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### Background

As link between consumption of collaborative economy and perception of data had not yet been investigated; a more in-depth analysis of consumer perception of data use by companies is needed.

### Purpose

The purpose of this study is to understand the consumers’ perception about the use of their data by companies of the sharing economy. The goal is to see if they are aware of this phenomenon and if it would modify their behavior regarding the use of these online platforms.

### Research Question

How does the generation Y perceive the fact that companies use their data in Sharing Economy businesses?

### Method

A quantitative, qualitative research has been done for this study to understand generation Y's perception of the sharing economy regarding the use of data by companies. With this research, we focused on a survey but also on four focus groups composed of five persons: French students aged from 18 to 25 years old who travel often for both studies and leisure. We took people from different social backgrounds and have chosen different studies. We emphasize this research with
previous theories about the consumer behavior with the buyer decision process in the sharing economy, the self-perception and the price-perception.

Theoretical framework: Theories regarding perception on several aspects, from the individual values, to benefit going through price have been included as a basis of discussion in order to analyze our empirical findings.

Findings and conclusion

Through our research study, we have seen that the Y generation uses the sharing economy essentially for the economy benefit and the time saved but also for its social character and its environmental aspect. Data protection is a really concerning matter for Y generation but they don’t do much about it. Internet use is essential for young people so they accept, when they are aware, to give their data against the free usage of the platform. In addition, we have noticed that the main marketing application of data collection, customized advertising, are misconducted by companies and doesn’t reach users. Despite the awareness of users regarding the protection of data, this generation thinks that collaborative platforms are not so intrusive in their privacy regarding personal information request.
# Table des matières

Acknowledgment ........................................................................................................... 1
Abstract ............................................................................................................................ 2
1. Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1
   1.4. Purpose .................................................................................................................. 4
   1.5. Research question .................................................................................................. 4
   1.6. Delimitations ........................................................................................................ 4
2. Theoretical Framework ............................................................................................... 6
   2.1. Consumer behavior models ............................................................................... 6
       2.1.1. Companies oriented ....................................................................................... 6
       2.1.2. Customer oriented ........................................................................................ 7
   2.2 Perception Theories ............................................................................................... 9
       2.2.1. Self-Perception ............................................................................................ 9
       2.2.2. Price Perception ......................................................................................... 10
       2.2.3. Benefit Perception ...................................................................................... 11
3. Methodology .............................................................................................................. 12
   3.1. Research approach ............................................................................................. 12
       3.1.1. Descriptive research .................................................................................... 12
       3.1.2. Quantitative research .................................................................................. 12
       3.1.3. Qualitative research .................................................................................... 13
   3.2. Research strategy ................................................................................................ 13
       3.2.1. Instrument to collect data ............................................................................ 13
       3.2.2. Quantitative method: the survey ................................................................. 15
       3.2.3. Qualitative interviews .................................................................................. 16
3.3 Population and sample ........................................................................................... 16
   3.3.1. Survey: selection of the sample ...................................................................... 16
   3.3.2. Development of the interview guide .............................................................. 17
   3.3.3. Focus group: choice of respondents ............................................................. 18
4. Empirical Study .......................................................................................................... 19
   4.1. Knowledge and use of sharing economy ............................................................ 19
   4.2. Perception and relation to data privacy ............................................................... 24
   4.3. Influence on collaborative consumption ............................................................ 27
5. Conclusion .......................................................................................................................... 32
  5.1. Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 32
  5.2. Limitations ................................................................................................................ 33
  5.3. Further research ........................................................................................................ 33
REFERENCES .................................................................................................................. 35
APPENDIX ....................................................................................................................... 43
  Survey .............................................................................................................................. 43
  Discussion with focus groups ......................................................................................... 45
1. Introduction

This chapter includes an introduction to the overall topic of the study, a background and problem discussion. The authors point out the idea of examining the collaboration economy, Generation Y, and consumer behavior to outline elements that influence the consumption through collaborative economy and the place of data in this usage. Moreover, the chapter explains the research purpose and questions, which represents a primordial part of the whole study. The delimitation is also highlighted in this part.

The Uberisation of the modern society seems to be a major turn regarding consumption and offer. According to Hamari, Jöklint and Ukkonen (2015), it can be considered as a going back to a local economy when exchanging on a local scale to create shorter economic routes between final consumer and service deliverer. This model has been used in different field such as transport and hospitality with big actors like Ubber or Airbnb. Hamari, Jöklint and Ukkonen (2008) mention that sustainability is an important factor in the formation for positive attitudes towards collaborative consumption, however, economic benefit is the stronger motivation to influence positively participation in sharing economy.

Moreover, Schiel (2015) describes a move to networked information economy when it used to be based on industrial information. Collaborative consumption cashes this phenomenon in; these entities are connecting people who are looking for a good, service and the one who is offering it. Due to them cards were shuffle and now final consumers are more powerful than they used to be. Consumer communities are gathering to exchange information, goods, knowledge; social media are spreading information of all kind. It is a huge advantage for final consumers which are not so final now, they can inject again on marketplaces object that they have already used and might have been considered as obsolete. That is why Piscicelli & al. (2014) considers that collaborative behavior is a greener way of consumption since it helps reduce the impact on planet by unused product. It will indeed increase the life cycle of a good with the opportunity for to people to put either a monetarized, or not, win-win relationship.

As a result, we can argue that people used to this inexhaustible actualized source of information hold concurrently with a strong will to create a different system are the more inclined to use these platforms; this population would not be impregnate by society codes. This factor leads us to consider young generation, more particularly the Generation Y, as potential users of these platforms. Indeed, the lack of monetary resources added to the characteristic candor of youth makes this generation Y a privileged target of collaborative economy platforms. Moreover, according to Bolton & al (2013), Generation Y uses
Internet and technology to access information, leisure or entertainment and they turned themselves to these channels in order to socialize and experience a sense of community. That is why we consider Generation Y to be a choice of consumption that young people may embrace. Prensky (2001) mentions that in what has become common parlance, members of Generation Y are Digital Natives, rather than Digital Immigrants. According to Bennett et al. (2008); Wesner & Miller (2008), they are the first generation to have spent their entire lives in the digital environment; information technology profoundly affects how they live and work. Generation Y actively contributes, shares, searches to consume content on social media platforms. We assumed we can encounter the same behavior regarding collaborative consumption.

The scientific community considers that the sharing of an event is needed to consider a group of people as a generation. Even though the economic crisis of 2008 might be one, the development of instant communication strategy has changed so deeply ways of consumption; these global events can be considered as a generational bond. Even if individual differences occur within a generation there are some characteristics that are common to define Generation Y. Indeed, the daily use of social technology added to the increasing development of customised product has shaped a generation that wants it all and wants it now (Ng et al., 2010; Twenge, 2010).

Although larger percentages of older generations are more online now than in the past, the young people still dominate the online population per Pew Research Center’s Internet and American Life Project surveys taken from 2006-2008 (Jones and Fox, 2009). Not only the younger generation is more familiar with e-commerce but it also processes website information five times faster than older generations (Kim and Ammeter, 2008; O’Donnell, 2006). Still, there are some members of the younger generation who do not like to shop online, primarily because they do not feel secure when purchasing online (Sullivan, 2004). Due to these generational characteristics, the generation Y will be the major target of online retailing. “The majority of college students are members of Generation Y and heavy users of the Internet in general.” (Dawn & al., 2013, p.83). It can be implied that each generation has its own consumer behavior. Nevertheless, these platforms, just like any other internet entities, are collecting and storing information on their customer. That is why we decided to use consumer behavior to determine if this data use is considered as an ethic problem for users. To answer this question, we analyzed consumer behavior and isolated perception factors to determine generation Y users of collaborative platforms, perception of privacy intrusion, and evaluate if it is a problem for them.
The consumer behavior is described in various ways as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faison and Edmund (1977)</td>
<td>“The assumption that people have series of needs which lead to drive state.”</td>
<td>p.172-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel, et al. (1986)</td>
<td>“Those acts of individuals directly involved in obtaining, using, and disposing of economic goods and services, including the decision processes that precede and determine these acts”.</td>
<td>p.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotler (1994)</td>
<td>“The consumer behavior is the study of how people buy, what they buy, when they buy and why they buy”.</td>
<td>p.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Consumer is the study “of the processes involved when individuals or groups select, purchase, use, or dispose of products, services, ideas, or experiences to satisfy needs and desires”.</td>
<td>p.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiffman (2007)</td>
<td>“The behavior that consumers display in searching for, purchasing, using, evaluating, and disposing of products and services that they expect will satisfy their needs”.</td>
<td>p.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, consumer behavior is the study of consumers and the processes they use to choose, consume and dispose of products and services. Despite the multiplicity of definitions for all these authors there is the idea of a process. The consumer will look for information and think about advantages and disadvantages related to their needs and desires. Moreover, the latter the definition comes in time the more important became the idea to relate consumer to the product and services they need. The idea of need is getting
far from the survival aspect of the word. Needs may be considered through values and
ideal consumptions of consumer. When talking about ethical way of consumption the
values of consumer are primordial.
In fact, consumer behavior is really important because all marketing decisions are based
on assumptions and knowledge of the client behavior; and from this will follow the
strategy to apply or the patterns to develop.
As mentioned by Agyekum & al. (2015), the effect of brand name and price representing
both 30% is stronger than the country of origin and the manufacturer, which are
considered as insignificant, representing only 7%. We can therefore argue that perception
is a major issue regarding consumption. Thanks to Blackwell (2001), Schiffman & Kanuk
(2007) we have been able to explain that perception is the process of selecting, organizing
and interpreting information inputs to produce meaning.
In order to develop the final choice, the subject goes through a consumer interpretation,
it consists in a perceptual process of many sub-processes. We can understand this by
taking a note of the input-throughput-output approach. This approach is based on the fact
that there is an input, when processed that gives outputs. The perceptual inputs will
comprise of stimuli in the environment.

1.4. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to depict what is the perception of the Generation Y regarding
data mining in sharing economy platforms consumption. The study will be approached
from a consumer perspective and more specifically from the generation Y.

1.5. Research question

This study aims at finding an answer to the following main research question:
How the generation Y perceives the fact that companies use their data in Sharing Economy
businesses?

1.6. Delimitations

The main point of this thesis is the perception. We focused on three big theories that may
help understand the customer behavior regarding sharing economy and data protection.
It appeared that the perception of individuals’ values, the effect of price on the
consumption and the benefice felt in consumption are, mixed together, a good way to treat
a large and coherent part of the customer perception aspects. Therefore, we focused on
these three theories to develop our argumentation regarding consumer perception. Of course, the perception will lead to consumer behavior that we discuss with models like the buyer decision model of Kotler. Nevertheless, lots of points are sidestepped in this essay since we are focusing on the consumer perception. We are not trying to develop a consumer behavior law about sharing economy. We also searched on the data-mining theories to be able to know the essence of the data business that can inspire fear to individuals. This is a wide field to study and it is not what we have decided to focus on. Nevertheless, the process that permits companies to use data seemed important to have a bigger picture of our subject. We related our research on model such as virtuous cycle of data or the SIPS model.
2. Theoretical Framework

The second chapter elaborates the various theories and concepts that are relevant in order to connect already existing findings with empirical findings in the study. The authors highlight the background of consumer behavior, from company and consumer point of view in order to correlate it with the place of perception in a buying process. Lastly, three parts of perception have been described in order to cover all perception aspects that may occur in the process.

2.1. Consumer behavior models

Theoretical framework offers numerous theories regarding consumer behavior from both company and consumer point of view. These two points of view have also evolved to consider the new era of Internet consumption showing that the consumer behavior has changed.

2.1.1. Companies oriented

AISAS model

First Lewis (1898) an American economist, as developed the AIDA model, which explains the steps, a company should focus on while trying to reach potential customers. It stands for Awareness, Interest, Desire, and Action. This model came up in the early 20th century, but from this period, Internet became part of customers’ everyday life and other authors try to adapt this model to new ways of consumption. Aruman, in 2011, developed its own model based on the AIDA, The AISAS model. It encompasses Attention to the product, Interest in it, searching for it on the Internet or similar, performing the purchasing Action, and finally Sharing one’s opinion of it with others. It therefore differs considerably from AIDA in the addition of the dynamic Search and Share items before and after Action. The Search item refers to the stage where a product has caught a person’s attention through an information program or an advertisement, prompting the person to look for information about it, or even for the advertisement itself, on the Internet. The Share item refers to uploading one’s review of a purchased product or of an interesting advertisement to share with others on the platform used.

When others find such shared information during a search, an information cycle is created, and such net-based “word-of-mouth” is also covered by the model. At the time when the model was published, sites such as Facebook and Twitter were not yet as
ubiquitous as they are now, but it can be said that the model reflects a foresight anticipating them. By adding the active elements Search and Share, the model goes beyond mapping the psychological change processes and acquires the qualities of a dynamic and bidirectional action model.

**Sips model**

Dentsu, in 2011, has presented another model going more into emotional ideas. The SIPS model is articulated as followed, Sympathize, Identify, Participate, Share, and Spread. Here, there is the idea that the consumption is tightly linked to the person and what is produced to reflect about it-self, which meet generation Y characteristics (Wesner & al., 2008). This aspect is linked to this study since the population focused on the essay and has developed the idea that they are what they consume (Agyekum & al., 2015). Moreover, digital natives use social media very often (Agyekum & al., 2015). At present, on social media such as Twitter or Facebook, the level of sharing of information has been increasing steadily.

The SIPS model (Dentsu, 2011), empathies with the information or philosophy disseminated by a person or company serves as the initiator of consumer behavior. Through consumers’ empathy and identification, the motivation for action is borne, in turn leading to participation (which also includes actions without a purchase), sharing and the beginning of diffusion. Through the initial motivation, consumers look for further information using search engines or social media, and take certain actions (which also include actions without a purchase).

Thus, when considering future marketing, it is important for companies to disseminate and share information, in order to induce empathy and to develop participation.

Although there is currently insufficient empirical research to substantiate this, it may be that the concept of empathy captures the young Internet generation’s behavioral patterns especially well.

2.1.2. **Customer oriented**

*Buyer decision process*

Kotler et al. (2010) treated the customer behavior based on a consumer orientation. To understand what drives purchasing action they developed the buying Decision Process. This illustrates how consumers actually make decisions. The conventional model shows five different stages. From recognition and information search, to alternatives evaluation,
the purchase decision phase and finally the stage of post-purchase evaluation (Kotler et al., 2010).

Considering the new paradigm of collaborative consumption as part of a consumer’s decision, the ‘Buyer Decision Process’ must be changed. According to Ammerman (2013), the first two stages of the conventional model maintain the same, when adapting to collaborative consumption. Starting off with the need of recognition and moving to information search. The information search leads the consumer to providers, which offer collaborative services or products. Especially for high involvement products, consumers find it important to obtain first-hand information; beyond that they appreciate the benefits of, for example, not having to own a product themselves or borrowing it from another person. There, the point of separation is reached. The consumer chooses to either buy or trade. If trading was chosen, the next stage – evaluation of alternatives – includes the assessment of different options. In general, a decision between systems of collaborative consumption has to be made. After that, consumers have the option to choose between different providers as in companies as well as in other peers offering their skills and services. This is done according to the consumers’ wants and needs. After evaluating all options the consumer trades, shares or barters during the sharing decision phase. Compared to conventional processes, there is no hazard in terms of financial losses to be expected.

The last phase – post-sharing evaluation - becomes an essential part of the process when engaging in collaborative consumption. It is of high importance to rate or evaluate other users on respective platforms in order to gain or hold up trust in the system.
2.2 Perception Theories

As we saw in the different process exposed, there is a moment in the process where the consumer has to consider the service. This third phase of the buying decision process, as well as in the sips model, is linked to perception. The choice of alternatives will be made based on the perception of customer regarding the need and to choose the sharing economy. That is why we needed to focus on perception theories since it appeared as the basis of analyses in this study.

2.2.1. Self-Perception

The choice to go on such a market (collaborative economy) represents a will to go against the establish system or at least to look for alternatives. Since this choice is an internal process we figured the subject would go to a definition of needs and desires. This aspect might be explained by the self-perception theory, which was developed by Bem (1965). This theory explains that in a new situation, a subject act regarding its own past behavior experienced and try to analyses what caused this new response. Bem (1965) postulated that a self-descriptive action is based on privates’ stimuli and partly from public events that are used as references. This idea reveals that a person may perceive something regarding its environment. Studying Self-Perception Bem (1965) explained some phenomena that involve environment; misattribution effect for example treats of how self-perception can be manipulated when the subject is given false information about its own attitude. It has been highlighted by Valins and Ray's (1967) experiment: The experiment consisted in using snake phobic subjects and asked them to look at snakes, by giving subjects wrong information on their heartbeat they managed to make them approach the snake closely.

This phenomenon is a misattribution because if the subject found out the false information it has no effect on the behavior. Nevertheless, people are not perfect information processors; it means either private or false information may not be processed. Then the behavior might be different. Also, he talked about what he called the self-attribution of disposal properties. It is an effect of the theory, which treats of environmental pressure and how it may influence a subject’s behavior on a long run perspective. Choosing to make a particular behavior in front of a special situation may affect the long-term behavior; the subject will see his choice as a part of what he is.

Although John & Robins (1994) studied the eventual bias in this theory and developed their method in order to define how accurate a self-evaluation may be regarding a collegial judgment. Their study reveals that a self-perception may be distort by a radical motivational process. They gave their results as: “Our findings demonstrate that, although self-perception reflects observable reality, they are not fully constrained to it” (p.215).
Nevertheless, this theory applied in our research because it shows that purchase action may be influenced by what a subject may consider as its standard. It is to say self-perception influenced the choice to go either on the regular market or use collaborative consumption to fulfill a need. This implies that a consumer would choose either one of these markets regarding his values in the present moment; value and need will be analyzed depending on the customer state of mind. This study focused on the reasons that lead generation Y to enter this market, what might be their motivations and are they personally oriented by the way they want to be perceived? We know that money might be one of the major aspects leading to collaborative consumption; this is why we decided to study this aspect also.

From this theoretical research, we developed the first hypothesis: the choice of cc is due to personal values, the society will make them feel like green is better.

2.2.2. Price Perception

Volkmann, in 1951, developed a range theory implying a linear link between the range evoked and the frame of references due to experience. It says that sensory judgment may be done regarding a range of values if the stimulus is in this range. Nunnally, in 1978, said about range theory the following statement: “Subjects tend to anchor their responses in terms of (1) stimuli of the same kinds they have experienced in the past and (2) the range stimuli in the set presented” (p.45). In this price perception theory, we may relate the first point as offer on the market in terms of price and the second as past subject’s experience prices that may have cross in his purchase action.

In the case of pricing theory, the transaction utility depends on the price an individual pay compared to a reference price already experienced (Kalyanaram and Winer, 1995). This reference price is used in the customer perception to evaluate the fairness of the price for a product.

We may also discuss Adaptation-level theory, which will include the notion of context in the theory (Thaler, 1985). This shows that the context is involved in the reference price and may change the attractiveness of the price.

Musyoka, in 2015, have studied consumer behavior of generation Y in Kenya. This study has revealed that the brand choice will be driven by the price and the green impact of the product. Moreover, the personal factors that led to a purchase action and manufacturing company attributes were also discussed. Results have shown that major factors expected were economic factors.

This proves that price perception is basic for Generation Y to choose a service. Also, the two most common strategies regarding product is the low cost strategy opposed to high quality and important value strategy. The fact that the second theory is a less more efficient that the first one, in terms of volume, implies that price is a more valuable issue for customer than quality. Nevertheless, when it comes to perception the notion of
fairness is important. The subject will use a personal range to evaluate the price and its consumption habits will be defined if he is willing to look for quality over price. Nonetheless in the sharing economy, the point is that there is no ownership but only the use. We can argue that the price would have a more important place than quality in this particular economy.

From researches on price perception the second hypothesis was formulated: The economic advantage of cc is a leading aspect of market expansion.

2.2.3. Benefit Perception

Hamari et al. (2015) have shown that collaborative consumption can be used as alternatives to other market places to fulfil several needs: Sustainability, Enjoyment, Economic benefits, Reputation. Every aspect that will meet customer expectation will have a positive impact on the consumer perception, and be perceived as a benefit.

On the other hand, Finucane et al (2000) have expressed a correlation between risk and benefit. Moreover, Alhakami et al. (1994) have expressed a theory including the emotional aspect I, the process. A subject will have a personal feeling about a special action that will influence their judgment. If a subject considers a particular action as good, its judgment will be changed and benefits will be perceived as high as much as benefits are low.

Regarding Internet consumerism, the notion of privacy control can be implemented in this idea of judgment bias regarding risk/benefit perception. Indeed, the perceived privacy control is explaining by Spiekermann (2005) as a feeling of power; the subject, to influence a situation and a competence, is capable by its knowledge and technical abilities, to change things.

Despite this loss of perceived control on the data leaking on an individual level, Awad et al. expressed a privacy paradox that implies a fear to lose their privacy on Internet but nevertheless won't protect them-selves. This study explains that when customisation is offered, the benefit has to be more important to outweigh the risk of losing privacy: “In the case of personalised service, where benefit is more apparent to consumers, previous privacy invasions are not significant, as the potential benefit of the service outweighs the potential risk of a privacy invasion. In the case of personalised advertising, on the other hand, the benefit is less apparent and the risk of an intrusion (i.e., e-mail spam) is more apparent.” (p.26).

Ziefle et al (2011) studied the willingness to share data by customers on Internet. Their essay concludes that customers are aware of the risk and they would accept to give data in the context of a greater goal. Results showed that the benefit from sharing data is less important than the concern of type of data asked or the risk of being identified.

From this last section, the third hypothesis of the study was created: The values of the subject and the attractive price outweigh the privacy concern.
3. Methodology

This chapter gives insight into method applied in this research. It also elaborates research approach chosen; the research method and design are also exposed. Furthermore, information regarding the data collection and selection of empirical data had to be defined. Further, explanations of the qualitative interview and methods used for data analysis are explained.

3.1. Research approach

3.1.1. Descriptive research

We based our study on models concerning the consumer behavior, the perception and also about the treatment of data so a descriptive research was the most suitable to first approach the topic. According to Robson (2002), Blanche, Durrheim & Painter (2006), a descriptive study attempts to describe phenomena and draw an accurate profile of certain situations, companies or persons and that is why we think that a descriptive research application can give to our assignment the best added value. Sauders, Lewis and Thornill (2007) have said that it is essential to have a clear impression of the phenomenon when directing a descriptive research, that has assured our choice of employing a descriptive research.

3.1.2. Quantitative research

We have decided to focus on the consumer’s perception in our topic through a quantitative study to emphasize the insights of the generation Y regarding the use of data and also to have foundations, thanks to the statistics, for our analysis. As mentioned by Kinnear & Taylor (1996), quantitative data are used to quantify or precisely measure a problem. Quantitative data are often associated with conclusive research (Kinnear & Taylor, 1996). Miles (2004) think that they are more efficient, more precise than qualitative research, but they are also more expensive. A quantitative research is based on a numerical data and on a defined population precisely targeted. Data were collected thought questionnaires and the questions asked were usually “closed” which means that the interviewee had to choose between few answers written by the
interviewer; or "semi-open", when the choice of answers includes "other" which let a bigger flexibility to the respondent (Marpsat, 1995).

3.1.3. Qualitative research

As the previous researches used were only to give an overview of the topic, that were not be enough to have precise data of perception, a qualitative research was necessary to add more consistency about the perception of consumers regarding the use of data by companies.

As said by Malhotra & Birks (2007) techniques of a qualitative research intend to create insights or accurate profiles of a research area. Indeed, Dahlberg & McCaig (2010) said that these techniques provide the researches detailed information on the relevant subject, which was our main intention in order to go deeper in the analysis for the study. In the qualitative research, we tried to follow the advice of Bryman & Bell (2011) when they explained that researchers should focus on the understanding of the social world through the interpretation of that world by their participants.

Moreover, according to Dahlberg & McCaig (2010) the chosen experts provide a deeper level of response in qualitative interviews so the quality of our answers should be higher.

Furthermore, a lot of authors have shown that we have a better access to the needed consumer's insights with a qualitative research. Newman & Benz (1998) have also said that the interviewer focuses on meanings and understanding of what they learn from the interviewee through this type of research.

Moreover, some people advice to do a qualitative research in earlier phases of the researches. Miles (1994) have said that qualitative data is more "rich", more time consuming and less able to be generalized than data which is more subjective.

Indeed, we passed a lot of time on these qualitative interviews because there are a lot of information to process, learn and use. The inconvenient of this kind of research is that findings are applied to a specific population so we cannot generalised them for the whole population and that is why we focused only on student from 18 to 25 in our study (Malhotra & Birks; 2007).

3.2. Research strategy

3.2.1. Instrument to collect data

When it comes to the collection of the data, there are two different kinds of data to collect, primary and secondary data. As stated by Saunders et al. (2012), primary data is data that can be explained as new information, information that will be gathered specifically for
one purpose. These two data collection methods can be used as completing sources of data providing structure that increase the credibility of the findings (Cowton, 1998), or making up for the others inadequacy.

The primary data will be collected through conversations and interviews where the researcher asks the questions and listens as the respondent’s answers while the secondary data will be collected through sources such as Internet and pamphlets (Carol & Warren. 2001). In other words, primary data can be obtained by different methods such as, survey research, experiments and observations.

As believed by Saunders, Lewis, Thornhill (2008), the survey strategy is usually associated with the deductive approach. It is a popular and common strategy in business and management research and is most frequently used to answer who, what, where, how much and how many questions. It therefore tends to be used for exploratory and descriptive research. Surveys are popular as they allow the collection of a large amount of data from a sizeable population in a highly economical way. Often acquired through a questionnaire conducted to a sample, these data are assimilated, that enable easy distinction. Moreover, people in general perceive the survey strategy as reliable and is easy to explain and to understand.

Furthermore, while using a survey strategy the data collected during the research can be used to explain several purposes for some relationships that happen between variables and to produce models of those relationships. Using a survey strategy should give more control over the research process and, when sampling is used, it is possible to generate findings that are representative of the whole population at a lower cost than collecting the data for the whole population. We have used a survey because it supposed to give more control among the research process and we also looked for other way to get information such as case study. Robson (2002, p.178) defines a case study as “a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context using multiple sources of evidence”. Yin (2003) also highlights the importance of context. Indeed, he mentioned that boundaries between the phenomenon being studied and the context within which it is being studied are not clear and must be taken seriously in consideration. It also differs from the survey strategy where the comprehension of the context is limited by the number of variables for which data can be collected. To summarize, the high context might bias a study and make it irrelevant or might be too specific and it will lose its sense. Thus, it may make it not trustful and easy to manipulate.

As mentioned by Krueger (1988), the focus group is a special type of group in terms of purpose, size, composition, and procedures. A focus group is conventionally composed of seven to twelve participants who are unfamiliar with each other and leaded by a trained interviewer. These participants are chosen because they have specific characteristics in common that relate to the topic of the focus group. The researcher creates an easy-going environment in the focus group that nourishes different perceptions and points of view, without pressuring participants to vote, plan, or reach consensus. To identify trends and
patterns in perceptions, the group discussion is managed several times with similar types of participants. Accurate and methodical analyses of the discussions provide clues and insights as to how a product, service, or opportunity is comprehended.

This study is composed of primary data with our survey and our focus groups, but also a secondary database with the use of a study case on Ikea. Thanks to the survey, targeting French student between 18 and 25 years old, we were able to analyse the results presented in statistics and graphs. We have used the social media Facebook but also Linkedin to diffuse our survey through our networks of friends because Facebook is the most popular platform for all generations to communicate between them and Linkedin because it is a professional network that can helped us to have more answers. We have counted on the snowball effect to obtain more answers to the study. Per Brooks’s findings (1957), the author defines snowball effect firstly starts from an initial state of small significance and builds upon itself or builds upon the effort from others, and then growing larger and becoming a big influence. In our words, the snowball effect consists in the use of individual as relay for the information to be spread even faster and to a bigger number. Moreover, it is with the help of secondary data from different sources as books or scientific articles used for previous research on the sharing economy; this ensured the validity and the consistency of the thesis.

By convenience we focused on the French market where the sharing economy is still in a development phase unlike American landscape where major players are already part of the major league. Furthermore, we focused on a young public who has no fear regarding Internet and master it and because it will be the next consumer generation that companies might target since it will develop its purchasing power.

3.2.2. Quantitative method: the survey

For the purpose of our research and to have a basic guideline we chose first to do a survey with closed questions about our three main topics: the knowledge and the use of the sharing economy, then the privacy of data and the awareness/concerned about this topic and finally the dangerousness of data trades and the sample feeling.

This method was the most suitable to obtain a lot of information about the perception of the generation Y regarding the use of data by companies and to have a good basis for our study.

Basically, we wanted to define and explore with sample both collaborative and data side of our research. We asked 12 questions to our sample, that were in total 120 persons, starting with general questions and gradually to more specific in order to focus only on those who were concerned. We chose to ask questions first about how known this type of service is and if the sample used it in order to understand what impact has the sharing economy in the landscape of generation Y consumption. The second part treated the relation to data policy and the perception of safety on Internet for purposes of learning.
and studying how concern people feel about data and what would be the limit to their commitment in a brand regarding their values about data and privacy. Finally, the aim for the last part was to determine a generic reaction about consumer loyalty and the influence of data mining in their approach regarding brands. Kinnear & Taylor (1996) have said that quantitative data are used to quantify or precisely measure a problem, well for us, it was necessary to use a survey because we wanted to measure precisely the problem though the perception of the generation Y and see what they know and think about it. The survey has been spread through social networks, emails or through our personal networks in order to multiply the chances of getting relevant information.

3.2.3. Qualitative interviews

In our study, we chose to use structured interviews while keeping some freedom on the questions’ order. Hence, we asked our questions in the pre-defined order for almost all our interviewees but for some we too the liberty of changing it to better catch the thinking of the students, as suggested by Bryman & Bell (2011) when they said that you can adapt the order of questions according to the interview situation. For the interviews, we prepared a list of questions, on the specific topics of our study to be prepared for the discussion but we were ready to change the format or the order of our questions. Indeed, we were prepared to not follow exactly the formulation of the questions or to change the order, to go deeper in their perception and to let them speak as much as they wanted about the sharing economy way of consuming and data issues. It was really important to have people who came from different places in France, with different backgrounds (school, study, age, and way of thinking) in order to have results that translated well the whole sample.

3.3 Population and sample

3.3.1. Survey: selection of the sample

It appeared clearly that due to the very specific point of view among a wide subject we had to choose carefully the population we wanted in our sample so we chose the non-probability sample method. As a matter of fact, the study may be biased by criteria chosen in order to define the sampling. Therefore, it can’t be discussed as a general pattern to develop a strategy about data perception but a picture of ideals and concerns shown by a generation about threats and fears that an omnipresent virtual world put on their minds. This picture has to be put in the world of collaborative consumption. Indeed, Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun (2012) said, about the non-probability sample, that “Each member of the population does not have an equal chance of being selected; some,
in fact, have no chance” (p.93-94). In fact, the non-probability sample is a judgmental sampling because it does not produce any member of the population an equal chance of being selected as part of the sample. One disadvantage of using this sampling technique is the possibility of bias. A bias is the greater probability of certain type/class of sample units/elements to be included in the selected sample (David, 2005). Mercado (2006) describes non-probability sampling as “choosing the respondents by choice” (p.173) so here the findings apply only to the sample.

In the context of our research it was mandatory to select this type of sampling because we have already chosen the generation Y as our basis sample. Indeed, we have entered some criteria in the first questions of the survey in order to select only the people corresponding to our research, which means the generation Y in France. Hence; we asked the age, the nationality and the occupation of the person in order to select only the French students from 18 to 25 years old that travel quite often. It was the range of people interesting for us because it is the generation using the most Internet and online sharing platforms.

### 3.3.2. Development of the interview guide

While working on the list of questions for our qualitative interviews we used the different models of our study, which were according to us, as the most relevant to develop our interview. To obtain the most information as possible during these interviews we have decided to ask several open questions such as “What do you think about the problem of data?”. This idea given by Bryman & Bell (2011) was a strategic choice in order to let them choose their own words and to not influenced the answers of the respondents. Of course, we asked some closed questions in order to guide them in the right direction because we needed some precise information on specific topics such as “Is it a problem for you to give personal information through social media?”

We have followed the guideline interviews of Podsakoff, P., Podsakoff, N., MacKenzie & Lee (2003) concerning the question order in the interviews and the questionnaires. The first questions of the interview were some basic questions to know their backgrounds, their position on the topic but also to enter slowly into the specific topic. We started to ask questions allowing them to feel at ease and we continued with more complicated questions that needed more analysis from them about the urberialisation. After a few background questions, we started with questions introducing the topic of sharing economy, online platforms and what was their utilisation within it. Starting at a more general level, we broke down the items into more specific questions related to their own experiences regarding the sharing economy. We wanted also to test their knowledge on the matter, see if we can relate it with the age and the kind of study they do, and finally ask them what they think about the role of the state in this kind of problem.
3.3.3. Focus group: choice of respondents

Once we have chosen the appropriate questions to ask, we needed to find the adapted interviewees regarding to our topic and our research question. Indeed, regarding Collis and Hussey (2009) finding capable interviewees is one of the most important point in qualitative researches.

The qualitative interviews were important to go deeper in the analysis of our topic and so we needed to follow the same method as the survey and targeted the same range of people. Hence, it was mandatory to target French students from 18 to 25 years old and who travel quite often. We have decided to interview four focus groups composed of four persons in each of it.

Those people were already part of our personal networks since they were friends or relatives but they have been totally chosen randomly according who were available considering the time required. Moreover, we thought it was better to interview people with whom we were at ease in order to get deep answers and eventually additional one. It was also mandatory that those groups came from different places in France and have different backgrounds that mean, different ages, studies, schools and ways of thinking so they can have several points of view on this matter. We also wanted to have the same amount of male and female respondents and a couple to be as accurate as possible even if there is no gender or relationship analysis.

Therefore, our groups were composed as following; in a first group, we had two people from two different business schools, one in a school of communication and another from a university of law. In a second group, we had one from a university in economics, one in a business school, one in a school of art and the last in license of management. In the third group, we had two students following a two years’ degree in bank and insurance, also a student in music school and another in tourism. In the last group, we had a student following a license in history, another from a school of art, one in second year of bachelor and the last student from a master degree in logistics.
4. Empirical Study

This chapter shows results of both quantitative and qualitative data run for this study. The content is based on the quantitative data correlate with results of focus groups to had depth in the empirical study. It is categorised in three parts, the awareness and knowledge of the sharing economy, perception and relation to data privacy and influence collaborative consumption.

Our survey is divided in three main parts: the knowledge and the use of the sharing economy by our sample. Then we talked about the privacy of data and the awareness and concerned about this topic. Finally, we discussed about the dangerousness of data trades and the sample feeling. Basically, we wanted to define and explore with sample both collaborative and data side of our research. Then lead discussion toward six of these to Internet consumption's aspects.

The number of answers we have obtained for our survey is 118. The sample is composed of French student that travel quite often every year, aged between 18 and 25 years old and from various social backgrounds and different studies. It is composed of 58.5% of women and 41.5% of men.

In this part, we have also presented results from our data collections; the statistics found in our survey and qualitative presentation of discussions with our four focus groups composed by our relatives from different studies and social backgrounds.

4.1. Knowledge and use of sharing economy

The point was to find out if people know what the sharing economy is and if they use it.

First, 85.6% of the sample knows what is the Uberisation or the collaborative consumption but 14.4% don’t know anything about this new trend. Still we can say that most of the people surveyed know this phenomenon and use it in their life.
• Do you know collaborative economy?

We have seen that 84.7% of the sample uses these platforms 1 or 2 times per month, 13.6% 2 to 5 times per month and 3.4% 5 or more times per month.

• How often do you use sharing economy platforms?
The most known services in France are transport and accommodation with platforms as Uber and Blablacar or Airbnb. In fact, the sharing economy for services or short task employment are not really yet developed in France. There is 76.3% of sample that have ever used Airbnb and 91.5% know about Blablacar and Uber. Despite only 5.1% know about more personal services.

- What type of platform do you use?

Finally, we have also seen that what drive these young people to use sharing economy is mostly the price and the ability of meeting their needs easily and rapidly. They have
answered the price with 97.5% and the facility of utilization and reaction with 57%. But these new trend is also really important for those who are concerned about the environment but who also just want to share a moment with a person during a car journey or to discover a new city with a native that can show them what to visit and where to eat. Therefore, the social side has a percentage of 36.7% and the environment gathers 20.3%. This new phenomenon has also found concerned people, in the fact that we live in a capitalist society and where people always buy new products or services. This is a good compromise to buy or spend less in products or services with 8.9% in hyper consumption.

Q4. Why do you use these online sharing platforms?
As we explained earlier we decided to go deeper in the sample’s perception thanks to discussions and asked them several questions to guide the debate between participants. First, we asked them what were the first words that cross their mind when talking about sharing economy. The point was to see what value or idea they were matching with the topic.

One of the most important answer was some brand names, and especially a French one, Blablacar; this implies that the Generation Y rediscovered the sharing economy and get out their comfort, egocentric sphere with 2.0 platforms. Some of the people also defined it through sharing, showing a social and proximity aspect for them. Once again it seems that it changes habits of consumption and rely to something more practical. Others had not a precise word to describe it; they were not so familiar with the concept and use it without really put interest in it.

We have noticed that transportation is the most common use of the sharing economy. They use it for the economic benefit at first and to enjoy the flexibility and reactivity offered by these platforms. For some of them, nearly the half, were interested by the community aspect that get people together and put some social characters in consumption choices.
Then we wanted to see how ecologic driven these consumption acts could be. The bigger part of them thought that the ecological aspect is undeniable. They came up with the point of less purchases using collaborative consumption, this will make companies lower and less polluting. Still some see that with the mobile devices utilization (a lot of electricity used) and public transportation, it can be less damaging for the environment than using the sharing economy.

Moreover, they perceived that using collaborative economy for personal services would be interesting but now they don’t have enough resources or needs to use it. They didn’t have an interest for these platforms yet, but when they will have a family and money to use it they will. However, some of them thought it might be interesting to sell their services on these platforms and make some money with it. The argument for them to use these services platforms is the low price in this economy against the market price for services, which is quite high. Also the system of notation on these platforms will help to have even a better service than what we can find in regular channels. Nonetheless some of participants thought that it is important to regulate this trendy market to protect people like craftsperson because the sharing economy can cause precariousness for employees. They have also said that services platforms are good but create platforms for every job is really a bad idea if it happens to teachers or medicines. Although everyone in discussions seemed engaged about using it in the future, these platforms have not meet their generation target that is comfortable with the Internet consumption to democratised it as it would be.

Furthermore, per them, with the development of the hyper-consumption and the importance of the marketing we cannot be sure if big firms are telling the truth about their ecological strategies so consumers can feel manipulated and cannot be sure if they are doing the best choice for the environment. In addition, they said that we cannot verify information provided by companies so they can hide things for example about the provenance of products without us even realized it.

**4.2. Perception and relation to data privacy**

With the results of our survey, we have seen that most of the students considered the data collection needed to subscribe to the platform not so intrusive. Indeed, young generation is so used to share this kind of information on Internet that these results are not surprising. This is true that when we want to subscribe to a service of any kind we always need first to give our background information. It has become a habit for every regular user of Internet so that nobody is surprised when we ask this kind of information now. In the survey, there were only 14.4% of the students that think it is too personal whereas 66.1% of them have answered no to the question. Finally, there are still 19.5% of people that had no opinion or did not want to answer to that question.

Q5. Do you think information asked is too personal?
Nevertheless, companies concern most of people in the sample with this problem of data collection. We have seen that 31.4% are really concerned about this topic, 29.7% are quite concerned, 20.3% are concerned and 18.7% are less concerned.

Q6. On a scale from 0 to 5 how concerned do you feel about data protection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Not at all 0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very much 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in our survey were mostly all aware about the business of data mining and they don’t like it very much as they consider it as an intrusion in their social life. In fact, 79.1% have answered that they are aware of this trade between companies but there is still 20.9% that don’t know about it. Moreover, they are 54.7% to think that this trade is an intrusion in their social life against 45.3%.

Q7. Are you aware of the business-related data mining?
Q8. On a scale from 0 to 5 are you in favor of customised advertisement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though they think this trade is an intrusion, most the sample use it and has already used a customised advertising on social media. Indeed, 34.7% have cliqued on a customised advertising at least once against 65.3% who did not. The interesting thing is that 44.9% of the sample is not for this kind of advertisement against only 3.5% that are really agreed with that.

Q9. Have you ever clicked on custom ads?

Q10. Do you think that data mining business is an intrusion into your privacy?

Concerning discussions, we could claim that on one hand most of people feel concerned by data protection but on the other hand they are aware having a regular Internet use, as we could describe it today, means concession about their personal data and by extension provides some to platforms with the most demanding policies: Facebook. Still, very few of them read policies of services they use because it takes too much time. Indeed, most of people want to give the least data they can, so they create new accounts
for every platform instead of registering with their Facebook account and deliver their personal data. However, they said that when it concerns non-important platforms they usually connect it with their Facebook account. They are doing it because they think Facebook is the most dangerous platform concerning the protection of their data, so they cannot know if Facebook shares their personal information to other firms.

Furthermore, we have noticed that most of the sample has not a good impression concerning advertising in general and so even less for customised advertising. Indeed, people receive everyday all-day a lot of advertising via their email box or their news feed on social media. In addition, they have noticed that beside Facebook there is now mostly all platforms which use the same business model, putting advertising everywhere, in orders to earn money easily. Some of them have also said that customised advertising would be interesting if they were able to choose what to receive in particular like the brand, the type of product or service, the date and the price. They have also talked about the google phone which offer a lot of customised services to the user and said it was very good but also really scaring to see that google can know where you are all the time, what do you do or with whom you are. Indeed, when the big data will need to use your data they will be able to know all they want about you.

As member of Generation Y, we asked them if they feel always in control while using Internet. It appeared that they don’t feel totally secured when purchasing on Internet but since the service is offered and makes life easier they still use it no matter the consequences.

4.3. Influence on collaborative consumption

We wanted to get some information on the repercussion of data, used by companies in the consumer loyalty, since for us it’s the most representative point to determine if a company and a consumer share the same values. Our survey revealed that the data policy is a major point of concern for young generation. They were asked if they would be more loyal to a company that respects their privacy. Indeed, 75% of the respondents would be more inclined to be loyal to a company that doesn’t use data to earn more money or to do a less aggressive communication campaign.

The idea of more safe platforms in terms of data is still not a communication aspect use now, but we can imagine that with the economy dematerialization, it can be a strong argument in future years. Since on a scale from 0 to 5 measuring implication on data protection regarding loyalty only 7% of people said they are concerned at 1 or below.

Q11. Would you be more loyal to a company that respect your privacy through data use?
Thanks to our discussions with the different groups, we can say on one hand, that most of them agree on the fact that if they know a platform in particular, share their personal information to others can be a reason to stop the utilization of the latter but on another hand these platforms improve increasingly their quality of service and with the lower price it is more difficult for them to give up the use of collaborative platforms. Moreover, they said that they would stop to use sharing platforms if they were asked to furnish too personal information like information about their families, their religious or political opinions but they also said: the sexual orientation, the reason why you want to use the application and finally a picture of you or a physique description.

We have also asked if they had trust in the comments written on the platforms and they answered mostly yes because for example on Blablacar or Airbnb there are not a lot of comments about the person who sell the service and it describes really well the behavior of the person. However, they talked about TripAdvisor and they said that they did not trust this platform because they know that there are a lot of false comments or grade.

We also wanted to know what they were thinking about the supposing role of the State concerning the protection of consumer’s data. They were nearly all agree on the fact that the State in France should regulate and protect the citizens concerning this matter. Indeed, the CNIL is already in charge to protect the personal information of consumers in France but they know that almost all companies are American and so the CNIL cannot do anything to prevent data leak to United States. Furthermore, they think that the firms using big data are very influential on a worldwide basis so they cannot do anything to protect French consumers on this territory. Moreover, they said that the State would be able to create its own platforms but with all the money it costs, it is difficult to compete with big firms like Google.
5. Analysis of data

Based on the empirical study and theoretical framework, this chapter is answer to the hypothesis formulated in the last cited part. This analysis reveals the way the generation Y consumers perceive the collaborative consumption regarding the three aspects of perception already explained.

H1: the choice of cc is due to personal values; the society will make them feel like green is better.

Per Christodoulides (2009) with the emergence of online and mobile technologies, a new consumer has appeared. This new consumer is empowered to interact not only with companies but also, and in the context of collaborative consumption even more important, with other consumers. Because of this, Botsman (2011) talked about the reinvention of old market behaviors and Seraj (2012) states, “online communities have turned out to be the new form of socialization platforms for fulfilling certain needs” (p.209).

According to the self-perception theory, the misattribution and the self-attribute of disposal properties has an influence on the self-perception. According to our survey social aspect, environment, and anti-consumerism perspectives, respectively 36, 4%, 17, 8%, and 11, 9%, are aspect that can be influenced by the environment. These figures validate that some respondent may feel a particular context that is favorable to collaborative consumption use which was confirmed by focus groups. In this context, the subject feels a general problem regarding consumption, from a consumer’s point of view collaborative systems represent substantial added value in many aspects. Focus groups illustrated that not merely money, but especially time, due to reactivity of these platforms, as well as other resources can be saved. The engagement in collaborative consumption from a consumer perspective is therefore a reasonable and environmentally friendly issue. Beyond that the benefits of collaborative consumption have a rather social character. In times when fragmented families are not particularly uncommon, it becomes highly important to make meaningful connections, even with neighbors or strangers (Walsh, 2011).

According to Bem (1965), the self-perception defines an individual through the values he considers as characterizing for himself. It is clear that these values and the look that people would put on them may change. We can argue that the part of personal value, enhanced by the lecture of the social environment is the major point for generation Y to consume through collaborative economy. Even with a volatile and fast changing society, this choice might be a long-term choice of consumption for focus groups; this type of consumption finds a resonance between their personal values and the way they want to be perceived in the current society.
H2: The economic advantage of cc is a leading aspect of market expansion

According to Kalyanaram (1995) the Price Perception theory is integrated in range theories which means it refers to a range defined by past consumers’ experiences to determine what a fair price would be for them. It is one of the leading factors when it comes to purchase action.

In our discussions and in the survey, the participants felt a strong economic benefit using sharing economy. This is the most competitive channel to use in term of price. Even if they could access other benefits, our results showed that the major aspect that led to collaborative consumption is the price benefit that beats all competitors on the market, indeed 96,6% of respondent use these platforms due to the competitive price regarding selling distribution. This study might show that collaborative consumption, can still expand even if the respondent fulfils specific needs with collaborative consumption, travel (91, 5%) and hospitality (76, 3%) are far away from services (5, 1%) which appear as insignificant.

We may consider that this way of consumption meet the expectations of generation Y since they want it all and want it now, nevertheless we might consider the fact that these habits of consumption is for now dedicated to leisure. This model can be implemented in other sector if it manages to export price attractiveness and reactivity of platforms.

H3: The values of the subject and the attractive price outweigh the privacy concern

In order to analyse the benefit perception of the sample we used the work of Siegrist (2000). Siegrist (2000) defines this theory as a set of criterion, which helps measuring the benefit through three main aspects acceptability, motives and attitudes. The benefit theory is tightly connected with self-perception; since the characteristics that an individual considers as representing himself will influence what he will examine as a benefit.

Moreover, the price perception will define the expectation of the consumer about the quality and service. According to the survey we can argue that the consumer see the benefit of using the sharing economy but he doesn’t see the point of the data mining as a marketing argument that could lead him to use this or this product, indeed 81, 4% are aware of the data processing by companies and 55,1% see it as an intrusion into their privacy.

The generation Y took the data collection by websites as a reality that will not change; they know how it works and live with it. Still the biggest part of this population perceives the danger related to this practice and is concerned about the protection of their privacy. Indeed, according to focus groups, they are really concerned about their personal information and what can get through these online platforms. They think they have no
choices but to give away their data if they want to use Internet since they know Internet is today indispensable for us to communicate, to study and to look for information. However, to prevent this problem they try to give or put on Internet, social media or on online platforms the least information as possible.

According to the survey and discussions, data protection is for our target an essential part of Internet consumption. The perception upon data mining practice is quite negative; the consumer fined this as an abusive process that lead to privacy violation. Still as we already said even if they are aware of this practice they live with it and still use Internet just trying to avoid an overflow of personal information.

The sample would, for the biggest part of them, stop using a service too personal demanding as a motive to protect them from being targeted by companies that will eventually don’t meet their needs. But when it comes to acceptability this is tough since they are accepting to deliver some data by using Internet but don’t want to give too much, we have a kind of blur line about this issue.

A balance would determine their consumption habits for them between quality of the service and the development of the big data in Internet; if the platform is perceived as too demanding in terms of data or if the benefit is too low, the consumer will stop using the service.

It seems that the privacy concern can be consider as minor depending on the platform; no rule or model can be designed. This issue will approach differently from a person to another one.

Nevertheless, in collaborative consumption the majority (66, 1%) doesn’t think that the data are too intrusive. We can then say that their data policy seems fine.

On a more societal orientation, we have noticed, thanks to our focus groups, that the entire sample agreed on one point: the customised ads are really annoying. It is indeed hard, to develop an algorithm that is smart enough to target the good individuals with the good ads. This is the major problem for consumers since they are already solicited all day long by all kind of ads, they can have a bad reaction towards brand that are miss targeting them. With all errors that may occur in those algorithms people are targeted or solicited by advertising that do not correspond to what they want; then they get bored by all and don’t even take the time to look to others that may correspond to their expectations.
5. Conclusion

Conclusion chapter get its roots from the analysis of data and overcome hypothesis to figure the larger issue. This part is the one going on a more practical field to sum up perception problem regarding the use of data in the current system. This can be an anchor for application and academic following researches.

5.1. Conclusion

To answer our research question: “How the generation Y perceives the fact that companies use their data in Sharing Economy businesses?”, we developed aspects regarding the generation Y sharing economy consumption, how they perceive the place of data in this economy and what is the relation of these two aspects, regarding their behavior toward it.

We can say that Sharing economy has strong impacts on the market behavior. We saw that in this new form of business, consumer must choose between: buying their own products or services or sharing what they already have in order to save money and time by sharing resources.

The survey has shown that money was the most important thing to save, with time and other resources. Moreover, it’s a reasonable and environmentally issue that is part of collaborative consumption, benefits have also a social character.

It is also notable that in France, services platforms are not yet really developed, especially not used by the young generation of our sample because of the lack of need. Finally, they don’t want to invest in ownership anymore because of their little budget; they’d rather use collaborative consumption for one time casually.

Concerning the sample perception of data, they are all concerned by the privacy of data but it is something they can’t really change or fight against because of the power that big firms have. In fact, the Generation Y needs Internet in its everyday life for leisure or work so they don’t have many choices than giving their data to online platforms.

The first application of data in Internet landscape is customised advertising, but this application seems to be annoying for the sample by too much presence on all channels used (email box, social media, website...). We have seen that people receive way too much advertising which sometimes do not match with their expectations. Consequently, the sample in general, do not take the time to read or to see what contained the ad so it becomes useless for consumers but especially for companies due to the waste of money spent on advertising. In their state of mind the potential intrusion in their privacy is not worth it, since the marketing application of it or the government database does not show any benefit for them. They just learn to live with this phenomenon and don’t look for any advantages no more.
Theories showed us that the perception of ourselves may change in a lifetime especially when it comes to the sensitive point of insertion in the active world. Therefore, our sample may change their needs and look to collaborative consumption. So companies need to evolve in order to meet customer’s values and wants. In addition, we saw that the perception upon data mining is seen by the sample as a potential privacy intrusion, which will end up by stopping the utilization of the platform. Although, most of these young people don’t think that sharing economy platforms are too demanding regarding data. This economy seems good on this aspect; nevertheless, the whole Internet world is not. It is, as we already said a major concern in our current society and even more for people who are just discovering what purchasing power is. The benefit of a platform is still more important than the feeling of risk for now but we can argue that Generation Y will be more and more focused on this problem. This is why in our conviction the data mining will be one of the prior point people will focused on, in their Internet consumption, in next years.

5.2. Limitations

In our thesis, we have focused on the perception of the customer but we have not discussed or analysed the company’s point of view already implemented on the market of the sharing economy. Our topic was not about what companies are doing with the consumer’s data and why are they doing it, since it should be a thesis problem by its own. All that concern the privacy of companies was not in our research field because this topic is really sensitive and still recent to talk directly with some companies that are doing this trade of data. Moreover, companies would not be able to tell us the truth concerning this topic because it concerns the privacy of consumers so it would have not been a good publicity for them.

5.3. Further research

For further research it could be interesting to analyses the company’s point of view and see if they have truly respect for consumer’s data. In fact, considering their process of treatment of data could be really informative to understand how it works, which information about consumers could be good for their business and how they trade data to other companies, in order to be used. The democratisation of sharing economy may have several others effects on how marketing is developed today. It is indeed a whole new aspect of consumption that can make people look away from nowadays regular-retailers. One other point is the risk for employment through notation that may influence their earnings. For now there is no special protection for people who offer their services.
through collaborative platforms so it could be a really interesting problem to solve in a future research.

In fact, we can soon face to a whole precarious market of workers because of this new form of business, so the society should find a solution to this problem quickly.
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APPENDIX

Survey

Survey reserved to French students aged from 18 to 25 years old from different studies, various social backgrounds and who are travelling quite often.

- Mark the answers below which correspond to you: (several answers possible)
  - You are French
  - You have between 18 and 25 years old
  - You are a men
  - You are a women
  - You are a student

2. Do you know the sharing economy?

- Yes
- No

3. If you use it, how often do you use it?

- 1 or 2 times per month
- 2 to 5 times per month
- 5 or several times per month

4. Mark the platforms below that you use (several answers possible)

- AirBnb
- Uber/Blablacar
- Yoopies/Dogbuddy/Stootie

5. Why do you use these online sharing platforms?

- The price
- Worried about the environment
- Because of the hyper-consumption
- The social side
- Facility of utilisation and reaction
6. Do you think that information requested in those platforms is too personal?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

7. Until which point do you feel concerned by the protection of your data?

- 0 : not at all
- 1 : a little bit
- 2 : a little more
- 3 : quite okay
- 4 : quite a lot
- 5 : really

8. Are you aware of the trade that companies do between them with your data?

- Yes
- No

9. Are you for the personalised advertisement created thanks to the data?

- 0 : not at all
- 1 : a little bit
- 2 : a little more
- 3 : quite okay
- 4 : quite a lot
- 5 : really

10. Have you already cliqued on a pop-up, which was reserved to you personally?

- Yes
- No

11. Do you think this trade of data is an invasion to your privacy?

- Yes
- No

12. Would you be more loyal to a company that will respect the privacy of your data?
Discussion with focus groups

• What are the first words that come into your minds when I say “sharing economy”?

• Do you like an online platform in particular? Do you use it?

• Why are you using these platforms?

• According to you, is there an ecological side in the use of the sharing economy?

• Do you think services to individuals are going to be developed on online platforms? Will you use it?

• What do you think about the problem of data?

• Is it a problem for you to give personal information through social media?

• Are you careful with information that can be used by websites or online platforms?

• What do you think about customised advertising? Do you use them?

• What is the type of information demanded that would make you stop the use of a platform?

• What do you think about the role of the State concerning the protection of data? What should be done by the State, according to you?
exchange student