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Abstract
The aim of this study is to investigate how platform organisations use control systems to create trustworthy platforms. This is done by studying how platform organisations use management control systems for enabling users to assess the trustworthiness of actors on platforms. Platform is a new phenomenon where users, often strangers, interact with each other and the behaviour of the users constitutes a large part of the operations. Therefore, the management control system is crucial for the platform organisation for managing the behaviour of the users. Further, the interaction between strangers on the platform creates a need for the platform to enable users to assess the trustworthiness of other users in order for the users to be willing to participate on the platform. The focus of this study is, therefore, the use of management control systems for assessing trustworthiness. To study this, a qualitative research design has been adopted. Interviews with six companies within three different business models have been conducted. A Framework for Analysis consisting of four different types of management control systems and four different characteristics of trustworthiness is applied to analyse the empirical findings. Based on the findings and analysis, it can be concluded that management control systems are useful for enabling assessment of trustworthiness of users. Also, a pattern of the management control system used in each business model and how these patterns differ between the business models have been found. Moreover, the study has contributed to previous research by adopting the framework of Merchant & Van der Stede (2012) in a new context, the firm boundary-spanning context of platform organisations. Further, the findings have created a wider view of what is important for assessing trustworthiness of the users.
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1. Introduction

This study investigates the use of management control systems in platform organisations for enabling users to assess the trustworthiness of actors on platforms. The platforms will be studied by using three different business models. There are several different definitions and explanations of what a platform organisation is. Douglas and Isherwood (1979) describe platform organisations as “Platforms that organize economic activity of third parties without directly controlling them” (as cited in Kornberger, Pflueger & Mouritsen, 2017, p.3). Benkler (2002) has a similar approach and explains a platform organisation as producers and sellers that interact with each other digitally through a third party. Additionally, Kornberger et al. (2017) describe platform organisations as a disruptive organisational phenomenon. A phenomenon where the users, instead of the organisation, are the ones creating the content, performing a service or owning the assets.

For these platform organisations it is not the employees that directly provide the customers with the service or product through the platform. The organisations provide a platform where two different categories of users in a peer-to-peer relation operate. Firstly, the category of users that for instance, sell products or perform services, are referred to as providers. The other category of users is referred to as customers, and they are the ones buying the products or services. In other words, the users constitute a large part of the operations in contrast to a more traditional organisation where the activities of the employees constitute the majority of the operations. These platforms are a common core for the growing and current area of collaborative consumption (Botsman, 2017a).

This new way of doing business, where the operations span outside the organisation's boundaries, creates new situations and recent research has identified new ways to handle this new context (Kornberger, 2017; Jeacle & Carter, 2011). The users on the platform are strangers and can only judge the trustworthiness of the other user based on what is visible on the platform, possibly resulting in a lack of trust (Botsman, 2017b). The platforms are distinguished from earlier sharing initiatives since the sharing happens between strangers where there is no knowledge from previous interaction with the other party (Schor & Fitzmanrice, 2015). Researchers have described trust as one party expecting another to be trustworthy (Hardin, 1993), which emphasises the importance of trustworthiness in the case of trust issues. Further, it has been commonly agreed that trustworthiness is an important factor to create willingness for providers and consumers to participate on the platform. (Botsman, 2017b; Cheshire, 2011; Grabner-Kräuter, & Kaluscha, 2003). Therefore, it is of high importance to establish trustworthiness between the actors on the platform (Kornberger et al., 2017; Schor & Fitzmanrice, 2015) According to Mouritsen & Thrane (2006), trustworthiness can be created in two ways, socially when trusting an individual and technically by management controls.
Douglas and Isherwood (1979) highlight that platform organisations need to establish an evaluative management control system in order to control the actions of third parties. The third party is not within the boundary of the firm, which makes it more difficult to control their actions. Therefore, the management control system is a crucial part for enabling the actors to be perceived as trustworthy (Kornberger et al., 2017). In addition, for platform organisations the users on the platform constitute such a big part of the operations instead of the employees as in a more traditional company. It could be assumed that other control systems would be needed in such a firm boundary-spanning context (Kornberger et al., 2017).

There are several reasons to why it would be relevant to study the management control in relation to trustworthiness in the context of different business models. For instance, de Rivera, Gordo, Cassidy and Apesteguía (2017) have found that the architecture of the platforms varies between different business models. This shows that interaction on the platforms is monitored differently based on the context. Therefore, it could be argued that it is of relevance to study how the management control systems are used within different business models.

Moreover, researchers argue that the context where the risk is taken is important for the creation of trust and especially in the case where a social distant relationship exists (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Blomqvist, 1997; McKnight & Chervany, 2001). The researchers explain that, the stake involved or the perceived level of risk are factors that affect the consequence of trusting someone. Similarly, Grabner-Kräuter, & Kaluscha (2003) state that different types of trust are needed dependent on various risk and uncertainties. It could be argued that the stake involved or the perceived level of risk is different when lending your car to a stranger or letting a stranger take care of your child compared to when selling a product to another person. This difference in risk would possibly create a need for different control mechanisms in order to create trustworthiness. Further, Botsman (2017b) explains that there are different aspects that contribute to trustworthiness and the level of importance for these aspects varies in different contexts. This implies that there will be a need to show different characteristics of the counterpart in different context, which result in a need for different control mechanisms.

In summary, trustworthiness within the area of platform organisations has been found important. However, there are still many aspects not covered by research both within and between organisations and for newer forms of organisations (Van der Meer-Kooistra & Scapens 2008). Platforms is one of these new forms of organisations and is therefore, an area relevant to explore. Moreover, the use of management control in order to create trustworthiness has mostly been studied in relation to evaluative controls. However, it has been stated that new types of controls are needed in this new context (Kornberger et al., 2017). Moreover, platforms are a relatively unexplored area and the use of management control systems for enabling assessment of trustworthiness has not been explored in the context of platforms.
1.1 Purpose & Research Question

The purpose of this study is to create an understanding of how platform organisations use control systems to create trustworthy platforms.

Research Question:
- How are management control systems used in different business models for enabling users to assess the trustworthiness of actors on platforms?

1.2 Structure of the paper

The first chapter, the Introduction, introduces the topic and discusses the relevant issues as well as presenting the Purpose and Research Question. In chapter two, Literature Review and Framework for Analysis, previous research within the area of platform organisations will be covered. Moreover, a Framework for Analysis will be developed based on extant research on management control systems and characteristics of trustworthiness. Chapter 3, the Method, will present the research design and methodology. Chapter 4, Empirical study and Analysis, will introduce the empirical findings for each company followed by an analysis for each business model. In chapter 5, Cross-business Model Analysis, a comparison between the different business models will be conducted and discussed. Chapter 6, Conclusion, will present the conclusions that can be drawn based on the research and the contribution to existing research and practice. Lastly, limitations and suggestions for future research will be discussed.
2. Literature Review and Framework for Analysis

In the following an overview of previous research within the area of platforms and trustworthiness will be presented to create an initial knowledge about the area. Further, management control systems will be discussed with a focus on various types of management control systems and potential conditions that affect the use of management control systems. Thereafter, the concepts trust and trustworthiness will be discussed and compared followed by a presentation of previously found characteristics of an individual’s trustworthiness. Lastly, the Framework for Analysis used for this study will be presented.

2.1 Platform organisations

Botsman and Rogers (2010) have divided platforms into the major business models based on what they offer. These have previously been widely referred to (de Rivera et al., 2017). The division by Botsman and Rogers (2010) consists of three different business models. One of the business models includes platforms where the provider sells a product to the customer and is called Redistribution Markets. Secondly, there are platforms where a provider performing a service for the customer constitutes the business model called Collaborative Lifestyles. Finally, the third business model consists of platforms where the provider rents an asset to the customer and this is referred to as Product Service System.

There are several different reasons for individuals to engage in these platforms. For instance, Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) and Tussyadiah (2015) have found motives for participating in the sharing economy platforms, which constitutes one part of the phenomenon of platform organisations. One motive both studies found is the economic incentive. The platforms enable new opportunities for the provider to earn money at the same time as creating value for the customer by reducing the costs of middlemen. The second motive Schor and Fitzmaurice (2015) found is reduced ecological impact. Although, Schor and Fitzmaurice motivates that not all platforms within the phenomenon reduces the ecological impact. The third motive found is to increase social connection. To create new contacts is another motive although it has been found that users are often disappointed about this point after joining the platform (Dubois, Schor & Carfagna, 2014). Further, other motives found is the interest of new concepts or being ideological committed (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015). However, even though these motives exist there is a need of trustworthiness in order for users to be willing to participate on the platform (Botsman, 2017b; Cheshire, 2011).

During previous years management control has been focused on accounting and how it controls managers and therefore, the development of different management control mechanisms has been influenced in this direction (Otley, 1994). Based on the view that organisations are less hierarchical today Otley (1994) suggests that the management control system should create mutual accountability between the actors
instead of having a hierarchical approach. Further, the management control system will then enable the organisation to handle a larger variety of activities and to be more flexible (Otley, 1994). Additionally, Van der Meer-Kooistra and Scapens (2008) emphasize the new types of organisations with a less hierarchical organisation where coordination and collaboration are a focus. Thus, new types of management controls are therefore needed. Trust has historically been established through institutions (Hardin, 1993; Botsman, 2017b). However, a shift towards distributed trust is happening, where trust is built and managed on a decentralized basis (Botsman, 2017b). Platforms create a new trust issue since mutual trust between peers is needed and the trust structure is more complex than in a B2C platform (Hawlitschek, Teubner & Weinhardt, 2016; Grabner-Kräuter, & Kaluscha, 2003). Botsman (2017b) explains that the increased distributed trust creates the need of new signals of trustworthiness. Both signals such as reviews but also institutional signals such as licenses can be of importance.

There have been several previous studies that have focused on trust and trustworthiness online (Kornberger et al., 2017; Stone, Nikitkov and Miller, 2014; Jeacle & Carter, 2011, Bolton & Ockenfels, 2009; Barrera & Buskens, 2009; Bhattacherjee, 2002)). For instance, Bhattacherjee (2002) found that for ecommerce the process of the transaction, the customer service that comes with an order and the management of private information are aspects of importance for creating trustworthiness. Moreover, Kornberger et al. (2017) explain that platform organisations is a new type of organisation and the evaluative infrastructure, consisting of protocol, relationality and an explorative rather than exposing approach is of relevance. Further, feedback loops, ratings and comments, in these firms are useful to build an evaluative infrastructure and to create trustworthiness of the users. Thereby, enabling decentralized control, while the power is still centralized (Kornberger et al., 2017). Further, Mouritsen and Thrane (2006) conclude that trustworthiness is not only created socially when trusting an individual but can also be created technically by management controls.

Moreover, de Rivera et al. (2017) have conducted a study focusing on the architecture of the platform and how this affects the social interaction between users. One of the dimensions of the architecture of the platform included in the study is trust and virtual reputation and the researchers found different functions that generate trust. These are profile information, user identification system and the rating system. Further, code of conduct and the ability for the platform to act in case of fraud is a way to create security on the platform. What de Rivera et al. (2017) could identify was a typology consisting of three different groups; network oriented, transaction oriented and community oriented. These groups represent different architectures of platforms. Further, Rivera et al., (2017) found that these types of architectures are represented to a varied extent within different business models. The transaction-oriented platforms were mostly focused on an efficient transaction and there were not much focus on social values and the relationship between individuals or in the network. The type of
platform represented here to a large extent was the Redistribution Market. Further, what distinguishes network-oriented platforms is that they enable a relationship between individuals while the community-oriented platforms rather focus on building a community and have a local focus. The network oriented platforms are mostly represented by the platform within the business model Collaborative Lifestyles while Access Instead of Property, a business model where one user rents its asset to another, is the most well represented within the community oriented platforms. (de Rivera et al., 2017)

Further, Stone, Nikitkov and Miller (2014) have studied the management control system of eBay, and its role to carry out their strategy. The control system has thereafter been adopted by other organisations facing similar challenges. Through the management control system eBay managed to create trustworthiness of the suppliers and customers by letting them evaluate each other (Stone et al., 2014). Another study on Ebay has been conducted, concluding on two explanations to the market imperfection (Bolton & Ockenfels, 2009). Firstly, some sellers do not understand the consequences of not shipping the product. It will affect their future opportunities of sales due to the rating and review system. Secondly, buyers avoid buying from sellers with a bad reputation since they are not perceived as trustworthy. Consequently, the future buyers will lack updated information about how the seller will behave today. Further, Barrera and Buskens (2009) have found that repeated interactions and the knowledge that other people have trusted the trustee increase the trustworthiness. Of high importance for the management control system of eBay was what Simons (1995) calls Diagnostic Control System which is the formal way the organisation can manage outcomes and deviations from what was expected. In the case of eBay, feedback system was used which enabled them to keep track of outcomes and monitor deviations (Stone et al., 2014) This is similar to the findings of Jeacle and Carter (2011) who mentions the reviews by other parties instead of evaluation by the organisation itself and that the platform acts as a reflexive tool. In addition, it has been argued that the trust toward another party can be increased by credible information from third parties about the actor (Grabner-Kräuter & Kaluschka, 2003). Another relevant aspect stated by Jeacle and Carter (2011) is that the ranking tool is based on calculations, which creates trustworthiness for the actors involved. These control mechanisms mentioned are an exemplification of how the control system can handle a firm boundary-spanning situation, which has been highlighted as a crucial factor and potential problem in previous studies (Stone et al. 2014; Otley, 1994).

2.2 Management Control Systems

Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) have defined management control systems as control mechanisms used to control the behaviour of employees. In addition, management control has been described as processes and mechanisms that are used in order to strive for objectives by shaping the actions of individuals and groups
(Bedford & Malmi, 2015; Langfield-Smith, 2006). This study will see management control systems as control mechanisms used to control the behaviour of individuals, in other words, not necessarily employees.

There are some well-known frameworks and typologies within the area of management control that in essence have divided the different types of management control in a similar way (Beusch, 2014; Langfield-Smith; 1997). Ouchi (1979) refers to output, behaviour and social controls while Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) divides the controls into result, action, people and cultural control. Furthermore, Baliga and Jaeger (1984) mention pure bureaucratic and formalized controls that consist of either measuring performance in order to manage output or by instructions in order to control behaviour. Moreover, they also mention that there are pure cultural controls in order to manage behaviour by shared values and managing output by norms of performance. In addition, Simons (1995) has developed a framework consisting of diagnostic control systems, boundary system, belief system and interactive control systems.

Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) have divided the management control systems into four different categories of control mechanisms. These are result control, action control, personnel control and cultural control. The controls are used for managing and monitoring the behaviour of the employees. Result control implies measuring result, performance and rewarding employees based on the result. This control category could be divided into four different steps. Firstly, deciding on the dimensions in focus. Further, the performance should be measured and targets to aim for should be established. Lastly, the employees should be rewarded for reaching the targets. This part of the management control system is common in a decentralised organisation. (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2012). Result control is similar to what Ouchi (1979) describes as output control. Ouchi (1979) explains that this form of control is useful when the best possible way to achieve the goals is not known. However, in order to constitute a well-functioning form of control the outcome of the performance should be possible to measure properly.

The second category of management control system is action control, it implies restricting the employees’ autonomous behaviour and discretion. There are four different forms of action control. Firstly, there are behaviour constraints, which consists of controls that make it difficult or impossible for the employees to perform specific actions. There can be physical constraints such as passwords on the computer or lock on a door. Additionally, there can be administrative constraints, which imply preventing an employee to do a specific task such as taking specific decisions or to attest expenditures. Moreover, an action control makes it impossible for one individual to perform a task independently of someone else. Merchant and Van der Stede refer to this as separations of duties. In addition, to behavioural constraints there are also pre-action reviews, which means that the plans of action are reviewed and approved by someone. (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2012).
Another form of action control is action accountability where the control system makes the employees accountable for their actions, which can be achieved by administrative modes, professional judgement or direct supervision and monitoring. Administrative modes can be control tools such as working rules, processes, policies or code of conduct. This form of control could be compared to what Ouchi (1979) call behavioural control, which he describes as rules and specification of each step. Professional judgement means that from some professions such as doctors it can be expected that they will have some kind of perception of what is a reasonable action and acts in line with it. Direct supervision and monitoring mean that the actions of the employees are continuously or on regular basis checked by a supervisor. Further, the last form of action control is redundancy, which means that the task is given to more employees than what is normally necessary in order to make sure that the task will be performed well. (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2012) These ways of controlling the actions is suitable in the case where the necessary and most suitable actions are known in advance (Ouchi, 1979).

Moreover, the third category of a management control system is personnel control, which aims to get employees to motivate and control themselves. This can be achieved for instance by a selection or placement process, such as interviews, where experience, education and skills are taken into account. Another part of personnel control is training which can be either more formal education or more informal training such as mentoring where the employee gets to take part in previous experience of the mentor. This is in line with the social control that is described by Ouchi (1979) as control that is performed through selection and training. The last part of personnel control is what Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) call job design and provision of necessary resources. Meaning that the tasks should be adjusted to the employee resulting in a high probability of succeeding to perform the tasks. Moreover, the employee should be given the resources needed in order to succeed. (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2012). Social and personnel control is suitable in the case where it is hard to measure performance or establish predetermined actions. (Ouchi, 1979).

Lastly, the fourth category of the management control system that is used in order to monitor behaviour is cultural control. The aim for cultural control is to achieve mutual monitoring and pressure on individuals that does not act in line with norms and values. Shared values, traditions, norms and attitudes on how to behave are important aspects for this control category. Code of conduct can be useful in order to know what is expected even without specific rules. Moreover, supporting the interaction among individuals does also impact the culture. Group rewards is also a tool that contributes to cultural control. (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2012) Further, the cultural control system is built from structures such as consensual decision-making, career paths and guarantees for long-term employment (Baliga & Jaeger, 1984)
Further, Ouchi (1979) and Baliga and Jaeger (1984) explains that there are no organisations where there is only one form of control present. Instead there is a mix of controls and the configuration of the control system depends on the informational and social characteristics (Ouchi, 1979). For instance, the need of information is high to be able to measure and put a reasonable target. The same applies for the behavioural control where information is needed in order to assess the most suitable actions. However, for social control, there is not the same information needed in order to use this kind of control. The social requirements needed refer to the extent to which a set of agreements between people needs to be established in order to adopt a specific form control. For instance, in order for employees to follow action controls there is a need of existing legitimate authority. However, in order for social controls to be adopted, there is a need of shared values and norms. In this way the established control system is dependent on these context (Ouchi, 1979).

Further, Baliga & Jaeger (1984) discusses the turnover of the individuals within the organisation and how it affects the combinations of controls used for managing the organisation. More precisely, a low turnover more easily enables creation of a culture and the possibility to delegate responsibility. When investigating the opposite, a high turnover of individuals creates a need for action and result control to compensate the difficulty to create a culture (Baliga & Jaeger, 1984). In organisations where there is a large quantity of relatively simple tasks without involving more complex decision making standardisations of processes is suitable (Baliga & Jaeger, 1984). In contrast, in organisations dealing with highly complex tasks training of individuals within the organisation is done and a standardisation of skills instead of activities is established (Baliga & Jaeger, 1984). Thus, creating a more decentralized environment.

The framework of Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) has been adopted by Vélez, Sánchez and Álvarez-Dardet (2008) that have studied how management control systems build trust in an inter-organisational relationship. The authors focus on how action-, result-, personnel- and cultural control generate goodwill- and competence trust. This is studied in an inter-organisational relationship between a manufacturing organisation and its distribution channel. In this context the collaboration has spanned over several years and trust has already been established. What can be concluded from the study is that the management control system can generate trust between the actors by aligning the behaviour of the actors with the objectives of the inter-organisational relationship.

2.3 Trust and trustworthiness

The two terms trust and trustworthiness are similar and often used synonymously, however, there is an important difference (O’Neill, 2013; Botsman, 2017b; Cheshire et al., 2010). Trust has been described in various ways, for instance, Mayer et al. (1995) describes it as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action
important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party”. This definition has been adopted by several researchers (Kim & Prabhakar, 2004; Gill, Boies, Finegan, & McNally, 2005; Grabner-Kräuter, & Kaluscha, 2003, Vélez et al, 2008). To make trust relevant both risk and uncertainty have to be evident (Cheshire, Antin, Cook, & Churchill, E, 2010; Cheshire, 2011; Mayer et al., 1995). The aspects of risk and uncertainty are of relevance for trustworthiness as well (Cook, Snijders, Buskens, & Cheshire, 2009) However, Hardin (2002) describes the difference between the two terms by explaining that trustworthiness is a moral characteristic of the trustee (the party to be trusted) while trust is the belief the trustor (the trusting party) has in the trustee to a specific task. Trust has been described as someone expecting another to be trustworthy while some has explained it as incentives of the trustee to be trustworthy that creates trust (Hardin, 1993). Hardin (1993) argues that it is often the trustworthiness that is the problematic part instead of the trust itself. This is in line with Botsman (2017b) who highlights that trustworthiness is what matters.

Trusting someone creates an opportunity of good outcomes at the same time as there is also a risk of loss and these two can never be separated (Hardin, 1993). Botsman (2017b) also highlights that people in general feel more about the loss than the gain, which result in a preference of status quo. In turn, trustworthiness creates opportunities in the same way as lack of trust results in loss of a possible transaction. In order for the social interactions between the users to occur, risk and uncertainty cannot be too high, although if that is the situation, institutional or organisational mechanism are needed (Cook et al., 2009). This aspect is relevant for platforms organisations since trustworthiness is the crucial factor for a transaction to take place. If there is no trustworthiness the provider and the customer loses the opportunity to take advantage of each other’s needs (Hardin, 1993).

Cheshire (2011) argues that it is not possible to create relational trust if users online only interact once. In order for the platform to work properly the customers and providers needs to find each other and the platform trustworthy (Botsman, 2017b, Cheshire, 2011). Chen, Zhang and Xu (2009) refer to this as mutual trust among members and members trust in the platform organisation. It has been found that mutual trust among members can enhance the trust to the platform (Chen et al., 2009), which shows the importance of mutual trust between the users.

The mutual trust is dependent on past transactions and experiences. In addition, similar characteristics of two individuals could contribute to trust (Zucker, 1986). However, it can be hard to estimate another actor’s characteristics online, which makes evaluations by others an important factor (Xiong & Liu, 2004; McKnight & Chervany, 2001) Hardin (1993) argues that when judging the trustworthiness of someone you do not share any experience with, your judgement is based on a general view which is based on experiences with other people. Moreover, the platform organisation’s actions and management of the platform play an important role in the
process of establishing mutual trust. The mutual trust is a basis for continuous transactions over time. However, if the trust is not mutual, the users on the platform might only be willing to take the role of one actor, either provider or customer but not both. (Chen et al., 2009)

2.3.1 Characteristics of trustworthiness

Mayer et al. (1995) has created a model of trustworthiness within an organisational context that takes two individuals’ perspectives into consideration, the perspective of the trustee and the trustor. In contrast to previous research that has only focused on trust from actor A to actor B the model of Mayer et al. (1995) also includes trust from actor B to actor A. In other words, they have a unidirectional perspective instead of a one-way perspective. Mayer et al. (1995) have based on previous research arrived at three characteristics that contributes to a perceived trustworthiness of a trustee. In addition, Botsman (2017b) has concluded on three similar but not identical characteristics of trustworthiness. These characteristics strengthen the perceived trustworthiness of a trustee and highlights what is important for building trust (Davis, Ted x, 2014). The importance of different characteristics of the trustee in order to create trust has previously been agreed on by various researchers (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953; Ring and Van de Ven, 1992). According to Hardin (1996), Luhmann highlights that establishing trustworthiness is an effective mean in order to create trust. Therefore, it could be argued that the model of Mayer et al. (1995) is applicable for discussing creation of trust between parties.

The three characteristics presented by Mayer et al. (1995) are ability, benevolence, and integrity. The comparable traits of trustworthiness that Botsman (2017b) has contributed with are competence, reliability and honesty. Firstly, ability is what makes it possible for an individual to be trustworthy in a specific setting by possessing skills, competencies and characteristics that are needed within that area. (Mayer et al., 1995). Similarly, the trait competence is described as the experience, skills and capabilities of the trustee, which is in line with the term ability (Botsman, 2017b; Mayer et al., 1995). The ability can be proven in online firms by presenting different figures, for instance, number of users or sales (Bhattacherjee, 2002).

The authors are emphasizing, that the ability and competence are setting specific. The trustee is perceived as trustworthy in that specific area and it does not mean that the trustee can accomplish tasks outside that area (Mayer et al, 1995; Botsman, 2017b). Therefore, it can be concluded that trustworthiness of a person to perform a specific task does not automatically mean that the trustor will find the trustee trustworthy in other settings (Zand, 1972).

Secondly, Botsman (2017b) use the term honesty to describe the second trait of trustworthiness. Honesty consist of both integrity and intention, which refers to if the trustee’s intentions are in conformity with the intentions of the trustor and the benefit
for the trustee to fulfil or not fulfil its duties (Botsman, 2017b). Botsman (2017a) enhances that intention is according to her the most important aspect of trustworthiness. Mayer et al. (1995) describe integrity as the trustors reliance on the trustee to comply with principles that are agreed upon and consistency in past actions. Mayer et al (1995), refers to McFall (1987), who discusses why it is meaningful that both the trustor finds the principles acceptable and that the trustee is acting in line with the principles in order for integrity to exists. For instance, there has to be a consistency of past behaviour, reliable information about the trustee, a belief that the trustee has a willingness to do right, combined with if the trustee acts in line with what is agreed upon. If the trustee adheres to this it would result in personal integrity. However, integrity does still not exist if the trustor does not find the principles as acceptable. In other words, it is of importance to take both these aspects into account. (McFall, 1987)

Thirdly, Botsman (2017b) include reliability as one of the three traits. This trait is described in a similar way to how McFall (1987) describe integrity. Reliability implies consistency in past behaviour and if the trustee will accomplish its tasks. In many situations it refers to the trustee being timely (Botsman, 2017a). If someone is reliable it means that you can depend on that person (Botsman, 2017b). In other words, it is partly similar to how integrity is described by McFall (1987) since he explains it as consistency of past behaviour and acting in line with what is agreed upon. However, McFall’s integrity is a wider term that includes for instance the willingness to do right, which is more similar to intention.

Lastly, benevolence is according to Mayer et al. (1995) to create value for someone else and the incentive to act in favour of the trustor is beyond the interest of the trustee. Attachment between the trustee and the trustor is one condition for benevolence. This creates willingness for the trustee to act in favour of the trustor without a selfish ground for the trustee or an extrinsic reward. (Mayer et al, 1995) Benevolence is not one of the three traits in Botsman’s (2017b) book “Who can you trust”, although at other occasions she has mentioned this aspect as well and explained it as how much the trustee cares. In addition, benevolence has been commonly agreed on by other authors (Mayer et al., 1995)

2.4 Framework for Analysis

The Framework for Analysis for this study includes both aspects of trustworthiness and management control systems, see Figure 1. As previously mentioned the trustworthiness is often what matters in the case of trust issues (Botsman, 2017b; Hardin, 1993), which is an important aspect in order for the users to be willing to use the platform (Botsman, 2017b; Cheshire, 2011). In addition, Cheshire (2011) argues that it is not possible to create relational trust if users online only interact once, which contributes to the importance for enabling assessment of trustworthiness of the other actor. This is of interest for platform organisations since the provider contributes to
such a big part of the organisations operations and a necessary condition is the willingness of the customer to be vulnerable to the provider. Moreover, on many platforms there is no continuous interaction between providers and customers, instead there is only a one-time interaction between the individuals. This creates the importance of a trustworthy provider and the possibility to assess the trustworthiness of the counterpart. Hereby, the trustworthiness is a relevant factor in this study.”

The trustworthiness part of the Framework for Analysis contains four aspects which is a combination of the models by Mayer et. al (1995) and Botsman (2017b). The model for trustworthiness of Mayer et al. (1995) has been widely adopted. Further, the aspects by Botsman (2017b) could be argued to be relevant as well since she has focused a lot on platforms during her studies, which makes the factors applicable for the context in question. The four aspects included in the Framework for Analysis are; competence, honesty, reliability and benevolence. Botsman (2017 b) explains that there is both a “how” and “why” dimension of trustworthiness. The “how-aspect” is represented by ability and reliability while the “why-aspect” is represented by honesty and benevolence in the Framework for Analysis (Botsman, 2017b). The two terms ability and competence described by Mayer et al., (1995) and Botsman (2017b) includes the same aspects. However, for this study the term competence is used. Further, benevolence is used in the Framework for Analysis, a term that is commonly agreed on (Mayer et al., 1995; Botsman, 2017a).

Further, honesty and reliability as described by Botsman (2017b) are used. These terms are similar to the term integrity used by Mayer et al., (1995) which includes partly both these aspects. Mayer et al. (1995) explains integrity as to adhere to a set of principles, which is included in the term honesty for this study. However, he also refers to Mcfall (1987) that also includes to act in line with the principles. This part of integrity is included in the term reliability for this study. It can be explained in the way that reliability represents “how” and honesty represents “why”.

Additionally, the framework representing the management control aspect are based on the different categories for a management control system identified by Merchant and Van der Stede (2012). In other words, action control, result control, personnel control and cultural control. Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) describe these controls as ways to monitor the behaviour of the employees. Although, the control aspect in this study is not focused on employees it could still be argued to be a relevant framework in this context. Today companies get more and more disintegrated and the accounting is found to go beyond the organisations boundaries (Kornberger et al, 2017). According to Otley (1994) accounting research has moved from an earlier focus on control mechanisms towards managers to now meeting the demand of a less hierarchical organisation. Kornberger et al (2017), motivates that platform organisation have a heterarchical organisational structure and they find new controls to be of importance that span outside the traditional firm boundaries. Therefore, a control system spanning past employees is required.
In summary, the Framework for Analysis consists of four aspects of control, action, result, personnel and cultural. Additionally, the trustworthiness consists of four different characteristics, competence, honesty, reliability and benevolence. It can be argued that it is of relevance to study these aspects separately in relation to each other since previous research has found that some aspects of control affect the level of trust to a different extent (Vélez et al, 2008). Therefore, it is of relevance to see if and in what way each dimension of control contributes to trustworthiness. All identified controls that enable assessment of trustworthiness will be placed in the box that represent the kind of management control system and the characteristic of trustworthiness it belongs to. Hereby, it is also possible to place a control tool in more than one box if it can form different kinds of management control systems and enable assessment of different characteristics of trustworthiness.

*Figure 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Model</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Framework for Analysis*
3. Method

3.1 Research approach

Since this study explores the use of management control systems in the new phenomenon platform organisations for enabling users to assess the trustworthiness of actors on platforms an abductive approach was chosen. Theory and empirical observations were gathered and processed simultaneously to create an understanding of the topic (Alvehus, 2013). Further, this logic is suitable when the studied topic is a relatively new and unexplored area, which management control applied on platform organisations and its users is (Kornberger et al, 2017). Firstly, the area was studied by reading previous research. However, a first round of interviews was conducted early in the process to create an understanding of the phenomenon, business models and potential issues. Also, an interview was conducted with Sunfleet, a carpool where the cars are owned by the entity to explore the phenomenon of collaborative consumption and platforms. Although, this interview has not been included in the result of the study since the operations are not peer-to-peer. Based on this information the research question was developed and the theoretical framework was adjusted. Thereafter, the second round of interviews was conducted followed by the processing of data and analysis.

To achieve depth and detail to the study, the researchers chose to take a qualitative approach. A qualitative approach is useful in order to explore a research area that is relatively unexplored (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2008). The empirical evidence was gathered through interviews. The benefit of conducting a study based on interviews is that it is an appropriate tool in order to gain a deeper understanding of the topic (Collis & Hussey, 2013). This methodology is useful in order to be able to map out the control system, which could be hard to find from external sources. Among other, interviews can be an appropriate method when the studied topic is highly confidential or sensitive (Collis & Hussey, 2013). However, this was not perceived as an obstacle or as something affecting the results of this study. The respondents were not reluctant to answer any of the questions.

Case studies enable the researcher to gather a wide range of information (Collis & Hussey, 2013). Conducting case studies could be a beneficial method to apply to the area of platform organisations, trust and management control since the management control system is designed internally. It can therefore, be argued that it is hard to capture without internal access to the information. Since this case study is based on several organisations, it increases the generalizability of the study.
3.2 Selection of case companies

In an early phase of the study the researchers studied the phenomenon of platform organisations, made lists and mapped out the different organisations within the area. Resulting in the establishment of a definition of what types of companies that were of interest for this study in accordance with the problem and thereby, it was possible to map out potential organisations relevant for this case study. The platform organisations of interest for this study are the ones that provide a platform where two different kind of users participate. One of the users, called provider, acts as sellers of product, owns the asset that is rented or provides the service. The other user, called customer, buys the product, rents the asset or buys the service from the provider. The platforms of relevance for this study are to a large extent within the area of collaborative consumption. Therefore, the division of platforms into three major business models within collaborative consumption by Botsman and Rogers’ (2010) is used. Botsman and Rogers (2010) explains that there are different characteristics of trustworthiness that are important for the three different business models, which makes this division relevant for this study.

Later on, after establishing the three business models, three different companies were chosen based on the fact that there were one company for each business model. Thereafter, empirical data from the first round of interviews were used in order to discuss the relevance of these categorizations. Based on this it was concluded that the business models were of relevance. From the categorisation of companies, three additional organisations belonging to the three different categories were chosen. In other words, two organisations in each category in total were chosen.

3.3 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with open-end questions were conducted, letting the respondent speak more freely about predetermined topics (Horton, Macve and Struyven, 2004; Bryman & Bell, 2015). In this way, the respondent was enabled to speak freely on the topics chosen by the researchers. This approach increases the reliability of the study in the way that the research is not biased or controlled by the researchers (Patel & Davidson, 2011). However, for the second round of interviews both open-end and closed questions were asked. The first interviews with each company were prepared with the same interview guide, with broad themes. General questions where sent out to respondents if they requested so, for the respondent to understand the area of interest and enable them to be well prepared. However, the interview guide that the researchers used during the interviews did also contain sub questions to make sure that all aspect where covered. However, these questions were not explicitly asked. Instead more open question that lead the respondent to the wanted area without affecting the answer where asked, see Appendix 1. Since the theory at that point was not totally set the first round of interviews had a broad view and the respondents had a substantial influence on the areas covered.
Three of the first interviews during the first round were conducted at each company's office and the other three interviews were conducted through a predetermined telephone call. The second round of interviews was conducted through telephone. The respondents for the interviews were chosen based on the fact that they had the contact with the users and knowledge about how the platform was constructed. The title of the respondents is described in Table 1.

After the first round of interviews the empirical data gathered was discussed in relation to the theory and thereby, the focus of the study was narrowed down and theory was adjusted. Thereafter, the second round of interviews was performed. For the second round of interviews a new interview guide with more detailed questions and questions relevant for the chosen area of focus were asked, see Appendix 2. However, for one of the platforms only one interview was conducted. This interview was conducted late in the process and therefore, it was possible to combine the two original interview guides into one to secure that all relevant aspects were covered during the interview. This interview started in the same broad sense and ended with more precise questions.
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution Markets</td>
<td>Tradera</td>
<td>2018-02-08</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>Press contact</td>
<td>71 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tradera</td>
<td>2018-04-10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Press contact</td>
<td>25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johansson &amp; Winge</td>
<td>2018-05-02</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>38 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Lifestyles</td>
<td>Yepstr</td>
<td>2018-02-09</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>Community manager</td>
<td>37 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yepstr</td>
<td>2018-03-04</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Community manager</td>
<td>22 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taskrunner</td>
<td>2018-02-13</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Community manager</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taskrunner</td>
<td>2018-04-05</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Community manager</td>
<td>35 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SnappCar</td>
<td>2018-02-09</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>Customer support</td>
<td>49 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SnappCar</td>
<td>2018-04-05</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Country manager</td>
<td>38 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Service System</td>
<td>Workaround</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One of the founders</td>
<td>32 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workaround</td>
<td>2018-04-17</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>One of the founders</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conducted interviews*

### 3.4 Complementary gathering of data

To get a deeper understanding and to make sure all aspects were included a netnographic method was used continuously as a complement to the interviews. Netnographic method arising from the term ethnographic implies studying the social interactions online (Kozinets, Dolbec & Earley, 2014). Further, a strength to this approach is that the netnographic approach results in a neutral view not biased by the respondents. (Kozinets et al., 2014). The sites were studied by looking at the interaction between users on the sites, where the user can assess the trustworthiness of other users. The researchers have studied the sites both before the first and the second round of interviews and additionally, after all interviews had been conducted. By combining interviews with and the netnographic approach it is possible to assess whether the respondents give a fair view of the platform.

Towards the end of the study the researchers participated in a seminar about the “Sharing Revolution” by The Swedish Chamber of Commerce. The seminar gave more insights and knowledge about the area. Further, the seminar was attended in order to secure that relevant aspects of the phenomenon where covered.
3.5 Analysis

All interviews were transcribed to capture all relevant information and to ensure that the right information was caught and used in the analysis. Further, the interviews were coded firstly based on the management control categories and this was placed into a table dividing the extracted information into the management control categories for each company. Thereafter, the interviews were coded based on the trustworthiness aspects and applied in a table dividing the information in different characteristics of trustworthiness for each organisation. The information in these two tables were thereafter applied into the Framework for Analysis for each company, in other words, the two original tables were mixed into one. One identified function on the platform is sometimes useful in order to assess different characteristics of trustworthiness or can constitute different kinds of management control systems. Therefore, one function can appear in various boxes in the Framework for Analysis. Thereafter, similarities between the companies within the same business model were found and thereby, the relevance of the business models were confirmed. Consequently, the Framework for Analysis for the companies within the same business model were merged and this groundwork was used as a basis for writing the Analysis.

This previously described analysis constitutes the first order analysis where the empirical findings in each business model was analysed based on the Framework for Analysis. In this way the different kinds of controls used in the different business models were identified in relation to the characteristics of trustworthiness.

Thereafter, the second order analysis was conducted. Hereby, a comparison between the business models was done based on the findings in the first order analysis. The tables developed by applying the Framework for Analysis enabled the researchers to identify similarities and differences between the business models. Further, after similarities and differences were identified, these aspects were analysed in relation to previous research.
3.6 Validity and Reliability

One aspect that can affect the reliability is the selection of respondents. The chosen respondents were the ones with knowledge about the processes on the platform and the interaction between users. In other words, the titles of the respondents were not the main criteria for choosing respondents. However, there have only been between one and two respondents for each platform. If more respondents from each platform had been interviewed then possibly more management control aspects would have been identified. Further, this study has focused on differences between business models. However, it has not been possible to exclude the risk that other factors than the business model are underlying reasons for the differences. For instance, different management control systems can be needed based on whether your rent your car or your electric drill even if these platforms would belong to the same business model in this study.
4. Empirical study and Analysis

The respondents of this study have talked about trustworthiness on three different levels; towards the concept and thereby, believing that the concept itself works, trustworthiness of the platform, and lastly, trustworthiness towards other individuals on the platform. The interviewees have expressed the importance of a trustworthy platform as a challenge since many users can find it hard to trust the platform itself. Further, in the case of the chosen business models the respondents have expressed that there is a different level of trustworthiness needed for the provider and the customer and the direction of trust and trustworthiness can vary. For example, the Country Manager of SnappCar explains that when the provider rents its asset to a customer there is a higher level of trustworthiness of the customer needed compared to the other way around in the relation.

“There is a bigger risk for a car owner to rent out their car, even though we have insurance. There is a bigger resistance than to try renting a car on SnappCar instead of a car rental company” - Country Manager of SnappCar.

On the other hand, according to the respondents for Collaborative Lifestyle platforms, it is of more importance that the customer can find the provider trustworthy than the other way around. In the case of the business model where the provider sells a product to the customer, the respondent at Tradera explained that the biggest issue of trustworthiness is from the customer to the provider. Additionally, the respondent believes that the biggest issue is if the customer will receive the product. In other words, it can be assumed that there are different directions of the trustworthiness needed in different business models.

The Empirical Study and Analysis is structured in the following way; the empirical findings and analysis is first presented for each business model separately. The findings for each platform are presented separately. However, the analysis is conducted for each business model, in other words, include both platforms within the same business model. The Analysis is performed in the way that each characteristic of trustworthiness is analysed based on the management control systems identified for each characteristic of trustworthiness. Thereafter, a Summary of Analysis is conducted at the end of each business model. Moreover, a table based on the analysis is presented for each business model after the Summary of Analysis.

4.1 Empirical study - Redistribution Markets

4.1.1 Business model

One of the business models in this study is called Redistribution Markets, which implies that one actor, the provider, sells an asset to a counterpart, the customer. In other words, the asset is redistributed. In this relationship the provider needs to be
trustworthy since the customer needs to be convinced that the product is delivered in the expected condition. Moreover, the trustworthiness of the customer is of importance since the provider needs to be sure that the payment is delivered. The organisations studied within this business model are Tradera and Johansson & Winge. Tradera is one of the leading second-hand platforms in Sweden with two million auctions per day. 80% of the sales are between individuals and for the remaining part there is a company involved in the transaction. The products sold on Tradera are described by the company itself as unique bargains and includes categories such as clothes, furniture, technology and collector’s items. The sales on Tradera are conducted through bidding. In the case of Johansson & Winge they have platforms targeting 171 different cities. In other words, there are 171 separate domains. These platforms are market places where individuals sell and buy products mostly locally. There are on average between 1000-2500 ads uploaded per day. Individuals upload the majority of the ads although companies upload a small part. The sales consist to a large extent of household products such as bikes and couches.

4.1.2 Findings - Tradera

In order to be a user on the platform of Tradera, the individual needs to register a profile by identifying yourself. The users need to assign their social security number during the registration, which is checked against the population registry. For providers that sell products this identification needs to be done through Mobile BankId. In contrast the verification through Mobile BankId is it not necessary for customers. Due to the verification requirement it is hard to register without being nationally registered in Sweden. In addition, it is not possible to register twice since the registration is based on your social security number. Once a profile has been created, the actors can start to both sell and buy assets. The profile does not contain much personal information about the user. However, the respondent of Tradera explains that a majority of the products are well described with pictures reflecting the item well, which is something Tradera advocates.

There is a standardized process on how the provider uploads an ad on the platform. The provider can set a minimum closing price in order to be sure that the product is not sold at a too low price. Tradera has established a system that catches unsuitable ads. In addition, there is an internal group responsible to audit these ads.

“Our staff responsible for the safety has a lot to do to keep fraud away. We put a lot of effort on that. That can affect the brand and for us it is very important that our users feel safe.” - Respondent of Tradera.

Further, in the case of providers selling collector’s items, there is a group consisting of experts within different categories that keep track of the items for sale to secure that no fake items are sold. A result from unwanted behaviour on the platform can be suspension and the users account are closed. Once the ad has been accepted, the other
actors can start bidding on the product. Moreover, there is an opportunity to ask questions to the seller through the platform. However, continuous communication thereafter is through email.

When a bidding is completed the shipping of the product and the payment remains. The payment process is regulated and the payment should be performed before the shipping. For all new accounts created within the last year, the payment needs to be transferred through Tradera and in turn Tradera transfers the payment to the provider. If the payment is made through PayPal, insurance is included which means that there is a refund if the product is not delivered. Additionally, Tradera has introduced ‘3D secure’, which implies that the users need to report the CVC-code. This has decreased the payment fraud significantly.

For the shipping process Tradera has collaborations with Schenker. It is optional to use this delivery method, however this service enables the customer to track the parcel during the delivery. In addition, if the actors use this delivery method insurance is included which refund the payment to the customer if the parcel is not delivered.

After the transaction has been completed both the provider and the customer are asked to rate and leave a review of the counterpart, which according to the respondent of Tradera is an important incentive system to behave properly.

“It is in their (providers) interest to offer as high quality and informative ads as possible, which actually results in more bidders and more money earned. So, it is quite self-regulating. In combination with the review system it contributes to good content on the platform.” - Respondent of Tradera

The rating system is firstly based on a positive or negative overall assessment followed by a comment describing the experience. In addition, the actors can rate specific characteristics of the transaction, such as freight cost and communication. These ratings and reviews are visible for all other actors on the platform. Moreover, these reviews can be divided into reviews based on the actor as a seller and the actor as a buyer. It is possible to see the number of positive and negative reviews divided into different time frames. The respondent of Tradera explains that good ratings and reviews for a user often result in a higher bidding price for future sales on the platform. In addition, users with high rating are rewarded with a better ranking in the search result.

The majority of the information distributed to users on the platform are guidelines for the transaction process and rules on the platform. Tradera has so far focused less on conveying values of Tradera to their users. This has mostly been an internal focus.
“We have values connected to the brand and to how we work internally on Tradera. Although, it is a recently started project and we have so far only established this internally. The next step is to convey it to the users, however there is still a lot to do on that aspect. We don’t do that to any large extent today” - Respondent of Tradera

4.1.3 Findings - Johansson & Winge

On the market places of Johansson & Winge only the providers, individuals selling products, need to register a profile. Once registered on the platform, the user is able to login on all the different domains. The registration requires the users to fill in a name, mail address and address, however there is no further verification. The profile of a user contains limited amount of information. What is visible for other users is other ads from the seller and the name. Although, in the registration process it is also possible to choose to hide your profile, which means that other users are not able to see who has uploaded the ad.

In order to upload an ad there is a standardized process to follow. The provider can upload a picture and relevant information about the product. Users located in different areas in Sweden can through their local domain search for ads both locally but also all over Sweden. However, the respondent of Johansson & Winge explains that the local transactions are the most common. If the customer finds a product of interest there is a function on the platform through which the customers are able to email the provider. In addition, there is a chat-function on the platform, which is another way for users to communicate with each other. The respondent of Johansson & Winge also explains that users sometimes write their telephone number in the ad. When the customer and the provider have agreed upon a price the most common way is that the users meet in reality instead of shipping the product due to the local focus on the platform. Hereby, they get a chance to meet the counterpart.

“Our focus is primarily local resulting in that the one that meets the seller, can see the product, shake his or her hand and make a deal. In this way the risk of fraud is decreased, compared to on a platform with a national focus where there is a risk of receiving a brick on the post.” - Respondent of Johansson & Winge

The payment process is not managed through Johansson & Winge. Instead this is a transaction directly from customer to provider and there are no recommended ways of payment. Johansson & Winge does not take a fee for each transaction. Instead their revenues come from commercials on the platform offered to other companies.

To prevent unsuccessful transactions and interactions due to users misbehaving Johansson & Winge has an internal group supervising the ads being uploaded. Moreover, their system catches specific words that are not wanted from Johansson & Winge and these ads are supervised before uploaded on the platform. Hereby, they can prevent unwanted behaviour and there is a risk for users with an inappropriate
behaviour to get suspended. If the users would not be satisfied with the experience they can contact customer support. They can get recommendations for solutions, however, Johansson & Winge points that they are not responsible for the transactions between users.

Except for contacting the customer support there is no way to evaluate the counterparts. The platform does not have any functions for ratings and reviews.

“Many misuses a rating and review system nowadays. If you adopt this tool then it is important that you do it correctly and that it works properly” - Respondent of Johansson & Winge

Further, there are no communication between the platform and its users to a large extent. The communication happens mostly when users contact customer support with questions. There is for example no introducing information sent to the users that register and they have not arranged any meetups.

4.1.4 Analysis - Redistribution Markets

4.1.4.1 Competence

In the case of this business model, characteristic of competence needed is knowledge about the product. The delivery service is performed by a third party or by users meeting each other in person. Therefore, no further skill is of relevance. The control mechanisms that have been identified in order to perceive this characteristic of trustworthiness are action control for both companies and result control for Tradera. No personnel- or cultural control has been identified. The result control identified on the platform of Tradera to create trustworthiness is the rating and review system that implies measurement of performance for specific categories and an overall assessment. Further, good result is rewarded by the increased likeliness that the other actors are willing to trade with the user in the future, which could lead to a higher price.

Further, the possibility to ask questions to the seller can contribute to a perceived competence through communication with the seller through the platform, which can create a sense of the counterpart’s knowledge within the area. For instance, if there is a collector’s item being sold the customer is able to communicate with the seller and thereby, get an idea of if the item is fake or not. This can be seen as an action control since it is a part of the process established on the platform. Therefore, this function is identified as an administrative mode. The possibility and the encouragement from especially one of the platforms to make detailed ads with pictures reflecting the product well could be seen as an action control in the way that it creates processes of how to act. Ads with a lot of information help the customer judge the quality of the product and thereby, increasing the perceived trustworthiness.
4.1.4.2 Honesty

Also, for the aspect of honesty, there has not been any personnel or cultural controls identified. However, for enabling the user to perceive the counterpart as honest action and result controls have been identified for this business model. Similar to the competence characteristic, the result control in form of a rating and review system is enabling the users to create honesty. Since the actors are aware of that the ratings and reviews are visible for all users this creates an intention to be honest and an opportunity for the actors to assess if the intentions are aligned.

Further, supervision on the platform identifies users with bad intentions and additionally, the process of suspending profiles from the platform makes it easier to assess that the counterpart has good intentions. Moreover, the experts that judge whether the items are fake or not contribute to the audit. These control mechanisms can be seen as action controls in the form of action accountability since the platforms traces the actions of their users.

Additionally, the action control that enables a contact function between users can also enable users to perceive the intentions of one another. By communicating with a person by mail or phone perceived honesty can be established. Another action control within the aspect of honesty is the 3D secure payment method that is a payment procedure that has to be followed. This is a form of administrative mode that establishes a procedure. The fact that someone is willing to register the CVC-code can indicate an intention of trustworthiness. Moreover, the fact that users on one of the platforms need to register and assign their social security number, and in the case of providers also identification through Mobile BankId, could be seen as a sign of willingness to adhere to a set of principles. This could contribute to perceived trustworthiness.

4.1.4.3 Reliability

Similar to the two previous characteristics of trustworthiness, there has not been any personnel or cultural control identified for reliability. To participate on the platform, certain procedures have to be followed. One example is the payment procedure on Tradera, where the customer has to pay to the platform before the provider sends the product. Consequently, this creates trustworthiness of the customer since it increases the likelihood that he or she will follow through. This control mechanism could be seen as an action control in the form of administrative mode. Another action control, more precisely a direct supervision and monitoring mechanism is the supervision group that audit the suspicious ads on the platform. The fact that these ads are reviewed can contribute with more trustworthiness for the users that has passed this check. Lastly, the previously mentioned result control identified on Tradera is the rating and review system that is useful to perceive someone as reliable through access to previous performance and the possibility to judge consistency in actions. Further, based on the reviews it is also possible to perceive a more clarified picture of the performance. In addition, the fact that users with high rating get a higher ranking in
the search result can increase the belief that the other party will follow through and be reliable since they have performed well during previous transactions.

4.1.4.4 Benevolence
For the business model Redistribution Markets there has not been any management controls identified that would enable the users to perceive the counterpart as trustworthy in this aspect.

4.1.4.5 Summary of Analysis - Redistribution Markets
For this business model it can be noted that the controls identified target both the provider and the customer to approximately the same extent. Further, only action control and result control has been found see Table 2. The result control identified is limited in the way that it has only been found on Tradera. However, Tradera enhance that the rating and review system that constitute the result control is of high importance for their platform. Further, the control mechanisms mainly focus on enabling an assessment of the trustworthiness aspects honesty and reliability. A control, such as the rating and review system that contributes to the assessment of competence has also been found for one of the platforms. However, it can be argued that the competence needed to send a parcel or make a payment is not as relevant as other information that can be generated from the rating and review system. For instance, the information about a user’s intention and past performance in the aspect of delivery and payment is not that important. In other words, the main contribution of the rating and review system as a control is to enable assessment of the honesty and reliability characteristics. Even if there are mainly only two out of four characteristics of trustworthiness that have been enhanced through the management control systems, these two characteristics represent both the aspects of “why” and “how”. Honesty shows the “why-aspect” and reliability stands for the “how-aspect”. In other words, both these parts of trustworthiness have been covered. Although, there is no personnel and cultural control identified the formal controls in the form of action and result control are quite covering and creates a strict process to follow.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution Markets</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honesty</strong></td>
<td>- Supervision&lt;br&gt;- Initiated communication through the platform&lt;br&gt;- 3D secure payment process&lt;br&gt;- Identification process</td>
<td>- Rating- and review system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>- Platform holding the payment&lt;br&gt;- Supervision group</td>
<td>- Rating- and review system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td>- Initiated communication through the platform&lt;br&gt;- Encouragement to have informative ads</td>
<td>- Rating- and review system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benevolence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Management control systems identified for Redistribution Markets.*

4.2 Empirical study - Collaborative Lifestyles

4.2.1 Business model

Collaborative Lifestyles implies one actor, the provider, performing small services for the customer. In this relation the customer needs to be able to determine if the provider is trustworthy since the provider often enter the customer’s home and the customer needs to know that he or she is competent enough to perform the task. On the other hand, the provider also needs to judge if the customer is trustworthy to know if he or she will get paid for the job and to feel safe when performing the job. The platforms studied within this business model are Yepstr and Taskrunner. Yepstr, is a platform that enables youths entering the labour market by performing small tasks within the neighbourhood. For instance, they can baby sit, assist at a party, cut the lawn, or be a homework support. On Yepstr the youths are the providers and are called “Yeppar” while the customer is the one uploading the ad asking for help with a task. In addition, to performing tasks for neighbours, there is also a possibility to perform tasks for a company. However, the majority of the tasks are between individuals. Taskrunner, is a similar service although the provider is an adult. The tasks enabled on the platform are therefore, adjusted to suit a more mature provider,
which they call “runner”. In this case, the customer is the one uploading the task on
the platform. Typical tasks performed at Taskrunner are assembling IKEA furniture,
transportation tasks and various household repairs.

4.2.2 Findings of Yepstr

To become a user on the platform of Yepstr the individual needs to register a profile
and identify him- or herself. The social security number is revised though the
population registry to identify all users. Further, there are guidelines on the platforms
to help the user create a profile with relevant information, for instance, guidance on
what to write about yourself, especially for the youth. Information that is
recommended to provide is what school the Yep attend, what program the Yep study
and so forth. However, there are no guidelines for the customer of what kind of
information to disclose in the profile. In addition, it is mandatory for the youths to
have a profile picture while it is only recommended for the customers. On the
platform there is a function to fill in what types of tasks the Yep wants to perform for
example gardening work, babysitting or dogwatch. Consequently, only these tasks are
notified in the Yep’s phone. Further, there are also company customers at Yepstr,
where the profile belongs to an individual although it is linked to a company profile.
Special skills other than the information in the profile with for example, special
interests are not being encouraged. The respondent at Yepstr, enhances that they want
to give every youth the same conditions irrespective of previous experience and
therefore, they do not show a list of skills they possess.

Further, there is no mandatory interview to sign up on the platform of Yeptr.
However, there is a possibility for customers to require an interview for a specific job
if they find this useful. In this case, the customer him- or herself conducts the
interview before accepting the youth to perform the task.

“During a time, we did consider to remove the possibility for customers to upload ads
for the more plausible tasks such as child care and homework support. However,
instead we added a little function to the ad, “this task requires an interview”. Then
we saw a strong increase in the number of ads within this area.” - Respondent of
Yepstr.

The users on Yepstr, especially the providers, receive a lot of information and
guidance of behaviour through guidelines, videos and communication with the
Community Manager. Although, there is no formal education on how the tasks should
be performed. For both customers and providers on Yepstr, a majority of the
communication is conveyed through short messages and the message is often values
that Yepstr wants to establish. The main values that are emphasised by the platform
are simplicity, safety and fun. All ads that are uploaded by a customer are audited to
make sure that the task is suited to youths and these values.
“We really care to secure that the tasks are suited for a sixteen, seventeen-year-old youth. It should not be dangerous and it should not require any previous experience.”  
- Respondent of Yepstr

On Yepstr, each Yep within a limited distance is able to pitch why he or she should receive the job. Yepstr, has restricted the distance from home where the youths can apply for a task. The idea is to connect customers and providers within the same neighbourhood.

“We have an area-based limitation, which results in that you get help from youths within your neighbourhood. “It is the daughter of Lasse, how nice”. We often recommend a youth that has received a job to bring their parents to introduce them to the customer so that they will feel safe.”  
- Respondent of Yepstr.

The Yep that wants to pitch themselves for a task gets examples on pitches and are encouraged to write approximately four sentences. Once the customer has received eight responses, the ad is removed and the customer can then choose who to hire. The process of removing the ad after some pitches is established to create a lower response time. The customer that has uploaded the ad can choose to chat with the youths before hiring them. If a Yep does not turn up at the predetermined time, the Community Manager of Yepstr helps to communicate with both parties in order to solve the problem. The Community Manager always call the Yep if he or she does not show and the Yep then needs to explain why they did not fulfil their task. If this is a recurring behaviour the user can be suspended from the sight. Moreover, the customer that did not get the task done is also informed about the fact that this is not an acceptable behaviour of the Yep how Yepstr handles this.

On Yepstr, both users of the platform can cancel the mission within the first thirty minutes if not content. After the task has been done, a rating and review system is opened, on both platforms the emphasis of this function is on the performance of the provider. The customer is only rated on a scale from 1 to 5 although there is no room for leaving a comment. In contrast to the providers on Yepstr who gets a comment and grade on their performance from the customer. The youth is also graded in different areas such as punctuality and performance.

There is a payment system on the platform where the customer pays through the site and a small provision is withdrawn to Yepstr. The youths are hourly paid and the salary is mainly based on their age. In addition, they can get a higher salary if they have performed well during previous jobs. When a payment is agreed upon, the customer pays the amount to the platform that holds the money until both parties have submitted that the task is performed. Help and support can easily be received from Yepstr, the agreement is done between the provider and customer although the platform sees their role as helping the process run smoothly. They continuously keep in contact with the users on the platform.
“We have many users and I daily talk to extremely many” - Respondent of Yepstr

The performance is rewarded through the gamification application that motivates and guides the youths to perform more tasks and motivates them to improve. Thus, when coming to a certain level it is possible to apply for performing tasks for companies. Moreover, a provider on Yepstr can get a higher salary based on good reviews.

4.2.3 Findings of Taskrunner

To become a user on the platform of Taskrunner the individual needs to register a profile with his or her real name and identify him-or herself. More precisely, a picture of the user’s ID is mandatory to upload for a provider. Further, all the providers have to go through a telephone interview to make sure the person is suitable and has the right intentions. During the interview, the runners receive introduction information of how the whole process works and the platform’s values. On the customer side, there is no verification needed in order to upload an ad and no profile information required like a photo or text about him-or herself. Only once the customer and the runner have agreed on a price and the customer pays the amount to Taskrunner the verification of the customer takes place. The verification is done by the registration of name of the bank account.

There are guidelines on the platforms to help the user provide the profile with relevant information. There is a small description of oneself that the provider has to fill in. Also, there is a requirement for the Runner to have a profile picture. There is a function to fill in what types of tasks the provider wants to perform and the runners can show what competences they have. Additionally, there is an opportunity to see the amount of times a runner has performed a specific kind of tasks.

The limit of what types of tasks that can be performed on Taskrunner is wide although still audited and Taskrunner encourage more simplistic tasks. Once an ad is uploaded the runner can start to communicate with the customer. In the case of Taskrunner the communication before the acceptance of a bid is done in an open chat on the platform. Moreover, through the netnographic study it has been identified through the open chat-function that some users find it hard to agree on a date and the actual task that needs to be performed. Further, it has also been found that some users have withdrawn their tasks and offers. Additionally, the Community Manager states that the open chat has resulted in that more experienced runners help other users to decide on a task when there is not clarity. Further, he keeps track on the actions of the runners and if they misbehave it can lead to suspension.

There is a payment system established on the platform where the runners first put a bid on the task they want to perform. When a payment is agreed upon, the customer pays the amount to the platform that holds the money until both parties have
submitted that the task is performed. A predetermined share of the amount paid is a provision to Taskrunner.

Help and support can easily be received on Taskrunner. The agreement is done between the provider and customer although Taskrunner see their role as helping the process run smoothly. Consequently, they continuously keep in contact with the users on the platform. Moreover, the Community Manager helps out by contacting suitable providers when there is a task that has no bids.

“I have a good overview of what runner that are good at what task since they all talk to me before we accept them on the platform. If someone has been an electrician for 35 years, then I can send them a text if there is a task within this area that has not received any bids.”

The Community Manager tries to target runners that have performed well within the specific task in order to secure that all tasks are assigned a competent runner enables content users. On the platform of Taskrunner, only the runner receives a comment and a rating from 1-5, the customer does not receive any judgement of their actions. The Community Manager of Taskrunner mentions that he often enhances the rating system to make worried customers have faith in the other person he recommends them to utilize the rating system.

There have been some rewards for runners that have performed a lot of tasks. Additionally, according to the community manager “it usually pays of itself”, meaning that good reviews naturally result in more tasks and possibility to take a higher price. Further, he usually gives the advice to customers to take the reviews of a runner into account in order to assess their trustworthiness.

“If I talk to a worried customer I usually recommend them to focus on the reviews of the runners”

4.2.4 Analysis - Collaborative Lifestyles

4.2.4.1 Competence

The competence of relevance in this business model is the ability to perform the specific tasks included in the service provided. On both platforms the users create a profile that reveal experience and skills. This procedure of creating a mandatory profile is an action control in the form of administrative mode. Further, it is useful to estimate the competence of the counterpart and therefore, contributes to the perceived trustworthiness. Another action control in the form of an established process on one of the platforms is the mandatory pitch that every youth have to make in order to apply for a task. Through this short message the Yep is encouraged to motivate why they would be suitable for the task, which enables the customer to assess the
competence. A result control that is present on both platforms is the rating and review system. This measures the performance while the provider can be rewarded in various ways. For instance, by higher salary, more tasks, and new kind of tasks. Based on the reviews, the customer can perceive the competence of the provider, which therefore, is useful to create trustworthiness.

Further, two kinds of personnel controls have been identified for both platforms. Firstly, there are selection processes in the form of interviews where the platform organisation or the customer conducts interviews with potential providers. These interactions create the opportunity to judge competence of the other actor and thereby, establish trustworthiness. In addition, the control tool referred to as job design has been applied in this business model. For Yepstr the platform organisation is very prone to make sure that all tasks available on the platform are suitable for all youths without experience. Further, on Taskrunner the Community Manager can contact specific runners directly if he is aware of their high level of skills within the area. Both these control tools increase the likeliness that the providers complete the task successfully.

4.2.4.2 Honesty

All four categories of management control systems are present in order to create perceived honesty on both platforms. The identification process is similar on both platforms, which results in that the platform is aware of all identities for all users and it can be assumed that this creates the motive to behave on the platform. Moreover, through the identification process, it is not possible to register two different accounts and thereby, hide bad reviews. Additionally, it is mandatory to have a profile on both platforms and where the users have the possibility to write personal information and where their intention can be expressed. Consequently, the counterparts on the platform can hereby judge the motives and intentions of the user, which is beneficial for the assessment of trustworthiness. Both the identification and the profile are a part of the process that all users need to pass and is a form of action control, namely administrative control.

Another action control is the supervision in order to secure that the ads are appropriate on the platform. The fact that the visible ads have passed this check can contribute to a perceived trustworthiness towards the users. In addition, another action constraint on one of the platforms is the distance limit, which implies that the provider can only apply for jobs within a specific area close to where they live. This can create a community feeling within the neighbourhood, which can affect the intention and motive to follow the principles. Further, action control identified on one of the platforms is the open chat that is visible for everyone. The possibility to see the conversation between all users enables the counterparts to identify what users that are sure of when and how they want help and what users that withdraw their offer. This indicates the intentions of the users, which can enable the judgement of trustworthiness. Another, action control is the possibility to cancel a mission the first
thirty minutes, which contributes to the motivation to perform well since the Yep is aware of this opportunity for the provider. On both platforms the payment function through the site is an action control that ensures that the payment is done when the task is performed, thus, aligning the motives and making the provider perform well.

Related to result controls the business model in question is similar to the Redistribution Market where the rating and review system works as a result control. The reviews represent a form of measurement of the user, which can be helpful to assess honesty. As described before different rewards are based on the reviews. Good reviews are also a basis for continuous task offers which creates incentives to behave properly. If there are various positive comments made by other parties on the platform these reviews become credible. In addition, this reward is enhanced by the Community Manager on Taskrunner, since he usually recommends customers to take these into account for enabling customers to have faith in the provider. Moreover, Yepstr has the gamification application where they strive for certain goals and advance to higher levels based on previous jobs. In other words, these result controls are beneficial for the perceived intention and honesty.

The personnel control applied for honesty is in similarity to the competence characteristic through interviews. Not only competence can be judged based on this, but also the motives and intentions of the counterpart can be assessed. For both platforms there is no professional competence needed, which makes the aspect of personality and motives of high importance. Further, for Taskrunner the Community Manager’s direct matching of ads and runners is a personnel control in the form of selection and placement where job requirements are matched with job experience, which can increase the perceived honesty.

Lastly, the extensive communication on both platforms between the Community Manager and the users is a form of cultural control. The Community Managers convey such as values and traditions of behaviour. The main values simplicity, safety and fun could be a cultural control creating trustworthiness both to the platform and the users. These messages create a culture on the platform that aligns intentions both between users and also between the platform and users. Moreover, through the gamification at Yepstr the way of behaving and aspects to keep in mind are delivered to the users. These control functions probably affect the attitude and approach of the users, which can contribute with a perceived honesty. In addition, on Taskrunner more experienced runners can help other users to agree on a task through the open chat. This creates a form of group pressure not to deviate from the expected behaviour and therefore, creates an intention to adhere to the principles.

4.2.4.3 Reliability
For the aspect of reliability, three of the management controls are evident, the result-, action- and personnel control. Firstly, the action control supervision is used on Yepstr
in the way that the community manager calls the Yep if he or she does not turn up and if the behaviour happens continuous times suspension is possible. In this way, the customer can perceive that the Yep is reliable since Yepstr will take action if that is not true. Similarly, on Taskrunner if the runner misbehaves he or she will be removed from the site, it creates perceived reliability for the existing users. Further, the previously mentioned action control in form of an open and visible chat at Taskrunner contributes to the assessment of reliability. It is possible to see what users that usually follow through and consistently keep to his or her offer. Additionally, the fact that the more experienced runners can help other users to decide on a task when there is unclarity also increase the likeliness that runners follows through.

Another action control relevant for this business model is the guidelines that inform the users on how to behave during a task and further, Yepstr are prone to tell the youths that it is important to be on time and to show up. This can help the users to perceive the counterpart as reliable and trustworthy. To create a perceived reliability of both platforms Taskrunner use a form of personnel control while Yepstr use an action control. In the case of Taskrunner the Community Manager contacts suitable runners for tasks that has not received any bids which helps the customer to find the platform trustworthy in the way that they get a response and the task is completed. This kind of trustworthiness is also created to Yepstr through their established process that removes an ad when the customer has received eight pitches. This can be seen as a form of action control that creates reliability in the way that it is working rules and processes that gives incentives to providers to apply for the job within a short time frame.

Also, for the reliability the rating and review system is a form of result control. Based on the reviews other users can assess whether there is consistency in actions and if the provider usually follows through. Thereby, a perceived reliability is created. Moreover, the personnel control job design where the Community Manager contacts suitable providers when an ad is lacking bidders can create a sense of reliability. This function results in that more customers get the help they ask for and that providers that have performed well and follow through what they have promised to do perform the service for the customer.

4.2.4.4 Benevolence
Action, personnel and cultural control have been used for enabling a perceived benevolence. The action controls are in the form of the previously described distance limit for applying for a job at Yepstr. If the counterparty is living in the same neighbourhood or is for instance, the parent of your friend it can create an attachment between the two actors and potentially the provider has the willingness to perform well not due to egoistic profit but due to the willingness to do good for the counterpart. The personnel control used is interview which enables the user to meet the counterpart before employing, resulting in a possibility to not only meeting someone online and thereby creating a possibility to judge the other party's
benevolence. Further, the cultural control used is communication of common values and how to behave. Supporting a culture on the platform, where kindness and going beyond the requirements without an own interest for the user.

4.2.4.5 Summary of Analysis - Collaborative Lifestyles

In the case of Collaborative Lifestyles, all four parts of the management control system has been identified, see Table 3. In addition, the control system enables all four characteristics of trustworthiness to be assessed. The action and result controls create a covering and strict process on the platform and enables the assessment of honesty and reliability. In the case of Collaborative Lifestyles, the competence is quite important since the providers performs tasks for the customer. Therefore, the rating and review system becomes relevant in order to assess competence. Moreover, personnel control has been identified and is useful in the case where competence is important in order to find suitable providers. In addition, the personnel control contributes to both honesty, competence and benevolence. Further, cultural control has been found as well and is useful in order to assess honesty and benevolence of users. Although, it can be argued that the cultural control for benevolence is week. Since benevolence is hard to perceive on the platform, it is not likely that every user on the platform is trustworthy in a benevolent way only due to the culture. In conclusion, it can be noted that also here both the “how-aspect” and “why-aspect” of the trustworthiness has been enhanced since. The "how-aspect" can be assessed since reliability and competence can be assessed and the "why-aspect" is assessed through honesty and benevolence.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Lifestyle</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Honesty**             | - Supervision  
- Removing misbehaving users  
- Open chat  
- Experienced runners helping out through chat  
- Guidelines on how to behave | - Rating and review system  
- Reward by community manager for doing a good job  
- Gamification application | - Interviews  
- Contacts experienced runners | - Verbal communication between Community Manager and the users  
- Gamification  
- Open chat |
| **Reliability**         | - Supervision  
- Removing misbehaving users  
- Open chat  
- Experienced runners helping out through chat  
- Guidelines on how to behave  
- Removing an ad after eight pitches | - Rating and review system | - Community Manager contacts experienced runners | |
| **Competence**          | - Profile  
- Mandatory pitch | - Rating and review system  
- Verbal communication between Community Manager and the users  
- Gamification  
- Open chat | - Interviews  
- Ensure that jobs suit youths  
- Platform contacts experienced runners | |
| **Benevolence**         | - Distance limit | | - Interview | - Communication of common values |

Management control systems identified for Collaborative Lifestyle.

4.3 Empirical study - Product Service Systems

4.3.1 Business model

Product Service Systems is the last business model studies and is based on transactions where one actor, the provider, rents an asset to the other actor, the customer. What is of importance is that the provider is trustworthy enough for the customer to expect that the asset is available and is in the expected condition. Further, the provider needs to perceive the counterpart as trustworthy since the customer is expected to use the rented asset carefully and return it in the right condition. In
addition, the provider needs to expect the customer to pay for the service. The organisations representing this business model in this study is SnappCar and Workaround. The platform was originally called Flexidrive although they were acquired by SnappCar in 2015. It is a platform where the customer can rent the car from a provider in order to prevent idling assets. The provider owns a car that is not used enough while the customer is in need of a car temporarily. Both actors are two individuals. Moreover, Workaround is a platform where one party rents an unused space of the office belonging to another party. In this case, the users are usually companies. However, it is also possible for individuals to rent a space if the company is willing to rent it to an individual. Most of the offices are located in Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö although there are offices located in other cities as well.

4.3.2 Findings - SnappCar

In order to rent out your car or rent another person’s car on SnappCar the individual needs to be registered on the platform. Customers register by uploading a picture of their driving license and transferring 1 SEK to SnappCar, which is followed by a matching check between driving licence and the owner of the bank account. Thereby, a profile is created. In addition, it is possible to connect the profile to your social media account, which further confirms your identity.

SnappCar has recently introduced more informative profiles compared to before when there was mostly information about the car. Now the profiles describe more about the person behind it. The main checks for the provider are that the car is inspected and registered with the user as owner. The provider that wants to rent out his or her car needs to upload a picture of the car with a visible license plate. Moreover, the provider can set up principles for the rent, such as age limit and maximum distance to drive within the set price.

On SnappCar, if the customer finds a car of interest that is available for the wanted dates he can send a request to the provider that can accept or deny. The provider’s average response time to a request is visible for the customers on the platform. The Country Manager at SnappCar further explains that to keep down the response time often results in a better review. Additionally, in the search result on the platform providers with a quick response time are placed further up in the list. The Community Manager at SnappCar explains that they check on the users. If providers at continuous requests do not accept customer’s requests they are contacted by the Community Manager that asks for the reason to the behaviour. If the provider is not willing to rent out the car the user can get guidance from SnappCar if there are any uncertainties or the provider can be removed from the platform. Further, there is a risk of being suspended from the platform also if the users do not behave properly.

“We have several systems where we perform checks. We can see the behaviour and compare between users. It is not limited to how they handle the car. It can be how
they use the platform. For example, that they have booked many cars and sends fifteen requests in the middle of the night.” - Country Manager of SnappCar

In combination with the customer’s request the customer can explain why they want to rent the car and SnappCar has put a minimum limit on how many words the customer has to use when asking for the car. Additionally, SnappCar include a helping start of a sentence where the customer is asking for the car in order to exemplify what information is relevant to give to the provider. The Country Managers explains that these mechanisms are established for enabling the provider to get an understanding of who the counterpart is and their purpose for renting the car. Thereafter, the users can communicate with each other through the chat-function on the website. If a request has been accepted on SnappCar the payment has to be done in order for the request to be valid. In addition, the platform encourages the users to agree on expectations of condition of the car. The respondent at SnappCar explains it as “I (provider) will not wash the car in advance but I neither expect you (customer) to wash it after you have rented it”.

SnappCar has established a payment method. The customer makes the payment to SnappCar that keeps the payment until some days after the rental. If the customer has driven more than what was included in the agreement he or she needs to pay a complementary amount to SnappCar that later forward this to the car owner. Further, the last step of the process is to rate the counterpart, which implies giving a rating from 1 to 5 and leave a comment on the experience and performance. This is visible on the profile of the user. A benefit of having good reviews for a provider is that these users is seen further up in the search result on the website. Further, factors that affect the ranking in the search result are response time, reviews, previously rented cars by the user, distance and also different quality aspects such as profile picture.

The Community Manager of SnappCar explains that she has a lot of contact with the users on the platform. The focus of communication is on the providers who are all contacted within some days after they have created a new account. Hereby, the provider is informed on how the process works, information about the insurance included and also about what is not included. In addition, SnappCar convey what is important for them and their expectation on the users’ behaviour. Moreover, internal values that SnappCar has internally are similar to the values communicated to the users on the platform.

“Values and communication is something we work a lot with at the moment. We focus on things like attitude. We need to build the atmosphere and how you should behave as a car owner on the platform” Community Manager of SnappCar

The Country Manager of SnappCar explains that it can be hard to make statements; such as the organisation itself is driven by social and environmental friendly values. This becomes more trustworthy if it is supported by external actors, such as for
instance, B Corporation that has certified SnappCar. The certification of B Corporation focuses on the impact on the shareholder within legal, social and environmental aspects. In addition, the organisation is engaged in discussions and industry associations. Communication to the users of SnappCar is focused on the fact that the users are a part of the operations and play an important role for the quality on the platform. Further, SnappCar has created interaction between both SnappCar and the users and between different users by arranging meet-ups where the platform users get an opportunity to meet each other. Likewise, Snappcar has a blog where they communicate information about users, collaborations and information about the concept and its benefits.

4.3.3 Findings - Workaround

In the case of Workaround, it is only the provider that has a profile. When creating an account at Workaround, an introduction mail is sent with information about the process and the support that is offered. Similar information can also be found on the platform. Hereby, Workaround clarifies how the user is expected to respond to requests and behave against customers. However, in the registration process there is no formal background check of the organisations that wants to upload an ad on Workaround. The respondent of Workaround mentions that they focus more on the behaviour on the platform instead of preconditions to register. This inspection is focused on responses to requests from customers, how the providers handle office viewings and the communication with the platform. For the customer side, they ascertain that there is a real business, when it was founded and the legal form of the organisation. Workaround explains that it is often the provider that is interested in this kind of information about the counterpart instead of the opposite way. If the users do not adhere to the processes and rules they can be suspended from Workaround.

For Workaround there are no high demands on what to include on the profile and in the ad. The organisations that want to rent out an office space do usually not publish information about the company itself. Neither do they usually refer to their webpage or information sources such as the company’s annual report. Instead there is more focus on informal aspects, such as the concept in the office building. For instance, if it is a co-working space. If Workaround finds the ad unfinished or missing information they contact the provider and offer them to help. There is also a possibility to email Workaround about the office the provider wants to rent out and let the platform create the ad.

Once a customer finds an office space of interest they make a request to the contact person of the object. Although, on Workaround there is no possibility for the customer to see the providers average response time. In addition, the request function does not specify how many words to include or any guidance on what information to include. If the customer is of interest for the provider they book an office viewing, which is done either through the platform or through the provider itself. In this way
the customer then gets a chance to see the office and the users get an opportunity to meet before the rental. If there is no specific office of interest for the customer they can also contact Workaround that tries to match the customer with an appropriate provider. Then characteristics of the two actors and the financial situation are studied in order to make sure that the customer can afford the object.

When a customer and a provider have agreed on a rental Workaround encourage them to agree on specific conditions in advance such as cleaning and other rules in the office. The contract for the rental is between the users and Workaround is not involved in this. Additionally, the payment is a direct transaction between the users. After the rental period Workaround contacts the provider and customer after the rental and evaluates the process. However, this evaluation is not visible for other user on the platform. A good review from the evaluation is rewarded by for instance, a higher ranking in the search result among the ads on the platform. In addition, Workaround are aware of their reviews when trying to match new users.

“You cannot buy a higher ranking in the search result. We want to see it as earned. We want to encourage to follow the process in a good way and in order to encourage we offer different kinds of benefits.” - Respondent of Workaround

However, the ranking in the search result is not only based on this evaluation. It is also dependent on parameters such as response time and to what degree the add on the platform is representative for the actual office.

Furthermore, Workaround has arranged After Works where users get a chance to meet each other and listen to speakers. Additionally, Workaround has a blog where they write about actors within the community, start-ups, workspaces and other relevant information for their actors. Hereby, interaction between the users is enabled.

4.3.4 Analysis - Product Service System

4.3.4.1 Competence

The only competence of relevance found for this business model is the users’ ability to look after the asset. The most evident control systems used for enabling users to perceive the counterpart’s competence is action and result control. The action control identified is an administrative mode in the form of a requirement to present a licence in order to register at SnappCar. The licence can be useful in order to perceive competence of the customer. Another action control is that the platform enables the provider to set up requirements for potential customers, such as age restrictions. It enables the possibility for the provider to select specific criteria that they find important to perceive the customer as competent.
Further, result control has been identified as a mean to create the trustworthiness characteristic competence. For instance, the rating system measures the performance and constitutes a basis for rewards. These rewards appear on both platforms in the form of higher ranking when receiving better rating. In this way the users can perceive the competence of the counterpart through the ratings and reviews and in addition, the customer can perceive the competence partly on the ranking in the search result. High ranking is an indication on good previous ratings.

4.3.4.2 Honesty
Three out of four controls are present in this business model to create honesty, action, result and cultural controls. Most prominent is action and cultural controls. One action control in the form of administrative mode consisting of recommendation for the rental process is the communicated advice from both platforms that users should agree on expectations and informal rules for their specific relationship. Thus, they can agree on principals and align intentions. Another aspect of relevance for the ability to perceive honesty is the supervision of provider’s ads. If they find ads with low quality, for example suboptimal pictures, the platform contacts the provider and offers them support. The low requirements for creating an ad on Workaround is compensated by supervision, which results in more descriptive profiles and this increases the possibility to judge if the intentions are aligned. Further, the requirement for the provider on Workaround to show the object for a potential customer enables both parties to judge the intention of the counterpart.

Supervision on the platforms is also focused on auditing and identifying inappropriate behaviour and to suspend these users, resulting in a higher probability that the actors on the platform adhere to the expected behaviour. In addition, the identification requirement on the platforms constitute an action control that point to a willingness to behave properly on the platform, which increases the likeliness that the intentions are aligned. The contact phase is also a part of the action controls and administrative modes established on the platforms. For SnappCar a chat-function on the platform has been identified, which enables the platform organisation to keep track of the communication and in the case of a conflict the platform support can use this tool to clear up the conflict, which decrease the risk of fraud. Additionally, the established word limit and guidance for an appropriate request for the initial contact with a provider on SnappCar helps the customer to convey the right information. Hereby, the provider has a better ability to judge the purpose and also intention for the customer to rent its asset. Moreover, the established process on SnappCar where the provider does not receive the payment until after the rent out is a form of action control that creates incentives for the provider to adhere to the principles and thereby, align intentions with the customer.

Result controls in the form of ratings, reviews and evaluations are used to assess performance. This communication from third parties creates a credible view of the counterpart and thereby, does good reviews enable a user to perceive someone as honest. Furthermore, good performance is a basis for rewards such as a higher ranking
in the search result and the possibility to take a higher price or pay a lower price for the rent. An additional reward is that the likelihood that another user would be willing to accept the user is increased. The knowledge about these rewards and the fact that the other party grades and reviews the user creates incentives to behave properly and a common interest, thus, aligns intentions.

Cultural controls such as forums; meetups and blogs are used by the platform organisations to convey values and norms and way of behaving. Through meetups users get the possibility to meet each other and the platform can signalize what values and behaviour they strive for. This can create a culture and a pressure on users on how to behave. Moreover, the platforms have a frequent verbal communication with the users, which is another mean to create shared values and traditions. Further, there are cultural controls used for enabling all users to perceive the platform itself as honest and with intentions aligned with the users. For instance, SnappCar uses a certification put pressure and creates guidelines for the employees on how to act and what values to adhere to. Thereby, it constitutes a form of cultural control for the employees. Moreover, the certification is a credible communication from other parties that demonstrate a sense of honesty.

4.3.4.3 Reliability
For the aspect of reliability within the Product Service System action and result control has been identified. Firstly, the administrative modes such as guidance and rules for behaviour and the process on the platforms constitute a form of action control, which standardize the way of acting. Thereby, consistency of action is created. Further, another action control that creates reliability is the supervision conducted by the platforms. The fact that the platforms remove users that does not behave properly creates a bigger possibility that the users on the platform follows through as expected. The platforms also contact providers if they do not respond to an offer, which decreases the response time on the platform. In addition, previously rented assets and users with a good rating appears higher up in the search result and thereby, enabling the customer to know how reliable the counterpart is. Lastly, the established communication process though the platform is another form of action control and the fact that the platform keeps track of the communication can affect the willingness to follow through for an actor. Thereby, perceived reliability can be assessed.

Result controls that create incentives to be reliable has also been identified for this business model. Likewise, for the honesty aspect the rating, reviews, evaluations and the belonging rewards are useful in order to perceive reliability. Based on the reviews it is evident if the counterpart performs well over time. The fact that good ratings result in a higher placement in the search result and thereby, enabling the customer to know how reliable the counterpart is. Moreover, the visible response rate on SnappCar for each user can assess the degree of reliability since the users can judge if it is likely if the counterpart responds and follows through.
4.3.4.4 Benevolence
For enabling a perceived benevolence cultural control has been used. The cultural controls are in the form of the previously described meetups, blogs and communication. Meetups establish values and beliefs that can lead to a sense of wanting to go beyond the requirements without an own interest for the users. For instance, meetups can create an attachment between the users by letting them get to know each other. Further, the blog and communication are utilised to communicate the values of the platform that goes beyond the platform's own interest, for instance, both organisations have the values to exploiting the idling capacity of the assets. By communicating this to the users it can contribute to that users act not only for their own interest but also because they want to take advantage of idling capacity.

4.3.4.5 Summary of Analysis - Product Service Systems
In the case of this business model action control, result control and cultural control are the controls adopted, see Table 4. The action and result controls are primarily enabling assessment of reliability and honesty. However, it also contributes to the characteristic competence. On the other hand, the knowledge generated from for instance, the review system about the competence of a user in this context is not as important as the knowledge about intentions and previous interaction. This is due to that the competence needed in this context is often basic skills and knowledge that the majority of the people possess or easy to check in form of a license. Further, cultural control is prominent for this business model since they have more meet-ups and blogs. Cultural controls are useful to assess honesty and benevolence, in other words, the “why-aspects” of trustworthiness. In total both the “why-aspect” and the “how-aspect” has been enhanced through the control system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Service Systems</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Honesty                | - Recommendation of agreement on expectations  
- Supervision of low quality ads  
- Requirements to show the object  
- Supervision  
- Removing misbehaving users  
- Identification process  
- Chat function  
- Word limit and guidance on request  
- Platform holding the payment | - Ratings, reviews and evaluations |  | - Meetups  
- Blog  
- Verbal communication between platform and users  
- Certification of the platform |
| Reliability            | - Guidance of rules and behaviours  
- Supervision by the platform  
- Removing users misbehaving  
- Contacts the provider if not responding to offers  
- Chat function | - Rating, reviews & evaluations  
- Visible response rate |  |  |
| Competence             | - Licence  
- Customers' requirements | Rating- and review system |  |  |
| Benevolence            |  |  |  | - Meetups  
- Blogs  
- Communication with users |
5. Cross-Business Model Analysis

The figures below (Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4) represent findings based on the analysis. It shows what type of management control systems that have been found for each business model and what characteristic of trustworthiness that can more easily be assessed by the identified management controls. The dark blue fields represent high representation of the control while the light blue indicates that controls has been identified, however they can be seen as less influential.

Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution Market</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Lifestyle</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Service Systems</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this study and these figures, it can be concluded that the action control and result control are used to assess the characteristic of honesty and reliability in all business models. Thereby, result and action control seem to be a basis and a necessary thing in order to assess the trustworthiness on the platforms. A reason to the importance of these management control systems can be the fact that these are easier for a platform organisation to implement and monitor. In contrast the cultural and personnel controls are more dependent on the users of the platform and therefore, creating a culture can be more complicated on a platform where individuals do not interact to a large extent. On the other hand, action control can be achieved by setting up a process on the platform, which can be easier to handle and use to accomplish the wanted result compared to the more informal controls.

Honesty and reliability are focus areas for all business models while the characteristics competence and benevolence are not represented to the same extent. Competence and benevolence can therefore, be seen as complementing in order to strengthen the perceived trustworthiness. This could be explained by the fact that honesty and reliability represent the attitude of the user and the willingness to perform well, which can often be a bigger concern than whether the counterpart has the right competence or cares more about the counterpart than what is expected. Especially for the platforms interviewed for this study where the competence is normally not the most crucial aspect. For instance, for the Redistribution market there is hardly any competence needed for making a payment or shipping a product. Further, for the Product Service Systems the competence needed is to handle the rented asset which in many cases is basic knowledge or easily proven by a license. For the business models studied the competence is most relevant for Collaborative Lifestyles where a service is performed. Although, the tasks performed on the platforms within this study consist of simple tasks. Even though there is not a high complexity of the tasks the platforms still enhance the competence of the users.

Further, management control systems to assess benevolence have not been identified to a large extent. From the study it has been found that it can be hard to express or show a person’s benevolence through a platform online, which can be an explanation to the lack of benevolence. The platforms where benevolence has been identified have enabled this assessment by controlling who can participate on the platform or by influencing the users through cultural aspects.

The fact that honesty and reliability are always present results in that what Botsman (2017b) refers to “why”- and “how”-aspects of trustworthiness are covered for all business models. However, these aspects are covered in different ways and by different controls. Reliability and competence represent the “how”-aspect and honesty and benevolence represent the “why”-aspect. As mentioned before for Distributed Markets only honesty and reliability are identified. However, both “why”- and “how”-aspects of trustworthiness are covered even though only two out of four types of management control system are identified. In other words, the aspect of “why” and
“how” are always present. Hereby, it can be argued that it is of importance for a user to be able to assess how the counterpart acts and what motives the counterpart has although these aspects can be assessed to a varied extent on different platforms. The variations could be explained by the fact that there are different stakes involved and different risk factors for each business model. Therefore, the management controls needed vary.

Further, an interesting aspect that has been found is that the kind of management control systems used for enabling assessment of trustworthiness differs between the different business models. For instance, in the case of the Redistribution Market there are only action and result controls used. One explanation to this can be that the actions needed are often simple and known in advance. Moreover, it is possible to standardize the process to a large extent, which is beneficial for action and result control. Further, Baliga and Jaeger (1984) argue that in these kind of situations with simple and known tasks there is no need for a complex control system. Therefore, it is possible to manage the actions on the platform through action and result controls. In the case of Johansson & Winge there is only action control used and the management control systems used for enabling assessment of trustworthiness is not developed to the same extent. An explanation to why it is sufficient with only action control for Johansson & Winge can be that they have a more local focus than Tradera. The local focus results in that the counterparts meet in reality, which creates an opportunity to assess trustworthiness.

On the other hand, for the Product Service Systems three out of four controls, action, result and cultural controls, were utilized. This business model could be distinguished from the other two in the way that there was more focus on the cultural control. An explanation to the importance of cultural control can be that the behaviour and how to handle the rented asset is of importance. The fact that both platforms encourage the users to agree on expected behaviour and expectations in advance is an indication that this is a relevant explanation. In order to achieve the wanted behaviour from users it can be argued that cultural control can be useful in order to create a way of behaving on the platform. Compared to Redistribution Markets the actions and behaviour wanted for Product Service Systems is not as standardized or possible for the platform to predetermine. In addition, there is more interaction in reality between users for Product Service System compared to Redistribution Markets. This is beneficial when creating a trustworthy culture.

Moreover, Collaborative Lifestyles also utilize cultural control, although not to the same extent. The behaviour of the users are of relevance for Collaborative Lifestyles as well and likewise for Product Service Systems it can be hard for the platform organisation to standardize the behaviour since it is not always possible to determine due to the variety of tasks. However, what is most prominent for Collaborative Lifestyles is that all types of management controls have been used. In addition, it is also the only business model where personnel control has been identified. It can be
argued that the use of personnel control can compensate for the less used cultural control compared to Product Service Systems. Personnel control enables the platform to monitor what users that can participate on the platform or who can apply for the task, which then affect the behaviour on the platform. This way of influencing and monitoring behaviour can be seen as more useful than cultural control for this business model since competence is more relevant and therefore, the skills needed and match between requirement and competence is important. Hereby, personnel control through interviews or job design becomes useful for controlling behaviour.

Further, what was prominent for Collaborative Lifestyles is that the management control systems identified enable the assessment of all four characteristics of trustworthiness through a lot of different controls. In other words, a characteristic of trustworthiness can be identified through more than one kind of management control. A reason to the fact that all characteristics of trustworthiness can be assessed through the management control system for Collaborative Lifestyles can be that it is the user itself that perform the wanted task compared to for Redistribution Markets and Product Service Systems where a product is what the customer actually pays for. For instance, when buying a product or renting an asset. It can be argued that the role of the provider constitutes the main focus for Collaborative Lifestyles and therefore, it is of more importance to assess all four characteristics of trustworthiness of the user.

Lastly, Ouchi (1979) explains that the need of information does affect what control that is suitable. This could be another explanation to the differences found between the business models. For instance, in the case of Redistribution Markets it is easier for the platform to have knowledge about the best actions needed and to establish measures of performance since the tasks are easy and standardized. Therefore, action and result controls are suitable. In contrast Product Service Systems, for instance, can differ more from case to case since the expectation from the provider or customer on the manner of the counterpart can vary between different users. Thereby, it creates a need of establishing a culture that controls the actions of the users to complement the more formal controls that are more dependent on knowledge about wanted actions. Moreover, in the case of Collaborative Lifestyles there is a need of information about the provider and that the provider is suitable for the task, which makes personnel a relevant management control system.
6. Concluding Discussion

The aim of the present research was to create an understanding of how platform organisations use control systems to create trustworthy platforms. What can be concluded is that management control systems are important for enabling users to assess trustworthiness of other actors on the platform. This study has identified all four types of Management Control Systems by Merchant and Van der Stede (2012), action-, result-, personnel- and cultural control for enabling assessment of trustworthiness. However, there are different management control systems adopted for the different business models. Although, what is common for all business models is that the management control systems always focus on enabling assessment of characteristics of trustworthiness both in the aspect of “how” and “why”, as describes by Botsman (2017b).

This study has contributed to previous research within management accounting by empirical evidence that management control systems are important and used within the firm boundary-spanning context of platform organisations. Hereby, the domain of management control has been broadened and it has been shown that the management control system of Merchant and Van der Stede (2012) is not only applicable for employees. These contributions are important since a firm boundary-spanning context and heterarchical relations become more common (Otley, 1994; Van der Meer-Kooistra & Scapens, 2008). Therefore, it is of relevance to see how management control systems are used within this context. Moreover, this study has contributed by confirming that different types of management control systems are of importance for different business models for enabling assessment of trustworthiness. In addition, this study has contributed to the study of de Rivera et al. (2017) by showing that not only the architecture of the platform, but also the management control systems, differ between business models.

Additionally, the Framework for Analysis has been used in relation to characteristics of trustworthiness and has been found relevant for this aspect as well. In other words, this study has contributed with findings on how management control systems can be used for enabling assessment of the different characteristics of trustworthiness. In relation to the study of Kornberger et al. (2017), we extend the view of what is important from a management control perspective in order to create trustworthiness on a platform. Kornberger et al. (2017) focus on management accounting for platform organisations and found what they call evaluative infrastructure, which includes for instance, feedback and rating. Additionally, Stone et al. (2014) have studied the role of the management control system in order to carry out the strategy of Ebay. They have found that reviews and evaluations are of importance for trustworthiness. However, this study has found various functions important for trustworthiness that are not limited to an evaluative characteristic, such as result control. Also, functions within action, personnel and cultural control have been found useful for enabling the assessment of trustworthiness. Hereby, a wider view of what is important for creating
trustworthiness has been identified. These contributions are useful to understand how trustworthiness is established on the platform, which is needed for users to be willing to participate on the platform.

Moreover, this study has extended the scope of the study by Vélez et al. (2008) in many different aspects and thereby, contributed to previous research within management control systems in the following aspects. To begin with, the study of Vélez et al. (2008) focuses on an inter-organisational relationship that is stable and long-term and where trust is already well established. The researchers investigate how management control systems can generate trust between the actors. Instead, this research focus on a platform where peer to peer actors interact with strangers and the platform organisation’s use of management control systems for enabling the platform’s users to assess the trustworthiness of other users on the platform. In other words, these are two different contexts and relationships. Moreover, in the study of Vélez et al. (2008) the management control system is established and used by the two actors where trust is generated. On the other hand, in this study there is a third actor, the platform organisation, which establishes and monitors the management control system used. Thereby, the platform organisation enables assessment of trustworthiness between two other actors, the users on the platform. Another difference is that the study of Vélez et al. (2008) focuses on trust while this study focuses on trustworthiness. Hereby, it can be concluded that this study has found that the logic of Vélez et al. (2008) is applicable in other settings.
6.1 Contribution to practice

The insights of this study have contributed to practise within the area of platform organisation in various ways. Firstly, the results of the study can guide the organisations on how they can enable trustworthiness between strangers on the platform by using different management control systems in form of different functions and processes on the platform. Further, the fact that different management control systems were used in different business models could be useful in practise since there can be different controls and functions that are important for different platform organisations. To be aware of this increases the chance of enabling assessment of trustworthiness on the platform and thereby, increasing the willingness of users to participate on the platform. In addition, awareness of this prevents practitioners to imitate other platforms within other business models and thereby, adopting unsuitable management control systems.

Since the management control systems of relevance differs between business models a recommendation to practice would be to investigate the business model of the platform in question. Hereby, a deeper understanding of what aspects are important for trustworthiness in the specific case is enabled and thereby, the right issues would be approached by the management control system. What was prominent for the business model Collaborative Lifestyle is that the provider is the main attribute of the service and therefore personnel control is of importance for these kinds of platforms. Therefore, platforms within this business model should consider including personnel control. Further, the ability to perceive competence of the counterpart seems to be important and can be achieved by for instance, personnel- and result control, such as interviews and rating and review systems. In the case of Product Service System, the asset is in focus and the study has shown that cultural controls such as meet-ups are suitable to impact the behaviour and agree on expected behaviour of the users. Lastly, for Redistribution Markets, have a well-developed processes that users adhere to is a main attribute that practitioners should focus on and it has been shown that to achieve this, action and result control are suitable.

6.2 Limitations and Future Research

There are still many research opportunities within the context of platforms and management control. Based on our study, it has been found that the management control system is of relevance in a firm boundary-spanning context as well. Therefore, it would be interesting to see how a controller's role is changing due to new business contexts, such as platforms. In addition, it has been found that online trust differs internationally (Shankar, Urban & Sultan, 2002). Therefore, it would be interesting to conduct a similar study with an international perspective and international selection of platforms. Do the local conditions affect the established management controls system? Moreover, the way the assessment of trustworthiness is enabled through the management control system in other contexts than platform organisations could also
be studied. For example, in other situations where trustworthiness is of importance, such as managing brokers.

One limitation of this study is that there are only two companies within each business model, which increases the risk of not identifying all management controls used within this business model. Hereby, the generalizability decreases. Therefore, it would be relevant to extend our study by including more companies. Furthermore, to extent this study it would be interesting to investigate if the Management Control System used depend on if there is a business-to-business or individual-to-individual relation between the users.

Furthermore, a limitation is that there can be factors not included in the study that affect the validity. For instance, we have not been able to conclude on how the turnover of users on the platform can be an underlying reason to the identified differences between business models. Therefore, it would be interesting to study whether the turnover of users affect the perceived trustworthiness of the users and the needed management control systems. Additionally, another aspect that could not be explained by this study is how the number of transactions or users on the platform affects the management controls used for enabling assessment of trustworthiness. The number of transactions could possibly create better or worse conditions for a specific type of control. For instance, controls such as interviews could be hard to handle when there is a large amount of transactions or users.
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Appendix 1

Interview guide - First round

Questions in bold font are the main questions steering the interview. The sub questions are only written to ensure that the researchers will ask questions to get the respondent to talk about these aspects. However, those questions were not explicitly asked and formulated like they were in the interview guide.

Background

● Tell us about yourself and your position at your company.

Introduction

● How would you describe your company and your platform?
  ○ Who are your main competitors?
  ○ Describe your organisational structure.

● How does your platform work?
  ○ What is needed from an individual in order to start an account become a user on the platform?
  ○ Profiles? Rating and reviews?
  ○ How do you generate revenues?

Managing the platform

● Do you strive for a standardised process or do you strive to create a more flexible platform?
  ○ What have you chosen to standardize/not standardize?
  ○ Do you have control of the prices? Recommendations for prices?
  ○ How does the payment work?

● To what extent do you communicate with the providers/customers?
  ○ What kind of information do you communicate?
  ○ Do you educate your users? Introducing information?
  ○ Can anybody register and be a user?

● Are there any opportunities for development/career for users on the platform.
  ○ Collecting credits?
  ○ Rewards such as “best seller”. Certificate for being a good provider/customer?

● Do you follow up/analyse result/profitability of users?
  ○ Usage of information about users’ activity? demography, preferences?
  ○ Planning - Any performance requirements on providers/customers. Do you convey your expectations on users.
○ Do you convey the company's internal goals to users?

● **Do you include feedback on the platform?**
  ○ Reward & Compensation?
  ○ Ratings and reviews visible for other users?
  ○ How do you utilise this information when developing the platform?

● **Is there anyone of the employees at your company that are responsible for the performance of users on the platform?**
  ○ Do you supervise the activity on the platform?

● **How do you ensure a big enough amount of users? Do work actively with matching the supply and demand of providers/customers?**
  ○ Difficult to estimate future supply and demand?

● **Do you work actively with creating a culture on the platform?**
  ○ How?
  ○ What kind of culture?
  ○ Do you convey internal values to users?
  ○ Meetups, forums for users?

● **What do you do in order to create a trustworthy and safe environment on the platform?**
  ○ What do you do if something goes wrong on the platform? What are your responsibilities?
  ○ Can users be suspended?

● **Do you have any guidance of behaviour for users?**
  ○ How do you convey these?
  ○ Do you have any formal contract for behaviour?

● **What do you perceive as the biggest challenge with being a platform organisations?**

● **Has your way to manage the platform changed over time?**
  ○ How?
  ○ Why did you do the changes?
  ○ Have you perceived any problems with the way you have historically or how you right now manage the platform?
Appendix 2

Interview - Second round

*Questions in bold font are the main questions steering the interview. The sub questions are only written to ensure that the researchers will ask questions to get the respondent to talk about these aspects. However, those questions were not explicitly asked and formulated like they were in the interview guide.*

- **Do you perceive that the users can doubt the trustworthiness of other actors?**
  - Which user (provider/customer) do you perceive have the most problems with trustworthiness of other actors?
  - In what way do you think the users doubt the other actors performance and actions?

- **What kind of information do you convey to users? Exemplify.**
- **Do you convey internal values externally? To what extent do you convey rules for behaviour respectively values?**
- **Do you have any group awards for users?**
- **Can a user express personal information such as interests and intentions?**
  - In what way?
- **Can you see the response rate of other users?**
- **Do you have any restrictions on what has to be included in the profile?**
  - Profile picture?
- **Do you recommend the users to communicate any special information when they are in contact with other users?**
- **Do you utilize algorithms?**
  - For matching users?
  - For ranking the search result?