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Personal mobility is undergoing a *technological* and *social* change

1998: “Don’t get into a stranger’s car”

2008: “Don’t meet people from the internet alone”

2018: “Order yourself a stranger from the internet and get into their car alone”
The sharing economy

• One of the ‘most significant economic developments’ of the past decade
• Consumer to consumer (C2C), or peer to peer (P2P), interactions
• Allow people to share, barter, lend, rent, trade, gift and swap their personal goods with others

‘Consumers granting each other temporary access to under-utilised physical assets’

– Frenken 2015
Peer-to-peer mobility innovations

**P2P car sharing**
An individual granting temporary access of their vehicle to another individual, often for payment

**P2P ride sharing**
An individual granting temporary access of a seat in their vehicle, and sharing a journey, with another individual, often for payment
Research question

Who are the adopters of peer-to-peer mobility innovations?
Methodology

Three parallel surveys: adopters of P2P car sharing, adopters of P2P ride sharing, non-adopters

- Socio-economic characteristics
- Personality traits
- Communication behaviours
- Travel behaviours
- Perceptions of P2P mobility
Methodology

Three parallel surveys: adopters of P2P car sharing, adopters of P2P ride sharing, non-adopters

- **Personality traits**
  - Trust
  - Sociality
  - Technophilia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P2P car sharers</th>
<th>P2P ride sharers</th>
<th>Non adopters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociality</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑ (↑)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technophilia</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key results - Sociality

There are no significant differences between any of the three samples.
Key results - Technophilia

P2P car sharers are significantly* more “technophilic” than are P2P ride sharers

P2P ride sharers are significantly* more “technophilic” than are non adopters

* p < .05
Key results - trust

P2P ride sharers are significantly* more trusting (in the platform and other users) than are non-adopters.

*P<.05
Key results - trust

There is no significant difference between how trusting non adopters and P2P car sharers are.
Identification of adopter profiles

**Past users**
“Used P2P ride sharing in the past, but not now”

**Commuters**
Middle aged (35 – 65)
Middle income
Use regularly
Often with the same people
Commuting

**Car-free**
Younger (under 35)
Lower income
Car-free households
Use monthly or less
One-off journeys
Comparisons of adopter types

Commuters have significantly* higher levels of trust than do both car-free users, and past users.

* p<.05
Future work

**Aim:** To assess the potential for P2P mobility innovations to reduce CO₂ emissions, through an exploration of two case studies: P2P car sharing and P2P ride sharing

1. **Who are the adopters of peer-to-peer mobility innovations?**

2. Why do adopters use peer-to-peer mobility innovations?

3. What are the impacts of peer-to-peer mobility innovations on CO₂ emissions?
Future work – next steps

Why do adopters use P2P mobility innovations?

Focus groups with adopter groups (past-users, commuters, car-free households)
- Role of contextual factors (institutional factors)
- Where is the agency?
- Role of trust
- Role of sociality, relationships
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