

A APPENDIX: TAXONOMY FOR SHARING PLATFORMS

The taxonomy comprises 10 dimensions.

(1) *Resource Type* describes the type of physical resource that a peer-provider must possess in order to be able to deliver the service to a peer-consumer. The definition of P2P SCC requires that a physical resource must be involved in the service delivery, such as an apartment, a car or a tool. P2P SCC is applied to a small yet growing number of resource types, so instead of using a general classification of goods, such as the International Classification of Goods and Services (World Intellectual Property Organization, 2014), we used our own classification that is based on the types of resources that are currently offered on the global P2P SCC market. We believe that this classification will offer a thorough overview of the present global P2P SCC market.

(2) *P2P SCC Pattern* characterizes what Andersson et al. (2013, p. 10) call the three “main types of peer-to-peer service sharing platforms”. Each pattern results from the combination of the planning horizon that is required for the service at hand and the degree to which each service instance becomes unique. Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) integrate the aspect of uniqueness in their dimension *temporality*. Accordingly, each access-based service “can be of short-term or longitudinal duration. At one end of the continuum, access can be short term, characterized by a one-time transaction, such as renting a car or a hotel room. At the other end, access can be longitudinal, where consumers have a membership in a community or club, such as in car sharing” (Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012, p. 884).

The pattern *deferred* describes P2P SCC platforms with services that require a long planning phase to be set up on the platform for every service-sharing instance such that every instance is unique. The pattern *recurrent* refers to the combination of long planning phase for the first set-up of the sharing service on the platform, followed by multiple service instantiations. The pattern *immediate* is assigned to platforms with services that require a short planning horizon to be set up on the platform for every service-sharing instance, while every instance remains unique. Therefore, accommodation offerings as seen on the *Airbnb* platform typically follow a deferred pattern, typical ride-sharing service like BlaBlaCar adopt the recurrent pattern, whereas the immediate pattern can be observed in services like Uber.

(3) *Type of Accessed Object* is a dimension that helps to clarify the nature of the access in a P2P SCC scenario by differentiating between access to a purely *functional* object like a storage space and

Table 10. Examples for the Mix Between Functional and Experiential Offerings

Platform	Example for experiential component
Liftsurfer	Ridesharing service calling for “not for sharing your miserable daily commute across suburbia [...] (but) for the cross country adventurer”
Misterbnb	An Airbnb clone with its statement “stay like a gay local”
Zimride	Published testimony from another ridesharing service, quote: “By zimriding, I met Shoshanna who is now like a sister to me.”

experiential access like a visit to a museum (Chen and Li, 2010). As there are no purely experiential cases, we define the characteristic *mixed* to represent access to objects that are neither purely functional nor purely experiential. There is a tendency to include experiential components into types of service delivery that are traditionally seen as functional services (Calder and Malthouse, 2013). For example, a ride-sharing service is more than transportation from one place to another, as it enables consumers to socialize, thus transforming a ride into a social experience. A good example is the platforms *BlaBlaCar*, where users are asked during the registration to indicate whether they would consider themselves “Bla”, “BlaBla” or “BlaBlaBla”, depending on their talkativeness. Correspondingly, the accessed object shifts from largely functional (Bla) to more experiential (BlaBlaBla). Testimonials and the platform-proclaimed value of the customer experience associated with the service are other indications that the accessed object is of the type *mixed* including an experiential component. Table 10 provide several other examples.

(4) *Resource Owner*. Although not included in the set of six dimensions of access-based services, the notion of the resource owner was used by Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012, p. 882) to differentiate between scenarios in which sharing or collaborative consumption can “occur from the company that owns the object of consumption rather than through sharing of personal (objects) among consumers.” We manifest this differentiation in the dimension *Resource Owner*. Given the scope of our work, we are interested in only two characteristics for the dimension: the characteristic *private person*, which refers to scenarios in which only private resources can be accessed among consumers; and the characteristic *private person or business*, which refers to scenarios in which both private individuals and companies can provide resources for SCC by individuals. For instance, the characteristic *private person or business* applies to the *Erento* platform, which allows users to “rent everything” and allows both private persons and businesses to list their resources.

(5) *Global Integration of the Service* denotes whether the service is offered in several silo-like

markets comprised of *separated* peer groups or whether it is *integrated* into a single market for all peers. It also denotes whether the markets are described by geographical scope, such *city-wide*, *state-wide*, *country-wide*, or *global*. If a service is comprised of a single portal that features no specific adaptations for any separated sub-community (with the exception of a multi-lingual user interface) and it is used in multiple countries, the service is considered to be integrated and global. If a service is comprised of a single portal that is exclusive to certain potential peers (e.g., because the website is available in a certain language only or the peer group is restricted to members of a certain country), the service is considered to be integrated and country-wide. If a service is comprised of multiple portals for separated peer groups, where members from one of the groups cannot execute transactions with members of the other groups, the service is considered separated. If these peer groups are, for instance, established on country-level, the service is considered separated and country-wide. The P2P SCC platform Share4friends illustrates the last example by welcoming an interested peer to its website with a request to select either a German or a US-based instance of the platform.

(6) The dimension of *Consumer Involvement* is used to assess the extent to which the customer is involved in the consumption experience (Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012). *Full-service* corresponds to a service in which the consumer has no or limited involvement and takes a passive role, whereas *self-service* means that the consumer is responsible for all activities involved, such as self-storage by the peer-consumer in a storage space that is offered by a peer-provider. The concept of consumer involvement is closely related to the concept of customer participation (Bendapudi and Leone, 2003), where customers may serve as “partial employees” in a service setting by sharing some of the production responsibilities (Mills and Morris, 1986). An example of full-service is a P2P SCC taxi service, where a customer is only required to get into the car. A self-service is also typical for a scenario, in which access is granted to a parking space. After placing the offering on a platform, no further action is required from the peer-provider of the parking space to supply the service.

(7) *Profit Orientation* — a dimension Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) originally proposed as market mediation — describes whether a P2P SCC platform is operated for profit or not-for-profit. We adopt this dimension but refine the original characteristic *for-profit* and *not-for-profit* to distinguish a for-profit orientation where the platform generates profit in one of four ways: through advertisement or customer data (*indirect profit*) by charging the peer-consumers (*profit from peer-consumers*), by charging the peer-providers (*profit from peer-providers*), and by charging both the peer-consumers

and the peer-providers (*profit from both peer-consumers and peer-providers*). If no profit is generated by the operator, the platform is classified as *not-for-profit*.

(8) *Money Flow* characterizes the process of payment for a transaction initiated on a P2P SCC platform. Many forms of payment can be categorized as either a direct *C2C* transaction using typical payment methods—such as wire transfer, cash on delivery/pickup/utilization of a service—or *C2B2C*, where the platform itself processes the payment and may act as trustee (Kreyer et al., 2007).

(9) *Payment Model* can be seen as a supplementing dimension to the money flow. It shows how a platform is charging its users. First, it can charge users *per transaction* meaning that each successful matchmaking between a peer-provider and peer-consumer results in a fee being transferred to the platform operator. Second, it can charge *per listing*. In this case, every new object that is put on the platform by a peer-provider requires a fee. Finally, platform operator can charge its users for *membership* either periodically or as a one-time registration fee. Combinations of the three characteristics can be present in one platform. Instead of providing three dimensions for each characteristic with yes or no characteristics, we decided to combine them into one dimensions with non-mutually exclusive characteristics.

(10) *Promotion of Sustainable Consumerism* refers to the P2P SCC platform's promotion of consumerism that is motivated by ideological, pro-social, or environmental interests. Based on the notion of the political consumerism, defined as “the use of market action as an area for politics, and consumer choice as a political tool” (Micheletti et al., 2004, p. vii), this dimension was introduced by Bardhi and Eckhardt (2012) as one of six dimensions to distinguish access-based services. Participation in access-based services can represent “a reflexive strategy of signaling access as a more environmentally sustainable or anti-market consumption alternative” (Bardhi and Eckhardt, 2012, p. 885). We extend the notion to *sustainable consumerism* because it enables the analysis of economic, ecological and social motivations of consumerism (Chasin, 2014). Even if the consumers' true motives are unknown, we assume that the explicit promotion of sustainable consumerism can serve as a proxy for the platform users' motivations.

The *Promotion of Sustainable Consumerism* dimension has three characteristics that can be present at the same time: *social*, *economic* and *environmental*. The mission statement of the French ride-sharing company BlaBlaCar illustrates the operationalization of the characteristics. The statement on the home page of the platform, “we connect people so that together they can reduce road traffic

and pollution, save money, and share enriching journeys”BlaBlaCar explicitly promotes all three aspects of sustainable consumerism. It must be noted that, similar to the *Payment Model* dimension, we could assure that every dimension consists of mutually exclusive characteristics (Nickerson et al., 2013) and split the dimension into three binary sub-dimensions. However, as it would only increase the complexity of the taxonomy and not its analytical power, we decided in favor of one dimension with three non-mutually exclusive characteristics.

In addition to the core taxonomy dimensions, following descriptive dimensions were assessed: the *Year of Launch*, *Place of Launch* and *Popularity*. The *Popularity* is approximated by the platform Web page view statistics and is based on the network traffic data that are provided by *Alexa*[FN]. *Alexa* is regarded as a reliable source of data and is widely used in the scientific community (Bernstam et al., 2005; Gallant et al., 2007; Fogg and Iizawa, 2008). *Year of Launch* is defined as the year in which the platform began operating according to the information provided on the platform’s website or—in case it is not stated—the Internet was searched for a date. *Place of Launch* describes the country and city where the platform was launched is derived according to the information provided on the platform’s Website itself or in the media archives available on the Internet. If the information provided on the platform’s Website and the Internet is not sufficient, missing information can often be retrieved by investigating the official domain name registration data for the platform *WHOis.net*. [FN]