The Sharing Economy: Why People Participate in Collaborative Consumption

**Information and communications technologies (ICTs) have enabled the rise of so-called “Collaborative Con- sumption” (CC): *the peer-to-peer-based activity of obtaining, giving, or sharing the access to goods and services, coordinated through community-based online services*. CC has been expected to alleviate societal problems such as hyper-consumption, pollution, and poverty by lowering the cost of economic coordination within communities. However, beyond anecdotal evi- dence, there is a dearth of understanding why people participate in CC. Therefore, in this article we investigate people’s motivations to participate in CC. The study employs survey data (*N* = 168) gathered from people reg- istered onto a CC site. The results show that participa- tion in CC is motivated by many factors such as its sustainability, enjoyment of the activity as well as eco- nomic gains. An interesting detail in the result is that sustainability is not directly associated with participa- tion unless it is at the same time also associated with positive attitudes towards CC. This suggests that sus- tainability might only be an important factor for those people for whom ecological consumption is important. Furthermore, the results suggest that in CC an attitude- behavior gap might exist; people perceive the activity positively and say good things about it, but this good attitude does not necessary translate into action.**

# Introduction

Attitudes towards consumption have shifted in recent years and brought increasing concern over ecological, soci- etal, and developmental impact. A growing concern about climate change and a yearning for social embeddedness by localness and communal consumption (Albinsson & Perera, 2012; Belk, 2010; Botsman & Rogers, 2010) have made the “collaborative consumption”/”sharing economy” (*The peer- to-peer-based activity of obtaining, giving, or sharing the access to goods and services, coordinated through community-based online services)* an appealing alternative for consumers. Past literature shows that people are turned away from ethical consumption because of economical and institutional reasons (Bray, Johns, & Kilburn, 2011; Eckhardt, Belk, & Devinney, 2010), yet with the develop- ment of new ways of consumption through the sharing economy, such as collaborative consumption (CC), these issues are addressed and potentially overcome. The sharing economy is an emerging economic-technological phenom- enon that is fuelled by developments in information and communications technology (ICT), growing consumer awareness, proliferation of collaborative web communities as well as social commerce/sharing (Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Wang & Zhang, 2012). We consider the sharing economy as an umbrella concept that encompasses several ICT developments and technologies, among others CC, which endorses sharing the consumption

of goods and services through *online* platforms. In this study, we explore how continued participation is motivated in the part of the sharing economy that is concerned with CC, namely sharing the consumption of goods and services through activities such as renting, swapping, or trading. This includes services such as Zipcar, as well as Couchsurfing and Airbnb.

Forbes (Geron, 2013) has estimated that “revenue flowing through the sharing economy directly into people’s wallets will surpass $3.5 billion, with growth exceeding 25% [SE is referring to only CC and microwork].” At the same time, investors regard the sharing economy as the new “mega-trend”; investing hundreds of millions into related start-ups (Alsever, 2013). Further, the rise of the sharing economy is predicted to have a major societal impact, and thus holds relevance to both practitioners and policy makers (EU Environment, 2013). For instance, a potential change in e-commerce patterns may have a significant impact on online sales, which makes it important to examine the role and effects of CC in an online consumption context.

Despite a growing practical importance, there is a lack of quantitative studies on motivational factors that affect consumers’ attitudes and intentions towards CC. The context is of especially great interest since participation in CC communities and services is generally characterized as driven by obligation to do good for other people and for the environment, such as sharing, helping others, and engaging in sustainable behavior (Prothero et al., 2011; Sacks, 2011). However, CC may also provide economic benefits (saving money, facilitating access to resources, and free-riding), which constitute more individualistic reasons for participating. For these reasons there exists a real practical problem of how CC could become more widespread. In particular, the possible discrepancy between motivations and their effect on attitudes and behavior war- rants an interesting context for research (Bray et al., 2011; Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

This article explores people’s motivations to participate in CC. We explore how CC can be defined in more detail in the section, The Sharing Economy as a Technological Phenom- enon, but we mainly consider CC to be based on access over ownership, the use of online services, as well as monetary and nonmonetary transactions such as sharing, swapping, trading, and renting (See Botsman & Rogers, 2010). We adopt the lens of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in attitude formation and use intentions related to CC (see e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1985; Lindenberg, 2001). The research model and hypotheses were developed as a triangulation of three sources: (a) self-determination theory (classification of motivations into intrinsic and extrinsic motivations) (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Lindenberg, 2001); (b) previous studies on parallel sharing economies-related phenomena (Hennig- Thurau, Henning, & Sattler, 2007; Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Nov, Naaman, & Ye, 2010); and (c) context-specific adjust- ments. The article is structured as follows. The next section presents the theoretical framework and background for our hypotheses. The subsequent section then outlines data and

methods, followed by the results. The article concludes with a discussion on implications and avenues for future research.

# Background

This section gives an overview of how CC is positioned in the sharing economy as a technological phenomenon. As a first step, we present our mapping of 254 platforms to better understand the overall CC landscape. We then unravel the contextual understanding of the term “sharing” within the sharing economy and the characteristics it is assigned, such as the common traits of social dynamics and collectiv- ism versus individual reputation.

*The Sharing Economy as a Technological Phenomenon*

The development of information technologies alongside the growth of web 2.0 has enabled the development of online platforms that promote user-generated content, sharing, and collaboration (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Classical examples of these include open source software repositories (e.g., SourceForge and Github), collaborative online ency- clopedias (e.g., Wikipedia) and other content sharing sites (e.g., Youtube, Instagram), or even peer-to-peer file sharing (e.g., The Pirate Bay). More recent examples are peer-to- peer financing such as microloans (e.g., Kiva) and crowdfunding services (e.g., Kickstarter). These four examples, open-source software, online collaboration, file sharing, and peer-to-peer financing, are considered as dif- ferent instances of the phenomenon we label the “sharing economy.” The phenomenon of the sharing economy thus emerges from a number of technological developments that have simplified sharing of both physical and nonphysical goods and services through the availability of various infor- mation systems on the Internet. We will thus view the “sharing economy” primarily through the lens of informa- tion technology.

We argue that although these different instances (open source, online collaboration, file sharing, peer-to-peer financing) of the sharing economy seem superficially differ- ent, they share a number of common aspects. To begin with, all have origins and growth stemming from the tech-driven culture of Silicon Valley. This is easily attributed to open source and content sharing services, but as reported by, for example, Sacks (2011), this is also where the first, largest, and most successful CC services have emerged in the last few years. More importantly, the various instances of the sharing economy also share the characteristics of online collaboration, online sharing, social commerce, and some form of underlying ideology, such as collective purpose or a common good, as will be discussed in the section, Aspects of the Sharing Economy. All of these characteristics can also be attributed to CC services.

In this article, also CC is mainly positioned as a category of this contemporary technology-driven sharing economy. In our view this is an interesting and relevant approach to CC, because almost all practical CC activities are mediated

by various information systems, as we will outline here. Therefore, we study CC mainly as a technological phenom- enon, as opposed to, for example, the perspective of an emerging consumer culture. We position our study in the literature on technology participation and adoption, as well as content contribution. We view CC as not just consumption but as an activity where both the contribution and use of resources are intertwined through peer-to-peer networks. The consumer-related literature is also relevant. For example, CC could be viewed from perspective of sharing (e.g., Belk, 2014a, 2014b), borrowing (e.g., Jenkins et al. 2014), reuse and remix culture (e.g., Lessig, 2008), charity (e.g., Hibbert & Horne, 1996; Strahilevitz & Myers, 1998), second-hand markets, sustainable consumption (e.g., Young, Hwang, McDonald, & Oates, 2010), and for instance, even anticonsumption (Ozanne & Ballantine, 2010). We note, however, that although framing CC in the context of consumer studies is of course complementary, it is beyond the scope of this work.

We define the term CC broadly as the peer-to-peer-based activity of obtaining, giving, or sharing access to goods and services, coordinated through community-based online ser- vices. This definition was formed by the combination of previous considerations as well as by the mapping of 254 CC websites of. The websites were identified by sys- tematically going through all the categories (i.e., transport, equipment, children, etc.) of the directory on [collaborative-](http://collaborativeconsumption.org/) [consumption.org.](http://collaborativeconsumption.org/) This contains a collection of various types of websites that relate their business to the sharing economy/ CC. The directory is continuously updated by adding CCs that are just starting out and also updated by removing those CCs that have halted operations.

To qualify for the mapping, the CC must be an online website, a mobile app, or a combination that is continuously used and maintained by the users. However, a website that advertises a standalone and purely offline activity, such as a flea market, would not qualify. The evaluation of each website was made by alphabetically and systematically going through the directory, opening the website, then reading and examining its content, and, if necessary, signing up for an account to look at any additional features. The mapping placed the CCs in different categories that described the mode of exchange: sharing, new purchase, second-hand purchase, renting, donating, swapping, and lending or borrowing. An overview of the mapping can be

seen in Table 1. Notably, some services facilitate multiple types of activities, such as renting as well as purchasing, and thus belong to more than one category.

The mapping of 254 CC platforms revealed that the activities may be separated into two main categories of exchange: access over ownership and transfer of ownership. However, it is possible for a platform to facilitate both modes of exchange. This occurs when the platform has more than one type of trading activity, such as lending (access over ownership) and donating (transfer of ownership), causing an overlap between the main categories. Out of the 254 platforms, 191 were identified as facilitating access over ownership while 139 provided the transfer of ownership. A total of 76 platforms had overlapping categories.

Access over ownership is the most common mode of exchange. Access over ownership means that users may offer and share their goods and services to other users for a limited time through peer-to-peer sharing activities, such as renting and lending (see Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2012). Most common was renting. For example, MonJouJou rents out childrens’ toys for a duration of 15, 30, or 60 days. Other examples are AirBnb, and RentTheRunway where goods and services can be accessed by users for a certain amount of time and often for a fee. Another example, Berlin-based Drivenow is a paid car-sharing service where a user may book any of the designated cars randomly distributed throughout the city and when the user is done, he may park the car anywhere within the assigned city area.

Alternatively, the transfer of ownership passes ownership from one user to another through swapping, donating, and purchasing of primarily second-hand goods. For instance, services such as Swapstyle or ReSecond help users to swap unwanted clothes. Other examples are Zilch and ThredUp. Swapping or donating are the most popular categories fol- lowed by the least popular category, namely purchasing used goods. An overview of the mapping can be seen in Table 1.

Furthermore, this analysis sheds light on numerous aspects of the sharing economy but particularly on the mul- tiplicity of the term “sharing.” We want to emphasize that our definition of the sharing economy differs slightly from those of other scholars (Belk, 2007, 2010), as well as some other definitions of “sharing economy” (Lessig, 2008; Sacks, 2011) or “collaborative consumption” (Belk, 2014a, 2014b; Botsman & Rogers, 2010).

\Moreover, CC operates through technological platforms, such as a website or mobile app, yet relies heavily on social dynamics for the actual sharing and collaboration. In fact, Wiertz and de Ruyter (2007) propose that firms that own and operate such online platforms do not control the actual sharing at all. Instead, the development is led by social dynamics, such as enjoyment and self-marketing of a community (Lin and Lu, 2011; Wasko & Faraj, 2000). Therefore, sharing economy (and in particular CC) platforms act merely as economical-technological coordination providers. This resembles for example, GitHub and Torrent trackers, which do not necessarily have control of the content distributed, exchanged and coordinated. “Collaborative consumption communi- ties” represent such coordinating centers in the context of CC.

In summary, this article suggests that CC is a peer-to- peer-based activity of obtaining, giving, or sharing access to goods and services, coordinated through community- based online services. This is based on existing definitions that are combined and refined with the findings from the mapping of the 254 platforms. Nevertheless, there remains a difficulty in defining this phenomenon, because of the wide variations in existing terminology. A definition should include CC’s socioeconomical as well as technological aspects, taking into account that it manifests varying degrees of digital and physical exchange. In this way, CC also affords several equally important perspectives for analysis. However, mainstream media have merely defined CC as an “economic model based on sharing, swapping, trading, or renting products and services, enabling access over ownership” (Botsman, 2013). Another previous schol- arly definition restricts CC only to nonmonetary transac- tions “the acquisition and distribution of a resource for a fee or other compensation” (Belk, 2014b, p. 1597). However, this is where the definitions diverge based on whether monetary exchange is allowed as a part of CC. Moreover, as we discussed earlier, publicly available list- ings of CC services include a variety of services that have different features and modes of exchange including mon- etary transactions. In this article we have primarily inves- tigated CC as a technological development, and have viewed it from the perspective of research on peer-to-peer technologies, such open source software repositories (e.g., SourceForge and Github), collaborative online encyclope- dias (e.g., Wikipedia), and other content sharing sites (e.g., Youtube, Instagram), or even peer-to-peer file sharing (e.g., The Pirate Bay). This approach provides a solid bridge to tie the CC phenomenon into the existing literature, both conceptually and in terms of theory.

*Aspects of the Sharing Economy*

In the following four sections we take a more detailed look at the characteristics of the sharing economy; namely online collaboration, social commerce, the notion of sharing online, and consumer ideology.

*Collaboration online.* The growing use of information tech- nologies in the web 2.0 era has increased the amount of user-generated content and also the manner in which infor- mation is created and consumed online (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Nov, 2007). The peer-to-peer platform has grown into an essential tool for the purposes of such information cre- ation and consumption. The term peer-to-peer is commonly associated with file sharing, however, it also refers to the larger phenomenon of collaborative activities between users online, such as consumer-to-consumer exchanges. In fact, Rodrigues and Druschel (2010) describe the peer-to-peer platform as a system in which content generation is highly distributed and decentralized as a result of the organic growth and strong user self-organization. Moreover, an essential aspect of this type of platforms is the focus on collaboration (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Rodrigues & Druschel, 2010), in which, for example, open software proj- ects may be gathered and facilitated. A particularly well- known example is Wikipedia, where online users work together to produce content by sharing knowledge. In addi- tion, studies on participation motives in open-source soft- ware (OSS) projects (Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Oreg & Nov, 2008; Roberts, Hann, & Slaughter, 2006) suggest that participation is influenced by a variety of factors such as reputation, enjoyment, and both intrinsic and extrinsic moti- vation (see also Wasko & Faraj, 2005).

*Social commerce.* Online social commerce rests on peer-to- peer interaction as it is “a form of commerce that is mediated by social media” and uses social media to “support social interactions and user contributions to assist activities in the buying and selling of products and services online and offline” (Wang & Zhang, 2012, p. 2). Social commerce and social shopping are often used interchangeably, although social shopping is a subcategory of social commerce (Stephen & Toubia, 2010) and is more related to the social influence exerted by peers on purchasing decisions (Wang & Zhang, 2012). On the other hand, group deals that are obtained via social buying services (such as Groupon) seem to mostly be motivated by saving money.

Social commerce thus relies on platforms with peer-to- peer interaction, which in turn rely on users being motivated to continue using and engaging through social networking sites (SNS). SNS and social commerce share common ground as both involve peer-to-peer interaction on social media, although the latter also include mercantile features (Ellison & boyd, 2013; Wang & Zhang, 2012). The motiva- tion of users to continue participating in social commerce is multifaceted, and often relies on the perception of individual enjoyment (also through relatedness) and economic benefits. Nevertheless, Wang and Zhang (2012) assert that social commerce is moving beyond individual enjoyment and cen- tering on economic concern. For instance, a pertinent form of social commerce is the consumer self-coordination of group deals for pursuit of economic gains (Wang & Zhang, 2012). Kozinets (1999) also proposes that consumers are empowered through peer-to-peer sharing in an online

commerce setting in which they turn to their social networks to retrieve information about products, rather than commer- cial sources. The role of marketers is thus reduced while the role of users is induced to be both a consumer and a pro- ducer. This is also important in many cases of CC in which the participants can be consumers, providers, or both.

*Sharing online.* The term “sharing” has experienced a major change in meaning with the evolution of online ser- vices, especially in an SNS setting (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). In an SNS context, the concept of sharing commonly refers to sharing information, such as status updates, links, or photos. However, increased reliance on IT-based e-commerce systems has also facilitated the sharing of goods and services through information technology (Galbreth, Ghosh, & Shor, 2012; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2007), such as CC platforms like Couchsurfing, Zipcar, Neighbourgoods, and Sharetribe.

The development of CC platforms, have thus far primar- ily been investigated from a service design perspective (e.g., Hamari, 2013; Lamberton & Rose, 2012; Suhonen, Lampinen, Cheshire, & Antin, 2011). For example, Couch- surfing, a community for sharing accommodation among travelers and one of the most successful sharing services to date, has received the most attention (Molz, 2012; Rosen, Lafontaine, & Hendrickson, 2011). Sharing has been studied in the context of digital goods (e.g., music files—see e.g., Shang, Chen, & Chen, 2008) and open source software. For example, Huang (2005) studies norms and motivations asso- ciated with peer-to-peer music sharing, whereas Zentner (2006) focuses on the effects of music sharing on record sales. Finally, in the context of information sharing, Nov (2007) examines motivations for Wikipedia editors and Nov et al. (2010) address online photography sharing.

*Ideological considerations.* Information technology is increasingly used as a means to further collective action in support of the advancement of an ideology or idea (Oh, Agrawal, & Rao, 2013). For instance, the social media plat- form Twitter was used as a reporting tool during the Arab Spring (Metzgar & Maruggi, 2009) and the 2008 U.S. presi- dential candidates campaigned extensively through social media (Wattal, Schuff, Mandviwalla, & Williams, 2010). Open-source and in particular the free software movement have strong ideological underpinnings (Raymond, 1999). However, the ideology and ideas that underlie the sharing economy may go beyond collective action for political pur- poses, even if notions of anticonsumerism clearly are related (Ozanne & Ballantine, 2010). We argue that green consump- tion (see e.g., Eckhardt et al., 2010) and other sustainable behavior are even more important drivers in the context of CC.

# Research Model and Hypotheses

As discussed, online collaboration, such as peer-to-peer activity, is fuelled by enjoyment, economic incentive,

reputation, and self-fulfillment. This is much like social commerce and online sharing that are also driven by enjoy- ment, economic incentive, reputation, yet additionally paired with collaboration. The application of ideology, such as sustainability and green consumption, is mainly propelled by reputation and economic concern. As a result, we propose four possible and distinguishable categories in which the forthcoming hypotheses are developed, namely *sustainabil- ity*, *enjoyment*, *reputation*, and *economic benefits*. These will be discussed in more detail.

Self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985) posits that motivations can be distinguished as intrinsic or extrinsic. The former emerge from the intrinsic value or enjoyment related to the given activity, whereas extrinsic motivations are related to external pressures, such as repu- tation and monetary gain. According to Lindenberg (2001), there are two kinds of intrinsic motivations: enjoyment derived from the activity itself and value derived from acting appropriately—that is, conforming to norms. Related studies have also classified these motivations by the degree of association with other people (Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Nov et al., 2010), which is complementary to Lindenberg’s (2001) conceptualization. For example, striving to enjoy an activity or obtaining economic gains through the activity are not directly affected by others’ opinions. On the other hand, reputation and conforming to norms depend directly on how other people reflect upon the activity. We operationalize these motivational dimensions as follows: for intrinsic moti- vations we consider (a) enjoyment, (b) sustainability and for extrinsic motivations, (c) economic benefits, and (d) reputa- tion. The following subsections discuss the variables and hypotheses in more detail.

*Sustainability*

Participation in CC is generally expected to be highly ecologically sustainable (Prothero et al., 2011; Sacks, 2011). Such motivations are generally linked to ideology and norms (Lindenberg, 2001), which in our theoretical framework and in related work (Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Nov et al., 2010) are conceptualized as intrinsic motivations. Recent develop- ments suggest that CC platforms are used to foster a sus- tainable marketplace (Phipps et al., 2013) that “optimizes the environmental, social, and economic consequences of consumption in order to meet the needs of both current and future generations” (Luchs et al., 2011, p. 2). Also, open source software development and participation in peer pro- duction (e.g., Wikipedia) are driven by altruistic motives such as openness and freedom of information as argued by Nov (2007) as well as Oreg and Nov (2008). Thus, partici- pation and collaboration in online platforms may be influ- enced by attitudes shaped by ideology and socio-economic concerns, such as anti-establishment sentiments (Hennig- Thurau et al., 2007) or a preference for greener consump- tion, which we believe to be a particularly important factor in the context of CC. Therefore, we operationalize the intrin- sic motivation related to norms as ecological sustainability.

We hypothesize that sustainability is a major predictor for attitude formation and behavioral intentions towards CC.

**H1a:** (Intrinsic motivation: Sustainability). Perceived sus- tainability of CC positively influences attitudes towards CC.

**H1b:** (Intrinsic motivation: Sustainability). Perceived sus- tainability of CC positively influences behavioral intentions to participate in CC.

*Enjoyment*

A fundamental dimension of intrinsic motivation is the autotelic nature of the activity or the enjoyment derived from the activity itself (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Lindenberg, 2001). In terms of intrinsic motivation, software developers contribute to open-source projects as a result of enjoyment and a feeling of competence (Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Nov, 2007; Roberts et al., 2006; Wasko & Faraj, 2000; see also Ryan & Deci 2000). Enjoyment has been regarded as an important factor also in other sharing-related activities, such as infor- mation system use (Van der Heijden, 2004), and information sharing on the Internet (Nov, 2007; Nov et al., 2010). Nev- ertheless, the initial motivation to collaborate does not explain nor predict sustained participation (Fang & Neufeld, 2009). A study on the continued use of social networking services established that enjoyment is a primary factor, fol- lowed by the number of peers and usefulness (Lin & Lu, 2011). Social networking services and similar service design used elsewhere can be seen to especially promote related- ness (see Hamari & Koivisto, 2015 and e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000 on relatedness), which is a major determinant for intrinsically motivated use such as enjoy- ment. Therefore, we include enjoyment as the second intrin- sic motivation to our model to predict attitudes and behavioral intentions towards CC.

**H2a:** (Intrinsic motivation: Enjoyment). Perceived enjoy- ment from participating in CC positively influences attitude towards CC.

**H2b:** (Intrinsic motivation: Enjoyment). Perceived enjoy- ment from participating in CC positively influences behav- ioral intentions to participate in CC.

*Reputation*

Reputation has been shown to be an important external motivation factor in determining participation in communi- ties and other online collaboration activities such as informa- tion sharing (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Wasko & Faraj, 2005) and open-source projects (Lakhani & Wolf, 2005; Nov et al., 2010). In particular, gaining reputation among like- minded people has been shown to motivate sharing in online communities and open-source projects (Parameswaran & Whinston, 2007; Raymond, 1999). Anthony, Smith, and Williamson (2009) reported that reputation and commitment to the community are important drivers for Wikipedia editors. When Wasko and Faraj (2005) explored why individuals share knowledge in electronic networks of practice, they

established that contribution is often underlined by the per- ception that it enhances personal reputation. Donath (1999) also supported the conclusion that reputation can be a moti- vator for active participation. Yang and Lai (2010, p. 1377) found that “individuals are more likely to gain self-based achievement rather than enjoyment in the process of sharing knowledge.” Hars and Ou (2001) also found that self- marketing and building of reputation are the strongest indi- cators of likelihood to collaborate online. Similarly, an active participant in CC may expect intangible rewards in the form of higher status within the CC community.

**H3a:** (Extrinsic motivation: Reputation). Perceived reputa- tion increase from participating in CC positively influences attitude towards CC.

**H3b:** (Extrinsic motivation: Reputation). Perceived reputa- tion increase from participating in CC positively influences behavioral intentions to participate in CC.

*Economic Benefits*

As the previous sections discuss, CC—and sharing goods and services in general—is often regarded as not only eco- logically sound but also economical. See, for example, the works of Belk (2010) as well as Lamberton and Rose (2012). Therefore, participating in sharing can also be ratio- nal, utility maximizing behavior wherein the consumer replaces exclusive ownership of goods with lower-cost options from within a CC service. Furthermore, there are signs of both positive and negative influences of economic incentives on sharing behavior (Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005; Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Kankanhalli, Tan, & Wei, 2005). Hars and Ou (2001) study both the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of participation in open source devel- opment, and find that a strong extrinsic motivation is the potential future rewards, such as economic benefits. Addi- tionally, in the context of peer-to-peer networks, sharing serves as an incentive for saving economic resources (Luchs et al., 2011). Therefore we hypothesize that extrinsic rewards, in the form of saving money and time, derived from CC positively influence attitudes toward CC and intentions to participate in it.

**H4a:** (Extrinsic motivation: Economic outcomes). Perceived extrinsic reward of participating in CC positively influences attitude towards CC.

**H4b:** (Extrinsic motivation: Economic outcomes). Perceived extrinsic reward of participating in CC positively influences behavioral intentions to participate in CC.

*Attitude*

Attitude is regarded as a major determinant of behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Furthermore, when studying a phenomenon with which there is reason to expect a possible discrepancy between attitudes and behavior it is essential to measure them separately.

With respect to motivation to participate or consume certain goods, consumer behavior literature suggests that

although consumers may be ideologically and ethically minded, their aspirations may not translate into sustainable behavior (e.g., Bray et al., 2011; Phipps et al., 2013; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). A few issues might explain this attitude- behavior gap: (a) actually pursuing sustainable behavior can be costly both in terms of coordination and direct cost, (b) people lack the means of deriving benefits from signaling such behavior (and thus not able to gain recognition from the behavior). For instance, studies show that people are moti- vated to take on sustainable behavior especially when other consumers have been able to signal that they are also par- ticipating (Goldstein, Cialdini, & Griskevicius, 2008). (c) There is not enough information for the consumers about sustainable consumption. We argue that technologically mediated CC may alleviate these concerns. They may enable a more efficient coordination of sharing activities, which in turn aids in the facilitation of active communities around a cause. Nonetheless, the question remains whether peoples’ attitudes towards CC are determined by for example, green values and if so, do they also reflect their actual behavior? Or does the attitude-behavior gap exist also in this context? In order to address this issue, among other predictions, we investigate the relationship between the attitudes and behav- iors.

**H5:** Attitude towards CC positively influences behavioral intention to participate in CC.