

Examining the Antecedents and Consequences of Trust toward peer to peer Accommodation.

Abstract

The theoretical understanding of peer to peer (P2P) accommodation has received much attention over the years; however, relatively little attention has been directed towards trust in peer to peer accommodation. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to develop and empirically test a model to understand the antecedents and consequences of guests trust toward peer to peer accommodation in the Egyptian context. Data collected from 793 respondents were analysed through partial least squares- structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) to test the proposed model. The findings indicate that our unified framework includes a satisfactory level of prediction power for guests' intention to use peer to peer accommodation and actual booking. Finally, overall trust leads to greater intention to book for males and older guests. This study contributes to the existing theory and practice by providing useful insights about the drivers and outcomes of guest trust toward peer to peer accommodation.

Keywords,

Peer to peer accommodation; Trusting beliefs; Intention to book; partial least squares- structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM)

1. Introduction

The rapid development of peer-to-peer accommodation business leads to great development in the hospitality and tourism context (eMarketer, 2017; Fortune, 2017; Skift, 2017; Tussyadiah and Pesonen, 2016; Garau-Vadell et al., 2018), and hence, it considers one of the top priorities for practitioners and researchers in the area (Heo, 2016; Karlsson and Dolnicar, 2016; Cheng, 2016; Tussyadiah, 2016; Tussyadiah and Park, 2018; Abrate and Viglia, 2017). In the context of peer-to-peer property rental, guests and hosts find each other online through platforms such as Airbnb and then meet face to face during the delivery of the service. Guests to make a proper decision regarding the reservation process, they face some issues not only related to the property attributes, but also the host characteristics (Tussyadiah and Park, 2018).

Since trading in a peer-to-peer marketplace is conducted between strangers, consumers and peer-to-peer accommodation hosts face information asymmetry as well as various risks, including economic and security risks (Ert et al., 2016; Lyu et al., 2018). More importantly, the sharing economy often involves multi-stage interactions that occur not only online, but also in offline environments, as opposed to typical retail websites where consumers simply communicate with sellers online a single stage interaction (Ellison and Hancock, 2013). Therefore, trust is considered a unique feature of the sharing system and, thus, is vital in peer-to-peer accommodation research (Wu et al., 2017; Martin-Fuentes et al., 2018). Indeed, connecting people and creating trust are considered the fundamental components in shaping a reliable environment of collaboration (Mazzella et al. 2016). However, while tourism studies have focused on identifying the drivers and inhibitors of using peer-to-peer systems (e.g., Gansky, 2010; Tussyadiah and Pesonen, 2016; Zekanovic-Korona and Grzunov, 2014), studies on understanding how trust is formed in the peer-to-peer based sharing is still limited (Wu et al., 2017; Cheng, 2016). In particular, researchers in the field of tourism and hospitality suggest that sharing economy would mainly change the future of tourism and hospitality industry (Tussyadiah and Park, 2018).

In the context of peer-to-peer accommodation, Wu et al. (2017) pointed out that trust lack considers one of the biggest issues among guests and hosts. Ert et al (2016) pointed out that trust in host plays an important role in hosts' decision making to book a particular property across the platforms of peer-to-peer. Prior studies have investigated the effect of consumer trust in service provided on customer decision in traditional service context (Johnson and Grayson, 2005; Coulter and Coulter, 2002), in particular in the hospitality and tourism industry (e.g. Liu and Zhang, 2014; Wang et al., 2015). In the sharing economy context, in particular peer-to-

peer accommodation platforms, trust in host and trust in platforms play a critical role in booking process (Hong and Cho, 2011; Chen et al., 2009; Pavlou and Gefen, 2004; Tussyadiah and Park, 2018). However, an empirical study about peer-to-peer accommodation, particularly in relation to the drivers and outcomes of trust in peer-to-peer accommodation, has been relatively modest (Tussyadiah and Park, 2018). As such, it is timely to undertake an empirical study on trust in peer-to-peer accommodation to advance the field.

Therefore, the present study adopts a distinctive approach to this topic: it develops and empirically tests a comprehensive framework. This contributes to the current literature since, no similar approach has ever been taken. The questions that arise are, why do guests trust peer to peer accommodation? Does trust toward peer to peer accommodation affect guests' intentions to book? The present research attempts to provide an answer to these questions.

Overall, the objective of the study is to examine the antecedents and consequences of guest trust toward peer to peer accommodation by integrating website feature perspective, personality perspective, interpersonal transactions perspective, and institutional feature perspective, and guests' attributes into one model. While past literature has examined the influences of website quality, trust, likability, privacy/security, and propensity to trust on purchase intention (e.g., Chiu et al., 2012; Yoon and Ocoña, 2015; Gao and Waechter, 2017; Oliveira et al., 2017), little studies have been done to combine these predictors of consumers trust and purchase intention and to test the moderating effects of guests attributes on the relationships between overall trust and intention to book. This study believes that the findings of this study may help both academics and practitioners gain insights into how to develop consumers trust and promote consumers' purchase intention.

2. Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Trust in the Sharing Economy

Prior studies investigate trust across various contexts such as social psychology, sociology, anthropology, and psychology (Beldad et al., 2010). In the marketing discipline, trust has been investigated primarily in relationship marketing environment (Doney et al., 1998; Morgan and Hunt, 1994). In seller-buyer relationship studies, trust in a salesperson develops over time and is based on a customer's perception about a salesperson trustworthiness, honesty, and reliability (Doney et al., 1998; Anderson and Narus, 1990). To understand trust in an e-commerce

environment, McKnight and Chervany, (2002) developed a trust typology for e-commerce that integrates the trust views of multiple academic disciplines, thereby making the concept of trust more fine-grained. In their typology, they distinguish disposition to trust, institution-based trust, trusting beliefs, trusting intentions, and trust-related behaviours. These concepts provide a useful overview of how trust is examined across studies, because they serve as a tool to classify the different ways in which trust has been measured.

Trust is important in situations of risk, uncertainty, and interdependence (McKnight and Chervany, 2002). These three elements are very prominent in the sharing economy. Think of, for example, Airbnb hosts who can experience severe damage to their properties or theft of personal belongings (Devine, 2014). These concerns raise difficult consumer protection issues because the sharing economy does not fall neatly into traditional legal categories (Katz, 2015); the result is legal grey areas and regulatory uncertainty (Ranchordás, 2015). This can cause a lack of trust in participating in the sharing economy (Hawlitschek, Teubner, and Weinhardt, 2016) and might erode future transactions

For the present study purpose, The current study used the trust definition as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer et al., 1995, p.715). In the context of peer to peer accommodation, hosts and guests present vulnerability and have expectation on the other party behaviour (Huurne et al., 2017). In the online environment, trusting beliefs has been categorised into three dimensions: ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995; Gefen and Straub, 2004; Wu et al., 2017). Our study has identified three dimensions of trusting beliefs; Ability is defined as the perception of guest about the competence and knowledge of host salient to the intended behaviour (Mayer et al., 1995; Lu et al., 2010). Benevolence is defined as the guest believes that the host intend to care about them (Lu et al., 2010; Mayer et al., 1995). Integrity can be defined as the extent to which hosts act in line with social norms and adhere to principles that guest accepts during and after the transaction, such as dependability and credibility (Lu et al., 2010).

2.2 Drivers and Outcomes of Trusting Beliefs in peer to peer Accommodation

A successful e-commerce website is one that magnetizes customers, makes them feel the site is trustworthy, dependable, and reliable (Liu and Arnett, 2000). Although trust in the online environment has several drivers and outcomes (see, Shankar et al., 2002; Beldad et al., 2010; Agag and El-Masry, 2016b), this study focus on website feature perspective, personality perspective, interpersonal transactions perspective, and institutional feature perspective as the drivers and on behavioural intention as the key outcome due to the potential practical implications that has been demonstrated previously. Based on previous studies in tourism and hospitality context, we chose website feature perspective, personality feature, interpersonal transaction, and institutional feature (see Figure 1).

2.2.1 Website feature perspective

Jeong et al. (2003) first introduced the concept “website quality” into the hotel industry. The researchers defined hotel website quality as “the overall excellence or effectiveness of a website in delivering intended messages to its audience and viewers” (p. 162). However, website quality is a key factor in e-commerce because the customers’ perceptions of website quality positively and directly impact their purchase intentions (Chang et al., 2014). With regard to website quality, Li et al. (2017) investigated the usability of hotel websites. Ma et al. (2008) claimed that website functionality is the most influential factor in determining the success of hotel websites, including the usage and purchase intention of a consumer. Ip et al. (2012) adopted a sophisticated approach to analyse the weights of hotel website functionality. The results demonstrated that “reservation information” is the most important criterion of hotel website functionality.

Website quality describes the positive evaluation of consumers of a website characteristics, ensuring it reflects the website excellence and meets the customer needs (Aladwani and Palvia, 2002). Website quality represents the website features that comprises service quality, information quality, and system quality (Zhong and Ying, 2008). Prior studies pointed out that website quality considers a multidimensional factor includes information quality, service quality, system quality, ease of use, and security (Agag and El-Masry, 2016a; Aladwani and Palvia, 2002; Urban et al., 2009; Hoffman and Novak, 2009). Prior studies revealed an empirical evidence on the link between website quality and consumer trust (Yoon and Occeña, 2015; Agag and El-Masry, 2017b).

Flavián et al (2006) pointed out that a website likability includes consumer ability to manage the system, the website design efficiency, consumer general satisfaction, and the degree of error avoidance. Roy et al (2001) found that usability of a website has a significant influence on consumers trust. Prior studies found that a website likability involves consumer friendliness and ease of use, which is a key role that effects on consumer trust (Huang and Benyoucef, 2013; Oliveira et al., 2017).

In the online context, online service provider is faceless and unidentified for consumers, so the vendor website interface becomes the "online storefront" that formed first impressions of consumers (McKnight and Chervany, 2002). One of the main variables affecting customer's intentions to buy in the online context is risk perceptions (Oliveira et al., 2017). For instance, consumers feel safe only when they search for their needs, but they have not completed the transaction on the internet because of their beliefs regarding the absence of integrity between the web sellers, and the web environment has no security or privacy (Oliveira et al., 2017). Consequently, paucity of security and privacy, which arose from the guest's negative feelings regarding the unsafe of using peer-to-peer accommodation platforms, expected to influence guest trust (Agag and El-Masry, 2016b; Ponte et al., 2015). Thus, it is decided to rule out website quality, likability, and lack of privacy/security as a guest trust drivers from our conceptual framework. Therefore,

H1: website quality has a positive influence on guest perception of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence.

H2: Likability positively influence guest perceptions of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence.

H3: lack of privacy/security negatively influence guest perceptions of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence.

2.2.2 Personality perspective

Many cognitive psychologists consider trust as a consumer personality trust (Yoo and Occeña, 2015). Personality to trust refers to the extent that a person demonstrates a consistent tendency to be willing to depend on others across a broad spectrum of situations and persons (McKnight and Chervany, 2002). Customers with a high propensity to trust perceive the risk to be less and thus have more confidence in online transactions. Studies have provided sufficient evidence that individuals differ considerably in their general propensity to trust other

people because of cultural backgrounds, personality types, religious beliefs, and past experiences (Rouibah, Lowry, and Hwang., 2016).

Trust is formed during childhood as a baby gets assist from their parents, leading to the propensity to trust others (Rotter, 1967). Therefore, consumers' backgrounds and culture influence on consumer propensity to trust (Cheung and Lee, 2006; Hofstede, 1980). Consumers who have a high level of intention to trust people are more likely to have high level of trust toward online buying compared to customers who do not have intention to trust others (Yoo and Occeña, 2015). Gong (2009) pointed out that consumer from high trust culture has a high propensity trust others. Thus, consumers have different level of propensity to trust according to their culture or experience that might effect on trust in online vendor (Yoon and Occeña, 2015). Trust stance refers to consumer beliefs that he/she will obtain better interpersonal outcomes by interacting with others in any case of whether people are trustworthy or not (McKnight and Chervany, 2002). Consequently, the rational guests are sharing their own information with peer to peer accommodation platforms only if they trust this online host (Palvia, 2009; Oliveira et al., 2017).

Consumer propensity to trust includes two dimensions: 1) trust stance, consumer's intention to rely on others and 2) faith in humanity, consumer believes that others are reliable (McKnight and Chervany, 2002). For instance, if customers have high intention level to trust, they are more possibly to trust people (Hu et al., 2010). Previous studies revealed an empirical evidence on the association between natural propensity to trust and consumer trust (Yoon and Occeña, 2015; Gefen and Straub, 2000). However, Kim et al (2009) asserted that natural propensity to trust has no influence on consumer trust in online service providers. Consequently, it is valuable and meaningful to investigate this specific association in the present study. Therefore,

H4: Guest natural propensity to trust positively influence guest perceptions of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence.

2.2.3 Interpersonal transaction perspective

Based on social network theory, trust can be transmitted from one consumer to another consumer (Sih et al., 2009). Others may influence a consumer trust level and the communication informal channels can play a key role in sharing information about product when the products are not easy to assess (Granovetter, 1973). In the online context, information asymmetry may result in paucity of customer trust in e- vendor (Yoon and Occeña, 2015). As

seller and buyer are separated by distance and time, buyer can use sellers descriptions in order to evaluate items online (Ghose et al., 2009). Reputation can be used in order to mitigate the issue of information asymmetry (Kauffman and Wood, 2000). Therefore, a good online vendor reputation result in enhancing consumer trust in online service provider regardless any experience in the online context (Jones and Leonard, 2008). Firm reputation represent a key role in developing customers trust in the online travel industry (Agag and El-Masry, 2016b; Oliveira et al., 2017). Beldad et al (2010) stated that a positive reputation lead to trusting association among the firm and customer, while a negative firm reputation result in reducing trusting association among customers and firm. Thus,

H5: Other's trust of a consumer/seller (i.e., WOM and reputation) positively affect guest perceptions of the host: **(a)** integrity; **(b)** ability, and; **(c)** benevolence.

2.2.4 Institutional feature

Companies use its own website as an important means to communicate its service assurances with its customers. Company uses this service assurance in order to enable its customers to derive a sense of positives outcomes and certainty on their transactions with the company. Prior studies term this notion as institution-based trust. Zucker (1986, p. 1842) defined institution-based trust as “one believes the necessary impersonal structures are in place to enable one to act in anticipation of a successful future endeavour”.

Internet users unwilling to provide electronic payments information or personal information online as they do not trust online shopping (Ponte et al., 2015). Agag and El-Masry (2017a) pointed out that more than 87% of Internet users are concerned about privacy and security in e-commerce because they do not trust online shopping. Consequently, trust in online service providers plays an important role in transactions online (Jones and Leonard, 2008; Wang et al., 2016). Therefore, third party recognition can decrease customers perceived risk about privacy and security issues through e-transactions (Jones and Leonard, 2008). When consumer see a web assurance seals on the online service providers' websites, they are more likely to make online purchasing (Wang et al., 2016; Yoon and Occeña, 2015).

Although technological mechanisms for securing payments and the protection of identity have improved online security, it does not adequately increase customers' faith in online transactions since people are still reluctant to purchase online. This is why hotels tend to rely on third party seals. Third party seals are typically represented by logos of a trusted independent

third-party agency (e.g., Verisign.com) that sets standards for the handling of customer data and ensures the reliability, security, and confidentiality of online transactions. Third party seals convey positive impressions that serve as associations to strengthen the consumer's belief that the trustee has positive attributes that are beneficial to the trustor (Lowry et al., 2008). They also contribute to reducing customer perceived risks, providing them assurance that a website discloses and follows its operating practices, and handling payments in a secure and reliable way. They also show that it complies with a privacy policy that says what it can and cannot do with personal data it has collected online (Kim et al., 2008). Third party seals also encourage consumer confidence in conducting online transactions (Grabner-Kräuter and Kaluscha, 2003).

Prior studies pointed out that security, integrity, and privacy issues represent three major obstacles in online transactions (Hu et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2011). Third party recognition like website assurance seals can be used to decrease these concerns. For example, a privacy assurance can be utilised to decrease perceived risk of consumers personal information leaking through websites, a third party supports assurance seal of privacy ensuring any websites has its symbol in line with the standards of its privacy. Many online service providers utilise a third party recognition to point trustworthiness to consumers and this website seal has guarantees to reassure the consumers (Wu et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2010). Third party recognition is a key driver of consumer trust and reduces customer perceived uncertainty (Oliveira et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2010; Gefen et al., 2003; Hu et al., 2010). Therefore, third party recognition expected to influence guest trust in e-host. Therefore,

H6: Third party recognition positively influence guest perceptions of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence.

2.2.5 Trusting beliefs, overall trust, and intention to book

Researchers agree that in a relationship, one party tends to have overall trust toward the other. Overall trust refers to general trust (Chen and Dhillon, 2003; Fang et al., 2014), which is not related to a specific behaviour of the other party, or any component of trust (Chen and Dhillon, 2003). Chen and Dhillon (2003) have identified three dimensions of consumer trust in online vendor that influence how people evaluate exchanges: integrity, ability, and benevolence. Integrity can be defined as the perception of trustor that trustee acts in accordance with social norms and stand by a set of principles that the trustor accepts during and after the transactions, such as credibility and dependability (Lu et al., 2010; Mayer et al., 1995). Ability refers to trustor's perception of trustee's competence and knowledge salient to the expected

behaviour (Lu et al., 2016; Mayer et al., 1995). Benevolence refers to the extent to which a trustee is believed to intend to do well to and care about the trustor, beyond its own profit motive (Lu et al., 2016, Mayer et al., 1995). A benevolent trustee would help the trustor with beneficial motives, even if the trustee has no reward from being helpful. Benevolence represents faith and altruism in an association, which places it against opportunistic behaviours.

Bélanger et al. (2002) define trustworthiness as the perception of confidence in the electronic marketer's ability, benevolence, and integrity. Evidence for the link between trusting beliefs and consumers trust toward the online vendor is reviewed elsewhere (Alfina et al., 2014). Chen et al (2015) also found a strong relationship between online services providers' integrity, ability, and benevolence, and consumers trust towards the online seller. Logically, if one believes that the other party is benevolent, competent, honest, and predictable, one is likely to form a trust toward that person. Therefore, trusting beliefs will positively impact consumers trust toward the online services providers. At a more general level, the literature that links trusting beliefs to trust toward online services providers supports this relationship (e.g., McKnight and Chervany, 2002; Ter Huurne et al., 2017). Fang et al (2014) discusses evidence that trusting beliefs and trust toward the online seller tend to stay consistent. They should be especially consistent at first, when one has no experiential basis not to believe the other person is trustworthy. Also, a seller's perceived social capital, ability, and integrity are attributes that have a significant impact on the feeling of trust towards the seller (Alfina et al., 2014; Chen, Lou, et al., 2015). Indeed, empirical support has been found for the effect of trusting beliefs (i.e., ability, benevolence, integrity) and consumers trust toward online vendor (e.g. Teo and Liu 2007; Chen, Lou, et al., 2015; Chen and Dhillon, 2003; Gao and Waechter, 2017; Oliveira et al., 2017). When a host has trustworthy characteristics (i.e., ability, benevolence, integrity), guests are more likely to form trust toward the host.

According to Palvia (2009), trust represents a key requirement for establishing the long-term business association with consumers, especially in the online environment as it achieves mutual benefits for both vendors and consumers. Chiu et al (2012), Oghazi et al (2018), Hsu et al (2015), and Agag and El-Masry (2016b) confirmed that consumers' trust toward online vendor is a key role in understanding consumers' purchase intentions. Moreover, behavioural intention is the most predictor of actual behaviour in prior studies conducted in different contexts, including online banking (Yu, 2012), collaboration technology (Brown et al., 2010), mobile internet (Venkatesh et al., 2012). Therefore, stronger guests' intentions to use peer-to-peer accommodation will result in a higher determination to engage in actual behaviour. Thus,

H7: Guest perceptions of the host: (a) integrity; (b) ability, and; (c) benevolence positively influence guest overall trust.

H8: Guest overall trust positively influence guest intention to book accommodation.

H9: Guests' intention to use peer-to-peer accommodation has a positive influence on their behaviour to use peer-to-peer accommodation.

2.2.6 The Moderating Effect of Guest Attributes (Age, Gender, and income).

In order to build trust in peer-to-peer accommodation, hosts need to know some other information about guests such as Age and gender that can reduce information asymmetry and decrease other dissatisfaction that can take place when guests and hosts communicate in the peer-to-peer platforms (Ufford, 2015). Despite, these essential features of guests in peer-to-peer accommodation are less researched. The role of age, gender and income in online behaviour has caught the attention of researchers in tourism and hospitality management and marketing as age, gender and income are considered key variables for market segmentation (Lee and Kim 2018; Samuel et al., 2015). Although younger and men have long been linked with e-commerce and older or women have been described as negative consumers in online shopping, older or women have utilised online shopping more than ever before (Hernández et al., 2011). However, prior studies in online context have ignored the influence of age and gender on consumer behaviour (Eid, 2011; Kang and Kim, 2012; Lai et al., 2012). The role of age, gender and income in consumers behaviour has been a subject of interest in tourism and hospitality management and marketing as age, gender and income are considered key variables for market segmentation (Lee and Kim 2018; Samuel et al., 2015).

In the online environment, trust in online vendor has a greater effect on intention to purchase for women than men (Awad and Ragowsky, 2008). Samuel et al (2015) asserted that gender moderates the relationship between consumer experiences, trust, and repurchase intentions. Their results revealed that consumers experience positively effect on trust for males; while trust has a greater effect on intention to purchase for males. Similarly, Karlsson et al. (2017) identified consumers' different reactions to service providers of different genders. Lee and Kim (2018) found the moderating effects of gender on level of involvement in accommodation decisions.

Previous research has suggested that age is a critical demographic variable that moderates the relationships between consumers' perceptions of technology and their behavioural intentions (Tarhini, Hone, and Liu, 2014). Although previous research has not shown clear

results regarding the moderating effect of age between consumers trust and consumer behaviours, some research has suggested the importance of including age as a moderator (Kirk, Chiagouris, and Gopalakrishna, 2012). However, the role of age in the relationships among consumers trust and behavioural intentions has not been extensively studied. This study proposed age moderates the impact of consumers trust on behavioural intentions. We assume that overall trust leads to greater intention to book for older guests. We consider that guest income has an effect on consumers intention to purchase online, as previous research has demonstrated, people with high incomes perceive less risk in the adoption of new ITs (Lu et al., 2003). However, the role of income in the relationships among consumers trust and behavioural intentions has not been examined. The present study shares this notion, and thus it has established that that overall trust leads to greater intention to book for high- income guests. Consequently we formulate the following hypotheses:

H10: The effect of guest trust on booking intention will be stronger among male than female guests.

H11: The effect of guest trust on booking intention will be stronger among older than younger guests.

H12: The effect of guest trust on booking intention will be stronger among high-income than low-income guests.

Insert Figure 1 about here

3. Methodology

3.1 Sampling Procedure

A positivist research philosophy was utilized with a quantitative approach to validate the proposed framework, and quantitative data were collected using survey questionnaires to address different levels of the study; the data were collected in June 2018 through a survey questionnaire.

Following ethical clearance by the human ethics review committee of the University, the e-mail addresses of 4,000 prospective participants were bought from a reputable Egyptian market list company. Potential panel participants were invited to join via a series of mailings, both in English and Arabic and by telephone follow-up to non-responders. At the time of the study, this marketing company had a database of more than 2.7 million registered consumers who had booked accommodation online during the last year ([www. directory.esomar.org](http://www.directory.esomar.org)). The initial e-

mails were directed to 4,000 respondents randomly chosen using probability-sampling methods (the customers' e-mail addresses were randomly selected by a generated sampling system, like random-digit dialling (RDD)). The survey was anonymous, and restricted to travellers aged 18 and above and was approved by the Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel. A filtering question at the beginning of the questionnaire determined the choice of respondents, by asking them if they had booked a peer to peer accommodation in the past six months. The e-mail invitation also contained details of the purpose of the study, the time it would probably take to fill out the survey and the URL hyperlink to the questionnaire. Data collection lasted for approximately two weeks in June 2018. During this time, 793 respondents completed the survey, representing a response rate of approximately 19.8%. This number was high enough to validate the material for further analysis (Hair et al. 2010). Table 1 shows the sample's characteristics.

Insert Table 1 about here

Of the participants, 53 percent were male and 36 percent were between ages of 30 and 39. Regarding the frequency of booking peer-to-peer online, 39 percent of the respondents stated that they had booked a peer-to-peer accommodation between 3 and 6 times in the last 6 months. Table 1 shows the characteristics of the sample

This study utilized Harman's single-factor test to evaluate the common method bias. The findings show that the first factors in the model explained 36.32% of the variance and no general factor accounted for above 50% of the variance; hence, the risk of common methods bias was excluded (Teo et al., 2015). Another method that has been used for assessing the common method bias as suggested by Liang et al (2007), the result indicates that the average substantive variance ratio to the average method variance is relatively small at 112:1. Furthermore, most of the factor loadings are insignificant and negative. Consequently, the risk of common methods bias was excluded.

3.2 Measurement Instruments

Intention to book peer-to-peer accommodation was measured through four items borrowed from prior studies the areas of tourism and hospitality context (e.g. Möhlmann, 2015; Lamberton and Rose, 2012; Tussyadiah and Park, 2018; Tussyadiah et al., 2016). Two items as suggested by Wu and Wang (2005) scales were borrowed to measure actual behavior. Three

items as suggested by Palvia (2009) scales were utilized to measure the variables of consumers' overall trust. The three constructs in the model (integrity, ability, and benevolence) were borrowed from previous studies (e.g. Colquitt and Rodell, 2011). Website quality construct was measured through four items borrowed from Everard et al (2006), and Jones and Leonard (2008). Likability were operationalized with four items as proposed Flavian et al (2006). Lack of privacy/security was measured throw four items borrowed from McKnight and Chervany (2002). Natural propensity to trust was measured using six items adopted from prior studies (e.g. McKnight and Chervany, 2002; Yoon and Occeña, 2015; Jones and Leonard, 2008). Established and validated measures for recognition and Other's trust of consumer/seller were adopted from McKnight and Chervany (2002), Yoon and Occeña (2015), and Jones and Leonard (2008). A pilot sample of 50 customers in Egypt who already have stayed in peer-to-peer accommodation (personally interviewed) was employed to ensure that the wording of the questionnaire was clear and to evaluate the quality of content and reliability of measures.

Insert Table 2 about here

4. Data Analysis and Results

Partial Least Squares (PLS), a component-based structural equation modelling (SEM) technique, was employed to examine our measurement model and test the proposed hypotheses. **Specifically, the SmartPLS 3.0 software was used.** There are several reasons to use the PLS technique. First, PLS has less strict requirements on sample size and residual distributions than covariance-based SEM techniques such as Lisrel and AMOS (Chin et al., 2003). Second, PLS is well-suited for studies in the early stage of theory building and testing (Jöreskog and Wold, 1982). Thus the PLS technique is well-suited for our research context, as the peer to peer accommodation is still largely unexplored or under-explored research area. Fourth, PLS is especially capable of testing large, complex models with latent variables and is virtually without competition (Wold, 1985). Our research model is fairly large and complex, including a large number of variables. Thus, the research model is rather complex, making PLS-SEM a favourable approach. To test the hypotheses, we ran the standard PLS algorithm and assessed the significance level of the estimates on the basis of 5000 bootstraps, as proposed by Hair et al. (2011). The sign change option was set to no sign changes, and the number of cases was set to meet the sample size (793 individuals) (Hair et al., 2017).

To establish the nomological validity of the research model, we analysed the survey data using partial least squares (PLS) with a two-step analytic approach. First, the measurement model was evaluated to assess the validity and reliability of the measures. Second, the structural model was evaluated to assess the strength of the hypothesized links among the variables. The psychometric properties of all scales were assessed within the context of the structural model through an assessment of discriminant validity and reliability.

4.1 Measurement Model

Tests of reliability and validity were required to assess the measurement model used in the study. According to Chin (2010) and Klärner et al. (2013), both the reliability of the construct measures and that of internal consistency were the general reliability indicators and both convergent and discriminant validity were the general validity indicators. As shown in Table 2, all loadings of each constructs items were more than 0.50, showing all our indicators as reliable (Hair et al., 2017). In addition, Cronbach's α and Composite Reliability (CR) values were above 0.7, which supports the internal consistency for all constructs. Furthermore, rhoA for all constructs were above 0.7, which confirmed the construct reliability. At the same time, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values for all constructs were above 0.50, which confirmed the convergent validity as well. As shown in Table 3, Discriminant validity was examined with the heterotrait–monotrait (HTMT) ratios method (Henseler et al., 2015) and Fornell and Larcker's (1981) criterion. All HTMT ratios between the constructs were below 0.85. Similarly, the root-squared values of the AVE were above the correlations between pairs of variables. These results confirm the existence of discriminant validity.

Insert Table 3 about here

4.2 Inner-model evaluation

The results of testing hypotheses from H1 to H9 using PLS-SEM approach were illustrated in Table 4. The values of average path coefficient (APC) = (0.173, $p < 0.001$), average R-squared (ARS) = (0.743, $p < 0.001$), average adjusted R-squared (AARS) = (0.691, $p < 0.001$), average block variance inflation factor (AVIF) = (2.037), and Tenenhaus GoF (GoF) = (0.704) indicates that our model global fit were suitable. All proposed hypotheses were supported in our study except H5a, H2b, H5b, H3c and H5c (Table 4).

We calculated the effect size f^2 for the endogenous latent variables (Hair et al., 2011). The results show that f^2 measures the increase in R^2 in relation to the unexplained variance of an endogenous variable. Furthermore, the Cohen (1988) effect size f^2 , defined as “the degree to which the phenomenon is present in the population,” was used to further examine the substantive effect of the research model. Cohen (1988) suggested 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 as operational definitions of small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively. Thus, our model suggested that integrity ($f^2 = 0.61$), trust ($f^2 = 0.73$), intentions to book ($f^2 = 0.59$), and actual behaviour ($f^2 = 0.46$) have large effect sizes whereas ability ($f^2 = 0.21$), and benevolence ($f^2 = 0.26$) have medium effect sizes.

Insert Table 4 about here

The current study model explains 61.3% of variance in hosts' integrity. Website quality ($\beta=0.27$, $p<0.001$), lack of privacy and security ($\beta=-0.41$, $p<0.001$), Likability ($\beta=0.196$, $p<0.001$), natural propensity ($\beta=0.12$, $p<0.001$), and third party recognition ($\beta=0.21$, $p<0.001$), are all significant. Therefore, H1a, H2a, H3a, H4a, and H6a are accepted. While, H5a, i.e. other's trust of buyer/seller ($\beta=0.08$, $p=0.22$), is rejected.

Website quality ($\beta=0.33$, $p<0.001$), lack of privacy and security ($\beta=0.-28$, $p<0.001$), natural propensity to trust ($\beta=0.16$, $p<0.001$), and third party recognition ($\beta=0.11$, $p<0.001$), are significant for justifying ability. Consequently, hypotheses H1b, H3b, H4b, and H6b are accepted. While, H2b and H5b, i.e. Likability ($\beta=0.08$, $p=0.17$), other's trust of buyer/seller ($\beta=0.06$, $p=0.37$), are rejected.

The current study demonstrates 63.8% of variance in hosts' benevolence. Website quality ($\beta=0.36$, $p<0.001$), Likability ($\beta=0.19$, $p<0.001$), natural propensity to trust ($\beta=0.43$, $p<0.001$), and third party recognition ($\beta=0.29$, $p<0.001$), are significant. Thus, H1c, H2c, H4c, and H6c are accepted. While, hypotheses H3c and H5c, i.e. other's trust of buyer/seller ($\beta=0.06$, $p=0.17$), lack of privacy/security ($\beta=-0.07$, $p=0.19$), are rejected. 73.9% of variation in guest overall trust is justified in this study model. Integrity ($\beta=0.61$, $p<0.001$), ability ($\beta=0.42$, $p<0.001$), and benevolence ($\beta=0.51$, $p<0.001$), are statistically significant for explaining guest overall trust, whereas H7a, H7b, H7c are supported. Finally, Intention to book is influenced by guest overall trust ($\beta = 0.72$, $p<0.001$), which supports H8.

We ran two separate models to test the support for baseline (direct effects only), baseline (direct and moderated effects). The basic model was confirmed. When interaction terms were

not included, there was significant effect for overall trust on intention to book P2P, and intention to book had significant impacts on use. When interaction terms were included, significant path coefficients were found with all constructs, such as overall trust \times gender \times age when predicting intention to book P2P. The results support the applicability and validity of our model as a theoretical base to predict consumers' behavioural intentions to book P2P. The variance in behavioural intention explained by our model with direct effects only and our model with moderated effects also was quite good at 43 percent and 57.2 percent respectively, and the variance explained in actual use was 28.6 percent and 49.3 percent respectively. Income has no influence on the link between trust and booking intention. We reran the tests with only significant paths in the model to examine the change in R². We found that R² decreased by less than 4 percent. Thus, H10 and H11 are supported, whereas H12 is not supported.

5. Discussions and Implications

5.1 Summary of findings

The important role of peer to peer accommodation in the context of hospitality and tourism calls for a comprehensive examination into the crucial role of trust in the sharing economy that involve not only transactions between peers, but also multiple interactions in online and offline settings. Particularly, peer to peer accommodation involves not only transactions between guests and hosts online, simplified by online platform (i.e. Airbnb), the use of **peer to peer accommodation** includes staying in a stranger accommodation. Therefore, trust between hosts and guests plays an important role in **per to per accommodation service**. Trust has been considered as one of the most essential elements that produces engagement between individuals and thus encourages purchases in the context of peer to peer accommodation services (Cheng, 2016; Huurne et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2017). In this respect, recognizing the significance of trust building between hosts and guests (Wu et al., 2017; Tussyadiah and Park., 2018), this study aims to examine the formation of trusting beliefs in hosts, comprising prospective guests' perception of ability, benevolence, and integrity of the hosts. Then, this study estimated the effects of trust antecedents, website feature perspective, personality perspective, interpersonal

transaction perspective, institutional feature perspective, on trusting beliefs as well as the consequence of trusting beliefs, overall trust and intention to book. Last, recognizing the relevance of gender differences in trust behaviour, the present study assessed the moderating influences of guests attributes (age, gender, and income) on the relationships between overall trust and intention to book peer to peer accommodation.

Overall, the results of the current study demonstrate support for the suggested model of drivers and outcomes of trust toward peer to peer accommodation. The results confirm that website quality, natural propensity to trust, and third party recognition have positive effect on guest perception about integrity, ability, and benevolence of hosts. These results are compatible with prior studies (e.g. Yoon and Occeña, 2015; Chen and Dhillon, 2003; Kim et al., 2009; Oliveira et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2010; Gefen et al., 2003; Hu et al., 2010), who found that website quality, natural propensity to trust, and third party recognition positively effect on consumer perception about integrity, ability, and benevolence of online service provider. Items such as approval seal can effect on trust in peer to peer accommodation context. The present study is the first to investigate the important role of personality in building trust in peer to peer accommodation. Furthermore, website quality plays an important role for online service providers (hosts) to achieve competitive advantages comparing to other peer to peer accommodation platforms.

The results also indicate that likability is relevant drivers in order to form guest perception of integrity and benevolence of hosts that is in line with prior study (e.g. Huang and Benyoucef, 2013; Oliveira et al., 2017). Moreover, likability had no significant influence on the guest perception about the ability of hosts. The results of the present study are consistent with Oliveira et al (2017), Ponte et al (2015), and Agag and El-Masry (2016b), which revealed that lack of privacy/security, has a significant influence on customer perceptions about integrity, ability, and benevolence of hosts. The findings indicate that others trust of consumer/seller had no significant influence on guests' perception about integrity, ability, and benevolence of host. Guests may get much information of the accommodation from other online sources; therefore, they do not tend to rely on others trust. This may be due to the specific nature of peer to peer accommodation. Guests may believe that because this is different from the one they are using, their base trusting behaviour does not apply. Finally, our study reveals that the association between overall trust and booking intention is conditional upon guest attributes such as age and gender.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

The current study has several theoretical implications, which can add to the body of the knowledge in various ways: First, it puts together in a single framework both drivers and outcomes of trusting beliefs in the context of peer to peer accommodation within the tourism field, this study suggests the significance of interpersonal trust based upon the particular features of sharing economy in which peers interact in mixed-mode settings (i.e., online and offline). The results revealed a hierarchical order model of interpersonal trust formation, in that trusting beliefs toward hosts is reflected in guests' perception of integrity, ability, and benevolence of hosts.

Second, it concurrently investigates the role of website, interpersonal transaction, personality, and institutional perspectives in forming guests' perception of integrity, ability, and benevolence of hosts. Interestingly, in the literature review there are no indications that likability influences competence. Theoretically, our results suggest that overall trust is explained in 73.9% of cases by competence, benevolence and integrity. The overall trust explains 57.2% of online purchase intention. According to Palvia (2009), whose previous study concluded that firms need to develop and nurture consumer trust by addressing its specific components (competence, benevolence and integrity), in order that the customers engage in a transaction and create long-term relationships.

Third, it provides a detailed examination of the effect of trusting beliefs on guests overall trust, which in turns influences on guests' intention to book a peer to peer accommodation. Fourth, it considers guest's attributes as key moderators, rather than determinants of guests intention to book peer to peer accommodation. Finally, it extends the current understanding by investigating the moderating role of guest attributes (age, gender, and income) in adoption of peer to peer accommodation. Responding to the recent calls for study for further examination on the topic (Lee and Kim, 2018), the current study indicated that age and gender influence the relationship among trust and booking intention.

5.3 Managerial Implications

Practically, the findings of the present study provide essential levers for both peer to peer accommodation platforms such as Airbnb and hosts to formulate effective strategies that encourage guests to book peer to peer accommodation. First, the knowledge of the drivers and outcomes of trusting beliefs is useful for peer to peer accommodation platforms managers and

hosts in order to develop actions and strategies aimed at increasing guests trust and, thus, their intention to book peer to peer property. Peer to peer accommodation platforms managers and hosts should search for new ways to satisfy their guests and improve their service quality continuously. Our findings confirmed the significant influence of service quality and privacy/security in increasing guests' trusting beliefs. Therefore, hosts can provide guests with high transmission quality, information system with security and privacy protection mechanism. Hosts should provide guests with personal recommendations for events, experiences, and local activities. Moreover, it may be a good idea for the hosts to include information regarding guests' views and beliefs.

Second, the present study findings provide managers with some broad implications. Managers must go beyond likability, other's trust of buyer/seller and focus on factors such as website quality, privacy/security, propensity to trust, and third party recognition in order to build trusting beliefs. Collectively, website quality, privacy/security, propensity to trust, and third party recognition are more influential predictors of trusting beliefs than are likability and other's trust of buyer/seller. Hosts can provide guests with details about their security approval symbol, rights, and money guarantees. Peer to peer accommodation hosts can provide their guests with apps for mobile devices, chatrooms, and virtual communities, all of which could be cost-effective options in order to increase perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, and improve guests' booking intentions. Furthermore, hosts can highlight information about properties, convenience, and the advantages of peer to peer accommodation to potential or inexperienced guests thus, at the initial stage of consumer capture, hosts should concentrate on guests believe that they able to perform all types of online transactions. Hosts can use third party seals of approval (e.g. BBBOnline and TRUSTe) in order to endorse the seals of their privacy, as guests are more likely to provide information to the website that has third party verification. Hosts can use certificates from third parties who are trusted and independent in order to foster guest trust.

Third, this study shows mechanism to increase customer trust since four factors played significant effect, namely: website quality, likability, privacy/security, propensity to trust, others trust buyer/seller, and third party recognition. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to integrate the effects of the propensity to trust in a peer to peer accommodation context, and we found that this variable has a strong effect on customer trust. Not surprisingly the Arab culture valued trust of other, and thus, the more customers in Egypt have a tendency to trust others, the more they perceive peer to peer accommodation as

trustworthy; however, our findings contrast with other studies on e-commerce that did not find a link between the propensity to trust and customer trust (e.g., Lowry et al., 2008). One of the reasons for these different findings could be because of the sample belongs to an Arab culture, which is considered feminine that promotes the well-being of people, exhibits high trust of others, and scores much higher on uncertainty avoidance than Western cultures; thus, the propensity to trust would be a more important factor in trust building in Egypt than Western countries.

Fourth, our results suggest possible new strategies for potential marketing of this business. On a high level, peer to peer accommodation needs a stronger IT artifact design that increases assurance and trust in completing payment transactions. These design features (e.g., adding the third party seals logo) must be at the core of any successful strategy that aims to promote the product to increase customer trust. Yet, increasing customer trust is not simply a matter of providing third party seals and assurances on peer to peer accommodation websites. Third party seals can work only if consumers understand their meaning; linked to this, companies need to invest efforts in promoting understanding of third party seals among its customers. Consumers can have a worthwhile experience, with reduced effort if the steps that are required between the selection of goods and making payment are minimized, where the time spent feels reasonable whilst, simultaneously, it is vital to guarantee that customers are satisfied with the vendor, by feeling pleased that they did the right thing in making purchases from them.

Finally, managers will have a better understanding of the significant role of guest demographic factors (i.e. age, gender, and income) and its influences on guests' behaviour intention to use peer to peer accommodation that manager can use in their plans and marketing strategies. Further implications for peer to peer accommodation hosts concerns age and gender differences in guests' intention to use peer to peer accommodation. Our study indicate that the trust had greater impact on intention to use peer to peer accommodation for older and males. Therefore, peer to peer accommodation hosts aiming to attract females and younger guests should emphasizes the value and benefits of peer to peer accommodation by highlighting the privacy and security aspects of the peer to peer accommodation. For example, hosts can provide guests with web assurance seals, referral mechanisms, digital certificates, and offering discounts for the first time guests.

5.5 Limitations and Further Research Directions

As with any research, there are some limitations that should be mentioned, which could provide fertile grounds for further research. First, although Egypt represents well the Eastern society; further study ought to replicate the findings of the present research in other western societies. Second, this study is limited to the peer to peer accommodation context, so further studies could examine the same model in other contexts, which may add to the knowledge if it validated in another service context. Third, the present study constructs have been measured at a single point of time. Therefore, future research can utilise longitudinal study to validate the suggest framework. Fourth, future work should address the host's perspective when examining trust. In the current research, trust has been mainly researched from the guest's point of view. This could result from incorporating traditional C2C e-commerce research wherein the position of the seller has not undergone any substantial changes. In the sharing economy however, the seller often faces larger risks, meaning that a seller has to overcome a trust barrier as well. This is an important point to address, especially to ensure the future supply of goods and services in sharing markets. Finally, the present study did not include other characteristics such as reviews and host pictures, as prior research has investigated these factors separately. Future research may integrate different host characteristics in order to examine the significance of these aspects in stimulating perceived trustworthiness and booking intention.

References

- Abraham, B., Parigi, P., Gupta, A., Cook, K. S., 2017. Reputation offsets trust judgments based on social biases among Airbnb users. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201604234.
- Abrate, G., Viglia, G., 2017. Personal or product reputation? Optimizing revenues in the sharing economy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 279-285.
- Agag, G. M., El-Masry, A. A., 2017. Why do consumers trust online travel websites? Drivers and outcomes of consumer trust toward online travel websites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(3), 347-369.
- Agag, G., El-Masry, A. A., 2016. Understanding consumer intention to participate in online travel community and effects on consumer intention to purchase travel online and WOM: An integration of innovation diffusion theory and TAM with trust. *Computers in human behaviour*, 60(2), 97-111.
- Ahuja, M. J., Thatcher, J. B., 2005. Moving beyond intention and toward the theory of trying: Effects of work environment and gender on post-adoption information technology use. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(3), 427-459
- Aladwani, A. M., Palvia, P. C., 2002. Developing and validating an instrument for measuring user-perceived web quality. *Information & management*, 39(6), 467-476.
- Alfina, I., Ero, J., Hidayanto, A., 2014. The impact of cognitive trust and e-wom on purchase intention in C2C e-commerce site. *Journal of Computer Science*, 10(12), 2518-2524.
- Al-Somali, S., Gholami, R., Clegg, B., 2009. An investigation into the acceptance of online banking in Saudi Arabia”, *Technovation*, 29(2), 130-41.
- Anderson, J. C., Narus, J. A., 1990. A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1), 42-58.
- Awad, N. F., Ragowsky, A., 2008. Establishing trust in electronic commerce through online word of mouth: An examination across genders. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(4), 101-121.
- Beldad, A., Jong, M. De, Steehouder, M., 2010. How shall I trust the faceless and the intangible? A literature review on the antecedents of online trust. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 857-869.
- Bélanger, F., Hiller, J., Smith, W., 2002. Trustworthiness in electronic commerce: the role of privacy, security, and site attributes. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 11(1), 245-270.
- Chang, C. M., Hsu, M. H., Hsu, C. S., Cheng, H. L., 2014. Examining the role of perceived value in virtual communities continuance: Its antecedents and the influence of experience. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 33(5), 502-521.
- Chang, K.C., Kuo, N.T., Hsu, C.L., Cheng, Y.S., 2014. The impact of website quality and perceived trust on customer purchase intention in the hotel sector: website brand and perceived value as moderators. *Int. J. Innov.* 5 (4), 255-260.
- Chen, J., Zhang, C., Xu, Y., 2009. The role of mutual trust in building members' loyalty to a C2C platform provider. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 14(1), 147-171.
- Chen, S. C., Dhillon, G. S., 2003. Interpreting dimensions of consumer trust in e-commerce. *Information Technology and Management*, 4(2-3), 303-318.

- Chen, D., Lou, H., van Slyke, C., 2015. Toward an understanding of online lending intentions: evidence from a survey in China. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 36(1), 1–22.
- Chen, D.Q., Preston, D.S., Xia, W., 2013. Enhancing hospital supply chain performance: A relational view and empirical test. *Journal of Operations Management*, 31(6), 391-408.
- Cheng, M., 2016. Current sharing economy media discourse in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 60(C), 111-114.
- Cheng, M., 2016. Sharing economy: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 57(1), 60-70.
- Cheung, C. M., Lee, M. K., 2006. Understanding consumer trust in Internet shopping: A multidisciplinary approach. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 57(4), 479-492.
- Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., Newsted, P. R., 2003. A partial least squares latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects: results from a Monte Carlo simulation study and an electronic-mail emotion/adoption study. *Information Systems Research*, 14(2), 189–217
- Chiu, C., Hsu, M., Lai, H., Chang, C. 2012. Re-examining the influence of trust on online repeat purchase intention: The moderating role of habit and its antecedents. *Decision Support Systems*, 53(4), 835–845.
- Christine Roy, M., Dewit, O., Aubert, B. A., 2001. The impact of interface usability on trust in web retailers. *Internet research*, 11(5), 388-398.
- Cohen, J., 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Colquitt, J. A., Rodell, J. B., 2011. Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1183-1206.
- Coulter, K. S., Coulter, R. A., 2002. Determinants of trust in a service provider: the moderating role of length of relationship. *Journal of services marketing*, 16(1), 35-50.
- Devine T. 2014. The 6 risks for sharers in the sharing economy/Huffington Post. Available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ted-devine/the-6-risks-for-sharers-i_b_5186282.html [accessed 12 December 2018].
- Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P., Mullen, M. R., 1998. Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 601–620.
- Eid, M. I., 2011. Determinants of e-commerce customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of electronic commerce research*, 12(1), 78-93.
- Ellison, N. B., Hancock, J. T., 2013. Profile as promise: Honest and deceptive signals in online dating. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 11(5), 84-88.
- eMarketer., 2017. Uber, Airbnb lead the way as sharing economy expands: 56.5 million people will use a sharing economy service this year. <https://www.emarketer.com/Article/UberAirbnb-Lead-Way-Sharing-Economy-Expands/1016109>.
- Ert, E., Fleischer, A., Magen, N. (2016). Trust and reputation in the sharing economy: The role of personal photos in Airbnb. *Tourism Management*, 55(4), 62-73.
- Everard, A., Galletta, D. F., 2005. How presentation flaws affect perceived site quality, trust, and intention to purchase from an online store. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(3), 56-95.

- Fang, Y., Qureshi, I., Sun, H., McCole, P., Ramsey, E., Lim, K.H., 2014. Trust, satisfaction, and online repurchase intention: The moderating role of perceived effectiveness of e-commerce institutional mechanisms. *Mis Quarterly*, 38(2).
- Feingold, A., 1994. Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 116(3), 429-476.
- Flavián, C., Guinalú, M., Gurrea, R., 2006. The role played by perceived usability, satisfaction and consumer trust on website loyalty. *Information & management*, 43(1), 1-14.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D. F., 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18, 39-50.
- Fortune, 2017. Airbnb's profits to top \$3 billion by 2020. <http://fortune.com/2017/02/15/airbnbprofits>.
- Gansky, L., 2010. *The mesh: Why the future of business is sharing*. Penguin.
- Gao, L., Waechter, K.A., 2017. Examining the role of initial trust in user adoption of mobile payment services: an empirical investigation. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 19(3), 525-548.
- Garau-Vadell, J.B., Gutiérrez-Taño, D., Díaz-Armas, R., 2018. Residents' Support for P2P Accommodation in Mass Tourism Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(3), 211-227.
- Gefen, D., Straub, D. W., 2000. The relative importance of perceived ease of use in IS adoption: A study of e-commerce adoption. *Journal of the association for Information Systems*, 1(8), 1-30.
- Gefen, D., Straub, D. W., 2004. Consumer trust in B2C e-Commerce and the importance of social presence: experiments in e-Products and e-Services. *Omega*, 32(6), 407-424.
- Ghose, A., Ipeiritos, P., Sundararajan, A., 2009. The dimensions of reputation in electronic markets. NYU Center for Digital Economy Research Working Paper No. CeDER-06-02.
- Gong, W., 2009. National culture and global diffusion of business-to-consumer e-commerce. *Cross cultural management: an international journal*, 16(1), 83-101.
- Grabner-Kräuter, S., Kaluscha, E. A., 2003. Empirical research in on-line trust: A review and critical assessment," *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 58(1), 783-812.
- Granovetter, M. S., 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 29(5), 1360–1380.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., Sarstedt, M., 2017. *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., 2011. PLS-SEM: indeed a silver bullet. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
- Hair, J. F., W. C. Black, H. J. Babin., R. E. Anderson., 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hao Suan Samuel, L., Balaji, M. S., Kok Wei, K., 2015. An investigation of online shopping experience on trust and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 14(2), 233-254.
- Hawlicsek, F., Teubner, T., Weinhardt, C., 2016. Trust in the Sharing Economy. *Die Unternehmung. Swiss Journal of Business Research and Practice*, 70(1), 26–44.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M., 2015. A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 43 (1), 115–135.
- Heo, Y., 2016. Sharing economy and prospects in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58(2), 166-170.

- Hernández, B., Jiménez, J., José Martín, M., 2011. Age, gender and income: do they really moderate online shopping behaviour? *Online information review*, 35(1), 113-133.
- Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P., 2009. Flow online: lessons learned and future prospects. *Journal of interactive marketing*, 23(1), 23-34.
- Hofstede, G., 1980. Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Hong, I. B., Cho, H., 2011. The impact of consumer trust on attitudinal loyalty and purchase intentions in B2C e-marketplaces: Intermediary trust vs. seller trust. *International Journal of Information Management*, 31(5), 469-479.
- Hu, X., Wu, G., Wu, Y., Zhang, H., 2010. The effects of Web assurance seals on consumers' initial trust in an online vendor: A functional perspective. *Decision support systems*, 48(2), 407-418.
- Huang, Z., Benyoucef, M., 2013. From e-commerce to social commerce: A close look at design features. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 12(4), 246-259.
- Hurne, 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.
- Ip, C., Law, R., Lee, H.A., 2012. The evaluation of hotel website functionality by fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. *J. Travel Tourism Mark.* 29 (3), 263–278.
- Jeong, M., Oh, H., Gregoire, M., 2003. Conceptualizing website quality and its consequences in the lodging industry? *Int. J. Hospitality Manage.* 22 (2), 161–175.
- Johnson, D., Grayson, K., 2005. Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business research*, 58(4), 500-507.
- Jones, K., Leonard, L. N., 2008. Trust in consumer-to-consumer electronic commerce. *Information & management*, 45(2), 88-95.
- Jöreskog, K. G., Wold, H. O., 1982. Systems under indirect observation: Causality, structure, prediction (Vol. 139). Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Kang, J. Y. M., Kim, E., 2012. e-Mass customisation apparel shopping: effects of desire for unique consumer products and perceived risk on purchase intentions. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, 5(2), 91-103.
- Karlsson, L., Dolnicar, S., 2016. Someone's been sleeping in my bed. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58(1), 159-162.
- Kauffman, R. J., Wood, C. A., 2000. Running up the bid: Modelling seller opportunism in Internet auctions. *AMCIS 2000 Proceedings*, 929-935.
- Kim, D. J., Ferrin, D. L. Rao, H. R., 2008. A trust-based consumer decision-making model in electronic commerce: The role of trust, perceived risk, and their antecedents. *Decision Support Systems*, 44(2), 544-564.
- Kim, M. J., Chung, N., Lee, C. K., 2011. The effect of perceived trust on electronic commerce: Shopping online for tourism products and services in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 256-265.
- Kim, Y. H., Kim, D. J., Hwang, Y., 2009. Exploring online transaction self-efficacy in trust building in B2C e-commerce. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, 21(1), 37-59.

- Kirk, C. P., Chiagouris, L., Gopalakrishna, P., 2012. Some people just want to read: The roles of age, interactivity, and perceived usefulness of print in the consumption of digital information products. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 19(1), 168–178.
- Klarner, P., Sarstedt, M., Hoeck, M., Ringle, C. M., 2013. Disentangling the effects of team competences, team adaptability, and client communication on the performance of management consulting teams. *Long Range Planning*, 46(3), 258-286.
- Krejcie, R. V., Morgan, D. W., 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, 30(2), 607-610.
- Lai, J. Y., Ulhas, K. R., Lin, J. D., 2014. Assessing and managing e-commerce service convenience. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 16(2), 273-289.
- Lamberton, C. P., Rose, R. L., 2012. When is ours better than mine? A framework for understanding and altering participation in commercial sharing systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(4), 109-125.
- Lee, S., Kim, D. Y., 2018. Brand personality of Airbnb: Application of user involvement and gender differences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 32-45.
- Li, W. Z., Jiao, A. Y., 2008. The impact of website and offline equality on relationship quality: an empirical Study on e-retailing. In *Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing, 2008. WiCOM'08. 4th International Conference on* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
- Li, L., Peng, M., Jiang, N. Law, R., 2017. An empirical study on the influence of economy hotel website quality on online booking intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 63(3), 1-10.
- Liang, H., Saraf, N., Hu, Q., Xue, Y., 2007. Assimilation of enterprise systems: the effect of institutional pressures and the mediating role of top management. *MIS quarterly*, 26(2), 59-87.
- Line, N. D., Hanks, L., 2016. The effects of environmental and luxury beliefs on intention to patronize green hotels: the moderating effect of destination image. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(6), 904-925.
- Liu, C., Arnett, K. P., 2000. Exploring the factors associated with website success in the context of electronic commerce. *Information & Management*, 38(1), 23-33.
- Liu, J. N., Zhang, E. Y., 2014. An investigation of factors affecting customer selection of online hotel booking channels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 39(2), 71-83.
- Lowry, P. B., Vance, A., Moody, G., Beckman, B. Read, A., 2008. Explaining and predicting the impact of branding alliances and web site quality on initial consumer trust of e-commerce web sites. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(5), 201-227.
- Lu, B., Fan, W., Zhou, M., 2016. Social presence, trust, and social commerce purchase intention: An empirical research. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 56(2), 225-237.
- Lu, Y., Zhao, L., Wang, B., 2010. From virtual community members to C2C e-commerce buyers: Trust in virtual communities and its effect on consumers' purchase intention. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 9(4), 346-360.
- Lu, J., Yu, C.S., Liu, C. Yao, J., 2003. Technology acceptance model for wireless internet", *Internet Research: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy*, 13(3), 206-22.
- Lyu, J., Li, M. Law, R., 2018. Experiencing P2P accommodations: Anecdotes from Chinese customers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 23(2), 1-27.

- Martin-Fuentes, E., Fernandez, C., Mateu, C. Marine-Roig, E., 2018. Modelling a grading scheme for peer-to-peer accommodation: Stars for Airbnb. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 2(69), 75-83.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Matzler, K., Strobl, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnick, A., Bauer, F., 2016. Brand personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management*, 52, 507-520.
- Mazzella, F., Sundararajan, A., D'Espous, V. B., Möhlmann, M., 2016. How digital trust powers the sharing economy. *IESE Business Review*, 26(5), 24-31.
- McCloskey, D. W., 2006. The importance of ease of use, usefulness, and trust to online consumers: An examination of the technology acceptance model with older consumers. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, 18(3), 47-52.
- McKnight, D. H., Chervany, N. L., 2002. What trust means in e-commerce customer relationships: An interdisciplinary conceptual typology. *International journal of electronic commerce*, 6(2), 35-59.
- Möhlmann, M., 2016. Digital trust and peer-to-peer collaborative consumption platforms: A mediation analysis. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2813367>
- Morgan, R. M., Hunt, S. D., 1994. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of marketing*, 58(3), 20-38.
- Nitzl, C., Nitzl, C., Roldan, J. L., Roldan, J. L., Cepeda, G., Cepeda, G., 2016. Mediation analysis in partial least squares path modelling: Helping researchers discuss more sophisticated models. *Industrial management & data systems*, 116(9), 1849-1864.
- Oghazi, P., Karlsson, S., Hellström, D., Hjort, K., 2018. Online purchase return policy leniency and purchase decision: Mediating role of consumer trust. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 41(2), 190-200.
- Oliveira, T., Alinho, M., Rita, P., Dhillon, G., 2017. Modelling and testing consumer trust dimensions in e-commerce. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 71(2), 153-164.
- Olya, H. G., Altinay Gazi, Z., Altinay Aksal, F., Altinay, M., 2018. Behavioural intentions of disabled tourists for the use of peer-to-peer accommodations: An application of fsQCA. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 436-454.
- Palvia, P., 2009. The role of trust in e-commerce relational exchange: A unified model. *Information & management*, 46(4), 213-220.
- Pavlou, P. A., Gefen, D., 2004. Building effective online marketplaces with institution-based trust. *Information systems research*, 15(1), 37-59.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., Podsakoff, N. P., 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Ponte, E. B., Carvajal-Trujillo, E., Escobar-Rodríguez, T., 2015. Influence of trust and perceived value on the intention to purchase travel online: Integrating the effects of assurance on trust antecedents. *Tourism Management*, 47(3), 286-302.
- Ranchordás, S., 2015. Does sharing mean caring: regulating innovation in the sharing economy. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science. & Technology*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2492798>.

- Rotter, J. B., 1967. A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of personality*, 35(4), 651-665.
- Rouibah, K., Lowry, P.B., Hwang, Y., (2016). The effects of perceived enjoyment and perceived risks on trust formation and intentions to use online payment systems: New perspectives from an Arab country. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 19(3), 33-43.
- Shankar, V., Urban, G. L., Sultan, F., 2002. Online trust: a stakeholder perspective, concepts, implications, and future directions. *The Journal of strategic information systems*, 11(3-4), 325-344.
- Sih, A., Hanser, S. F., McHugh, K. A., 2009. Social network theory: new insights and issues for behavioural ecologists. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, 63(7), 975-988.
- Skift, 2017. Airbnb is becoming an even bigger threat to hotels says a new report. Retrieved from <https://skift.com/2017/01/04/airbnb-is-becoming-an-even-bigger-threat-to-hotelsays-a-new-report>.
- Tarhini, A., Hone, K., Liu, X., 2014. Measuring the moderating effect of gender and age on e-learning acceptance in England: A structural equation modelling approach for an extended technology acceptance model. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 51(2), 163–184.
- 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.
- Teo, Thompson S.H., Jing Liu., 2007. Consumer Trust in E-Commerce in the United States, Singapore and China. *Omega*, 35(1), 22–38.
- Teo, A. C., Tan, G. W. H., Ooi, K. B., Hew, T. S., Yew, K. T., 2015. The effects of convenience and speed in m-payment. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 115(2), 311-331.
- Tussyadiah, I. P., 2016. Factors of satisfaction and intention to use peer-to-peer accommodation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55(2), 70-80.
- Tussyadiah, I. P., Park, S., 2018. When guests trust hosts for their words: Host description and trust in sharing economy. *Tourism Management*, 67(1), 261-272.
- Tussyadiah, I. P., Pesonen, J., 2016. Impacts of peer-to-peer accommodation use on travel patterns. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1022-1040.
- 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.
- Urban, G. L., Amyx, C., Lorenzon, A., 2009. Online trust: state of the art, new frontiers, and research potential. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(2), 179-190.
- Wang, L., Law, R., Guillet, B. D., Hung, K., Fong, D. K. C., 2015. Impact of hotel website quality on online booking intentions: eTrust as a mediator. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 47(1), 108-115.
- Wang, W. T., Wang, Y. S., Liu, E. R., 2016. The stickiness intention of group-buying websites: The integration of the commitment–trust theory and e-commerce success model. *Information & Management*, 53(5), 625-642.
- Wold, H., 1985. Partial least squares (Encyclopedia of statistical sciences). New York: Wiley

- Wu, G., Hu, X., Wu, Y., 2010. Effects of perceived interactivity, perceived web assurance and disposition to trust on initial online trust. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 16(1), 1-26.
- Wu, J.H., Wang, S.C., 2005. What drives mobile commerce? An empirical evaluation of the revised technology acceptance model. *Information & management*, 42(5), 719-729.
- Wu, J., Ma, P., Xie, K. L., 2017. In sharing economy we trust: the effects of host attributes on short-term rental purchases. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(11), 2962-2976.
- Yoon, H. S., Occeña, L. G., 2015. Influencing factors of trust in consumer-to-consumer electronic commerce with gender and age. *International Journal of Information Management*, 35(3), 352-363.
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., Chen, Q., 2010. Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 197-206
- Zekanovic-Korona, L., Grzunov, J., 2014. Evaluation of shared digital economy adoption: Case of Airbnb. In *Information and Communication Technology, Electronics and Microelectronics (MIPRO), 2014 37th International Convention on* (pp. 1574-1579). IEEE.
- Zucker, L. G., 1986. Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840–1920. *Research in organizational behavior*. eds. B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 1986) pp. 53–111.