical concerns for different stakeholders. For customers and managers of the sharing economy it can be argued that the phenomenon is highly advantageous both in the short- and long-run. It is argued that the sharing economy is highly sustainable even though the current research shows that a positive attitudes do not translate into corresponding actions regarding sustainability in the sharing economy. Previous research argues how it is actually the top motivating factor for participation in the sharing economy. Notwithstanding sustainability being the top driver for participation, people are still engaging in the sharing economy now more than ever. From a production perspective, resources will be saved as an outcome of the increased efficiency in the use of the asset. With less consumed new assets and more shared underused assets, the environmental advantage is clear.

Furthermore, this thesis could also be beneficial for sharing economy businesses in terms of Corporate Social Responsibility, or CSR. As this thesis gives an implication for what drives customers in the sharing economy, this information can be useful from an economic-, sustainability-, and social perspective. The underlying concept of the sharing economy is to optimize the resources available, corresponding to the corporate social responsibility of companies. Customers of Rentl clearly consider the phenomenon of the sharing economy to be a sustainable way of consuming. However, this positive attitude does not necessarily translate into an actual action for participation. This is something that can be implemented by sharing economy businesses when, for example, setting up their respectively business plan where CSR and sustainability are brought to attention. Once again, this implies the high relevance of the subject in today's society.

From a policy-makers perspective it is more complicated. There has been growing skepticism of many individuals alongside with the rapid expansion and the success of the sharing economy. And as previously discussed there is an ongoing debate concerning the sharing economy and if it is an ethical and fair way of consuming or not. Since it is expected that the sharing economy will expand rapidly in the upcom

Legal and privacy aspects
As previously mentioned, the sharing economy has come with some debates regarding the sharing economy. Arguably, inter alia, a benefit behind the engagement in sharing economy is somewhat based on the idea that the user does not have to pay for ownership of a rented product. However, this might in some instance cause legal- and insurance issues regarding the dispute as to who should stand liable for a broken or lost rented product. This issue would arguably not arise to the same extent, had the business transaction occurred in a traditional business to customer setting instead. This is because individuals engaged on a sharing platform are just that - individuals. As such, when an individual orders a taxi fare, he or she is not buying a service from a company with professional drivers, but is instead essentially getting a ride from another individual engaged on the same platform. If this car were to be in an accident, a dispute regarding who is liable for damages emerges. Furthermore, as individuals themselves are making use of the underused assets markets, such as the taxi industry or the hotel business, they might face severe damage. If customers change their behavior in the sense that they do
not engage in traditional ways of consuming and instead engage in the sharing economy, eventually one might question the need for the traditional *business to consumer* business model.

### 7.5 Limitations and Future Research

Even though the authors have presented significant findings of the conducted research describing the relationship between attitudes and actions of customers in the sharing economy it is also of importance to acknowledge the limitations of the research. The major limitation and disadvantage with the current study is the concern for the low response-rate. It is still of relevance and importance to present the results, conclusions and discussion, although it is presented with the assumption of having obtained an adequate response-rate. In order to counteract a low response-rate, several precautions were taken by the authors to ensure a representative sample. There amongst, three reminders were sent out to the sample of 2096 customers of Rentl. As previously discussed in section 4.4.1, there is no widely accepted minimum response-rate of which a study needs to obtain. While data from 145 respondents were collected and a response-rate of 10.79% was obtained the response-rate can still be considered as of adequacy since customer behavior is assumed to be homogeneous within the targeted population Rentl. Additionally, the sample can give an indication of adequacy considering the sample is still normally distributed according to Central Limit Theorem.

Taking into account the fact that the authors of this thesis are both students writing a degree project, the limitation of time and money is inevitable. Consequently with the limitations of time and money come limitations regarding the practical method. With more time and money it would have been possible to maintain the questionnaire open for a longer period to reach out to more respondents and send out more reminders in order to ensure or representative response-rate of the sample. Additionally, the relevant population to draw generalization from for this research is customers participating on the sharing platform of Rentl AB. It could be interesting to investigate the entire market of the sharing economy and not limit it to a certain geographic area. Lastly, this study does not make any distinctions between providing customer and renting customer of the sharing economy which may limit the study in the sense that the general attitudes and incentives among these two segments for participation may differ from each other. Instead this study considers all customers of the sharing economy as one homogeneous entity.

With the presented limitations in mind, future researchers are enlightened on how to imitate and improve this study. The authors of this research highly recommends future research regarding the customer behavior in the sharing economy, and more importantly, future research regarding the attitude-action gap. When conducting a study in this specific area of research, future researchers face many opportunities. The main suggestion for future research which the authors of this thesis recommend, is to entirely replicate this study with the aim of obtaining a higher response-rate. Due to the low response-rate of this study, no actual discussion can be held and hence, no actual conclusions of the results can be drawn.

Future researchers could also further investigate the reasons behind the attitude-action gap, assuming there is one identified in future research. It could be of interest to make the distinction between providing customer and renting customer and thus compare them both towards each other. As previously discussed, there is an ongoing debate
whether or not the sharing economy is an ethical way of consuming or not. With this in mind, the authors of this thesis wanted to conduct a quantitative study because of the minimum amount of interaction with the respondents leaving little or no room for opinions influencing their answers. Although, it could be of future interest to conduct a qualitative study or a mixed methods study in order to gain a deeper knowledge regarding the relationship between attitudes and actions.

7.6 Quality Criteria in Business Research

When conducting a quantitative study it is vital for the researchers to discuss the reliability, validity, and generalizability in order to evaluate the quality of the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 41; Yilmaz, 2013, p. 320). The criterion of reliability evaluates the accuracy of what is studied (Heale & Twycross, 2015, p. 66). Reliability is concerned with whether the results of the research are possible to repeat, and if repeated and used in a similar situation consistently shows likewise results (Heale & Twycross, 2015, p. 66). Thus, the reliability is concerned with the internal consistency of a measure of interest to research (Heale & Twycross, 2015, p. 66). In order to test the internal consistency, and hence the reliability of a research a commonly used test is Cronbach’s alpha (Heale & Twycross, 2015, p. 67). A reliability analysis was therefore performed by the authors where all variables were tested. All variables of interest for this research were found to be statistically reliable according to Cronbach’s alpha. This because all coefficients for internal reliability were above 0.8 according to Cronbach’s alpha and can thus be considered as statistically reliable.

Validity is the most important criterion of any research which is related to the criterion of reliability according to Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 42). Validity is concerned with the ability to measure what the research is supposed to measure (Coughlan et al., 2007, p. 662). Considering all the variables of interest to research were found to be reliable, although just because they are reliable does not consequently mean that they are valid. If they are found not to be measuring what they are supposed to, the constructs would be reliable but not valid. As the authors previously explained in Chapter 4, the questionnaire item is constructed based on several previous researches. In other words, most of the questions and statements in the survey has already been used and tested statistically which increases the validity for this study. More importantly the validity increased as a pilot study was conducted where respondents gave their feedback of the survey construction in relation to the aim of this study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 160).

The criterion of generalizability is concerned with the ability of applying the results of the research to other individuals than those already covered in the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 163). It is common that researchers of quantitative studies seek the ability to generalize the findings of the research (Yilmaz, 2013, p. 323). Additionally it is common with a research embracing an objective research philosophy and relies on quantitative methods for collecting and analyzing numerical data to aim at making generalizations by collecting many responses (Yilmaz, 2013, p. 323). With the conducted study it is of interest to apply the results to other than the respondents obtained from Rentl, but rather all customers of the sharing economy in Sweden. In other words, it is in the authors' interest to generalize the findings beyond just this case. In order to increase the ability to generalize the results of the research, one of the most important techniques for researchers is to conduct a random-sampling when collecting the data (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 169). This is done for the reason of getting a representative sample, and further being able to state that the empirical findings of the
research are not solely unique to the sampled customers. If this is not emphasized, there is the risk of the sample being one-sided and not properly representing the population of interest. Thus, one cannot generalize the results. For this research a simple random sample is the used sampling technique in order to collect the data of relevance and thus increases the generalizability. However, considering the response-rate is insufficient which made it difficult to generalize the data collected by the questionnaire - the generalizability is in this study therefore of inadequacy.

Although the current research falls short in its generalizability, it measures what it is supposed to, and does so with accuracy. Therefore, the criteria of validity and reliability are fulfilled. Notwithstanding the arguably low response rate, given that the members of Rentl AB can be considered a homogenous group, the obtained results given in chapter five maintain the ability to draw inferences about the entire population (the registered users at Rentl AB). Accordingly, although the research at hand has studied the relationship between attitudes and actions with accuracy, it lacks the ability to generalize these results to other settings than that of Rentl’s registered members. However, the authors of the current thesis maintain the belief that this thesis possesses valuable data for other managers than those at Rentl AB. This is because it provides them with insights on people’s incentives for participation in sharing economy, and if they actually follow up on them.
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## Appendix 1

### Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I find participating in shared economy to be a wise move.</td>
<td>Ajzen, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I think shared economy is something positive.</td>
<td>Ajzen, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I think participating in shared economy is something good.</td>
<td>Ajzen, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I believe shared economy is a better way of consumption than selling and buying individually.</td>
<td>Ajzen, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>I think shared economy is enjoyable and fun.</td>
<td>Hawlitschek, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>I think shared economy is exciting and interesting.</td>
<td>Hawlitschek, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>I think shared economy is a sustainable way for consumption.</td>
<td>Hamari et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>I think shared economy is environmentally friendly.</td>
<td>Hamari et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>I think shared economy is convenient.</td>
<td>Schiel, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>I think shared economy is time saving.</td>
<td>Schiel, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>Engagement in sharing economy benefits me financially.</td>
<td>Hamari et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits</td>
<td>Engagement in sharing economy can improve my financial situation.</td>
<td>Hamari et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Actions</td>
<td>When I last participated in shared economy I did it because it was enjoyable.</td>
<td>Constructed by the authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Actions</td>
<td>When I last participated in sharing economy, I did it because it was sustainable.</td>
<td>Constructed by the authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Actions</td>
<td>When I last participated in sharing economy, I did it because it was convenient.</td>
<td>Constructed by the authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Actions</td>
<td>When I last participated in sharing economy, I did it because it was financially beneficial.</td>
<td>Constructed by the authors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Google Forms Questionnaire

Konsumentbeteende inom delningsekonomi

Käre Rentl-kund,

Vi är två civilkonomistuderande från Umeå Universitet och är intresserade av just din äsikt. För tillfället öser vi vårt fjärde år och skriver examensarbete om delningsekonomi och kundbeteende. Denna enkåt är en del av vårt examensarbete och tar endast 5 minuter att färdigställa, och just ditt svar har stor betydelse för vår studie. Dina svar behandlas helt anonymt och kommer inte vara möjliga att ursera ur resultaten.


Vi vill tacka dig så hensiktigt mycket för samarbetet!

Med vänliga hälsningar,
Anders Nordström och Rebecka Esseen

*Obligatorisk

1. Nationalitet *
   - Svensk
   - Annan

2. Kön *
   - Man
   - Kvinna
   - Annat

Jag är kund hos Rentl *
   - Ja
   - Nej

3. Ålder *
   - Ditt svar
4. Har du någonsin varit delaktig inom delningsekonomi genom att erbjuda tjänster eller varor? *
   ○ Ja
   ○ Nej

5. Har du någonsin deltagit i delningsekonomi genom att svara på erbjudanden från andra? *
   ○ Ja
   ○ Nej

6. Om ja till någon av två ovanstående frågor - när skedde ditt senaste deltagande? *
   ○ Mindre än 3 månader sedan
   ○ Mindre än ett år sedan
   ○ Mindre än tre år sedan
   ○ Mer än tre år sedan
   ○ Har inte deltagit

Skicka ditt lösenord med Google Formulär

Det här innehållet har varken skapats eller godkänts av Google. Anmäl otillåten användning. - Användarn villkor
Ytterligare villkor

Google Formulär
Konsumentbeteende inom delningsekonomi

*Obligatorisk

Konsumentbeteende inom delningsekonomi (sida 2)

7a. Jag tycker att deltagande i delningsekonomi är ett smart agerande.*

Håller inte alls med □ □ □ □ □

Håller fullständigt med □ □ □ □ □

7b. Jag tycker att delningsekonomi är något positivt.*

Håller inte alls med □ □ □ □ □

Håller fullständigt med □ □ □ □ □

7c. Jag tycker att mitt deltagande i delningsekonomi är något positivt.*

Håller inte alls med □ □ □ □ □

Håller fullständigt med □ □ □ □ □

7d. Jag tycker att delningsekonomi är ett bättre sätt att konsumera på än att traditionellt sälja och köpa.*

Håller inte alls med □ □ □ □ □

Håller fullständigt med □ □ □ □ □

Slippa aldrig läsningar med Google Formulär

Det här innehållet har varken skapats eller godkänts av Google. Anmäl obehörliga användningar - Användarvillkor - Yttrandefrihet villkor

Google Formulär
Konsumentbeteende inom delningsekonomi

8a. Jag tycker att deltagande i delningsekonomi är underhållande och kul. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>åsikt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fullständigt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8b. Jag tycker att deltagande i delningsekonomi är spännande och intressant. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>åsikt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fullständigt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9a. Jag tycker att deltagande i delningsekonomi är ett hållbart sätt att konsumera. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>åsikt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fullständigt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9b. Jag tycker att engagemang i delningsekonomi är miljövänligt. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>åsikt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fullständigt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10a. Jag tycker att deltagande i delningsekonomi är praktiskt och bekvämt. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>åsikt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fullständigt med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. Jag tycker att delningsekonomi gör att jag sparar tid. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håller inte alls med</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11a. Jag tycker att delningsekonomi gynnar mig ekonomiskt. *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Håller inte alls med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11b. Jag tycker att delningsekonomi kan förbättra min ekonomiska situation. *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Håller inte alls med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bakåt**  **Nästa**

Skicka aliigt lösenord med Google Formulär
Konsumentbeteende inom delningsekonomi

12a. När jag senast deltog i delningsekonomi var det på grund av att det var kul. *

12b. När jag senast deltog i delningsekonomi var det på grund av att det var miljövänligt. *

12c. När jag senast deltog i delningsekonomi var det på grund av att det var bekvämt och praktiskt. *

12d. När jag senast deltog i delningsekonomi var det på grund av att det var ekonomiskt fördelaktigt. *