

Extended Summary

Introduction

The work arises as a result of the fruitless research to correlate the motivations of the collaborative economy (collaborative or sharing economy) with other psychological constructs. As we did not find any empirical questionnaire in Spanish, we decided that it would be ideal to translate and validate a scale in English which groups three dimensions: Enjoyment, Economic Benefits and Sustainability

The Collaborative Economy or Collaborative Consumption is a new term coined by Ray Algar in 2007 who predicted a breakdown in current socio-economic models due, in large part, to the meteoric assimilation of technology in people and the deep crisis that haunted us at that time.

The tools that allow access to this new economic model are generally digital platforms supported by social networks, so that accessibility and ease of use is mainly nuclear in the dominant profile of consumption: young people.

According to the European Forum of Collaborative Economy (EUCOLAB) held in Brussels last 2017, Spain leads the list of countries with the highest percentage of use with 6%, with half of Europe being 5%. In 2016 it represented the sixth position, rising in the ranking quickly.

The vast majority of accesses to this commercial alternative occur on the Web, by applications or web pages approved for it. The most recent cases, cultivation of conflicts included, have been Uber (car sharing) and Wallapop (previously agreed exchange of objects or lifelong barter). People are increasingly interested in this new market and, given the nullity of rigorous studies, we think it is important to have a tool in our language.

Methods and Data

Participants. The sample was randomized and the age limited was the adequate to work. The sample consisted of 73 men and 109 women with a global of 182 people.

Materials. The configuration of the scale in Spanish was done through the translation and retro translation of the original questionnaire. The original instrument was translated semantically (not literally) from English into Spanish by a bilingual researcher of Spanish origin; and then another bilingual researcher translated the translated questionnaire into English.

Finally, the Spanish version was reviewed by three graduates in Economics to verify the comprehension of the questionnaire and 10 non-professionals were replied to assess the legibility of the questionnaire.

Procedure. The information was collected using an online survey for creating forms in order to speed up the process of capturing the sample and the subsequent quantification of data. To this end, the questionnaire was delivered to university students from all the Faculties as well as to other people who took part in the proposed age range into the Valencian Community. We were able to attract 183 users.

Subsequently, the relevant statistical parameters were measured in order to analyze the validity of the questionnaire following the empirical logic. First, we analyzed construct validity using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy tests and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. And for reliability in terms of internal consistency we used the Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculation for all the factors of the questionnaire.

For the construction of the database, Microsoft Office Excel was used and the statistical package SPSS v.22.0 was used for the analysis.

Results

To check the validity of the construct, the questionnaire was submitted to an exploratory factor analysis where a significance of <0.000 and a KMO index of 0.886 was obtained in Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

This analysis was carried out using the principal components method, with varimax rotation. The result displayed two factors that explained 58.7% of the variance.

To check the internal consistency, the Cronbach's alpha was analyzed, which obtained a score of 0.91 points overall.

To verify the bidimensionality, we submitted the questionnaire to a confirmatory factor analysis, forcing a third factor that theoretically corresponds to a third dimension. The result corroborated the data obtained with the exploratory factor analysis

Conclusions

In our context, there are no instruments that allow empirically measuring the interest and motivation towards the collaborative economy. This questionnaire presents metric qualities that are more than acceptable and its simplicity and small size favor and facilitate administration.

The original scale started from three differentiated dimensions: Enjoyment, Economic Benefits and Sustainability. Once applied the methodological criteria what was discovered was that there are two particular factors, one that would encompass the dimension of enjoyment and economic benefits as a univocal motivation and another that would follow the original conceptualization as sustainability divided into five unambiguous items.

The exploratory factor analysis confirmed the results found in the exploratory factor analysis, which verifies the existence of two main dimensions. This would rethink the theoretical conception by virtue of a consensus appropriate to the metric results obtained.

On the other hand, the internal consistency of the items is very acceptable, showing a Chronbach alpha close to the unit.

With all this, and given the nullity of questionnaires that measure this construct, we can conclude that the questionnaire is adequate for its administration.

It would be desirable to increase the sample of the study or carry out other investigations with other different or complementary samples in order to increase the population heterogeneity which would represent the coercive profile of an economic model with more diverse followers every day.

References

- Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M & Ukkonen, A. (2013). The Sharing Economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science And Technology*.
- Gansky, L. (2010). *The Mesh: Why the Future of Business Is Shring*. Penguin Group.
- Nica, E., & Potcovaru, A.-M. (2015). *The social sustainability of the sharing economy*. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, 10 (4), 69-75.