



Sharers and sellers: A multi-group examination of gig economy workers' perceptions

Mark R. Gleim^{a,*}, Catherine M. Johnson^a, Stephanie J. Lawson^b

^a College of Business and Innovation, The University of Toledo, Mail Stop #103, Toledo, OH 43606, United States of America

^b College of Business Administration, Winthrop University, 209 Thurmond Building, Rock Hill, SC 29733, United States of America

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Gig economy
Sharing economy
Direct selling
Structural equation model

ABSTRACT

The increased usage and proliferation of businesses entering the gig economy has meant more employment options for individuals wishing to participate in the gig economy. However, not all gig employment opportunities are the same. Typically, gig employment opportunities fall into one of two categories: the sharing economy or direct selling. These two types of gig employment are unique in the perceptions of those that choose to engage in them. This research seeks to provide insights into the drivers of gig worker perceptions of the product, organizational trust, job outcome status and satisfaction. Results suggest that direct sales workers have higher levels of self-congruence, and lower levels of perceived commerciality, leading to positive evaluations of the product offered, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Conversely, sharing economy workers have much lower levels of self-congruence, and higher levels of perceived commerciality, leading to a more complicated relationship with the outcome variables.

1. Introduction

The growth of businesses entering the gig economy has meant more employment options for individuals seeking freedom and flexibility amidst wage stagnation and increased income volatility. In 2017, over 57 million adults, or 36% of the eligible workforce, participated in the gig economy (Hayzlett, 2018). According to Fabio Rosati, the CEO of Upwork, gig work contributes more than \$700 billion to the national economy (Horowitz & Rosati, 2014). This work is appealing for a variety of reasons. For example, gig work provides younger people the ability to earn money while still going to school or participating in other activities not conducive to traditional employment. For workers who are underemployed or suffering from wage stagnation, the gig economy offers the opportunity to supplement income. For those nearing retirement age, gig work offers a way to delay collecting social security. In fact, the AARP and Uber have a partnership that encourages senior citizens to drive for the ride sharing company (aarp.com). The recent proliferation and rising importance of the gig economy as a formidable economic force is, in part, evidenced by the concept being recently recognized by both the Financial Times and NPR as a word of the year (Hook, 2015; Nunberg, 2016).

The gig economy is a labor market of ad hoc, short-term, freelance, or otherwise non-permanent jobs. It is distinct from the traditional full-time, permanent labor force. One distinguishing characteristic of the

gig economy is that individuals working in this space are almost universally considered independent contractors, not employees of the company they represent. This is an important distinction, because companies classifying workers as contractors frees them from the obligation of offering benefits common to full-time permanent employees like minimum wage, health insurance, and retirement benefits (Wiessner, 2018). On the other hand, being contractors also unencumbers gig workers from typical job “rules” and allows them autonomy to work when and how they want. This flexibility is another hallmark of the gig economy and from whence the name was coined during the Great Recession of the 2000s, which saw individuals making ends meet by working side jobs, or “gigs,” to make extra money (Alton, 2018).

While the term “gig economy” is relatively new, the phenomenon is not. Even before the rise of technological platforms that enabled the gigs of today, people found ways to supplement their income and have flexible work schedules. For example, the direct selling company Avon was founded in 1886 followed by Tupperware in 1946. By the early 1960's both Mary Kay and Amway had joined Avon and Tupperware in giving (predominantly) women the opportunity to earn money by selling products to friends and acquaintances from their own homes and on their own schedule. Today, the employment options for individuals wishing to participate in the gig economy are numerous and varied. However, a dichotomy has emerged such that gig employment

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: mark.gleim@utoledo.edu (M.R. Gleim), catherine.johnson3@utoledo.edu (C.M. Johnson), lawsons@winthrop.edu (S.J. Lawson).

opportunities typically fall into one of two categories: the sharing economy or direct selling. Despite many similarities between the two, sharing economy and direct selling gigs differ in several ways, including both their modes of work and revenue generation. Thus, the purpose of this research is to shed light on these differences by comparing a sample of sharing economy and direct sales workers from a wide range of companies to offer insights into the different perceptions and outcomes between the two groups and, ultimately, the implications of these differences.

Existing research related to gig economy workers has not differentiated these groups but instead focuses on either a respondent group in one industry (e.g., [Wotruba & Tyagi, 1991](#) examine direct sellers from four firms), or more commonly one firm. For example, despite a multitude of companies in the space, existing sharing economy research is almost exclusively comprised of studies that examine only one company, Airbnb (e.g., [Edelman, Luca, & Svirsky, 2017](#); [Lutz & Newlands, 2018](#); [Zervas, Proserpio, & Byers, 2017](#)). Additionally, much of the research tends to focus on consumers that utilize the gig economy rather than those working in it (e.g., [Lawson, Gleim, Perren, & Hwang, 2016](#); [Milanova & Maas, 2017](#); [Roos & Hahn, 2017](#)) or has been conceptual ([Benoit, Baker, Bolton, Gruber, & Kandampully, 2017](#)). There is a clear gap in the literature with regards to understanding gig economy worker perceptions and outcomes, which this research seeks to help fill. Given the differences in the type of work, and the way in which income is earned, that exist between sharing economy and direct sellers; it is likely there are unique attributes that differentiate one from the other. As the gig economy grows, the unique challenges facing gig workers and the impact of those challenges will be important for companies to understand and address.

This research has several implications for both theory and practice. While employees have long been a group of interest in management studies, the focus of extant literature is generally on those that are formal employees in typical firm contexts. In contrast, this research focuses on the individuals who work outside of the traditional economic system that have been largely neglected by research, which is surprising given their growing impact on the economy ([Hayzlett, 2018](#)). Specifically, this study offers insight into understanding gig economy workers' perceptions of the company they work for and the subsequent impact on job outcome status and satisfaction. Further, it offers more nuance than previous studies by addressing the reality that not all gig work is the same and thus differentiating between gig economy workers in the sharing economy versus those in direct selling roles. Our findings are important to firms that need to attract and retain talented workers in the gig economy. Understanding the differences between individuals in the sharing economy versus direct selling should enable gig economy firms to target individuals that are the most appropriate for the type of work that is being done. It should better equip firms to constructively engage in internal marketing efforts to increase worker congruence with the organization, improve perceptions of the products offered, and increase organizational trust, all of which should lead to greater job outcome status and satisfaction.

2. Theoretical background and hypothesis development

2.1. Sharing economy versus direct selling workers

Individuals working in the gig economy are often associated with being a part of the sharing economy or, in the broader sense, a lateral exchange market ([Belk, 2014](#); [Perren & Kozinets, 2018](#)). Lateral exchange markets (LEMs) are broadly defined as technologically-enabled networks that facilitate exchange among providers and users that are equivalently positioned ([Perren & Kozinets, 2018](#)). Sharing economy companies are encompassed in this conceptualization. The sharing economy refers to companies that use online or other platforms to facilitate the matching of supply and demand for services. Examples include Airbnb, a website that allows people to rent out their own homes

to travelers, Uber and Lyft, ridesharing apps that allow individuals to use their own vehicles to give rides to others, or TaskRabbit, an app that allows people to offer their own services to those in need of work such as household chores or handyman tasks. Specifically, sharing economy companies, like Uber and AirBnB, are categorized as “Matchmakers” under the LEMs Market Typology. These “Matchmakers” pair providers, or gig workers, with users to provide a service ([Perren & Kozinets, 2018](#)).

Direct selling refers to companies that use a network of salespeople to sell business-to-consumer goods and build selling teams without any brick and mortar stores ([Peterson & Wotruba, 1996](#)). Direct selling brands tend to have a self-care or lifestyle focus and invite consumers who buy the product to become direct sellers themselves to earn extra income and become more entrenched in the brand lifestyle. Direct sales representatives often attempt to recruit other existing buyers of the product to also become direct salespersons. Recruited salespeople become a part of the recruiter's “downline” and are a source of income to the recruiter who is given a portion of their sales. Salespeople work out of their own homes, or through social media, to sell directly to customers who are the end-users of the product. Examples include skincare and makeup companies like Avon, Rodan + Fields, and BeautyCounter, essential oils and nutritional supplements like doTerra and Thrive, and LuLaRoe, a clothing company. Traditionally those in direct sales would sell face-to-face to customers individually and through “parties” in places such as personal homes (73% of gatherings in the mid-nineties), workplaces (12%), or other venues ([Peterson & Wotruba, 1996](#)). However, in recent years the customer exchange context has largely transitioned online as direct sales representatives can reach their customers and have “parties” on social media platforms to sell their goods online.

Those working in the sharing economy or direct sales are both participating in gig work; however, distinctions exist in the nature of the work and the level of responsibility to maintain a customer base. One of the biggest differences is that the sharing economy typically provides a service, whereas direct selling offers tangible goods. Thus, direct sellers' reliance on tangible goods (e.g., clothing, jewelry) renders the quality of the offering much more dependent on the parent company, while sharing economy workers themselves, as the service providers, constitute a larger component of their offering quality. Furthermore, the nature of sharing economy digital platforms is such that service providers match up with unknown customers seeking their offerings. An Uber driver or AirBnB host cannot reach out to customers directly to promote his/her services to stimulate demand, but rather the demand is based on users seeking services on that particular platform. Conversely, direct selling workers seek to stimulate product demand themselves, often relying on their own personal networks and quasi-social events, or parties, to build and maintain a customer base ([Johnson, 1999](#)). [Table 1](#) illustrates the similarities and differences between the two types of gig work.

2.2. Self-congruence

Self-congruence refers to how closely the personality of the brand aligns with the way that the worker sees himself and his own personality ([Sirgy et al., 1997](#)). In a consumer context, there is a wealth of research suggesting that consumers prefer brands and products that are congruent with their self-image. This congruence is linked with, among other things, brand preference ([Dolich, 1969](#)), retail store patronage ([Stern, Bush, & Hair, 1977](#)), brand evaluations ([Graeff, 1996](#)), brand loyalty ([Kressmann et al., 2006](#)) and satisfaction ([Hosany & Martin, 2012](#)). This positive effect has also been demonstrated in employees. For example, identification with the brand is linked positively to salesperson job outcomes such as job satisfaction, performance, and organizational commitment ([Mallin, Gammoh, Pullins, & Johnson, 2017](#)). The more individuals can relate to and see themselves reflected in something, the better connection they will have with it. This high

Table 1
Similarities and differences between sharing economy and direct selling workers.

Sharing economy	Direct selling
Similarities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent contractors • Supplemental income • Flexibility/freedom in work hours and amount of work
Differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a service • Workers offer their own resources (cars, homes, skills) to customers • Manages demand • Relies on consumer platform adoption • Customers are typically strangers to the seller • Flat incentive structure • Income derived from providing service to platform-specified standard
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offers a product • Sellers offer standardized inventory from parent company to customers • Creates demand • Relies on personal social networks • Customers are typically known to the seller • Tiered incentive structure and performance-based incentives • Income derived from creating and managing downtime

self-congruence should engender more positive feelings towards the product or service.

There is early evidence that self-identification with a company may be important in the gig economy as well. Through qualitative interviews with Amway (a direct selling company) salespeople, Palmisano and Pannofino (2013) found that the company encourages and cultivates employee identity transformation, to align employees with the organizational identity, through activities and symbolism that are analogous to religious conversion. Therefore we hypothesize the following:

H1a. Gig workers' self-congruence with the company they work for is positively related to their perceptions of product quality.

H1b. Gig workers' self-congruence with the company they work for is positively related to their product satisfaction.

H1c. Gig workers' self-congruence with the company they work for is positively related to their perceptions of product value.

2.3. Perceived commerciality

Perceived commerciality is the degree to which individuals see money and financial outcomes as the primary focus of an exchange (Johnson, 1999). Specifically, it refers to an individual's own perceived financial stake in an exchange, rather than the motives of the company for which they work. People performing a job have an expectation that they will receive compensation, but there are other reasons that a person may choose to work. S/he may really like, and thus be strongly motivated by, the company or the product offered, the flexibility of the hours, or the social opportunities provided by the work. While salesperson motivation is a well-researched topic (e.g., see sales control systems; Miao, Evans, & Shaoming, 2007; Oliver & Anderson, 1994), there are very few studies that explicitly examine how salesperson financial motives inform their attitudes towards the firm.

When perceived commerciality is high for gig workers, they are more likely to see their job as primarily about making money and may be more reliant on that income. For example, an Uber driver focused on the financial rewards of gig work would likely care most about the efficiency of the transaction to maximize revenue. Conversely, when perceived commerciality is lower for gig workers, other aspects of the job (e.g., flexibility, social rewards, learning opportunities, etc.) may be more important to them than the money that they make (Rosenblat, 2016). Referring to the Uber driver example, a driver choosing to drive due to the social aspect of meeting new people and socializing likely focuses more on the customer rather than the speed of the transaction. A person less focused on the monetary outcome likely places a greater importance on socializing with the customer, thus creating a higher quality, more satisfying experience.

Due to the nature of gig work, gig earnings can be volatile, non-existent, or for direct sellers who have to carry inventory, negative (Taylor, 2011). For example, reported monthly income averages can

range from as little as \$25 a month for Jamberry workers (Cunha, 2018) to as high as \$440 a month with Airbnb (Bhattarai, 2017). While money may serve as an important means to make ends meet or simply provide extra disposable income, it is unlikely, at such low levels, to be the sole motivation for engaging in such work. For example, some may find the ability to meet new people, socialize, have fun, or interact with a product that they feel strongly about equally or more important than financial gain when engaging in gig work (Rosenblat, 2016). Similarly, rideshare workers can be categorized across a continuum from full-time to hobbyists, suggesting gig workers motivations for participation vary with some participating in their spare time without reliance on the additional income they earn (Rosenblat & Hwang, 2016).

If gig workers' non-financial motives are strong, it is more likely that they are engaged in gig work for other non-monetary reasons and thus are more likely to positively assess the goods or service they offer. That is, the more varied a worker's motivations are, the more areas there are across which the worker can be satisfied. For example, someone with low perceived commerciality may not let low financial gains keep him/her from enjoying an equally important factor of the job such as the opportunity to socialize or to access his/her favorite products at cost. Furthermore, gig workers actively choose to work in any given gig sphere; for individuals with low perceived commerciality, their decisions to enter the gig work force were motivated by more than purely monetary incentives. As such, they are more likely to have taken the non-financial characteristics of the job into account in their decision and are more likely to have found a company or product that they enjoy for reasons other than just the ability to serve as a source of income (Manyika et al., 2016). If an individual has expectations other than being financially rewarded for selling a product, it is more likely that s/he is directing time and effort towards the product because of his/her own satisfaction with it and belief in its quality and value.

Conversely, if a gig worker's motives for engaging in his/her work are dominated by financial gains, s/he may be less invested or interested in specific features or hedonic characteristics of the product offered and instead focus primarily on its potential lucrativeness when deciding which gig company to work for. Hence, a person driving for Lyft and working for TaskRabbit would choose to work for the company paying the higher rate at a given time regardless of other factors. Additionally, given that the majority of gig workers are part-time workers, those who rely on contingent-based platforms, like Uber, for their sole income are inequitably impacted by variances in demand and the sustainability of wage earnings (Zatz, 2016). Thus, we hypothesize the following:

H2a. Gig workers' perceived commerciality of the job is negatively related to their perceptions of product quality.

H2b. Gig workers' perceived commerciality of the job is negatively related to their product satisfaction.

H2c. Gig workers' perceived commerciality of the job is negatively related to their perceptions of product value.

2.4. Organizational trust

Broadly, trust is the confidence in another's reliability and integrity (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Trust is often expressed as an aggregate evaluation of “generalized expectancy” with regards to how a business should act and perform (Sabel, 1993; Selnes, 1998). Thus, research suggests that an individual's evaluations of product quality, value and satisfaction may be used to form the generalized expectancy of trust in a business (Selnes, 1998). A gig worker's organizational trust represents his/her perception that the organization with which one has partnered is competent, can be relied on to do what is right, and can be generally trusted based on his/her evaluations of product quality, value and satisfaction.

A worker who believes the product being offered is a good value, high quality and satisfying should have more trust in the organization. Many direct sales workers started as consumers of the products, and due in large part to their belief in the value and quality of the products, started selling for the company. Their satisfying experience with the products likely led to greater levels of trust in the organization, which led to a willingness or desire to work for the company. In fact, direct selling company doTerra credits high levels of product satisfaction with contributing to a 68% retention rate among its direct sales representatives (doTerra.com).

Further, there is evidence that customer satisfaction with product or service quality increases trust in a company (Chiou & Droge, 2006; Chumpitaz Caceres & Paparoidamis, 2007). Implicit in product value and quality perceptions are assessments that the firm consistently delivers on its duty and promises regarding the product. Sharing economy workers are often providing a service and rely on positive evaluations of that service via post-experience ratings for on-demand platforms to maintain employment. Consumers utilizing the service may evaluate the service itself, as well as the digital platform through which they access the service (i.e., app or website) (Chumpitaz Caceres & Paparoidamis, 2007). Thus, when a worker provides a high quality and satisfying experience, and is recognized for doing so, that should lead to greater levels of organizational trust. We expect this to be the case for gig economy workers' product assessments and organizational trust. Therefore we hypothesize the following:

H3. Gig workers' perceptions of product quality are positively related to organizational trust.

H4. Gig workers' product satisfaction is positively related to organizational trust.

H5. Gig workers' perceptions of product value are positively related to organizational trust.

2.5. Job satisfaction & outcome

Ultimately, it is important to understand gig workers' job satisfaction and job outcome status. Job outcome status is the extent to which a desired result has been achieved (Agrawal & Maheswaran, 2005). It more generally assesses how a worker would rate the outcome of his/her participation in the gig economy. Alternatively, job satisfaction more directly measures how a gig worker assesses his/her job specifically. Job satisfaction is the attitude and feelings that a person has about his/her job and work environment (Churchill, Ford, & Walker, 1976). We are interested in not just satisfaction that is specific to the job, but also the job outcome status with participation in the gig economy. Since gig work is a non-traditional employment situation, the nature of it may encroach on other aspects of an individual's life such as free time or personal relationships that is separate from job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has long been a construct of interest to researchers and a managerially desired outcome that has precipitated the search for significant antecedents. Organizational or managerial trust has been shown to lead to job satisfaction in several contexts from salespeople

(Rich, 1997) to healthcare workers (Spence Laschinger, Finegan, & Shamian, 2002) to casino employees (Lee, Song, Lee, Lee, & Bernhard, 2013). If an employee has confidence in the reliability and integrity of the organization for which they work, this should help to engender and bolster positive feelings towards their work. While this has been shown in more traditional employment contexts, there is not yet a study that extends this link in to gig economy workers. Thus, the following hypotheses are generated:

H6. Gig workers' organizational trust is positively related to job outcome status.

H7. Gig workers' organizational trust is positively related to job satisfaction.

2.6. Direct selling vs. sharing economy

Given the differences between the sharing economy and direct selling, it follows that workers in each category may have different drivers of product perceptions, organizational trust, and job satisfaction. As such, we expect differential effects between the two groups for the hypothesized relationships in our model.

Gig workers in direct selling deal almost exclusively with products that are tangible goods and they sell directly to customers. Examples include LulaRoe (clothing), doTerra (essential oils), or Herbalife (nutrition supplements). Alternatively, gig workers in the sharing economy almost exclusively provide services. Examples include Airbnb (the worker rents out his/her own home or apartment to travelers), Uber and Lyft (ride sharing, wherein the worker is giving rides to others in his/her personal vehicle), MTurk (on-demand workforce providing online services that requires human intelligence), or TaskRabbit (freelance labor for things such as handyman work or household chores).

Sharing economy workers simply rely on the parent company's technological platforms to facilitate their work or make connections with customers, yet the deliverable itself is largely a function of the individual's own expertise and resources. For example, the quality of an Airbnb stay depends on things like the location and cleanliness of the home, the responsiveness and helpfulness of the owner, and other characteristics that are dependent on the gig worker, not on Airbnb the company. An Uber driver's friendliness, driving ability, car quality and comfort are up to the driver and entirely within his or her control. Because the quality of a service received is attributable to the service-providing individual, the platform where the customer found the person may be largely irrelevant to both customers and workers. This is illustrated by the reality that rideshare workers often drive for both Uber and its direct competitor, Lyft, and that many homes for rent are posted simultaneously on both Airbnb and other direct competitor sites such as VRBO (Vacation Rental by Owner) and HomeAway.

Alternatively, in direct selling, the gig worker is more reliant on the parent company since their own business is inextricable from the company's goods. While direct sellers may have control over their own level of customer service or salesmanship, they cannot control the goods available to them to sell to their own customers. For example, an individual selling doTerra essential oils is at the mercy of the company for the selection, availability, sales promotions and quality of the oils s/he can offer her/his customers. Additionally, individual sellers are often part of a hierarchical sales network reporting up to other independent sellers in a sort of social pyramid to monitor, motivate and incentivize sellers. Further, the quality of a customer's experience with a doTerra seller is largely inseparable from the goods that they receive. As such, the company that a direct seller works for is highly relevant to their gig work.

Given the importance of the parent company to direct sellers relative to sharing economy workers, we hypothesize that the product and organization will be more salient to them and a stronger component of job satisfaction. This leads to the following hypothesis.

Table 2
Respondent profiles.

Metrics	Direct sales (n = 184)		Sharing economy (n = 203)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Sex				
Female	117	63.5	64	31.5
Male	67	36.4	139	68.5
Education				
High school diploma	13	7.0	26	12.8
Some college	47	25.5	55	27.1
Associates degree	34	18.5	28	13.8
Bachelor's degree	69	37.5	76	37.4
Graduate degree	17	9.2	14	6.9
Ethnicity				
White	151	82.1	147	72.4
Black/AA	11	6.0	16	7.9
American Indian	3	1.6	6	3.0
Asian	7	3.8	22	10.8
Other	11	6.0	10	4.9
Household income				
Less than \$20k	22	12.0	33	16.3
\$20k–\$40k	38	20.7	59	29.1
\$40k–\$60k	38	20.7	57	28.1
\$60k–\$80k	28	15.2	16	7.9
\$80k–\$100k	26	14.1	16	7.9
\$100k–\$150k	13	7.1	12	5.9
\$150k +	10	5.4	3	1.5
Average age	33.5 years		31.7 years	
Length of employment	30.5 months		18.1 months	

H8. The type of gig work performed will moderate all of the relationships such that the relationships hypothesized will be stronger for direct sellers compared to those in the sharing economy.

Our goal is to provide further insights into the drivers of product perceptions, organizational trust, job outcome status and satisfaction. To accomplish this task, we have conducted a multi-group study aimed at addressing the research question. The study employs a multi-group structural model across two unique samples in order to explore multiple aspects of the phenomenon of interest. The remainder of the article is organized as follows. Given the unique nature of the gig economy a combined group SEM model is analyzed, followed by a multi-group SEM model. The results are discussed, followed by the theoretical and practical implications of the research, limitations and potential avenues of future research.

3. Research methodology

To test the validity of the hypothesized model, we conducted a large-scale data collection via an online survey. The following sections outline the administration and validation procedures that were employed.

3.1. Measures

We sought to assess the concepts of self-congruence, perceived commerciality, perceptions of product value, quality and satisfaction on organizational trust and job outcome status and job satisfaction. All measures employed were adapted from scales published in existing research (see Appendix A). Specifically, we adapted scales on self-congruence (Sirgy et al., 1997), perceived commerciality (Johnson, 1999), product quality (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991), product satisfaction (Oliver & Swan, 1989), product value (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991), organizational trust (Morgan & Hunt, 1994), job outcome status (Agrawal & Maheswaran, 2005) and job satisfaction (Netemeyer, Maxham III, & Lichtenstein, 2010). In an attempt to reduce the likelihood of common method bias, the item sets for each scale were

presented in a random order. We also separated the dependent variables (i.e., job outcome status and job satisfaction) spatially from the independent variables by inserting other questions between the two areas.

3.2. Survey administration

The data for empirical assessment were collected using a standard survey administration technique (Dillman, 1978) while incorporating practices that have been noted as being beneficial to increasing the effective response rate. The survey was designed for individuals performing gig work. Specifically, we sought people working with a sharing economy company or those working with a direct sales company. The survey started with a brief introduction laying out the specifications for participation in the study and examples of companies that fit each criteria (e.g., for sharing economy: UBER, AirBnB, GrubHub, Turo, Freelancer, Handy, Juno, TaskRabbit, Gigwalk, Postmates and for direct selling: LuLaRoe, Mary Kay, Rodan + Fields, Pampered Chef, Amway, Travelling Vineyard, doTerra, Herbalife, Plexus, LipSense). Then each participant was asked to enter in the name of the company that they worked with and were informed that the questions that followed would be about that company. The company that they entered was automatically inserted into each question that followed, when appropriate.

The survey was administered in multiple waves. First, students at a large Midwestern university were given credit for recruiting individuals that met the criteria for either employment category (i.e., sharing economy or direct sales). This yielded 139 completed surveys for direct sales and 92 completed surveys for the sharing economy in the first wave of data collection. Next, to ensure a large enough sample to run an effective multi-group SEM model to test for moderation, additional participants were sought from Amazon's MTurk. The participants from MTurk had to meet the same criteria noted above and took the same survey. We received 80 completed surveys from direct sales workers and 135 surveys from sharing economy workers. The MTurk participants were paid a nominal fee for completing the survey.

Responses were eliminated when any respondent did not meet the qualifying criteria (i.e., work in gig economy or direct selling), failed to correctly answer a quality check question, or data were missing or incomplete. Individuals were given a quality check question that read "Please do not provide a response to this statement," which was imbedded within the survey and removed when a response was recorded (Smith, Gleim, Robinson, Kettinger, & Park, 2014). These procedures resulted in a final usable sample of 184 direct sales workers and 203 sharing economy workers. Characteristics of each respondent pool are reported in Table 2.

3.3. Invariance testing

Before combining the two samples (student recruited and MTurk), we sought to assess their invariance. While traditionally done with cross-national data, we sought to show that our unique samples are invariant before combining. A multi-group confirmatory factor analysis was used to assess the configural and metric invariance of each of the two samples for both types of gig economy workers (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). All factor loadings were significant and the fit indices indicate that the proposed measurement models fit the data reasonably well (Sharing Economy Worker: $\chi^2 = 753.44$, $df = 448$, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.06, Direct Sales Worker: $\chi^2 = 913.05$, $df = 448$, CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.07). Thus, support for configural invariance is established.

We then tested the samples for metric invariance, which provides for a stronger test of invariance by introducing the concept of equal metrics across samples (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). Full metric invariance is assessed by constraining the factor loadings in the two groups (student recruited and MTurk) to be equal, and comparing this

model with one in which the factor loadings were free to be estimated across groups. The results indicate that the sharing economy worker samples have full metric invariance ($\Delta\chi^2(16) = 23.58, p > 0.05$), however the direct sales worker samples are not fully invariant ($\Delta\chi^2(16) = 37.55, p < 0.05$).

However, Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998) recognize that while full metric invariance is ideal, it is often not achieved. Instead, it is more reasonable to expect partial metric invariance. This is evident if at least one item for each construct is invariant (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). A comparison of loadings and critical ratios suggest that only two (one item each for value and quality) out of 24 items are metrically variant ($\Delta\chi^2(14) = 17.7, p > 0.2$). Thus, the samples achieve partial metric invariance and are deemed appropriate to combine and utilize in the comparison of the structural models.

3.4. Analysis and results

The psychometric properties of the items were evaluated through a comprehensive confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). All items were simultaneously tested in one model and were restricted to load on their assigned factors. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis are identified in Table 3. Due to the sensitivity of chi-square to sample size, the model fit was evaluated using the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI). These fit indices were identified based on their relative stability and insensitivity to sample size (Gerbing & Anderson, 1992; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The measurement model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 608.43, df = 224, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.07$). Reliability was measured via the composite reliability (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) with results indicating that the constructs were reliable, as each exceeded the recommended value of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). All scales were reliable with construct reliability estimates ranging from 0.88 to 0.95. Convergent validity was evaluated through an examination of the average variances extracted (see Table 3). All of the average variances extracted were > 0.50, indicating convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Discriminant validity was tested in accordance with Fornell and Larcker's (1981) criteria, whereby the average variance extracted for the construct was compared with the shared variance between the construct and other variables in the model. The results indicate discriminant validity for all of the squared correlations, as evidenced by the average variance extracted by each of the scales being equal to or greater than the shared variance between the constructs.

Once the measurement model was used to validate the constructs, a structural model was estimated in accordance with Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) two-step procedure. We tested the conceptual model (see Fig. 1) for the proposed relationships using the entire sample and the results indicated that the data fit the model well ($\chi^2 = 743.46, df = 237, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.07$). The results of the structural analysis offer broad support for the model (see Table 4) while



Fig. 1. Hypothesized model.

denoting the impact of the specified relationships. Specifically, self-congruence significantly affected product quality ($\gamma = 0.595, p < 0.001$), product satisfaction ($\gamma = 0.646, p < 0.001$) and product value ($\gamma = 0.481, p < 0.001$) which effectively supports H1a, H1b and H1c. Conversely, perceived commerciality was negatively associated with product quality ($\gamma = -0.087, p < 0.05$), product satisfaction ($\gamma = -0.089, p < 0.05$), but not product value ($\gamma = -0.024, p > 0.05$) which lends support for H2a, H2b, but not H2c. Organizational trust was found to be positively impacted by product quality ($\beta = 0.358, p < 0.001$), product satisfaction ($\beta = 0.488, p < 0.001$) and product value ($\beta = 0.177, p < 0.001$). These results offer support for H3, H4 and H5. The results also suggest that organizational trust has a significant impact on job outcome status ($\beta = 0.754, p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.890, p < 0.001$), which offers support for H6 and H7. The proposed model provides sound explanatory power of the endogenous constructs as indicated by the variance explained for product quality ($R^2 = 0.37$), product satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.44$), product value ($R^2 = 0.24$), organizational trust ($R^2 = 0.91$), job outcome status ($R^2 = 0.57$) and job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.79$).

In order to more fully understand gig workers' product perceptions and job outcome measures and test H8, we divided the sample into two groups based on the type of gig work that was performed. We then ran a two-group structural equation model in order to investigate if the type of gig work performed impacted the proposed model. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4 and suggest that individuals do have varying perceptions based on the type of work they perform as the models are significantly different ($\chi^2 = 263.06, df = 51, p < 0.001$). The results of the multi-group structural model suggest that the data fit the model reasonably well ($\chi^2 = 1482.35, df = 480, CFI = 0.90, TLI = 0.88, RMSEA = 0.07$). When comparing the two groups every path except for two remain significant, which is consistent with the result of the original model.

3.5. Discussion of results

Interesting points emerge when looking at the individual paths of the two-group model. The results appear to indicate that direct sales workers have higher levels of self-congruence with the company that they work for compared to those working in the sharing economy. This increased self-congruence appears to lead to more positive evaluations

Table 3
Measurement model results.

Construct	CR	(1) SC	(2) PC	(3) PQ	(4) PS	(5) PV	(6) OT	(7) JO	(8) JS
(1) Self-congruence	0.93	0.81	0.01	0.35	0.40	0.23	0.45	0.30	0.40
(2) Perceived commerciality	0.89	-0.10	0.80	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01
(3) Product quality	0.94	0.59	-0.15	0.84	0.72	0.55	0.72	0.49	0.61
(4) Product satisfaction	0.92	0.63	-0.16	0.85	0.79	0.49	0.71	0.52	0.71
(5) Product value	0.95	0.48	-0.07	0.74	0.70	0.81	0.52	0.37	0.55
(6) Organizational trust	0.88	0.67	-0.15	0.85	0.84	0.72	0.72	0.42	0.66
(7) Job outcome	0.92	0.55	-0.12	0.70	0.72	0.61	0.65	0.80	0.55
(8) Job satisfaction	0.94	0.63	-0.08	0.78	0.84	0.74	0.813	0.74	0.85

Note: $\chi^2 = 608.43, df = 224, RMSEA = 0.067, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.95$ Correlations are shown below the diagonal; shared variances are depicted above the diagonal; the AVE is depicted in **boldface** on the diagonal.

Table 4
Structural model results.

Path	Hypothesis	Combined model		Direct sales		Sharing economy	
		Standardized loading	t-Value	Standardized loading	t-Value	Standardized loading	t-Value
SC-PQ	H1a	0.595	12.3	0.689	10.1	0.663	9.8
SC-PS	H1b	0.646	13.1	0.786	11.8	0.667	9.5
SC-PV	H1c	0.481	9.5	0.666	9.6	0.480	6.8
PC-PQ	H2a	-0.087	-2.1*	-0.257	-3.9	0.058	0.9**
PC-PS	H2b	-0.089	-2.2*	-0.352	-5.5	0.147	2.3*
PC-PV	H2c	-0.024	-0.5**	-0.226	-3.3	0.044	0.6**
PQ-OT	H3	0.358	5.8	0.210	4.1	0.603	10.9
PS-OT	H4	0.488	8.0	0.623	8.6	0.423	8.6
PV-OT	H5	0.177	4.4	0.278	5.3	0.174	4.4
OT-JOS	H6	0.754	14.9	0.735	9.2	0.783	10.4
OT-JS	H7	0.890	19.5	0.897	11.3	0.874	13.5

Notes: SC = self-congruence, PC = perceived commerciality, PQ = product quality, PS = product Satisfaction, PV = product value, OT = organizational trust, JOS = job outcome status, JS = job satisfaction. All values are significant at $p < 0.001$ unless noted.

* $p < 0.05$.
** $p > 0.05$.

of the product that they are offering. In addition, direct sales workers tend to report that their business endeavor is not driven purely by financial motives, suggesting that there are likely other contributing factors to their choice of gig work. Conversely, sharing economy workers appear to understand that the relationship they have with the gig economy is financially driven, and their gig work does not have as much of an impact on product evaluations. The results are mixed when examining the impact of product quality, value and satisfaction on organizational trust. Sharing economy workers appear to base their trust in the organization on their perceptions of product quality and satisfaction more than on product value. However, direct sales workers appear to base their organizational trust on offering a satisfying product, with quality and value playing significant, but less impactful roles. Organizational trust has a very strong relationship with both dependent variables for both groups. However, organizational trust appears to be more impactful on job outcome status for sharing economy workers, while it is more impactful on job satisfaction for direct sales workers.

In addition, each model provides high levels of explanatory power for each of the endogenous constructs. The model containing the direct sales workers had high explained variance for product quality ($R^2 = 0.50$), product satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.67$), product value ($R^2 = 0.46$), organizational trust ($R^2 = 0.91$), job outcome status ($R^2 = 0.54$) and job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.80$). The model containing the sharing economy workers had high explained variance for product quality ($R^2 = 0.43$), product satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.44$), product value ($R^2 = 0.23$), organizational trust ($R^2 = 0.92$), job outcome status ($R^2 = 0.61$) and job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.76$). Compared to the combined model and sharing economy model, the direct sales model had a much higher explained variance for product value, quality and satisfaction (see Table 5). The sharing economy model was slightly higher on job outcome status, while organizational trust and job satisfaction were quite similar across the groups.

Table 5
Explained variance (R^2).

	Model		
	Combined	Direct sales	Sharing economy
Product quality	0.37	0.50	0.43
Product value	0.24	0.46	0.23
Product satisfaction	0.44	0.67	0.44
Org. trust	0.91	0.91	0.92
Job outcome status	0.57	0.54	0.61
Job satisfaction	0.79	0.80	0.76

The results of the combined model provide interesting insights into gig worker perceptions of the products offered, organizational trust, and job outcome and satisfaction. It is clear that perceptions of product quality, value and satisfaction are greatly impacted by the self-congruence of the worker with the company. Perceived commerciality had a negative impact on perceptions of product quality and satisfaction, however the relationship with product value was insignificantly negative. Additionally, perceptions of product quality, satisfaction and value are all strong drivers of organizational trust. Finally, it is clear that organizational trust is a very strong driver of a gig worker's job outcome status and job satisfaction. Taken collectively, the results appear to suggest it is important for gig workers to be aligned with the company that they work for since they consider the job as more than a way to make money. The results also indicate that it is important for organizations to stress to workers the quality and value of the products offered and how they are satisfying to customers. When workers believe in the products they are offering, they are more likely to believe in the organization and be more satisfied with their employment.

4. Discussion

4.1. Theoretical implications

While research examining the gig economy is becoming more prevalent, there are still gaps in the research that this study helps to address. Prior research on the gig economy has tended to focus on the consumer or the impact of gig work on employment law, while failing to investigate those working in this area (e.g., Davidson, Habibi, & Laroche, 2018; Kuhn, 2016; Lawson et al., 2016). Most of the prior research examining contract workers has been focused in management and is only tangentially related to the current research (Friedman, 2014; Kuhn, 2016). Thus, from a theoretical standpoint, we seek to advance our theoretical understanding of the gig economy by investigating those working in the gig economy, and specifically, the differences between those working in the sharing economy versus direct sales. The extant literature has yet to make a distinction between these groups and has limited the scope of research to focusing on only a single company (e.g., Burtch, Carnahan, & Greenwood, 2018; Lutz & Newlands, 2018).

Self-congruence with the organization has been shown to positively impact organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Mallin, Gammoh, Pullins, & Johnson, 2017). Our findings suggest direct sales and sharing economy workers have significantly different perceptions of the organizations for which they work. Persons working for direct sales companies often have higher levels of congruence with the

organization compared to those working in the sharing economy. Given that direct sales networks often rely on building downlines by recruiting product users to be future sellers, our finding is further supported by practice. This is particularly important since higher levels of self-congruence have been shown to increase brand evaluations (Graeff, 1996), brand loyalty (Kressmann et al., 2006) and satisfaction (Hosany & Martin, 2012). Our findings suggest that self-congruence for persons working in the gig economy positively impacts perceptions of quality, value and satisfaction, however the impact varies depending on the type of gig worker. It is important for researchers to recognize that the type of employment may impact the role of self-congruence for workers.

Conversely, our findings suggest the level of perceived commerciality for a worker may have a wide-ranging impact on perceptions of quality, value and satisfaction. The typical impetus for many people working in the gig economy is to earn supplemental income, however our findings suggest that persons approaching the business endeavor with financial motives may have lower evaluations of the brand (Smith, 2016). However, as perceived commerciality decreases, and non-monetary motivations like socialization and fun increase as incentives, evaluations of the brand should increase (Rosenblat, 2016). Given the varying levels of perceived commerciality between the two groups in our study, it is important that researchers recognize the unique motivations within the various types of gig workers.

In addition, quality, value and satisfaction have disparate levels of impact on organizational trust within each of the two groups. Customer satisfaction with product or service quality has been shown to increase trust in a company, however that may not be true in all contexts (Chiou & Droge, 2006; Chumpitaz Caceres & Papparoidamis, 2007). Specifically, from a theoretical standpoint, our findings suggest that gig economy workers perceptions of trust are largely dependent on the type of gig work they perform. This is an important distinction revealing that organizational trust is uniquely impacted by perceptions of quality, value and satisfaction, depending on the type of work that is performed. Organizational trust has been shown to lead to greater levels of job satisfaction in several contexts (Lee et al., 2013; Rich, 1997; Spence Laschinger, Finegan, & Shamian, 2002). Our findings support previous research, across both groups of workers, that organizational trust is an important predictor of job outcome status and satisfaction.

4.2. Managerial implications

Our results have implications for gig economy businesses seeking to hire and retain top performing workers. As the gig economy continues to grow at a tremendous pace, it is important for gig economy firms to understand workers' perceptions with the goal of enhancing product perceptions, organizational trust and job satisfaction. As Uber and TaskRabbit compete with LuLaRoe and Herbalife for workers, it is paramount that firms in each industry understand what can be done to attract and retain the top talent that will increase firm performance. The study reported offers an enhanced understanding of the collective group of gig workers, but also the two unique groups of gig economy workers, those in direct sales and those in the sharing economy. One area gig economy organizations, in particular those in the sharing economy, should focus their efforts is on finding the right fit with a potential worker. Too often, sharing economy businesses are quick to hire any person that applies and meets the minimum standards (Meza, 2017). Due to the rapid expansion and high employee turnover in the gig economy, businesses have not had the luxury of vetting beyond the minimum requirements, which often precludes finding the best-suited candidates. Finding a potential worker that sees the company as consistent with him or herself will likely lead to greater levels of self-congruence. Gig economy businesses could use brand personality tests to gauge how potential workers view the organization in terms of personality and image (Aaker, 1997). Organizations may consider passing on applicants with high amounts of talent if there is a lack of

organizational fit.

Similarly, when competing for customers and workers alike, companies need to make the public aware of the values they hold. For example, in the past year, Uber's toxic workplace environment and stories of drivers committing violent crimes have been prominent in the news (Matousek, 2018). That negative news likely has a spillover effect to other sharing economy businesses, giving potential workers reasons to consider other options. Thus, Lyft, a direct rival of Uber, should be attempting to generate favorable press regarding its positive workplace environment, allowing the company to attract top talent and also reinforce the decisions of its current workers to continue, and to potentially recruit other talented people that would fit within the organizational culture.

Similarly, businesses should focus their internal marketing efforts on informing existing workers about various efforts and initiatives of the company. For example, if AirBnB or LipSense have made financial contributions to the local community, those affiliated with the company should be informed and made aware of contributions the business is making to the community. Workers respond positively when they are working for a company that believes in doing the right thing (Greening & Turban, 2000), so sharing such information internally is important. In particular, those in direct sales appear to be more aligned with the company, so they will likely feel an even greater bond with the organization. Given that there is often a monetary incentive for those in direct sales to recruit additional sales persons and make sure they are successful, those in direct sales should have very positive beliefs towards the company and its products. Hence, the hierarchical sales relationship networks focus on providing important product/company information as well as recognition for direct sales workers. Retreats, company bonding activities, or other types of events that help workers feel like they are really part of the organization should enhance their level of congruence with the organization and subsequently yield positive returns.

When those working for gig economy companies believe in the products they are offering, they are more likely to have trust in the company with which they are affiliated. This is important because trust in the organization appears to be a major predictor of job outcome status and satisfaction. The more a worker likes and believes in the product, the more s/he trusts the company, and in turn likes his/her employment with the company. An example of a company that has lost the trust of its workers is direct seller LuLaRoe, which is currently facing a lawsuit filed by sales reps over its inventory return policies and onboarding practices (Donnelly, 2017). Specifically, with numerous LuLaRoe sellers flooding the market, there are fewer customers to go around for workers who are required to pay for and hold seasonal inventory. For LuLaRoe to remain a viable company, it will have to address its inventory and return policies and better manage the number and geographical dispersion of gig workers it brings onboard (Donnelly, 2017). Direct sales workers tend to be satisfied with the products they are offering and have high levels of trust in the organization. Since those in direct sales are often selling to friends, friends of friends, or family members, it is important they have high levels of trust in the company or they may not be feel comfortable selling to people they know.

Those in the sharing economy appear to have trust in the organization due to product quality. This is interesting given that the quality of the offering is largely attributable to them, the workers, who are providing the service. Thus, the platform itself may be less important than the person it connects you to. In this environment, sharing economy workers often work for direct competitors simultaneously (i.e., driving for both Uber and Lyft), or at least have the option to switch quite easily between working for competing firms. As such, it is critical for sharing economy firms to remove frustrations and impediments for their workers, either institutionally (such as Uber's negative work environment) or technologically (such as more user-friendly website and mobile app interfaces) in an effort to maximize the

percentage of workers' efforts they capture. Furthermore, as workers are able to perform at a higher level for a company that they enjoy, it should increase customer satisfaction and the overall performance of the company (Bernhardt, Donthu, & Kennett, 2000).

Another factor that organizations need to examine is that of perceived commerciality. One would assume that most people working in the gig economy are doing so to make money, but our findings suggest that those in direct sales may have alternative motives. In order to better understand the motivations of those in the direct sales area, we looked at some of the additional questions that were on the survey. As a part of the survey we asked respondents to select their rationale for working with their current company. The most commonly selected answer was to make money. However, there was a large disparity between the two groups. Ninety percent of those participating in the sharing economy selected making money as the motivation for employment, versus only 56% of those in direct sales.

While those participating in direct sales plan on making money, they are also involved for other reasons. Regarding congruence with the organization, 28% of those in direct sales noted their love for the company or its products as the main reason they started working with a company. Compared to < 4% of those in the sharing economy, it is clear that financial motives appear to be more influential than the company or its products for those in the sharing economy. It is important that gig economy businesses reward the right kind of behavior such as repeat sales, employee accuracy scores, or customer service ratings. However, it is also important for firms to cultivate and reward non-financial and non-tangible activities and actions for high achieving workers.

There are additional respondent statistics that suggest those in direct sales have a stronger connection to the company and its products. The average length of time working with a company is just over 2.5 years for those in direct sales versus just 1.5 years for those in the sharing economy. In addition, those in the direct sales have recruited an average of nearly three people to work with their company versus just under two for those in the sharing economy. Is it that direct sales companies are doing a better job of promoting the company and its products to its workers, or did those working for the company already like it and its products before they started working there? There is often a financial motivation for those in direct sales to recruit other people that they believe will be successful, thus potentially explaining their propensity to proselytize the company to others. Additionally, many direct sales companies, such as Pampered Chef, Mary Kay, and Amway, which have been around and familiar to people for decades, are very established and have been able to build a reputation over the years. While there are still many direct sales companies, such as LuLaRoe, LipSense and Fundanoodle, that are newer to the marketplace, all sharing economy companies are relatively new to the marketplace, due to the fact that they rely on new digital technologies to facilitate the business of matching service providers with customers.

Appendix A

Measures

Self-congruence (Sirgy et al., 1997)^a

1. The personality of *COMPANY* is consistent with how I see myself.
2. The personality of *COMPANY* is a mirror image of me.
3. The personality of *COMPANY* is close to my own personality.

Perceived commerciality - sharing economy (Johnson, 1999)

1. Working with *COMPANY* is really about making money.
2. Working with *COMPANY* is centered on money.

Perceived commerciality - direct sales

5. Limitations and future research

The results of this research contribute to our understanding of the gig economy; however the study is not without limitations. The data was collected from single sources that were self-reported. Self-report data increases the possibility that there could be common method variance (CMV) induced in the model results. However, we did not measure intentions but rather perceptions and evaluative scores. Care was taken to mitigate the potential for CMV via the arrangement of the survey constructs as well as other recommendations made in the literature (e.g., spatially separating independent and dependent variables) (Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As there is no single accepted method to address the potential for CMV, we acknowledge this as a limitation. Additionally, the data was collected in two waves, rather than at one time. This is a limitation that also allowed us to get a more unique and diverse sample. Additionally, the research is limited to the variables selected to be included. Other constructs may provide additional insight into the perceptions of those working in the gig economy.

Many additional opportunities exist for future research related to gig economy employment. Given the impact of self-congruence on product perceptions, research should examine ways to increase congruence between the organization and its workers. Is hiring the right type of person critical, or are there certain messages that an organization can expose to existing, less vetted employees to increase congruence? Similarly, given that perceived commerciality can negatively impact product perceptions, future research should address ways to decrease perceptions of commerciality. Obviously gig workers are working partly for the money, but what else can the organization stress to make the job feel less about the money and more about the company or customer?

In addition, perceptions of quality, value, and satisfaction are important in forming perceptions of organizational trust. Gig economy businesses, especially those in the sharing economy need to better understand how to focus on the quality and value in the products and services they offer. Given the unique nature of the business, and the role that the service workers play, researchers need to explore ways to increase sharing economy workers' perceptions of the company's role in the services they provide. Since the workers essentially are the product, service research should focus on this unique relationship between high-tech apps and the frontline workers who provide those services. The findings of this research provide marketers with insight into gig economy employment and lay the foundation for future research in this ever-growing field.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Thomas Sharkey and Stanford Westjohn for their support and feedback on the manuscript. The authors are also very grateful for the comments and guidance provided by the *JBR* reviewers and editorial team.

(continued on next page)

Measures (continued)

When you read event, we mean either online or in person when you are selling a product for COMPANY.

1. The event is really about making money.
2. The event is centered on money.

Product quality (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991)

1. COMPANY products (or services) are excellent quality
2. COMPANY products (or services) are high quality
3. COMPANY products (or services) are superior quality

Product satisfaction (Oliver & Swan, 1989)

1. The choice of a(n) COMPANY product (or service) is a wise one.
2. I enjoy COMPANY products (or services).
3. I am satisfied with COMPANY products (or services).

Product value (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991)

When thinking about COMPANY products (or services), answer the following:

1. The price is very good for the quality.
2. The prices are very economical.
3. The products are a good buy.
4. The prices are acceptable.

Organizational trust (Morgan & Hunt, 1994)

1. COMPANY can be depended on to do what is right.
2. COMPANY is competent.
3. COMPANY can be trusted at all times.

Job outcome status (Agrawal & Maheswaran, 2005)

What has been the result of working with COMPANY?

1. Negative: Positive
2. Unfavorable: Favorable
3. Failure: Success

Job satisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 2010)

1. All in all, I'm satisfied with my present job at COMPANY.
2. All things considered, I am satisfied with my present job.
3. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job with COMPANY.

^a Each participant was asked to enter the name of a sharing economy or direct sales company. The name of that company was then piped in everywhere COMPANY is in the question. Also, they were told that questions would be about the company they entered. The "(or services)" noted in the questions were included in the scales for the sharing economy, not for direct sales.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(7), 347–356.
- Agrawal, N., & Maheswaran, D. (2005). Motivated reasoning in outcome-bias effects. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 798–805.
- Alton, L. (2018). Why the gig economy is the best and worst development for workers under 30. Retrieved from Forbes <https://www.forbes.com/sites/larryalton/2018/01/24/why-the-gig-economy-is-the-best-and-worst-development-for-workers-under-30/#622151c96d76>, Accessed date: 29 October 2018.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411.
- Belk, R. W. (2014). You are what you can access: Sharing and collaborative consumption online. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1595–1600.
- Benoit, S., Baker, T. L., Bolton, R. N., Gruber, T., & Kandampully, J. (2017). A triadic framework for collaborative consumption (CC): Motives, activities and resources & capabilities of actors. *Journal of Business Research*, 79, 219–227.
- Bernhardt, K. L., Donthu, N., & Kennett, P. A. (2000). A longitudinal analysis of satisfaction and profitability. *Journal of Business Research*, 47(2), 161–171.
- Bhattacharj, A. (2017). Side hustles are the new norm. Here's how much they really pay. Retrieved from The Washington Post https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/business/wp/2017/07/03/side-hustles-are-the-new-norm-heres-how-much-they-really-pay/?utm_term=.4599cff9a06f, Accessed date: 28 May 2018.
- Burtch, G., Carnahan, S., & Greenwood, B. N. (2018). Can you gig it? An empirical examination of the gig economy and entrepreneurial activity. *Management Science*, 64(12), 5461–5959.
- Chiou, J., & Droge, C. (2006). Service quality, trust, specific asset investment, and expertise: Direct and indirect effects in a satisfaction-loyalty framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 613–627.
- Chumpitaz Caceres, R., & Paparoidamis, N. G. (2007). Service quality, relationship satisfaction, trust, commitment and business-to-business loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(7/8), 836–867.
- Churchill, G. A., Ford, N. M., & Walker, O. C. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction in the salesforce. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13(Nov), 323–332.
- Cunha, D. (2018). Beware of Selling Yoga Pants on Facebook: Is the social-media gig economy a form of entrepreneurship, fraud – or something else entirely? Retrieved from The Atlantic https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2018/04/multilevel-marketing-yoga-pants-facebook/558296/?utm_source=atflb_test8_4, Accessed date: 30 May 2018.
- Davidson, A., Habibi, M. R., & Laroche, M. (2018). Materialism and the sharing economy: A cross-cultural study of American and Indian consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 82, 364–372.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. Vol. 19. New York: Wiley.
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(7), 307–319.
- Dolich, I. J. (1969). Congruence relationships between self-images and product brands. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6(Feb), 80–84.
- Donnelly, G. (2017). Everything you need to know about the \$1 billion LuLaRoe lawsuit. Retrieved from Fortune <http://fortune.com/2017/11/01/lularoe-lawsuit/>, Accessed date: 30 May 2018.
- Edelman, B., Luca, M., & Svirsky, D. (2017). Racial discrimination in the sharing economy: Evidence from a field experiment. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 9(2), 1–22.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39–50.
- Friedman, G. (2014). Workers without employers: Shadow corporations and the rise of the gig economy. *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 2(2), 171–188.
- Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1992). Monte Carlo evaluations of goodness of fit indices for structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 21(2), 132–160.
- Graeff, T. R. (1996). Image congruence effects on product evaluations: The role of self-monitoring and public/private consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, 13(5), 481–499.
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business & Society*, 39(3), 254–280.
- Hayzlett, J. (2018). Is the gig economy killing the 9-to-5 job? No, but its' giving it a run for its money. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/310368>, Accessed date: 10 June 2018.
- Hook, L. (2015). Year in a word: Gig economy. Retrieved from The Financial Times <https://www.ft.com/content/b5a2b122-a41b-11e5-8218-6b8ff73aae15>, Accessed date: 15 May 2018.
- Horowitz, S., & Rosati, F. (2014). 53 million Americans are freelancing, new survey finds. Retrieved from <https://blog.freelancersunion.org/2014/09/04/53million/>, Accessed date: 2 October 2018.
- Hosany, S., & Martin, D. (2012). Self-image congruence in consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(5), 685–691.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
- Johnson, S. D. (1999). Perceived commerciality of direct selling parties. In S. P. Brown, & D. Sudharshan (Vol. Eds.), *1999 AMA Educators' proceedings: Enhancing knowledge*

- development in marketing. Vol. 10. 1999 AMA educators' proceedings: Enhancing knowledge development in marketing (pp. 9–17). Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Kressmann, F., Sirgy, M. J., Herrmann, A., Huber, F., Huber, S., & Lee, D. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of self-image congruence on brand loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(9), 955–964.
- Kuhn, K. M. (2016). The rise of the “gig economy” and implications for understanding work and workers. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(1), 157–162.
- Lawson, S. J., Gleim, M. R., Perren, R., & Hwang, J. (2016). Freedom from ownership: An exploration of access-based consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2615–2623.
- Lee, C., Song, H., Lee, H., Lee, S., & Bernhard, B. J. (2013). The impact of CSR on casino employees' organizational trust, job satisfaction, and customer orientation: An empirical examination of responsible gambling strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 33, 406–415.
- Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114–121.
- Lutz, C., & Newlands, G. (2018). Consumer segmentation within the sharing economy: The case of Airbnb. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 187–196.
- Mallin, M. L., Gammoh, B. S., Pullins, E. B., & Johnson, C. M. (2017). A new perspective of salesperson motivation and salesforce outcomes: The mediating role of salesperson-brand identification. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 357–374.
- Manyika, J., Lund, S., Bughin, J., Robinson, K., Mischke, J., & Mahajan, D. (2016). Independent work: Choice, necessity and the gig economy. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/McKinsey/Featured%20Insights/Employment%20and%20Growth/Independent%20work%20Choice%20necessity%20and%20the%20gig%20economy/Independent-Work-Choice-necessity-and-the-gig-economy-Full-report.ashx>, Accessed date: 8 October 2018.
- Matousek, M. (2018). An Uber driver and killed a passenger in Denver. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/uber-driver-shoots-kills-passenger-in-denver-2018-6>, Accessed date: 12 June 2018.
- Meza, S. (2017). Uber hired drivers with criminal records, faces \$8.9 million fine. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/uber-fined-hiring-drivers-criminal-records-718095>, Accessed date: 10 June 2018.
- Miao, C. F., Evans, K. R., & Shaoming, Z. (2007). The role of salesperson motivation in sales control systems—Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation revisited. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(5), 417–425.
- Milanova, V., & Maas, P. (2017). Sharing intangibles: Uncovering individual motives for engagement in a sharing service setting. *Journal of Business Research*, 75, 159–171.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 20–38.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Maxham, J. G., III, & Lichtenstein, D. R. (2010). Store manager performance and satisfaction: Effects on store employee performance and satisfaction, store customer satisfaction, and store customer spending growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(530), 95.
- Nunberg, G. (2016). Goodbye jobs, hello ‘gigs’: How one word sums up a new economic reality. Retrieved from National Public Radio <https://www.npr.org/2016/01/11/460698077/goodbye-jobs-hello-gigs-nunbergs-word-of-the-year-sums-up-a-new-economic-reality>, Accessed date: 14 May 2018.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R. L., & Anderson, E. (1994). An empirical test of the consequences of behavior- and outcome-based sales control systems. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 53–67.
- Oliver, R. L., & Swan, J. E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 21–35.
- Palmisano, S., & Pannofino, N. (2013). It isn't just about the money: The implicit religion of Amway Corporation. *Implicit Religion*, 16(1), 27–46.
- Perren, R., & Kozinets, R. V. (2018). Lateral exchange markets: How social platforms operate in a networked economy. *Journal of Marketing*, 82(1), 20–36.
- Peterson, R. A., & Wotruba, T. R. (1996). What is direct selling?—Definition, perspectives, and research agenda. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 16(4), 1–16.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–904.
- Rich, G. A. (1997). The sales manager as a role model: Effects on trust, job satisfaction, and performance of salespeople. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(4), 319–328.
- Roos, D., & Hahn, R. (2017). Does shared consumption affect consumers' values, attitudes, and norms? A panel study. *Journal of Business Research*, 77, 113–123.
- Rosenblat, A. (2016). What motivates gig economy workers. Retrieved from Harvard Business Review <https://hbr.org/2016/11/what-motivates-gig-economy-workers>, Accessed date: 14 October 2018.
- Rosenblat, A., & Hwang, T. (2016). Regional diversity in autonomy and work: A case study from Uber and Lyft drivers. Retrieved from <https://datasociety.net/output/regional-diversity-in-autonomy-and-work-a-case-study-from-uber-and-lyft-drivers/>, Accessed date: 6 October 2018.
- Sabel, C. F. (1993). Studied trust: Building new forms of cooperation in a volatile economy. *Human Relations*, 46(9), 1133–1170.
- Selnes, F. (1998). Antecedents and consequences of trust and satisfaction in buyer-seller relationships. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(3/4), 305–322.
- Sirgy, M. J., Grewal, D., Mangleburg, T. F., Park, J., Chon, K., Claiborne, C. B., ... Berkman, H. (1997). Assessing the predictive validity of two methods of measuring self-image congruence. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(3), 229.
- Smith, A. (2016). Why join the gig economy? For many, the answer is ‘for fun’. Retrieved from Pew Research Center <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/18/why-join-the-gig-economy-for-many-the-answer-is-for-fun/>, Accessed date: 15 May 2018.
- Smith, J. S., Gleim, M. R., Robinson, S. G., Kettinger, W. J., & Park, S. (2014). Using an old dog for new tricks: A regulatory focus perspective on consumer acceptance of RFID applications. *Journal of Service Research*, 17(1), 85–101.
- Spence Laschinger, H. K., Finegan, J., & Shamian, J. (2002). The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Advances in health care management* (pp. 59–85). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), 78–90.
- Stern, B. L., Bush, R. F., & Hair, J. F. (1977). The self-image/store image matching process: An empirical test. *The Journal of Business*, 50(1), 63–69.
- Taylor, J. M. (2011). The case (for and) against multi-level marketing. Retrieved from Consumer Awareness Institute https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_comments/trade-regulation-rule-disclosure-requirements-and-prohibitions-concerning-business-opportunities-ftc.r511993-00017%2C%2A00017-57317.pdf, Accessed date: 10 May 2018.
- Wiessner, D. (2018). U.S. Judge says Uber drivers are not company's employees. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uber-lawsuit/u-s-judge-says-uber-drivers-are-not-companys-employees-idUSKBN1HJ311>, Accessed date: 10 May 2018.
- Wotruba, T. R., & Tyagi, P. K. (1991). Met expectations and turnover in direct selling. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(July), 24–35.
- Zatz, N. (2016). Is Uber wagging the dog with its moonlighting drivers? Retrieved from <https://onlabor.org/is-uber-wagging-the-dog-with-its-moonlighting-drivers/>, Accessed date: 21 October 2018.
- Zervas, G., Proserpio, D., & Byers, J. W. (2017). The rise of the sharing economy: Estimating the impact of Airbnb on the hotel industry. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 54(5), 687–705.

Mark R. Gleim is an Associate Professor of Marketing in the College of Business and Innovation at the University of Toledo. He earned his Ph.D. from Florida State University. His research interests include access-based consumption, services marketing, sustainability and marketing strategy. His research has appeared in the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Journal of Service Research*, *Journal of Business Research*, and *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, among other outlets.

Catherine M. Johnson is an Assistant Professor of Marketing in the College of Business and Innovation at the University of Toledo. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of Alabama. Her research interests include sales, corporate social responsibility, and consumer behavior. Her research has appeared in the *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, and *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, among other outlets.

Stephanie J. Lawson is an Assistant Professor of Marketing in the College of Business Administration at Winthrop University. She earned her Ph.D. from Florida State University. Her research interests include collaborative consumption, access-based consumption, co-production issues in services marketing, and sustainability. Her research has appeared in the *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, and *Marketing Letters*, among other outlets.