

소셜 네트워크 기반 공유경제 서비스에 관한 밀레니얼스 소비자 세분화 연구: 사이코그래픽 관점에서[☆]

Segmenting Korean Millennial Consumers of Sharing Economy Services on Social Networking: A Psychographic-based Approach

이 재 현¹ 최 재 원¹ 김 기 연^{1*}
Jae Heon Lee Jae Won Choi Ki Youn Kim

요 약

본 질적연구의 목적은 이머징 소셜 네트워크에 익숙한 밀레니얼스 세대 소비자들의 소셜 네트워크 기반 공유경제 서비스를 대하는 소비자 행동학적 동향, 사이코그래픽적 특성, 다양한 인지적 유형이 어떠한지 탐색하고 발견하는 것이다. 이를 위해, 본 연구는 Q방법론을 적용하여 최신 기술의 ICT 장비, 디바이스 또는 사회·문화적 웹서비스나 네트워킹을 능숙하게 다루는 젊은 밀레니얼 소비자들을 해석적 관점에서 4가지 차별화 된 유형의 이론적 정의를 제시한다. 최근 국내 산학 분야에서 모두 창조경제 정책에 힘입어 공유경제 서비스의 영향력이 증가하고 있지만, 아직 공유경제를 주제로 한 기존 연구들이 본격화 된 것은 그리 오래되지 않았다. 본 연구는 개인의 내재적 관심, 선호, 태도, 의견 등을 포함하는 일명 스키마타(Schemata)라고 불리는 응답자의 사고 구조의 독특한 사이코그래픽적 특성을 발견하는데 초점을 둔다. Q방법론의 연구 절차에 따라, Q모집단과의 인터뷰 및 여러 문헌들의 메타 스타디를 통해 수집한 180개의 진술문으로부터 축약한 최종 40개의 Q샘플(진술문)을 35명의 밀레니얼스 세대(P표본) 응답자이 Q소팅 하여 등급화 하였다. 마지막으로, QUANL PC 분석프로그램을 활용하여 소셜 네트워크 기반 공유경제 서비스에 대한 젊은 층 소비자들의 4가지 시장 세분화를 수행하였다. 도출된 유형들은 제1유형 'Early majority', 제2유형 'Laggard', 제3유형 'Opinion leader', 제4유형 'Late majority' 라고 명명하였다. 본 연구의 결과는 향후 밀레니얼스 신세대 소비자의 행동 및 심리적 특성, 시장 세분화를 깊이 있게 탐구하려는 질적 관점의 후속 연구들의 기초 연구로 활용될 수 있을 것이다.

☞ 주제어 : 공유경제, 주관성 연구, 밀레니얼 세대, 소셜 네트워크, 사이코그래픽적 시장세분화, Q방법론

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore consumer behavioral trends, psychological characteristics and various cognitive types of Millennial Generation consumers, primarily in their 20s, who are familiar with sharing economy services based on the emerging social networking technology. Using Q methodology, this paper theoretically defines four and interprets via a social science perspective four different types of these young consumers who are skilled at state-of-the-art ICT equipment, devices or online networking services. Sharing economy services in Korea's academic and industrial services are influenced by government policy, and related research is relatively new. This study is focused on discovering unique psychographic characteristics called 'schemata' that include personal interest, preference, attitude, and opinion. On the basis of 40 Q-sorted data samples, the analysis examined 180 collected statements from meta-studies and interviews with 35 individuals born between 1997 and 1992. As a result, four consumer groups were identifies: Type 1 'Early majority', Type 2 'Laggard', Type 3 'Opinion leader', and Type 4 'Late majority'. The results of this research can be used to explore to study in greater detail the behavior and psychological aspects of Millennial General consumers'.

☞ keyword : Sharing Economy, Subjectivity Study, Millennial Generation, Social Network, Psychographic segmentation, Q Methodology

1. Introduction

The concept and culture of the 'sharing economy,' in

¹ Dept. of Marketing Information Consulting, Mokwon University, Daejeon, 302-729, Korea.

* Corresponding author (gracekykim@mokwon.ac.kr)

[Received 15 April 2015, Reviewed 22 April 2015, Accepted 10 July 2015]

[☆] This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2014S1A5A8016275)

[☆] A preliminary version of this paper was presented at ICONI 2014 and was selected as an outstanding paper.

which resources are open and available for collaboration consumption and exchange, resonates with Korea's history of cooperative groups and the concept of labor exchange. A term was initially coined by Laurence Lessig (2007) in Harvard University and notion has expanded from products and services to include online communications and markets for ideas and information.

Previous research focused primarily on early sharing economy case studies, and many were quantitative versus qualitative, unlike this one, which takes consumers' subjective perspectives into account. Few academic studies on the subject before 2010 exist. This study selected mainly Millennial Generation 20-somethings who are skilled at working with cyber environments and smart devices. This is a generation of people who easily use computers and electronic information devices and enjoy social network services.

With recent information technologies and spread of SNS, dealings of consumer-to-consumer affected by less physical and spatial limitation, sharing economy is expanding as a place for communication in on-off line and market day by day. Also types of shared resources are diversified from existing products, services and labors to knowledge and information ideas. Domestic sharing economy tends to become serious from various angles such as academic interest on sharing economy or from a perspective of business administration, sociology, economics and policies. Social and cultural interests on sharing economy intensified, it's important to understand features of consumer behaviors to activate sharing economic businesses successfully. Proceeding researches were focused on early concepts of sharing economy and case studies mostly; consumer studies about certain models of sharing economic services were conducted. Many consumer studies until now were objective researches based on operational evidence by researchers.

Compared to proceeding researches, this study is a qualitative research in psychographics perspective to search recognition of consumers about sharing economic services discriminatorily. Especially, with consumers subjectivity research applied Q method, consumers were classified according to consumer's awareness, internal thoughts and tendency of self-concept. The purpose of this study is to suggest guidelines for better marketing and communication

strategies. Another is to raise awareness of and help target specific types of consumers as SNS platforms are used to spread the sharing economy.

Consequently features of segmented consumers were defined in theory according to type of consumer awareness and classified into four parts. In addition, it is expected to use for primary data to establish industrial strategies and policies based on social network. At this stage of attempts to study for activating sharing economy, SNS platforms can be a breakthrough (driving force) for spread of sharing economic services and businesses.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Sharing Economy

There a trend of studies with topics of sharing economy to increase in quantity. After meta study of existing studies, studies with various kinds of topics such as concept and definition of sharing economy, internal and external market trends, case studies of each service models, developments of sharing economic services in a technical perspective, strategies and policies to activate sharing economy in a business perspective and platform research of consumers' opinions on sharing economy are spreading in the perspectives of business administration, sociology, economics, science technology, policy, etc. Most studies were done seriously after 2010; there are not enough academic studies in quality and quantity [1-4].

The sharing economy is based on the idea of cooperative consumption in which many people share ready-made products. The key aspect of this alternative consumption concept is that it is aimed at sharing cultural values versus claiming individual ownership, and it has been known to be referred to as a collaborative economy, shared economy, and peer-to-peer economy, among other terms [5]. In other words, it's a means of Creating Shared Value (CSV) in a broad sense.

Moon(2010) suggested classifying shared economy enterprise such as companies that have traditional economic activities but include social value components [6]. Choi(2013) asserted existing companies incorporate Corporate Social Responsibilities (CSR) into their portfolios as a new means of

creating new values in finance and sustainability [7]. Hong et al.(2010) studied the effects of each company’s management structure on their value, examining the relationship between CSV and economic value added [8].

2.2 Social Networking and Sharing Economy

Social Network Site (SNS) service technologies, which provide a virtual space for information, idea, and product exchange, are essential for cooperative consumption and consumer-to-consumer trust building. Companies such as ‘Airbnb’, Uber, and other companies that rely on electronic commerce certainly could not survive without them. SNS contributes to growth of sharing economy and range of sharing economic services are extended into whole industries from tangible products to digital goods such as ideas, information, functions and etc. [9]. Evolution of commercial transaction due to e-Commerce, m-Commerce, s-Commerce reduces dealing costs of consumers and activates networks between individual consumers (C2C or P2P). Ultimately digital economy paradigm with mutual help between consumers based on social network draws attentions to be an alternative to enhance overall social welfare.

There were similar economic activities of sharing economic system such as ‘ANABADA(save, share, exchange, reuse)’ or ‘exchange of labor’. Sharing economy now is a new economic ecosystem with IT or SNS technology in a contrary of ‘sharing’ concept in the past [10]. Thus sharing economic system has developed quickly in short time, and become a human-oriented economic infrastructure which economic units between consumer-provider or consumer-consumer can build strong trust relationships in

online. SNSs such as Facebook, Twitter, and Pinterest provide information to all providers and members so that they can develop connections and solidify reputations while creating a community spirit and collective intelligence. Choi et al.(2013) asserted that building digital cultural capital helps grow the sharing economy and will evolve into new types of systems connecting groups of people [11].

2.3 Perceptual Trends on Sharing Economy

Personal perspectives on SNS services can influence whether a person thinks positively about the sharing economy or not. Participation, familiarity, capability, interest, and values related to can all make a difference, with greater ease and awareness generally leading to a more positive view of the technologies. A Nielsen survey of 30,000 individuals in 60 countries, and showed on out of every two Koreans (49%) intended to rent or use products or services through the sharing economy to earn money and make profits. Individuals in Asia-Pacific regions, which have a strong emphasis on communal cultures, were more likely to have that intention than individuals in North (43%) and South-America (73%) and in Europe (44%), the study showed.

In On the other hand, most of Koreans (97.3%) thinks creativity is a important fact for economic development, but points out the limitation of gap between social structure and public perceptions which prevent to unleash their creativities institutionally. In a study of Kim et al.(2013), consumers were classified into three groups according to subjective attitudes. Overall, according to the study, consumers thought positive about sharing economy services but only as buyers.

(Table 1) Q Samples

Q _n	Statements
Q ₁	With a reasonable price I have an intention to use sharing economic services.
Q ₂	Because sharing economic services are cooperative consumption between consumers, it can create more values than general commercial economy.
Q ₃	I think sharing economy protects environments and natural resources because they don’t produce new products but share existing products.
Q ₄	Sharing economy has potential utilities which were extended from tangible product exchange to intangible services and community spirits.
Q ₅	I think sharing economy is a good consumption culture to share together.
Q ₆	Sharing economic movement has something in common with creative economy which changes possessing many goods and serviced changes into sharing them.

Segmenting Korean Millennial Consumers of Sharing Economy Services on Social Networking:
A Psychographic-based Approach

Q ₇	I know sharing economy is good, but have worries about possibilities to strike existing economic foundation.
Q ₈	Sharing economic services seem better at a lower price than general rental services.
Q ₉	Consumers can do smart consumption such as comparison shopping, decrease of waste and etc because they can share the types and prices of many products.
Q ₁₀	I am willing to use sharing economic services with high profits.
Q ₁₁	When I use sharing economic services, I want to use short-term using products than long-term ones.
Q ₁₂	I like free sharing economic services. If I should pay, I will not use.
Q ₁₃	I have intention to use* high-involvement products (ex: car, house, home appliances, etc) with sharing economic services willingly.
Q ₁₄	I mind to share things with others. Even though there is a profit.
Q ₁₅	I just want to use sharing economic services as a purchaser, not lender.
Q ₁₆	I like to share things with my close friends or acquaintances that I can trust only.
Q ₁₇	I still prefer specialty rental shops having various kinds of things to shops of sharing economic services.
Q ₁₈	I am worried about possibilities that sharing economic services can be used in criminals or frauds.
Q ₁₉	To develop sharing economic services, alternatives to prevent damages and losses of sharing properties should be prepared at first.
Q ₂₀	I don't want to lend my properties because people would use roughly without ownerships.
Q ₂₁	I am not willingly to share expensive products with a risk.
Q ₂₂	It's difficult to use sharing economic services for lack of information. I don't use them intentionally.
Q ₂₃	In Korea, sharing economic services are not common, so I hesitate to use them.
Q ₂₄	I think the trends of sharing economy activation will accelerate with the policies of 'creative economy' from governments.
Q ₂₅	I feel bad when I reuse things after lending others.
Q ₂₆	I never share my private things. (ex: my house, my car, my clothes, etc)
Q ₂₇	I don't like sharing economic services to use things with others because it fades meanings of my 'own' possessions.
Q ₂₈	Sharing economic services can solve the problems of surplus resources which are not used or wasted.
Q ₂₉	I mind to use sharing economic services without certain identifications of users or trustworthy media.
Q ₃₀	I might use sharing economic services securely through membership or approved communities.
Q ₃₁	I don't know the difference between sharing economic services and rental shops.
Q ₃₂	The concept of sharing economy has been made in long time, but still perceptions and understandings of people are low.
Q ₃₃	If there are contracts or notarial acts to trust each other, no problems would happen.
Q ₃₄	It is necessary for inducement for successful sharing economic programs to enhance perceptions of the public.
Q ₃₅	I like sharing economic services which allows opportunities to experience many kinds of products reflected personal tastes.
Q ₃₆	Sharing economic services are inconvenient because they are not my possessions to use even they are cheap.
Q ₃₇	I want to use sharing economic services, but use procedure of them seems to be complex. (ex: information search, meeting of seller-buyer, application of IT)
Q ₃₈	Products of sharing economic services seem to be low quality.
Q ₃₉	Luxury items and expensive things which are hard to buy new ones are good to use second hand things with sharing services.
Q ₄₀	It's worth to use temporary things using sometimes. (ex: equipments for leisure, nursery products, camping gear, etc)

* High-involvement products: products with psychological and physically high risk when people make a purchasing decision, it takes long and complex procedures. Ex. house, car

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Q Theory

Q theory recently has been applied in a wide range of research fields such as psychology, politics, journalism, literature, nursing science, medical science, education, and policy studies. Compared to R methodology, Q studies

expand social science beyond the limitations of existing empirical evidence(R study) to study people's subjectivity in other words, their viewpoints [12]. It focuses on analyzing individual schemata to understand how people think about a topic in terms of their preferences, emotions, values, and other factors [13]. It also promises to collect important data about issues related to psychology, lifestyle, and other important aspects of how we operate in the world [14].

3.2 Research Process

Step 1: Data Collecting and Sample

In R methodology many people are selected as samples but relatively the number of analysis items is smaller. In Q, a small number of people are required in contrary. In Q, people are variables, and samples are items. In short, a number of respondents are enough to generate factors and compare to each factors [15-16]. This study conducted in-depth interview with totally 40 respondents of 20s males and females and developed 180 statements for analysis. These items mean Q population without omitted information as much as possible to embrace every respondent's subject opinion on the topic. In other words, Contents of questions are about Korean customers' thoughts of sharing economic services. Informal questions and interviews were conducted to draw a thinking value system about awareness tendency of inspectors, values, attitudes and etc. And then we compressed final representative 40 items from above 180 Q populations about topics of this study.

Step 2: Q Sorting

Q sorting is an investigation process that each respondents give scores to Q sample items in an individual perspective. For this, applying Flash Q system respondents made a rank of every statement in Q sorting distribution chart with a drag-and-drop method. This study conducted sorting targeting Millennial Generation with 40 Q collected samples; every statement was sorted after division into 3 parts, agreement, objection, and neutrality for a convenience of response. To understand respondents's subjectivities thoroughly, their Q sorting processes were observed closely and in-depth interviews were conducted to ask why they chose items for agreement and objections in personal. Average sorting period for each respondents are 20~30 minutes. Distribution shape of sorting was composed of 9 point scale with 'the most opponent (-4)', 'neutral (0)', 'the most consentient (+4)'.

Step 3: Analyzing

Analysis procedure of this study is including Q factor analysis and interpretation of type procedure. Q factor means

a grouping of groups with similar opinions related to study topic, and for analysis Q factor analysis of data collected by Q sorting was conducted through QUANL PC program. Interpretation of type is patterned after gathering all information from demographic information of respondents, observed data between Q sorting, respondents interview, 'the most consentient', interview of respondents' 'the most opponent' in Q sorting, Q analysis procedures. This analysis is a procedure to group people who have similar opinions about certain topics. And it's not a clustering of people with similar opinions, but a typing procedure based on subjective features of independent individuals. This study used 35 samples except inappropriate data out of 40 data in Q sorting for patterning users of sharing economic services.

4. Results

4.1 Q Factor Analysis

As shown below <Table 2>, there are 4 categorized patterning results of subjectivities of 20s consumers of sharing economics services. Eigen value is a square sum of each load values, and other figures indicate variance, total variance and cumulative variance. Each factor value of 4 categories are calculated each 10.0835, 5.0472, 2.5564, 2.0464. Eigen values for each factor are over 1.0 desirably, total variance which cumulative variance indicates is 0.5638 and this means that 4 types in the study have 56% of explanation power in statistical interpretation.

Total variance which is a degree of explanation variance for each factor is calculated each 0.2881(28.8%), 0.1442(14.4%), 0.0730(7.3%), 0.0585(5.8%). After judgmental rotation of 35 P samples, according to factor loading, this study assigned in type 1(N=10), in type 2(N=10), in type 3(N=11) and 2, 11, 13, 21 in 2, 11, 13, 21 in type 4(N=4). In each type, P sample with over 1.0 factor weighting is a person who has representative features of the type. Especially it has more factor weighting, more representatives. P sample representing typical features of type 1 is P6, 4, 8, 1, 3. Type 2 is P34, 19, 22, 9, 26, 25, 20, type 3 is P27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 17, 31 and type 4 is P11.

(Table 2) Q Factor Analysis

Type	P _n	Gen-der	Age	Factor loading				Factor Weight	Eigen value	Variance	Cumulative Variance
				Factor 1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4				
Type I (N=10)	P ₆	M	25	.782	.081	-.062	.129	2.0141	10.0835	.2881	.2881
	P ₄	M	25	.768	-.138	.347	.126	1.8689			
	P ₈	F	29	.748	-.040	.311	.098	1.6970			
	P ₁	M	26	.686	.374	.002	.147	1.2946			
	P ₃	M	25	.628	.082	.118	.325	1.0361			
	P ₁₄	F	23	.592	.072	.308	.227	.9107			
	P ₁₂	M	25	.578	.213	.284	-.038	.8694			
	P ₁₈	M	24	.504	.285	.211	.372	.6750			
	P ₅	M	24	.476	-.013	.264	.382	.6162			
P ₂₈	M	23	.450	.171	.001	-.311	.5645				
Type II (N=10)	P ₃₄	F	25	.022	.800	.009	.063	2.2217	5.0472	.1442	.4323
	P ₁₉	M	25	.062	.800	.300	-.249	2.2174			
	P ₂₂	M	23	.189	.746	-.297	.318	1.6785			
	P ₉	M	25	.266	.708	.199	.062	1.4177			
	P ₂₆	F	22	.135	.685	.028	.215	1.2928			
	P ₂₅	F	22	.292	.664	.072	-.121	1.1894			
	P ₂₀	M	25	-.489	.639	-.113	.078	1.0801			
	P ₂₉	M	26	.263	.570	-.303	.415	.8429			
	P ₂₃	M	24	-.365	.521	.097	.164	.7153			
P ₁₀	M	25	.161	.474	.153	.335	.6108				
Type III (N=11)	P ₂₇	M	25	.248	-.090	.698	.133	1.3587	2.5564	.0730	.5053
	P ₃₀	F	24	.374	.167	.689	-.184	1.3101			
	P ₃₂	M	25	.391	.118	.669	.327	1.2108			
	P ₃₃	M	25	-0.14	.422	.639	.045	1.0805			
	P ₃₅	M	24	.266	-.112	.634	-.174	1.0620			
	P ₁₇	F	24	.417	-.002	.626	.241	1.0295			
	P ₃₁	M	27	.424	-.298	.622	.276	1.0135			
	P ₁₆	F	24	-.027	.280	.584	.196	.8853			
	P ₇	F	26	.428	.134	.506	.422	.6811			
P ₁₅	F	24	.158	-.212	.478	.390	.6192				
P ₄₂	M	24	-.108	.075	.458	.144	.5804				
Type IV (N=4)	P ₁₁	M	25	.249	.202	.124	.685	1.2931	2.0464	.0585	.5638
	P ₂	M	25	.225	.253	.257	.606	.9570			
	P ₁₃	M	25	.253	.365	.313	.576	.8618			
	P ₂₁	M	25	-.035	-0.01	.045	.469	.6013			

4.2 Typologies and Interpretations

Features of sharing economic services by type are analyzed based on subjective tendencies of individuals thoroughly. It is interpreted reflecting items of 'strong agreement'(Z-Score>+1) and 'strong objection'(Z-Score<-1), relationship between items, demographical information and interview data about both pole items of Q sorting ('the most consentient', 'the most opponent'). With the analysis, there are 4 types of 'Early Majority', 'Laggard', 'Opinion Leader', and 'Late Majority'.

4.2.1 Type 1: Early Majority

Product Life Cycle (PLC) is classified whole process of new products, technologies and cultures have adopted in the market and disappeared into introductory period, growth period, maturation period, decline period. This model can be connected with accepting process connected with the typical features of consumers with the spread of consumers in Diffusion of Innovation of Rogers (1957). There are 5 groups of 'Innovator(2.5%)', 'Early Adaptor(13.5%)', 'Early Majority(34.0%)', 'Late Majority(34.0%)' and Laggard(16%)'.

Considering the point of early adoption of economic cultures in this study, I want to explain patterning types to substitute in new products accepting process of consumers based on the analysis results of two theories.

Type 1 20-something consumers are not opposed to the sharing economy, but they are concerned about safety and require safeguards such as contracts, regulations, and approvals to participate in transactions. <Table 3> shows the distinctive features of Type 1, based on analysis of 40 Q sample items. Type 1 is concerned about “trustworthy notarial acts in sharing,” (Q33, z=1.31). They also emphasize “sharing through approved communities,” (Q30, Z=1.11) or “A/S methods of sharing products,” (Q19, Z=1.23). At the same time, Type 1 understands the advantages of the sharing economy via SNS.

This type of consumer wants “temporary products to share,” (Q40, Z=1.76) and has tendency “to solve surplus resources to share,” (Q34, Z=1.24). They shows open tendency about sharing economy with denial of ‘strong resistance of sharing behaviors’ (Q14, Z=-1.70). Type 1 consumers are different from Type 2 and 4. Type 1 pursuing reasonable and practical values is different from people who want to use sharing economic services for nothing

unconditionally and they think economic rationality (Q12, Z=-2.05) to pay ‘appropriate’ opportunity cost important.

They think they should pay corresponding price or cost because they should pay for value of sharing products. It's a responsibility of the product. (Q12, P1,8)

And their strongly negative opinions on the item of sharing between only close acquaintances (Q15, Z=-1.78) showed their consuming tendencies appropriate in open sharing economy like respondents Type 3. After Q sorting, with statistical analysis data from additional interview data and demographical features and consuming tendencies of respondents, these tendencies of Type 1 are understood more specifically. Consumers classified as Type 1 are less affected by viral marketing than other types. This means that their consumption patterns are stable, without taking risks, and they have strong convictions. They present the early majority of new product consumer types, who want to buy new products but are careful and check others’ reviews.

In short, consumers in Type 1 are called “Early Majority” because they are people who make decisions based on reviews from Opinion leaders and buy approved products.

(Table 3) The Type 1 Respondents’ Statements and Z-Score

Q	Q Sample	Z_Score
Positive		
40	It's worth to use temporary things using sometimes.	1.76
33	If there are contracts or notarial acts to trust each other, no problems would happen.	1.31
28	solve the problems of surplus resources which are not used or wasted.	1.29
34	It is necessary for inducement to enhance perceptions of the public.	1.24
19	Alternatives to prevent damages and losses of sharing properties should be prepared .	1.23
30	I might use sharing services securely through membership or approved communities.	1.11
32	The concept of sharing economy perceptions and understandings of people are low.	1.06
Negative		
25	I feel bad when I reuse things after lending others.	-1.15
17	I still prefer specialty rental shops having various kinds of things.	-1.23
38	Products of sharing economic services seem to be low quality.	-1.23
27	I don't like sharing because it fades meanings of my 'own' possessions.	-1.35
7	I have worries about possibilities to strike existing economic foundation.	-1.55
16	I just want to share things with my close friends or acquaintances that I can trust only.	-1.63
14	I mind to share things with others. Even though there is a profit.	-1.70
15	I just want to use sharing economic services as a purchaser, not lender.	-1.78
12	I like free sharing economic services. If I should pay, I will not use.	-2.05

4.2.2 Type 2: Laggards

Type 2 Millennial Generation consumers are individuals who are not like or trust the sharing economy, especially when it involves more expensive products related to personal lifestyle choices and transactions with strangers instead of family, friends, and acquaintances. They are private and do not want to deal with strangers, the risk of damage if they share things. In short, they assert that credibility between co-owners should be premised under sharing economic environments. Comparing to other types, the most distinctive feature of them can be explained with Q sample items of ‘the most consentient’ they selected. Type 2 strongly agreed that they mind to share things related closed to private life such as house and car (Q26, Z=2.14) or expensive products(Q21, Z=1.59).

Looking through features of Type 2 in the contents of interview, the item like ‘sharing only with close friends or acquaintances who can trust’ (Q16, Z=1.47) can be interpreted that they have strong subjectivities or schemata of their own and they are affected by internal factors such as characteristics, attitude, education and etc that external factors under sharing economic environments. Type 1 and 3 showed open tendency to sharing economy, but Type 2 is a contrary consumer. And their strong denial of ‘intentions to share high-involvement products through sharing economic services’ showed their resistance that they don’t want to share things and provide things to share. Furthermore, they do not want the sharing

economy trend to be accelerated by government economic policies. Consider this feedback from a Type 2 consumer:

My house and car is very private space my family and I live in, and it’s not easy to lend them to others without trust. (Q26, P22,34)

I don’t want to lend my things and neither use high-involvement things with risk of breaking. (Q13, P22,23,25)

And they agreed the items like ‘prior considerations about A/S methods for sharing things’ (Q19, z=1.29) and ‘rough use without ownership of sharing things’ (Q20, z=1.23). This is similar tendency with Type 1 and Type 2 is also sensitive in safety of sharing problems. In negative response of Type 2, they don’t think ‘accelerating trends to activate sharing economy with creative economic policies’ (Q24, Z=-1.92). This is opponent tendency with respondents of Type 3 who cares potential effective values of sharing behaviors.

There should be alternatives because there are little people who think sharing things are their own possession though they pay for sharing. Without alternatives, sharing economy cannot continue longer. (Q19, P26,34)

Creative economy policies might not be a motive of sharing economy. They don’t match together, and I wonder whether sharing economy will accelerate or not.(Q24, P9,19)

(Table 4) The Type 2 Respondents’ Statements and Z-Score

Q	Q Sample	Z_Score
Positive		
26	I never share my private things. (ex: my house, my car, my clothes, etc)	2.14
21	I am not willingly to share expensive products with a risk.	1.59
18	I am worried about sharing economic services can be used in criminals or frauds.	1.51
16	I just want to share things with my close friends or acquaintances that I can trust only.	1.47
19	alternatives to prevent damages and losses of sharing properties should be prepared .	1.29
20	I don’t want to sharing because people would use roughly without ownerships.	1.23
29	I mind to use sharing economic services without certain identifications of users.	1.08
Negative		
15	I just want to use sharing economic services as a purchaser, not lender.	-1.10
12	I like free sharing economic services. If I should pay, I will not use.	-1.20
6	Sharing economic movement has something in common with ‘creative economy’.	-1.36
8	Sharing economic services seem better at a lower price than general rental services.	-1.37
24	Sharing economy activation will accelerate with the policies of ‘creative economy’. I have	-1.92
13	intention to use high-involvement products with sharing economic services.	-2.40

In addition, Type 2 customers classified here as “Laggards” are highly loyal to familiar products and will only share high-value things such as homes and cars with people they trust. Their preferable sharing products are rarely selected high-involvement products such as house, car which are related private lives closely. It indicates characteristics of Type 2 which considers trust the most. And they are pursuing particular consuming lives without damages and rejecting to share high-involvement products. In short, they are called ‘Laggard (conservative consumers who ask why 00 is necessary?)’ type consumers who concerns trust between users and have closed consuming lives.

4.2.3 Type 3: Opinion Leader

A Type 3 consumers, classified as an “Innovator” or “Early adopter” is someone who is interested in the sharing economy. Interviews showed they think not only about the benefits of e-commerce, but also about the protection of the environment, recycling surplus resources, sharing information and talent, and otherwise maximizing the value of the sharing economy for greater social good. They are aware of and knowledgeable about the sharing economy and are often opinion leaders who lead the way.

This type are consumers who want to diffuse cultural movements and have tendency of early adopter who are satisfied to use products in the beginning of launching, a little bit slower than Innovator, and opinion leaders who affect directly purchasing behaviors of others. Thus this study is called them ‘Opinion leaders’. Feature of consumers in Type 3 is that they don’t have a resistance of sharing economic services and they are ‘Homo sociologicus’. They have higher awareness of sharing economy compared to others, and have an accurate concept of sharing economy.

Based on interview statements of 20s consumers in Type 3, their tendencies were explored. As mentioned before, they concern for potential values of sharing economic activities in the social aspect(Q4, Z=1.28) and think sharing economy can recreate values(Q28, Z=1.47). And they support the fact that ‘sharing can protect natural resources and environment’(Q3, Z=1.76) strongly. The practical Type 1 consumers believe the sharing economy offers economic efficiency, but Type 2 consumers are more concerned about the economics behind

creating social value. Even though Type 3 are kinds of people who lead the sharing economy market, they want stability and the market with all types of other people. They think the importance of institutional system of stable sharing economy like others. It’s an example of ‘considerations of A/S methods for sharing things’(Q19, z=1.46). Consider these comments from Type3 consumers:

The biggest value of a sharing economy is potential utility. Because a bigger economic ripple effect can be brought when intangible knowledge or information are shared beyond simple type of goods and services. (Q4, P7)

Temporary products such as nursery products, camping gears have little chance to use again but they are very expensive, so sharing services are best for these categories. Also, individuals’ purchases are difficult to store but waste with unusual usages. (Q40, P16,33,35)

I think the expansion of a product’s life cycle can protect the natural environment. (Q3, P30)

Type 3 consumers did not believe Q factors such as the ‘quality of sharing things might be low’(Q38, Z=-1.75) and ‘inconvenience not to use things like mine’(Q36, Z=-1.67). These factors are opponent parts of attitude to perceive sharing economy with consuming tendency of Type 2.

And Type 3 did not agree with statements such as ‘I will not use sharing economic services when I have to pay’(Q12, Z=-2.05) and ‘I feel bad to share things with others despite of benefits’(Q14, Z=-1.66). They seemed to reflect the open-mindedness of Type 1 respondents, but are also leaders in the sharing economy and influencers of public opinion.

According to the result of additional consuming tendency survey, people in Type 3 have much higher awareness of sharing economy than others in items of awareness about sharing economy. This means that they know sharing economy very well already and accept it positively. This fact indicates that consumers in Type 3 are leading sharing economic services and active participants who lead public opinions. Thus this study can explain consumers in Type 3 consumer.

(Table 5) The Type 3 Respondents' Statements and Z-Score

Q	Q Sample	z_Score
Positive		
3	Protects environments and natural resources because don't produce new products.	1.76
1	With a reasonable price I have an intention to use sharing economic services.	1.61
28	Solve the problems of surplus resources which are not used or wasted.	1.47
19	Alternatives to prevent damages and losses of sharing properties should be prepared.	1.46
40	It's worth to use temporary things using sometimes. (ex: equipments for leisure)	1.41
4	Has potential utilities extended to intangible services and community spirits.	1.28
5	I think sharing economy is a good consumption culture to share together.	1.24
Negative		
27	I don't like sharing because it fades meanings of my 'own' possessions.	-1.06
37	I want to use sharing economic services, but procedure of them seems to be complex.	-1.30
15	I just want to use sharing economic services as a purchaser, not lender.	-1.30
31	I don't know the difference between sharing economic services and rental shops.	-1.60
14	I mind to share things with others. Even though there is a profit.	-1.66
36	Sharing economic services are inconvenient because they are not my possessions.	-1.67
12	I like free sharing economic services. If I should pay, I will not use.	-1.74
38	Products of sharing economic services seem to be low quality.	-1.75

4.2.4 Type 4: Late Majority

Type 4 consumers are the potential consumers of the future. They wait to see if the sharing economy is popular and participate in the market after it matures but now mind to use sharing economic services for lack of information or experiences broadly under the early stage of forming sharing economic services. They don't feel any need or obligation to participate in the sharing economy until then, but they are optimistic. They think public awareness is growing and that the sharing economy should be expanded. They have intention to use only temporary things(Q40, Z=1.42).

In their interview responses, they said, 'my awareness or understandings of sharing economic services is low(Q32, Z=1.26)' and 'It's hard to participate due to a lack of information about sharing economic services(Q22, Z=1.09)'. One respondent said, 'I hesitate to use sharing economic services because it's not common(Q23, Z=1.08)' indicating that more marketing and communications are required to promote the shared economy among this group of Korean consumers. They also want better procedures to guarantee safe transactions and to protect shared products and are skeptical about whether a shared economy can solve the problem of surplus resources. Because Type 4 consumers have an open attitude toward the sharing economy but low overall awareness, they are classified as "Late Majority". They will

use products after products are popularized over certain standards and evaluations about product's performances or functions are stable without problems. They have the potential to become active participants.

More commercials are required because many people are strange to sharing economic services. On Korean closed characteristics, a term of sharing is not familiar and it requires more promotions. (Q32, P2,21)

Type 4 respondents said, 'I mind to use sharing services without accurate identification between users(Q29, Z=1.34)' and 'It will be OK if there are contracts or notarial acts to trust before sharing(Q33, Z=1.05)'. On the contrary to Type 2, they have low awareness of sharing economy but don't worry about attitudes of users, and hope to use sharing economic services positively.

Enough information of each other before sharing and procedures to handle problems with rental things are desperately necessary. Then people can feel better to lend things and people would be more careful when they use rental things.(Q33, P11)

Concretely reflection of marketing strategies for Type 4 can be checked through the following items they don't agree. Their denial items are 'sharing economy can solve the

(Table 6) The Type 4 Respondents' Statements and Z-Score

Q	Q Sample	z_Score
Positive		
19	Alternatives to prevent damages and losses of sharing properties should be prepared.	1.45
4	Has potential utilities extended to intangible services and community spirits.	1.44
40	It's worth to use temporary things using sometimes. (ex: equipments for leisure)	1.42
29	I mind to use sharing economic services without certain identifications of users.	1.34
32	The concept of sharing economy perceptions and understandings of people are low.	1.26
22	It's difficult to use sharing economic services for lack of information.	1.09
23	In Korea, sharing economic services are not common, so I hesitate to use them.	1.08
33	If there are contracts or notarial acts to trust each other, no problems would happen.	1.05
1	With a reasonable price I have an intention to use sharing economic services.	1.05
Negative		
12	I like free sharing economic services. If I should pay, I will not use.	-1.03
15	I just want to use sharing economic services as a purchaser, not lender.	-1.09
36	Sharing economic services are inconvenient because they are not my possessions.	-1.12
7	I have worries about possibilities to strike existing economic foundation.	-1.18
16	I just want to share things with my close friends or acquaintances that I can trust only.	-1.19
27	I don't like sharing because it fades meanings of my 'own' possessions.	-1.20
13	I have intention to use high-involvement products with sharing economic services.	-1.28
3	Protects environments and natural resources because don't produce new products.	-1.32
31	I don't know the difference between sharing economic services and rental shops.	-1.40
14	I mind to share things with others. Even though there is a profit.	-1.45
37	I want to use sharing economic services, but procedure of them seems to be complex.	-1.45
28	Solve the problems of surplus resources which are not used or wasted.	-1.45

problems of surplus resources(Q28, Z=-1.45)' and 'sharing can protect natural resources and environment(Q3, Z=-1.32)'. It's an opponent item to show contrary tendency of Type 3, and it seems that Type 4 thinks sharing economic services can hardly create value in uneconomical parts. And denial items of Type 4 are 'I mind to share things with others despite benefits'(Q14, Z=-1.45) and 'I want to share things only with close friends and acquiesces who can trust(Q16, z=-.1.19), and they seem to have potentials values as consumers of sharing economic services.

I don't think sharing economic services is common enough to solve the problems of surplus resources. I wonder whether sharing economic services can solve the problems of surplus resources or not(Q28, P2,21).

5. Conclusion

This study conducted an analysis of consumer's views about the sharing economy via social network technology. Research showed there are four types of awareness about shared economy

services: (1) "Early Majority," (2) "Laggard," (3) "Opinion Leader," and (4) "Late Majority."

Type 1 reflects the many consumers who have open-minds toward sharing economy and collaborative consumption; they pursue opportunities with reasonable and cautious approaches. Type 2 respondents consumers who do not like to share and have trust issues in relationships with others online. Type 3 consumers take active roles in the sharing economy and are interested in maximize social values. And Type 4 have open-minds about the sharing economy but a lower awareness compared to the others and less need to use it; they can be potential consumers if the concept matures and they become more knowledgeable about it.

It was a meaningful achievement to pattern, explore and interpret consumers' features and based on internal schemata consumers sentiment, self-concept, lifestyle tendency in quantitative research to verify a hypothesis of researchers or distribution of sharing economy consumers according to the statistical analysis. Especially, this study focused on Millennial Generation members who is active and familiar with social networks or state-of-the-art information devices so

they are patterned into group of young generation consumer who look for sharing economic services and markets. Research methodology is adopted Q methodology which can find individual subjectivities of respondents and speculative hypothesis about consumer's features is defined based on the fact of "operant definition" they suggest.

This study suggests it would be worthwhile to pursue further academic study and consumer research among a bigger population to find ways to promote the shared economy and to build marketing strategies. Also it has limitation to adopt the result in general. In follow-up studies, though Q study is based on inner sampling theory, it can be applied in general if Q analysis is conducted to generalize demographic distribution of respondents more equally.

References

- [1] S. W. Shin and W. T. Kim, "Business model study of design social enterprise for shared values," *Society of Design Convergence*, Vol. 12, No.6, pp. 383-401, 2013. http://www.converge.or.kr/html/sub02_01.asp
- [2] H. N. Maeng, B. S. Kim, Y. H. Kim, and S. I. Woo, et al., "A Study on gamification and the evolution of sharing economy: focused on 5 sharing economy-based web," *Proceedings of Human Computer Interaction*, pp. 485-488, 2014. <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/ArticleDetail/NODE02333661>
- [3] K. Yoon and E. J. Lee, "A comparative study on the effects of CSR and CSV: the moderating role of self-efficacy and message involvement," *The Korean Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 25, No.2, pp. 53-72, 2014. <http://www.earticle.net/article.aspx?sn=214105>
- [4] B. M. Lee, and W. T. Kim, "Sharing economy service for one-person household focus on efficient use of resources - based on consumption patterns of 20-30 years," *Conference of Korea Digital Design Council*, pp. 115-116, 2014. <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Article/NODE02414468>
- [5] J. Y. Oh, "Era of shared economy, creating a new model of employment for reaching employment," *National Information Society Agency*, pp. 1-24, 2013.
- [6] B. G. Moon, "Reinterpretation of economic rationality: focused on comparing social enterprise companies and shared economy companies," *The Korean Journal of Advertising*, Vol.22, No.4, pp. 341-362, 2010. <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/PDFView?id=NODE01595294>
- [7] D. W. Choi, K. B. Kim, and S. M. Leey, "A study on relationship between corporate governance and earnings management: focusing on CSV-EVA difference," *Korean Society of Strategic Management*, pp. 213-243, 2013. <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/PDFView?id=NODE02269925>
- [8] S. H. Hong, and M. S. Kim, "A comparative study on the effects of CSR and CSV: the moderating role of self-efficacy and message involvement," *Korean Academic Society of Business Administration*, Vol.2010, No.0, pp. 1-21, 2010. <http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/PDFView?id=NODE06081561>
- [9] H. S. Kang, H. J. Jae, and S. Park, "Sharing economy and urban industry," *Public Officials Benefit Association*, Vol. 48, No.540, pp. 32-36, 2013.
- [10] J. S. Kim, W.S. Ji, and S. J. Kang, "Condition of success and future of sharing economy," *Gyeonggi Research Institute*, No.134, pp. 1-20, 2014. http://kiss.kstudy.com/journal/thesis_name.asp?name=kiss2002&key=3173516
- [11] Y. Choi and J. K. Lee, "Effects of digital cultural capital on the perception of sharing economy," *Korean Journal of Communication Studies*, Vol. 21, No.1, pp. 89-110, 2013. [http://210.101.116.36/InSiteSearch/\(iboeza45wia3ro3oj2fskqmr\)/ISS_Detail.aspx?a_key=3137289](http://210.101.116.36/InSiteSearch/(iboeza45wia3ro3oj2fskqmr)/ISS_Detail.aspx?a_key=3137289)
- [12] H. G. Kim, "A study on usefulness of Q method," *Korean Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity*, No.1, pp. 15-33, 1996.
- [13] Stephenson, William, 1967, *Play Theory of Mass Communication*, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- [14] K. Sanders, William Stephenson: *The Study of (His) Behavior*, MCR(Dec.), p. 13, 1994.
- [15] K. Y. Kim and H. K. Kim, "A study on consumer preference typologing toward sharing economy service models based on collaborative consumption: a strategic

approach to marketing communications,” Korean Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity, No.27, pp. 23-40, 2013.
<http://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/ArticleDetail/NODE02385077>

[16] K. Y. Kim and B. G. Lee, “Marketing insights for mobile advertising and consumer segmentation in the cloud era: A Q - R hybrid methodology and practices,” Technological Forecasting & Social Change, Vol. 91, pp. 78-92, 2015.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.01.011>

● 저 자 소 개 ●



이 재 현 (Jae-heon Lee)

Jae Won Choi is an undergraduate student in the Department of Marketing Information Consulting at Mokwon University, Daejeon, Republic of Korea. His research interest includes marketing, social economy and networking, sharing economy, and CSR(corporate social responsibility) etc.

E-mail : jhlee2911@naver.com



최 재 원 (Jae-won Choi)

Jae Won Choi is an undergraduate student in the Department of Marketing Information Consulting at Mokwon University, Daejeon, Republic of Korea. His research interest includes marketing, CSR(corporate social responsibility), and ODA(official development assistance) etc.

E-mail : wae1324@naver.com



김 기 연 (Ki-youm Kim)

Dr. Ki Youm Kim is an assistant professor in the Department of Marketing Information Consulting at Mokwon University, Daejeon, Republic of Korea. She received her Ph.D. and M.A. degree in Management of Information Systems at Yonsei University. She conducted researches on the fields of BI&A(business intelligence and analytics), marketing, social economy, CSR(corporate social responsibility), and ICT policies and industries.

E-mail : gracekim@mokwon.ac.kr