UQAC

Université du Québec
à Chicoutimi

The impacts of behavioral variables on switchover effects in the collaborative economy (CE)

par Émilie Boily

Mémoire présenté à l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi en vue de l'obtention du grade de Maître (M. Sc.) en gestion des organisations

Québec, Canada

ABSTRACT

This study is based on the broad theoretical corpus of spillover effects from the pro-environmental literature. Behavioural characteristics would influence spillover effects in pro-environmental behaviour (PEB). This research assumes that this dimension of behavioural characteristics would also explain the switchover effects in the collaborative economy (subsequently CE), either in the transition from user to provider of goods or services. To measure the impact of behavioural variables, empirical data were collected with the MTurk platform and compiled with Qualtrics from 207 consumers who have already conducted collaborative practices in the past. The study uses a quantitative approach with an experimental design of three variables with two levels (type 3 x 2 x 2). The data were analyzed with a series of ANOVA analyses to verify each independent variable's main effect and their interaction effect on the dependent variable. Research results indicate that behavioural variables (e.g., number of people performing the behaviour, perceived difficulty level, and experience with the collaborative behavior) could explain the CE's switchover effects.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude se base sur le vaste corpus théorique relatif aux effets de renversement (*spillover effects*) issu de la littérature pro-environnementale. Les caractéristiques du comportement constitueraient une dimension exerçant une grande influence dans les effets de renversement dans les comportement pro-environnementaux (PEB). La présente recherche suppose que cette dimension des caractéristiques comportementales expliquerait également les effets de renversement dans l'économie collaborative (subséquemment ÉC) soit dans le passage du rôle d'utilisateur à fournisseur de biens ou de services. Pour tenter de mesurer l'impact des variables comportementales, les données empiriques ont été collectées avec la plateforme MTurk et compilées avec Qualtrics à partir de 207 consommateurs qui ont déjà réalisés des pratiques collaboratives dans le passé. L'étude utilise une approche quantitative avec une conception expérimentale de trois variables avec deux niveaux (type 3 x 2 x 2). Les données ont été analysées avec une série d'analyse ANOVA afin de vérifier l'effet principal de chaque variable indépendante et leur effet d'interaction sur la variable dépendante. Les résultats de la recherche révèlent que les variables du comportements (ex., le nombre de personnes réalisant le comportement, le niveau de difficulté perçu et les comportements passés) pourraient expliquer les effets de renversements au sein de l'ÉC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA: Analysis of Variance

CE: Collaborative economy

Df: Degree(s) of freedom

EFA: Exploratory Factor Analysis

F: Fisher statistic

INT: Intentions

MC: Manipulation check

P2P: Peer-to-peer

PEB: Pro-environmental behavior

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

DEDICATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the collaborative economy (subsequently CE) has significantly disrupted the landscape of retail and consumer services (Möhlmann, 2015; Tussydadiah & Pesonen, 2018). This phenomenon is noticeable in various areas such as food, accommodation, transport, and access to goods and services (Correa et al., 2019; Yeo et al., 2017). The CE's specific characteristic is that it allows the consumer to change roles from a user status to a provider of goods or services and vice versa (Ertz et al., 2019). In their work, Ertz et al. (2016, 2019) assume that specific behavioral characteristics can explain this transition in the CE. However, existing studies and research do not reveal how such behavioral characteristics drive consumers from a user role to a provider role in the CE. This is crucial because the success of collaborative business models depends on their ability to recruit enough suppliers. Otherwise, the demand is declining (Eisenmann et al., 2006; Chu and Manchanda, 2016; Marte, 2015). Suppliers have 3.5 times more impact than users on collaborative systems' growth (Chu and Manchanda, 2016).

The motivations that lead individuals to acquire and dispose of objects appear similar and go beyond financial characteristics. Several authors have looked at the motivations of consumers predicting their participation in the CE (e.g., Hawlitschek et al., 2018; Li & Wen, 2019; Park & Armstrong's, 2019; Ter Huurne et al., 2017). For example, Torrent-Sellens et al. (2020) have developed a model based on previous research to study the motivations and barriers present among consumers on providing and obtaining platforms. The main motivations identified are price, novelty, convenience, non-monetary exchanges. The main barriers identified are lack of responsibility, lack of fulfilling expectations, and lack of trust. Overall, some authors have pointed that consumers' motivations are closely related to their behaviour (Ertz, Durif & Lecompte, 2017; Haire, 1950; Tauber, 1972; Webster & Von Pechmann, 1970; Westbrook & Black, 1985). Recently, Ertz et al. (2021) have associated change in the transition from a user role to a provider role in the CE with the concept of spillover effect taken from the pro-environmental literature. The spillover effect refers to how the adoption of behavior leads to adopting one or other behaviours. According to the studies on pro-

environmental behavior (PEB), the present research assumes that this dimension of behavioral characteristics, identified at several levels by the authors in the pro-environmental literature (e.g., Thøgersen, 1999; Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003; Thøgersen, 2004; Thøgersen & Crompton, 2009), would also explain the original concept of switchover effects in the CE, i.e., in the transition from user to supplier of goods or services. To some authors who have studied PEB (e.g., Truelove et al., 2014), the perceived difficulty of the behavior may significantly influence the adoption of other behaviors so that negative spillover effects occur. On the other hand, for authors such as Van der Werff et al. (2014), the difficulty and uniqueness of behavior appeal to individuals as it contributes to their forming a personal identity. Personal identity is being reinforced when people put more effort into performing. While past studies have been carried out about individuals' motivations to participate in the CE, no existing study has considered the importance of behavioural variables (e.g., the perceived level of difficulty or the uniqueness of the behavior) and their impacts on the newly introduced concept of switchover intimately linked to the spillover effect taken from the pro-environmental literature (e.g., Harland et al., 1999, Thøgersen, 1999; Truelove et al., 2014; Van der Werff et al., 2014).

For this reason, the overall objective of this research is to determine the process underlying the switchover effects in the CE. According to an experimental design, the specific objective is to empirically estimate to which extent specific behavioural variables lead consumers to move from a user role to a CE supplier. Thus, the research question is read as follows: To what extent do variables related to collaborative behaviour lead consumers to move from a user role to a provider role in the CE?

To meet the overall and specific objectives, this study uses a causal methodological design based on an experimental approach (Malhotra, 2009) of type 2 (experience with the collaborative behavior: none, one, two or more) × 2 (perception of people performing the behavior: FEW, MANY) × 2 (perceived behavioural difficulty: DIFFICULTY, EASE). For the purpose of this study, Difficulty of the behavior and Number of people doing the behavior, which relate to the uniqueness of the behavior, are retained. Behaviour achievement is measured at the within-subject level, while the

2

perception of people performing the behaviour and perceived behavioural difficulty are both manipulated using a between-subject design. The study conducts an online experiment using Qualtrics software, and participants are recruited on Amazon's MTurk platform. Data were analyzed with the statistical software platform Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The study includes a filtering survey that ensures that respondents are at least eighteen years old and are users but not providers in CE exchange schemes (see Appendix I). After having indicated their experience with the collaborative behavior, participants are randomly assigned to four conditions consisting of four scenarios in which the variables of perception of the number of people performing the behaviour and the perceived difficulty of the behaviour are modulated (Scenario 1: FEW people, easy behaviour or EASE; scenario 2: many people, easy behavior or EASE; Scenario 3: FEW people, difficult behaviour; Scenario 4: many people, difficult behavior). Respondents also answer questions about the control of the priming of the experimental conditions (i.e., manipulation checks) as well as control variables (e.g., age, sex, income, education, marital status) (see Appendix III). Therefore, this study seeks to provide a basis for future research on the impacts of behavioral variables, or other variables, on switchover effects in the CE.

The contributions of this research are twofold. On a theoretical level, the main contribution of this research is the creation of the new concept of the switchover effect, previously non-existent in the literature on the CE. The idea was developed from the pro-environmental literature on spillover effects. This research also differs from previous ones by using an experimental model to understand the impacts of behavioural variables on consumers' intention to change roles (i.e., users or providers) in CE. More broadly, the new findings of the research provide a basis for future research. Recent data have been collected and tested with individuals, which had not been done before. These new results provide unique insights on individual behaviours in marketing and consumer behaviour. On a practical level, this study has found that some specific behavioral variables (i.e., experience with the collaborative behavior, the difficulty of the behaviour, and the number of people performing the behavior impact switchover effects. While the success and development of collaborative platforms

depend on the system's ability to renew and attract new suppliers (Chu and Manchanda, 2016), managers of these platforms must understand the factors that lead individuals to achieve collaborative behaviors. With the increasing digitalization of platforms and the number of digital and collaborative platforms, it is therefore essential that managers receive information about this growing environment that transforms governance, transaction costs, user confidence (Ertz & Boily, 2019) and the amount of customer data (Ghilal & Nach, 2019).

This research is divided into six main parts. (1) A review of the literature on spillover effects has been produced to show the correlation between this concept identified in the pro-environmental literature and the concept of switchover effects. (2) After selecting behavioural variables that may explain switchover effects in CE, data collection and analysis were conducted (3). (4) The results are presented to perceive the distinctive elements in the behaviours of consumers involved in CE. (5) Research also involves presenting the contributions for literature and management fields. (6) Finally, the limits of the study and future avenues are identified.

CHAPTER 1

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE COLLABORATIVE ECONOMY

1.1 DEFINING THE COLLABORATIVE ECONOMY

The CE's emergence has significantly disrupted the retail and consumer services landscape (Möhlmann, 2015; Tussydadiah & Pesonen, 2018). This phenomenon is noticeable in various areas such as food, accommodation, transport, and access to goods and services (Correa et al., 2019; Yeo et al., 2017).

Expanding in parallel with digital technology (Acquier et al., 2017), the CE relies primarily on peer-to-peer exchanges (Belk, 2014; Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Ertz et al., 2019). As such, the CE is transforming how people produce, consume, finance, and learn, using networks of connected individuals and communities rather than centralized institutions. The CE consists of four (4) significant subdivisions: collaborative production, collaborative education, collaborative finance, and collaborative consumption (Botsman, 2013). The CE includes trading, renting, pooling, or sharing, instead of traditional trade (Ertz et al., 2016).

Currently, there is no commonly accepted definition of the CE (Botsman, 2013). According to Hawlitschek et al. (2016), it can be explained by the rapid growth of collaborative practices. The CE is generally associated with concepts such as sharing economy, collaborative consumption, on-demand economy, on-demand services, group economy, independent economy, peer economy, digital economy, gig economy, and platform economy (Botsman, 2015; Rinne, 2017). For this study, the term ''collaborative economy'' is used as it is best suited to the idea of a new socio-economic model involving cooperation between peers (Tussyadiah & Pesonen, 2018). It is also used because of its ability to include redistribution and mutualization (Ertz et al., 2019). While redistribution refers to exchanges involving the transfer of ownership, mutualization relates to access to resources without ownership (Acquier et al., 2017). Ertz et al. (2019) argue that the CE allows for mutualization through new exchange systems.

Ertz et al. (2019) explain that the CE allows mutualization through new circulation systems that involve peers and essentially involve the use of web platforms. Also, the concept of a CE increases consumption as well as production and distribution. Hence, the CE can be defined as a comprehensive, hybrid system (Dalli & Corciolani, 2008; Corcionali & Dalli, 2014; Ertz et al., 2019; Figueiredo & Scaraboto, 2016; Scaraboto, 2015) that incorporates classic forms of exchange such as gifts, sharing and product exchanges in a unified way (Belk, 2010; Corciolani & Dalli, 2014; Ertz et al., 2019). According to Botsman (2011, 2013, 2015), the CE can be defined as:

> An economy built on distributed networks of connected individuals and communities versus centralized institutions, transforming how we can produce, consume, finance, and learn (Botsman, 2011, p.1).

The CE involves a redistribution of goods through a monetized exchange and swapping or donation (Botsman & Rogers, 2010). These activities are mainly carried out through organizations, offline channels, or multi-channel systems. Therefore, they refer as much to the use of digital platform intermediaries, such as Uber or Airbnb, as to participation in face-to-face exchange meetings or local exchange systems (Albinsson & Perera, 2012; Arsel & Dobscha, 2011; Ertz et al., 2019).

Through alternative practices, the CE engages the consumer in the value production chain (Ertz et al., 2016). Therefore, the user is not considered a simple consumer (Engel et al. 1978; Hawkins et al. 1980), suggesting that the modernist distinction between production and consumption has been weakened (Perret, 2015). The individual can now assume a co-producer's role through recycling, composting, repairing, or providing goods or services (Ertz et al., 2019; Martin & Schouten, 2012; Wood & Ball, 2013). As Eisenmann, Parker, and Van Alstyne (2006) demonstrated, the consumer's role is changing by nature. The transition of consumers to a buyer or a supplier role is a leading component of the CE. Ertz et al. (2016) underline the importance of consumers' changing role in these exchanges. Collaborative systems allow consumers to change their roles by becoming suppliers of goods and services (Ertz et al., 2018).

1.2 DEFINING USER AND PROVIDER ROLES

It has been previously said that the CE is transforming the respective role of consumers by allowing them to become suppliers. According to Ertz et al. (2016), a consumer who provides a specific resource or service directly or indirectly through an intermediary (for example, a peer-to-peer platform such as Airbnb or Uber) is a *provider*. Conversely, a consumer seeking a resource provided directly by another consumer or indirectly by an intermediary is an *obtainer* (or a *user*). Table 1 presents the functions and actions of the user role and the provider role within the CE.

Table 1: Distinction between User and Provider in the collaborative economy (adapted from Ertz et al. 2016; 2018)

Role	User	Provider
Function	Seeks to use a resource provided either directly, by another consumer (i.e., the supplier), or indirectly through the mediation of an organization as a "facilitator intermediary" or "Intermediary mediator" (for profit or not for profit)	Provides a specific resource either directly, to a consumer (i.e., the user), or indirectly through a "facilitator" or an "intermediary mediator" (for profit or not for profit)
Action	Use - Redistribution: second purchase main (including the purchase of products refurbished or reconditioned), receipt of donation, barter; - Pooling: rental/loan/access to a free resource or for a compensation (excluding access resources from companies only)	Provision - Redistribution: sale of occasion, gift, barter (in including reverse logistics or trade-in programs with an organization); - Pooling: rental/loan a free resource or for compensation

Ertz et al. (2019) affirm that the consumer moves from a user role to a supplier role through a switchover effect. These authors define the concept switchover effect by demonstrating its relationship to a more widely understood concept: the spillover effect. To study the implications of this concept in the CE, the relationship between spillover effects and switchover effects must be considered.

CHAPTER 2

**CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE SPILLOVER AND THE SWITCHOVER EFFECTS IN THE
COLLABORATIVE ECONOMY**

2.1 DEFINING THE SPILLOVER AND THE SWITCHOVER EFFECTS

Spillover effects (also called ripple effects) are studied in various academic disciplines, such as marketing, economics, psychology, environmental behaviors, and international relations. The literature on spillover effects is mainly associated with pro-environmental behaviour (subsequently PEB) (e.g., Harland et al., 1999, Thøgersen, 1999; Truelove et al., 2014; Van der Werff et al., 2014). The authors argue that this concept's limited scope can be expanded when PEB in one or more areas spread to other domains (e.g., Ertz et al., 2021; Thøgersen, 1999). Chatelain et al.'s (2018) research results highlight the idea that the reversal shift occurs when the achievement of an initial behavior increases or decreases the probability that another behavior occurs. When the initial behavior spurs another related behavior, this can be defined as positive spillover. If the initial behavior dampens the occurrence of another related behavior, this can be defined as negative spillover (Chatelain et al., 2018).

Truelove et al. (2014) provided a unifying theoretical framework to review existing research on PEB spillover effects. Their study demonstrates that spillover effects are associated with consumer behaviour and positively or negatively impact the PEB (Truelove et al., 2014). These positive or negative outcomes can also have an impact on other behaviours. For example, spillover occurs when implementing a local plastic bag tax affects plastic bag consumption and recycling behavior. Spillover effects can be both negative and positive. Negative spillover occurs when the successful increase in one PEB is associated with a reduction in another PEB (Thøgersen & Crompton, 2009), for example, a drop in participation in a recycling program in response to the introduction of a bag tax. Positive spillover occurs when an increase in one PEB is associated with an increase in another PEB (Austin et al., 2011, DEFRA, 2008), for example, an increase in recycling products in response to the introduction of a bag tax (Trulove et al., 2014, p. 128).

Truelove et al. (2014) have also studied external and internal motivating and moderating PEB factors. For example:

- An external motivating factor can be to be paid or forced to do something;
- An internal motivating factor can be a boost in moral self-image when carpooling or recycling;
- An external moderating factor can occur if a reduction in energy costs leads to new appliances.
- An internal moderating factor can be the perception of losing a lot of time when taking the bus rather than drive a car.

The research results of Truelove and al. (2014) indicated the presence of actions taken to positively encourage behavioural change in society, such as public awareness campaigns, tax incentives, regulatory policies, and so on. Accordingly, Thøgersen and Crompton (2009) claim that negative spillover occurs when a specific behaviour or initiative reduces another behavior.

Recently, Ertz et al. (2021) have proposed a definition of the spillover effect by associating the concept with changes in individual motivation or preferences. According to these authors, the spillover effect refers to how adopting a specific behavior leads to adopting another behaviour or other behaviours. Their research differs from studies on the subject by incorporating the concept of "crossover" that occurs when an effect changes the target from the initial impact (Ertz et al., 2021). To this end, Ertz et al. (2016) underline the importance of consumers' changing role in these exchanges. Behavioural characteristics significantly influence the spillover effects (Harland et al., 1999; Thøgersen, 1999; Truelove et al., 2014; Van der Werff et al., 2014).

The switchover effect is associated with the spillover effect in that it refers to the sequential aspects of a reaction chain or a passage from an "A" point to a "B" point. However, the spillover effect occurs between behaviours with a certain level of similarity (e.g., composting to recycling) (Lauren et al., 2016). In contrast, the switchover refers to switching from a specific behaviour (e.g., user) to a different one (e.g., reseller).

To identify switchover effects' fundamental characteristics, the study using a model based on three examples (a buyer moving to a seller role, a consumer moving to a producer role and a receiver moving to a gift giver role). Their research identified five (5) specific elements:

- The switchover effect is induced by a cause that varies depending on the context;

- The switchover effect is not restricted to the similarity of behaviour (all passages from point A to point B are considered a switchover);

- The switchover effect can lead to different, opposing or contradictory states;

- The switchover effect involves a wide range of effects resulting from the transition from point A to point B;

- The switchover effect is potentially reversible.

In short, the switchover is induced by a cause that conducts the individual to move from one role (A) to another (B). This switchover then to brings changes in behaviours, perceptions, relationships, roles, and identities. However, the individual in a new role (B) may return to the role (A) that preceded the switchover.

However, since past research has not conceptualized the switchover effect, it remains unclear to which extent behavioural characteristics support the switchover effect in the CE, particularly in the transition from user to supplier of goods or services. In the present study, it is assumed that this dimension of behavioral characteristics, identified at several levels by the authors in the pro-environmental literature (e.g., Thøgersen, 1999; Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003; Thøgersen, 2004; Thøgersen & Crompton, 2009), would also explain the switchover effects in the CE, i.e., in the transition from user to supplier of goods or services. However, existing studies and research do not reveal to which extent behavioural variables drive consumers to switch from a user role to a provider role in the CE.

2.2 SWITCHOVER EFFECTS IN THE COLLABORATIVE ECONOMY: IDENTIFYING VARIABLES

Currently, there is a limited amount of studies on the switchover effect in the CE. However, the exploratory research carried out previously by the Laboratoire sur les Nouvelles Formes de Consommation (LaboNFC) at the Université du Québec à Chicoutimi (Ertz et al., 2021) has

identified a total of four meta-categories that may explain the transition from a user role to a supplier one in the CE.

The lab members conducted an exploratory study that included in-depth interviews with 31 consumers who had experience as purchasers. These acquirers can potentially become suppliers. The researchers have performed a combination of snowball sampling with convenience sampling (ad posted to a Facebook group) and reasoned sampling (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to recruit respondents. Respondents were selected according to two criteria: (1) be a part of the millennial generation (18 and 33 years old) because this cohort is the most active in the CE (Godelnik, 2017; Hwang & Griffiths, 2017); and (2) have experience in the CE as an acquirer and/or a supplier. Researchers sought to optimize respondents' heterogeneity (Patton, 2002) in terms of age, gender, and citizenship. The in-depth method provided complexity and profundity of thought, while the relatively large sample size provided breadth (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Both helped to generate information-rich data (Patton, 2002). The interviews lasted between 25 and 70 minutes, were all audio-recorded and transcribed in the text to be used as input for qualitative data analysis. Each interviewee had to read a definition of the CE and critical terms such as redistribution and mutualization. They also received a cheat sheet to remember each definition.

Subsequently, respondents were asked to (1) describe their redistribution and/or mutualization (i.e., buying used items, reselling, giving or receiving donations, swapping, lending or renting, leasing, pooling, sharing) activities carried out in the past; to (2) indicate whether they started as a buyer or a supplier; to (3) describe how they went from one role to another. Interviewers used conventional qualitative techniques (Patton, 2002), such as asking for clarification, repeating and rephrasing respondents' answers, triggering spontaneous and honest responses, showing empathy, and ensuring privacy and confidentiality. At the end of the interviews, they were asked to mention anything that came to their mind about the CE. For the analysis, a thematic analysis technique was applied to all the data collected. The transcripts resulting from the discussions with the 31 respondents were analyzed and summarized in a short synthesis. The results allowed the authors to identify three

themes. These themes were classified to consider the three meta-categories of the literature that could explain the switchover effects in the CE. These themes are:

- individual;

- context;

- behavioral characteristics.

Their research also revealed the existence of a new variable absent from literature: sociality.

2.2.1 NEW META-CATEGORY IDENTIFIED: SOCIALITY

The new theme identified by the research team is the importance of social gains through collaborative practices. As they move from one role to another in the CE, participants perceive socially beneficial elements. In terms of sociality, respondents indicated that moving from a user role to a supplier role, and vice versa, allowed them to: meet new people, discover new cultures, chat and interact meaningfully with others. Respondents were conscious that the CE enriches their interactions with others and their human relationships (Ertz et al., 2021).

2.2.2 META-CATEGORIES IN THE LITERATURE: INDIVIDUAL, CONTEXTUAL, AND BEHAVIOURAL VARIABLES

There are many references to individual variables in the existing literature. These variables can potentially explain the CE's changing role, previously described as the shift from a user status to a supplier status of goods or services, and vice versa. The authors mention personal identity, past behaviors, self-efficacy, norms and values, intrinsic motivations, intention, source of behavior, objectives, and resources. Indeed, individuals seem more likely to change roles or collaborative behaviors when it matches their identity (Dolan & Galizzi, 2015, Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014; Nilsson et al., 2017; Poortinga et al., 2013; Whitmarsh & O 'Neill, 2010), they are confident in their ability to perform the associated behavior (Corral-Verdugo et al., 2016; Lauren et al., 2016), the associated behavior conforms to their norms and values (Corral-Verdugo et al., 2016; Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014; Poortinga et al., 201 3; Thøgersen, 2004; Trope et al., 2007), and the associated behavior enables them to achieve the same set of similar objectives and goals (Margetts & Kashima, 2017; Thøgersen, 2004). In the specific context of switchover, Ertz et al. (2021) identify self-efficacy,

satisfaction, and self-construal (independent vs. dependent) as useful explanatory variables in the switchover process.

In their exploratory study, Ertz et al. (2021) also identify the importance of context for understanding switchover. Many authors point out that the context (e.g., regulation, financial incentives, or verbal rewards) has a strong influence on the adoption of the initial and the following behaviors (Corral-Verdugo et al., 2016; Nilsson et al., 2017; Thøgersen, 2004; Trope et al., 2007; Whitmarsh & O'Neill, 2010; Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014). The context brings extrinsic motives that may result in the adoption of a behavior by an individual. In the context of switchover, Ertz et al. (2021) support that commerciality and solidarity explain switchover effects in the CE.

Studies that focus on the adoption of a behavior and the behavioral variables generally refer to the consequences of past behaviors, similarity, and the difficulty or the cost associated with the behavior (Dolan & Galizzi, 2015; Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014; Lauren et al., 2016; Margetts & Kashima, 2017; Poortinga et al., 2013; Thøgersen, 2004; Thøgersen & Crompton, 2009; Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003; Trope et al., 2007; Truelove et al., 2014). It seems that the switchover effect and the desire to engage in a different but related behavior is more likely to occur when the consequences of the behavior performed in the past are positive, that the associated behavior is considered to be similar to the initial behavior, that the behavior is judged not to be too difficult (Lauren et al., 2016) or the cost associated with the behavior is not too high (Dolan & Galizzi, 2015; Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014). Ertz et al. (2021) support past behaviour, perceived level of difficulty, and perceived number of people as key behavioural indicators underlying the switchover process.

CHAPTER 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BEHAVIOR

This study is part of a larger research project that covers all of the meta-categories presented above. The current component focuses on the impacts of behavioural variables in the CE. Therefore, the individual, social, and contextual variables will not be addressed in this study but could be explored in future research. It should be specified that Ertz et al. (2021) have highlighted the influence of behavioral-specific variables in the switchover process in the CE, including experience with collaborative behaviour (i.e., experience with the collaborative behavior) and perceived behavioural difficulty. According to Thøgersen (1999) and Truelove et al. (2014), behavioural characteristics are a dimension that has a significant influence in the spillover process for PEB and, although the switchover effect is only tangential to the spillover one, those behavioural characteristics may also play a crucial role in explaining the switchover effects in the CE.

Based on the results previously obtained by Ertz et al. (2021), characteristics of the behavior can refer to the consequences of experience with the collaborative behavior, the difficulty, and the uniqueness of the behavior. The consequences of experience with the collaborative behavior refer to the extent to which the behavior resulted in a positive or negative outcome. Steg and Vlek (2009) pointed out the importance of experience with collaborative behavior in forming habits. Similarly, past positive consequences arising from a given behavior may trigger the desire to engage in a different although related behavior.

Regarding similarity, researchers are very consensual on the fact that individuals are more likely to engage in other similar rather than dissimilar behaviors (Dolan & Galizzi, 2015; Lanzini & Thøgersen, 2014; Lauren et al., 2016; Margetts & Kashima, 2017; Poortinga et al., 2013; Thøgersen, 2004; Thøgersen & Crompton, 2009; Thøgersen & Ölander, 2003; Trope et al., 2007; Truelove et al., 2014). Individuals adopt a number of behaviors that they consider similar while finding it hard to adopt a behavior that is not similar to their initial behavior. Thus, depending on the mental representations that the individual makes of the characteristics of the behaviors as similar or not, this could influence

the probability of the spillover effects (e.g., the probability of performing similar collaborative behaviors).

In addition, the difficulty and the uniqueness of the behavior can also act on the spillover effects, but the results are mixed. To some authors (e.g., Truelove et al., 2014), the difficulty may be a brake on adopting other behaviors so that negative spillover effects occur. On the other hand, for authors such as Van der Werff et al. (2014), the difficulty and uniqueness of behavior appeal to individuals as it contributes to their forming a personal identity. Personal identity is being reinforced when people put more effort into performing difficult and unique behaviors because difficulty alone is not enough. In that sense, both difficulty and uniqueness are more conducive to spillover effects by activating personal identity.

3.1   EXPERIENCE WITH THE COLLABORATIVE BEHAVIOR

In the exploratory research conducted by the LaboNFC (Ertz et al., 2021), several respondents indicated that their first collaborative experience was significant in determining whether they were eligible to adopt a reverse user-provider role. A first collaborative behavior familiarizes users with the mechanisms of the collaborative scheme and makes the participant feel comfortable with this system. Conversely, some respondents indicated that they did not feel comfortable enough to adopt another role because the experience of initial collaborative behaviour was negative. The verbatims of the interviews identified that experience with collaborative behavior could stimulate or inhibit the switchover effect. Also, Ertz et al. (2021) identify additional contingent variables in the CE that mitigate these results (i.e., distrusting strangers, sense of personal intimacy, lack of resources to share, lack of skills). Therefore, the positive result of behaviour in one role (e.g., user) does not guarantee the transition to another role (e.g., provider). For example, despite their positive experience as users of the Airbnb platform, respondents often feel reluctant to offer the service as hosts (providers) due to privacy or intimacy barriers. Subsequent pre-tests also demonstrate a reluctance to become hosts among some respondents who had positive experiences in the past as users of a collaborative platform, such as Airbnb.

3.2 PERCEIVED DIFFICULTY OF THE BEHAVIOUR

The verbatims identify the participants' perceived difficulty as a determinant of the switchover effect (Ertz et al., 2021). If, in general, participants think that collaborative behaviours are easy to achieve, they may adopt more collaborative behaviours. Using the internet would facilitate collaborative practices for some participants (e.g., using a collaborative platform to exchange property with another user). Nevertheless, some participants consider it easy to perform collaborative behaviors without going on the internet (e.g., giving something to a loved one).

3.3 PERCEIVED NUMBER OF PEOPLE PERFORMING THE BEHAVIOR

Besides, to confirm switchover effects variables of previous research (e.g., pro-environmental behaviour), this study reveals a new meta-category of explanatory variables specific to the CE consistent with its inherent community aspect (Qasem et al., 2018). On a social level, this means that switchover can be fostered by social debt modulation, socialization, and peer influence (Ertz et al., 2021). While peer influence is a variable derived from socialization, there is a lot of research showing its behavioural implications for consumer choice in the CE and pro-environmental practices (e.g., Hamari et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015). For this reason, peer influence is included in research under the variable: number of people performing the behavior.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS AND STUDY DESIGN

Before starting the main study, it is necessary to verify the relevance of the variables acting on the behaviours previously identified in the work of the LaboNFC. The scenario method is used to perform a pre-test. The scenario method is a projective and participatory model applicable to the humanities and social sciences investigation. A scenario refers to a qualitative study using projective techniques, including describing a given situation or individual (Hughes & Huby, 2002; Schenberg & Ravdal, 2000). There seems to be a consensus in the literature on the effectiveness of scenarios because it is a simulation of real events (Finch, 1987; Gould, 1996; Wilson, 1978) that appeals to the imagination (Finch, 1987; Poulo & Norwich, 2001). Respondents read short stories, view images, watch a video, or are subjected to another stimulus (Hughes & Huby, 2002), and indicate what they would do or think another person would do in that specific situation (Finch, 1987). The most common method is to submit a text followed by multiple-choice questions (Finch, 1987).

The first models were implemented by Jean-Yves Trépos (1988), based on the work of Jean Kellerhals and François de Singly in the early 1980s (Meyer, 2008). Poulou and Norwich (2001) argue that respondents more easily indicate their perceptions and judgments by using fictitious scenarios than familiar situations. Participants are also able to remain in a position of retreat from these situations. The scenario methodology increases the possibility to make sense of an experience (Wacheux, 1996) by simulating real and realistic life situations (Schenberg & Ravdal, 2000). For example, in this study, the proposed scenario frames a home rental experience on a collaborative platform to users. Cavanagh and Fritzsche (1985) note that scenarios provide the researcher with information to adapt certain research elements while integrating complex, multidimensional questions that replicate decision-making in a real-world situation.

4.1 PRE-TEST

For the pre-test, eight scenarios containing eight conditions were submitted to participants. Each scenario has a mix of different levels of variables for a total of 8 scenarios. The experiment involves a 2 (experience with the collaborative behavior: none vs. one, two or more) × 2 (perception of the difficulty of the behavior: EASE vs. MANY) × 2 (perception of the number of people achieving behavior: FEW vs. MANY) design. Each scenario combines a different configuration of the variables and their related level. For example, scenario 1 (no experience with the collaborative behavior, easy behavior or EASE, FEW people realizing the behavior), scenario 2 (at least 1 experience with the collaborative behavior or EASE, FEW people realizing the behavior), and so on, up to 8 scenarios in total. The survey was randomly administered to sixteen (16) consumers who read only one scenario. Participants' comments and contributions were used to improve the wording and assess the extent to which the elements used adequately reflect the concept intended to be measured (e.g., the propensity to become a supplier in the CE).

After the pre-test, some textual elements had to be modified. Three amendments were brought to the text:

1) Review the condition of the feeling of ease: there were several inconsistencies. In scenarios 1, 3, and 7, the respondents perceived MANY people in the scenario that indicated FEW. It was, therefore, necessary to review the scale.

2) Add a condition "DIFFICULTY, FEW." A priori, it is in this condition that there should be the lowest score, but it was not the case.

3) Review the formulation of the scenarios based on the respondents' comments (clarity, comprehension, ability to project oneself into the scenario, realism, and so on).

Ambiguous, unclear, or complicated elements have been rewritten to be more easily understood. The variable DIFFICULTY has been rewritten since it didn't allow to measure the concept sufficiently. Once the corrections were made, it was possible to carry out the primary data collection.

4.2 EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

As explained previously, the main study uses a quantitative approach with an experimental design (Malhotra, 2009) of type 3 (experience with the collaborative behavior: none, one, two, or more) × 2 (perception of the number of people realizing the behavior: FEW, MANY) × 2 (perceived difficulty of the behavior: EASE, DIFFICULTY).

Three main types of experimental plans can be selected by considering how independent variables vary (within-subjects, between-subjects, and mixed). Each participant is tested in a between-subjects experiment in only one condition and randomly distributed in different modalities. In a within-subjects experiment, each participant is tested under all conditions. When between-subject and within-subject variables are combined into an experimental plan, the experimentation is called a mixed design (Bell, 2009; Cochran & Cox, 1957; Emerson, 1991; Kirk, 1995).

For this experiment, the experience with the collaborative behavior is measured at the within-subject level. In contrast, the other two variables, the perceived number of people performing the behavior and the perceived difficulty of the behavior, are manipulated following a between-subject design. The study consists of carrying out an online experiment using the Qualtrics software and recruiting participants on Amazon's MTurk platform. This platform involves using a ''non-random sampling technique'' with convenience sampling (self-selecting respondents). Purposive sampling was also used to select the participants who best met the study's needs and objectives. A total of 207 participants have completed the study, and the answers have been used as valid data for the study analysis. Table 2 describes the sample based on variables D1-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6-D7-D8 (see Appendix II).

Table 2: Description of the sample according to demographic question

Question	Answer	Frequency	Valid Percent*
Have you ever stayed in a hotel, hostel, motel, guest house, or bed & breakfast?	Yes	190	96,4
	No	7	3,6
What is your sex?	Male	101	51,3
	Female	96	48,7
What is your age?	18-25	22	11,2
	26-35	80	40,6
	36-45	58	29,4
	46-55	28	14,2
	56 and over	9	4,6
What is the highest grade or level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?	Less than a high school diploma	1	0,5
	High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)	20	10,2
	Some college, no degree	46	23,4
	Bachelor's degree (e.g., B.A., B.Sc.)	97	49,2
	Master's degree (e.g., M.A., M.Sc., M.B.A.)	26	13,2
	Professional degree (e.g., MD, LLD, DVM)	5	2,5
	Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	2	1
What is your main employment status?	Full-time employment	132	67
	Part-time employment	15	7,6
	Unemployed	10	5,1
	Self-employed	19	9,6
	Home-maker	6	3
	Student	11	5,6
	Retired	3	1,5
	Other	1	0,5
You are (…)	A renter	94	47,7
	An owner	103	52,3
You live in (…)	An apartment	53	26,9
	A house	139	70,6
	Other	5	2,5

*Percentage adjusted. Demographic data collected from 197 respondents (10 respondents did not answer this part)

Following a filtering questionnaire ensuring that the respondents are at least eighteen years old, as well as users but not providers in the CE, the participants were randomly assigned to four conditions consisting of four scenarios in which the variables of perception of the number of people performing the behavior and perceived behavioral difficulty have been modulated (scenario 1: FEW people, easy behavior or EASE; scenario 2: many people, easy behavior or EASE; scenario 3: FEW people, difficult behavior; scenario 4: many people, difficult behavior). Experimentation control questions (manipulation checks) and control variables (i.e., age, sex, income, education, marital status) were also submitted to respondents. Furthermore, participants were asked to read additional scenarios that did not impact the research results and did not relate to the main topic (see Appendix II). The goal was to lead respondents into thinking that the study was trying to assess their ability to stay focused while reading. It was also intended to encourage respondents to complete the questionnaire or answer truthfully. ''Exercise 2'' of the survey represents a diversionary study in research. The purpose of the exercise is to prevent respondents from guessing the study objective and thus deliberately distorting their responses. For example, fill questions were inserted to deflect respondents from the actual goals of the study.

To test the conditions, a between-subject 2×2 online experiment, in which the variables NUMBER of people (MC1) and LEVEL of difficulty (MC2) are manipulated, is conducted using a factorial design (Malhotra 2009) (see Table 3).

Table 3: Factorial design of the study

		Level	
		EASE	DIFFICULTY
Number	FEW	Group 1	Group 3
	MANY	Group 2	Group 4

The dependant variable refers to participants' intentions to become suppliers on collaborative hosting platforms (INT). The study has four measurement items: MC1 (manipulation check of the perceived LEVEL of difficulty), MC2 (manipulation check of the perceived NUMBER of people performing the behavior), INT (Intention to become a provider), SQ1A who identify respondents who have completed one or more collaborative behavior in the past (FREQUENCE experience with the

21

collaborative behavior). Since the dependent variable INT has only one measurement item, there is no need for measurement analysis (such as EFA, Cronbach's alphas). The study is performed with the SPSS (26.0) software, and the ANOVA analysis are performed on the data collected.

CHAPTER 5

MANIPULATION CHECKS

5.1 PERCEIVED LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY

The manipulation check MC1 (perceived NUMBER of people) is analyzed to verify whether participants in the EASE condition perceive the behavior as easier to achieve than those in the DIFFICULTY condition. To do this, a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used. The control variable MC1 is used as the dependent variable, and the variable LEVEL indicating the level of perceived difficulty in behavior is used as a factor.

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe it is easy to book housing on a collaborative housing platform (from 1 "very easy" to 7 "very difficult"). The null hypothesis H_0 is to consider that all participants perceive the same level of difficulty. The alternative hypothesis H_1 considers that participants in the EASE condition perceive the behavior as easier than those in the DIFFICULTY condition. The number of participants in the EASE category is 121, and the number of participants in the DIFFICULTY category is 86, for a total of 207 participants (see Table 4).

Table 4: Between-Subjects Factors (MC1)

		Value Label	N
Perceived level of difficulty	1.00	EASE	121
	2.00	DIFFICULTY	86

As shown in Table 5 and Table 6, participants in the EASE condition report an average of 2.421 difficulty levels, whereas participants in the DIFFICULTY condition report an average of 6.465 difficulty levels. In total, participants report an average of 4.10 difficulty levels. Tables 6, 7, and 8 further show that this difference is statistically significant since participants in the DIFFICULTY condition perceive a significantly higher level of difficulty than those in the EASE condition (F(1, 205) = 622.016; $p < 0.001$).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics (MC1)

Dependant variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Perceived level of difficulty	**Mean**	Std. Deviation	N
EASE	**2.42**	1.189	121
DIFFICULTY	**6.47**	1.092	86
Total	4.10	2.303	207

The Standard Error column (Std. Error) in Table 5 shows the sample average variability. The smallest variability is for the EASE group because of its higher number of participants.

Table 6: Perceived level of difficulty (MC1)

			95% Confidence Interval	
Perceived level of difficulty	Mean	St. Error	**Lower Bound**	**Upper Bound**
EASE	**2.421**	0.105	2.215	2.628
DIFFICULTY	**6.465**	0.124	6.221	6.710

It was 95% certain that for EASE participants, the average population's actual value is between 2.215 and 2.628. It was also 95% sure that for participants in the DIFFICULTY category, the real value of the average is between 6.221 and 6.710.

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (MC1)

Dependant Variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	821.970[a]	1	821.970	622.016	.000
Intercept	3969.951	1	3969.951	3004.214	.000
LEVEL	**821.970**	**1**	**821.970**	**622.016**	**.000**
Error	270.899	205	1.321		
Total	4575.000	207			

Corrected Total	1092.870	206			

a. R Squared = .752 (Adjusted R Squared = .751).

Table 8: Contrast Results (K Matrix) (MC1)

Dependant Variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Perceived level of difficulty Difference Contrast		Dependent Variable
		How easy do you think it is to book housing on a collaborative housing platform?
Level 2 vs. Level 1	Contrast Estimate	4.044
	Hypothesized Value	0
	Difference (Estimate - Hypothesized)	**4.044**
	Std. Error	.162
	Sig.	**.000**
	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	Lower Bound	3.724
		Upper Bound	4.363

Table 9: Test Results (MC1)

Dependent Variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Contrast	821.970	1	821.970	622.016	**.000**
Error	270.899	205	1.321		

Therefore, participants in the EASE condition perceive the behaviour as easier than those in the DIFFICULTY condition. The difference between levels (LEVEL) is significant (see Table 7). The difference is 4.044 (see 8 and 9). There is no significant effect of the control variables.

The MC1 condition analysis necessitated the creation of a dummy variable (also called indicator variable). In statistics, particularly in regression analysis, a dummy variable uses only the value 0 or 1 to indicate the absence or presence of a particular quality or characteristic. In other words, it is a variable uses to include categorical data in a regression model. For the creation of dummy variables, an n-dimensional classification variable is converted to fictitious n-1 variables. The

D5 control variable on participants' employment status (see Table 10) is converted to 7 fictitious variables in the following tests. This indicates that D5 - 8 is defined as a reference group. All the other groups are compared to this one (see Table 10 and Table 11). This procedure allows checking the values of the second column for the other groups are significant or not. Only the LEVEL dependent variable is significant.

Table 10: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (MC1)

Dependent Variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	820.201[a]	28	29.293	22.003	0.000
Intercept	124.572	1	124.572	93.572	0.000
LEVEL	**715.789**	**1**	**715.789**	**537.664**	**0.000**
D1	0.392	1	0.392	0.294	0.588
D2	6.585	4	1.646	1.237	0.297
D3	5.468	6	0.911	0.685	0.662
D4	7.649	5	1.530	1.149	0.337
D5	**7.472**	**7**	**1.067**	**0.802**	**0.587**
D6	1.300	1	1.300	0.976	0.325
D7	1.164	2	0.582	0.437	0.646
D8	2.443	1	2.443	1.835	0.177
Error	223.657	168	1.331		
Total	4317.000	197			
Corrected Total	1043.858	196			

a. R Squared = 0.786 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.750)

Table 11: Parameter Estimates (MC1)

Dependant Variable: Perceived level of difficulty

Parameter	B	Std. Error	T	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intercept	4.739	1.887	2.512	0.013	1.015	8.464
[LEVEL=1.00]	-4.040	0.174	-23.188	**0.000**	-4.384	-3.696
[LEVEL=2.00]	0ª					
[D1=1]	0.099	0.182	0.542	0.588	-0.261	0.458
[D1=2]	0ª					
[D2=1]	-0.058	0.527	-0.110	0.913	-1.099	0.983
[D2=2]	-0.221	0.437	-0.505	0.614	-1.082	0.641
[D2=3]	-0.481	0.435	-1.106	0.270	-1.339	0.377
[D2=4]	0.096	0.466	0.206	0.837	-0.825	1.017
[D2=5]	0ª					
[D3=1]	-1.336	1.549	-0.862	0.390	-4.395	1.723
[D3=2]	-0.030	0.955	-0.032	0.975	-1.915	1.855
[D3=3]	-0.254	0.925	-0.275	0.783	-2.080	1.571
[D3=4]	-0.100	0.908	-0.110	0.913	-1.893	1.693
[D3=5]	-0.007	0.937	-0.007	0.994	-1.855	1.842
[D3=6]	-0.928	1.057	-0.878	0.381	-3.015	1.158
[D3=7]	0ª					
[D4=1]	0.021	0.519	0.040	0.968	-1.004	1.045
[D4=2]	0.611	0.455	1.344	0.181	-0.287	1.510
[D4=3]	0.297	0.454	0.655	0.513	-0.599	1.194
[D4=4]	0.300	0.484	0.620	0.536	-0.656	1.256
[D4=5]	0.599	0.496	1.209	0.229	-0.379	1.577
[D4=6]	0ª					
[D5=1]	**1.859**	**1.220**	**1.524**	**0.129**	**-0.550**	**4.268**
[D5=2]	**1.848**	**1.262**	**1.464**	**0.145**	**-0.643**	**4.339**
[D5=3]	**2.281**	**1.284**	**1.776**	**0.077**	**-0.254**	**4.816**
[D5=4]	**1.828**	**1.243**	**1.471**	**0.143**	**-0.626**	**4.282**
[D5=5]	**1.247**	**1.389**	**0.898**	**0.371**	**-1.496**	**3.990**
[D5=6]	**2.271**	**1.309**	**1.735**	**0.085**	**-0.313**	**4.856**
[D5=7]	**1.238**	**1.404**	**0.881**	**0.379**	**-1.535**	**4.010**
[D5=8]	**0ª**					
[D6=1]	-0.211	0.214	-0.988	0.325	-0.633	0.211
[D6=2]	0ª					
[D7=1]	0.646	0.724	0.894	0.373	-0.782	2.075
[D7=2]	0.525	0.695	0.756	0.451	-0.847	1.898
[D7=3]	0ª					
[D8=1]	-0.680	0.502	-1.355	0.177	-1.670	0.311
[D8=2]	0ª					

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

There is a significant difference between Level 1 and Level 2 (LEVEL). According to the results, there is no significant difference between the groups considering the D5 control variable as the reference group.

5.1.1 SUMMARY OF MC1 ANALYSIS

In sum, respondents in the EASE condition are more likely to perceive the behavior as being easier (M = 2.42, SD = 1.189) than those in the DIFFICULTY condition (M = 6.47, SD = 1.092). The difference between different LEVEL is significant (F (1, 205) = 622.016; p= 0,000). The difference between both levels is 4.044. There is no significant difference between the groups of control variables.

5.2 PERCEIVED NUMBER OF PEOPLE PERFORMING THE BEHAVIOR

The MC2 control variable is analyzed. The MC2 variable checks whether the participants in the FEW condition perceive that there are fewer people who realize the behavior than in the MANY condition. The same procedure as for the control variable MC1 is applied. The MC2 control variable is used as the dependent variable, and the NUMBER variable is used as the factor.

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with the following statement: Many people use collaborative housing platforms (from 1 "Totally disagree" to 7 "Totally agree"). The null hypothesis H_0 is to consider that all participants perceive the same number of people realizing the behavior. The alternative hypothesis H_1 considers that participants in the MANY condition perceive more people who perform the behaviour than those in the FEW condition. The number of participants in the FEW category is 101. The number of participants in the MANY category is 106. The total number of participants for the Number of people performing the behavior was 207 (see Table 12). Table 13 indicates that respondents in the FEW category perceive an average number of people of 2,98 on a scale of 0 to 8, 0 corresponding to disagree and eight corresponding to agree. Table 13 also indicates that respondents in the MANY category perceive an average number of people of 7,63 on a scale of 0 to 8.

Table 12: Between-Subjects Factor (MC2)

Dependant Variable: Number of people performing the behavior

		Value Label	N
Number of people performing the behavior	1.00	FEW	101
	2.00	MANY	106

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics (MC2)

Dependant Variable: Number of people performing the behavior

Number of people performing the behavior	**Mean**	Std. Deviation	N
FEW	**2.98**	1.414	101
MANY	**7.63**	1.149	106
Total	**5.36**	2.660	207

Table 14: Number of people performing the behavior (MC2)

			95% Confidence Interval	
Number of people performing the behavior	Mean	St. Error	**Lower Bound**	**Upper Bound**
FEW	**2.980**	0.128	2.728	3.232
MANY	**7.632**	0.125	7.386	7.878

The Standard Error column shows the variability of the sample average. It is 95% certain that for the participants of the FEW category, the real value of the average population is between 2.728 and 3.232. It is also 95% certain that for participants in the MANY category, the average value is between 7.386 and 7.878 (see Table 14).

Table 15: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (MC2)

Dependant Variable: Number of people performing the behavior

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1119.215[a]	1	1119.215	677.588	0.000
Intercept	5824.703	1	5824.703	3526.356	0.000
NUMBER	1119.215	1	1119.215	677.588	**0.000**
Error	338.611	205	1.652		
Total	7410.000	207			
Corrected Total	1457.826				

a. R Squared = 0.768 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.767)

The difference between NUMBER levels was significant (see Table 15). Participants in the MANY category perceive that more people perform behaviour than those in the FEW category. The difference in the number of perceived people (NUMBER) is significant and amounted to 4.652 (see Table 16).

Table 16: Contrast Results (K Matrix MC2)

Number of people doing the behavior Difference Contrast		Dependent Variable
		To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Many people use collaborative housing platforms?
Level 2 vs. Level 1	Contrast Estimate	4.652
	Hypothesized Value	0
	Difference (Estimate - Hypothesized)	**4.652**
	Std. Error	0.179
	Sig.	**0.000**
	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	Lower Bound	4.300
		Upper Bound	5.004

The analysis of variance on MC2 also required the creation of dummy variables. The previously described steps are repeated. The analysis includes the variables D1 D2 D3 D4 D6 D7 D8 to observe which variable is significant (see Table 17 and Table 18).

Table 17: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (MC2)

Dependant Variable: Number of people performing the behavior

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1131.793[a]	28	40.421	25.010	0.000
Intercept	197.847	1	197.847	122.412	0.000
NUMBER	**914.319**	**1**	**914.319**	**565.711**	**0.000**
D1	2.823	1	2.823	1.747	0.188
D2	10.621	4	2.655	1.643	0.166
D3	11.364	6	1.894	1.172	0.324
D4	4.922	5	0.984	0.609	0.693
D5	4.118	7	0.588	0.364	0.922
D6	0.001	1	0.001	0.000	0.984
D7	2.001	2	1.001	0.619	0.540
D8	1.188	1	1.188	0.735	0.392
Error	271.527	168	1.616		
Total	7150.000	197			
Corrected Total	1403.320	196			

a.   R Squared = 0.768 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.767)

Table 18: Parameter Estimates (MC2)

Dependant Variable: Number of people performing the behavior

Parameter	B	Std. Error	T	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Upper Bound	Upper Bound
Intercept	7.276	2.102	3.461	0.001	3.126	11.425
[NUMBER=1, 00]	-4.574	0.192	-23.785	0.000	-4.953	-4.194
[NUMBER=2, 00]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D1=1]	-0.267	0.202	-1.322	0.188	-0.666	0.132
[D1=2]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D2=1]	-0.721	0.581	-1.241	0.216	-1.868	0.426
[D2=2]	-0.628	0.483	-1.299	0.196	-1.581	0.326
[D2=3]	-0.323	0.482	-0.669	0.505	-1.275	0.630
[D2=4]	0.060	0.517	0.116	0.908	-0.960	1.079
[D2=5]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D3=1]	**2.907**	**1.710**	**1.700**	**0.091**	**-0.469**	**6.283**
[D3=2]	**1.378**	**1.051**	**1.312**	**0.191**	**-0.696**	**3.452**
[D3=3]	**1.165**	**1.016**	**1.147**	**0.253**	**-0.840**	**3.170**
[D3=4]	**1.511**	**0.999**	**1.513**	**0.132**	**-0.460**	**3.482**
[D3=5]	**1.153**	**1.029**	**1.121**	**0.264**	**-0.878**	**3.183**
[D3=6]	**0.724**	**1.162**	**0.623**	**0.534**	**-1.571**	**3.018**
[D3=7]	**0[a]**	**.**	**.**		**.**	**.**
[D4=1]	-0.424	0.572	-0.741	0.460	-1.553	0.706
[D4=2]	-0.648	0.502	-1.292	0.198	-1.638	0.342
[D4=3]	-0.615	0.501	-1.228	0.221	-1.603	0.373
[D4=4]	-0.350	0.533	-0.657	0.512	-1.403	0.703
[D4=5]	-0.731	0.546	-1.339	0.182	-1.810	0.347
[D4=6]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D5=1]	-1.102	1.340	-0.823	0.412	-3.748	1.543
[D5=2]	-0.827	1.389	-0.595	0.553	-3.569	1.916
[D5=3]	-1.426	1.415	-1.008	0.315	-4.219	1.367
[D5=4]	-1.238	1.366	-0.906	0.366	-3.935	1.459
[D5=5]	-1.400	1.525	-0.918	0.360	-4.411	1.611
[D5=6]	-0.930	1.441	-0.645	0.520	-3.775	1.916
[D5=7]	-0.993	1.551	-0.640	0.523	-4.055	2.069
[D5=8]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D6=1]	0.005	0.236	0.021	0.984	-0.461	0.471
[D6=2]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D7=1]	0.863	0.797	1.083	0.280	-0.710	2.437
[D7=2]	0.722	0.765	0.943	0.347	-0.789	2.232
[D7=3]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[D8=1]	0.478	0.558	0.857	0.392	-0.623	1.580
[D8=2]	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.

a.   This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

5.2.1 SUMMARY OF MC2 ANALYSIS

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with the following statement: Many people use collaborative housing platforms (from 1 "Totally disagree" to 7 "Totally agree"). Respondents in the FEW condition are more likely to perceive that fewer people realize the behavior (M = 2.980, SD = 0.128) than those in the MANY condition (M = 7.632, SD = 0.125). The difference between both levels of NUMBER is significant ($p < 0.05$). ($F_{(1, 205)}$ = 677.588, p= 0.000). The difference between level is 4.652. There is no significant difference between the groups of control variables.

5.3 PROPENSITY TO BECOME A PROVIDER

The INT variable is the dependent variable. Combinations of the control variables MC1 (LEVEL) and MC2 (NUMBER) and the control variables D1-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6-D7-D8 are included as independent variables. The null hypothesis H_0 stipulates no difference between groups regarding the intention to become a provider on collaborative hosting platforms, including control variables (LEVEL, NUMBER, D1-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6-D7-D8). The alternative hypothesis H_1 posits that intention to become a provider or not between groups varies depending on the perceived level of difficulty, the perceived number of people performing the behaviour, and the demographics D1-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6-D7-D8.

Test results on the INT dependent variable indicate differences between groups in participants' intent to become providers on collaborative hosting platforms. In the "MANY" group, there is a significant difference between EASE and DIFFICULTY. The average difference was 1.024. In the "DIFFICULTY" group, there is a significant difference between FEW and MANY. The average difference is 1.877 (see Table 19).

Table 19: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (INT)

Dependant variable: Propensity to switchover

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Correct Model	185.399[a]	30	6.180	1.454	0.073
Intercept	77.808	1	77.808	18.308	0.000
D1	8.282	1	8.282	1.949	0.165
D2	10.391	4	2.598	0.611	0.655
D3	34.788	6	5.798	1.364	0.232
D4	15.240	5	3.048	0.717	0.611
D5	13.124	7	1.875	0.441	0.875
D6	9.721	1	9.721	2.287	0.132
D7	1.565	2	0.783	0.184	0.832
D8	3.694	1	3.694	0.869	0.353
NUMBER	**55.740**	**1**	**55.740**	**13.115**	**0.000**
LEVEL	0.942	1	0.942	0.222	0.638
NUMBER *LEVEL	**40.090**	**1**	**40.090**	**9.433**	**0.002**
Error	705.484	166	4.250		
Total	3364.000	197			
Corrected Total	890.883	196			

a. R Squared = 0.208 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.065)

The analysis focuses more on the main effect of NUMBER and the interaction effect of NUMBER and LEVEL. The difference between other control variables is not significant. Analysis of INT also needed the creation of dummy variables (see Table 20). The same procedure for MC1 and MC2 is used.

Table 20: Parameter Estimates (INT)

Dependant Variable: Propensity to switchover

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Upper Bound	Upper Bound
Intercept	6.916	3.445	2.007	0.046	0.113	13.718
[D1=1]	0.458	0.328	1.396	0.165	-0.190	1.105
[D1=2]	0ᵃ					
[D2=1]	1.370	0.945	1.449	0.149	-0.496	3.236
[D2=2]	0.904	0.788	1.148	0.253	-0.651	2.460
[D2=3]	0.829	0.783	1.059	0.291	-0.717	2.376
[D2=4]	0.583	0.840	0.694	0.488	-1.075	2.241
[D2=5]	0ᵃ					
[D3=1]	-4.692	2.780	-1.688	0.093	-10.180	0.797
[D3=2]	-1.123	1.707	-0.658	0.512	-4.493	2.248
[D3=3]	-0.199	1.655	-0.120	0.905	-3.467	3.070
[D3=4]	-0.536	1.624	-0.330	0.742	-3.744	2.671
[D3=5]	-0.444	1.675	-0.265	0.791	-3.751	2.863
[D3=6]	-2.081	1.890	-1.101	0.273	-5.813	1.651
[D3=7]	0ᵃ					
[D4=1]	1.188	0.930	1.279	0.203	-0.647	3.024
[D4=2]	0.389	0.818	0.476	0.635	-1.225	2.004
[D4=3]	0.289	0.816	0.354	0.724	-1.323	1.900
[D4=4]	0.080	0.877	0.091	0.928	-1.652	1.811
[D4=5]	0.057	0.891	0.064	0.949	-1.701	1.816
[D4=6]	0ᵃ					
[D5=1]	-1.398	2.187	-0.640	0.523	-5.715	2.919
[D5=2]	-1.647	2.266	-0.727	0.468	-6.121	2.826
[D5=3]	-2.202	2.308	-0.954	0.342	-6.759	2.355
[D5=4]	-1.351	2.230	-0.606	0.545	-5.753	3.051
[D5=5]	-2.760	2.488	-1.109	0.269	-7.673	2.153
[D5=6]	-1.637	2.351	-0.696	0.487	-6.279	3.004
[D5=7]	-1.648	2.527	-0.652	0.515	-6.637	3.341
[D5=8]	0ᵃ					
[D6=1]	-0.580	0.384	-1.512	0.132	-1.337	0.177
[D6=2]	0ᵃ					
[D7=1]	-0.186	1.293	-0.144	0.886	-2.739	2.367
[D7=2]	-0.406	1.243	-0.327	0.744	-2.861	2.048
[D7=3]	0ᵃ					
[D8=1]	-0.858	0.920	-0.932	0.353	-2.675	0.959
[D8=2]	0ᵃ					
[NUMBER=1.00]	-2.207	0.501	-4.404	0.000	-3.196	-1.218
[NUMBER=2.00]	0ᵃ					
[LEVEL=1.00]	-1.167	0.475	-2.455	0.015	-2.105	-0.229
[LEVEL=2.00]	0ᵃ					
[NUMBER=1.00] * [LEVEL=1.00]	2.027	0.660	3.071	0.002	0.724	3.330
[NUMBER=1.00] * [LEVEL=2.00]	0ᵃ					
[NUMBER=1.00] * [LEVEL=2.00]	0ᵃ					
[NUMBER=2.00] * [LEVEL=1.00]	0ᵃ					
[NUMBER=2.00] * [LEVEL=2.00]	0ᵃ					

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

As shown in Table 21, the result is significant. Results for each combination of a variable are presented in Table 22 and Table 23.

Table 21: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (INT)

Dependent Variable: Propensity to switchover

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	71.891[a]	3	23.964	5.685	0.001
Intercept	2473.584	1	2473.584	586.806	0.000
NUMBER	**52.445**	**1**	**52.445**	**12.441**	**0.001**
LEVEL	1.976	1	1.976	0.469	0.494
NUMBER *LEVEL	31.343	1	31.343	7.435	**0.007**
Error	855.713	203	4.215		
Total	3502.000	207			
Corrected Total	927.604	206			

a. R Squared = 0.078 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.064)

Table 22: Descriptive Statistics (INT)

Dependent Variable: Propensity to switchover

Number of people doing the behavior		Mean	Std. Deviation	N
FEW	EASE	3.413	2.017	46
	DIFFICULTY	2.800	1.704	55
	Total	3.079	1.869	101
MANY	EASE	3.653	2.251	75
	DIFFICULTY	4.677	2.166	31
	Total	3.952	2.265	106
Total	EASE	3.562	2.160	121
	DIFFICULTY	3.476	2.079	86
	Total	3.526	2.122	207

Table 23: Perceived level of difficulty * Number of people doing the behavior

Dependant Variable: Propensity to switchover

Perceived level of difficulty		Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
EASE	**FEW**	**3.413**	0.303	2.816	4.010
	MANY	**3.653**	0.237	3.186	4.121
DIFFICULTY	**FEW**	**2.800**	0.277	2.254	3.346
	MANY	**4.677**	0.369	3.950	5.404

The result is significant (see Table 24). Combinations give different results. It seems that, in each category, the dependant variable Number of people performing the behavior is the most revealing.

Table 24: Test results (INT)

Dependant Variable: Propensity to switchover

Propensity to switchover			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b]	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
FEW	EASE	DIFFICULTY	0.613	0.410	0.137	-0.196	1.422
	DIFFICULTY	EASE	-0.613	0.410	0.137	-1.422	0.196
MANY	EASE	DIFFICULTY	-1.024*	0.438	**0.020**	-1.888	-0.160
	DIFFICULTY	EASE	**1.024***	0.438	**0.020**	0.160	1.888

Table 25: ANOVA Test (INT)

GROUP		NUMBER	
		1	2
	1	**1**	**3**
LEVEL	2	**2**	**4**

Univariate tests are performed to see differences between groups. Four (4) groups were identified (see table 27). Group 1 refers to ''NUMBER = 1 and LEVEL = 1'' (FEW – EASE), Group 2 refers to ''NUMBER 1 and LEVEL 2'' (FEW – DIFFICULTY), Group 3 refers to ''NUMBER = 2 and

LEVEL = 1'' (MANY – EASE) and Group 4 refers to ''NUMBER = 2 and LEVEL = 2'' (MANY – DIFFICULTY).

5.3.1 RESUME OF INT ANALYSIS

Test results on the INT dependent variable indicate differences between groups in participants' intent to become providers on collaborative hosting platforms (see Table 27 and Table 28). In the "MANY" group, there is a significant difference between EASE and DIFFICULTY. The results will be explained in the next section.

Table 26: Descriptives (INT)

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1.00	46	**3.41**	2.017	0.297	2.81	4.01	1	9
2.00	55	**2.80**	1.704	0.230	2.34	3.26	1	6
3.00	75	**3.65**	2.251	0.260	3.14	4.17	1	9
4.00	31	**4.68**	2.166	0.389	3.88	5.47	1	7
Total	207	3.53	2.122	0.147	3.24	3.82	1	9

Table 27: ANOVA (INT)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	71.891	3	23.964	5.685	**0.001**
Within Groups	855.713	203	4.215		
Total	927.604	206			

5.4 INTERACTION OF FREQUENCY, LEVEL AND NUMBER ON THE VARIABLE INT

At the end of the analysis, the interaction between all variables was tested to see the effect of frequency of behaviors with independent variables and the ultimate variable INT that observes respondents' intention to become providers. The control variable FREQ_SQ1A, which checks the frequency of respondents' past experiences, includes three categories: option 1 (no collaborative experience on an online housing platform in the past), option 2 (one experience on an online housing

platform in the past), and option 3 (two and over). Table 28 shows the number of respondents in each

category (option 1 contains 27 respondents; option 2 includes 64 respondents, and option 3 contains

106 respondents, for a total of 197 respondents).

Table 28: Between-Subjects Factors (INT)

		Value Label	N
Number of people doing the behavior	1,00	FEW	95
	2,00	MANY	102
Perceived level of difficulty	1,00	EASE	116
	2,00	DIFFICULTY	81
How often have you used an accommodation service directly provided by another consumer using an online platform?	1	None	27
	2	1	64
	3	2 or more	106

Table 29 shows the mean for the participants' responses in the category Frequency, Number,

and Difficulty. To analyze the effect of the variable FREQ, it was necessary to create dummy variables

for D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, and D8. Depending on their subject, the variables are identified with

the acronym "_D" to differentiate them from the initial variables (see Table 30). As with previous

analyses, the participants perceive the higher number of individuals and the greater difficulty in

achieving the behaviour with the highest intention to become providers. Table 30 also contains the

Fisher test results and shows that only NUMBER and LEVEL interaction is significant.

Table 29: Descriptive Statistics (FREQ)

Dependent Variable: INT

Number of people doing the behavior	Perceived level of difficulty	How often have you used an accommodation service directly provided by another consumer using an online platform?	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
FEW	EASY	None	4,27	1,009	11
		1	3,33	2,348	12
		2 and over	3,3	2,179	20
		Total	3,56	2,004	43
	DIFFICULTY	None	5	1,414	4
		1	2,81	1,601	21
		2 and over	2,33	1,569	27
		Total	2,73	1,693	52
	Total	None	4,47	1,125	15
		1	3	1,887	33
		2 and over	2,74	1,894	47
		Total	3,11	1,876	95
MANY	EASE	None	4,67	3,011	6
		1	3,33	2,708	21
		2 and over	3,63	1,959	46
		Total	3,63	2,276	73
	DIFFICULTY	None	6,5	0,837	6
		1	4,8	2,201	10
		2 and over	3,92	2,06	13
		Total	4,76	2,116	29
	Total	None	5,58	2,314	12
		1	3,81	2,613	31
		2 and over	3,69	1,967	59
		Total	3,95	2,279	102
Total	EASE	None	4,41	1,873	17
		1	3,33	2,545	33
		2 and over	3,53	2,017	66
		Total	3,6	2,17	116
	DIFFICULTY	None	5,9	1,287	10
		1	3,45	2,014	31
		2 and over	2,85	1,875	40
		Total	3,46	2,086	81
	Total	None	4,96	1,808	27
		1	3,39	2,286	64
		2 and over	3,27	1,983	106
		Total	3,54	2,132	197

Table 30: Tests Between-Subjects Effects (FREQ)

Dependent Variable: INT

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	62,849	1	62,849	14,887	,000
	Error	534,423	126,588	4,222[a]		
sex_d_1	Hypothesis	13,127	1	13,127	3,323	,070
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
age_d_1	Hypothesis	5,286	1	5,286	1,338	,249
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
school_d_1	Hypothesis	,001	1	,001	,000	,985
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
income_d_1	Hypothesis	8,218	1	8,218	2,081	,151
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
employment_d_1	Hypothesis	2,982	1	2,982	,755	,386
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
youare_d_1	Hypothesis	20,149	1	20,149	5,101	,025
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
youlive_d_1	Hypothesis	2,564	1	2,564	,649	,422
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
stayed_d_1	Hypothesis	,270	1	,270	,068	,794
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		
NUMBER	Hypothesis	31,951	1	31,951	34,651	,000
	Error	35,346	38,332	,922[c]		
LEVEL	Hypothesis	6,739	1	6,739	1,055	,397
	Error	15,213	2,382	6,388[d]		
FREQ_SQ1A	Hypothesis	43,248	2	21,624	3,429	,221
	Error	12,985	2,059	6,306[e]		
NUMBER * LEVEL	Hypothesis	20,469	1	20,469	21,370	**,001**
	Error	11,011	11,495	,958[f]		
NUMBER * FREQ_SQ1A	Hypothesis	,480	2	,240	,503	,662
	Error	1,038	2,172	,478[g]		
LEVEL * FREQ_SQ1A	Hypothesis	13,539	2	6,769	18,387	,124
	Error	,446	1,212	,368[h]		
NUMBER * LEVEL * FREQ_SQ1A	Hypothesis	,921	2	,461	,117	,890
	Error	699,119	177	3,950[b]		

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARIZING THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS

This study aims to determine the effect of the independent variables (i.e., Experience with the collaborative behavior, Number of people, and Level of difficulty) and their interaction on the dependent variable under study (i.e., propensity to become a supplier on collaborative hosting platforms). Multiple variance analysis enables to test for the main effect of each independent variable and their interaction effect on the dependent variable.

The univariate variance analysis (ANOVA) was carried out on the dependent variable INT to observe how it varies according to the four scenarios under study. Combinations of control variables MC1 (LEVEL) and MC2 (NUMBER) and control variables D1-D2-D3-D4-D5-D6-D7-D8 were included—this last step required, in some cases, the creation of dummy variables. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with the following sentence. Imagine the following situation: you are no longer a student, you own your own home. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: You intend to become a collaborative housing provider (Totally disagree 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 agree).

Respondents in the DIFFICULTY condition are more likely to become collaborative housing providers when MANY people realize the behavior. The following results seem to point to a greater propensity to switch when several people realize the behavior. On the other hand, it is not necessarily when the behavior is easier to realize that the behavior will be more frequent. The switch would seem more frequent when the behavior is more difficult. Simple contrasts reveal that in the group MANY, there is a significant difference between EASE and DIFFICULTY. The mean difference is 1,024. In the group DIFFICULTY, there is a significant difference between FEW and MANY. The average difference is 1,877. In other words, the impact of Group (MANY – DIFFICULTY) is significantly higher than Groups (FEW - DIFFICULTY) and (MANY – EASE). The last analysis results, which observe the interaction between FREQ, NUMBER, and LEVEL on the dependant variable INT, show that only the interaction between NUMBER and LEVEL is significant. The participants who perceive the higher

number of individuals and the greater difficulty in achieving the behaviour have the highest intention to become providers. Results also show that control variables do not have a confusing effect. However, if initially there was expected to be a frequency effect, the frequency variable seems to be considered a non-important control variable.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The analysis allows to see the combinations of the dependent variable INT for the following combinations [EASE – FEW; EASE – MANY; DIFFICULTY – FEW; DIFFICULTY – MANY]. Since the existing literature highlights the importance of experience with the collaborative behavior in the study of switchover effects, the study emphasized the experience with the collaborative behavior (none, one, two, or more).

The third-order analysis results indicate that the groups of respondents perceived the higher number of people performing the behavior and who have never performed a collaborative behavior that is the most likely to become providers in the CE. In individuals who have already performed collaborative behaviour, the variable in the number of people performing the behaviour is the one that seems to give the most illuminating results. Based on the existing literature (e.g., Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Forgas & Williams, 2001; Kamargianni et al., 2014; Manca et al., 2020, Rashotte, 2007), the concept of peer influence can potentially explain why individuals in the MANY category reported having a higher intention to become a supplier in the CE.

The group effect has been studied several times, particularly in psychology and marketing, such as consumer behavior (e.g., Hamari et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015). In their research, Manca et al. (2020) tested the individual's peer attitude variable in different components of a hybrid choice model to understand its behavioural implications on individual choice. Their research shows that peer attitudes have a direct impact on the individual's decision-making process. This phenomenon can be explained by the significant link between the peer attitude and the individual's latent attitude (Manca et al., 2020). In the existing literature, social influence is a vast and articulated concept that can be defined as a set of mutual and non-mutual interactions in different forms, including cognitive and behavioural factors that lead to changes in individuals' thoughts and behaviours (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Forgas & Williams, 2001; Manca et al. 2020; Rashotte, 2007). Cialdini and Goldstein (2004) have identified two main processes associated with the concept of social influence: conformity and

compliance. Conformity corresponds to the willingness that individual behaviours correspond to those of others. At the same time, compliance is associated with a behavior change to reply to other people's requests (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

Peer influence seems to be a significant explanatory variable in PEB (e.g., Hamari et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015; Zhiguo et al., 2016). For example, Watson et al. (2015) have found that PEB performed by peers in a green dorm positively affects recycling, advocacy, and conservation. In contrast, the study of Hamari et al. (2016) suggests that there could exist a difference between behaviors within collaborative practices. It seems that individuals who have a positive perception of collaborative behaviours tend to talk about the practices positively but do not necessarily intend to participate in the CE (Hamari et al., 2016).

Overall, the present studies' results seem to indicate that the number of people performing the collaborative behavior significantly impacts the individual intention to participate actively in the CE. Data analysis shows that respondents in the MANY category have a higher propensity to become providers in the CE. The dependant variable Number of people performing the behavior is indeed the most revealing. The concepts of peer influence and group effect (e.g., Hamari et al., 2016; Watson et al., 2015) can potentially explain the result in the present studies, considering that the spillover effect occurs when the adoption of behavior leads to the adoption of one or other behaviours (Ertz et al., 2019).

In summary, peer influence and group effect seem to increase changes in individual motivations or preferences, but also in individual behaviors. Results reveal that: 1) the more people who perform the behavior, the higher the chances for a switchover to occurs; 2) It is not necessarily the people who perceive the behaviours as easier that are most likely to become a supplier. People in the DIFFICULTY category are more likely to change roles if more people perform it.

The results also show that the frequency of the behavior does not significantly affect the study results. At first, the frequency was expected to impact the intention of respondents significantly to become providers. However, the results do not demonstrate a sufficiently convincing interaction

between the LEVEL, NUMBER, and FREQ variables to maintain the hypothesis that the frequency of behaviour affects participants' intention to become providers in the CE. The ''novelty effect'' identified previously as a motive to achieve a first collaborative behaviour (Akbar et al., 2016; Amaro et al., 2019; Guttentag et al. 2018) does not appear to have an impact on this study.

CHAPTER 8

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Recent literature on participant motivations in collaborative exchanges (e.g., Aspara & Wittkowski, 2018; Benoit et al., 2017; Hamari et al., 2016; Lawson et al., 2016; Nguyen et al., 2020) is interested in the distinctive feature of collaborative practices, namely interchangeability (Nguyen e al., 2020) or the shift from a role as users to a role as providers of goods and services (e.g., Ertz, Durif & Arcand, 2018). Although these researches extend the literature on collaborative practices by examining how interchangeability influences participants' attitudes and behavior (Nguyen et al., 2020), a scientific void remains regarding the behavioral variables that lead individuals to change their role in the CE through a switchover effect. Moreover, no study has yet applied pro-environmental theory (e.g., Truelove et al., 2014) to collaborative practices to explain the behaviours that lead consumers to switchover.

Also, recent CE articles focus primarily on service users (e.g., Lawson et al., 2016; Hamari et al., 2016; Möhlmann, 2015). While some articles broaden the observations to include both service users and providers (e.g., Ertz et al., 2018; Nguyen et al., 2020), the existing literature does not contain any empirical studies analyzing consumer behaviour by selecting behavioural variables from the pro-environmental literature to explain the shift from one role to another. Although the recent study by Nguyen et al. (2020) uses an approach based on the construal level theory and the psychological dimension of social distance to investigate collaborative practices, the authors focus mainly on the social dimension of proximity, peer trust, and participants' intentions in an attempt to explain interchangeability and decision making. The present research differs from previous articles and studies in the field of CE by including both roles (i.e., users and providers of goods and services), the behavioural variables from the previous exploratory study conducted by the LaboNFC (e.g., Ertz et al., 2021) and the concept of switchover that has never been applied to collaborative practices until now.

In this regard, the main contribution of the research is to have introduced the concept of the Switchover effect, which was non-existent in the literature on CE. Indeed, the concept was developed from previous research on the spillover effect. As previously stated, the spillover concept comes from pro-environmental literature (e.g., Harland et al., 1999; Thøgersen, 1999; Truelove et al., 2014; Van der Werff et al., 2014). The particularity of this research is to assume that this concept can also be applied to the CE and can potentially explain the changing role of consumers (i.e., transition from a user role to a provider role, and vice-versa).

As mentioned above, this research also differs from previous ones by using an experimental model to understand and measure the impacts of behavioural variables on consumers' intention to change roles (i.e., user or provider) in CE. Existing studies on the motivations of providers and users in the CE consider motivating factors and barriers among consumers who perform collaborative behaviors and examine which of these factors leads or prevents consumers from being obtainers/users or providers (e.g., Ertz, Durif & Lecompte, 2018; Hawlitschek et al., 2018; Li & Wen, 2019; Park & Armstrong, 2019; Torrent-Sellens et al., 2020). However, no studies have tested behavioural variables that may explain consumers' transition to a user or provider role in the CE. By giving new results tested with individuals, the present study provides original insights on individual behaviours among the consumers who participate in the CE.

Overall, this study thus sheds new light on the literature on CE. Many authors have been interested in the underlying aspects of the CE and how to define this concept in general (Acquier et al., 2017; Belk, 2014; Botsman & Roger, 2010; Botsman, 2013; Botsman, 2015; Correa et al., 2019; Ertz et al., 2016; Rinne, 2017; Yeo et al., 2017), by associating it in particular with concepts such as sharing economy, collaborative consumption, on-demand economy, on-demand services, group economy, independent economy, peer economy, digital economy, gig economy, and platform economy (Botsman, 2015; Rinne, 2017). Although the literature on CE has increased in recent years, few studies are looking at behavioural or psychological variables in this sphere of activity and their effect on the transition from a user role to a provider role (e.g., Ertz et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2020). More specifically, no studies have analyzed the impact of behavioral variables on switchover effects

in CE. In this line, the new findings can provide a basis for future research that will deepen the subject by filling a void in the existing literature and bringing a unique angle that had not previously been exploited.

8.2 PRATICAL IMPLICATIONS

Over the past decade, there has been a significant increase in studies on the motivations of suppliers of goods and services. This increase in research is perceptible in contexts as diverse as alternative markets (Albinsson & Perera, 2012), peer-to-peer rentals (Hawlitschek et al., 2018), or clothing exchanges (Albinsson & Perera, 2018). The phenomenon is also visible in intercultural contexts (Albinsson & Perera, 2019). According to Ertz et al. 2017, although the reasons for acquiring (or using) and disposing of (or providing) objects become more apparent, the underlying process of transition from user to provider remains undetermined.

In this vein, the research of Philip et al. (2015, 2018) is closest to a study of the process of transition from user to provider role by considering online peer-to-peer rental and exchange. The authors provide a typology of participants by classifying them according to one of the following three functions:

- As one-way users who act as users only or providers only;

- As two-way users who use and provide;

- As non-users.

While the classification offered by Philip and al. (2015, 2018) provides a better understanding of the factors that lead non-user consumers to become users, the studies do not identify the factors that explain the shift from a user role to a provider role on peer-to-peer platforms (Ertz et al., 2017). Albinsson et al. (2019) also sought to identify the factors that lead non-users to become users. Drawing on previous work by Philip et al. (2015, 2018), the authors found that certain characteristics in individuals play a role in the process leading to use: perceived sustainability, materialism, generosity, trust, risk-taking, and cultural factors. Nevertheless, the concept of transition from one

role to another remains absent. More recently, Nguyen et al. (2020) have proposed that the interchangeability characteristic can potentially foster participation intentions either as a user, as a provider, or both. Nevertheless, a gap remains in terms of probing individual-specific variables to explain role change. Overall, the literature offers emerging themes and theoretical foundations for further research on the process of transition from user to provider roles. The purpose of this study is to seek to deepen this process by identifying the behavioral variables drawn from the pro-environmental literature (e.g., Harland et al., 1999, Thøgersen, 1999; Truelove et al., 2014; Van der Werff et al., 2014), that support the transition from a user to provider role on the collaborative platform, which became a decisive component for the sustainability and understanding of this business model.

According to the results, the number of people performing the collaborative behavior significantly impacts the individual intention to participate actively in the CE. Data analysis shows that respondents in the MANY category have a higher propensity to become providers in the CE. The dependant variable Number of people performing the behavior is indeed the more revealing. Peer influence and group effect further seem to increase changes in individual motivations or preferences, but also in individual behaviors. Results reveal that: 1) the more people who perform the behavior, the higher the chances for a switchover to occurs; 2) It is not necessarily the people who perceive the behaviours as easier that are most likely to become a supplier. People in the DIFFICULTY category are more likely to change roles. As previously stated, collaborative platforms have a critical need for suppliers because they have 3.5 times more impact than users on the growth of collaborative systems (Chu and Manchanda, 2016). In other words, the success and development of collaborative platforms depend on the system's ability to renew and attract new suppliers. Managers of these platforms need to understand users' motivations and preferences and know what leads individuals to achieve collaborative behaviors. Moreover, for the prosperity of collaborative platforms, managers must know what makes it possible to increase the number of suppliers of goods and services within the collaborative economy.

CHAPTER 9

STUDY LIMITATIONS AND AVENUES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The research is subject to several limitations. The study is culturally limited to the Continent of North America. It might have other results in different socio-cultural contexts. Even if the world is becoming flattered (e.g., global business and trade or international communication and information flow), our global culture isn't homogenized yet (Wang et al., 2015). Cultural differences in consumers' online behavior (e.g., perception of the same website) have to be considered (Patrick et al., 2002). Also, the researchers of the Laboratoire sur les Nouvelles Formes de Consommation (LaboNFC) at the Université du Québec à Chicoutimi (Ertz et al., 2021) has identified (4) four meta-categories. The present study only explores one of these meta-categories: characteristics of the behavior. The study prioritizes a behaviour (i.e., co-housing) that implies a low propensity for the switchover from a user to a provider role. The results show that individuals agree to rent an apartment or a house but are less inclined to share their homes. Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate not to consider the study results because of the limitations mentioned above. Indeed, research manages to reveal interaction effects, even for behaviors for which the switchover is deemed difficult to achieve.

Therefore, this study brings interesting results for the management field by providing new insights and avenues for future research on collaborative practices, especially for the study of collaborative behaviours. This research can potentially provide an analytical basis for future research in CE by providing data and results that have never been revealed before. Also, because this study is part of a much larger research project, the results can be used as a basis for data collection, processing, and future analysis on the meta-categories identified: individual, context, and sociality,

CONCLUSION

While past research has amply explored the antecedents to getting involved in the CE, no study has studied the switchover from a user role to a provider role, nor the underlying effect of behavioural variables. Besides, these behavioural variables had not been tested with individuals. Furthermore, no experimental study has examined the impact of behavioural variables on switchover effects in the CE. For this reason, the overall objective of this research was to determine the process underlying the switchover effects in the CE. According to an experimental design, the specific objective was to empirically estimate to which extent specific behavioural variables lead consumers to move from a user role to that of a CE supplier. Thus, the research aimed to discover how the variables related to collaborative behaviour led consumers to move from a user role to a provider role in the CE.

The findings offer exclusive and experienced information on individual behaviours in marketing and consumer behaviour: the difficulty of the behaviour and the number of performing the behavior impact switchover effects in the CE. By providing new insights on the subject, this research can also provide future research on the impacts of behavioral variables or other variables on the newly introduced switchover effects in the CE.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T., & Pinkse, J. (2017). Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: An organizing framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 125*,1-10.

Akbar, P., Mai, R. & Hoffmann, S. (2016). When do Materialistic Consumers Join Commercial Sharing Systems. *Journal of Business Research 69* (10): 4215–4224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.003.

Albinsson, P. A., & Yasanthi Perera, B. (2012). Alternative marketplaces in the 21st century: Building community through sharing events. *Journal of ConsumerBehavior, 11*(4), 303-315.

Amaro, S., Andreu, L. & Huang, S. (2019). Millenials' Intentions to Book on Airbnb. *Current Issues in Tourism 22* (18): 2284–2298. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1448368.

Arsel, Z., & Dobscha, S. (2011). Hybrid pro-social exchange systems: The case of Freecycle. *ACR North American Advances, 39*,66-67.

Austin, A., Cox, J., Barnett, C. T. (2011). Exploring Catalyst Behaviours: Executive Summary. A research report completed for the Department for Environment, Food. *Climate Research Brook Lyndhurst for Defra*, London, 1-15. Retrieved from: https://www.scopus.com/record/display.uri?eid=2-s2.0 85032661886&origin=inward&txGid=384eb847761830422e8dac26ab992eef

Belk, Russell (2010), "Sharing," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 36 (February), 715-34.

Belk, R. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(8), 1595-1600.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.10.001.

Bell, S. (2009). Experimental Design. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 672-675. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044910-4.00431-4.

Berlyne, D. E. (1954). A theory of human curiosity. *British Journal of Psychology, 45,* 180– 191.https://doi-org.sbiproxy.uqac.ca/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1954.tb01243.x

Botsman, R. (2013). The sharing economy lacks A shared definition. Fast Company. Retrieved from http://www.fastcoexist.com/3022028/the-sharing-economy-lacksa-shared-definition.

Botsman, R. (2015). Defining the sharing economy: What is collaborative consumption-and what isn't. Fast company. Retrieved from https://www.fastcompany.com/3046119/defining-the-sharing-economy-what-is-collaborative-consumption-and-what-isnt.

Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2010). What's mine is yours. New York, USA: Penguin Press.

Botsman, R., & Rogers, R. (2011). What's mine is yours: How collaborative consumption is changing the way we live (Vol. 5). London: Collins.

Cavanagh, G.-F., & Fritzsche, D.-J. (1985). Using vignettes in business ethics research". In : Preston, L. E. (Editions), *Research in corporate social performance and policy, vol. 7, JAI Press, Inc., Greenwich, CT, 279-293.*

Chatelain, G., Hille, S. L., Sander, D., Patel, M., Hahnel, U. J. J., & Brosch, T. (2018). Feel good, stay green: Positive affect promotes pro-environmental behaviors and mitigates compensatory "mental bookkeeping" effects. *Jour. of Envir. Psy.*, *56*, 3-11.

Chu, H, & Liao, S (2007). Exploring consumer resale behavior in C2C online auctions: taxonomy and influences on consumer decisions. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 11 (3), 1-25.

Chu, H, & Liao, S (2010). Buying While Expecting to Sell: The Economic Psychology of Online Resale. *Journal of Business Research*, 63 (9), 1073-1078. Doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.03.023.

Chu, J., P. Manchanda. (2016). Quantifying cross-network effects in online C2C platforms. Market. Sci. 35(6), 870–893.

Cialdini, Robert & Goldstein, Noah. (2004). Social Influence: Compliance and Conformity. *Annual review of psychology, 55.* 591-621. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015.

Cochran, W.G., and Cox, G.M. (1957). *Experimental Designs,* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Corciolani, M & Dalli, D (2014). Gift-giving, sharing and commodity exchange at Bookcrossing. com: new insights from a qualitative analysis. *Management Decision*, 52 (4), 755-776. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MD-03-2012-0241.

Corral-Verdugo, V., González-Lomelí, D., Rascón-Cruz, M., & Corral-Frías, V. O. (2016). Intrinsic motives of autonomy, self-efficacy, and satisfaction associated with two instances of sustainable behaviour: frugality and equity. *Psych.*, *7*(05), 662.

Correa, J. C., Garzon, W., Brooker, P., Sakarkar, G., Carranza, S. A., Yunado, L., et al. (2019). Evaluation of collaborative consumption of food delivery servicesthrough web mining techniques. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 46*, 45-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.05.002.

Dalli, D., & Corciolani, M. (2008). Collective forms of resistance: The transformative power of moderate communities. *International Journal of Market Research*, *50*(6), 757–771.

DEFRA. (2008). DEFRA: A Framework for Pro-environmental Behaviours
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, London (2008)

Dolan, P., & Galizzi, M. M. (2015). Like ripples on a pond: Behavioral spillovers and their implications for research and policy. *Jour. of Eco. Psy.*, *47*, 1-16.

Edbring, E. G., Lehner, M. & Mont, O. (2016). Exploring Consumer Attitudes to Alternative Models of Consumption: Motivations and Barriers. *Journal of Cleaner Production 123*, 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.107.

Eisenmann, T., Parker, G. & Van Alstyne, M.W. (2006). Strategies for Two-Sided Markets. Harvard Business Review, 84, 92. Retrieved from : https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/1704705/mod_resource/content/1/Eisenmann%20 -%20Estrat,gias%20para%20mercados%20multilaterais.pdf

Emerson, J.D. (1991). Introduction to transformation. In D.C. Hoaglin, F. Mosteller, and J.W. Tukey (eds.), *Fundamentals of Exploratory Analysis of Variance.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Engel, J. F., Blackwell, R. D., & Kollat, D. T. (1978). Consumer Behavior. Dryden Press, Hinsdal , IL.

Ertz, M. & Boily, É. (2019). The rise of the digital economy: Thoughts on blockchain technology and cryptocurrencies for the collaborative economy. *International Journal of Innovation Studies 3*(4), 84-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2019.12.002

Ertz, M., Durif, F., & Arcand, M. (2016). Collaborative consumption: Conceptual snapshot at a buzzword. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 19*(2), 1e23.https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2799884.

Ertz, M., Lecompte, A., & Durif, F. (2017). Dual roles of consumers: towards an insight into collaborative consumption motives. *Inter. Jour. of Mark. Res.*, *59*(6), 725-748.

Ertz, M., Durif, F., & Arcand, M. (2018). Towards multilife marketing: How goods multiple lives practices create value for consumers. *Journal of Promotion Management, 24*(6), 863-894. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2017.1408527.

Ertz, M., Durif, F., & Arcand, M. (2019). A conceptual perspective on collaborative consumption*. Academy of Marketing Science Review, 9*, 27-41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-018-0121-3.

Figueiredo, B. & Scaraboto, D. (2016), The Systemic Creation of Value through Circulation in Collaborative Consumer Networks. *Journal of Consumer Research.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucw038.

Finch, J. (1987) The Vignette Technique in Survey Research, *Sociology*, 21, 105-114

Forgas, J.P. and Williams, K.D. (2001). *Social Influence: Direct and Indirect Processes*, Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Förster, J., Marguc, J. and Gillebaart, M. (2010), Novelty Categorization Theory. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4,* 736-755. https://doi-org.sbiproxy.uqac.ca/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00289.x

Ghilal, A., & Nach, H. (2019). La technologie de la chaîne de blocs: Fondements et applications. In

M. Ertz, D. Hallegatte, & J. Bousquet (Eds*.), La reconfiguration de l'échange marchand. Tour d'horizon, enjeux et perspectives* (pp. 113-131). Québec, Canada: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Godelnik, R. (2017). Millennials and the sharing economy: Lessons from a 'buy nothing new, share everything month'project. *Envir. Inn. and Soc. Trans.*, *23*, 40-52.

Gould, D. (1996), Using vignettes to collect data for nursing research studies: how valid are the findings? *Journal of Clinical Nursing,* 5, 5, 207-212.

Guttentag, D., Smith, S., Potwarka, L. & Havitz, M. (2018). Why Tourists Choose Airbnb: A Motivation-Based Segmentation Study. *Journal of Travel Research 57* (3), 342–359. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517696980.

Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., & Ukkonen, A. (2016). The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association forInformation Science and Technology, 67*(9), 2047-2059. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23552.

Harland, P., Staats, H., Wilke, H. a. M., (1999). Explaining proenvironmental intention and behavior by personal norms and the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(12), 2505–2528. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00123.x

Hawlitschek, F., Notheisen, B., & Teubner, T. (2018). The limits of trust-free systems: A literature review on blockchain technology and trust in the sharing economy. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 29, 50-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2018.03.005.

Hawlitschek, F., Teubner, T. & Gimpel, H. (2018). Consumer Motives for Peer-to-Peer Sharing. *Journal of Cleaner Production 204*, 144–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.326.

Hughes, R. & Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 37*(4):382-386. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02100.x

Hwang, J., & Griffiths, M. A. (2017). Share more, drive less: Millennials value perception and behavioral intent in using collaborative consumption services. *Jour. of Cons. Mar., 34*(2), 132-146.

Kagan, J. (1972). Motives and Development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22*, 51– 66. Retrieved from: https://psycnet-apa-org.sbiproxy.uqac.ca/fulltext/1972-24142-001.pdf

Kamargianni et al. (2014). Incorporating social interaction into hybrid choice models. *Transportation, 41,*1263–1285. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-014-9550-5

Lanzini, P., & Thøgersen, J. (2014). Behavioural spillover in the environmental domain: an intervention study. *Jour. of Envir. Psy., 40*, 381-390.

Lauren, N., Fielding, K. S., Smith, L., & Louis, W. R. (2016). You did, so you can and you will: Self-efficacy as a mediator of spillover from easy to more difficult pro-environmental behaviour. *Jour. of Envir. Psy.*, *48*, 191-199.

Li, H., & Wen, H. (2019). How is Motivation Generated in Collaborative Consumption: Mediation Effect in Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation. *Sustainability 11* (640), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030640.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Lutz, C., Hoffmann, C. P., Bucher, E. & Fieseler, C. (2018). The Role of Privacy Concerns in the Sharing Economy. *Information Communication & Society 21* (10): 1472–1492.https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1339726.

Manca, M., Prochazkova, Z., Berardi, U., Alfaro, L. & Pich-Aguilera, F. (2020). Building Circular Economy: a Case Study Designed and Built Following a BIM-Based Life Cycle Assessment Approach. *V International Conference on Durability of Building Materials and Components.* https://doi.org/10.23967/dbmc.2020.179

Margetts, E. A., & Kashima, Y. (2017). Spillover between pro-environmental behaviours: The role of resources and perceived similarity. *Jour. of Envir. Psy.*, *49*, 30-42.

Marte, J. (2015). Thinking of renting out your home on Airbnb? Consider these costs first. Washington Post, July 27.

Martin, D; Schouten, J. (2012). Sustainable Marketing. New Jersey: Pearson.

Meyer, V. (2008). La méthode des scénarios : un outil d'analyse et d'expertise des formes de communication dans les organisations. *Espaces urbains, Espaces publics, Paroles et interprétations des habitants*. https://doi.org/10.4000/edc.778

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

Nilsson, A., Bergquist, M., & Schultz, W. P. (2017). Spillover effects in environmental behaviours, across time and context: a review and research agenda. (Vol. 23, pp. 573-589): Routledge.

Ertz, M., Deschênes, J., Sarigöllü, E. (2021). From user to provider: Switchover effects in the collaborative economy. *Sustainability*, *13*(10), 5662.

Park, H., & Armstrong, C. M. J. (2019). Is Money the Biggest Driver? Uncovering Motives for Engaging in Online Collaborative Consumption Retail Models for Apparel. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 51,* 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.05.022.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Patrick Y. K. Chau, Melissa Cole, Anne P. Massey, Mitzi Montoya-Weiss, & Robert M. O'Keefe. (2002). Cultural differences in the online behavior of consumers. *Commun. ACM 45, 10 (October 2002), 138–143.* https://doi-org.sbiproxy.uqac.ca/10.1145/570907.570911

Perret, B. (2015). De la propriété à l'usage : Vers la démarchandisation? *Esprit July 30-39.* Retreived from : https://www.jstor.org/stable/44136082

Poortinga, W., Whitmarsh, L., & Suffolk, C. (2013). The introduction of a single-use carrier bag charge in Wales: Attitude change and behavioural spillover effects. *Jour. of Envir. Psy.*, *36*(C), 240-247.

Poulo, M. & Norwich, B. (2013). Cognitive, Emotional and Behavioural Responses to Students with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties: A model of decision-making. *British Educational Research Association.* https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920120109784

Qasem, Z., Algharabat, R., & Alalwan, A. A. (2018, June). Adoption of Sharing Economies of Communitive Consumption Providing an Exchange of Services: A Conceptual Frame Work. In *Int. Working Conf. on Transfer and Diffusion of IT* (pp. 90-101). Springer, Cham.

Rashotte, L. (2007). Social Influence. In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, G. Ritzer (Ed.). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss154

Rinne, A. 2017. 'What Exactly is the Sharing Economy?' *World Economic Forum,* 13 December. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/12/ when-is-sharing-not-really-sharing/

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology, 52,* 141– 166. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

Scaraboto, D. (2015). Selling, Sharing, and Everything in Between: The Hybrid Economies of Collaborative Networks. *Journal of Consumer Research, 42*, April 152-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv004

Schoenberg, N.-E. & Ravdal, H. (2000), Using vignettes in awareness and attitudinal research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3, 1, 63-74.

Spindeldreher, K., E., Fröhlich, Ak, J. & Schlagwein, D. (2019). Why Won't You Share? Barriers to Participation in the Sharing Economy. *Proceedings of the 25th American Conference on Information Systems, 1–10.* ACIS.

Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29*(3), 309–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004

Ter Huurne, M., Ronteltap, A., Corten, R. & Buskens, V. (2017). Antecedents of Trust in the Sharing Economy: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour 16* (6): 485–498. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1667.

Teubner, T., & Flath, C. M. (2019). Privacy in the Sharing Economy. *Journal of the Association of Information Systems 20* (3): 213–242. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00534.

Thøgersen, J., & Crompton, T. (2009). Simple and Painless? The Limitations of Spillover in Environmental Campaigning. Journal of Consumer Policy, 32(2), 141-163. doi : 10.1007/s10603-009-9101-1

Thøgersen, J. (2004). A cognitive dissonance interpretation of consistencies and inconsistencies in environmentally responsible behavior. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 24(1), 93-103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(03)00039-2

Thøgersen, J., & Ölander, F. (2003). Spillover of environment-friendly consumer behavior. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23(3), 225-236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(03)00018-5.

Thøgersen, J. (1999). Spillover processes in the development of a sustainable consumption pattern. Journal of Economic Psychology, 20(1), 53-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4870(98)00043-9.

Torrent-Sellens, J., Cugueró-Escofet, N. & Ertz, M. (2020). Motivations of collaborative obtainers and providers in Europe. *Behaviour & Information Technology.* https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2020.1851770

Trépos, J.-Y., (1988), *La construction sociale des conflits de consommation*, Thèse d'État en sociologie, Université Lille 1.

Trope Y, Liberman N, Wakslak C. Construal Levels and Psychological Distance: Effects on Representation, Prediction, Evaluation, and Behavior. J Consum Psychol. 2007;17(2):83-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1057-7408(07)70013-X. PMID: 21822366; PMCID: PMC3150814.

Truelove, H. B., Carrico, A. R., Weber, E. U., Raimi, K. T., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2014). Positive and negative spillover of pro-environmental behavior: An integrative review and theoretical framework. Global Environmental Change, 29(C), 127-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.004

Tussyadiah, I. P., & Pesonen, J. (2018). Drivers and barriers of peer-to-peer accommodation stay-an exploratory study with American and Finnish travellers. *Current Issues in Tourism, 21*(6), 703-720.

Van der Werff, E., Steg, L., & Keizer, K. (2014). I am what I am, by looking past the present: The influence of biospheric values and past behavior on environmental self-identity. Environment & Behavior, 46(5), 626-657. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916512475209

Van Valkenburgh, P., Dietz, J., De Filippi, P., Shadab, H., Xethalise, G., & Bollier, D. (2015*). Distributed collaborative organisations: Distributed networks and regulator frameworks*. Harvard Working Paper. Retrieved from: http://bollier.org/distributed-networks-and-law.

Yeo, V. C. S., Goh, S.-K., & Rezaei, S. (2017). Consumer experiences, attitude and behavioral intention toward online food delivery (OFD) services.Journal ofRetailing and Consumer Services, 35,150-162.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.12.013.

Wacheux, F. (1996), *Méthodes quantitatives et recherche en gestion.* Editions Economica, Paris.

Wang, Y., Tang, Y-Y. & Wang, J. (2015). Cultural Differences in Donation Decision-Making. *PLoS ONE, 10*(9), 1-8. https/doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138219

Watson, L., Johnson, C., Hegtvedt, K.A. and Parris, C.L. (2015), "Living green: examining sustainable dorms and identities", International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 310-326. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-09-2013-0118

Whitmarsh, L., & O'Neill, S. (2010). Green identity, green living? The role of pro-environmental self-

identity in determining consistency across diverse pro-environmental behaviours. *Jour. of*

Envir. Psy., *30*(3), 305-314.

Zheng, Z., Xie, S., Dai, H., Chen, X., & Wang, H. (2017). An overview of blockchain technology:

Architecture, consensus, and future trends. In 2017 *IEEE international congress on big data*

(BigData congress) (pp. 557-564).

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I: MAIN SURVEY

SCREENING
SQ1: Have you ever used an accommodation service directly provided by another consumer using an online platform (e.g., Airbnb, Couchsurfing)?
- YES (Skip to SQ1A)
- NO (Skip to exercise 2)

SQ1A: How often have you used an accommodation service directly provided by another consumer using an online platform?
- None
- 1
- 2 or more

SQ2: Have you ever rented out your house, apartment or room to provide an accommodation service directly to another consumer using an online platform?
- YES (Skip to exercise 2)
- NO

SQ3: Have you ever rented out your house, apartment or room to provide an accommodation service directly to another consumer **without** using an online platform?
- YES (Skip to exercise 2)
- NO

STUDY`

This research aims at identifying the sources of distraction during an intellectual task such as reading. You will have to read a short text on a random topic, and answer four questions. At the end of this exercise, please take some time to provide up to three sources of distraction that prevented you from focusing on the topic.
EXERCISE 1
Please read the following text and answer to the questions. When reading, please fully immerse yourself into the scenario and do not take into account your past experience regarding collaborative housing. Then, answer the questions with the scenario in mind.

You are a student and you need a place to stay when visiting another city. Having access to the internet, you decide to do a search on a collaborative housing platform. [Feeling of ease; EASE: It is very easy for you to find a home that suits you and you make the reservation quite easily. DIFFICULTY: You find it difficult to find a home that suits you and it is difficult for you to make the reservation]. Collaborative housing seems like an interesting option because you will have access to the entire home of an individual for a modest price. [Number of people who perform the behavior; FEW: However, according to the media, and according to information that you have gleaned on the Internet, very few people resort to collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very low. MANY: Besides, according to the media and according to the information that you have gleaned on the Internet, many people are using collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very high]. You try again the experience by booking accommodation on the platform for other stays.

EASE – FEW PEOPLE PERFORM THE BEHAVIOR

You are a student and you need a place to stay when visiting another city. Having access to the internet, you decide to do a search on a collaborative housing platform. It is very easy for you to find a home that suits you and you make the reservation quite easily. Collaborative housing seems like

an interesting option because you will have access to the entire home of an individual for a modest price. However, according to the media, and according to information that you have gleaned on the Internet, very few people resort to collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very low. You try again the experience by booking accommodation on the platform for other stays.

EASE – MANY PEOPLE PERFORM THE BEHAVIOR

You are a student and you need a place to stay when visiting another city. Having access to the internet, you decide to do a search on a collaborative housing platform. It is very easy for you to find a home that suits you and you make the reservation quite easily. Collaborative housing seems like an interesting option because you will have access to the entire home of an individual for a modest price. Besides, according to the media and according to the information that you have gleaned on the Internet, many people are using collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very high. You try again the experience by booking accommodation on the platform for other stays.

DIFFICULTY – FEW PEOPLE PERFORM THE BEHAVIOR

You are a student and you need a place to stay when visiting another city. Having access to the internet, you decide to do a search on a collaborative housing platform. You find it difficult to find a home that suits you and it is difficult for you to make the reservation. Collaborative housing seems like an interesting option because you will have access to the entire home of an individual for a modest price. However, according to the media, and according to information that you have gleaned on the Internet, very few people resort to collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very low. You try again the experience by booking accommodation on the platform for other stays.

DIFFICULTY – MANY PEOPLE PERFORM THE BEHAVIOR

You are a student and you need a place to stay when visiting another city. Having access to the internet, you decide to do a search on a collaborative housing platform. You find it difficult to find a home that suits you and it is difficult for you to make the reservation. Collaborative housing seems like an interesting option because you will have access to the entire home of an individual for a modest price. Besides, according to the media and according to the information that you have gleaned on the Internet, many people are using collaborative housing, and you realize by yourself that the number of users is very high. You try again the experience by booking accommodation on the platform for other stays.

Questions

MC1 : How easy do you think it is to book housing on a collaborative housing platform?

Very easy 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 Very difficult

MC2 : To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Many people use collaborative housing platforms.

Totally disagree 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 Totally agree

Imagine the following situation: you are no longer a student, you own your own home. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: You intend to become a collaborative housing provider.

Totally disagree 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Totally agree

END OF THE EXERCISE

Please indicate up three sources of distraction that prevented you from focusing on this topic:
- Remark 1 :_____
- Remark 2 :_____
- Remark 3 :_____

EXERCISE 2

Please read the following text and answer to the questions. When reading, please fully immerse yourself into the scenario and do not take into account your past experience. Then, answer the questions with the scenario in mind.

You ordered a new smart thermostat from your energy provider. For the installation of the thermostat, your energy provider collaborates with a subcontractor. In order to install the thermostat at your home, you make an appointment with a technician from the subcontractor. The subcontractor's technician comes to your house, installs the thermostat and it works well afterwards.

Questions

To what extent do you find that energy provider is collaborative?

Not at all collaborative 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Very collaborative

To what extent do find that the subcontractor is responsible for the work?

Totally disagree 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Totally agree

To what extent are you satisfied with the subcontractor's work?

Very satisfied 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Very dissatisfied

What is the likehood that you will make business with this energy provider again?

Highly unlikely 1-2-3-4-5-6-7 Very likely

END OF THE EXERCISE

Please indicate up to three sources of distraction that prevented you from focusing on this topic:

- Remark 1 :_____
- Remark 2 :_____
- Remark 3 :_____

APPENDIX III: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

D1: What is your sex?

- Male
- Female

D2: What is your age?

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56 and over

D3: What is the highest grade or level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
- Less than a high school diploma
- High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
- Some college, no degree
- Associate degree (e.g., A.A., A.S.)
- Bachelor's degree (e.g., B.A., B.Sc.)
- Master's degree (e.g., M.A., M.Sc., M.B.A.)
- Professional degree (e.g., MD, LLD, DVM)
- Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)

D4: What is your total household income?
- Less than $20,000
- $20,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more

D5: What is your main employment status?

- Full-time employment
- Part-time employment
- Unemployed
- Self-employed
- Home-maker
- Student
- Retired
- Other

D6: You are (…) :

- A renter
- An owner

D7: You live in (…) :

- An apartment

- A house
- Other, please specify: _____

D8: Have you ever stayed in a hotel, hostel, motel, guest house or bed & breakfast?

- Yes
- No

APPENDIX IV: ETHICS CERTIFICATION

UQAC
Université du Québec
à Chicoutimi

Le 05 avril 2019

À l'attention de :

Myriam Ertz, Professeure
Département des sciences économiques et administratives

Objet : Approbation éthique de votre projet de recherche

 # Projet : 2019-2

Titre du projet de recherche : Étude des effets de renversement dans l'économie collaborative

Source de financement : CRSH

Bonjour,

Votre projet de recherche a fait l'objet d'une évaluation en matière d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains par le Comité d'éthique de la recherche de l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi (CER-UQAC).

Un certificat d'approbation éthique qui atteste de la conformité de votre projet de recherche à la Politique d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains de l'UQAC est émis en date du 28 mars 2019. Prenez note que ce certificat est **valide jusqu'au 28 mars 2020.**

Veuillez noter que le Formulaire d'information et de consentement a été revu et légèrement modifié par le CER-UQAC. Ce document est déposé dans votre projet (voir les documents précédés d'un carré mauve dans la section "Fichiers" - "Documents officiels"). Cette version est celle autorisée par le CER et elle devra être utilisée pour votre projet.

Notez qu'en vertu de la Politique d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains, il est de la responsabilité des chercheurs d'assurer que leurs projets de recherche conservent une approbation éthique pour toute la durée des travaux de recherche et d'informer le CER de la fin de ceux-ci. Vous devrez donc obtenir le renouvellement de votre approbation éthique avant l'expiration de ce certificat à l'aide du formulaire *F7 - Renouvellement annuel.* Un rappel automatique vous sera envoyé par courriel quelques semaines avant l'échéance de votre certificat.

Un rapport non remis entraînera la fermeture du dossier éthique dans les 30 jours qui suivent et une mention y sera ajoutée. Ainsi, la poursuite de la **cueillette de données** auprès des participants, sans certification éthique valide, ou le fait d'**apporter une modification significative** (à la population ciblée, au formulaire de consentement, au protocole d'expérimentation, à la méthode de collecte ou de traitement des données, etc.) **ou affectant le niveau de risque du projet** sans approbation du CER-UQAC représentent des situations relevant de la Politique relative à la conduite responsable en recherche et en création. De plus, le chercheur a l'obligation de signaler tout incident grave dès qu'il survient.

Si des modifications sont apportées à votre projet avant l'échéance du certificat, vous devrez remplir le formulaire *F8 - Modification de projet* et obtenir l'approbation du CER avant de mettre en oeuvre ces modifications. Si votre projet est terminé avant l'échéance du certificat, vous devrez remplir le formulaire *F9 - Fin de projet* .

NAGANO Approbation du projet par le comité d'éthique suite à l'approbation conditionnelle
www.innowik.io Comité d'éthique de la recherche - UQAC

1 / 3

UQAC
Université du Québec
à Chicoutimi

Par ailleurs, puisque votre demande d'approbation indique l'obtention d'un financement, les professionnelles du Décanat de la recherche et de la création sont mises en copie conforme afin de les informer de l'obtention de votre certification éthique.

Enfin, dans le cadre de l'Entente pour la reconnaissance des certificats d'éthique des projets de recherche à risque minimal, nous aviserons le Comité d'éthique de de l'université d'attache de votre/vos cochercheur(s).

En vous souhaitant bon succès dans la réalisation de votre recherche, veuillez recevoir nos salutations distinguées.

Le CER-UQAC

UQAC
Université du Québec
à Chicoutimi

CERTIFICAT D'APPROBATION ÉTHIQUE

La présente atteste que le projet de recherche décrit ci-dessous a fait l'objet d'une évaluation en matière d'éthique de la recherche avec des êtres humains et qu'il satisfait aux exigences de la politique de l'UQAC en cette matière.

De plus, les membres jugent que ce projet rencontre les critères d'une recherche à risque minimal.

Projet # : 2019-2

Titre du projet de recherche : Étude des effets de renversement dans l'économie collaborative

Chercheur principal :
Myriam Ertz, Professeure
Département des sciences économiques et administratives
UQAC

Cochercheur(s) :
Emine Sarigollu, Professeure
Faculté de gestion Desautels
Université McGill

Financement : CRSH

Date d'approbation du projet : 28 mars 2019

Date d'entrée en vigueur du certificat : 28 mars 2019

Date d'échéance du certificat : 28 mars 2020

Tommy Chevrette