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# Findings from a German study outlining definitions of services frequently confused with P2P carsharing

**Research background:** What is P2P carsharing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>In P2P carsharing I own a car together with friends and use it whenever I need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>In P2P carsharing I share a ride with someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>In P2P carsharing I rent a car provided by a company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>In P2P carsharing private individuals rent cars to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>In P2P carsharing I found a carpool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=1000, EBS, 2016*
Comparison of different access-based-mobility services

Research background: What is P2P carsharing?

Driving yourself
- Car rental
- Car sharing

Being driven
- Taxi
- Mass ride hailing
- Ride hailing

B2C

P2P
Main differences of B2C and P2P carsharing from a renter’s perspective

Research background: What is P2P carsharing?

**B2C**
- Commercial, standardized vehicles
- No personal interaction
- Spontaneous, short-term access
- Fixed rental fees

**P2P**
- Personal vehicles
- Personal interaction with car owner
- Predefined time period
- Individual rental fees
## Relevance of P2P Carsharing

### Academic Perspective

- **Shift from ownership to access**
  
  *(Botsman & Rogers, 2010; Belk, 2014)*

- **P2P services enable consumers to enter the market for access-based-services as renters and owners**
  
  *(Botsman & Rogers, 2010)*

- **Academia has mainly investigated participation in B2C services but findings may not be applicable to P2P contexts**
  
  *(Lamberton & Rose, 2012; Moeller & Wirtz, 2010; Philip, Ozanne, & Ballantine, 2015)*

- **Scholarly debate has mostly assessed permanent disposition – insights on temporary disposition are limited**
  
  *(Jacoby, Berning, & Dietvorst, 1977; Philip et al., 2015)*

- **Qualitative identification of motives triggering the usage of P2P carsharing**

### Management Perspective

- **Changing mobility demands**
  
  *(EY, 2015; Kühnimhof, Buehler, Wirtz & Kalinowska, 2012)*

- **57% of Germans are interested in P2P carsharing**
  
  *(EBS, 2016)*

- **Favorable public perception & successful adoption in other countries**
  
  *(Shaheen & Cohen, 2012; Scholl, 2016)*

- **Semantic confusion & reservations to usage**
  
  *(EBS, 2016)*

- **Need to attract two distinct customer groups: Car owners and car renters**
Peculiarities of the German peer-to-peer carsharing market

3 major P2P networks

Opel and Daimler entered the market

120,000 active users

57% interested non-users

Germans love their cars

Contra-campaigns and legal uncertainty

Short term rentals not insured

Self-service technology in pilot-phase
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**Means-end chain analysis**

### Background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Academic application</th>
<th>Managerial value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means-end chain analysis is a qualitative method used to uncover overarching participation motives and cognitive motive structures.</td>
<td>MEC analysis has been applied to a variety of marketing areas such as consumer behavior and strategic marketing</td>
<td>Results are of great managerial relevance and indicate the values making a service relevant to a specific consumer group. They help managers to identify market segments and develop positioning strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reynolds & Gutman, 1988*  
*Bagozzi & Dabholkar, 1994; Herrmann & Huber, 2000; Schaefer, 2013*  
*Reppel & Szmigin, 2010; van Rekom & Wierenga, 2007; Wagner, 2007*
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The „Big Picture“

The hierarchical value map of peer-provider participation

- Quality of Life
- Economic Interest
- Help Others
- Sustainability
- Belonging

- Value
  - Psychological Consequences
  - Functional Consequence
  - Attribute

- More than six associations
- Five to six associations
- Three to four associations
- Two associations

- Additional Income
- Reduction of Fixed Costs
- Car is Moved
- Decrease Vehicle Need
- Formation of Acquaintance ship

- Rent Increase
- Low Utilization
- Interest in Sharing

- More than six associations
- Five to six associations
- Three to four associations
- Two associations
## Three main participation motives of car owners

### The Main Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Motives</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost-conscious</strong></td>
<td>... desire to save money by renting out their vehicle. They are attracted by the possibility of reducing ownership costs and costs associated with low vehicle utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spenders</strong></td>
<td>... driven by the generation of extra disposable income through participation to invest in activities enhancing one’s overall quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience enablers</strong></td>
<td>... participate for the joy of providing renters with mobility, thus being an integral part in the creation of mobility-experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>... matters to respondents, who wouldn’t participate if it would have adverse effects on the environment. But sustainability is merely a sufficient condition in P2P carsharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Implementation Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Owners</th>
<th>Service quality is influenced by car owners. Owners need to be trained and incentivized to deliver good services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pricing Rentals</td>
<td>Rental prices are an attribute - yet cars are frequently overpriced. Owners need guidance in correctly pricing their vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitalization</td>
<td>Owners engage in cost-benefit analyses. Objectively, transactions require extended time investments. Digitalization could reduce involvement significantly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managerial implications and areas for further research

Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Implications</th>
<th>Further research areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing is not always caring. Owners participate chiefly for personal benefits.</td>
<td>Analysis of non-users participation barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners deliver most service at their discretion. Hence, rental experiences can vary greatly.</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary comparison of usage motives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is vital for managers and policy makers not to perceive the population of car owners as homogeneous, participating only for the motives outlined by the utilitarian or idealistic view of the sharing economy.</td>
<td>Quantitative investigation of participation motives and assessment of relative importance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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