

Adoption Dynamics of the Sharing Economy in the Construction Sector: Toward Sustainable Project Delivery in Qatar

Oluwasola Temitope Adeolu*

**Built Environment, Northumbria University, New Castle, UK.*

sola_adeolu@outlook.com

Abstract:

The sharing economy represents a paradigm shift in global production and consumption, enabling resource optimization through digital collaboration and non-ownership models. However, its integration into capital-intensive sectors such as construction remains underexplored, particularly in emerging economies. This study investigates the awareness, adoption and determinants of sharing economy practices among construction companies in Qatar, an economy undergoing rapid transformation under its National Vision 2030. A quantitative research design was employed, using structured questionnaires distributed to 31 construction firms across five contractor classes (A–E). Descriptive and inferential analyses (ANOVA) were conducted to evaluate variations in awareness and adoption factors. The results indicate a moderate overall awareness of sharing economy practices, with Class C companies demonstrating relatively higher engagement. Economic incentives, collaborative opportunities, and product variety were the primary drivers of adoption, whereas lack of trust, process risk, and cultural attachment to ownership emerged as significant barriers. The findings reveal that despite the sharing economy's potential to enhance resource efficiency, reduce costs, and support sustainability, institutional and socio-cultural barriers hinder widespread adoption. The study recommends the establishment of trust-enhancing regulatory frameworks, digital infrastructure development, and awareness initiatives to foster collaboration within the sector. These measures can enable Qatar's construction industry to leverage the sharing economy as a strategic tool for competitiveness, efficiency, and sustainable growth.

I. INTRODUCTION

The activities of the sharing economy signify a significant transformation in business paradigms, generating substantial new economic and social value across numerous global economies. According to [20], the sharing economy is perceived as a disruptive influence on firms, business processes, industrial sectors, and their marketplaces, characterized by its global reach and rapid, intense transformational capabilities, while simultaneously serving as a significant engine for financial value generation. Some of the biggest dramatic market disruptions have included Airbnb for accommodations, Uber and Didi Chuxing for ride-hailing, which transformed the choice sets for hospitality and taxi versus auto

transportation for 100s of millions of people around the world.

The sharing economy is recognized as a transformative force across multiple industries, including those related to construction and infrastructure. It promotes resource efficiency and creates new value by sharing goods and services, which can indirectly influence the building sector by changing how resources are allocated and utilized ([33]). The advancement of information systems and technologies enhances the attractiveness of sharing economy activities within the building sector. Online platforms like Dozr in Ontario, Ramirent in Finland, Yard Club and Getable in San Francisco, and EquipmentShare in Missouri facilitate

peer-to-peer equipment rental marketplaces for contractors, promoting sharing practices among project stakeholders and other companies ([20]).

The relevance of the sharing economy has been highlighted in several studies. According to [10], businesses worldwide are grappling with resource scarcity, leading to idle client resources and increased construction costs. To combat this, companies are increasingly adopting sharing practices, which are prevalent across sectors like hospitality, transportation, labor, logistics, media, fashion, and finance. The UK Office for National Statistics reported that in 2015, 275 European collaborative platforms generated £4 billion (\$5 billion USD) in revenue and facilitated £28 billion (\$35.5 billion USD) worth of transactions ([26]). These studies largely focused on sectors including housing, transportation, media, and communication. [21] found that the sharing economy is altering the Chinese construction sector, highlighting the use of sharing platforms among project stakeholders and private firms. However, there is a shortage of studies assessing the extent of sharing economy adoption in the construction sector, revealing a research vacuum to be addressed.

The construction sector is increasingly understanding the need of embracing the sharing economy to lower costs related with equipment and personnel while minimizing liability. Despite this, a literature study reveals that awareness and acceptance of the sharing economy within the construction sector remain low globally, including in Qatar. This gap in adoption is particularly notable given Qatar's significant investments in infrastructure development, which have driven substantial growth in its construction sector. Qatar's construction sector is experiencing significant growth due to large-scale projects like the 2022 FIFA World Cup. The market is projected to reach USD 68.70 billion by 2025 and 106.33 billion by 2030, driven by economic diversification and public-private partnerships ([27]). The adoption of the sharing

economy aligns with Qatar's broader goals of economic diversification and sustainability. Qatar's progressive policy frameworks and investment initiatives create opportunities for the sharing economy to flourish.

However, the low level of awareness and adoption of the sharing economy among construction companies in Qatar poses a significant challenge. This gap not only hinders the effective use of resources but also limits the sector's ability to achieve its full potential in contributing to Qatar's economic diversification and sustainability goals. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the level of awareness and factors influencing adoption of the sharing economy among construction companies in Doha, Qatar, the primary operational hub for many construction firms in the country.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The Rise of the Sharing Economy

The sharing economy has attracted substantial attention, with experts defining the term "sharing" and constructing a framework of behaviors. Sharing refers to the act of giving goods to others and obtaining or taking something from others for use. Understanding sharing can be regarded from several conceptual dimensions, such as possessiveness, independence, privacy, and utilitarianism. [17] propose a sharing-exchange continuum to quantify business models based on sharing-related qualities and exchange-related characteristics. Sharing practices, dual model behaviors, and pseudo-sharing activities are identified in the sharing economy. True sharing is driven by social concerns, pseudo-sharing seeks for economic rewards, while dual model practices emphasize both social concerns and economic gains. This study explores these activities from a broad viewpoint, stressing the necessity of understanding the sharing economy from multiple angles ([21]).

The sharing economy, also known as collaborative consumption, access-based consumption, or peer-to-peer economy, is a concept that incorporates numerous non-ownership consumption behaviors such as swapping, bartering, trading, renting, sharing, and exchanging. Online portals like Airbnb and Roomorama allow access to rooms, tools, vehicles, bikes, and taxi services. Scholars often emphasize the contentious nature of the sharing economy and its potential for change. [15] define it as customers offering each other temporary access to under-utilized physical assets, maybe for money. [23] define it as a web of markets where individuals employ various types of compensation to redistribute and access resources, mediated via a digital platform maintained by an organization. The sharing economy is a complex and controversial idea that continues to change and evolve.

Scholars suggest numerous frameworks to analyze the sharing economy, including online cooperation, social commerce, consumer ideology, on-demand economy, second-hand economy, product service economy, access economy, platform economy, and community-based economy. [18] advise investigating it from four aspects: online cooperation, social commerce, sharing online, and consumer ideology. [15] separate it from on-demand economy, second-hand economy, and product service economy in terms of consumer-to-consumer interactions, transitory access, and tangible commodities. [1] place the sharing economy as a foundational core of the access economy, platform economy, and community-based economy. [25] highlight seven main characteristics of the sharing economy, including platforms for cooperation, under-utilized resources, peer-to-peer contacts, collaborative governance, mission-driven approach, alternative funding, and technology leveraging.

The influence of sharing economy behaviors on the economy, society, and environment is multifaceted and mostly unknown. While some researchers indicate that

sharing can lead to environmental, social, and good economic outcomes, others argue that regime and niche actors adopt opposing framings for the development of a sharing economy ([15]). The former portrays the sharing economy as an economic opportunity and an unregulated marketplace for commercial aims, whereas the latter views it as sustainable consumption and a decentralized and equitable economy for social and environmental principles ([24]). However, the sharing economy is also associated with moral hazards and uneven distributions of income and welfare. Sharing produces a tug-of-war between primary producers and secondary sharers, and certain innovative methods raise issues about consumer rights, public health and safety, the quality of goods and services, and unfair competition. For example, a 1% increase in Airbnb listings can lead to a 0.05% loss in quarterly hotel income ([35]). The entry of the sharing economy can contribute to the tourism industry by drawing more tourists and producing new job possibilities, but its marginal effect declines due to the replacement of low-end hotels. Further empirical knowledge is needed to understand the links between sharing economy behaviors and sustainability performance ([14]).

B. Sharing Economy Practices in the Construction Industry

Online platforms like EquipmentShare, Dozr, Yard Club, Faber, and Emoding are promoting the sharing of materials, labor, and equipment among construction firms. However, there is a lack of empirical studies on sharing economy practices in the construction industry. The sector is known for high capital inputs, energy consumption, and labor intensity, and is responsible for a significant portion of energy and material resource consumption ([11]). The construction industry produces 35% of total waste in Europe, highlighting the need for improved resource utilization efficiency and increased recycling. A sharing economy could potentially encourage under-

utilized and idle resource sharing for sustainability ([13]).

Reference [21] in their study explored the sharing economy in the construction sector using a socio-technical perspective. They emphasize community-based interactions, including internal and external sharing practices among stakeholders and unfamiliar companies. The sharing economy is seen as a technological phenomenon, with the development of information systems and technologies making it more appealing. [21] highlighted the use of digital platforms in both internal and external sharing practices. They identified internal sharing practices, external sharing practices, and digital platform applications as three aspects of sharing economy practices in construction projects.

The sharing economy is centered around sharing idle capacity and under-utilized assets. Internal sharing practices involve project stakeholders, such as subcontractors and contractors, granting each other temporary access to idle capacity or under-utilized assets during project implementation. This is primarily for social concerns. For instance, subcontractors can share machinery to execute tasks. Information management systems and smart site platforms promote information and resource sharing among stakeholders. These practices are considered not-for-profit initiatives, as suggested by [17]. They aim to establish social capital and collaborative relationships, ensuring successful project delivery. Money is often irrelevant to sharing practices among project stakeholders.

External sharing practices involve sharing with unfamiliar companies, allowing temporary access to idle capacity or underutilized assets for monetary benefits. This reduces the need for ownership of these assets. For instance, contractors can rent machinery from unfamiliar construction firms to implement their projects, rather than purchasing it from the market ([17]). Construction firms can also arrange trades in spare or idle construction materials. These practices

are characterized by exchange-related attributes, market norms of supply, demand, and efficiency, and are characterized by salient money exchanges, short interactions, and being profit-oriented. Construction firms are involved in these practices with strong profit-seeking motivations and explicit expectations of reciprocity ([6]).

Reference [1] highlight the importance of digital platforms like EquipmentShare and Dozr in the sharing economy, highlighting their role in connecting consumers to services and commodities. [24] highlights the efficiency of sharing under-utilized assets through internet peer-to-peer platforms. [8] highlight the reduction in costs associated with accessing products and services. Construction firms can use these platforms to release supply information, place reservations, arrange payments, and implement rating systems. Digital technologies enable platforms to remotely coordinate, manage, and control monetary or non-monetary sharing practices through algorithms like evaluations, information flows, pricing, rating, and insurance.

C. Awareness of Sharing Economy

The recognition and adoption of sharing economy techniques in the construction industry are affected by various factors, such as financial limitations, sustainability issues, technical progress, and evolving consumer preferences ([30]). Moreover, legislative frameworks, industry norms, and cultural attitudes about sharing significantly influence comprehension and acceptability within the sector ([2]). The sharing economy has numerous benefits in construction, including reduced project expenses, enhanced resource efficiency, greater flexibility, and improved collaboration ([30]). Nevertheless, extensive adoption is impeded by obstacles such as legislative limitations, participant trust, liability issues, and asset quality concerns ([28]). The construction industry encounters difficulties in implementing sharing economy models due to the necessity for reliable systems to guarantee

the safety and quality of shared equipment and skilled personnel ([21]).

Various players in the construction industry demonstrate differing degrees of understanding and perspective regarding the sharing economy. Certain enterprises are keen to participate in collaborative platforms and embrace sharing economy principles, whilst others exhibit reluctance stemming from uncertainty over prospective profits and apprehension about unwarranted risks ([7]). Established business frameworks and cultural resistance hinder the implementation of sharing methodologies ([34]). As the sharing economy continues to expand, it is projected to have a greater impact on the building sector. Future studies should focus on resolving implementation difficulties, establishing strategies to promote sharing economy principles, and examining the long-term sustainability consequences of sharing practices in the building industry ([29]). Despite its potential, overall understanding of sharing economy concepts remains low ([12]), which inhibits its expansion.

D. Factors Influencing Adoption of Sharing Economy

Several studies highlight the economic benefits of adopting sharing economy practices in construction. Cost savings and revenue generation are major drivers since they align with Qatar's economic diversification goals ([9], [15]). Product variety and cooperation are also major drivers of sharing behavior, improving project performance by allowing access to specialized skills and equipment ([3], [22]). The entry of technology and the internet has been pivotal in facilitating sharing of resources and improving efficiency, leveraging the high levels of technology adoption in Qatar ([5]). Minimal barriers to entry and easy access to products make sharing economy models more appealing, reducing idle capacity and optimizing operations ([16]).

Despite such drivers, certain barriers are hindrances to the widespread adoption of sharing economy practices. Regulatory complexities and lack of trust are major deterrents, which require separate legal frameworks in order to build trust between parties ([31], [19]). Materialism and ownership status are some cultural constraints that limit sharing behavior because such norms do not promote common use but prefer individual ownership ([6]). Privacy concerns and security threats also pose additional challenges, which are countered by strong security controls against threats ([6], [31]).

Organizational and cultural factors also affect the adoption of sharing economy models. Organizational leadership and culture support are necessary in establishing a favorable environment for sharing practices, with companies emphasizing innovation and collaboration being more likely to adopt sharing economy models. Additionally, considerations for trust, safety, and legality are crucial in building confidence among stakeholders and facilitating sharing economy values ([4]).

III. Methodology

A. Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative research design using a structured questionnaire to achieve the stated aim and objectives. Quantitative research involves gathering numerical data to analyze patterns and trends, making it suitable for this study's focus on awareness, adoption, influencing factors, and shared resources in the sharing economy among construction companies in Qatar. The questionnaire was designed to collect data from all classes of construction companies registered with the Qatar Government that have engaged in equipment and labor hiring or sharing. It was structured to obtain information on companies' understanding of the sharing economy, their level of awareness and adoption, factors influencing adoption, and the types of resources being shared.

B. Study Population and Sampling Frame

The study population comprised construction contractors registered with the Qatar Government. These contractors are classified into five categories (Classes A–E) based on their annual turnover and project execution capacity. Class A companies can execute projects valued at QR10 billion and above, while Classes B, C, D, and E handle projects ranging from QR500 million to QR1 billion, QR250 million to QR500 million, QR50 million to QR250 million, and QR1 million to QR50 million, respectively. Table 1 presents details of the registered construction companies across these classes.

B. Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A stratified sampling technique was adopted for this study due to the classification of contracting companies into distinct categories by the Qatar Government. Stratified sampling is appropriate when the population is divided into subgroups or strata based on specific characteristics, ensuring adequate representation of each category.

The sample size was determined by applying a sampling ratio of 30% to each class of registered construction companies. This approach ensures proportional representation across all classes while accounting for variations in company size and capacity. The sample included three companies from Class A, four from Class B, five from Class C, seven from Class D, and eleven from Class E, resulting in a total sample size of 31 companies (Table 2).

C. Method of Data Collection

Data for this study were collected through a questionnaire survey administered digitally using JISC online survey tools and Microsoft Forms. This approach allowed for wider coverage of respondents across all classes of construction companies in Qatar.

D. Techniques for Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (such as percentage frequency and mean score) and ANOVA were employed for data analysis.

IV. Results and Discussion

A. General Profile of Respondents

Table 3 presents the general information of the respondents with their designation, professional qualification, and experience in years. From the table, the respondent category reflected that a significant proportion of the participants were managers (31%) and senior staff (37%), reflecting their involvement in decision-making activities within their organizations. 11% were represented by Directors and 9% by CEOs/MDs. This categorization reflects the representation of individuals with operational and strategic roles to ensure that the findings are grounded on various organizational hierarchy levels.

In accordance with professional position, quantity surveyors were in highest numbers (35%), followed by engineers (31%) and architects (12%). Builders formed 11% with other professionals representing 10%. This splits witnesses the multi-professional nature of the building industry and affirms the rudimental contributions of quantity surveyors and engineers toward resources control and project delivery.

For membership within their profession, the highest proportion of respondents belonged to associations such as the Chartered Institute of Building (MCIOB) (36%), followed by the Qatar Society of Engineers (MQSI) (18%) and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (MRICS) (11%). 17% were non-members, indicating the majority of professionals belong to credible institutions, which could have a bearing on their familiarity and adoption of new paradigms such as the sharing economy.

The highest academic qualifications among the respondents ranged from postgraduate degree holders such as M.Sc./MBA (17%) and M.Phil./Ph.D. (21%)

to Higher National Diploma (HND) holders (20%). The majority held bachelor's degrees (33%), which would reflect a highly educated workforce in Qatar's construction sector. This education would reflect a workforce capable of understanding and implementing complex concepts such as the sharing economy.

Respondents' years of work experience differed, with 30% having 10–20 years and 21% having 10 years of experience or fewer. The 48% with 20 or more years had 16% with 30–40 years and 12% with greater than 40 years. This range of experience ensures that the findings account for both seasoned professionals and relatively newer industry members.

B. General Profile of the Company

The general profile of the respondent construction firms was analyzed to determine their background characteristics. Table 4, revealed that most firms have been operating for many years, with 36% operating for over 40 years and 29% for 21–30 years. This reveals that the construction sector in Qatar is made up of established firms. While these very established companies may have lots of experience, they may also be hard-pressed to adapt to new ideas due to entrenched operating habits. Similarly, classifications by the Qatar Government showed a distribution across Classes A to E, indicating the presence of a range of companies with the potential to carry out projects of varying scales. Class A, representing companies with the capacity to execute QR10 billion and above projects, was made up of 25% of the respondents. The range reflected the presence of a broad spectrum of companies in the Qatari construction sector, with Class A companies leading the pack in terms of capacity. The possibility of larger businesses participating in the sharing economy is greater with improved access to resources and specialist technology. Asset value-wise, a majority of the companies (32%) have assets between QR1 billion and QR10 billion, showing a relatively strong financial base. Such financial strength can enable these companies to invest in sharing platforms

and adopt sharing economy strategies. However, the lower asset values in smaller firms may be limited, rendering them less resourceful to participate actively in resource-sharing activities ([2]).

Result for the size of the labor force indicated that nearly half of the companies (49%) employ more than 1000 people, reflecting high operational capacity. The large labor force capacity may mean higher resource requirement, and as such, these companies may be potential participants in the sharing economy.

C. Awareness of Sharing Economy among Construction Companies

The results, as presented in Table 5, showcase the level of awareness of the sharing economy among construction companies, categorized by their respective classes (A through E). Revealing notable variations in awareness levels across these categories. Class A companies, on average, exhibit moderate awareness (mean = 2.9), with the distribution showing 50% indicating "Very Low" and only 18.5% indicating "Very High" awareness. Class B companies recorded a lower mean awareness score of 2.45, with the majority clustering towards "Very Low" and "Low" awareness levels. This pattern contrasts with Class C companies, which demonstrated a relatively higher awareness, reflected in a mean score of 3.41 and 64.4% of respondents reporting "Moderate" awareness. Both Class D and E companies recorded moderate awareness levels but with different frequency distributions, as shown in Table 4.

These findings are consistent with existing literature suggesting that there remains a significant gap in the understanding and recognition of sharing economy principles among construction companies, even in developed economies ([12]). Several factors may explain these patterns, including varying levels of exposure to innovative business models, differences in access to information and training resources, and organizational culture.

D. Factors Influencing the Adoption of Sharing Economy among Construction companies

The results for the drivers and barriers to the adoption of sharing economy practices in the construction sector in Qatar reveals that there is a complex interplay of drivers and barriers (Table 6 and Table 7). Economic benefits, such as income generation and cost savings, are among the top drivers for the adoption of sharing economy, with average scores of 3.85 and 3.71, respectively (Table 6). These findings are also aligned with the broader economic goals of Qatar to promote efficiency and reduce the cost of construction projects, emphasizing the potential of sharing economy models to contribute to economic diversification ([9], [15]). The economic benefits of sharing economy practices can manifest in the form of increased profitability for construction companies by way of reduced idle capacity and better resource utilization, which is particularly vital for a sector with high capital investments and volatile demand.

Following closely are collaboration and product diversity as drivers with mean scores of 3.69 and 3.35, respectively (Table 6). These variables enhance project outcomes by exposure to specialized tools and expertise that are instrumental in complex construction projects, thereby promoting the growth of the sharing economy in the Qatari construction sector ([3]). Stakeholder coordination can foster innovation and improve project delivery timelines, while product diversity ensures that construction companies are exposed to a large pool of resources, which enables them to deal with dynamic project needs more effectively.

The advent of technology has a mean score of 3.25, indicating how it has helped facilitate resource sharing and efficiency (Table 6). While technology is mentioned as an enabler, its impact is observed to be less direct compared to economic benefits, meaning that more technological integration would enhance the adoption of sharing economy models. Online

platforms can reduce transaction costs and improve the flow of information, making it easier for companies to engage in sharing activities. However, the full effect of technology on the sharing economy is possible only when there is widespread adoption and integration of digital technologies in the construction sector as a whole.

Despite these drivers, there are numerous barriers to the application of sharing economy principles. The most significant barrier is the absence of trust, with a mean value of 3.85 (Table 7). Developing trust among stakeholders is paramount to developing confidence in sharing economy models, highlighting the need for robust trust-enhancing mechanisms to overcome this barrier ([31]). Deficits in trust can be fueled by liability issues, data protection, and intellectual property rights that must be addressed through exhaustive contractual terms and regulatory frameworks.

Process risk and awareness level are the major challenges with mean scores of 3.61 and 3.59, respectively (Table 7). These findings emphasize the necessity of having clear regulatory frameworks and training programs in order to address these challenges and enable the adoption of sharing economy principles ([19]). Process risks may involve operational challenges and logistical challenges in resource sharing, while low awareness levels among stakeholders may discourage the adoption of sharing economy models. Awareness can be created and information on the benefits and limitations of sharing economy practices can be provided through educational workshops and programs.

Cultural factors, prestige of ownership, and materialism are obstacles, with mean scores of 3.50 and 3.28, respectively (Table 7). These norms favor private ownership over shared use, making it difficult for sharing economy models to be accepted. To overcome these cultural barriers must be founded on a deeper understanding of societal norms and values influencing business practices in Qatar ([6], [32]).

Cultural change towards more collaborative and sustainable practices can be achieved through public sensitization campaigns and leadership programs that encourage the adoption of sharing economy models.

V. Conclusion and Recommendation

While the sharing economy has immense potential to maximize the use of resources and reduce costs in Qatar's construction industry, its adoption is hampered by a complex interplay of factors. These must be addressed through strategic interventions in the form of strengthening trust among stakeholders, establishing a clear regulatory framework, sensitization through training schemes, and effecting a change of heart towards collaboration and sustainability. Subsequent research needs to develop tangible measures to counter these problems and apply sharing economy principles to the particular case of Qatar's construction sector in order to gain greater long-term competitiveness and sustainability.

References

- [1] Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T. and Pinkse, J., 2017. Promises and paradoxes of the sharing economy: An organizing framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 125, pp.1-10.
- [2] Ahvenniemi, H., Huovila, A., Pinto-Seppä, I. and Airaksinen, M., 2017. What are the differences between sustainable and smart cities?. *Cities*, 60, pp.234-245.
- [3] Akbar, P. and Hoffmann, S., 2023. Collaborative space: framework for collaborative consumption and the sharing economy. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 37(4), pp.496-509.
- [4] Al Mulla, S.H., 2024. *Evaluation of Sustainability at Mega Sporting Events: A Study of the FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022* (Doctoral dissertation, Hamad Bin Khalifa University (Qatar)).
- [5] Al-Yafei, H., Aseel, S., Al-Karbi, A., Al-Sulaiti, A., Al-Hajri, A., Al-Siddigi, A. and Kucukvar, M., 2021, March. Integrated sustainability assessment of sharing economy models: The case for Qatar. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Singapore* (pp. 7-11).
- [6] Belk, R.W., Eckhardt, Giana M ; Bardhi, Fleura 2019. Introduction to the Handbook of the Sharing Economy: the paradox of the sharing economy. *Handbook of the Sharing Economy*, p.1-8.
- [7] Bocken, N. M., Short, S. W., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2014). A literature and practice review to develop sustainable business model archetypes. *Journal of cleaner production*, 65, 42-56.
- [8] Botsman, R. and Rogers, R., 2010. What's mine is yours. *The rise of collaborative consumption*, 1.
- [9] Breidbach, C.F. and Brodie, R.J., 2017. Engagement platforms in the sharing economy: Conceptual foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 27(4), pp.761-777.
- [10] Carl, H. 2017. Impact of the sharing economy on construction craft labour and equipment markets. [online] Available at: https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Impact_of_the_sharing_economy_on_construction_craft_labour_and_equipment_markets
- [11] Chang, Y., Li, X., Masanet, E., Zhang, L., Huang, Z. and Ries, R., 2018. Unlocking the green opportunity for prefabricated buildings and construction in China. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 139, pp.259-261.
- [12] Chipkin, H. (2015). *Sharing economy awareness soars young usage up*. [online] Travelweekly.com. Available at: <https://www.travelweekly.com/ConsumerSurvey2015/Sharing-economy-awareness-soars-young-usage-up>
- [13] del Mar Casanovas-Rubio, M. and Ramos, G., 2017. Decision-making tool for the assessment and selection of construction processes based on environmental criteria: Application to precast and cast-in-situ alternatives. *Resources, conservation and recycling*, 126, pp.107-117.
- [14] Fang, B., Ye, Q. and Law, R., 2016. Effect of sharing economy on tourism industry employment. *Annals of tourism research*, 57(C), pp.264-267.
- [15] Frenken, K. and Schor, J., 2019. Putting the sharing economy into perspective. In *A research*

- agenda for sustainable consumption governance (pp. 121-135). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [16] Geissinger, A., Laurell, C., Öberg, C. and Sandström, C., 2019. How sustainable is the sharing economy? On the sustainability connotations of sharing economy platforms. *Journal of cleaner production*, 206, pp.419-429.
- [17] Habibi, M.R., Kim, A. and Laroche, M., 2016b. From sharing to exchange: An extended framework of dual modes of collaborative nonownership consumption. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, 1(2), pp.277-294.
- [18] Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M. and Ukkonen, A., 2016. The sharing economy: Why people participate in collaborative consumption. *Journal of the association for information science and technology*, 67(9), pp.2047-2059.
- [19] Hudson, S. and Li, J., 2018. Competing with the sharing economy: a case of hotels getting social. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Cases*, 7(1), pp.23-33.
- [20] Kauffman, R. J., & Naldi, M. 2020. Research directions for sharing economy issues. *Electronic commerce research and applications*, 43, 100973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2020.100973>
- [21] Li, Y., Ding, R., Cui, L., Lei, Z., & Mou, J. 2019. The impact of sharing economy practices on sustainability performance in the Chinese construction industry. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 150, 104409.
- [22] Luna, T.F., Uriona-Maldonado, M., Silva, M.E. and Vaz, C.R., 2020. The influence of e-carsharing schemes on electric vehicle adoption and carbon emissions: An emerging economy study. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 79, p.102226.
- [23] Mair, J. and Reischauer, G., 2017. Capturing the dynamics of the sharing economy: Institutional research on the plural forms and practices of sharing economy organizations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 125, pp.11-20.
- [24] Martin, C.J., 2016. The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism?. *Ecological economics*, 121, pp.149-159.
- [25] Muñoz, P. and Cohen, B., 2017. Mapping out the sharing economy: A configurational approach to sharing business modeling. *Technological forecasting and social change*, 125, pp.21-37.
- [26] Nicholls, K. 2016. *The feasibility of measuring the sharing economy*. [online] Ons.gov.uk. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/articles/thefeasibilityofmeasuringthesharingeconomy/progressupdate>
- [27] Qatar Economic Report 2019. Qatar Economic Report 2019. Retrieved from <https://pwstg02.blob.core.windows.net/pwfiles/Library/Files/d4399576-df5c-498e-9d53-7a56253b852f.pdf>
- [28] Rathnayake, I., Ochoa, J.J., Gu, N., Rameezdeen, R., Statsenko, L. and Sandhu, S., 2024. A critical review of the key aspects of sharing economy: A systematic literature review and research framework. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 434, p.140378.
- [29] Rojanakit, P., de Oliveira, R.T. and Dulleck, U., 2022. The sharing economy: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, pp.1317-1334.
- [30] Samadzad, M., Nosratzadeh, H., Karami, H. and Karami, A., 2023. What are the factors affecting the adoption and use of electric scooter sharing systems from the end user's perspective?. *Transport policy*, 136, pp.70-82.
- [31] Spindeldreher, K., Fröhlich, J. and Schlagwein, D., 2018. I Won't Share!: Barriers to Participation in the Sharing Economy. In *PACIS* (p. 223).
- [32] Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, 39(2), 273-315.
- [33] Washington State University 2018. *Sharing Economy: How it's Transforming Business*. [online] WSU Online MBA. Available at: <https://onlinemba.wsu.edu/blog/how-the-sharing-economy-is-transforming-business>.
- [34] Yuen, K.F., Huyen, D.T.K., Wang, X. and Qi, G., 2020. Factors influencing the adoption of shared autonomous vehicles. *International journal*

of environmental research and public health, 17(13), p.4868.

- [35] Zervas, G., Proserpio, D. and 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), pp.687-705

Appendices

Table 1: Registered Construction Companies with Government

Class	Contract Value	Registered Construction Companies
A	QR10 billion and above	9
B	QR500m to QR1 billion	14
C	QR250M to QR500 million	18
D	QR50m to QR250 million	24
E	QR1m to QR50 million	38
Total		103

Table 2: Sample Size for the Study

Class	Contract Value	Registered Construction Companies	Sampling Ratio (%)	Selected Companies
A	QR10 billion and above	9	30	3
B	QR500m to QR1 billion	14	30	4
C	QR250M to QR500 million	18	30	5
D	QR50m to QR250 million	24	30	7
E	QR1m to QR50 million	38	30	11
Total		103	-	31

Table 3: General Information of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Designation of the Respondents		
CEOs/MDs		
CEOs/MDs	8.00	9%
Directors	10.00	11%
Managers	27.00	31%
Senior Personnel	32.00	37%
Others	10.00	11%
Total	87.00	100%
Professional Designation of the Respondents Architects		
Architects	11.00	12%
Quantity Surveyors	31.00	35%

Engineers	28.00	31%
Builders	10.00	11%
Others	9.00	10%
Total	89.00	100%
Professional Membership of the Respondents		
MRICS	10.00	11%
MCIOB	32.00	36%
Engineer	15.00	17%
MQSI	16.00	18%
Non-Member	15.00	17%
Total	88.00	100%
Highest Academic Qualification of the Respondents		
HND	17.00	20%
PGD	8.00	9%
B.Sc/B.Tech	29.00	33%
M.SC./MBA	15.00	17%
M.PHIL/PHD	18.00	21%
Total	87.00	100%
Years of Work Experience of the Respondent		
0-10yrs	19.00	21%
10-20yrs	27.00	30%
20-30yrs	18.00	20%
30-40yr	14.00	16%
Above 40yrs	11.00	12%
Total	89.00	100%

Table 4: Profiles of the construction companies

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Years of Establishment of the company		
0-10 Years	3.00	4%
11-20 Years	19.00	23%
21-30 Years	24.00	29%
31-40Years	8.00	10%
Above 40 Years	30.00	36%
Total	84.00	100%
Class Of Company		
Class A	22.00	25%
Class B	26.00	30%
Class C	25.00	28%
Class D	9.00	10%
Class E	6.00	6%
Total	88.00	100%
What is the worth of your company's Total Assets in the		

last		
Financial year (in Qatar Riya)		
0-500million	6.00	7%
500-1billion	22.00	26%
1billion-10billion	26.00	32%
10billion-30billion	17.00	18%
Above 30billion	14.00	16%
Total	85.00	100%
Size of Work Force/Number of Employees in your company		
1-250	9.00	10%
250-500	5.00	6%
500-750	15.00	17%
750-1000	15.00	17%
Above 1000	43.00	49%
Total	87.00	100%
What is the Level of Ownership of the available equipment in your company?		
0%-10%	8.00	9%
11%-30%	12.00	14%
31%-50%	23.00	26%
51%-70%	20.00	23%
71% and above	25.00	28%
Total	88.00	100%

Table 5: Level of Awareness of Sharing Economy

Class of Companies	Very Low				Moderate				Very High				Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Class A	4.00	50	6	23.1	4.00	8.9	2	18.2	5.000	18.50	2.9		
Class B	2.00	20	5	19.2	2.00	4.4	1	9.1	1.000	3.700	2.45		
Class C	2.00	15	7	26.9	29.00	64.4	5	45.5	15.00	55.60	3.41		
Class D	0.00	10	3	11.5	2.00	4.4	1	9.1	4.000	14.80	3.6		
Class E	0.00	5	5	19.2	8.00	17.8	2	18.2	2.000	7.400	3.06		
Overall	8.00	6.8	26	22.2	45.00	38.5	11	9.4	27.00	23.10	3.2		

Table 6: Factors Influencing the Adoption of Sharing Economy in the Construction Industry (Driver)
CLASS OF COMPANIES

S/ N	Factors (Drivers)	Overall I	Class I		Class B		Class C		Class I		Class I		ANOVA		
		Mean	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	F	Sig
1	Income generation	3.85	1	0.60	1	0.75	1	0.58	1	0.67	2	0.53	1	0.482	0.749
2	Economic benefit	3.71	2	0.55	2	0.58	4	0.59	3	0.45	2	0.72	1	0.598	0.665
3	Collaboration	3.69	3	0.39	6	0.57	2	0.56	2	0.47	2	0.64	1	1.415	0.235
4	Growth opportunity	3.56	4	0.55	4	0.62	9	0.74	4	0.57	1	0.67	5	0.73	0.573
5	Easy access to product	3.35	5	0.67	4	0.52	5	0.64	9	0.77	20	1.27	18	3.958	0.005
6	Product variety	3.35	6	0.49	10	0.62	6	0.57	14	0.74	20	0.60	5	1.862	0.123
7	Quality	3.34	7	0.51	9	0.62	14	0.76	12	0.57	15	0.67	7	0.969	0.428
8	Social commerce	3.27	8	0.51	18	0.73	7	0.58	9	0.63	15	0.67	18	4.333	0.003
9	Advent of technology	3.25	9	0.62	8	0.55	17	0.64	17	0.69	18	0.67	12	0.366	0.832
10	Reputation	3.23	10	0.57	18	0.39	14	0.49	12	0.58	20	0.64	18	4.434	0.002
11	Value creation and appropriation	3.20	11	0.49	17	0.60	19	0.54	11	0.63	2	0.60	1	4.267	0.003
12	Effort expectancy	3.14	12	0.59	15	0.57	12	0.53	18	0.53	13	0.69	15	3.054	0.020
13	Insurance	3.14	13	0.51	18	0.49	19	0.72	15	0.62	18	1.07	12	2.927	0.025
14	Attitude	3.13	14	0.55	18	0.62	16	0.60	15	0.63	15	0.67	7	5.46	0.001
15	Enjoyment in sharing	3.06	15	0.51	20	0.49	16	0.63	20	0.63	6	0.78	7	4.122	0.004
16	Rules and regulation	3.02	16	0.51	18	0.54	13	0.71	14	0.85	14	0.80	12	2.981	0.023
17	Anti-consumption Movement	2.97	17	0.51	17	0.54	17	0.76	16	0.59	17	0.80	18	4.24	0.003
18	Low entry barrier	2.95	18	0.51	14	0.44	17	0.67	12	0.55	19	1.04	18	0.897	0.469
19	Reduce Ownership burden	2.89	19	0.39	12	0.47	20	0.49	20	0.45	13	0.79	7	4.498	0.002
20	Independence through ownership	2.85	20	0.51	12	0.62	19	0.57	16	0.59	14	0.72	20	1.266	0.288

M-Mean Score; Rk-Ranking; Sig-Significant

Table 7: Factors Influencing the Adoption of Sharing Economy in the Construction Industry (Barriers)

S/N	Factors (Drivers)	Overall		Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		Class E		ANOVA	
		Mean	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	M	Rk	F	Sig
1	Lack of trust	3.85	1	4.53	1	3.70	1	3.74	8	3.43	2	4.27	1	4.080	0.004
2	Process risk	3.61	2	3.76	4	3.40	9	3.87	1	3.19	12	4	5	2.845	0.028
3	Level of awareness	3.59	3	3.94	3	3.13	19	3.68	9	3.56	1	4.09	2	2.406	0.054
4	Pretige of ownership	3.50	4	2.82	16	3.43	8	3.84	2	3.43	2	3.91	6	3.999	0.005
5	Resources Scarcity	3.48	5	3.35	9	3.40	9	3.55	13	3.38	4	3.91	6	0.974	0.425
6	Accessibility	3.46	6	3.76	4	3.30	15	3.39	16	3.24	9	4.09	2	2.325	0.061
7	Necessity and change	3.45	7	3.18	11	3.37	11	3.68	9	3.38	4	3.55	12	1.488	0.211
8	Consistency	3.45	7	3.59	6	3.37	11	3.77	6	3.00	16	3.45	14	2.127	0.083
9	Having too much sense of belonging	3.44	9	2.76	17	3.50	6	3.81	4	3.33	8	3.45	14	3.072	0.019
10	Physical risk	3.44	9	3.41	7	3.63	2	3.84	2	2.81	20	3	20	6.729	0.000
11	Lack of knowledge	3.41	11	4.00	2	3.23	16	3.32	18	3.14	13	3.73	8	2.295	0.064
12	Perception that resources are scarce	3.41	11	2.41	19	3.60	4	3.81	4	3.24	9	3.64	9	11.185	0.000
13	Privacy risk	3.39	13	3.18	11	3.63	2	3.65	11	2.90	19	3.27	17	3.316	0.013
14	Rules and regulations	3.37	14	3.41	7	3.37	11	3.39	16	2.95	17	4.09	2	3.327	0.013
15	Network issues	3.35	15	3.29	10	3.13	19	3.61	13	3.38	4	3.27	17	1.354	0.255
16	Feeling of possession	3.34	16	2.41	19	3.50	6	3.77	6	3.06	13	3.55	12	6.978	0.000
17	Loss of enjoyment to other	3.30	17	3.12	14	3.17	18	3.45	15	3.24	9	3.64	9	1.177	0.325
18	Materialism	3.28	18	2.76	17	3.37	11	3.55	13	3.05	14	3.55	12	4.721	0.002
19	Undesired social interaction	3.25	19	3.18	11	3.33	14	3.32	18	3.05	14	3.36	16	0.570	0.685
20	Effort expectancy	3.23	20	3.00	15	3.20	17	3.13	20	3.38	4	3.64	9	1.164	0.331

M-Mean Score; Rk-Ranking; Sig-Significant